LABBAI (LUBBAI) (Tamil, iḻoppai, said to be a corruption of arabi), a class of Indian Musalman, also known as Ḏojnaks (Skt. varana, “Greek, western”), supposed to be descended from Arab immigrants who intermarried with native women, but now having nothing to distinguish them from the aboriginal people, except their mode of dress and manner of shaving the head and trimming the beard. In 1911 they numbered 401,703, found chiefly on the E. coast of Southern India. Most of them are Sunnis, of the Shāfī madhhab, and their head-quarters are at Nagore, the burial place of their patron saint, Shāh al-Hamid 'Abd al-Kādir (ob. 1600), commonly known as Kādir Wali or Mīrān Shāh (see Gazetteer of the Tanjore District, p. 243). They read the Kurān in Tamil translation, written in Arabic characters. They are industrious and enterprising, especially as fishermen and traders.


LABBAKA. [See TALHIYA.]

LABĪD B. RABI'A ABŪ 'A'ĪS Ḥ, an Arab poet of the pagan period, who lived into the days of Islam (muxhadram), belonged to the family of Banū Ḍajjar, a branch of the Khālaba, who belonged to the Banū 'Amir and therefore to the tribe of Hawāzin. According to Ibn Sa'd, vi. 21, he died in 40 (660/661) in the night on which Mu'awiyah arrived in al-Nakhlah to conclude peace with Ḥasan b. 'Alī. Others, like Ibn Hadjar, iii. 657, whom Nöldeke (Fünf Meṣ'alaṭyāt, ii. 51) thinks ought to be followed, give 41 a. h., others again 42. He is said to have reached an unusually great age (al-Sidjestānī, K. al-Mu'ammārin, ed. Goldziher, ch. 61). In fact he makes several allusions to this in his poems. The date of his birth can only be approximately fixed. Even before 600 a. d. he seems to have attained a prominent position in his tribe by his command of language. As quite a young man he is said to have accompanied a deputation from his tribe to the court of king Abū Kābūs Nu'mān of al-Hira (c. 580—602), and when the latter was invited against the Banū 'Amir by his friend Abū Rabi' b. Ziyād al-'Aṣīs (of the tribe to which Labīd's mother belonged), Labīd succeeded with a satirical raqīṣ (Divān, No. 33) in so ridiculing him to the king that he restored his favour to the Banū 'Amir. A verse from Nu'mān's answer to his counsellor who sought to defend himself from the lampoon on him became proverbial (cf. al-Mufaḍḍal, al-Fāakhir, i. 41 sq.; al-'Askarī, Amtahl, on the margin of Maitānī, ii. 33; K. al-Abārānī, iv. 1—94 sqq., 91 sqq., xvi. 1—22 sqq., 21 sqq.; 'Abd al-Kādir, Ḍojnān al-Adab, ii. 79 sqq., iv. 171 sqq.). In his later poems Labīd also often prides himself on having helped his tribe by his eloquence. He remained loyal to his tribe even when a famous poet and scorned the profession of a wandering singer, practised by his contemporary al-'Aṣārī. But the coming of the Prophet Muhammad threw him out of the usual groove. We do not know the exact date of his conversion to Islam. As early as Ḏumādā II of the year 8 the chiefs of the tribe of 'Amir b. Ṣa'da, 'Amir b. Tufail and Arbad b. Kais, a stepbrother of Labīd, seem to have negotiated in Medina about the adhesion of their tribe to the new constitution without reaching any result (see Caetani, Annali, ii. 90 sqq.). Both men are said to have soon after come to an untimely end, 'Amir from plague and Arbad from a lightning stroke; the latter story seems to find confirmation in Labīd's lament for him (Divān, No. 5). The accusation on the other hand that Arbad attempted to kill the Prophet is quite incredible; for in that case Labīd, could hardly have composed several elegies on him and they would certainly not have been included in his Divān. In the year 9 the tribe again sent a delegation to Medina which included the poet and an agreement was reached. Labīd is said on this occasion to have become a Muslim. He later migrated to Kāfā where he died. Of his family only a daughter is mentioned who is said to have inherited his talent (see al-Maitānī, ii. 49 sqq.; al-Ghuzūlī, Mafāsī al-Budūrī, i. 52 sqq.).

Labīd's poems were very highly esteemed by the Arabs. Al-Nabigha is said to have declared him the greatest poet among the Arabs or at least of his tribal group, the Hawāzin, on account of his Mω'allaṭū. He himself is said to have claimed third place after Imru 'l-Kais and Ṣa'da. Al-Djumābi (Ṭubahāt al-Shawārī, ed. Heill, p. 29 sqq.) places him in the third class of pagan poets along with al-Nabigha al-Djumābi, Abū Dhūlāib and al-Shummākī. Labīd showed himself equally master of the Ḍuzūl, the mawṣūla and the kāfūra. One of his Ḍuzūl was adopted into the collection of mω'allaṭūt and is thought by Nöldeke (Fünf Meṣ'alaṭyāt, ii. 51) to be one of the best specimens of Beduin poetry. Labīd uses the traditional pictures from the animal world — wild asses and antelopes fleeing before the hunter and fighting with his dogs — as charmingly as the usual complacencies about drinking bouts. He seems on the other hand to have only cultivated the mω'ab, because it had been traditional. He deals far less with the subject of woman's love than with the description of the AṭĪl which he likes to compare with
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artistic calligraphy. He is also fond of recalling memories of places of his native district, the palm-groves and irrigation works of which continually move him to charming descriptions; indeed in one such connection he gives the whole itinerary (Diriān, No. 19, v. 4 sqq.) of a journey from central Arabia to the coast of the Persian Gulf (see von Kremer, op. cit., p. 12). As his almost contemporary Abū Dhū‘ayib is fond of doing, in the Mā‘allaqa, v. 55 sqq. he turns however once more to his beloved and thus combines the nasīb with the main part of the kāfīda to an organic whole; but for him this is simply a mode of transition to a new descriptive passage. His poetry is however distinguished from that of other poets of the pagan period by a certain religious feeling which seems to have been not exactly rare among his contemporaries, even before Muhammad’s mission. While Zuhair, for example, still expresses his practical wisdom derived from the experience of a long life, in plain though impressive language, Labid on such occasions always strikes a religious note. He certainly did not profess Christianity nor can we see in him a representative of the so-called Ḥanifs of the Sīra, as von Kremer wished to do. In him rather we find the belief in Allāh as the guardian of morality finding particular expression, a belief widely disseminated in Arabia by the preaching of the Christian church. Such passages naturally invited the Muslim traditionalists to increase them. Indeed a later author went so far as to ascribe to him a verse by Abū ʿAṭā‘iyāh (fig. 18). But many passages of his Dirīān seem to owe inspiration to their author. The statement that he wrote no more poetry after his conversion to Islam is obviously an invention (see Ibn Sahl, vi. 21, 4, repeated later; e.g. al-Chuṭā‘ī, Ma‘ṣūr, i 52 infra); it is contradicted by the simple fact that poems 21 and 53 of the Dirīān were composed shortly before his death (K. al-Aḥānān, xi. 101) The description of Paradise (Dirīān, No. 3, 4) is certainly inspired by the Kurān like the idea that precedes it, that a record is kept of the doings of men. Under the influence of Islam in No. 39 and 41, verses 11 of which, as Ibn Kūtāiba (K. al-Aḥānān, p. 153), already points out, certainly must be written after his conversion, it is not to be considered an interpolation, he replaces the nasīb by pious admonitions. Thus he creates a new artistic form that of poetical paraphrase on the transitory acts of human life; besides the Kurān he may of course have been influenced by Christian preaching. He only follows older models in the connection when he combines admonition with the averting of blame from a woman in No. 14, as in Tanfā’s Mū‘allaqa, verses 50 sqg. 63–65 (cf. C. Schökel, Das Schiskīt, p. 9). The jump herein is only an episode in the text.


LACCADIVES (Lākhā dīwān, “the hundred thousand isles”), a group of coral atolls lying off the Malabar Coast between 8° and 14° N. and 71° 40’ and 74° E. There are thirteen islands in all, but only eight are inhabited, and these are divided into two groups—the northern, including the inhabited islands of Aminī, Kardamāt, Kīltān and Cettāt, and the southern, including the inhabited islands of Attā, Kavaitāt, Androth and Kelpen. The northern group, for administrative purposes, forms part of the south Kārnā District and the southern, of the Malabar District. To the south of the Laccadives stands the isolated island of Minikōi, belonging physically, neither to this group nor to the Maldives, but approaching rather to the latter. The Laccadives were originally colonized by Hindus from Malabar but the inhabitants were converted to Islam in the thirteenth century, according to tradition. They number about 10,000, and in habits and customs resemble the Mā‘pīllass of North Malabar, but their women hold a higher position, and are neither veiled nor secluded. Inheritance follows the female line. The people formerly owned allegiance to the Rāja but were virtually independent until, in the sixteenth century, the Rāja be-towed them on his admiral, the Ḥāli Ṭāja of Kanan, whose descendants governed them until 1791, when Kanan was conquered by the British, into whose hands they fell.


(L. W. Hagen)

LĀDHIK (Lādeīk, Gr. Λαδήικα), the name of several towns in Asia Minor.

1. The ancient Lādeīkai kai ārēs ev Aòsia Mínos (Lādeīkai). It probably derived this name from the smelting furnaces which it had, around the centre of the quicksilver mining area. It was in Karaman on the west coast of Asia Minor. Hājjī Khāliṣī knew it by its modern name of Yörğān Lādeīk or Lādhikīya in Karaman.

LÄDIK — AL-LÄDHIKĪYA


2. Lâdik (Hadżâl Khâla’a: Lâdkhîa), the ancient Laodicea ad Lycum in the southeast of Djemînîya. Al-Battāni calls it, following Greek sources, Lâdkhîyû Frêdî (Φρέδίς) while Ptolomy places it in Caria. According to Ibn Baṭîta it was a large town with 7 Friday mosques, beautiful gardens, flowing rivers and springs and fine markets. The Greek women there made remarkably beautiful and durable woolen goods, embroidered with gold. Ibn Baṭîta also praises the hospitality of the inhabitants but censures the freedom of their morals. Slave girls were sold and prostitution practised even in the public baths. On the history of the town (now Eski Hîgar) see Dârîzî.


3. Lâdik, the ancient Laodikeia Po- sitiva south of Amâsia.


AL-LÄDHIKĪYA, a sea-port in Northern Syria, the ancient Laodikeia Λαοδίκεια; ïπι ἐκάστου. It was founded by Seleucus I, who called it after his mother Laodike, and towards the end of the Seleucid empire it was a member of the alliance of the four most important Syrian cities, the πολές ἀλλήλας, Antiocheia, Apameia, Seleuceia and Laodicea. In the reign of Justinian I it became the capital of the newly founded province of Thraciopolis.

When the Arabs under the governor of Hims, 'Ubâda b. al-Asîr, advanced on the town, the inhabitants made a determined resistance. 'Ubâda encamped near Lâdîkîya and had deep trenches dug in which even horsemen could advance unobserved. After a prolonged retreat he returned in the night and was then able to sur- prise the inhabitants who had unsuspectingly opened the great gate of the city, and to enter the town. The citadel was then stormed and 'Ubâda proclaimed upon the walls Allâh akhbar. A section of the Christian inhabitants was forced to surrender (Greek: τρικλήσιον; al-Baladhûrî, ed. de Goeje, p. 133, 4 should thus be corrected for al-Yusayyîd: Ed. Schwarz in Wellhausen, Z. D. M. G., lx. 246). Their request to be allowed to return to the town was granted on payment of a fixed sum as khârîj. They retained possession of their church, while 'Ubâda had a new mosque built which was later enlarged (al-Baladhûrî, op. cit., p. 132 sq.). About 97 (according to al-Baladhûrî: 100 A. H.), the Greeks attacked the coast of al-Lâdîkîya with a fleet, burned the town and carried off its inhabitants as prisoners. Baladhûrî, op. cit.; Balîkî, *Târîkh*, 731-978, xviii., p. 135. 'Umar had al-Lâdîkîya rebuilt, fortified and ransomed the inhabitants from their captors. Yazîd confirmed the restoration of the city after 'Umar's death and he also put a garrison in it. According to another story however, Yazîd's services to the town were only the renovation of the defences and the strengthen- ing of the garrison (al-Baladhûrî, op. cit.; Mašâ'î, *Mamââlîk al-†âbâh*, Paris, viii., p. 281).

The Nicephoros Phoka in 961, freed the whole of Northern Syria from the Byzantines (Yahyâ b. Sa‘îd al-Anjâski, ed. Krâtîkovsky and Vasiliev in *Petrolog. Oriental*, 1924, xviii., p. 816). In 980, according to Yahyâ b. Sa‘îd, who, Rosen thinks, took his statement from a local chronicle of al-Lâdîkîya, the emperor Basîl II appointed a certain Kârmûrûk, who had distinguished himself in an expedition against Ŧârubûlus which belonged to the Fâimid, to be governor of the town. When it was besieged by the Arabs Nazîzî and Ibn Shâkir, he was captured during a sortie, and beheaded in Cairo (Rosen, *Zaﬁrî Imp. Akad. Nauk*, xlv., p. 16 sqq., 153 sqq.). Michael Burztes (al-Burzî) in 992 put down a rising of the Muslims in the town and had them deported to Bilad al-†âmî (Yahyâ, ed. Rosen, op. cit., p. 30, 237). In 1056 al-Lâdîkîya belonged to the Banû Mun‘îb of Shaisar (Derenbourg, *Ouâsîme*, p. 27 sq) who had, however, to cede it to the Salûdî Malik Shâh. In August 1068, the Count of Normandy took the town; it then passed in rapid suc- cession to the Byzantines, to Bohemund of Tarento, to the Byzantines again and finally after 15 months' siege, to Tancred of Antîkîya (Hohlrett, *Gesch. des Kyris. †aum*, p. 45, note 8). In 1104 we again find the Greeks besieging it by land and sea, and Bohemund promised the Emperor Alexis ComnenoS in the treaty of Devol (1108) the cession of this πστευσις among other places (Anna ComnenoS, *Alexias*, Bonn, ii., p. 241, 6). Tancred however soon afterwards with the help of a Pisan fleet took the town which in the meanwhile had again passed over to the Muslims. The governor of Ŧalab took and sacked it in 1136; in 1157 and 1170 it was visited by two severe earthquakes, in the latter only the principal church was damaged intact. On July 21, 1188, Sâ‘îd al-Dîn took the town (*îmâd al-Dîn, Fâthî*, p. 141; Ali Shâmîa, *Kîlîb al-Rawdûfîn*, ed. Cairo 1257/1288, ii., p. 128 = *Hist. Orient. des Crois.*, iv., p. 361). In autumn 1197 Bohemund III succeeded once more in conquering al-Lâdîkîiya or a part of the town at least. In 1223 the Ŧalabîs destroyed the town or its citadel out of fear of the Christians approaching on the Fifth Crusade. But even after this (since 1197), half the city remained in possession of the Franks. Baillars in 1275 demanded that they should hand over this part of it. In 1281 al-Lâdîkîya belonged to the emir Ŧonkûr, to whom the Sûlîta had been forced to surrender it in a treaty (June 24); but after the fall of Ŧonkûr, another emir won it back from Baillars (April 20, 1287); soon afterwards a new earthquake almost completely destroyed several of its strong towers, the pigeon-tower, the light-house and the towers in the sea; great siege engines completed the destruction of the fortifications.

AL-LĀDIḤIYAH

París MSS. Abb. 4430, fol. 94v, 152v, 243v, in van Berchem, Voyage en Syrie, p. 29c, note 3; al-Kalqashandi, Ṣūbāh al-fishāḥ, iv. 145, transl. Gaudez-Demblynes, La Syrie, p. 113 sq.). The Arab geographers and historians mention many ancient buildings that had survived in the town; they also tell of two castles connected with one another on a hill which commanded al-Lādiḥiyah (Bahā al-Din, in Hist. Or. des Crois., ii. 116), a great city-gate, which it took a number of men to open (al-Baladhuri, op. cit., p. 132), and the description of it in the modern town of al-Din (Maxuṭ, Muḥadi ḍi al-Dhahīṣ al-Ṣawāl, p. 281; Dimashki, ed. Mehren, p. 209; Abu l-Fikrī, Geogr., transl. Reinaud-Guyard, i. 35; in Ibn Baṭṭalīa, i. 183; al-Farāhi), called after Till Fāris still the name of the eminence to the north of the town (M. Hartmann, Z.D.P.V., xiv., pp. 166 and map). A short description of al-Lādiḥiyah is given by Rasul of Cæsarea (Geisa Tamuradi, ch. 144; Kohler, Z.D.P.V., x. 316 has put together a list of the monuments of the town from Frankish and other sources). In spite of the earthquakes and frequent pillaging that occurred in the town in course of centuries, it never seems to have been quite desolate and uninhabited. The fine, high houses and the straight streets, paved with marble blocks, noted by Ibn al-Muḥir and Abu Shāma (Hist. Or. des Crois., i. 740; iv. 361) and which they say had suffered much when the town was sacked (cf. also Yaqūbī, ed. de Goeje, B.G.A., vii 258), recall the description of Laodicea in Posidonius as a kallipta ἔστησεν πάν. (Strabo, xvi., p. 753), and of the modern town van Berchem says (J.A., 1902, p. 425; cf. Voyage, i. p. 289 sq.): la ville de Lattakia a gardé ses rues droites. Il est curieux que ce plan, d'aspect tout moderne, existât au moyen âge, il remonte peut-être à l'antiquité, comme certaines rues droites de Damas et de Jerusalem. The origin of the straight streets and the square plan of the town (cf. Th. Schreiber in the Pfeifferchrift fur H. Kiepert, 1898, p. 335-348) has been ascribed to architects of the Roman empire (A. v. Gerkan, Grieche. Staatsbauten, 1924, passim), but more recently Cultrera has shown that they already existed in the early Hellenistic period and had been borrowed a-early as by Hippodamos of Miletus (fifth century) from the architecture of the ancient east (Architekturne Fundamente, in Memoire dell' Accad. dei Lincei, ser. v., vol. xvii., p. 403; 433 sq.; 473): Cannom, Familier du Douair-Europe, Paris 1916, xix. note 4, 25 sq., 483).


LAGHUAT, al-Aghawat, a town and oasis in Southern Algeria, 250 miles south of Algiers in 2°55' East, Lat., 33°48' N. Lat., at 2,400 feet above sea-level. In 1911 it had 5,599 inhabitants of whom 955 were Europeans. Laghaut which forms part of the "Territorial" of Ghardaia is the capital of a mixed commune and a native commune of 6,650 square miles with 19,810 inhabitants.

The town and the oasis lie on the right bank of the Wād Miṣr, which comes from the Djebel Amīr and finally under the name of Wād Ḥiḍī on the right bank of which is the Shasjel Melghir in the south of the province of Constantine. The houses lie in terraces on the slopes of two rocky hills, spurs of the Djebel Tisgarte, the European quarter on the north-west slope and the native quarter on the north-east slope. It is defended by a wall and two forts on the summit. The oasis extends in a semi-circle north-west and south-east of the town. The north-west part is the more extensive and contains palm groves and fields of cereals. A canal led by a dam from the Wād Miṣr called the Wād Lekkher provides for the irrigation of the gardens. The palm-trees to the number of 30,000 produce dates of mediocre quality, but they supply the food of the inhabitants. The situation of Laghaut between the southern Osrān and southern Constantine at the point where roads diverge to the west, to the Ulā Sidi Shāhik, to the south of the Mab and to Wargla, to the east to the Ziban and Biskra, makes this place a considerable centre of commerce.

History. In the tenth century A.D. there was already on the banks of the Wād Miṣr a little town, the inhabitants of which, after having recognised the authority of the Fātimids, took part in the rebellion of Aḥd Yazid. The country round was inhabited by wandering Berbers of the family Maghrawa. The Hilāli invasion brought other tribes of the same stock into this region, notably the Kelse, driven out of the Zab, who founded a village called Ben Bitta. The rest of Kyur (Ba Membala, Nadjar, Solī Mīmīn, Badila, Khashat Ben Fotli) were built by other refugees, some of Arab origin (Dawwāda, Ulā bi Zayan), others came from the Mab. These groups together took the name of al-Aghawat.

We know very little of the history of this town down to the xvith century. At the end of the
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xvith century it paid tribute to the Sultan of Morocco; in 1666 the Kshar of Badala and of Kasbat Fotou were abandoned. In 1698 a Marabout originally from Tlemcen, Si Al-Hajj}dji Aissa, settled at Ben Bita, imposed his authority on the people of the three Kshar and on the neighbouring tribe of the Lurba. Under his leadership the people of Lahquat defeated the people of Ksar Al-Agha but were forced to pay tribute to the Sultan of Morocco, Mulay Ismail, who camped under the walls of the town in 1708. After the death of Si Al-Hajj}dji Aissa (1738 a.d.) the history of Lahquat is reduced to that of the struggle between the two sons who disputed control of it, the Uld Serghine, of the south-west quarter and the Hallaf who inhabited the north-east quarter. In the middle of these feuds which bathed the oasis in blood, the Turks made their supremacy recognised. In 1727 the Bey of Titter had imposed an annual tribute on the Kshtrians. The Mzabis driven from the oasis where they had acquired a part of the gardens, formed for the nomads of the south a confederation, over which the people of Lahquat triumphed with the help of the Lurba. Towards the end of the xvith century the Turks reappeared and enforced once more their suzerainty with an army small, while the town had been gradually casting off. The Bey of Melea fell in the first expedition (1784), but the Bey of Oran, Muhammed al-Kabir, seized the town and destroyed the quarter of the Uld Serghine (1786). His successor Othman then took the field against the Hallaf whom he scattered (1787).

The two enemy factions were not long however in reorganising themselves and civil strife began again until the chief of the Hallaf, Ahmad b. Salim, succeeded in making himself master of Lahquat and the neighbouring Kshas (1828). But peace did not last long. The Uld Serghine supported by Abid al-Kadir regained the upper hand in 1837. Their chief Al-Hajj}dji al-Arbi was appointed khalifa by the Amir. He could not fight and was forced to take refuge in Mzab. His successor Abid al-Ba} was no more fortunate, although he had 700 regular troops and a cannon. In obedience to the Amir's orders he tried to imprison the notables but this provoked risings and he had to leave Lahquat (1839). Al-Hajj}dji al-Arbi, again appointed khalifa, was defeated by Ahmad b. Salim in alliance with the Marabout of Ain Mahdi, Tidjani, and then taken prisoner. Thus becoming again lord of Lahquat, Ahmad b. Salim placed himself under French protection who appointed him their khalifa in 1844. A French column under the command of Colonel Marey-Monge on this occasion camped at the very gates of Lahquat. The French came back again in 1847 but did not definitively install themselves till 1852, when the Sharif Muhammed b. Abdullah, already lord of Wargla, had gained entrance to the town with the help of a section of the Hallaf. To retake it from him a column was sent under General Pelissier. Lahquat was taken by storm after a desperate fight in which General Boucaren and Commandant Morand were killed (December 1852). A permanent garrison was then stationed in Lahquat and it became the base of French operations in the south.

Bibliography: R. Basset, Les dictors satiriques attribues a Sidi Ahmed ben Youcef, in J.A., 1890; E. Daumas, Le Sahara al-

gierien,Paris 1845; Fromentin, Un et des Sahare,Paris 1874; Marey Monge, Expedition de Lahquat, Algiers 1844; Moulay Ahmad, Voyages dans le sud de l'Algerie, transl. Bertrugger,Paris 1846.

LAHIJDJ, a sultanate in South Arabia with its capital of the same name north-west of Aden, bounded by the Hwahabi territory on the north, the Fa'li territory on the east, the Akrabi land in the south and the Sabiha territory in the west. The capital, called Lahijdj or el-Huse lies at a height of 350 feet above sea-level between the two Tanns of the Wadi Tabar, the Wadi Lahijdj and the Wadi Kabir, in a fertile oasis which, occupying a wide valley, owes its existence to its irrigation by canals led from the mountain streams and wells of excellent water as much as 15 feet deep. The town is surrounded by palm-groves and fields on which cereals are grown, notably durra (holcus sergum) and different vegetables; in addition to date-palms there are all kinds of fruit trees, including citrons and cocoa-palms, this being one of the most northerly points in Arabia where the latter are found. The town which was visited in 1503 by Ladovico di Barthena and in 1810 by V. G. von Stocken and which Neidhofer still calls on the town wall of Lahijdj 400 houses and 800 straw or reed huts with almost 5,600 inhabitants, owes its prosperity to the Russo-Turkish war in the course of which in 1878 England temporarily proclaimed a state of siege in 'Aden and exacted the Arabs and Somalis from 'Aden. The latter went to Lahijdj where they built themselves thousands of huts close to the town, which now form extensive suburbs and considerably increased the number of inhabitants. The sea of houses is dominated by the palace of the Sultan, built by Italian architects and four or five stories high with extensive subsidiary buildings; it is entirely built of clay and painted white. The palace is surrounded by a clay wall, on the east of which lies the town with its numerous rectangular flat-roofed houses, all built of sun-dried bricks made of a mixture of dung, clay, straw and dried grass and one or two stories high. The monotony of the picture is broken only by the very simple, insignificant mosques which are outlined in white round the roof. To the east of the palace in the shade of beautiful leafy trees and palms is a pleasant looking one-storied bungalow built by the Sultan for foreign guests. Round the town are scattered little groups of low straw huts, made of durra stems and surrounded by a hedge which are inhabited by Somalis and their families. In addition to these there are also Sawalls settled in Lahijdj. The great mass of the inhabitants however are Yemen Arabs, who live in the numerous houses and mud-huts, which form the town with its narrow, winding, dusty streets. A part of the town is reserved for the Jews, who look wretched and are merchants and artisans. There are also a few Muslim Jews who are traders. All types of the population are met with in the bazaar street which is barely six feet wide. Not far from this is the armourers' market where smiths, Arabs and Jews have erected their simple workshops in open booths. The principal weapons made here are the fine daramkas while the long cavalry lances, which are used by the Yemen Kabilis are made in Dhajina, Ansab or Hawir and brought for sale to the Lahijdj market. In
Wellsted's time there were also 30 silk-weavers here, who got their yarn from India. The oasis is very well watered and the numerous little canals are fed by the perennial stream which passes not far from the town. Lahijj which plays an important part in the caravan traffic is connected by a road with 'Aden and in 1907 was to have been linked up by a railway with 'Aden and Dallë, part of which was actually surveyed but the plan was abandoned. England took up the scheme again in 1915 during the war and laid a strategic railway of 1 metre gauge for 25 miles to Lahijj; in 1921 it was extended a few miles beyond the oasis of Lahijj and now reaches Habil al-'Hamra, 8 miles N. W. of al-Hijj. The continuation of the railway to Sa'âb would open up Southern Yemen and increase the importance of Lahijj.

History. The name Lahijj (Lahij) which means a damp low lying area intersected by water-channels, a place-name that admirably suits Lahijj, is connected by the geologists with the Hijmyar Lahijj b. Wâli b. al-Ghawth b. Kânân b. 'Arîb b. Zuhair b. Abyan b. al-Humaisî and is applied by the geographers to a district in Yemen which forms part of the territory of Abyan north-east of 'Aden. Al-Hamdînî mentions it among the towns of Tihâmeh and says that in his time the descendants of Asbâh b. 'Amr b. al-Dhârthi Abu Abyâbâ b. Malik b. Zaid b. al-Ghawth b. Sa'd b. 'Abî b. Abyân b. Malik b. Zaid b. Sidab b. Zu'a Hijmyar al-Aghzir were alive. Ya'âsî says the same for the district of Lahijj which included the towns and villages. A number of poets, particularly South Arabsians, are familiar with the town, e.g. Kais b. Makhjûl 'Amr b. Ma'dikarîth, Khâdîjû b. 'Amr, Suiyid b. Hijmyar, Ahsân b. al-Sâlimî and especially the famous 'Umar b. Abî Khabâb, who had property there.

After Yemen had been won for Islâm, Lahijj shared the fortunes of this extensive province of the Arab empire Lahijj thus passed with Yemen to the Umayyads and then to the Abâbâsids until under al-Ma'mûn the bold 'Abî Ibrahim b. Mišî b. Di'âsîr b. Muhammad, drove his governor Isâhâk b. 'Isâ al-'Abâsî out of Yemen and made himself independent there. In 203 (818/9) the Caliph made a partition of Yemen by which the coast lands from Mecca to 'Aden were put under the governor Muhammad b. 'Abdallâh b. Ziyâd al-Umâwi who founded the town of Zaidih and became the founder of the Ziyâdî dynasty which with one interruption (the capture of Zaidih in 203 [905/6] by the Karmaçîn 'Abî b. al-Faqî al-Hijmyar al-Khôshârî, d. 309 [915/6]) ruled over Zaidih until 402 (1014/1015) Lahijj with 'Aden, Abyan, Harâanntî and al-Sâhirî passed into the hands of the Banû Ma'n in the time of the Abyssinian slaves, who ruled the Ziyâdî kingdom when the dynasty died out. In 436 (1047/1048) 'Aden came under the rule of 'Abî b. Muhammad al-Sâhirî (d. 459 = 1066/67). Zu'ayî b. al-'Abbâsî (d. 485 = 1092/93) was installed as governor there and ruled in a practically independent fashion. Ibn 'Umar, the ruler of Lahijj, al-Shîrî and Husamîn, who later seized 'Aden and ruled jointly with his brother Masûd, made an alliance with him. Their successors succeeded in conquering a great part of the Yemen, but internal dissensions soon weakened them and in 152 A.D., the caliph al-Manṣûr took 'Aden with the help of treachery and was able to hold it until the Ayyûbid al-Mâlik al-Mu'aqqam Tîrân-shîh in 1173 A.D. conquered a great part of Yemen including 'Aden, with whose fate that of Lahijj was henceforth linked. Tîrân-shîh placed a governor in 'Aden, the brother of the Imam of Sa'âb, Malik al-Masûd, whose successor Sulûn Nîr al-Dîn (1233-1249 A.D.) was the founder of the Rasûlîd dynasty of Yemen. He soon conquered the whole of the Yemen and ruled it under the nominal suzerainty of the Abû-basîd Caliph, with whom he quarrelled in 1249 so that Sulûn al-Malik al-Mu'aqqar Shâhîs al-Dîn was sent against him and took 'Aden and Lahijj from him. In 1251 al-Mu'aqqar granted Lahijj and 'Aden to his brothers Mafâdjîl and Fâsîs as a fief. Lahijj again changed its owner when in 294 Ibrahim b. Mu'aqqar took 'Aden and Lahijj, but had soon to part with them again to Dâ'ûd, Mu'aqqar's successor. In 1302 Lahijj passed as a fief to the Shârif Imâd al-Dîn Idrîs. In 1307 the town was pillaged by the Iqâshîl, in 1323 'Umar b. Dîvâdân rebelled in Abyân and Lahijj and besieged 'Aden as his son again did in 1325. In 1454 'Aden with its hinterland passed to the Tîhirîs who held it till 1507. The expeditionary force led by Husain al-Mu'âshirî which had marched from Tanîl Khânûn, sent them at the request of the Tîhirîd Sulûn 'Amîr b. 'Abî al-Wâshîbî to prevent the encroachment of the Portuguese in the Red Sea and which conquered a great part of the Yemen, only paved the way for the Turks. In 1538 the Turkish governor of Kulzum, Sulaimân Fâshâ, set out with a fleet and took 'Aden which belonged to the Turkish empire until in 1635 the Turks had to leave the Yemen, which again became independent under the Imâms of Sa'âb. Quarrals among the claimants to the imâmate however soon shattered the kingdom and in 1728 the 'Abdallâh leader Faqî b. 'Abî b. Faqî b. Sâîlî b. Sîfîm, the founder of the dynasty of Lahijj, made himself independent of the Imâms and made Lahijj the capital of his territory. In 1735 he took 'Aden. His grandson Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Karîm in 1802 concluded through Sir Home Popham a commercial treaty with England but his nephew and successor Muhsîn came into conflict with England (1837) through the plundering of the Indian ship Doria Dowlat by his people and thus lost 'Aden, the fort of which passed to England by a preliminary treaty concluded on January 25, 1838, while the Arabs in the town were to remain under the jurisdiction of the Sulûn of Lahijj who received in compensation a subsidy of 541 dollars a month. On January 19, 1839 the English occupied 'Aden and by a second treaty of June 18, 1839, Captain S. B. Haines made an arrangement between Sulûn Muhsîn of Lahijj and England, by which the former agreed to guarantee the security and regularity of the caravan traffic with 'Aden and to maintain a loyal friendship with England, while Haines in return undertook to pay subsidies to the tribes of Faqî, Ya'î, Hâshîb and 'Amir and to pay Sulûn Muhsîn and his descendants 6,500 dollars annually from Dhu l-Ka'da 1254. At the same time the contracting parties agreed to support one another in case of war between the 'Abdallâh and Lahijj, to put subjects of the Sulûn coming to 'Aden under English jurisdiction during the time of their stay and those who came to Lahijj from 'Aden under that of the Sulûn; further all goods belonging to
the Sultan, or his sons were to enter or leave 'Aden free of duty. In spite of this treaty the Sultan, who was still sore over the loss of 'Aden, continued to intrigue against the English and supported the attack of the Arabs on 'Aden in 1840 and even had the English representative in 'Aden, Hasan Khathib, murdered and regularly adopted a hostile attitude towards the English. His constant failures however forced him to change his policy and on February 11, 1843 he concluded a new agreement with England which was renewed in a more stringent form on February 20, 1844, before his monthly allowance was again paid to him. Muhsin b. Faḍl, who had again allowed himself to be involved in a war with England in 1816 in which he was defeated, died on November 30, 1847. His son and successor Ahmad maintained friendly relations with England as it was in his best interest to do so. He died in 1849 and was succeeded by his brother ʿAli who resumed a policy of hostility to England and roused the hostility of the tribes against 'Aden. On March 7, 1849 a treaty was however concluded with the East India Company which was ratified on October 30, by Lord Dalhousie, but an attitude of constant friendship to England was not thereby secured. The Sultan even cut off supplies and it finally came to open fighting in which the Sultan was defeated on March 15, 1858 at Sheik ʿUthman so that he had again to reconcile himself to a peaceful policy. When in 1873 the Turks in their reconquest of the Yemen advanced on the hinterland of 'Aden, the English occupied Lahij and the Turks had to retire as a result of English diplomatic negotiations with the Sublime Porte. Whether these negotiations were instigated or approved by the Sultan who had lost his independence — only nominal it is true — by the Turkish occupation of his territory, is not known. In any case in 1887, as E. Glaser records, Sultan Faḍl b. ʿAli was receiving a monthly allowance of 1,250 dollars from 'Aden.

GENEALOGICAL SURVEY OF THE SULTANS OF LAHIDJ.

Faḍl b. ʿAli b. Sinḥ b. Sālim (1728–1742)

(machine-cut text continues)

In the World War Turkey assumed the offensive from the Yemen in June 1915 against the English sphere of interest and Turkish troops in conjunction with those of the Imam Yahyā b. Hamid al-Dīn, their ally, under the command of Muhammad Naṣr reached Lahij and in their advance on 'Aden where there was a battle with the English and their allies. In the course of the fighting the English troops evacuated Lahij and Sultan ʿAli b. Ahmad was shot. A counter-attack on July 21, 1915 restored Lahij to the English but by August 21 they were again driven out of Lahij which was occupied by the Turks who held it till the beginning of 1918. It was not till the collapse of Turkey on the Palestine front and the cutting of communications with the Yemen that the position became untenable for the Turkish troops and forced them to retire. Since July 1915, ʿAbd al-Karim b. Faḍl b. ʿAli has been ruler of the Sultanate of Lahij.

Lähidjän. I. A town in Gilân to the east of the Safid-Rûd and north of the mountain Dulfaq (cf. the ancient name of a people Dulafa) on the river Kom-khala (Purdesar) which 8 miles higher up flows through Langardû, the present capital of the district of Rân-i Kûh.

Lähidjän although unknown to the early Arab-geographers is certainly one of the oldest towns in Gilân. Its foundation is attributed to the legendary Lähidj b. Sâm b. Nâh. The river Safid-Rûd divides Gilân into two parts. In ancient times the river formed the frontier between the Amardoi on the east and the Kadsûoi or Gilâi on the west; cf. Andreas, Amardus, in Paulus-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopædia. In the Muslim period the part of Gilân to the east of the river was called Biya-pish and that to the west Biya-pass (the word biya “water” [cf. Ahmad Kazi in Dorn, Auszage, p. 100], corresponds to the Avestan wali, “water-course”). According to Kâhidjân, the people of Biya-pass were ‘Afsâ (“Arabs”) and those of Biya-pass Hamdanîs or sectarians of ustâd Abû Djalâf (＝Tabari).

The old dynasty of Biya-pish was that of the Kawûm or Hawûmûn (in the modern Rân-i Kûh). Its founder was Nasr al-Hâkî Hasan Útîbâ, a descendant of the Caliph ‘Ali, who preached Zaidi doctrines in Gilân and died in 304 (917) (Ibn al-Athîr, vii. 61; Tabari, iii. 2292). His descendants are known as Nâsrîwân. Later the family divided into two branches; in the reign of Udjugàt the lord of Kawûm was Sâlih b. Sâlih b. Kâkâwû b. Shâhînsâh (the descent of this branch is not quite certain); the lord of Lähidjän, the most powerful of the princes of Gilân (or of Biya-pish), was Naw-Pâdişhâh (or Shâh-i na’îw). When in 768 (1070) Udjugàt arrived before Lähidjän (via Târom-Lowshân-Dailamân-Rustûk) Naw Pâdişhâh submitted to him and thus kept his position.

Lähidjän became more generally known as the capital of the dynasty of Biya-pish called Kâr-Kiâyâ. These sayids came originally from the village of Khebâr, which is the district of Khebâr (Kîh). About 709 during the civil war between the two lines of Nâsrîwân, the descendants of Shâfâr al-‘in of Lähidjän and those of Amir Muhammad of Kân-i Kûh, Saiyîd ‘Ali b. Saiyîd Kiây seized Biya-pish, Dailamân and some districts of Mâzandaran. The power of the Nâsrîwân was re-established in 791—792; in 908 (1502) the troops of Amir ‘Hî-‘in al-Din of Fûman (Biya-pas) sacked the town and similar invasions were repeated in 910 (1504) and in 914 (1508), but, except for such interruptions, the dynasty of the Kâr-Kiây lasted till 1509 (1952). The Safawis had close connections with Lähidjän. In the road from Shakhânbar on the road from Lähidjän to Langarûd is the tomb of Shâh Ibrâhîm Zâhid (d. in 714 = 1314) who was the spiritual father (firm) of Shâh ‘Âli al-Din, the famous ancestor of the Safavid dynasty. Shâh Ismâ‘îl I, a fugitive from the Al-Koyuru, found refuge with the Kâr-Kiây Mîr ‘Ali and studied under Mâlûm Shams al-Din Lähidjân (E. Denison Ross, The early years of Shah Ismail, T. E. A. S., 1895, p. 286). These friendly relations were broken in the reign of the Kâr Kiây Khân Ahmad Khân (943—975 and 985—1000) who was at first imprisoned by Shâh Tâhmâsp and later driven from the throne by Shâh ‘Abbâs, who was indignant at his intrigues with the Ottomans. Ahmad Khân ended his days in Constantinople (Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 562, 576). In 1000 (1592) Shâh ‘Abbâs came to Lähidjän and destroyed the garden in front of the castle. During their occupation of Gilân (1724—1734) the Russians built two forts in Lähidjän. Lähidjän has now lost all political importance, but has retained its local importance as the centre of one of the largest and richest districts in Gilân. The town has 2,260 houses with 10,000 inhabitants. There are many tombs there of members of the old ruling family.

The district is divided into seven cantons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kâhpîya</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashmân</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kânâr-Farîz</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râh Shâh-i bâlā</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowkâ</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cârâdzh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lâshtâ Nîshâ</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Several districts in Persia have however derived from the stems Lâh and Lâr [i.e.: Lähidjân, an important little town in Transcaucasia west of Shâmarâsh [cf. Shirmâsh]; Lähidjân, a village in the canton of Kûrâl in the province of Fars; Lähidjân, a canton of Mukîr Kudûstân [cf. Sawân-’Allâq], which the Sharafûnûs, i. 280 calls Lähidjän. There is a village of Lähidjän near Lîkhtân, south of Tabriz and a village of Lârjân south of the Araxes about 12 miles above the mouth of the river of Ardabil (Kara-Þû). These stems Lâh and Lâr may both come from *Ladh [cf. the old Persian Mîshân, which gave Mîsh in Persian and Mîsh in Armenian]. According to the dictionaries (Vullers) the old name of the town of Lâr [i.e.: Lâdîf] was Lâdîf; the silk called Lâsh is also known as Lâsh (Lâsh however may equally well be explained by Lâj); the change of d (dh) to r is
attested in the Caspian dialects (it is regular in Tāt; in Mzandarān we have the parallel forms گئید/گئار); Melgunof, p. 221). The fact that we have districts of Lāhidjān and Lāhidjān in the adjoining provinces of Gilan and Mzandarān is remarkable, but still more significant is the fact that Lāhidjān of Shirwān represents an idlet of Iranian Tāt surrounded by Turks (the Tāt are now found scattered throughout Daghstān, the country round Tēherān, Astarābidjān, etc.). Their present name has a rather general and vague character, of Tāt. The colony of Lāhidjān may have retained the original dialect formerly spoken in the metropolis. The name of the silk چلیچ/چلاچ suggests the former existence of a place called Lād, which produced silk (cf. Yākūt, s. v. Lāhidj). [Yākūt says that Lāhidj produces the silk called ‘Lāhidjī’ which is not of high quality]. With the suffix -ī, the word Lāh-ī would mean the people of Lād. It remains to be seen if the region of Lāhidjān is not the ancestral home of numerous Lāhidj colonies. At the present day it is spoken in Lāhidjān — although with certain local peculiarities — the Gilaki dialect but this parent dialect has here exercised a levelling influence, of which the foreign Tarkijī was incapable in the case of the people of Lāhidj of Shirwān. Among the Lāhidjān of Kurdistān we may recall the hypothesis of Andreas that the name ‘Dimlāv’ by which the Zāzā call themselves (north of Diyarbakr) is a metathesis of Delām (Uslamlam). The emigrations from Gilān, still very obscure, certainly penetrated far to the west. — [To the names mentioned one might add perhaps that of گفتکی Lāhidj in Khūzistān (?); cf. Tārīkh-ghzida, G. M. S., xiv/1, p. 240].

(V. MINORSKY)

LAHOR, capital of the province of the Panjāb, British India, situated on the river Rāwī, at 31° 35′ north latitude, 74° 20′ east longitude. Population in 1911, 228,687, of whom 129,301 were Muhammadans. The foundation of Lāhōr is traditionally attributed to the mythical Lava or Loh, son of Rāma, after whom it was named Lohāwar. It is not mentioned in the chronicles of the invasion of Alexander the Great, nor is the town described either by Strabo or Pliny; but it may be the Labokla of Ptolemy, which Sir Alexander Cunningham (in his Ancient Geography of India) explains as Lalwala, “the abode of Lava”. In the Mahābhārata, the Pandjāb is called Tākada, or the country of the Tākas. According to Huien Tsiang, Tāki was the capital of the Pandjāb in 633 A.D. He makes no mention of Lāhōr by any name capable of identification as such, though he traversed the entire province and stayed in it for quite two years. Possibly the Lohkot of the Purānas is Lāhōr. The Derawar Bhāyi (a compilation from the Purānas) gives an account of a battle between Bāmnāl, Rādjā of Lāhvār, and one Bhīma Sen Kānīkot, the mythical ancestor of the solar Rājdūpt princes of Central India, is said to have migrated south from Lohkot, an event assigned by Colonel Tod to c. 145 A.D. One of the city gateways is known as the Bāhti Gate; the Solankhis and Bhāts of Radjputāna point to Lāhōr as the seat of an earlier settlement. The first distinct mention of Lāhōr occurs in the history of the campaigns of Subuktigin, and of Māhmūd of Ghurān, when the Brahmans kings of the Kābul valley, being driven from Pashāwar and Ohind, established their new capital first at Bhera on the Djelām, and then at Lāhōr. Both Dujāī Pāl, and his son Anuṅg Pāl, the successive antagonists of the Ghurān invaders, are called Rājda of Lāhōr by Fariṣhta, according to whom the Hindū dynasty was subverted in A.D. 1031, when Lāhōr became the residence of a Muslim governor under the king of Ghurān. A final insurrection of the Hindūs was quelled by Mawdūd in 1042, and the city was left in charge of Malik Ayāz, whom Mūḥammadan tradition regards as the founder. During the reign of Māsūl III (1099—1114), Lāhōr became the capital of the Ghurān dynasty, but was captured in A.D. 1186 by Shihāb al-Dīn, known as Mūhammad Ghiyath, the Mūhammadan conqueror of India. The town was sacked by the Mongols of Ṣiŋži Khān, and of Timūr, and in the reign of Mubārak Shāh, it was “a desolate waste in which no living thing except the owl of ill-omen had its abode” (Elliott-Dowson, iv, 56, 57). Lāhōr remained insignificant throughout the period of the Pathīn dynasties. In 1336, Bahol Lodi seized Lāhōr as a first step to power. It was plundered by Bābar’s troops in 1524.

Even at this time the Pandjāb was an almost uninhabited waste, except for a few walled cities in which the Hindūs could exist in some security from the frontier raids of Balkh and Kābul. Every year used to make raids on the Pandjāb, and for this reason the province remained depopulated for a long time, and very little agriculture was carried on. Rai Kām Deo Bhatti, of Patišā, rented the whole Pandjāb from the governor of Lāhōr for 900,000 takaś (5,200)’ (Bābar’s Memoirs). Under the Great Mughals, Agra, Dihū, and Lāhōr were the three chief cities and mint-towns of the Mughal Empire. Akbar held his court here from 1542 to 1558, and repaired and enlarged the fort. In the time of Dājahārī, who made it a secondary capital, Lāhōr reached its zenith of wealth and splendour; the tombs of this emperor and his famous courtier Nār Dāhān, are on the opposite bank of the Rāwī. The place fully shared in the misfortunes which attended the decline of the Mughal Empire. Situated on the high-road from Afghanistan, it has been exposed to the visitation of every Western invader, and suffered from the successive conquests of Nūr Shāh, Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, and other less famous depredators. Lāhōr was a bone of contention between the Sikhs and the Muslims, and the great city of the Mughal princes and their viceroys was reduced to little more than a heap of ruins. But the rising of Sikh power under Rāndjī Singh (1798 A.D.) made Lāhōr once more the centre of a flourishing realm. It reigned into anarchy after Rāndjī Singh’s death. Then followed the First and Second Sikh Wars, and annexation to British India in 1849. Since that time the capital of the Pandjāb has grown steadily, and a new town covers a large tract which was recently a wilderness. The native city is a walled town with thirteen gates. It has been a municipality since 1867. The old crafts are moribund, but have been replaced by trades of a modern character. There are power mills — cotton, flour, iron — and a large agricultural market. The European quarter, or Civil Station, lies to the south and east of the city, and is a large administrative, educational, and business centre. The older part is known as Anārkanī, and here are the buildings of the Government Secretariat,
University of the Pandžab, Government College, Medical and Law Colleges, and Museum. Anārkali is connected with the newer Civil Station by a fine thoroughfare called the Upper Mall, on which are the High Court, Cathedrals (Anglican and Roman Catholic), Lawrence Gardens, and Government House. Further out is the important military station of Lahor Cantonment, formerly known as Mian Mir. Lāhōr is a great railway centre, and the headquarters of a big system, the North Western Railway, with extensive workshops and a large railway colony.


(K. B. WHITEHEAD)

**LAILA (ā.),** night, *Laiat al-barā'ā, Laiat al-Kadr,* see KAMĀN.

**LAILA l-AKHAYLIYAH, an Arab poetess, daughter of 'Abdallāh b. al-Rahhāl (al- 'Abdallāh b. al- Ḥāfiz b. al- Ḥāfiz b. al- Ḥāfiz b. al- Ḥāfiz b. al- Ḥāfiz) b. Ka'b b. Mu'āwiyah of the tribe of Ḫaṭāl b. Ka'b. She got her name from the fact that her father — according to other traditions one of her ancestors Ka'b or Mu'āwiyah — was known as al- Ḧāyli (= the falcon); perhaps it was a common name in her family and the phrase nāmu 'l- Ḧaylī in her verses glorifying her family may refer to this (Al-Qāhī, x. 80; Hamdān, p. 711). Lāla is usually mentioned in connection with her fellow-tribesmen Tawbā b. Ḥumayyir al- Ḧaṭṭāfī; fragments of her laments for him are preserved in the Kitāb al- Ḧaylī. She also wrote an elegy on the death of the Caliph ʿUthmān. It is also recorded of her that she exchanged lampoons with Nāhibī al- Ḫaḍī. Her conversations with Mu'āwiyah, 'Abd al-Malik and Ḥaḍūjāt b. Yūsfū are several times recorded. She begged the latter, in her old age to take her to her uncle Kūtaba b. Ḫusayn in Kītāb, and she is said to have died on the way. She must therefore have flourished in the second half of the first century A.H.


(H. H. BRAU)

**LAILA KĀHĀN, with Fitnet Kāhān, the greatest Turkish poetess of the older school, at the end of the romantic and beginning of the modern period. Born in Constantinople, the daughter of the Kāk̄-a-ker Morezi-end Ḥāmīd Efendi, she received an excellent education. Izsett Mollā [q.v.] contributed most to her poetical development; she was related to him and always retained a grateful memory of him as is shown by her elegy, full of deep feeling on his death. In her case the lack of information about her is characteristic of the old Turkish conception of women about whom very little is spoken in public. She was early married but divorced very soon afterwards. She had the reputation of a Lez-bian. She cared very little about the opinion of the world. She lived for her pleasures and her writing. A few anecdotes relate to her infringements of the social code of Turkish ladies. She joined the Mewlewī and was buried in the Mewlewī convent in Galata. She died in 1264 (1848).

Lālā Kāhān left a regular Divān entirely lyrical which was several times printed (Būlāk 1260, Constantinople 1267, 1299 etc.). Although she is still completely in the purely Oriental conventional period of Turkish poetry, her place at the end of the old school is not to be denied. Her verses are simple and clear and free from the affected bombast of the time and with their classically correct language much easier to understand than the majority of contemporary poets, wherefore admirers of the old school like M. Nāḏī can find "very few "good", verses in her. Her hymns (mawṣūlāt) and elegies were particularly admired. She was celebrated for her ready wit.


**LAILĀ U-MADJNŪN.** See MADJNĪN.

**LAITH.** See KINĀNA.

**LAK.** The most southern group of Kūrd tribes in Persia. According to Zain al-ʿĀbidīn their name (Lāk, often Lak) is explained by the Persian word lak (100,000) which is said to have been the original number of families of Lak tribe. The group is of importance as the Ṭand dynasty arose from it. The Lak now living in Northern Lūṭistan are sometimes connected with the Lur (Zain al-ʿĀbidīn), whom they resemble from the somatic and ethnical point of view. The facts of history however show that the Lak have immigrated to their present settlements from lands further north. The Lakki language, according to O. Mann, has the characteristics of Kurdish and not of the Lur dialects [cf. Lūk]. Čirikov, *Putesestvye Journal*, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 227, says: "the Lur and the Lak speak different dialects and hate one another". The Lak appear in the Sharaf-nāma, i. 323 alongside of the Zand, among the secondary Kūrd tribes, subjects of Persia. According to Rabino, the Lak were settled in Lūṭistan by order of ʿAbīl ʿAbbās who wished in this way to create some support for the new wāli of Lūṭistan, Ḥusain Kāhān, whom he had chosen from among the relatives of the old Shahwardī Attabeg (Ṭūrāk-i Ḫāmāsī, p. 369). Of these tribes, the Sīsilā had formerly lived at Māhidāṣht (S.W. of Bahmānshāh); the Dīlfān take their name from Abīl ʿAbīl [cf. the article AL-KĀSĪM u. ʿEŠ] whose fief in the third (ninth) century lyed in the north of Lūṭistan [cf. SULĀN XEED]; the Bādīlān of Zohūb [q.v.] as well as of Lūṭistan say they come from Mawjil and are evidently one tribe. The Lūṭistan branch seems to have exchanged its Kurmandji dialect for
Lakki during its sojourn among the Lak in the time of Shah 'Abbas. Even after Shah 'Abbas there were several Lak tribes outside Luristan. Zain al-'Abidin (beg. of the sixteenth century) mentions among the Lak: the Zand, the Mäfi, the Badjalan, and the Zand-yi kula (7). To the last tribe (according to Houtum-Schindler: Begele) belonged Karim Khan Zand (born in Pârîyâ, the modern Pârî about 20 miles from Dâwlatâbâd on the Sulânâbâd road). When at Shîrâz, Karim Khan sent for the Lak tribe of Bârainvând. In 1212 (1797) the Bârainvând and the Badjalan actively supported Muhammad Khan Zand in his attempt to take the power from the Kâdhâr (H. J. Brydges, A History of Persia, London 1833, p. 46, 58; R. G. Watson, A History of Persia, London 1866, p. 116). Under the Kâdhâr several Lak tribes were broken up. The Zand have almost completely disappeared; in 1830 remnants of them were found among the Badjâlân of Khânkîn (Khursûd-Efendi, Siyâsat-nâme Na'îrî, Russ. transl., p. 112, 221); there are still a few Zand families in the Dorâ-Fârâmân district to the S.E. of Kirmânshâh (R. M. M., xxxviii, p. 39); a section of the 'Amâla of Pušt-i Kuh claims to be descended from the Karim Khan tribe. At the present day there are Mâfi at Waramîn, Tîhrân and Kazîn. According to a good list compiled by Rousseau at Kirmânshâh in 1807 (cf. Fundgruben d. Orient, Vienna 1818, p. 53), there are 16 Lak tribes as Lak the following tribes: Kâhîrân, Mâfi, Nânâkî, Dîlâwârân, Pâyâmârân, Kûlânî, Şîfûtânwâd, Bârâmânwâd, Karkûkî, Tawallî, Zîyûrânwâd, Kâkûwâd, Nâmânwâd, Ahmânwâd, Bohûğî, Zîlîya, Hârsîni, Şâlikwâd. According to O. Mann and Rabino, the Lak tribes of Luristan are as follows: Sîsilâ (9,000 families), Dîlân (7,470), Tîhrân-Amârî (1,582 families), the Bârainvând (6,000 families) and Dîlânvând (1,000 families) forming part of the Bâlû-ghirîwâ group, a total of about 15,000 tents. The Bârainvând and Dîlânvând live to the east of Khurramâbâd around the sources of the river which then meets by the end of tâleh, the Dîlân occupy the beautiful plains of Alûsrât and Kâhâwâ respectively while the Tîhrân (perhaps = Târkân, i.e. "exempt from taxes") live between the left bank of the Saimara and the lower course of its left bank tributary from Khurramâbâd. The territory occupied by the Lak and including N. and N.W. Luristan is sometimes called Lakistân. The cohesion of the Lak tribes is evident from the fact that even before 1914 the Sîsilâ, Dîlân and Tîhrân were united under the authority of Nażar 'Alî Khân of the Amârî clan. In addition to the bonds of tribe and language, there is that of religion to all the Dîlân and many of the Akhâ. When the Amârî of Tîhrân belong to the extremist Shî'ite sect of the Ahl-î Hakî (cf. Sîlûzân 1893). Bibliography: E. Beer, Das Tsâghi Zendje, Leyden 1888, p. xxvii., p. zî; Zain al-'Abîdîn Shîrâwân, Bustân al-Shîrâhî, Tîhrân 1315, p. 522; O. Mann, Skize d. Lurisitikte, S. B., Ak. Wien, 1904, p. 1173-1193; O. Mann, Die Mundarten d. Lur-Sâmme, Berlin 1910, p. xxiv., xxv.: to the number of tribes speaking "Lakhi" the author adds the Kalbar of Kirmânshâh and the Mâfi of the Pušt-i Kuh; Rabino, Les tribus du Luristan, R. M. M., 1915; Mînory, Notes sur la secte des Ahlî Hakî, R. M. M., 1916, 2. Name given themselves by the Gbîrî.
practically reduced to little more than a title of honour. Its archaic flavour, the glories memories which it recalled of the phylarchs of lṭākeit, was very impressive in the “Burke” or “Almanac de Gogha” of the Arabs. But as to the Lakhnuids, they no longer have a separate existence from the Dīdūṣhām. When in the lands to the west of the Euphrates, we find them mentioned alone, the name must be taken to mean the Dīdūṣhām. It is in the latter that the chronicler has really had in mind.


(II. LAMMENS)

**LAKHNAU, former capital of the province of Oudh (Awadh), now secondary capital of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in British India; situated on the river Gomti, at 26° 52' N. L., 80° 56' E. L. Population at the 1911 census, 197,828, of whom 4,409 were Muhammadans. Nothing is known of its history prior to the Muhammadan invasion; even the derivation of the name is uncertain, though the first syllable is a contraction of Latman or Lakhman. The oldest part is the Lalman Tila, which was colonised by Shaikhs at the close of the thirteenth century. A member of this fraternity, Shāh Mīr, who died in 1478, gained much sanctity and his tomb is an object of pilgrimage. Lakhnau’s prominence began in the time of the Sūri kings of Dīlī. It was occupied by Humāyūn in 1526, and taken by Bābur in 1528; under Akbar it was the chief town of a sūra. The decay of the Moghul Empire enabled Khād ī Khān (1724) to found the dynasty of the Nawāb-Wazirs of Oudh, who ruled as independent governors, and latterly as kings of Oudh, till 1856. Sa’ādāt Khān, a Sayyūd from Persia, of the Shāfī sect, a viceroy of the Empire, destroyed the power of the Shaikhs of Lakhnau, but retained his capital at Faizābād. He adopted the Shīkh as the dynamic bādghe. The grandeur of the city dates from the time of Aṣāf al-Daula (1775–1797), the fourth of his line, whose reckless munificence has passed into a proverb, and whose reign was the golden age of Lakhnau, which he made to the capital of Oudh. East of the beautiful Victoria Park (1857) is a fine group of buildings of the Kānī Darwaza, the Great Ima’mbāgh, and a mosque, all built by Aṣāf al-Daula. The second and third are in the Manzil Bhaiwan, or old fort; here also is the Lalman Tila, surmounted by the mosque of Awrangzēb. The Great Ima’mbāgh is the chief architectural glory of the city. To the same period belongs the Martimiire, built by General Claud Martin, first as a residence for himself, afterwards converted into a school.

Sa’ādāt ‘Alī Khān (1797–1814) constructed the Dilkushah palace and the Sikandra Bāgh. He and his successors continued to adorn the suburbs with palaces, gardens, parks, and country seats. The meretricious style of the period marks the decay of Indian Muhammadan architecture.

Ghāz al-Dīn Haidar assumed the title of king of Oudh. He built the Chattar Manzil palace, and the mausoleum called the Shāh Nādirah.

Muhammad ‘Ali Shāh (1837–1842) reformed the administration, and by his economic measures stayed the downfall of his house for two more reigns. His name is associated with the buildings at Husainbābā. During the reign of his son Amīr ‘Ali Shāh, all the old abuses returned, and the government of the country became utterly paralysed. Wajīd ‘Ali Shāh (1847–1856) was the last king of Oudh. He built the Kāhirah Bāgh palace, a florid structure of stuccoed and gilt brick.

Mal-administration by one of the most extravagant courts known to history led to the annexation of Oudh in 1856 during the vicereignty of Lord Dalhousie. Some of the finest fighting in the Mutiny took place at Lakhnau, the name of which will be ever remembered in connection with the gallant defence of the Residency.

Modern developments have been stimulated and controlled by the wise generosity of the Local Government, and Lakhnau with its suburbs is regarded by many as the finest city in Northern India. As a centre of Urdu culture, it is the rival of Dīlī itself and is a seat of learning with unusual facilities for female education. The Canning College (1864) in the Badshāh Bāgh, King George’s Medical College (1910), and the Isabella Thorburn College for women, are now included in the University. Secondary establishments include the Colvin School, and the Reid Christian College. The Provincial Museum is also in Lakhnau. The Cantonment is the largest military station in the United Provinces. The city is a great railway centre, and the head-quarters of the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway are here. There used to be an extensive native manufacture of gold and silver brocade, muslins, embroidery, brass and copper ware, but here as elsewhere indigenous arts have fallen on evil days.


(R. E. Whitehead)

**LAKHNAUTI.** [See GAUR]

**LAKĪT.** [See LAKATU]

**LĂLĂZĂNĂ.** [See MEHMED LĂLĂZĂRĂ]

**LĂM (BANI LĂM), an Arab tribe living a nomadic life on the lower course of the Tigris (‘Ali Charbi, ‘Ali Sharīk, ‘Amāra). According to the statistics of Khurshid Efendi (middle of the sixth century) there were over 4,400 families of Bani Lăm west of the Tigris (between ‘Amāra and Shāy al-Hay) and 5,607 east of the Tigis, along the Persian frontier from Mandalî to the region of marshes (kūnh) into which the Karkhī disappears. 17–50 families of the Bani Lăm went over to Persian territory between 1788 and 1846 (the southern parts of the Pusht-i Kūh, the domains of the wāli of Huwazir); some columns were even established east of the Karkha and at Fdlāhīya. The Bani Lăm claim to come originally from
the neighbourhood of Mecca (Lyclama a Nijeholt, T'ouyage, iii. 225) and their eponym was their chief Farādā Lām. The Bani Lām, for the most part Shi'i, were on friendly terms with the wāli of Ḥuwaizara (Ibn Subrah) who, q.v. who played an active part in Persian politics in the time of the ʿĀrifīs. In 1678, 1715, 1742, 1748 the Bani Lām in connivance with the chief of Ḥuwaizara rebelled against the qāḍī of Baghdađ. Less happy were the relations of the Bani Lām with the Lūr wāli of Pūshṭı Kūh who deprived them of the villages of Bayār, Def-b Lūrān and Bāršāyā, but as a rule the Bani Lām got on well with their Lūr neighbours.

ʿAli Rida Šāh (in 1836) and Nadjbī Ārānī (after 1843) inflicted heavy defeats on the Bani Lām. The central Persian government also (ex- peditions of Muʿtamid al-Ḍawla in 1841) drove the Bani Lām from the left bank of the Karkhā but, protected by the mountains of Pūshṭı Kūh and the Lūr on the north and east and by the gūr to the south, the Bani Lām kept till 1914 a position of autonomy between Turkey and Persia. The presence of the Bani Lām in the region of Gūrān and Lāms between Amor Nūr, Pūsh Pūl and Dīzčīl had stopped commercial traffic by this direct route.

The unity of the tribe was lost in the sixteenth century; the section on the right bank and that on the left of the Tigris had each its own šāhī." In 1821 the energetic Mādīkūr (Matkür), son of Dīnjālī, succeeded the deceased Shaikh ʿArū but Layard noticed that he had already little authority over his rivals. Lady Blunt speaks of Shaikhs Mīz-bān and her son Bōne, Shaikh ʿUṣmān, son of Bōne, at the beginning of the war of 1914 attacked the English force at Aḥwās but was soon disposed of.


(L. MINORSKY)

**LĀM, 23rd letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value 30.** For palaeographical details see the art. ARABIA, plate I.

**LAMAS-Sū (Turk. "river of Lamas"; Ar. LAMIS), a river in Cilicia, coming from the Taurus, a day's journey from Taşsū between Ayāsh and Mersina; in ancient times it marked the boundary between the two Ciliae (of the mountains and the plains). On the banks of this river exchanges of prisoners with the Greeks and the Seljuk was several times made. The first of these took place in the reigns of Hārūn al-Rashid and the emperor Nicephorus I in 189 (805); the second under the same caliph and emperor in 192 (808); the third in the reigns of the caliph Abū ʿAbbās and the emperor Michael III the "Drustard" in Muharram 231 (Sept. 845) the fourth in 241 (856) and the fifth in 246 (860)

under the same emperor and the caliph al-Mu'tawakkil; the sixth in 283 (896) under the caliph al-Mu'tadb and the emperor Leo VI; the seventh called "redemption from treachery" under the same emperor and the caliph al-Muktaṣir in 292 (905); the eighth three years later in 295 (907); the ninth took place in 305 (917) under the caliph al-Muṣtaṣir and the emperor Constantine Porphyrogennetos; the tenth took place in 313 (925) under the same rulers; the eleventh in 326 (938) under the same emperor and the caliph al-Ḥārūn; the twelfth took place in 333 (946) in the caliphate of al-Mu'tūf through the intermediacy of Saif al-Ḍawla the Ḥamānī, lord of Aleppo. This river had at this place either a ford or a bridge which the ransomed prisoners crossed. There was also a town of the same name (Lūcūjt, Lamū) on this river not far from the sea.


(C. G. HUARD)

**LAMGHĀNĀT, a district in eastern Afghanistan. It is often referred to by Bābur, see W. Erskine's translation of his "Memoirs", p. 141 and P. de Courteille, i. 287. The name is fancifully connected with Lamech, the father of Noah.

(H. BEVERIDGE)

**LĀMIĪ, nom de plume (nakḥalat) of Shahīr Muḥammad b. ʿOtāmān b. ʿAli al-Naḳḳāsh, a celebrated Sūfi writer and poet of the early part of the reign of Sulaimān I, the era, not only of the greatest political development of the Turkish empire, but also that in which literature was most cultivated. He was born in Brussa, the son of the defterdār of Sulṭān Bāyāzīd's treasury. His grandfather had been taken by Timurlenk after his invasion to be transported to Transoxania (Samarqand) where he learned the art of nakḥalat (embroidery and painting) there highly cultivated and on his return to Asīa Minor introduced the first embroidered saddle. On the completion of his theological studies with Mollā Akhawān and Mollā Muḥammad b. al-Ḥādīdi ʿIṣān-zāde, Lāmī, who had an inclination to Sufism, became mīrād with the Naḵḵbandī Shaikh ʿArīf bā-Ḥāṣīd Sayīd Ahmad al-Bukhārī. He spent his whole life in the calm retirement of a Sūfi, free from external cares and favoured by the patronage of Sultān Selim and Sulaimān who frequently showed signs of their favour to him and his numerous family; he lived in Brussa writing industriously till his death in 938 or 940 (1532 or 1533). He was buried in the mosque built by his grandfather on the citadel in Brussa.

The versatility and quality of his literary output in prose and poetry is really astonishing. But his work was not so much original as translations and
adaptations, as was characteristic of the period which regarded Slavish attachment to Persian models as the highest ideal. He usually took as his model Đâmí, then the most celebrated poet of Persia with whom he had a further link in their both being Nağşbandis and therefore was called Đâmí-i Râmî. His proximity is greater than that of any Turkish writer. We have a cycle of nine romantic poems from his pen. His importance to Turkish literature is considerable but is greatly exaggerated by von Hammer who devotes the longest monograph in his Gesch. d. orts. Dichtkunst (ii. 29-195) to him. Lâmî'i's style is still comparatively lucid and simple. There is not yet any trace in him of the overwhelming turidity of the later artificial classicism, yet it must be confessed that most that is beautiful in him is due to his Persian originals. Ziyya Pasha in his Kharâbât has for this reason paid no attention to him.

The list of his works as given in the Skaraf al-İsmân numbers 24 but in reality there were more. His prose writings are the translations of Đâmî's Sûfî works: Nafşât al-Câs (biographies of Sûfîs with the sub-title Fahîth al-Mađhîdîn i-i Tarâqî Qâlah al-Majâhibîn) and Skaraf al-İsmân (="The works of progeny ") printed at Constantinople in 1293; the Skaraf al-İsmân, "The worth of man", considered by Lâmî to be his masterpiece which is a Turkish version of Part 22 of the 51 Arabic tractates (Kasâ'il) of the İskân al-Nâfia, the struggle between man and animal (ed. and transl. by Duteriki, Berlin 1858, Leipzig 1879 and 1881: Thier und Mensch vor dem Konige der Geister). His works of a religious character are Mu'ammâr Asmâ al-İhsâni, translation and commentary on the 100 verses of Mir Hussein Nishâbûrî on the 99 names of God and Miftâh al-Nâdîj fi Khâvâfi al-İsmân transfer. He also wrote a collection of letters, Münâzârât, a commentary on the Dîbâqî-i Sûfîsân of Sûfî's, and Fêret-numâ (="Book of examples"), a collection of tales and allegories, lth. Constantinople, n.d.); a Mâkma al-Laîfî, or Laîfî-fêretelim (a collection of often very daring anecdotes, quite in the style of Boccaccio's Decameron, which received its final form from his son, 'Abd Allah Lemi, also known as a poet). Finally as a kind of transition to pure poetry he wrote two mûnâzurâs (disputations in the mixture of prose and verse later so popular), namely: Mûnâzurat Behar u-Sâha ("Disputation between summer and winter"), Constantinople 1290, with the title Munâzâra-i Sûfîsân Behar kâ Sîhâyân Sûhta) and Munâzurat Nâfia u-Rûsî ("Disputation between Soul and Spirit").

His very much more important poetic works include a large Divân of about 10,000 verses which contain much that is beautiful and original; besides lâzî's, Chezeli's etc. it also contains the Skhab in 1288; transl by Feinmaier, Verkörung der Engli-Bursa (separately printed at Constantinople 2164, Vienna 1839).

His great Mûnâzurât poems were of permanent influence: some deal in a popular fashion with stories from Persian legends, namely: Sulâmîn b-Âl-i (dedicated to Sultan Selim), from İsmî's original: Vâzâ û-Râsân (dedicated to Sultan Sulaimân, from the original of Fâhî Layhâni (d. 1048) and a version of Nûşûm al-Ârâ'î al-samârâkânî: Vâzâ 'î-Âl-i-3î from the Persian original of 'Usûrî (d. 1050) translated at the express desire of Sultan Sulaimân (transl. by von Hammer, Vienna 1833); Farhâd-nâmâ (transl. by von Hammer, Stuttgart 1812); Heft Paîkar, "The seven beauties" (based on Hâfiz'i's Heft Manzar, which again goes back to Nâşîmî's Heft Paîkar). Besides the two allegorical dramas Gûl-i Cârûqân ("Ball and Bat") and Şâmî ni-Purâvîn, "Candle and Butterfly", the latter probably from the Persian of Ahî Şirâzî, he also wrote two Müşâyârâs of a religious nature, the Namrât-i-Harâz-i Alûm Īsmân hiding the Shî'î Ta'rîzî (illustrated MS. in the 'Êshâr Library, No. 249) and Man-kubat (or Ma'nâbî'î ïïsâst-i Alûm-î-kâmî.

Finally there are his political allegories Hîsun u-Dîl from the Persian original of Fâhî Manzûrî and the Turkish version of Adî (ed., transl. and annotated and compared with Lâmî's Turkish version by R. Drovâk, Hûsun u-dîl, persische Al-legerie von Fâhîî aus Nîzîpur), the Khârîd-nâmâ ("Book of the Intelligence") and the Qâbûr-nâmâ.


(Th. Menzel)

LAMTA, a large Berber tribe of the Barani family. Its exact origin does not seem to have been known to the Arab and Berber genealogists, who simply make them brethren of the Şâhidjia, Haskara and Gazzila; others give them a Himyari origin like the Hawawa and the Lawata.

The Lamta were one of the nomad tribes who wore a veil (mudahlîsiman). One section lived on the south of the Mzab, between the Massïfa and the Targa (Tuareg) on the east; they even seem to have extended as far as the Niger. In the south of Morocco, in al-Sis, where there were Lamta who led a nomadic life, in company with the Gazzila, the Lamta occupied the territory nearest to the Atlas. On the coming of the nomad Arabs of the Ma'ârî family, the two sections of the Lamta were absorbed by their pen. The Dwâi Hâsân; the remaining sections then joined the Shabamâ, another Ma'ârî tribe, to oppose the Gazzila who joined the Dwayne Hâsân.

In the territory of the Lamta of al-Sis at the mouth of the Wadi Nâî (now Wad Nâî) lay the commercial town of Nul or Nul of the Lamta, the first inhabited place one reaches on coming from the Sahara. Several Moroccan dynasties have struck coins there.
The jurist Waggāg b. Zallū of Sidjilmāsa, a pupil of Ābū ʾImrān al-Fāsi, was a member of the tribe of Lamta; one of his pupils was Ābū Allāh b. Yāsīn al-Gazullī, founder of the Almoravide empire.

The country of the Lamta was noted for the lamta bucklers made at Nāl with the skin of the lamta antelope.

**Bibliography:** al-Īdrīsī, al-Bakri, Ibn Khalдан, Kitiāb al-Ibar, indices, s.v. Lamta and Nīl; Leo Africanus, *Description de l’Afrique*, ed. Schefer, ill. 272, 437. (G. S. Colin)

**LAMṬA, a large Berber tribe belonging to the ethnic group of the Šaḥāda who lived in tents, and led a nomadic life in the desert to the south of Morocco with other tribes whose members veiled their faces with the ṣiṭām [q.v.] (muḥṣatulmumūn).**

At first idolators, the Lamta embraced İsľām and converted also the Negro peoples who lived around them. After having had a series of independent kings, they fell into anarchy until Yaḥyā b. Ībrahim al-Gudalī took control of them; having gone on a pilgrimage to Mecca in 440 (1054—1049) he brought back from Nafis the jurist Ābū Allāh b. Yāsīn al-Gazullī, who after having instructed the Lamta in the principles of religion and Muslim law, made himself their chief, conquered their neighbours, the Gudālī and Massūfī, and led them to the conquest of Morocco. He was the founder of the Almohad empire, also known as the empire of the Mulāshūtum or Lamta (cf. ALMORAVIDES). At the fall of the Almoravide empire the Lamta disappear from the history of Morocco. Their name is still borne by some tribes of Mauritania.

**Bibliography:** The first paragraphs of the chapter devoted by the Arab historians to the history of the Almavide dynasty especially: Ibn Abī Za‘r, Rawaḍ al-Kiṣās; Ibn Khalḥān, Kitiāb al-Ibar, ed. de Slane, i. 235 and 237; al-Bakri, Kitiāb al-Muqāṣirīt, ed. de Slane, 1911, p. 164—168. (G. S. Colín)

**LANKORAN (LENKORAN), the capital of the district of the same name in the province of Bbū. Larkoran is the Russian pronunciation of the name which was written as Lankorâ in the Arabic (anchorage, or perhaps Langar-karan (place which pulls out the anchors) which is pronounced Lar karâ in Persian and Lankân in Tâlish. The ships of the Bbū-Enzel (q.v.) line call at Lar koran, which has an open roadstead but at 8 miles N.E. of the town is the island of Sarā, which has an excellent roadstead which shelters the ships in bad weather.

In the district of Lar koran, de Morgan found monuments of very great antiquity (dolmen, tombs, cases of exposure of bodies in the Mazdaean (†) fashion), but it is not known at what period the town of Lar koran was founded. Certain statements (cf. Taqī-i Amīr-ārā under the year 490 [1553] in Den. Anoticum, IV, 283; and Shaikh ʿAlī Hāna (about 1723 A.H.), Taqī-i Amīr-ārā (ed. Balfour, p. 157) suggest that the capital of Tâlish was originally at Astārā; towards the end of the xvith century Lar koran became the capital of this Khá nate. The whole district was annexed by the Russians under Peter the Great (treaties of 1723 with Taḥmās II and 1729 with the Afghān Ṣāyraf) but returned to Persia by the treaty of 1732. Retaken by Count Zubow in 1796, Lar koran was retaken in 1812 by the Persians who fortifed it. On the 9th Muḥarram (Ta‘ārīḫ) 1228 (Jan. 1, 1813), Lankoran was taken by storm by General Kotlikâwski after a brave resistance of the Persians. This event hastened the conclusion of the treaty of Gulsrān (1813) by which Persia ceded to Russia part of Tâlish to the north of the river Astārā. From 1846 Lankoran was the capital of the district. The fortress was dismantled in 1865. Since 1921 Lankoran has formed a part of the republic of Adhar-balādīn, a former member of the Soviet Union.

The population of the town, which was 3,970 in 1867, had reached 11,100 in 1897. The district of Lankoran has an area of 5,000 sq. miles and in 1840 had 30,200 inhabitants and in 1861 99,632. Later the district was reduced to 2,000 sq. miles: in spite of this, its population in 1897 was 125,805 of whom 46.5% were Azari Turks, Iranian Tâlish 46.2%, Russians 6.9% (in the north) and Armenians (0.2%). The district is composed of 3 zones: to the north, an eastern continuation of the steppes of Mughān; to the east, a marshy littoral intersected by lagoons and covered with a rich subropical vegetation; to the west are wooded mountains running from 5,500 to 7,500 feet above sea-level which rise from the Russian frontier forming the boundary with the Persian province of Ardabil. The district is rich in forests and has good fishing.

**Bibliography:** Cf. the article Tâlish; Zain al-Abidine Shīrāwī, Bustān al-Nisbat, Tbrīz 1335, s.v. Lankorān; Beréziat, Puchkovsky p. Daghstoun, Kazan 1849, ill. 113; Semenov, Geogr-statist. slovar Ross. imperii, St. Peters burg 1867; La Grande Encycl. russ, (ed. Brockhaus-Efion); G. Radde, Reisen an d. persisch russ. Grenze, Leipzig 1886; Radde, Tâlish, Pet. Mtt., xxxi., 1875; de Morgan, Mission scient., Études géogr., i. 231—289; Études archéol., i. 13—125, with an archaeological map; N. V. Mair, Tâlish, pubil. by the Acad. des Sciences Pétrograd 1922 (with a detailed bibliography); B. Miller, Predvar. otsot poyezde w Tâlish, Bbū 1926 (mainly linguistics).

(V. Minkovskiy)

**LĀR. I. Capital of the district of Lārīstan, to the southeast of Fārs. Very little is known of Lārīstan and its early history. The country appears to correspond to the land of the dragon Hafisa-bōkt which was killed by Ardashīr Pāpāken. According to Persian legend, Ardashīr’s adversary lived in the village of Alr in the rustāk of Kūdjarān which was one of the maritime rustāks (rasātk al-sīf) of the province Ardashīr-Khurra (Tabari, i. 820); Noldke in his translation of the Kārmanak (p. 50) gives the variants Gālār(?) and Kūčār; the Shāh-nāme, ed. Mohi, v. 368: Kudjarān. Lastly the Armenian geography of the seventh century mentions a Kudjar-Ḥūsrān in Persia (Khuārsān) (cf. Marquart, Erdmth., p. 44): the preening of an a to the name Lār (cf. below). Marquart identifies Kūčārān with the castle of Dēgdān near Strāf; on the other hand the Fars-nāme-yi-Vâzir mentions a village of Kudjar-Ḥūsrān in the canton of Galla-dār (the ancient Fāl Sep Vāl Bāl of Ibn Bāṭtīta; Khud jāb = Khudjā bāl) immediately adjoining Lārīstan. According to a verse attributed to Firdawsi (cf. Vullers, Lexikon, s.v. Lād) but not found in the known editions of the Shāh-nāme, the town was
originally called Lād (and fell to Gurgin Milād, one of the heroes of the cycle of the Kayānīd Kāi Khwāraw). This would be a very curious case of the changing of d to r found especially in Armenian and in the Caspian Tati dialect (Darmesteter, *Ét.-iranienne*, i. 73). The Fārs-nāmayi-Nāsirī mentions another legend according to which the people of Lār in Fāris had come from Lār in Damāvand (cf. below) the cold of which they could not endure.

The Arab geographers do not mention Lār, for apparently the old routes linking up the chief towns of Fāris, with Sīrāf and Kāis, or Hurmāz (by Fāsā and Furg) avoided the town of Lār (cf. Naṣīrī al-Mulk, *p. 185, 187*). According to Ḫamdallāh Mustawfī, Lār is a vilayet near the sea and Ibn Baṭṭūta alone talks of Lār as "a large town, with springs, considerable rivers and gardens".

Lār had a local dynasty. Its princes, relying on the verse already mentioned regarding the presentation by Kāi Khwāraw of the town of Lād to Gurgin, son of Milād, traced their descent from this hero. They were even crowned with the crown of their ancestor and this treasure was among the booty taken by the Safawids in 1010.

The first prince of Lār to be converted to Islam (about 1000) was Djalāl al-Dīn, while according to the genealogy of the Milādns, Bāqālānḡārī was ruling there between 731 and 753. The independence of Lār on the Mazārīfīs is shown by a gold coin of Shāh-budja (760–786) struck in Lār (S. Lane-Poole, *The Coins of the Mongols in the British Museum*, 1881, *p. 240*). In 799 the troops of Muhammad Sultan, grandson of Timūr, ravaged the eastern part of Fāris on the lines of Kārin-Fāl, Djamār-Lār, etc. (Czerny-Nāsirī, i. 809).

There are Timūrid and Caghātai coins struck at Lār (O. Codrington, *A Manual of Moslemian Numismatics*, London 1904, *p. 183*). In the reign of the Milādnī Djamānghā (850–883), the Russian merchant Alanast Nikūn, passed through Lār in 1469 on his way to Hurmāz and India and in 1472 on his way from Hurmāz to Shīrāz. The Milādnī Nāshirīn (the just) (930–948) was a poet, musician and author; he died by the hand of a lāl. His successor Ibrahim Khān submitted to the Safawids and received the title of Amir Pīdān. His son Nūr [Nawr!] al-Dahr lived in the time of Sultan Muhammad Safawī. Under 'Abbās I Mirā' Alā' al-Mulk, son of Nūr al-Dahr, was authorised to take the name of Ibrahim Khān II.

The young Khān showed signs of independence and oppressed merchants and travellers. This could not be tolerated at a time when Lār lay on the great road between the capital and the sea. As a preparation for the occupation of Gombrūn (see Bandar-i 'Abbās) in 1614 (* supra*) and of the island of Hurmāz in 1622, the Beglerbeg of Lār, Allahward Khān, in 1606 and 1610 (1601) marched against Ibrahim Khān and seized his possessions. Ibrahim II had to surrender to the mercy of Allahwardi who treated him humanely and took him to Shīrāz 'Abbās at Bālkh, where he died during an epidemic. The government of Fāris was then entrusted to Kādī Tāškīn of Lār, a sincere Shīrāzi (*tāškī-i shāhī sewānī* [*q. v.*] paimādana; *Tāhir-i Alamārā,* 1314, p. 423–426. Buildings of the Milādns are still to be seen at Lār — a mosque and a bazaar of hewn stone covered with stucco. The bazaar was restored in 1015, by Kanbar *Alt Beg Djal-omī, waṣīr of Lār.*

The memoirs of Shahāq Ali Hażīn contain interesting notes on the domestic life of Lār at the beginning of the sixteenth (xviii) century (rule of the Afghan Khudādād-Khan, passage through Lār of the route army of Shīrāz in 1523). According to Alī Hazīn (1520) the people of a part of the Lār lands (*gāmīr*) of Lārīstan were Shīhīs. They had prospered under the Afghāns but Nādir, wishing to reduce them, sent against them the *sālār* of Fāris, Muhammad Khān Balōc. The latter met with difficulties at Lār and having come to terms with its inhabitants returned to Fāris. In 1146, Muhammad Khān rebelled against Nādir and tried to raise the Shīhīs of Lār. The latter maintained a waiting attitude but by order of Nādir they were massacred and scattered. Lār was later annexed by a certain Nāṣir Khān, formerly a brigand in the *bulāk-i sāfā* (a region between Lārīstan and Kirmān) who received from the Shīh the title of Khān. His family (the begler-legi) remained more or less autonomous till 1206 (1845) when the governor-general of Fāris sent troops to Lār and appointed a simple kalāntar there (*Fārs-nāmayi-Nāsirī*).

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Balbī Mihīl Khān invaded Lārīstan (Pottinger, *Travels in Bokhistan*, London 1816, *p. 163*). In 1256 (1840) Lār was occupied by the chief of the Ismailīs, Akā Khān who had rebelled against the Shīh (Schindler, *The Eastern Persian Irāk*, p. 94).

The town of Lār lying 57 fasākhās (5.3 km) from Shirāz was very frequently visited by European travellers in the xviiith century when it lay on the direct route Shirāz–Djamār–Dījūmy–Lār–Bandar-i 'Abbās: Figueron (1617), Sir T. Herbert (1627), J. A. Mandelslo (1638), J. B. Tavernier and Thevenot (1665), Struys (1672), Chardin (1673), Dr. J. Fryer (1676), Le Brun (1703). At this time there was a factory of the Dutch East India Co. at Lār (Thevenot, *Voyage*, Amsterdam 1727, *i. 460–476*). After the fall of the Safawids, Bandar-i 'Abbās became the port for the province of Kirmān only, while Būshīr became the principal port of the Persian Gulf. Lār conducted a local trade with the ports of Bandar-i 'Abbās, Linga [*q. v.*] and Tāhirī (the older Sīrāf; *q. v.*), of especially Sturke, *Ancient Trading Centres of the Persian Gulf*, G. J., 1895, *p. 166–173*.

In the sixteenth century, Lār has been described by Dāprē and Stack.

Of the 76 bulks of Fāris, that of Lār called Iārīstan is the most extensive (57 x 47 farsākhās, i.e. about 45,000 square miles). It is bounded on the N.W. by Barānum, on the S.E. the bridge of Lārīstan separates it from the nāhhīya of Bandar-i 'Abbās. This latter had a separate dynasty (the Kahlāt princes of Hurmūz). To the south Lārīstan is washed by the Persian Gulf (the ports of Kung, Linga, Mughūr, Čārak, Nakhibī). In 1617 A. T. Wilson found Lār quite prosperous (*Notes on a Journey from Bandar-Abbās to Shiraz*, Geogr. *Journ.*, Series 1908, *p. 152–170*). On the west it is bordered by the canons of Malīkī, Alā-marwadashi, and Khanī; on the north-west by the buluk of Dījūm; on the north by the buluk of Darāb; on the northeast by the Bulūk-i Saftā. **Lār**
The country is full of mountain ranges running parallel to the shore of the Persian Gulf and has a torrid climate. Water is scarce and brackish. The river of Lārīstān, variously known as Rūd-khwāna-yi shūr-i Galladār, Shūr-i Hing, Rūdkhwāna-yi Lamān etc., runs from west to east and flows into the sea a farakāh east of Kung.

The subdivisions (nāhiya) of the bālūk of Lārīstān are as follows (their orientation from Lār is given and the distance from it is in farakāhs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nāhiya</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Central</td>
<td>Lār</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shīb-i Kūh-i Lārīstān</td>
<td>Bandar-i Ĉārak</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linga</td>
<td>Linga</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dījāngiriya</td>
<td>Bastak</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kāvarstān</td>
<td>Kāshāni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Māzādīdān</td>
<td>Izād-Khāst</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bībkū-yi Ashkhān</td>
<td>Bairam</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bībkū-yi Fāl</td>
<td>Ashkhānān</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fūṁstān</td>
<td>Gawbandi</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term bībkū in the local dialect means a valley shut in by two ranges of mountains. Fūṁstān is derived from the word fūmn, corn.

The population of Lārīstān is thinly scattered. The most important towns are Lār (Dupré: 15,000 inhab.; Stack: 1,200 houses: 7,000 inhabitants) and Linga [q.v.]. The majority of the population is Persian. In canton No. 6 there are some Bahārū Turkis and Nos. 2 and 3 are inhabited by Arabs.

Lārīstān has Persian dialects of its own (O. Mann, Die Tadjik-Mandarien der Provinz Fars, Berlin 1909, p. xxxiv. 126—131 and there is even a local literature in them. The Fārs-nāma mentions Ağhund Mullā Muhammad Bākir ("Suḥbat") who was well acquainted with Arabic, Persian and "Dari". Romaskewič has collected some of the poems in the local dialect of the poet Mahdijār as well as Persian quatrains by several popular poets, natives of Lārīstān (Romaskewič, Pers. narod. ečnerovičiši, in Zapiski, 1916, xxiii. 313—349).


2. An island in the Persian Gulf now called Abū Shāʿīb. Near the island at its periphery lies the two great branches of the river Lārīstān, the Nūr and the Bahārū. The Greek names for the rivers were Lārīstān and Bāzū; the name of the island according to Le Strange are Aľān and Lān. The Fārs-nāma, ed. Le Strange, p. 241 makes it a dependency of the island of Ardashīr-Khurra. Yākūt (iv. 341) places it between the islands of Kōr and the port of Sirāf. The Portuguese called it Ilha de Lázaro from the village of Lār (should this be Lādžī—probably the est end of it). It is 13 x 2½ miles in area. The east of it lies the little isle of Shītwār (Cītīvar). Some ten miles north of Lār on the coast of Fārs lies the little harbour of Nakhālū. We do not know if there is any connection between the names of the town and the island Lār. An island "Lārāk" ("little Lār") lies south of the island of Hūrnāz. Bibliography: Tomasevček, Die Kustenfahrt Naruchs, in Sitaeber. Wiener Akad., cxxi., 1890, p. 55.

3. A high valley lying in Māzandarān, on the sources of the Harmāz-pei. The altitude of Lār is from 8,500 to 6,500 feet. It lies west of Damāvand. The valley is deserted in winter. In summer the nomads pitch their tents there. The people of Tībrān also go there for summer quarters. Stahl however (Petraem. Mittel., Ergänzungs-heft Nö. 118, 1896, p. 619) found traces of ancient dwellings on the right bank of the river Lār. The locality is sometimes called Lāridān, which must be a plural of Lārīdān "inhabitant of Lār" (on the suffix -īd, cf. Marquart, Beiträge, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 666). The same derivation explains the Arabic transcription al-Lāriz (Balāzhīrī, p. 8), one of the cantons of Tabaristān (not however found in the list in Ibn Rusta, p. 146). Al-Irīz formed part of the possessions of al-Masmūghān taken in 131 (748) by Abū Muslim (Marquart, E. Fādżur, p. 127, 137). The term Lāridān seems to have been applied especially to the place below the high valley of Lār near the modern bridge of Pallīr; cf. Dīf-Falūl in Ibn Isfandiyār, transl. Browne, G. M. S., p. 67. Lāridān is said to have been the longest inhabited part of Tabaristān. Its village, Waraka was said to have been the birthplace of Fāridūn. In the villages lying on the slopes of Damāvand, Stahl saw a festival celebrated in memory of the death of Zohak (Aug. 11; cf. Morier. Second Journey, p. 357). At Lāridān there was a special marzūdā under the ispahabhs of Tabaristān (Ibn Isfandiyār, iibid., p. 15, 183, 280). On the district of Lāridān (Lāridān) cf. Lāridān. — Spiegel (Varena, Z.D.M.G., 1876, xxiv., p. 716—726) was inclined to suppose a connection between Warak (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 15: Waraka, native place of Fāridūn = Thraētoons) and the Astac-e countains Varena. The site of Waraka is unknown but in Lāridān there exists a village Wana: on the disappearance of r in Persian dialects, cf. Grundrisse d. Iran. Phil., ii, p. 559, 351.

(V. Minorsky)
LÁRANDA (also called Karamín from the name of the dynasty which reigned there in the sixth century), a town in Asia Minor, capital of the kaça of the same name and of the sandjak of Konia, to the S.E. and 35 miles from this town. It is 4,000 feet above sea-level, has 2,000 houses, 7,500 inhabitants, 105 mosques, 21 Friday mosques, 4 dervish monasteries, 515 shops, 30 warehouses, 9 cafes, 4 caravanserais, 14 baking ovens, 7 baths, 5 mills, 1 military depot, 110 fountains, 1 barracks, 1 Greek school, 10 Muslim schools, 21 madrasas. There are a ruined fortress, mosques and other monuments in ruins from the time of the Karamín-çehi (mosque of Amir Măsă with pillars from ancient buildings). The town was annexed to the Ottoman empire in 1464. To the north is the Kara-Dagh covered with mediaeval monasteries now in ruins (ibir bir kille = 1001 churches).


LARI MEHMEH. [See MEHMEH LARI]

LARIN (lar-i), a silver coin current in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean in the xviith and xviiith centuries. It takes its name from Lār (k.v.), the capital of Lārāstān (q.v.), at which it was first struck; cf. Pedro Teixeira (Travels, Hakl., Soc., 1902, p. 341). "There is also the city of Lar... whence are called laris, a money of the finest silver, very well drawn and current throughout the East" and Sir Thomas Herbert speaking of Lar in 1627 (Some Years' Travels, London 1605, p. 130): "near this byzar the larnes are cowed, a famous sort of money". The larin weighed about 74 grains (4.9 grammes) and had a high reputation for the purity of its silver. It was worth ten pence in English money (Herbert) or one-fifth of a French crown (Tavernier) or 60 Portuguese reis.

The larin is in shape quite unlike any other coin. It is a thin silver rod about 4 inches long, doubled back and then stamped on either side with inscriptions of dates like any other coin. It is admirably described by William Larret in his account of the moneys of Al-Başrā in 1558 (Hakluyt, P. oriental voyages, Glasgow 1902, v. 12): "The said larin is a strange piece of money, not being round like all other current money of Christianitie, but is a small rod of silver of the greatness of the pen of a goose feather where with we use to write and in length about one eighth part thereof, which is so wrested that the two ends meet at the juste halfe part and in the head thereof is a stamp Turkesco and there be the best current money in all the Indies and six of the larnes make a ducat".

The kings of Lār ceased to issue these coins after its conquest by Shah Abbās the Great of Persia (Chardin, ii. p. 223. Amsterdam 1755, iii. 128), but its popularity led to this type of coin being adopted by other states of the Indian Ocean. The kings of Hormuz of the latter half of the xviith century issued laris as did the Shāhs of Persia at Shirz and the Ottoman Sultan at Başrā. In India they were struck in the xviith century by the Ādī Shāhs dynasty of Başrā and other rulers and the frequent finds of larin in Western India show how extensive was their circulation there.

In the Malāve Islands in the early xvith century the king struck his own laris as we know from the Voyage of F. Pyrard de Laval (Hakl. Soc., 1857, vol. 1, p. 232 sqq.). In Ceylon they were also struck, not only by the natives but also by the Portuguese merchants at Colombo; in this island they were twisted roughly into the shape of a fish-hook, whence the term "fish-hook" money. These pieces are either uninscribed or bear rude imitations of the Arabic script. In Ceylon the "fish-hook" money survived into the xviiith century.

A degenerate descendant of the larin still exists (Philly, Heart of Arabia, ii. 319) on the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf, in Hāsa where it is known as a façula, i.e. the "long" (coin). It is only an inch long and of very base silver, if not copper, without any trace of inscription. It is described by Palgrave (Journey, etc., London 1865, ii. 179) who adds that there is a proverb "like a Hāsa façula", applied to any one who like the local currency of no use away from home.


(J. Allan)

AL-LĀT, an old Arabian goddess. The name (from al-lāhat; cf. Al-lāt) means "the goddess" but was the proper name of a definite deity, according to the Arabs themselves (e.g. Ibn Yaʿṣīsh, ed. Jahn, p. 44, 23) the sun. She is found as early as the Nabataean and Palmyran inscriptions and was later worshipped by various Beduin tribes (e.g. the Hewāzin; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 849, 13). An oath by al-lāt is frequently found in the poets, e.g. Ādū Saʿīd ibn Ḥishām, p. 567, 7, Mutamāmmis, ed. Vollers, v. 2, 1, Aws b. Ḥadjar, ed. Geyer, v. 11, 2, and even in al-ʿAqīd, Kibāb al-ḥijābī, vii. 173. She had her principal sanctuary in the valley of Wadijir near Ῥα fiscal, where the Muṭṭāb (ʿAttāb) b. Mālik b. Kaʿb were her priests and a white stone hung with all kinds of decorations was her symbol. She is frequently mentioned along with al-ʿUzza (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 145, 7; 206, 2; 874, 6, where Wudd also is mentioned; Aws b. Ḥadjar, p. 11, 2) and among the Kuraish she, along with this goddess and Mānat, was held in such high esteem, that Muhammad once went so far as to recognise these three goddesses as intercessors with Allāh but soon afterwards withdrew this (Sūrūn, li. 15 sqq.). According to Ṭabāisī, i. 1395, 3 Ābū Suṣyāf carried al-Lāt and al-ʿUzza with him into the battle of Yūḥ. After the capture of Mecca, al-Lāt was destroyed by her sanctuary in Ῥα fiscal by al-Mughira, who were related to her priests. But she was not forgotten, for, according to Doughty, there are still in Ῥα fiscal blocks of stone which the people call al-ʿUzza, Ḥalal and al-Lāt, at which they secretly seek help in cases of illness.

LAWATA, a Berber ethnic group, belonging to the family of BAttir, whose eponymous ancestor was Lawâ the younger, son of Lawâ the older, son of Zubâk. Ibn Khaldún disputes the view of certain Berber genealogists recorded by Ibn Hazm who consider the Lawâta as Saddaâita and the Mazâta as of Coptic origin. Others say the Lawâta with the Hawâwara and the Lâmta were of Himyarite origin. In any case the oldest home of the Lawâta seems most likely to have been the eastern part of North Africa. They were found in Egypt to the north between Alexandria and Cairo; to the south in the oases and in al-Sâ'id. Some

Lawâta led a nomadic life in the region of Borka. In the Maghrib they lived in the Ljâbal Lawâta (south of Gabes and Sfax) and it is probably this section that is mentioned by Corippus under the name Lujący = Berber: lawûtûn; others lived in the country round Bougie and in the region south of Tlaret (Tâlert) where they had adopted the Idrâdi heresy. In Morocco there were Lawâta in the Tâdil (the Zânara section), in the south of Fès and in the land between Tangier and Arzila.

Bibliography: al-Ibrîsi and al-Bakrî, indices; Ibn Khaldûn, Kitâb al-Fitr, ed. de Siane, i. 147-150; transl., i. 171, 231-236.

LAWH (A.), board, tablet; the first meaning is found in the Kurân, Sûra, lvi. 13, where Noah's ark is called al-lawh al-kabîr. The second meaning is that of lawh as writing material, e.g. the tablets of the lawh (Sûra, viii. 142, 149, 153; where the plural al-lawâh is used; see Lâlîn, iii. 421). Al-lawâh, wâl-lawâh (Bukhârî, Tâsîfî al-Kurân, Sûra, iv., bâb 18) corresponds to our "paper and ink". The expression mâ bâna l-lawâhîn "what lies between the two boards" is found in Hadîth, to describe the whole Kurân (Bukhârî, Tâsîfî, Sûra lix., bâb 4; Lâlîn, bâb 84); cf. mâ bâna l-dîffâshân (Bukhârî, Naṣîrî al-Kurân, bâb 16). — In modern linguistic usage al-lawh also means a school-child's slate.

Al-lawh thus means the tablet kept in heaven which in Sûra, lxxv. 22 is called lawh muhâfiz (cf. ii. 1066b, 1076a). According to this passage, it is usually described as the "safely preserved" tablet. But it is not certain whether the words in this passage are really syntactically connected. If we read mâmâ'în, the word does not go with lawh but with the preceding kâ'ûnîn and the translation is: "Verily it is a Kur'an, famous, preserved on a tablet" (see the commentators); "preserved" i.e. against alteration.

In the commentators on Sûra, xxvii. 1, the tablet is again mentioned: "We sent it down (the Kurân) in the night of the decree"; this refers either to the first revelation made to Muhammad or to the descent of the Kurân from that tablet which is above the seventh heaven to the lowest.

The tablet as the original copy of the Kurân is thus identical with wân al-kabîr.

The decisions of the divine will are also written on the lawh with the pen kalâm [q.v.]. We have therefore to distinguish two quite different conceptions:

a. The tablet as the original copy of the Kurân. This idea is found in the pseudographical literature. In the Book of Jubilees, ill. 16, it is said that the laws relating to the purification of women after childbirth (Lev. 15:1) are written on tablets in heaven. In Jub., xii. 28 sq., says the same of the law regarding the "feast of booths" (Lev., xxiii. 40-41) and Jub., xxxii. 15 of the law of tithes (Lev., xxvii).

b. The tablet as the record of the decisions of the divine will is also found in the Book of Jubilees. In Jub., v. 13 it is said that the divine judgement on all that exists on earth is written on the tablets in heaven. Enoch prophecies the future from the contents of these tablets (Book of Enoch, xiii. 2; cf. lxxvii.; xii. 2; xvi. 19). The "scripture of truth" is mentioned as early as Daniel, x. 21, the contents of which
Daniel announces in prophetic form. These ideas are connected with the Babylonian conception of "tablets of fate".

From these passages it is evident that in the pseudo-epigraphic literature also the tablets in heaven are also regarded as the originals of revelation, sometimes as tablets of fate. This is sufficient to explain the double meaning of lāzkh in Muslim literature.

For other passages, cf. the Index to Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, v. "Tablets"; it cannot always be said definitely to which of these two conceptions a statement belongs.

In mystical and philosophical literature lāzkh is given a place in the cosmic system and sometimes explained as qbl fā'āl and sometimes as nafs kuli or umm al-kulī.


(A. J. Wensinck)

**LAZ,** a people of South Caucasian stock (Iberic, "Georgian") now dwelling in the southeastern corner of the shores of the Black Sea.

The ancient history of the Laz is complicated by the uncertainty which reigns in the ethnical nomenclature of the Caucasus generally; the same names in the course of centuries are applied to different units (or groups). The fact that the name Phasis was applied to the Rion, to the Čorokh (the ancient Akampsis) and even to the sources of the Araxes also creates difficulties.

The earliest Greek writers do not mention the Laz. The name *Δζζσι* is only found after the Christian era (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, iv. 4; *Periplus* of Arrian, m. 2; Ptolemy, v. 9, 5). The oldest known settlement of the Lazoi is the town of Lazos or "old Lazik" which Arrian puts 680 stadia (about 80 miles) south of the Sacred Port (Noworossisk) and 1,020 stadia (100 miles) north of Pityus, i.e. somewhere in the neighbourhood of Sochi. In the 5th century the Lazoi occupied the land of the Kerkei, who in the first centuries of the Christian era had migrated southwards under pressure from the Sauki (i.e. the Čerkés [q.v.]) who called themselves Adlighe (Adlighe); the same author regards the Kerkei as a "Georgian" tribe. The fact is that at the time of Arrian (second cent. n. c.), the Lazoi were already living to the south of Sukhumi. The order of the peoples living along the coast to the east of Trebizond was as follows: Colchē (and Sami); Machelones; Ilenichii; Zydrite; Lazari (Δζζσι), subjects of king Malasus; Apilaei; Abasgi (cf. *APKhA*); Sanges near Sebastopolis (Sukhumi).

During the centuries following, the Laz gained so much in importance that the whole of the ancient Colchē had been renamed Lazica (Anonymous *Periplus,* *Frgm. Hist. Græc.* v. 180). According to Constantine Porphyrogenetus, *De Administr. Imperii,* Ch. 53, in the time of Diocletian (283–303), the king of the Bosporus, Sauromatus, invaded the land of the Lazoi and reached Halys (N. Marr explains this last name by the Laz word meaning river). Among the peoples subject to the Laz, *Prop.*, *Frgm.* iv. 2 and 3 mentions the Aba-gi and the people of Sunnial and Skyvania (i.e. Le-tchumi). It is probable that the name Lazica referred to the most powerful element and covered a federation of several tribes. The Laz were converted to Christianity about the beginning of the 6th century. "In the desert of Jerusalem" Justinian (527–565) restored a Laz temple (*Prop.*, *De Aedificiis,* v. 9) which must have been in existence for some time before this. The Laz also sent bishops to their neighbours (*Prop.*, *Bibl. Got.*, iv. 2). In Colchē the Laz were under the suzerainty of the Roman emperors who gave investiture to their kings and the latter had to guard the western passes of the Caucasus against invasions by the nomads from the north. On the other hand the monopolistic tendencies of the commerce of Rome provoked discontent among the people of Colchē.

In 458 King Gobazes sought the help of the Sasanid Vehshgird II against the Romans. Between 539 and 562 Lazica was the scene of the celebrated struggle between Byzantium (Justinian) and Persia (Khosraw II). According to *Prop.*, who accompanied Belisarius on his expeditions, the Laz occupied both banks of the Phasis but their towns (Archaeopolis, Sebastopolis, Pityus, Skanda, Sarapasis, Rhodopolis, Mochoresis) all lay to the north of the river while on the left bank which was desert land the lands of the Laz only stretched for a day's march to the south. Nearest to Trebizond were the "Roman Pontics" which only means that the inhabitants were direct subjects of the Roman emperor and not of the Laz kings; from the ethnical point of view the "Roman Pontics" could not have been different from the Laz. This strip of shore continued longest to shelter the remnants of the Laz.

In 1204 with the aid of troops lent by queen Thamar of Georgia, Alexis Comnenus founded the empire of Trebizond, the history of which is very closely connected with that of the southern Caucasus. Nicephoros Gregora (v. 7) says that the founder of the dynasty had seized "the lands of Colchē and of the Lazes". In 1282 John Comnenus received the title of "Emperor of the East, of Iveria and of the lands beyond the sea". In 1341 the princess Anna Anakhshata ascended the throne with the help of the Laz. The lands directly under the authority of the emperor of "Trebizond seem to have extended as far as Makrieli while Gonia was under a local dynasty (cf. *Chronicle of Panaetor*, under the year 1376).

In 865 (1461) Sultan Muhammad II conquered Trebizond and as a result the Laz came into contact with Islam, which became their religion (*Şahi*). The stages of their conversion are still unknown. The fact is that even in the central regions of Georgia (Akhaltsikhe) Islam seems to have gained ground gradually from the 13th century (N. Marr in the *Rast. of the Acad. of St. Petersburg*, 1917, p. 445–446, 478–506).

In 926 (1510) Trebizond with Batum was made a separate eyalet. According to EulYSIS Celebi who went through this region in 1550 (1640) the five sandjaks of the eyalet were: *Djanikha* (*Djanik = Samani*); *Trebizond*; *Guniya* (Gonia); Lower and Upper Batum. The modern Lazistan was governed from Gonia, for among the *khatas* of this fortress we find Atina, Sunial, Witte; *Bile* (= Witte- or Arkhawi); Eulaysia and the version of the *Dzhab-nama* in Fellmayer, *Original-Fragmente*, Abb. d. Bayer. *Abh.*, 1846. HeaderValue Khaltiis and Eulaysia Celebi deceased by the similarity in sound of Caucasian
names (as also was Vivien de St. Martin) proposed a theory of the identity of the name Legzi and Laz. Ewliyä calls Trebizond "former Legzi wilâyêt". Hâddjî Khalîfîha after enumerating the peoples of the district (Legzi): Mingrelians (Megrîl), Georgians, Abkhaz (Abaza), Çerkes and Laz, adds that the latter are those who live nearest to Trebizond. To the S. E. of Trebizond in the Çepni mountains he mentions the Turks who "worship as their God mûcûdîn the Șàhlî of Persia (i.e. are extreme Shî'is) and are associated with the Laz". Hâddjî Khalîfîha and Ewliyä do not agree on the number of the afiût of Trebizond; Ewliyä only says that the value of the eyalet has depreciated through the unreliness of many of its 41 nahiye (Dîjîhân-nu mê, p. 429; Ewliyä, ii. 81, 83—85).

The first serious blow to the feudal independence of the derê bey of Lazizân was only struck at the beginning of the sixteenth century by the Ottoman Paşa of Trebizond, but Koch who visited the country after his expedition still found most of the hereditary derê bey's in power, although shorn of some of their liberties. He counted fifteen of them: Atina (two), Buîep, Artashîn, Witse, Kapîste, Ar-khawe, Kisse, Khopa, Makria (Makrâiî), Gonia, Barum, Maradêt (Maradîdî), Perlewan and Çat. The lands of the three latter lay however on the Corôkh behind the mountains separating this valley from the river of Lazizân in the strict sense. On the other hand among the derê bey of Lazizân was the lord of Hamshîn, i.e. of the upper valleys of Kalopotamos and of Furtuna inhabited by Muslim Armenians. According to the Armenian historian Lewond, transl. Chahnaçarian, Paris 1826, p. 162, the latter with their chief Hamam of the Amatuni family had settled in the district in the time of Constantine VI (760—797) (the old Tambur was given the name Hamshin < hammoshem, "built by H."). It is evidently this region that Clavijo (1403—1406), ed. Sreçewski, St Petersburg 1881, p. 383, calls *tierra de Arqaqiel*. He adds that the people, dissatisfied with their king Arqaqiel (Arakiel), submitted to the Muslim ruler of Tisir. The Muslims are now only those of Khopa have not forgotten Armenian. A Hamshin lexicon was published by Kiphidzhe.

With the institution of the wilayets the sandjak Lazizân became part of the wilayet of Trebizond. Its capital was at first Batum but, after the Russian occupation of Batum in 1878, the administration of the sandjak was transferred to Rize (Rhazaon), detached for this purpose from the old central sandjak of Trebizond. Lazizân lying to the west of the Ottoman-Russian frontier occupied a strip of coast 100 miles long and 15 to 20 miles broad. The kajîs of the sandjak were: Khopa, Atina and Rize, subdivided again into 6 nahiye (Samy-Bey, Kamis al-Alâm, v. 3966). Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, i. 118—121, mentions Of as a fourth kajî and gives 8 (7) nahiye (Hamshin, Karadere, Mapawa, Waf, 'Kar'a-yi-sab'a, Witse, Arzkawâ). In 1880 there were in the sandjak 364 inhabited places with 138,467 inhabitants, of above 689 were orthodox Greeks and the rest Muslims (Laz, Turkicised Laz, Turks and "Hamshin"). The number of true Laz cannot be more than half the total population.

The term Laz is used in the west of Turkey to designate generally the people of the south-east country round the south-east of the Black Sea, but in reality the people calling themselves this name and speaking the Laz language now live in the two kajîs of Khopa (between Kopolısh and Gurupı) and Atina (between Gurupı and Kemem). Laz is spoken in 64 of the 69 villages of the kajî of Atina. To these should be added the very few Laz who used to live in Russian territory to the south of Batum. These Laz were incorporated in Turkey by virtue of the Turco-Soviet treaty of March 16, 1921, which moved the Turkish frontier to Sarp (to the south of the mouth of the Corôkh). Rize and Batum are now outside the Laz country proper.

The Laz are good sailors and also practise agriculture (rice, maize, tobacco and fruit-trees). Before 1914 many of them earned a living in Russia as bakers and often came home with Russian wives, who became converts to Islam. The Laz are known for their conversatism in religious matters. Turkish proverbs and the marionette theatre (harağoz) are often very scathing about the Laz (Lazarîth termûnî musulman yore bûn, "the Muslim does not eat Laz jelly"); termûnî from the Greek bêzaq).

The Laz language is closely connected with Mingrelian (which is a sister language of Georgian) by N. Y. Marr small peculiarities which it is difficult to consider it a Mingrelian language rather than a dialect. In the Laz-Mingrelian group he believes he can find resemblances to the more Indo-European elements in old Armenian (Grabar). There are two Laz languages, eastern, and western with smaller subdivisions (the language of the Çkhala). Laz is very full of Turkish words. It has no written literature but there are local poets (Rashid Hilmi, Pehlivian-oglu, etc.). The Laz are forgetting their own language, which is being replaced by the Turkish patois of Trebizond (cf. Pisarew in Zap., 1901, xii., p. 173—201) in which the harmony of the vowels is much neglected (cf. a specimen in N. Marr, Tekstî i rozïkaniyä, St Petersburg, viii., p. 55).

The Georgians call the Laz Čan but the Laz do not know this name. Čan is evidently the original of the Greek name Sannoi/Tzannoi and it survives in the official name of the sandjak of Samson (Dianîk). From the historical point of view the separation of the Laz and Čan seems to have taken place in spite of the close relationship between the two of them. In the time of Arrian, the Sannoi were the immediate neighbours of Trebizond. In an obscure passage in this author (cf. the perplexed commentary of C. Muller in Geogr. Græce Minores, ad Arriani Perip., 8) he places on the river Of the frontier between the Colchis (Laz?) and the Tzannoi (?). Koch mentions the interesting fact that the people of Of speak a "language of their own" and according to Morige, the people of Khoshgish (near Atina) speak an incomprehensible language. Procopius places the Sannoi who are now called the Tzannoi on the area adjoining the mountains separating Corokh from the sea (the Parayades range, the name of which survives in the modern Parkhar/Balkhar). The researches of N. Y. Marr have shown that the Čan (Tzannoi) had at first occupied a larger area including the part of the Corokh and its tributaries on the right bank from which they were temporarily displaced by the Armenians and finally by the Georgians (Kharthi). The chronicles of Trebizond continue to distinguish the Laz from the Tzannoi (Tzannoi). The latter in alliance with
the Muslims attacked the possessions of Trebizond in 1348 and in 1377 were punished by the Emperor. At this period the Tătănași must have been in the southwest of Trebizond (besides, the sandjak of Dănak is to the west of this port). Thus the Georgian application of the name C'an to the Laz may be explained by the confusion of the two tribes, one of whom (the true C'an living to the south and west of the Laz) was ultimately thrust to the west of Trebizond.


(V. Minorsky)

LAZARUS is the name in the Gospels of 1) the poor man who finds compensation in Abraham's bosom for the misery of this world (Luke, xv. 19–31); 2) the dead man whom Jesus raises to life (John xi.). The Qur'ân mentions neither one nor the other, but among the miracles with which it credits Jesus is included the raising from the dead (Sura, iii. 43). Muslim legend with its fondness for the miracle of resurrection is fond of telling of the dead whom Jesus revives, but rarely mentions Lazarus. Tabari (Anniel) talks of these miracles in general. According to him, Hâm b. Nâsh is revived by Jesus (i. 187). Al-KisâI only mentions Sam b. Nâsh of those restored to life by Jesus. Thâlât relates, closely following St. John's Gospel, "al-'Azîr died, his silver sent to inform Jesus, Jesus came 3 days after his death, went with his sister to the tomb and caused al-'Azîr to arise; children were born to him." In Ibn al-Athîr the resurrected man is called "Asir," the el of Elâzar was taken for the article, as in al-Yâsâ (Elissa) and Alexander (al-Ikandar) or in Æzar in the Qur'ân, whose name Fraenkel derives from Eliezer. In Ibn al-Athîr we find Muslim legend endeavouring to increase the miracle, Jesus raises not only "Asir (Lazarus) but also his wife (children are born to him), and Sam (son of Nâsh), the prophet "Asir and Ya'hûb b. Zakariya (John the Baptist).

Bibliography: Tabari, Annals, i. 187, 731, 739; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kamîl, i. 122, 123; Thâlât, Kisâ al-i'adîbâ, Cairo 1325, p. 307. On the name Efâzar, Eliezer, 'Asar, see S. Fraenkel, in Z. D. M. G., 1902, lvii. 71–73; J. Horovitz, Hebrew Union College Annual, 1925, ii., p. 157, 161; as., Koranische Untersuchungen, 1926, p. 12, 85, 86. (Bernhard Heller)

LEBANON. [See Id al-Fitr.]

LEO AFRICANUS, al-Hasan b. Muhammed al-Wazzân al-Zayyâtî, called Yûhanna al-Asad al-Gharbî, in Latin Johannes Leo Africanus, born at Granada in 901 (1465) was brought up in Fès. Entrained with three diplomatic missions to the South of Morocco by the Banu Waïs, he went to Mecca in 921 (1516) and then to Stamboul. Captured on his way home by Sicilian corsairs he was taken to Naples in 926 (1520), then to Rome where the Pope baptised him "Johannes Leo." At Rome he compiled the following works, only the first of which has come down to us in the original Arabic text: 1. Arabic-Hebrew-Latin Vocabulary composed in 930 (1524) for the physician Jacob ben Simon (MS. Escorial 598; cf. H. Dero- bourg, Cat. ms. arabes de l'Escarial, Paris 1884, i. 410): 2. Descrittione dell'Africa, which he translated into Italian on March 10, 1526 (divulged since 1531; publ. by Ramusio, Navigationi, viagg., Venice 1550, i. 1–103; French transl. by Temporal, ed. Schefer, 1896; Latin by Florianus; English by Purdy, ed. Browne, 1896; Dutch by Leers; German by Lorsbach); 3. Libellus de viris illustribus apud Arabes, finished in 1527, Latin transl., ed. by Hottinger, then by Fabrius. These works gave the west the earliest materials for the history of Islam; as. in the economic and social monograph on the city of Fès, Descrittione, Bk. iv., Ch. 23–54, a remarkable resume from the Maliki point of view of the historical development of their country. Before 957 (1559) Leo returned to Tunis where he died, a good Muslim.

Bibliography: Widmansdantz, Evangelia syriaca, 1555; introduction; Casiri, Bibliotheca arabico-bizantina, Madrid 1770, i., 172 sqq.; Schefer, op. ladin.; Goldscher, op. Pallas Nagy Lexicon, Az ossze ismerettek enciklopédiaja, 1897, xi. 426; Massignon, Le Maroc . . . . d’après Leo d’Africain, Algiers 1906, p. 4–11, 32–59. — According to H. de Castries (in his Summae), Signora Angela Codazzi, of Milan, is preparing a critical work upon the Arabic materials of the "Descrittione".

(1. Massignon)

LEPANTO, the Italian form of the name of the Greek town Naupactos which the Turks call Ile Bahlî. This is how the Turkish form is transcribed, e.g. by Leunclavius (Annalia Turcici, p. 33) while von Hammer (G. O. K., iii. 318) transcribes it as Aina Bahlî, which he translates
“Spiegelgluck”; in view of the Greek form however it is very probable that the Turks originally pronounced it Ine Bakhir. The town is situated in the ancient Locris, north of the strait which leads from the Ionian Sea towards the Gulf of Corinth, known since the middle ages as the Gulf of Lepanto.

After froming the xviith century part of the despoty of Epirus, Lepanto fell into the hands of the Venetians who made it one of the strongest places in Greece, Muhammad II during his war with Venice therefore undertook an expedition to take the town by land. In 1477 Khâlid Suleiman Pasha was given the task but did not succeed (Tvârîk, i. i. ‘Othman, p. 115). It was Bâyazid II who ultimately took the town in 1499 with the help of the Turkish fleet after the latter had defeated the Venetians near the island of Sapientza (Burûk Rec’s Adası) in July. The town was already being besieged by Mustafa Pasha, beglerbeg of Rûm III; Bâyazid joined the army later. The commander of the garrison had declared he would never surrender until Turkish vessels should enter the strait. This happened after the battle of Sapientza, for the Venetians made a feeble resistance. The Venetian commander capitulated on Aug. 26, 1499 (cf. Tâvârîk-i Ali ‘Othman, p. 127 and ‘Âshk Pasha Zade, p. 257—258, which gives the date as 3 of Muharram 905 = Aug. 16, 1499). Immediately afterwards Bâyazid built two foris to defend the entrance to the Gulf.

Lepanto is particularly celebrated for the famous naval battle fought on Oct. 7, 1571, between the Turkish fleet and the Christian fleet consisting of 108 Venetian galleys, 77 Spanish, 6 Maltese, 3 Savoy and 12 Papal in addition to 8 enormous Venetian galleasses (the figures given by the Turkish historians vary considerably) united under the command of Don John of Austria. This great combined expedition of the Christian fleets had been provoked by the capture of Cyprus by the Turks under Lala Mustafa Pasha in 1570 and 1571. The Turkish fleet came for the most part from Cyprus with the zer-a’ker Pertew Pasha and the Kapudan Pasha Salı and was joined by Uludğ Ali Pasha (Ochiali) beglerbeg of Algiers with 20 ships. After raids on the coast of Crete and the Ionian Islands it had cast anchor off Lepanto; it was here the Turks learned of the approach of the Christian fleet. The Turkish fleet consisted of 300 ships (so von Hammer; Hâddîji Khalifa speaks of 180); it was not at the top of its strength on account of the numerous desertions. Against the advice of Pertew Pasha and Uludğ Ali, the Kapudan Pasha decided to leave the bay of Lepanto and to attack. The Christian ships entered the Gulf on Oct. 7; the battle which followed only lasted a few hours and ended in the complete destruction of the Turkish fleet; the Kapudan Pasha perished in the battle; Pertew Pasha escaped with difficulty and Uludğ Ali who commanded the left wing succeeded in saving 40 vessels. This, their first great defeat at sea, is called by the Turks singhia donanna seferi, the “expedition of the destroyed fleet”. The immediate results of this event were not considerable, for the Allies could not take advantage of their success and the Turks very soon succeeded in making good their losses in material; Muhammad Soğolli [s.v.] was credited with saying that the empire was rich and powerful enough to make the anchors of the fleet of silver, and the ropes of silk and the sails of atlas (Peçewi, i. 499). The moral results however were very great and justify the great importance attached in history to the battle of Lepanto.

In June 1687 the Venetian and Austrian forces seized Lepanto, but they had to surrender the town to the Turks by the treaty of Carlowitz (1699); as Venice then held the whole of the Morea, Lepanto remained the only Turkish stronghold in this region. The Turkish history of the town ended with the insurrection of the Greeks, as a result of which Naupactus was incorporated in the kingdom of Greece.

The defence of Lepanto consisted of 3 successive lines of fortifications on a cone-shaped hill; it was the residence of a szâbâr-bey of the esvel of the Kapudan Pasha (Hâddîji Khalifa, Tüfîfat el-Kilîr, p. 673). Its great strategic and maritime importance is explained by Hâddîji Khalifa in Rumîli und Bosna, transl. by von Hammer, p. 125.


(J. H. Kramer)

LERIDA, the ancient Lernia, the Arabic Lerída, a town in northern Spain, halfway between Saragossa and Barcelona, now the capital of the province of the same name, with a population of about 29,000. It lies at a height of about 600 feet on the right bank of the Segre (the Wûdî Şîhâr of the Arabs); Yâkût, Mu’âlam el-Bulûnî, s.v., wrongly makes this another name of Lerida), and forms an important strategical point at the entrance to the plains of Aragon.

Lerida, which is undoubtedly of Iberian origin, was taken by Julius Caesar in 49 B.C. in the first Civil War between him and Pompey. In 546 a council met there and it was occupied by the Muslims in the first half of the eighth century. It seems to have henceforth shared the fate of Saragossa and to have been an important point for the defence of the Upper Frontier (al-fûghr al-dîrâ). It was later part of the independent kingdom of the Banû Hûd of Saragossa. At the division which took place on the death of Sulamîn b. Hûd al-Mustânîn bi ‘Ilâm (1046), it fell to his son Yûsuf but was again taken by the ruler of Saragossa Ahmad al-Muqtadir.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

LEWEND, the name of the members of an irregular militia, which formed part of armed forces of the Ottoman empire during the early centuries of its existence; they were chiefly
employed as soldiers on the fleet in the period when the Turkish navy consisted mainly of the corsair vessels, the Sultans employed for their naval expeditions. The word *lewends* seems to have been borrowed like many other naval terms from the Italian. The Italian word would have been *levantesino* (Sami, Kainru-i Turk) or *levanti* (Djedwat Pasha) and was originally used by the Venetians for the soldiers whom they recruited from the inhabitants of their possessions in the Levant, to defend the coasts or serve on the fleet. It was the same category of men, i.e. Christian Greeks, Albanians or Dalmatians, living on the Mediterranean coasts that the Turks used at first. After a time Turkish elements from Asia Minor joined them.

The levends were a soldiery almost without discipline whom it was impossible to make use of when the navy came to be regularly organised. Even in the time of Muhammad II the use of *saçaks* had been begun for the naval service and under Bayazit II, the first regular body of marines was formed, consisting of 400 *saçaks*. About the same time the *lewends* were employed on the gallORIES as *kurucjig* in place of the less loyal Christians (İhşiçi Khalifa, Tufaşı al-Kitār, p. 108). Thus the true levends were gradually removed from the navy. We find however that the word *lewend* is still used at a later period to indicate the soldiers of the navy, especially the riflemen (*fürekçı*, cf. Djedwat Pasha); in Constantinople there were two barracks of levends, belonging to the organisation of the arsenal. In a figurative sense, the great naval captains of the 18th century are also called *lewend* (e.g. by Safvat Bey in his article *T. O. E. M., Nov. 24*).

The levends after having been removed from the fleet still continued to exist as marauders, especially in Asia Minor where they were a scourge to the country. The word *lewend* thus acquired the meanings of vagabond and rascal; this last meaning has even passed into Persian. On the other hand, the *Pasha* in the province for long continued to recruit their bodyguard among the levends (cf. the picture of a *lewend* in the plate on p. 416 of the third volume of *Dh'obon*).

From the end of the 18th century, the government found itself forced to take steps to abolish the bodies of levends still in existence. Ordinances of 1695, 1718 and 1720 gave them permission to join the new corps of the *ja* and *jaža* (*Randum, Tariq*, Constantinople 1822, v. 13, 123). Finally a series of military expeditions in 1737, 1747, 1752, 1759 and 1763 exterminated the last bands of this turbulent soldiery, who still existed in different parts of Asia Minor (*Izgi, Tariq*, p. 22, 30, 78, 299; *Wajji, Tariq*, p. 117, 234).

From the end of the 18th century, the government found itself forced to take steps to abolish the bodies of levends still in existence. Ordinances of 1695, 1718 and 1720 gave them permission to join the new corps of the *ja* and *jaža* (*Randum, Tariq*, Constantinople 1822, v. 13, 123). Finally a series of military expeditions in 1737, 1747, 1752, 1759 and 1763 exterminated the last bands of this turbulent soldiery, who still existed in different parts of Asia Minor (*Izgi, Tariq*, p. 22, 30, 78, 299; *Wajji, Tariq*, p. 117, 234).

The hadiths concerning *lisan* (A.), an oath, which gives a husband the possibility of accusing his wife of adultery without legal proof without becoming liable to the punishment prescribed for this, and of denying the paternity of a child borne by the wife. In the language of the *Sharī'*, evidence given by the husband, strengthened by oaths, by which the husband invokes the curse (*la'a*: from this the whole process is a *poto*: named and the wife the wrath of Allāh upon themselves, if they should lie; it frees the husband from *hadād* (the legal punishment) for *hadī* (accusation without proof of infidelity by persons of *irratable* character) and the wife of *hadād* for *incontinence* (A. Spranger, Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Muslims, Bibl. Indica, Old Series, ii., 1309). On the technical use of the related verbal forms, cf. the Arabic lexicons and Dozy, Suppl. aux Dict. Arabes, s. v.; al-Kaṣṭallānī, commentary on al-Bukhārī, *Ṭabāb*, 25, at the beginning; al-Zurqānī, commentary on the *Mawża*, *Bāb mā dā'ū fi 'l-lisan*, at the beginning.

1. The following Kur'ānic passage is the basis for the regulations regarding the *lisan*: xxiv. 6 sqq.: "As those who accuse their wives (of adultery) without having other witnesses than themselves, the man concerned shall swear four times by Allāh that he is speaking the truth and the fifth time that the curse of Allāh may fall upon him if he lies; but the woman may avert the punishment from herself if she swears four times by Allāh that he is lying and the fifth time that the wrath of Allāh may fall upon her if he is speaking the truth. If Allāh were not gracious and merciful towards you and wise and turning lovingly towards you".

These verses belong to a part of the Kurān, apparently composed at one time, containing various regulations about adultery and consisting of xxiv. 1—10, 21—26; verses 11—20, which certainly belong to the year 5 were inserted later, our verses must therefore be older (cf. Noldeke-Schawally, Geschichte des Qorans, i. 210 sq.; H. Grimmer, Muhammad, ii. 27, puts the *Sura* between the battles of Badr [2 A.H.] and Uhud [3 A.H.]).

They form a regulation in favour of the husband, an exception to the punishment strictly laid down in Kurān, xxiv. 4 (cf. also verses 23—25) for *kāfū* and are therefore, like this penalty, primarily Muslim and have no affinities in Arab paganism in which an institution like the *lisan* had no place at all (contrary to D. Santillana, *Istitutioni di dotto musulmano*, i. 221 below). The word *lisan*, which comes from the Kurān, is unknown to the pre-Muhammadan poetry.

The hadiths concerning *lisan* are almost entirely (the oldest probably exclusively) exegeetical and profess to give the occasion of the revelation of the Kurān verses in question; they are to some extent contradictory (attempts to harmonise them are found in al-Zurkānī, commentary on the *Mawża*, *Bāb mā dā'ū fi 'l-lisan*), systematised and unshakable (cf. Noldeke-Schawally, etc., where further references are given, to which may now be added those in A. J. Wensinck, Handbueck of Early Muslim Tradition, p. 56 sq. [to p. 56 ult. may be added *Tir. 44, Sura 24*]). Four types may be distinguished among them: 1. the husband (unnamed) laments his sad case to Prophet in covert language whereupon the verses are revealed (oldest form); 2. Usamah b. Härih asks in the same way, first through the intermediary of a friend and then directly of the Prophet (a development of the first type); 3. Hilāl b. Umayra accuses his wife of adultery and is to be punished with *hadād*.
for this, when Allah saves him sometimes by the revelation of the verses (this type probably a development of the first, in which Sa'd b. 'Ubada also is often involved, who had previously with scornful criticism called attention to the possibility of the dilemma which has now actually happened, has of the three the most schematic and not original appearance); 4) some one marries a young woman and finds her not a virgin while she disputes his assertion; the Prophet therefore orders 'I'dân (not exegetic). There are of course other transitional and mixed forms. In so far as the hadîths yield nothing new about 'I'dân, this brief outline is sufficient; they are only of importance when they afford evidence for the oldest juristic adaptation of this Kur'anic institution.

2. The first subject of the earliest legal speculation was the question, not touched upon in the Kur'an, whether 'I'dân makes separation between the husband and wife necessary. In many hadîths this question is so expressly (sometimes polemically) affirmed that there must have been a school which approved the continuity of the marriage after the 'I'dân. The statement that al-Mu'sab b. al-Zubair is said to have held this view (Muslim; Nasa'i) is however based only on an inadmissible interpretation of another hadîth, in which he appears as a contemporary; on the other hand that 'Uthman al-Battî held it may be considered sufficiently proven (al-Zurqânî on the Mawwata'). Among the oldest representatives of the other view which later became predominant, that a continuance of the marriage was impossible after 'I'dân, may be included with some probability 'Abd Allah b. Umair and with certainty al-Zuhri in whose time it was already sunna, and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (Kitâb al-Ahkâm); the tracing of this opinion back to 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbas, which we find in the hadîths, must however be regarded as unhistorical.

Next arises the question how this annulment of the marriage as a result of 'I'dân is to be carried through, whether by a triple talîk, which the husband has to pronounce against his wife or by the decision of the judge before whom the 'I'dân is taken or by the 'I'dân itself. The first view is undoubtedly based on a large number of traditions, while no trace of its use in law has survived; these traditions are rather interpreted in favour of the second view (cf. the Hadîth of al-Zuhri in al-Tabari, Ta'rif and al-Buhârî, Talik, bâb 50 and Hadîd, Lâb 43; the tradition in Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, v. 380 sq. forms in its abbreviated form only an apparent exception; a polemic against the first view in al-Tâālîsî, N. 2607). The second opinion survives in the form of the legal talîk, apart from the ample testimonies to it; the oldest representatives known with probability or certainty are 'Abd Allah b. Umair, al-Zuhri, in whose time it appears as sunna, and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (Kitâb al-Ahkâm); its ascription to 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbas is again not historical. For the third there is no evidence in tradition; it is only found after the rise of the madhâkhîb. We seem therefore to have a tendency to development in a particular direction.

Other prescriptions about 'I'dân in tradition, going beyond what is laid down in the Kur'an, are of less importance. Thus, when the question is raised at all, it is unanimously laid down that the husband can never marry the wife again at a later date, that a 'I'dân may take place during pregnancy (legal ilkîlîf is later attached to their interpretation of this hadîth), that the child has only relationship with its mother as regards kinship or inheritance i.e. is considered illegitimate. Other hadîths say that the 'I'dân must be taken in a mosque and attribute the formula to be spoken there by the kâfî to the Prophet. We are also brought into contact with questions of detail, which play a part in the later ilkîlîf by a tradition according to which the Prophet did not allow 'I'dân unless the husband and wife were on equal terms as regards Islam and freedom; a series of older authorities who held the contrary view is quoted in the Mawwata.

Details of the further teaching of Ibrahim al-Nakha'i on 'I'dân are given in the Kitâb al-Ahkâm. Two more general pronouncements in Malik and al-Shâfi'i bring us to the period of the rise of the madhâkhîb. Malik states definitely that it was the sunna of al-Madina, about which there is no doubt and no ilkîlîf, that the husband and wife after the 'I'dân has taken place could never marry one another again and al-Shâfi'i says that with 'I'dân divorce of the pair and denial of the paternity of the child was sunna of the Prophet.

3. The teachings of the separate madhâkhîb develop the views of their earliest representatives, not entirely on the same lines (e.g. from the Mawwata'); it is to be assumed with probability that Malik followed the second view regarding the element in 'I'dân which annulled the marriage (cf. above), while his school later held the third opinion entirely). The most important regulation of the Fâhîf regarding 'I'dân that go beyond what has been so far discussed are as follows: if the husband accuses the wife of adultery or denies the paternity of his child without being able to prove it in the legally prescribed fashion and she denies his charge, recourse is had to the procedure of 'I'dân. If the husband refuses to pronounce the formulae prescribed for him, he is punished with the hadîf for hadîf, according to Abû Hanîfa; however, imprisoned until he pronounces the formulae, whereby he is set free or is declared to have lied, whereupon he is liable to hadîf. If the wife refuses to pronounce the corresponding formulae, she is punished with the hadîf for adultery, according to Abû Hanîfa and the better tradition of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, however, imprisoned until she pronounces the formulae, whereupon she is set free or confines her transgression and is then liable to hadîf. On the question whether 'I'dân is possible if one partner is not a Muslim or not free or not 'âlid, there is wealth of ilkîlîf, which cannot be detailed here; the same applies to the possibility of 'I'dân during the pregnancy of the woman, with the object of denying the paternity of the child. On this point the strength of the principle that the marriage decides the descent of the child, is remarkable, as is the distinction between two objects of 'I'dân (accusation of the wife of adultery and denial of paternity) which is only a result of later developments. In the whole of the earlier period these two objects come from the juristic point of view. The divorcing element in 'I'dân is, according to the Maliks (on their presumed divergence from Malik himself on this question; cf. above) and a tradition of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, the 'I'dân of the wife, according to al-Shâfi'i that of the husband, according to Abû Hanîfa and the
better tradition of Ahmād b. Ḥanbal however the verdict of the judges pronounced after the Ilīn of both. Opinions also differ regarding the legal consequences of a later withdrawal of the Ilīn by the husband; according to Abū Ḥanifa and one tradition of Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, a new marriage of the two people is possible in this case, according to Abū-Muṣṭafī, he, the better tradition of Ahmād b. Ḥanbal it is not; among older authorities only Saʿīd b. Ḏubair is in favour of the first view, while ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allāh b. Maʿṣūd, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, ʿAbdārā and al-Zuhri are quoted as in favour of the second (not all have historical confirmation) which was also held by al-Awza`ī and Ṣufyān b. Ḥijrīt. Finally it is a disputed question whether the Ilīn can only be performed orally or (in the case of a dumb person) by gestures; al-Bukhārī devotes chapter 25 of his Kitāb al-Tālibī to the discussion of this question and the reasons for his attitude to it.

It is easy to understand that resort was only made to the Ilīn in extreme cases. Thus we find a scholar of Cordova in the fourth century A.H. pronouncing the Ilīn against his wife simply in order to revive this sunna of the Prophet, which had fallen into oblivion (I. Goldziher, Muhammadienische Studien, ii. 21). But it has not yet fallen completely into desuetude, as Muslim law has no other means of disputing the paternity of a child (cf. Juynbohl, Handledung, p. 217, note 2; Santillana, Institutionen, p. 222).

Bibliography: In addition to the works already quoted the jāhā books and works on tradition; E. Schau, Muhammadienisches Recht, p. 73 sqq.; Th. W. Juynbohl, Handlungen des Islamischen Gestrues, p. 192; do., Handlungen, tot de konia von de Mohammedaenske Wet, p. 216 sqq.; D. Santillana, Institutionen di diotto musulmano nashikita, p. 219 sqq.; Th. P. Hughes, A Dictionary of Islam, v. v. Ilīn.

(Joseph Schacht)

LIHYÂN, an Arab tribe, a branch of the Hudhayl [q. v.]. Genealogy: Liyyān b. Hudhayl b. Mudirka b. al-Yāb b. Muṣār. Settled like the other branches of the Hudhayl in the country N. E. of Mecca, the Liyyān do not seem to have had the same period just before, and after Islam a history independent of their brethren; it is only rarely that they are mentioned apart from them, e.g. in Ḥumaydī, p. 34; a propose of their battles with the weak-potent Taʿāliba Sharāb; ʿAbdārā, Ma'dīqim, ed Wüstenfeld, ii. 272; iv. 104 (cf. Ḥumaydī of the Buyaytis, p. 80—81; Ibn al-Dajhrār, ed. H. H. Bru, N° 86 = S. N., II in, 203. 4. 1927, pl. 31), n 614 of a battle with the Khurās. The poets of this tribe are as a rule reckoned among those of the b. Hudhayl — e.g. Ma'il b. Khalid al-Khurās, al-Mutairiṭr al-Khurās, et al. At the time of the preaching of Islam we find them like the rest of the Hudhayl under the political influence of the Kuraish. This explains their hostile attitude to Muhammad, which resulted in the murder of their chief Ṣufyān b. Khalid b. Nubayl by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar at the instigation of Muhammad. This murder was cruelly avenged by the Liyyān who slew several Muslims in their turn (al-Maṭrūq, 4. A. H., cf. Hā'ibī). As there is no further mention of hostile relations between the Muslims and the Liyyān, it is probable that the latter were included in the submission which the Hudhayl made to Islam.

After the triumph of Muḥammad and in the periods following, there is almost complete lack of information about the Liyyān and there are very few persons of note belonging to this tribe: the grammarians al-Liyyānī, whose full name was ʿAṭī b. Ḥāzim (Khaṣṣūm) or b. al-Muhabbīn, d. 243 (cf. al-Zubayrī, Tābihat al-Nabībī, ed. Krenkow, K. O., n. 271, 85, 145, 149, 153, with bibliography; Flügel, Die gramm. Schulen, p. 51) perhaps belonged to it, but other sources (Ṭālī al-Arīsī, n. 324, 19) trace his nisba al-Liyyānī to the unusual length of his beard (līkīa).

There was some reason to suspect that the Liyyān at a remoter period of Arab history had played a more important part than that almost unnoticed, which they did later: this seems evident from a passage in Ibn al-Kalbī (K. al-Aṣīrī, p. 57 = Yākūt, Muṣārīm, iii. 184, 15) who assigns to the Liyyān certain priestly functions (ṣadūn) in the cult of the Hudhaylī idol Suwā (cf. Wellhausen, Arab. Heidentum, p. 182; 197); the discovery of several inscriptions and graffiti in the north of the Hájār has not only confirmed this suspicion but revealed the existence of a Liyyānī state several centuries before the coming of Islām. These inscriptions, first known from the imperfect copies of Doughty and Iuber, were later collected in large numbers (over 900) by Euting and deciphered by D. H. Muller after preliminary work by J. Halévy. They are now available in still larger numbers and better known as a result of the discoveries and publications of Fathers Jaussen and Savignac. They are almost all in the vicinity of the village of el-Ola (especially in the area full of archaeological remains, called el-Kherbāk and in the rocky cliffs to the east of this) not far to the south of the great Nabataean centre of al-Hāḍr [q. v.], Mādā'in Śaliḥ; some have even been found here although in much smaller numbers. Their epigraphy closely resembles that of the Minaean inscriptions (which are also found in very large numbers east of el-Ola) of which the Liyyānī inscriptions represent a dependent or parallel form, but in any case of a decidedly later date (against D. H. Muller who wrongly thought them older). Their language on the other hand is quite like that of the Thamudean and Saʿā Đứcitic inscriptions, in Northern Arabic and only differs from classical Arabic by several peculiarities (especially the use of ha in place of al for the article, and of a participle of the form nif'at in contrast to the form muʃin'at of the classical Arabic).

From these inscriptions we learn that el-Ola — the old name of which is given in the form Ḍ大唐 identical with the Dādān of the Bible — was the capital of a "kingdom of (or of the) Liyyān", of which some of the kings were Talmā' and II (cf. the name of Talmā', king of Gezūr, father-in-law of Ab-salām, II Sam. iii. 3 and xiiii. 17), Tashmā, Lawān, Hanā'ash M-SF-M, Karibl. This kingdom seems to have been for a long period of remarkable size and importance; before it was formed or became quite independent el-Ola—Dādān was a colony of the Minaeans and formed one of the stages on the great trade route which brought the commerce of the Yemen and India to the ports of the Mediterranean. After the fall of the Minaean kingdom (according to M. Hartmann between 230 and 200 B.C.) the Nabataeans
replaced the Mineans in the control of trade and settled in al-Hijr; but at the same time the Li'yân, who had absorbed Minean civilization, was apparently independent and asserted the southward advance of the Nabataeans; the frontier of the two states must have been between al-Hijr and el-'Ola. It is probable that these Li'yân were simply a section of the Thamûd [q.v.] whom we find mentioned in the annals of Sargon of Assyria, while there is no ancient reference to the Li'yân until Pliny who mentions them (Hist. Nat., vi. 33, 3) under the name of Lecchiâni. Their power must have increased after the fall of the kingdom of Petra (106 A.D.) and it seems that from this time onwards, they also held al-Hijr, abandoned by the Nabataeans.

When and how the Li'yân fell in their turn to the position in which we find them in the sixth century forming part of the tribe of Hudhail, and settled in a territory considerably to the south of their original home, we cannot tell, on account of the complete absence of documents. Muslim tradition has lost all memory of them and confounds them apparently under the general designation of Thamûd with the Thamûd proper and the Nabataeans of al-Hijr: a memory of a very vague one of the old kingdom of Li'yân may perhaps have survived in the isolated mention in a tradition that the Li'yân were "remnants of the Djarhum", who later became part of the Hudhail (Tabari, Annals, ed. de Goeje, i. 749, 11-12; cf. Djarhum) following Ibn al-Kalbi; Ta'zi al-Arûd, x. 324, 1-2, following al-Hamdânî, probably in al-Ikhl and the passage is not found in the text of the Qasîrat al-'Arâb). The Thamûdaean graffiti (which used to be called proto-Arab) are a development (later or parallel) of the Li'yân script, the last stage of which is seen in the Safatîc graffiti; but we are completely ignorant of the historical relations of the peoples who used these similar scripts.

The ruins of Dâdân-el-'Ula, although they have so far only been superficially explored give us some idea of the advanced stage of civilization to which the Li'yân had attained; besides tombs, some of which are decorated with sculptures in high relief, Fathers Jaussen and Savignac have discovered a sanctuary with a central basin circular in form (for ablutions) and ornamented with large statues several important fragments of which have been discovered. An inscription in this sanctuary mentions an abhay of the god Wadd: this term, which certainly is the name of a sacrificial office, is not known to Muslim Arab tradition (Agâhânî, xxxix. 686; Ibn Duraid, K. al-Istihlâh, p. 197, 7). Among the deities worshipped by the Li'yân we find alongside of typically Arab ones like Allâh, al-Lât, Wadd, Yaghûth and a god Dhu Ghâbat of whom we know nothing definite, gods of Aramaean origin, like Balsamen, the god of the sky and, in a theophoric name, Sâlim; in these names as well as in the use of other Aramaic terms (among them nafa in the sense of "degree") there is apparent the influence of the Nabataeans, who undoubtedly contributed with the Mineans to form the character of Li'yân civilization. The presence of Judean elements, which Muller and Glaser thought they recognised is on the other hand more than doubtful.


LIMNI, Turkish form of the name of the island of Lemnos in the Aegean Sea between Mount Athos and the mainland of Asia Minor about 50 miles S.E. of the entrance to the Dardanelles. In ancient times a possession of Athens, in the middle ages it belonged to the Byzantine empire; in this period, in 901, the island was sacked by the Muslim inhabitants of Crete. Towards the end of the middle ages Lemnos had passed into the hands of the Italians who called the island Stafimene (formed with the addition of the Greek preposition εις and the article). When the Turks took Constantinople the island belonged to the Genoese lords of Lesbos (Midilli), the Gattelio. Under Bâyazid I, who had fortified the Dardanelles, Lemnos passed with the other islands under Turkish rule. When but Constantinople became the Turkish capital it was inevitable that Lemnos, the largest of these three islands commanding the entrance to the Dardanelles (the others are Imbros and Tenedos, or Dardija Ada) entered the direct domination of the Turks. In 1456 took place Muhammad II's expedition against Ainos as a result of which the Conqueror became lord of the islands of Thasos, Samothrace and Imbros. Negotiations had been going on between the lord of Lesbos and the Sultan regarding the payment of tribute. But in the course of these negotiations the people of Lemnos, dissatisfied with the rule of Nicholas Gate- lusio, brother of the lord of Midilli, voluntarily submitted to the Sultan who appointed Hamza Beg governor of the island and entrusted Ima'm, beg of Gallipoli, with the task of installing him there. Gatulio succeeded in leaving the island before the arrival of the Turks. The date of these happenings which are recorded only by the Byzantine historians Ducas (xlv. 190) and Chalcocondylas (viii. 248) is not certain; but Ducas who was representative of the princes of Lesbos at the Sultan's court, may be considered a reliable authority. In 1457 a Papal fleet drove out the Turks — the Pope had intended to establish an order of Knights on Lemnos — but some time afterwards the same Ima'm Beg recovered Lemnos with the adjoining islands (Zinkesien, ii. 235 sqq.). In 1462 Muhammad became master of Lesbos also. In the following year the Turkish possession of Lemnos was disputed by the Venetians whose Admiral Canale in 1467 (A.H. 872 in Neshri and Sâ'd al-Din, according to von Hammer) took Ainos and the islands in this part of the Aegean Sea (cf. also Munsejdžim Baqî, iii. 394); these conquests resulted in Muhammad's great expedition against the island of Euboia or Negropont (in Turkish:
Eghrisos) in 1468. Soon afterwards the Turks retook Lemnos and by the peace concluded with Venice in 1479 this island remained definitely a possession of the Turks. In this last year the island of Tenedos was fortified by the Sultan so that the Dardanelles was completed.

In July 1456 the Venetians won a victory over the Turkish fleet before the Dardanelles and as an immediate result took Tenedos, Samothrace and Lemnos. These conquests were such a threat to the capital that the grand vizier Mustafa Koprulu took energetic measures and sent an army of 4,500 men under the Kapudan Paşa Topal Muhàmmad; the latter besieged the citadel of Castro for 63 days, after which he laid siege to the town of Tenedos on November 15, 1657. Tenedos was regained from the Turks by the same expedition (Na'im, ii. 578, 585, 633). Finally in 1770 in the Russo-Turkish war Count Orloff laid siege to Castro and after 60 days had obtained its surrender, when the Kapudan Paşa Husan attacked the Russian fleet in the harbour of Mudros (Turkey: Munduros), forced the Russians to withdraw on October 24, 1770 (Wájs, ii. 118).

Turkey lost Lemnos after the Balkan War. By the peace of Athens (November 14, 1913) it had been stipulated that the powers should delimit the boundaries of the island. In February 1914 allotting all the Aegean islands to Greece except Tenedos, Imbros and Castelorizo. Turkey, reinforced by a strong public opinion, would not accept this decision, but the outbreak of war in 1914 prevented the negotiations being brought to a satisfactory conclusion. In the course of the war the strategic importance of the island for Turkey became manifest; after the failure of the naval attempt to force the Dardanelles, the Entente powers in April 1915 established a naval base in the Gulf of Mudros which lies on the south side of the island to serve as a base of operations for the forces which were to be landed at Gallipoli, to force a road to Constantinople. This is how the British admirals' flag-ship in the Gulf of Mudros came to be the scene of negotiations which preceded the Armistice of Mudros between Turkey and the Entente powers on October 30, 1922.

In the old administrative division of the Turkish empire the island formed part of the sandjak of Gallipoli which was the sandjak of the Kapudan Paşa; after the reforms of the sixteenth century Limni became a sandjak in the Bahri Safid Vilayet including the kula's of Limni, Bozgà Ada (Tenedos) and Imros (Imbros). Castro, a little harbour on the west coast, was always the seat of the governor and had the garrison. Cuenot gives 27,079 as the total of the population which has always been predominantly Greek. Cuenot gives the Muslims as 2,450. One of the specialties for which Lemnos has always been celebrated since ancient times is "terra sigillata" (Turkish "sokkuma"), a kind of earth found near the village of Kokkino on the south coast (where it has been sought to locate the site of the ancient Haphaestia) which is credited with medicinal virtues. This bed of clay was unearthed once a year (August 16) to the accompaniment of certain ceremonies at which the Greek priest and the Turkish hoja both assisted (Na'im, ii. 586).

von Hammer, G. O. R. 3, i. 81, 186, 438 sqq., 494, 534; iii. 457, 482; iv. 685; V. Cunet, La Turquie d'Aile, i. 475 sqq., 480 sqq.

J. H. Kramers)

LINGA, a little seaport on the Persian Gulf which lies between Lãrísîn [q.v.] and the desert. The old port was at Kun, 8 miles east of Linga; the Portuguese had a factory there where they ruled long after the loss of Hormûz (to 1711). In the reign of the Zand dynasty, 1,000 Djawâsim Arabs (Bedi Djaâsim, Djaâwâsim, Kowâsim) with their chief Shâhî Sâlih came from Ras al-Khîmah ("Omân) and took Linga from the kâlnâr of the district Djaâwhângiri. In 1827 the Persian government took possession of Linga and deported to Teherân the last hereditary shâhî (Kadib). The present population is very mixed (Arabs, Persians, Hindus, Africans). On the shore at Linga pre wharves for building boats for local traffic and the port is fairly busy, but the mountains which rise from 3,500—4,000 feet behind Linga make communication with the hinterland difficult (Lâr is 45 farsâkhs from Linga).


V. Minorsky)

LISÂN Al-DIN. [See Ibn al-Khatîb.]

LISBON, Portuguese Lisbon, a city at the mouth of the Tagus, now the capital of Portugal, with 435,000 inhabitants; tradition ascribes its foundation to Ulysses and it originally bore the Phoenician name of Olíppio. Under the Romans it received the name of Félicitas Julia and formed a municipium. It was under the rule of the Alans from 407, of the Visigoths from 858 to 715 when it passed into the power of the Muslims.

For the Arabic transcription of the name of Lisbon we find the two forms Licbînâ and Ucûbînâ with or without the article (cf. especially, David Lopes, Os Árabes nas obras de Alexandre Herculano, Lisbon 1911, p. 58—59 and the references there given). The most usual ethnic is al-Ucûbînî. Lisbon was not a large town in the Muslim period but it was nevertheless frequently described by the Arab geographers. Al-Frisî speaks of its ramparts and its castle and of the springs of warm water which rose in the centre of the town. It is built, he says, opposite the fort called al-Ma'dân (Almada), so called from the gold dust washed up on the bank by the Tagus. It is also from Lisbon that this geographer followed by several authors makes the legendary expedition of the "Adventurers" set out (no doubt to the Canary Islands; cf. above in. p. 880, s.v. al-Abûnî). Lisbon was very early (by 711) fell into the hands of the Muslims and under the Omeyyad caliphs of Córdova formed a part of the district of Bâlîa, along with Santarem and Cintra. The Arab chroniclers record several risings there which were quickly suppressed. It was however from the Normans (Mudjar) that Lisbon suffered most in this period. During their first invasion of al-Andalus in 229 (941) it was there that they disembarked for the first time. According to Ibn 'Idârî, their fleet consisted of 54 galleys and 54 vessels of less
importance; the alarm was given to the caliph of Cordova by the governor of Lisbon, Walib Allâh b. Hazm. Again during the invasions of 966—971, in the reign of al-Hakam II, the Normans began by ravaging the plains of Lisbon after landing at Alcacer do Sal (Kāṣr Abi Dīnār). For further details, cf. the article Málaga and the literature there quoted.

After the fall of the Omayyad caliphate of Spain, Lisbon formed part of the independent kingdom founded by the Afṣāṣids [q. v.] with Badajoz (Batalayn) as capital. Under the Almoravids, it seems to have been taken for a brief period by the Christians and retaken at the end of 504 (1110) by the Emir Sir b. Abi Bakr, at the same time as Santarem, Badajoz, Porto and Évora. It was only some 40 years afterwards, in 542 (1147) that it was finally conquered by Alfonso I Henriques of Portugal with the help of a body of Crusaders who were on their way to Palestine under Arnold van Aerschot.


(L. E. Lévi-Provençal).

LÎTHAM (A. sometimes also pronounced lîthâm), the mouth-veil, is a piece of material with which the Beduins concealed the lower part of the face, the mouth and sometimes also part of the nose (see the commentary on Harirī, ed. de Sacy, Paris 1821, p. 374, 2). It served the practical purpose of protecting the organs of respiration from heat and cold as well as against the penetration of dust (cf. Ibn l-Rumma, No. 5, 43, also No. 39, 24, and 73, 10; and the commentaries on Mutanabbi, p. 464, 27 and Harirī, p. 374, 2). It also made the face more or less unrecognisable and thus formed a protection against the avenger of blood (Goldzweber, Z. D. M. G., xli. 101). The lîthâm was therefore also sometimes worn as a deliberate disguise by people who did not usually wear it; thus in the 1001 Nights (ed. Macnaghten, ii. 878) it is worn by a princess, who disguises herself as a man, and (ibid., ii. 59) by a woman for similar reasons. A denominative verb has been formed from lîthâm, the fifth form of which in particular means “to put on the lîthâm” (e.g. Ağhānī, viii. 102, 20; xxi. 55, 19; Ağhānī, ed. Kossegin, p. 121, 7; Wright, Opuscula arabica, p. 111, 2; Harirī, Maḥāmā, ii. 433, 2), while the eighth form in the meaning “to put on something as lîthâm” is generally used only metaphorically (see below) Tâlîthmān usually means a woman’s veil (Cherbonneau in J. d. A., i. 182, 6; i. 64), but tâlîthmāt al-bayâdīf is also found as the distinctive title of a particular office under the Faiṣīms; their chief kâdis wore it along with the turquoise and tâlîthmān (de Sacy, Chrest., ii. 92). In general however, the lîthâm does not seem to have been worn by town-dwellers.

The lîthâm has no considerable importance for Islam from the purely religious point of view; it is forbidden along with certain other garments for the mukhrīm (Bukhārī, i. 390, below).

The custom of wearing a lîthâm was generally disseminated among the Sanhâda tribes [q. v.] in N. W. Africa, who are therefore described as lîthâm-wearers, mukhrīmīs or aṣṣāla al-mukhrīmīn; as the Almoravids originated in one of their clans, the Lamūna, the lîthâm thus came to have a certain political significance. The custom of wearing a lîthâm (below the nîghāb, see Bakri, p. 170) was found in other parts of Africa also, e. g. in Kāmān (Maṣṭirī, i. 193, 33 sq.) and still prevails among the Tuareg. These Africans retained their veils even on journeys into the eastern lands of Ḩaṣm, where it was not the fashion, while their women went unveiled. A tradition of late invention explains the remarkable customs by a story that on one occasion during an attack on a village where there were many women but only a few men, the men put on veils and the women took up arms to deceive the enemy as to their real numbers (Goldzweber in Z. D. M. G., xli. 101); another story has it that after the fall of the Omayyads, 200 Omayyads escaped to Africa disguised as women and that the Almoravid lîthâm are descended from them (Wisticsfeld, Der Tod des Haspīn, p. vii.); according to Bakri (text, p. 170 = transl., p. 321), they never took off the lîthâm and if one of them fell in a battle and lost the lîthâm, not even his friends could recognise him till the lîthâm was put on him again; they also called other men who did not wear the lîthâm “fly-mouthed”. The Almohads, particularly Ibn Tûmār, opposed the veiling practised by the Almoravids. They continuously insisted that it was forbidden for men to imitate the dress of women, but they did not succeed in abolishing the custom of wearing the lîthâm (Goldzweber in Z. D. M. G., xli. 102). Among further passages, where the term mukhrīmīn occurs in this sense may be mentioned ʿAbdallatif, ed. de Sacy, p. 483, note 48 (with other references); Flei-cher, Kleine Schriften, ii. 243 (discusses several passages); Marquart, Die Benimmvorschriften, Index, s. v. lîthāmīrān.

The word lîthâm and its derivatives was very much used in figurative language, especially by poets. From expressions like “to kiss the lips of the beloved one, which are under their lîthâm” (Dory, Vieimeurs, p. 400; cf. mā tālā hā lîthāmāin = the face in Mutanabbi, p. 464, 7, 10; especially “to kiss another”, mūlthām, the place which is kissel (Forazdāk in Dory, Supplément). A girl is given a lîthâm woven out of her own hair (1001 Nights, Brésilier edition, ii. 52, 2); the camel has a lîthâm of foam around its mouth (Tirrimmāb, p. 431 of the wave, we find it said in Ḩamīs, i. 762, 17: lam ṭalāthīkam; the wine-jar has a lîthâm, i.e. a piece of cloth over its mouth (mūlthām, Maṣṭirī, ed. Lyall, No. 125, 7; cf. also Akhtal, ed. Sallahī, p. 85, 2, and ʿAlkāma, ed. Socin, ii. 43, on jars); the sun is darkened by clouds of dust and is thus given, as described in dawn in Ibn Ṭārābshī, ed. Gohius, [description of dawn in Ibn Ṭārābshī, ed. Gohius, p. 64, 3 from below; cf. the commentary on Harirī, Maḥāmā, ii. 430, 10: kāṭalaʿī (Kāṭalaʿī al-lîthāmīs; many titles of books also begin with Kāṭalaʿī al-lîthāmīs; cf. Brockelmann, C.A.L., ii. 659);
the līthām is to be taken from the walls of buildings, i.e. they are to be exposed (īmād al-Dīn, ed. Landberg, p. 65, 12); to doff the līthām of one's origin = to confess it freely (Harrīt, Maḥāmārī, ii. 426, 3); the archangel Ṣāfārīl has one of his four wings veiled like a vast mouth-veil (īlākhanāna) from heaven down to the seventh earth (Kazwini, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 56, below); a voice may be hidden, māltūkh (Tarsa, ed. Ahlwardt, N°. 5, 26 = Fairūt ed., 1886, p. 10); a further metaphor is found in Ibn al-Fārid in de Sacy, Chrest., iii. 55, verse 25.


(W. Börkman)

LIWĀ (A. "flag", from lāwā to "euro") means in Turkish official terminology an administrative area, several of which form a vilayet "province" and one is in turn divided into kāzā "districts". It corresponds pretty much to the département in France. It is synonymous with sanjak (T. "flag") and is used alongside of it. The Sanjk is governed by a mutasarrif, whence a third synonym mutasarrif-lik. The institution of the lazāq goes back to the early days of the Ottoman empire but it was under Māḥmūd II in 1834 that the present administrative organisation came into being.

Bibliography: Ubicini, Lettres sur la Turquie, Paris 1853, i. 44, 50.

(CL. Huart)

LIWĀN (A., for al-liwān; Dozy, Supplement, ii. 563) in eastern houses is a hall, enclosed by walls on three sides and open through an arch on the fourth; it is raised two or three steps and forms the focus of the house, all the rooms of which open on to this atrium, which is ornamented with plants and trees. This is a type borrowed from the Sāsānian palaces, of which a specimen has survived to the S.E. of Baghštād, in the ruin called Tāb-i-kisrā, "vault of Chosroes", or Tāb-i-kisrā, "hall of audience". It corresponds to the īlār of the modern Persians. It is open on the north side to get the cool air.


(CL. Huart)

LODI, the name of a clan of the Ghilzai tribe of Afgānistān. A family of this tribe was established in Mūltân before India was invaded by Māḥmūd of Ghaznī, for that district was ruled, in 1005, by Abu 'l-Fath Dīwād, grandson of Shaikh Ḥāmid Lodī who had established himself there, but the importance of the tribe dates from the reign of Fīrūz Tughlūk when some of its members entered India for purposes of trade, but soon occupied themselves with politics. Dawlat Ḥān Lodī competed with Khādīr Khān [q.v.] for the throne on the extinction of the Tughlūk dynasty. Malik Bahārum Lodī took service under Malik Mardān Dawlat, governor of Mūltân, and his eldest son, Sulṭān Shāh, served Khādīr Khān at Mūltân. After the battle on Nov. 12, 1405, in which Khādīr Khān defeated and slew Māřī (īkhāl Khān), Sulṭān Shāh received the title of Iṣlām Khān and the sief of Sirhind, where he settled with his four brothers and assembled a body of 12,000 horse, mostly of his own tribe. His next brother, Khālīd, had a son named Buhālī (usually called "Baholī" in India), whom Iṣlām Khān adopted, to the exclusion of his own son, Khūṭ Khān, and married to his daughter. Khūṭ Khān fled to Dīlī and entered the service of Muhammad Shāh the Sayyid, to whom he described his relations as a danger to the state. Muhammad sent a force against them and they were defeated and fled to the hills, but almost immediately returned, recovered their possessions, and defeated the minister, Iṣām Khān, near Sādāhwa. In 1442 Dīlī was threatened by Māḥmūd Khādījī II, of Mālāwa, and Muhammad Shāh appealed to Buhālī, who demanded, as the price of his assistance, the execution of his enemy, Iṣām Khān and the appointment of Iḥām Khān as minister. The feeble king complied, and Buhālī marched to Dīlī with his contingent and took command of the army. The battle with the army of Mālāwa was indecisive, but Māḥmūd was recalled by the news of a riot in his capital and Buhālī was hailed as the saviour of the kingdom, and received the title of Khān Khānān and the government of the Panjāb. He shortly afterwards picked a quarrel with Muhammad and besieged him in Dīlī, but retired to Sirhind without capturing the city. In 1443—1444, Muhammad died, and was succeeded by his son 'Ālam Shāh, a feeble monarch who, after a brief and troubled reign in Dīlī, retired to Budhūn, which he made his place of residence. Buhālī then marched to Dīlī and 'Ālam Shāh abdicated in his favour. Buhālī ascended the throne on April 19, 1451, and reigned for thirty-eight years. He was succeeded, on July 17, 1459, by his son Šikandar, who reigned until November 21, 1517, when he died and was succeeded by his son Ibrāhīm, who was defeated and slain by Bābur on the field of Panipat on April 22, 1526.


(T. W. Haig)

LOJA (A., Lawāka), a little town in Andalusia, 35 miles S.W. of Granada, on the left bank of the Genil at the foot of an imposing limestone mountain, Periquetes. It has now rather less than 20,000 inhabitants but seems to have been more important in the Arab period. It was the birthplace of the famous Iḥān al-Khaṭīb Līsān al-Dīn [q.v.] who wrote an enthusiastic description of it. One can still see there the ruins of the imām which commanded the town in the Arab period. It was repopulated in 280 (893) in the reign of the caliph Ahmad b. Muhammad. This "key of Granada" was besieged in 1458 by the Catholic Kings who took it after a month's siege with the help of a body of English archers.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

LOMBOK (usually called by the natives Tanah Sasa), the second in order of the Little Sunda Islands lying east of Java; the Strait of Lombok separates it from Bali, the Strait of Alas
from Sumbawa. A not very broad, rather flat, strip runs from east to west approximately through the centre of the island, which is in part extremely fertile and is shot in by hills on the north and south. In the north is the volcanic island of Kindjani revered as holy by a large section of the population. The island is one of the richest parts of the Archipelago; the main industries are agriculture and cattle-rearing, the first being on a particularly high level. A quantity of the rice which is in part grown on fields exceedingly irrigated is exported.

Even if we exclude the foreign traders settled on the coast, the population of the northern towns (especially Baginese, Arabs and Chinese) is not homogeneous but consists of two groups which are sharply distinguished territorially also; the smaller western part is inhabited by Balinese, the centre and the east by the much more numerous Sasak.

The inhabitants of the western part are descendants of the Balinese, who came as conquerors to Lombok in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and gradually extended their power over the whole island; they intermarried very little with the native population, so that they do not differ very much from the people of their original home; their language is Balinese, and they profess the popular form of Islam and Buddhism which is found in their mother island, with a few exceptions (they have for example adopted a dewas-slam into their pantheon and the sacrifices to this Muslim god must not include pork).

The Sasaks are the true aborigines of the island; they are quiet and industrious; in their physical features they most closely resemble the Sumbawanese and their language (not yet fully studied) shows a similarity in certain points with the Sumbawanese. They have all adopted Islam except for the little group of the Bodha, who have remained pagan; they live quite apart from the rest of the island, especially in the northern districts of Lombok and Bima on the south coast and engage in agriculture of a primitive type. They claim to be the descendants of Balinese who migrated hither in ancient times before the great invasions; there is however no ground for this assertion; physically and linguistically they are in no respect different from the Sasaks around them and the name Bodha is also found in other parts of the East Indian Archipelago as an expression used by the Malayan Muslims to indicate groups of people who have remained pagan.

Of the earlier history of the island we only know that in the sixteenth century was a possession of the Javanese empire of Madjapahit; we have no really reliable information how and when it became converted to Islam. Islam probably came to Lombok from Eastern Java at the time of the decline of the Empire of Madjapahit. Evidence of a considerable Javanese influence can still be traced, and according to a chronic in the Javanese language found in Lombok, it was Pangeran Prapen, the son of Raden Paku (Sunan Giri) who converted Lombok by force to Islam.

The Sasaks are of course no more orthodox Muslims than any other people in the East Indian Archipelago, but Islam has so far influenced them that we may see in it the reason why, in spite of the large Balinese population in the island, there has been no assimilation between Balinese and Sasak. They are divided into two groups or sects: Waktu lama and Waktu tiga (tiga). The former, who live mainly in the plain of Central Lombok are the Orthodox among the Lombok Muslims; their name shows that (in theory at least) they observe the obligations prescribed by Islam of performing 5 (==-lima) prayers a day. In keeping with this, the name of the Waktu tiga (who live mainly in the mountains) would mean that they are of the opinion that three (tiga, ~== tiga) prayers a day are sufficient. This is however an improbable explanation. Many are of the opinion that the name is to be explained by the fact that the Waktu tiga only know of three times of prayer, namely the gah on Friday (or at the moment of death, and at the end of the month of fasting); others say that the full name is waktu-lama-lama, which is said to be an expression indicating the old paganism (the religion of the time of the three kings, namely the kings of Selaparang, Sakra and Pedajangi). There is no certainty on the point however. In any case the Waktu tiga are regarded, and not without reason, by their countrymen the Waktu lama as half heathens. There are few mosques in their country; they leave the performances of practically all religious observances to their political leaders (khs) and they do not observe the form of fasting or pilgrimage to Mecca. They only observe Muslim principal festivals and their marriage ceremony also shows that they wish to be regarded as Muslims.

At the same time pagan sacrifices and pilgrimages (which however can also be found among the Waktu lama) play a prominent part in their life. In their villages, there is always in addition to the Muhammadan ksa a piman, i.e. one who acts as an intermediary at the worship of all kinds of spiritual powers from the world of animism. It is particularly among the Waktu tiga that we find the custom that the village headman keeps two coarse pieces of cloth woven out of different coloured threads (the one "male" and the other "female") to which offerings are made in case of illness etc.; every household makes a copy on the pattern of these pieces of cloth, which are also treated with reverence.

Practically nothing is known of the early period after the conversion of Lombok to Islam; the island was divided into little principalities often at war with one another; the eastern part was under the influence of Macassar and Sumbawa, the western under the influence of Bali. In 1574 the Dutch East India Company concluded its first treaty with the princes of Lombok. Soon afterwards in 1692 took place the first serious Balinese invasion and about 1740 the king of Karangasem succeeded in bringing the whole island under his sway. Four small Balinese kingdoms thus arose on Lombok which were frequently at war with one another until in 1838 the king of Mataram overthrew his opponents and ruled over the whole of Lombok. Down to 1849 he regarded himself as a vassal of the King of Karangasem on Bali; he then placed himself under the sovereignty of the government of the Dutch East Indies. The Sasak repeatedly rebelled against their Balinese rulers until finally in 1894 the Dutch intervened with the result that they conquered Mataram; since 1895 Lombok has been directly under Dutch rule and administered jointly with Bali.

Bibliography: A complete bibliography for Lombok to the end of 1919 is given in C. Lekkerkerker, Bali en Lombok, Rijswijk 1920.

(W. H. Rassers)

LORCA (Lorob), a town in Eastern Spain between Granada and Murcia, with 26,700 inhabitants. It is the ancient Iluro or Heliocorica of the Romans. In the Muslim period it formed part of the kurra of Tudmir [q.v.] and was famous for the richness of its soil and subsoil and for its strategic position. Its hirin was one of the most substantial in Andalusia. It is 1,200 feet above sea-level on the southern slope of the Sierra del Cane, and dominates the course of the river Guadalestín. Under Arab rule it usually shared the fortunes of Murcia and became Christian again in 1266.


LUBNân (Lebanon). The Arabs have a somewhat confused, almost mysterious idea of Lebanon. Here they place the sojourn of the AKBAL [q.v.]. They do not distinguish it from the Anti-Lebanon for which they have no special name. "Djbal Sanir" means to the Arabs the section of Anti-Lebanon to the north of the valley of the Barâdât [q.v.]. The massif of Hermon has been known since the time of Hassân b Thâlat as Djbal al-Thalâth; it is the Djbal al-Shelb of modern writers. Nor are the Arab geographers agreed about the northern boundary of Lebanon. Some include al-Lattakâm (Amanus) in it. This confusion has been facilitated by the vague popular appellation Djalâl, which has been applied from the Middle Ages to the pre-emptory right to the range parallel to the Mediterranean running through Syria from the mouth of the Orontes to Galilee; from this comes the name AKBAL-Djalâl, "mountaineers", applied by the Muslim chroniclers to the Nusairîs, Mutawâlîs, Druses, etc. A hadîth tells us that stone from Lebanon was used in building the Ka'ba. This tradition perhaps explains why the Arab geographers see in Lebanon the continuation of the long arête which separates the Hûdjâr from Nâjd and Syria and Anatolia to the Black Sea. The southern frontier of Lebanon is usually made to coincide with the lower valley of the Lâjînî, the modern Kâshîmîyâ. Current usage, conforming to local tradition, makes the Lebanon lie between this river and the Nahr al-Kabîr (the ancient Eleutherus) on the north. This is the region which our historical survey will cover. The backwardness and the scattered population of the Anti-Lebanon has always gravitated in the orbit of the towns of Eastern Syria, while Lebanon with its towns opening to the sea and its flanks watered by the abundant rains yielded by the moisture from the sea, which it gives to the rest of Syria by its rivers, is in economic and political dependence on the centres of the ancient Phoenician country.

Lebanon is rarely mentioned by the pre-Muslim madian poets; for example by Nâbiha Dhûbyâni, whose patrons were phylarchs of Ghassân. The name becomes more familiar to their Muslim successors, e.g. Abû Dahbal al-Djumâthi, Nâbiha al-Shâlînâni and Abû al-Râfâmân b. Hassân, from their attendance at the Omayyad court. Its territory, covered with forests of pine, pines, cedars, for the difficulty of access, cut up by deep valleys and torrential rivers, from the Arab conquest has offered a place of refuge to several small nationalities, increased from time to time by the influx of all the oppressed and persecuted.

The semi-independence which it has never ceased to enjoy has favoured its evolution on individualist lines and the local development of its communities, formed at the expense of orthodox Islam i.e. the Mutawâwalîs, the Druses and the Nusairîs [q.v.], not to speak of the Christian sects, Melkites, Jacobites and Maronites; these last are nowhere mentioned by name by the Arab writers, when dealing with Lebanon. The degree of autonomy won by these groups, religious in their origin but finally strictly national, enables us to follow the fluctuations of Arab penetration and Muslim power in Syria.

Each sect, often each district, lived under the rule of petty native dynasties, supposed to be founded by suzerains in Damascus, Baghdad or Cairo. They received grants of investiture and were in return liable to certain obligations and military service, when the actual authority was able to force them to it. With a remarkable agility, the feudal chiefs of Lebanon practised the art of manoeuvring through all the tumults that saw successively installed in the east the rule of the caliphs, Sâlîhîs, Suljûqânîs, Ayyûbîds, Franks, Mamlûks and Turkish pâshas.

Not realising its strategic importance, the Omayyads and ABBÁSIDS did not think of occupying Lebanon, still thinly populated except in the districts on the coast; they were less far-seeing than the Crusaders, who built massive fortresses on the frontier of the "Mountain": Husn al-Akrâd [q.v.] and Shâkîf Arrûnî. This negligence enabled the Djûrâjdêm [q.v.] to enter Lebanon. The establishment of the Mâronites in the upper regions of northern Lebanon must have coincided with the coming of these Anatolian invaders and have facilitated the organisation of this Christian group, which was destined to play a preponderating part in the Mountain. At the end of the ninth century,
Arabs of Tanūkh, coming from the region of Aleppo carved out for themselves in southern Lebanon a principality, that of the "emirs of al-Gharb" in the middle of peoples, partly Arabised and influenced by Shi`a teaching. The development of this emirate was arrested in the eleventh century by the creation of the Frankish dukedoms of Sayfet (Saida) and Barut (Bairut). The lordships of Gibelet (Jibbail), Batron (Batrun) and the county of Tripoli depended for support on the Christians of northern Lebanon.

After the expulsion of the Franks, the Mamluks of Egypt entrusted the defence of Bairut to the Tanūkhids. In the xiiith and xivth centuries, the rising against the Mamluks followed by the extermination of the Mutawalli and Druse rebels of Central Lebanon made it easier for the Maronites to occupy the lands south of the Nahr Ibrāhim (Adonis). In the beginning of the xvith century the Tanūkhids joined the Ottomans who were conquering Syria. Weakened by internal dissensions they had soon to yield place to the Banū Ma`n of whom Fākhr al-Din (q.v.) was the most noteworthy representative. In 1566 on the death of the last of the Ma`nids their political inheritance passed to their relatives, the Banū Shihāb who came originally from the Wādī 'Tain, on the western slopes of Hermon.

The fall of Fakhr al-Din had opened Lebanon to Turkish intrigues. They were not long in undermining the authority of the Shihābids, constantly struggling with the insubordination and encroachments of the Druze feudal chiefs. In the interests of agriculture the Ma`nids had encouraged the immigration of Christians from the north into southern Lebanon. This policy was intensified by the Shihābids who were on good terms with the Maronites. The last of the Ma`nids was Fakhr (q.v.) a Christian by birth (b. 1367). Resuming the scheme of the Ma`nids Fakhr al-Din, he worked for half a century in forming a great state of Lebanon. Deposed in 1580 he died in exile. Direct Turkish rule in Lebanon (1540-1860) perpetuated anarchy and insecurity there and fighting between the Maronites and Druses. This ended in the massacre of Christians by the Druses and the landing of French forces to restore order. An international commission was appointed to elaborate a "Règlement Organique", the charter of a new autonomy for Lebanon, under the control of Europe. At the head of it was a Catholic governor-general, appointed for five years with the approval of the Powers in whom was centralised all the executive power. As a counterpoise to this authority, an administrative council was elected in such a way as to secure representation to the various communities. From this "Règlement Organique" arose modern Lebanon which owes to it fifty years of prosperity and peace such as it had never before known.

The Great War upset everything. Turkish forces occupied the Mountain and a Turkish governor was appointed; famine and disease soon decimated the population. On April 25, 1915, at a conference at San Remo entrusted to France the mandate for Syria and Lebanon. On Sept. 1 of the same year, at Bairut, General Gouraud, High Commissioner of the French Republic, solemnly proclaimed the creation of the "État du Grand Liban" with Bairut as its capital. In addition to the "Autonomous Lebanon" created in 1860, this new state included the districts of Tripoli, Saida and Tyre. It stretches from the Nahr al-Kabīr in the north to the borders of Palestine and is bounded on the east by the chain of the Anti-Lebanon. Grand Liban is governed separately from the "Confédération Syrienne", with which it reserves the right to conclude agreements. It is administered by a French official until a native governor is appointed. A representative council of 30 members elected by vote discuss matters of general interest and the budget.

According to the last census (1921-1922) the population is 629,000. The Christians number 350,000 of different sects of whom 200,000 are Maronites; 275,000 Muslims (125,000 Sunnis, 105,000 Mutawallis or Shi`is, 43,000 Druses etc.); 3,500 Jews; 20,000 foreigners.


Ludd, a town in Palestine. S.E. of Yaffa, is mentioned in the Old Testament (only in the later books: Chr. ii. 33; Neh. vii. 37, xi. 35; 1 Chr. viii. 12) under the name of Lod, in the Greek period as Lydda; the Greek name of Diospolis given in the Roman period did not drive out the old name, the preservation of which was helped by Acts, ix. 32 for example. It was an important place in the early centuries of the Christian era; the capital of a tophary; it had a rabbinical school and was the see of a bishop at quite an early date. It was particularly famous for the alleged tomb of St. George above which a church was built. It was conquered with several of Palestine by 'Amr b. al-`Aṣ and at a later date was the temporary capital of Sulaymān whom his brother, the Caliph Walid (705—715), had appointed governor of Filastin, until he rebuilt Ramla, after which Lydda began to decline. In the tenth century, Maqaddas mentions the splendid church of St. George and the Muslim legend connected with that of the dragon-
sly, according to which Christ will one day slay Antichrist at the door of this church. After the church had been destroyed by the Fatimid Caliph Hakim (996-1020) and rebuilt once more, it was destroyed in 1099 by the Muslims on the approach of the Crusaders, so that the victors only found the splendid tomb when they arrived. Under Christian rule Lydda again became the see of a bishop and a new church was built immediately adjoining the ruins of the old one but was destroyed by Saladin. The town never recovered from its complete destruction by the Mongols in 1271. A mosque was erected on the site of the earlier church while the ruins of the church of the Crusaders were handed over to the Greeks who restored them in modern times.


LUDHIANA, is the name of a district and town in the Delhiadhrs Division of the Panjab province of British India. The tract is an alluvial plain bounded on the north by the river Satlej and traversed by the old bed of that stream; the area is 1,455 square miles. There is some irrigation from the Satluj Canal. The early history is obscure; Sunet is a site where ancient coins are found peculiar to the place. The tract is prominent in the annals of the Sikhs. In the year 1809 Ludhiana town became the British frontier cantonment, and the district assumed almost its present limits at the conclusion of the first Sikh War in 1845. The population of the district in 1921 was 567,692, of whom 30 per cent were Jat Sikhs, fine men and excellent farmers. Gudjarats, Arains and Muhammadan Rajaqts come next in numbers.

The town of Ludhiana stands on the Grand Trunk Road close to the Durbarullah: it is an important junction on the North Western Railway. The founders were Lodi Pathans from whom it took its name. After the first Afghan War the exiled family of Shāh Shuja’d domiliated here. The population in 1921 was 51,880. Ludhiana is a busy market town famous for the manufacture of shawls and turbans, of furniture and woodwork, and for wool and silk dyeing. Military contractors supply uniforms and accessories to the Indian Army. The principal women’s hospital of the Province is here, founded by the American Presbyterian Mission, which has its chief station in Ludhiana.


LUHAYA, a harbour at the southern end of the Gulf of Dāra on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea. The little, now unimportant, town lies on what was once an island but has become joined to the mainland in comparatively recent geological times and is separated from it at high tide, while the harbour is dry at low tide. The town in Nubian times had no wall around it, but there were ten or twelve towers on the land side at intervals of 250 paces with entrances at a height above the ground reached by a ladder. The towers were armed with a few cannons. When Ehrenberg visited Luhayia in 1825 the town was enclosed by walls. At the present day there rises behind the town a fort built by the Turks with one or two modern guns. The houses of the town are for the most part wretched little straw huts, such as are usual in Tihama; only a few are built of stone. The harbour of Luhayia is hardly worth the name, as the anchorage is bad and the entrance is made difficult by sunken reefs. Even quite small ships have therefore to anchor far from the town and at low water even small boats cannot reach the shore if loaded. The drinking-water is brackish and dear. The coast around Luhayia is dry and sterile. The main industry of the population, who are mainly Arabs, but include a few Banians was and still is fishing and trading. Luhayia owes its importance mainly to the trade in coffee, which is brought down from the highlands, stored, sheltered and sold. Near the town there are also a few coffee plantations, the produce of which is highly esteemed and used to be reserved for the Sultan of Turkey. There was and still is a busy trade with Djedda, Hodeida and Aden, mainly conducted by Arab sailing-ships. The principal articles of export is coffee and corn is imported. Luhayia is connected with Djedda and Hodeida by a caravan road 621 miles long. There is also a telegraph line to Hodeida. The Eastern Asia Service of the Lloyd Triestino has a three monthly service to Luhayia.

Nothing definite is known about the origin of Luhayia. A. Sprenger identified the town with the Maqalbas kāwī of Ptolemy but this equation seems at best only possible. The identification of Luhayia with the old town of Sambrachata or the harbour of Laupas or Naqīdātā which E. Glaser supports, is very improbable. Niebuhr supposes that the harbour on the coast when the demands of the export trade in coffee from the interior required it. Here also, as at Mokhā, the hermitage of a Muslim saint is said to have been the nucleus around which the admirers of the saint gradually collected and built the town. A chapel was built over his tomb, the vicinity of which was considered auspicious for living and dead. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Portuguese who call the town Luya for the first time became acquainted with Luhayia. In 1513 Afonso d’Alboquerque entered the harbour on an expedition into the Red Sea. Luhayia then formed a part of the territory of the Imam of Ṣan’a’ to whom it paid tribute. In the second half of the sixteenth century Luhayia suffered from the raids of the Hāṣid and Bakī tribes, who on one occasion burned it down. In spite of this the trade of the town must even then have been not inconsiderable, for about 1760 in Mawsīm (April to July) it paid 3,000 dollars from the harbour revenues to the Imam of Ṣan’a’. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the governor of the Imam of Ṣan’a’ made himself independent in Luhayia; but when the Wahhabis invaded the Yemen and defeated the jā’il of Luhayia, the latter went over to the victors and took from the Imam of Ṣan’a’ the whole of Tihama from Luhayia to Bāb al-Mandab along with Ṭīq al-Fakih and a considerable part of the coffee-growing country. Luhayia now seemed to
LUHAIVA — LUKMAN

have a brilliant future before it; for it was to be the main harbour of export not only for the whole of this vast area but of the Wahhabi country also and negotiations were opened with the East India Company, who were invited to establish a factory in Luḥaiya. Luḥaiya's prosperity was again interrupted by the invasion of Muhammad 'Ali who occupied Luḥaiya in 1833. In 1869 we find it in possession of the Turks under whom the port and its hinterland formed a qaḍā in the sānduq of Ḥodeideh. Luḥaiya was also used by them as a base of operations against the never completely pacified highlands of 'Asir, which obtained independence with the collapse of Turkey in the world war. Satyāli 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Idrisi, lord of 'Asir who is considerably under Italian influence, has held Luḥaiya and Ḥodeideh since 1918.


(adolf grohmann)

LUKTA (A.), an article found (more precisely: "picked up"). The leading principle in the Muslim law regarding articles lost and found may be said to be the protection of the owner from the finder, sometimes mingled with social considerations. The picking up of articles found is generally permitted, although it is sometimes also regulated and regulated according to the circumstances. The finder is bound to advertise the article which he has found (or taken) for a whole year unless it is of quite insignificant value or perishable. The particulars of this advertising are minutely regulated by special rules. After the termination of the period, the finder, according to Mālik and al-Shāfi‘ī, has the right to take possession of the article and do what he pleases with it, but according to Abū Ḥanīfa, only if he is "poor"; but the use of the articles as religious alms (sadūqa) even before the expiry of a year is permitted in a preferential clause in Abū Ḥanīfa and Mālik. If the owner appears before the expiry of the period he receives the object back, as he does after the expiry of the period if it is still with the finder; but if the finder has disposed of it in keeping with the law, he is liable to the owner for its value; Dāwūd al-Zāhirī alone recognised no further claim by the loser in this case. The establishment of ownership is facilitated, compared with the ordinary process in Mālik and Abūmālik b. Ḥanbal (in al-Bukhārī also; cf. his superscription to Luqatā, bab 1). As regards the finding of domestic animals in the desert, there are special regulations which are less onerous for the finder in the case of injured animals and more onerous when they are not injured. Abūl-Shāfi‘ī and Abūmālik b. Ḥanbal have similarly some special regulations concerning the legal rights of the finder in the Haram, the sacred territory in Mecca, which at bottom go back to the old idea of a special right of ownership by Allāh in the Haram and articles found in it.

These prescriptions of the Fiḥā are based on certain hādīth which have been handed down with several variants (cf. al-Bukhārī, Luqatā; Muslim, Constantinopole 1326 q.v., v. 133) which need not be quoted in detail here as they agree with the principles in question. But it may be mentioned that in a very old stratrum, later worked over, there is mention of a two or three year period. In the conception of the primitive jurists the article found is sometimes described as deposited (waqfā); further, out of special religious scruples, one is careful not to pick up found dates and eat them, as they might belong to the zakāt; finally there is a hādīth which forbids the Meccan pilgrims (khājiq) to pick up articles found at all. From the superscription by Bukhārī to Luqatā, bab 11, it is evident that found articles might be handed over or used to be handed over to a government office, their retention in the finder's care is justified by quoting a special tradition.

None of these traditions can be considered historical; at most the prohibition by the Prophet in his address after the occupation of Mecca from keeping found articles written in the Hārum without advertising the inscription (cf. above) may be genuine on account of its antiquated terminology; Luqatā is not mentioned in the Kur'ān.


(j. schacht)

LUKMĀN, a legendary figure of the period of Arab paganism, who was adopted into the Kur'ān and later legend and poetry. The story of Lūkmān shows three main stages of development: I. The prophet Lūkmān; II. The sīhā of Luğmān, the obsessed hero of the Dāhiliya; III. The Kur'ānic: Luğmān, the wise maker of proverbs; III. The post-Kur'ānic: Lūkmān, the writer of fables.

I. Lūkmān in the old Arab tradition. Even the earlier legends already show Lūkmān in several aspects: 1. as Mu'ammār; 2. as a hero; 3. as a sage. — He is offered a long life. He chooses the duration of the lives of the seven vultures; he brings up a vulture; when it dies, he keeps a second one and so on, for six vultures, which he survives, but he dies at the same time as the seventh, Lubad. The vulture was by far the most popular emblem of longevity among the Arabs (Ps. cxxiv. 4; Goldziher, Asīb. zur arab. Phil., ii., p. 11 sqq.); R. Basset (Leqmān Btrbyr, p.
Luke is remarkable parallel in the interpretation given by Sidonius Apollinaris, for example, of Romulus’s watching for birds: Romulus sees twelve vultures, which means the twelve periods through which Rome will endure. The Kitāb al-
Mu'āmmara of Abū Hātim al-Sijistānī gives Lukman second place for longevity: Khidr was the longest lived man, and Lukman the second, who lived seven times the length of a vulture’s years, i.e. 7 × 50 = 350 years; but the figure is increased in different stories to 1,000, 3,000 or even 3,500 years. The last of the vultures revered by Lukman was called Lubad—endurance; when Lubad finally lets his wings droop, Lukman stirs him up to fly again, but in vain; Lubad dies and with him Lukman. Lukman, as Damiri noted, was already celebrated by Nābiqār. Various adventures are ascribed to Lukman such as the heroines of the Dāhilīyā always had to go through; he was the first to punish the adulterers by stoning and the thief by cutting off his hand. — Lukman belonged to the tribe of Ad. Here we have the old Arab saga coalescing with the Qur’ānic legend. Ad, sinful like Sodom, is devastated by drought. An embassy is sent to Mecca to pray for rain and Lukman goes with it. In the enjoyment of the hospitality given them the ʿAdis forgot the purpose of their journey. Reminded of their duty, one of them obtains by prayer a black cloud. This cloud brings to the tribe of Ad the destruction which was to be their punishment for rejecting the Prophet Ḥūd.

Lukman was already known in the pagan period as a sage. His wisdom is celebrated by pre-Muslim poets (Horovitz, Korānische Untersuchungen, p. 133). It is natural to suppose that the old stories refer to more than one person. Lukman’s wisdom forms the transition from the Dāhilīyā to the Qur’ān.

II. Lukman, the Maker of Proverbs.

In Sūra xxxi of the Qur’ān, Muḥammad introduces Lukman as a sage and makes him utter pious admonitions. These latter do not bear the stamp of Lukman nor of Muḥammad but belong to the common stock of proverbial sayings. A characteristic example is the following: “If all the trees in the earth were pens, and if God were to swell the sea into seven seas of ink, the words of God would not be exhausted.” (Sūra xxxi. 26.)

This great hyperbole is found in hundreds of variants (N. Reinhold Kohler, Und wenn der Himmel so oft Regen, in Orient und Orientf., n. 545—559; Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn, i. 317—323, 441—453). It is recorded that this saying arose out of a dispute with the abhūr of the Jews. The abhūr insisted that all knowledge was contained in the law, and the saying is directed against them. Does this really mean that Muhammad borrowed this hyperbole from the Jews, to whom it really belonged originally? In the admiration of Lukman: “Moderate thy pace, lower thy voice, for of all voices, that of the ass is most hateful.” (Sūra xxxi. 48) Rendel Harris has found the model in a Muslim: “Lower thy head, speak quietly, and look down! For if a house could be built by a loud voice, the ass would build two houses in a day.”

Once Muḥammad had consecrated Lukman as the wise utterer of proverbs, everything that was thought pious or sensible could be attributed to him. Wahb b. Munabbih is credited with saying that he had read 10,000 chapters of Lukman’s wisdom. The Arabic collections of proverbs (notably Maḏiḏ‘) attribute much to Lukman (see R. Basset, op. cit., xlv. — liv.). Thā‘alib‘i devotes a chapter of his Maḏjalla to the wisdom of Lukman. Many sayings seem to link up with the Sūra of Lukman. Sūra xxxi. 14 advises reverence for parents but warns against being led astray by parents to worship false gods. Thā‘alib‘i’s authority makes Lukman say: “Be amenable to your friends but never so far as to act against God’s Law.” There is much that recalls Aḥkāf: Lukman teaches that the rod benefits the child like water the seed. In Aḥkāf we have: “Spare not thy son for strokes of the rod are to a boy like dung to the garden.” Lukman says: “When thou seest people who remember God, join them; hast thou knowledge it will be useful to you with them and they will increase it; if thou hast none, they will teach thee; when thou seest people who do not remember God, do not join them; for if thou hast knowledge, it will not avail thee, and if thou art ignorant, they will increase thy ignorance.” Aḥkāf says: “Join the wise man, then thou wilt become as wise as he, but join not the fool and he will make thee his guest.” Lukman gives excellent advice for one going on a journey and also adds that he should be armed, similarly Aḥkāf. In Maḏiḏ‘ the Arabic proverbs Lukman is credited with the following admonition: “My son, consult the physician before thou fallest ill!” This corresponds to the first saying in Ben Sira’s alphabet: “Honour the physician before thou requirest him.” On the other hand Lukman’s warning against hypocrisy is found in similar form in the Disciplina clericalis.

Muslim legend is fond of making the sages and wise men of the past into prophets. But since Muḥammad quotes Lukman as a sage, the story was told that God offered Lukman the choice between becoming a prophet or a sage. Lukman chose wisdom and became vizier to King David, who called him fortunate: “Hail to thee, thine wisdom, ours the pain!” Lukman lived down to the time of the prophet Yūnus (Jonah). He is also called judge of the Jews. Muslim legend sometimes also, although very rarely, makes Lukman a prophet and even gives him the “Madjalla” (megillah), the roll of wisdom (Ṭabarani, Annals, i. 1208).

III. Lukman, the Writer of Fables.

Lukman was honoured by Muḥammad and after him as a maker of proverbs. A few centuries later he became a writer of fables also, perhaps because amṭul‘ mentioned both proverbs and fables. Lukman thus became the Aesop of the Arabs. Much was transferred to Lukman that was told in Europe in Aesop. The tendencies to this can be traced quite early. While the very earliest legend saw in Lukman the hero and Muslim legend makes him a sage, judge, vizier, or even a prophet, the later Oriental legend delights in describing him as a carpenter, a shepherd, a deformed slave, an Egyptian, Nubian or Ethiopian slave, a feature which is obviously modelled on the story of Aesop. Lukman’s vizier order lies him to set the best before his guests. Lukman gives them the tongue and heart of a sheep. On another occasion his master tells him to set his worst before them. Once again Lukman sets a heart and tongue before them, for there is nothing better than a good tongue and a good
heart and nothing worse than an evil tongue and an evil heart (in Plutarch and in the *Vita Aesopi* of Maximus Planudes the tongue only is mentioned and not the heart). — Luḳmān’s fellow-slaves on one occasion eat their master’s figs and accuse Luḳmān. At Luḳmān’s suggestion the master makes them drink warm water. Luḳmān vomits water only, the other slaves figs and water — Luḳmān’s master in his cups had wagered he would drink up the sea. Sobered he asks Luḳmān’s advice. The latter demands of those who had taken upon the wager that they should first dam back all the rivers flowing into the sea, as his master had promised to drink up the sea only but not its tributaries. The latter is a widely disseminated motive in fairy tales of the type of the Emperor and the Bishop (Walter Anderson, *Kaiser und Arzt*, F. F. Communications, No. 43, p. 134—140, especially p. 139 where reference is made to Luḳmān; Chauvin, *Bibliographie*, viii, 66—62). These anecdotes are also found in the *Vita Aesopi* of Planudes (xivth century), but they are known as early as Plutarch, *Convidium septem Sapientiam*.

The older Arabic literature does not know fables of Luḳmān. They first appear in the late middle ages. The Paris manuscript published by Jos. Derenbourg belongs to the year 1299 and contains 41 fables. These fables have often been published and thoroughly discussed in scholarly fashion especially by Derenbourg, R. Basset and Chauvin. Out of the 41 fables, No. 22 alone has no parallels; the thornbush begs the gardener to tend it so that kings may delight in its flowers and fruits; the gardener waters it twice a day and the thornbush overruns the whole garden. R. Basset recalls the fable of Jotham of the thorn-bush which destroys everything (*Judgec*, ix). All the others with the exception of the thirteenth (the mudge and the bull) are found in the Syriac fables of Sophos (= Aesopus) published by Landsberg. All are found in Aesop except No. 9, the garden of the thorn-bush and No. 12 (the wasp and bee), No. 40 (the man and the snakes). It has been further observed that in these fables the very animals indigenous among the Arabs, the ostrich, the hyena, the jackal and the camel play no part. As these fables first appear in the late middle ages there can now be no doubt that we have to deal with a selection of Aesop’s fables translated into Arabic.

IV. Related legendary figures.

Luḳmān is a many-sided figure: he is *Muḥammad*, hero, sage, maker of proverbs, and writer of fables. It is no wonder then that he has often been compared and identified with other legendary heroes, Prometheus, Alkmaion, Lucian and Solomon. Abu ‘l-Faraj makes Luḳmān the teacher of the pedagogues. Three of these equations deserve closer examination: 1) with Balaam, 2) with Akḥiḳar and 3) with Aesop. The identification with Balaam is old. Arabic legend gives the following genealogy: Luḳmān b. Baʿṯr b. Nāḥīr b. Tarīkḥ. It is evident that the Qurʾān exegetes sought for something corresponding to Luḳmān in the Bible. They found this in Balaam as the vowels *baʿ* and *laʿ* both mean the same: “to devour.” This then became a Muslim tradition, which then forced the Hebrew *Maḥīle Simḥah*, where Luḳmān is one of the seven wise teachers of the king’s son (ed. Cassel, p. 220 sq.) and also the *Disciplina clericalis* of Petrus Alphonsus, where the correct text is *Balaam qui lingua arabica vocatus Lucaman*” (ed. Hilske-Soderhjelm, p. 3). The Qurʾān exegetes had no doubt about this identity. The question arises however: did Muḥammad himself see Balaam in Luḳmān — and next: is Luḳmān really Balaam? Derenbourg, Basset and Eduard Meyer (*Die Israeleiten und ihre Nachbarn*, p. 523) answer in the affirmative. But it is quite incredible. The pre-Qurʾānic tradition about Luḳmān, the Qurʾān Sūra, which shows deep reverence for Luḳmān, have no single feature of the hated Balaam of the Bible and the Haggada. This identification was only made later by Qurʾānic exegetes, who wished to connect Luḳmān with the Bible at any cost, and made him the son of Beʿr, i.e. Balaam, just as they sometimes made him the nephew or cousin of Job. Luḳmān’s similarity to Akḥiḳar was also noticed long ago, but it is only quite recently that the identification has found a vigorous champion in Rendel Harris, who devotes the chap. vii. of his *Story of Akḥiḳar* to it. He bases his identification on the agreement of Sūra xxxi. 18 with Akḥiḳar’s warning about the voice of the ass, and on Arab hypotheses which compare Luḳmān with other fables in legend and history, notably to the relationship of Luḳmān, Akḥiḳar and Aesop. The story of Aesop shows originally a close relationship to that of Akḥiḳar. The later legend of Luḳmān has borrowed much of the story of Aesop and thus becomes like the Akḥiḳar story but in reality Luḳmān is not directly connected with Akḥiḳar but with Aesop.

The development of the Luḳmān legend seems varied but clear. Luḳmān properly belongs to the legends or possibly the history of Arab paganism. For even this period already knows the sage Luḳmān. With Muḥammad he becomes the teacher of pious doctrines. Incited by the Qurʾān the interpreters of the Qurʾān found Luḳmān’s saying, in many places and found Luḳmān himself in the Balaam of the Bible. He was credited with fables in addition to the proverbs and was thus made the Aesop of the Arabs.


(Bernhard Heller)

The Lūr/Luli gipsies (cf. the reference above to their dark skin) must be clearly distinguished from the Lur [q.v.] highlanders who live in the southwest of Persia, have a fair skin and speak an Iranian dialect with no trace of Indian elements. The situation is however slightly complicated by certain minor points. In the first place the use of the terms Luri, Luri, Lur, etc., is not always quite clear. In the confederation of 'Arab tribes of Fars there is a Lur clan; Sykes, *Ten thousand Miles*, p. 330: Ritich, *Povëdka v Bultistain*, *Isv. Geogr. Obšč.*, 1902, xxxiii., p. 69 speaks of a Lori section (Persian pronunciation of Lūr*) among the Lūrī of Kirmān. Edmonds notes the existence of a Lori? clan in Luristan in the Dasht-i Qandīn division of the Barīmawand group. In Kūstānīdēr there is a clan Lur-ī Khāfāghār [cf. Sena].

Still more confusing is the fact that some Lurs follow the profession of acrobats, bear-leaders, etc., (cf. Curkow, p. 277). As early as the sixteenth century, Shīkhī al-Dīn al-Ārmarānī mentions the talent of the Lurs in these directions and in our own day we find wandering troops of Lurs as far north as Tabriz where there is a permanent colony of Kāračī gipsies, professional actors and singers. It is possible that the special qualifications of the Lur and gipsy players differ somewhat; the Sāmānī of Kūstānīdēr [cf. Sarful and Sena] who excel in singing and dancing are not acrobats. But we must first of all wait till a special investigation settles to what precise section the wandering Lur artists belong.

There is nothing impossible in a gipsy infiltration into Luristan. Whatever was the ethnical entity covered by the name Ṭuṭ (on the confusion of the Ṭuṭ with the Lūr see above: Hamza, Ḥašālabī) the existence of Ṭuṭ colonies in Khūzestān is known as early as the time of al-Hādījādī [q.v.] (cf. Hāwat al-Ṭuṭ between Arradhān and Kīrām-Hūrzū; the modern town of Ḥašālabī [the 'Indian'] may have a similar origin). According to Ḥalādhūrī, p. 382, when in the second quarter of the first century A.H. the Ṭuṭ had apostatised from Islam, they were joined by the local Kurds, who provoked the punitive expedition of ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭamīr al-Ṭuṭādī (Mālamū, the future capital of the Kurds). The alliance of the Ṭuṭ and Kurds (Ṭuṭ or Lur; q.v.) so early a date is curious. Under al-Ṭuṭ, Vahānī, p. 833 mentions two places in Kurd and a small district (nāhīyā) under Ahwāz in Khūzestān, Schwarz, *Persien im Mittelalter*, v. 665, identifies this Rūr with the district of al-Lūr (cf. LURISTAN). In the light of what has been said above one might suppose the existence in al-Lūr of a very ancient Indian colony. But as our sources contain no positive confirmation of this hypothesis—[according to Ibn Hawkal, p. 176, the "Kurī" were predominant in al-Lūr] the question of the origin of the name al-Ṭuṭ in Khūzestān, of the identity of this al-Ṭuṭ with al-Lūr and the remoter origin of the name Lur must for the present be left open. In any case even if the name Lur came from the town of
al-Lūr, the origin of the word would not necessarily settle the question of the ethnic origin of this people.

As to the general question of the gipsies in Persia, their names in the provinces other than Kirmān and Bāltīsītān are as follows:

in Khoarāsān: Kīrshāmīl (in which a fantastic popular etymology sees ghāir-i shumār, interpreted as "innumerable"); in Transcaucasian Turkish dialects "bāltīsī" means "vaurien"; cf. the comedies of Fath 'Ali Akhoundū, q.v.;

in Āstarābād and Māzandarān: Dājū (and elsewhere: Kūlīl (==Kābulī)).

The names mentioned may correspond to slight local distinctions not yet fully known. Gobineau collected the following names of particular tribes leading a nomadic life in the north of Persia: Sanātī (?), Kasātarāsh, "cup-makers", Budghāli, Adenesīr (Adhar-nāsī,); Zargār-i Kirmānī, "gold-smiths of Kirmān"; Shahīniyār (winter at Hamadān, summer near Damāvand); Karjī, Toar-kābulī (dasnūr + kābulī "sleep-doctor"), Gāzbābi, Bāsh-kāpān (in Turkish bāshkāpān "the who seizes"), Gāzbāri (big hunters in Māzandarān; cf. de Morgan), Kāšhī, Badjāmān. According to Newbold the Persian gipsies fall into two classes: Ŧālī (or Ghurbatī) and Gāzbāri.

As names applied to Persian gipsies in general Gobineau gives Bešābhāvān giàushābhāvān (cf. the name of the Armenian and Transcaucasian gipsies, the Besho) and Oldjīl (cf. The following names have a general and neutral character: Ghurbatī, "living in a foreign land"; according to Ivanov, the gipsies who confuse žīl and žīlə in būrbi an offensive allusion to the promiscuity (būrbi, "relationship, consanguinity") of which isolated communities in all ages have been accused; the name is sometimes transcribed būrbati and kūrbati, Fiyyūd (from the Arabic, fiyūd, "couriers"), Ustākār, Aghā, Ghurbālband ("sieve-makers").

The number of gipsies in Persia may be estimated at 20,000 families, or 100,000 souls, of whom 5,000 families are in Āstarābād, 500 in Kirmān (Sykes). The gipsies have an organisation of their own at the head of which is the chief of the Şāhī's runners (shārīs-brāshī) under whom are the provincial deputies (kāltāntar). In western Persia the gipsies are very little different from the Persian peasantry (Sykes, Ivanov).

In Khoarāsān they play a considerable part in the life of the rural community as artisans, making and repairing sieves, chains, combs etc. In Āstarābād the Gāzbāri are coppersmiths, carders of wool and cotton (de Morgan). Throughout Persia one sees the black tents of the nameless lūr who must be gipsies. It remains to be seen also if the Kurd tribes bearing names like Khorār ("turners"), Harārī, Kūhāsh ("shutters") are not of gipsy origin (cf. the article SENNA). In the towns, such as Sābavāvar, Nishāpūr and Tabriz, the gipsies have quarters of their own. There are troops of gipsy dancers and musicians in Persia but they do not seem to be very popular. Ouseley gives a description of the dances and of the marionette theatres of the Kārači (Tabriz). The dancers and singers of the Sūmāni tribe in Kūrdistan have often been described by travellers; cf. notably: Lycklama and Nijeholt, Voyage, iv., p. 30—70; Cirkow, Probleme, p. 299, 330; Kshushl-Efend, Sīyāšt-i Nūrī, Russian transl., p. 119: cf. T. Thomson, "The Surnram: are they Gipsies?," T. Gipsy Lore Soc., ii., 1909, p. 275—276.

The language of the gipsies of Persia (Sykes, de Morgan, Ivanov) has taken its morphology from modern Persian; its vocabulary also is full of Persian words (cf. the lists in de Morgan); Indian elements seem to be rarer than in the Roman of Europe; the language of Kirmān and Khoarāsān (Sykes, Ivanov) contains a large number of unrecognisable elements. Loughor Dames out of 86 words in Sykes's vocabulary 4 Arabic, 28 Persian and 52 of unknown origin. He would regard this dialect rather as an artificial secret jargon. Denys Brey (quoted by Ivanov) in any case confirms the fact that in the land of the Kūrdistan is learned by the children as a separate language ("is at any rate acquired naturally by Lūr children, as a language for the home circle").

The Sūmāni tribe are known by Kūrdi. According to Cirkow they are called Dūmān, which must correspond to Dūmān (Dūmān, the name of a low caste in India), which corresponds with the well-known name for gipsies: Reım). The vocabulary of the Dūmān (Baghdād, Aleppo) is collected by Newbold, J.K.A.S., 1854, p. 303 from an informant from Altun-köprü, is full of Kurdish words: kivār, "tone", khoi, "salt", liwā, "boy". A Kūrd tribe in the east of Bohtág bears the suggestive name of Sīndi/Sindīyān (the "Sindians"). According to the Sīnān of Būlān the chief of the Kūrdi clan (of the Zāk) had married a gipsy woman. In discussing the relationships of gipsies and Kurds it should be remembered that in 1220 (835) a section of the Zanṭ settled in K̄ānīkūn, i.e. at the gate of Kurdish territory; cf. de Goeje, Mémoire, p. 30; Tabari, iii. 1168.

According to Sampson, two categories of gipsy speech may be distinguished according to the fate of the primitive Indian aspirated mānas: the one changes them into aspirated tenses, i.e. Piśikrit, bānāti > phar (Armenia, Europe), the other deprivates them of aspiration, bānāti > ban (Persia, Syria, Egypt). The interest of the Persian dialects is in the fact that Persia was the first country in which the gipsies returned after leaving India (probably in the Sā-Ṣāni period). In the gipsy dialects of Persia, as yet very insufficiently studied, we may expect to find traces of a rather archaic phonetic system. Ouseley for example found among the Kārači of Tabriz the word khan "sister" which must be older than ābān or ban (cf. also 2. in Gobineau).

Bibliography: See the article LUR, SARTU, SENNA, ZÜT. — Don Juan de Persia, Relaciones, Valladolid, 1604, p. 17 (on the looseness of gipsy morals); English translation by J. L. Strange, London 1926, p. 67; Ouseley, Travels in various Countries of the East, London 1819—1823, i. 309; iii. 400, 405 (the Kārači of Tabriz); Ker Porter, Travels in Georgia etc., London 1822, ii. 528—532: the Kārači near Marāgha; Die Zigeuner in Persien und Indien, Das Ausland, Munich 1833, p. 163—164; Bataillard, Nouvelles recherches sur l'apposition et la dispersion des Bohémians, avec un appendice sur l'immigration en Perse entre les années 420 et 440.
al-Din Arslān Shāh his successor and Lulu' his regent. When Ṣimâl al-Din seized the fortress of al-Imādyya in Ramādān of the same year (Dec. 1218), Lulu' sent an army against him. Lulu'’s troops besieged al-Imādyya but had to return with nothing effected, whereupon the other fortresses in al-Hakkāriya and al-Zawāzīn surrendered to Ṣimâl al-Din when the latter made an alliance with the lord of Irbi, Muṣaffar al-Din Kokbūr. Lulu' sought the assistance of the Ayyūbid al-Malik al-Aṣharf, who ruled the greater part of Mesopotamia, and recognised his suzerainty, whereupon al-Aṣharf sent an army to Naṣībīn to help Lulu' if necessary. In Muḥarram (April 1219) Lulu' was defeated by Ṣimâl al-Din’s forces near al-Ahr and had to flee to Irbi. Peace was however soon afterwards concluded through the intervention of al-Aṣharf and the Caliph al-Nāṣir, but when the sickly Nūr al-Din died in the same or the following year and his brother Naṣīr al-Din Māhmūd, who was some three years old, succeeded him, Ṣimâl al-Din and Muṣaffar al-Din began to raid and plunder the district of al-Mawṣil whereupon Lulu', who had first sent his eldest son with an army to al-Aṣharf to help him against the Franks, appealed for help to Abeg, al-Aṣharf’s general in Naṣībīn. Abeg set out at once and joined Lulu’. On Raḥib 2, 616 (Oct. 20, 1219) Lulu’ was defeated near al-Mawṣil; but while he was again collecting his followers around him Muṣaffar al-Din retired. After the conclusion of peace, Ṣimâl al-Din occupied the fortress of Kauwaḥ, and Lulu’ had again to appeal to Aṣharf. Muṣaffar al-Din however induced a number of emirs, among them Ibn al-Mashjūb to secede from al-Aṣharf and take up a position at Dunā‘īr to prevent the latter’s passing. The emirs however soon changed their views with the sole exception of Ibn al-Mashjūb who went to Irbi. He was twice defeated, first by the garrison of Naṣībīn and then by the troops of Farraḍī Shāh, lord of Sinjār, who took him prisoner. When he had been released, he collected a plundering horde around him and ravaged the country far and wide. He was defeated by an army of Lulu’’s and took refuge in the fortress of Tell A‘far. The latter was besieged and Lulu’ himself came up from al-Mawṣil. On Raḥib 17, 617 (June 21, 1220) he had to capitulate and Ibn al-Mashjūb was taken prisoner and brought to al-Mawṣil. After al-Aṣharf had made peace with Muṣaffar al-Din he handed over to Lulu’ the fortresses of Dündalā, Naṣībīn and the governorship of Mesopotamia, to which other fortresses were later added. After the death of Naṣir al-Din (619 = 1222-1223) or according to others not till 631 = 1233-1234) Lulu’ was recognised as Aṭṭebeg of al-Mawṣil and assumed the name of al-Malik al-Rahim. In 635 (1237-1238) he became involved in war with the Ayyūbīd al-Nāṣir Naṣīr al-Din. The latter took the Khārṣmians into his service and granted them Harrān and Edessa whereupon they seized al-μ the town of Naṣībīn. About three years later they were defeated by the ruler of Ḥalab and Ibn-Last and Lulu’ regained Naṣībīn with Dārā. Lulu’ had also to fight the lord of Ḥalab, the Ayyūbīd al-Nāṣir Yusuf. In 648 (1250-1251) he was defeated and Naṣībīn, Dārā and Karakishāh fell into the hands of the Aleppo forces. Lulu’ died in 657 (1259) aged over 60, after recognising the suzerainty of Ḥālim [v.]

LU'LÜ' I. A Mamlûk of Salīf al-Dawla the ruler of Aleppo, vizier of his son Sa'id al-Dawla and his grandson Sa'id al-Dawla. On the latter’s assassination, he became guardian of his sons and from 394-400 (1003-1009) independent governor of Aleppo under Fātimid suzerainty; cf. the article HAMĀDI, where the bibliography also is given.

2. A eunuch and the trusted advisor of the Salджûk Sultan Ridwān of Aleppo; on the latter’s death in 507 (1113) he became Aṭālēg of his son Alp Arslān al-Akbār (lit. “the dumb”), so called on account of an impediment in his speech). Alp Arslān who left the government in the hands of Lu’lu’ rendered himself hated by his court on account of his crimes and tyrannical conduct and fell a victim to a conspiracy in which Lu’lu’ seems to have had a share. To retain a firm hold on the reins of government, he appointed Alp Arslān’s six year old brother Sultan Shāh his successor, who reigned in name till 517 (1123). Anarchical conditions prevailed in Syria throughout the whole period (cf. the art. ḤAMĀDI). To retain his power Lu’lu’ had to steer a course between the Crusades, the Salджûk Sultan and the Great Salджûk Sultan Muhammad. He promised to hand over Aleppo to the latter but at the same time secretly sought the help of the Aṭālēg Toghtikīn [q.v.] of Damascus against him and of Ughzār of Marīdin and on the other hand to prevent them becoming too strong betrayed their movements to the Crusaders who were able to inflict damage on them. He succeeded in retaining Aleppo with the help of Toghtikīn’s cavalry. To raise the necessary funds to pay these and his own troops he extorted the last farthing out of his viziers and the wealthier inhabitants of Aleppo. He himself never left the citadel for fear of conspiracies. When he was at last forced in 510 (1117) to make a journey, either to take his treasure to a friend’s care or to get money stored with him, his Türkic bodyguard fell upon and killed him. The latter seized his treasure and tried to take Aleppo by surprise but were defeated by the garrison and had to give up their attack. Lu’lu’ is a typical example of the anarchy in Syria at the beginning of the Crusades which was only put an end to by the energy and ability of Nāṣ al-Dīn.

were later called after the places where they had settled, like the Djangrū (Çangrū’i, Djangardi) and the Ürari (Azstari). The governing family of the Atbhes of Little Lur belonged to the Djangrū (the name of their clan, the Saḥarā, Saḥgarā should be corrected from Salwārţi, ‘Amāna-yā, p. 360; Salwārţi, ‘Alī Ḥazīn, Tahkhrū’ā, p. 135 and Salwārṭi in Houtum-Schindler). The Zhāqā-yi Ġorāṅi concludes by enumerating the 8 clans (gānhan) of the two principal gūrih and the 18 other tribes (ajā’īb) of the Lurs.

A few names (Māngarra, Anārkā, Dībādkā) correspond to modern names. Finally 4 clans are mentioned: Sāhā (Sāmī), Arsān (Arstān, Aṣān), Arki and Bāh, who, although speaking Luri, are not Lurs; the people of the other villages of Mānjūd were peasants (turū). About 500 (1106), a hundred (or 400) Faḍlawi Kurd families arrived from Syria. They came by the north (Shurtān-Khū) and settled at first on the lands of the Khūrādhī waṣīr (cf. the article on the ethnical composition of the Great Lur. It is not known if the word gīdāhk). At the beginning of the viııth (xiııth) century new tribes flocked to the standards of Hāzanā-yā of the Great Lurs. Among them were 2 Arab tribes: Īlā (‘Āli; cf. the place of this name below Shūshār), and Ḥāshimi and 28 different tribes (mātagarī) among whom we find the Baktāyār (Maktārū), the Ģīrānšād (Māris, the Gītand (cf. the village near Shūshār), the ʿUle, the Iṣrāwī, the Māmāsān (Māmāsen) etc. According to the Šeṣa-i-rās (i. 26) all these tribes also came from Syria. These waves of immigration must have had a considerable effect on the ethnical composition of the Great Lur. It is probable that the immigrants were Kurds and that traces of them still survived among the Kurds whom Ibn Batṭūṭa (ii. 21–39) found at the beginning of the xıııth century near Bahshār and Rām Hurnūz when on his way to the capital of the Grand Lur. There has long been a village of Kurdštān on the Dzhānān and it had even given its name to this river. Shāhāb al-In al-Urmān (V, p. 8, p. 320–332) mentions the presence of Lurs in Syria and Egypt and tells how Salādān (563–580), alarmed by their dangerous ability to climb the steepest ramparts, had them massacred en masse. This anecdote throws some light on the causes which produced the arrival of the tribes in this region (cf. returnEM) Luristan about 600 A.H. of numerous Iranian tribes.

The southern part of Little Lur was exposed to miltarily by Kurds, especially through the valley of Kafkha (cf. IKB; just to the north of Su-sa is a tree ṣār-ṭi Bānā, bearing the name of a clan of the Kird tribe of Ṣeṣa, located in the history of the Ḥasanawāhīs; cf. Ibn al-ʿAṣān, V, p. 146, 219) and exposed to Turk and Mongol invasions (cf. the devastating of the Atbhes of the Lur-ṭi Kūk against the Bayāt and Āiwa (= Bahārā, Turk.)

In the Ǧaftāw period, Turkish tribes were introduced into Luristan from the direction of the Kūh-Gūri (where traces of them still exist) and Georgian and Armenian colonies to the north of the Kūh-Gūri country. On the movements of the population under Nādir, the title and Čaḏars were below. The ethnical situation gradually stabilized in the xıııth century.

The names of the Lur tribes and groups are now quite well known and as we have lists going from 1836 to 1922 a companion enables us to note the changes that have taken place meanwhile. Regroupings seem to be taking place more rapidly among the Lurs than among the Kurds but the general framework of the tribal grouping remains essentially the same.

In 1881 (Curzon, ii. 274) there were 421,000 Lurs of whom 170,000 were Baktāyrā, 41,000 Kūh-Gūri, and 210,000 Fellā. According to Rabino, this last section numbered in 1873 150,000 (or 130,000 individuals) in Puh-Kūh, and 10,000 tents (or 50,000 individuals) in Pusht-i Kūh (this last figure seems too low).

The Māmāsān (Mamassam) group includes 2 main tribes: the Bakāsh, Dībādkā (Dījāwī), Dushmanzārī and Rustamī (cf. the article Šīlū). The Kūh-Gūri group (Kūh-Gūri) includes 3 large tribes (Aḵārābar, Bāwā and Dījākī). The first of these tribes (cf. the name of the old Turkish tribe of Aḵādārā) is of a composite character, for of its 7 clans four (Āṣur, Begdā, Cāštān and Kārākhā) are Turkish (evidently the remains of the Aḵārābar, Bāwā and Dījākī, who, according to the Kūh-Gūri, had been given under the Ǧaftāw) and a fifth clan (Tiṅkūt) bears the name of a district in Kurdštān of Sennā (? v.). On the second tribe, Bāwā, O. Mann notes that it bears the name of an Arab tribe of the neighbourhood of Ahwāz but there is also a mountain called Bawā to the south of Khurramābād. The third tribe, Dījākī, is purely Luri and is composed of two main sections: Čaḵwānī and Dījāwī with many subdivisions. This threefold composition of the Kūh-Gūri group is typical of many of the Lur tribes.

As to the Baktāyrā, Sawyer as long ago as 1894 said that their territory was "thoroughly surveyed" and that every tribe visited in their own encampment, everything appertaining to the Baktāyrāis may now be said to be known." But Curzon’s tables (1890) are still the last word available to the student. Of the two Baktāyrā groups: Ǧaḥār-lang and Hāft-lang, the latter is the more important at the present day The Ǧaḥār-lang, who used to be in the south are now mainly on the outskirts in the district north of the northern barrier (between Burīgūr and Gulpāyagān).

The main groups of Lurs are: Tārīn, Dīlnān, and Dīlā (cf. IKB) and Bāg-Gūri. The tribes of the last group are the Lurs par excellence and have important subdivisions: Dir, Goud, Sagward etc. It is possible that the Dir-Goud are the real nucleus of the Lur race. Their chiefs are called mir.

In contrast to what we find among the Kurds, where the individual members of the tribe are usually much attached to their hereditary chief, the Lurs proper (Bāg-Gūri) are distinguished by a more democratic feeling. The power of the hereditary families of khan is based on their "guard" (fātāl), but this power is considerably reduced by the authority of the chief of the clan (fīnān). The khans are forced to court the favours of these wild, turbulent chiefs (Edmonds: "uncouth headmen"); the latter are amenable to the solicitations of their neighbours and in this way the tribes are broken up and new groupings take place.

Little is known of the ethnology of the Lurs. The names of Duhouisset (who commanded a Lur regiment in 1859), Études sur la popul. de la Perse, p. 23, of Khânkoff, Min, sur l’ethnogra-
manifestation who is called Bābā Khošin and numbers among his "angels" Bābā Tāhir [q. v.]. An important sanctuary of the sect, the tomb of Shahvāde Aḥmad (the alleged son of the imām Mīrū Khān), is in the district of Kūs near Bī-āw (territory of Ķalawand) and is kept by Saiyids of the Ḩāfī tribe; these Saiyids wear red turbans which recalls the predilection for red of the old Muḥammads = Khurramiya [q. v.] whose flags were of this colour.

The religion of the Lurs was so little orthodox even from the Shī‘a point of view that at the beginning of the sixteenth century prince Muḥammad All Mirzā had to send for a mujtahid to convert the tribes to Islām (Rahino, p. 24). All the Lur and Lak tribes are officially Shī‘is (contrast the attachment of the true Kurds to Sunna orthodoxy).

Language. Down to the beginning of the eighteenth century our knowledge of the Lur dialects was confined to 88 words collected by Rich, to 4 Bakhtiyari verses in Layard and to some thirty words collected by Houtum-Schindler. As late as the Grundriß d. iran. Phil., 1/2, 1898—1901, p. 249, we find the thesis stated that Luri is closely related to Kurdish and may even be described as one of its dialects. The materials of the Pāpī tribe, collected in 1852—1853, were published the day after the death of the author (d. 4/1/1918). The merit therefore of having first established the important fact that Kurdish and Luri are quite separate ("eine tiefgehende Scheidung des Kurdischen vom Luri") is due to O. Mann. This scholar has shown that although these are Kurd tribes in Luristan (cf. the article LAK), the true Lurs speak dialects which belong undoubtedly to the S.W. Iranian group (like Persian and the dialects of Fās) and not to the N. W. group (like Kurdish and the "central" dialects).

The Luri dialects which have none of the asperities of Kurdish (cf. KURD) fall into two categories. To the first belong the dialects of the Great Lours Masamsani, Khūghlu and Bakhtiyari (the latter has a few in-significant peculiarities of its own); to the second belong the dialects of the Little Lur, i.e. of the Feith Lurs.

Even the first group possesses very few special features compared with modern Persian. From the point of view of phonetics: -nm at the end of a word becomes -am, -an (muk mon ammanom; dhom ḥomn); n changes into l: pālīlī; intervesicale / gives dh (l): mukshamītād; the combination -kt -st give -kīh and -līt (l): dahktar-lītār, rāfīt; initial kh becomes k: khōlnām, etc. Peculiar to Bakhtiyari is the change of intervesicale m to v: ġūnāv-ğūnā the occasional change of š to s: ṣās = ėsān. It is remarkable that some of these phonetical peculiarities were long ago noted by Handalāv Mustawfī (Tārīkh-e Ġūbir, p. 537—538). He says that Luri (although full of Arabic words) does not have the peculiarly Arabic sounds, like š, ḥ, ẓ, ǧ, etc. Inflection: Plural in -č (švānč); accusative in -m instead of -m: ţām, got = mānu: feitation of the present: ʃ instead of Persian m; first Persian plural ending in -mān(š): škūrāmān = nikšām. Luri usually forms the pretende of active verbs as in Persian with the help of personal endings (active construction) and not like Kurdish and the majority of Persian dialects (including those of Fās) which
give the preterite a passive construction. Vocabulary.

In the present and the preterite stems Luri usually follows Persian but we find stems and words unknown in Persian: زُمان, نَمان، "to throw"; نَرُن, اَنَارُن, "to be able"; نِی, "eye", etc. From the Mongol period, Luri has kept several expressions like: نَرُن, "chief of a clan"; نَسُن, "official"; کَریکُن, "guard of the khan"; in Eastern Turkic "camp, lager", cf. Burdaw, it. 102; کَریکُن, "encampment", in Mongol, کُریکُن, "camp, tent".

As to the Felli group, their dialect differs very little from ordinary Persian (Mann: "weiter nichts als ein stark abgeschilfertes Persisch").

The Luristan is a few islands of Kūrīsh of some importance. Such are in the north the Lur tribes [q.v.]. Among the Felli, the Maliki group (on the frontier of Kirmānshāh, at Hulānam, and farther south) speaks a southern Kūrīsh dialect like that of the Kullur. The Kūrīshīhān group (to the south of Pusht-i Kūr) speaks a "Kurmandji" Kūrīsh. Linguistic conditions in the Pusht-i Kūh still require further study.


Literature. The Lur tribes and especially the Bakhtiyārī have a rich popular literature, fairy tales, epic fragments, celebrating the exploits of their heroes (like Muhammad Taḵi Khan Čaj-Lang and Hājīdīt Hājīt Haf-lang), lyrics, songs sung at marriage (zāma) and in cradle-songs (čalo). These pieces are often pretty and full of sentiment; of the collections by O. Mann and Zuakoowski (the latter published an article on Persian and Bakhtiyārī lullabies in the Journ. Mus. Xav. du. Pressoir, Jan. 1899); D. R. K. Lorimer and E. O. Cameron, 1. Tr. Trans., London 1909, p. 107–134, translation only.


History. On the participation of the tribes of Kūrīshīhān and Fāsī in the fighting between Arabs and Persians in the early centuries of the Hijrī calendar (q.v.). The Carolingians interfered directly in the affairs of the country, especially in Luristan (q.v.). The fortunes of the Lurs were more closely associated with the Iranian dynasties ruling in Kūrīshīhān, at Shirāz, Isfahān, Hamadān and on the Zagros: the Saffarids, Būyids, Kūkāwhīds, Ḥasanawīds and their successors of the family of Abu l-Shawk (cf. the article Kūrīshīhān).

We have coins of the Būyids struck at Iṣfāṣī (Codrington). In 532 the Būyid army marched through Luristan (Ṣūs — Shāʾīrūk-hāst — Karājī). The Ḥasanawīd Kūds whose capital was at Sarmādī (south of Bāstān) extended their dominions into the valley of the Karkha. Shāʾīrūk-hāst (= Khurramubad) formed part of their possessions about 400 (1009) (Din al-Aṣghir, it. 89; Taḏīrī al-ʿawma, ed. Amedroz, ii. 291, itt. 451). The Kūkāwhīd Garāshāp maintained a siege by the Saljuqs in Shāʾīrūk-hāst (453 = 1062). The amirs of this last dynasty later settled in northern Luristan: the family of Zangi b. Bursuq in Shāʾīrūk-hāst before 499 (1005), Ḥisām al-Dīn Alphāghī at Dūz-i Malki on the Karkha before 549 (1154) (Rūhsat al-Salṭanā, G. M. S., p. 285). A Turk Ḥiṣām al-Dīn Shīhāka or Aḵsāri is mentioned as lord of Luristan and of a part of Kūrīshīhān between 547 and 570. A long inscription (Kūfī?) on a stele near Khurramubad is still undeciphered (cf. a copy in von Bode, ii. 298; Rawlinson thought he recognised in it the name of the Atabeg Shajāʿ al-Dīn but according to Curzon it has an earlier date [517 = 1123]).

In any case all attempts from outside to subdue Luristan or to take parts of its territory affected the tribal system very little, the development of which came to a head at the coming of the Aḥtabeks.

The principal source for the domestic history of the country is the Tarīḵ-e Gūzīdah (730 = 1330) based in turn on the Zubštāt al-Tawqīrāh of Ljumal al-Dīn al-Kāshānī (of which the Preussische Staatsbibliothek has only the first volume, No. 368 of Pertz's Catalogue). The Madīna al-ʿAṣāb (c. 742) is based on independent oral tradition but is less accurate. The Dāftār-i-Ābān although late (its author Maḥmūd al-Dīn al-ʿAbān in 1752) uses unpublished data. The Maḥsura (1105 = 1693) is based on the Zubštāt al-Tawqīrāh or perhaps a good copy of the Tarīḵ-e Gūzīdah. According to these sources which supplement the statements of the Arab geographers, the situation in Luristan about 902 (1300) was as follows:

The ShīṬ [q.v.] — who are not mentioned by the Arab before the Mongol epoch — occupied a part ("half") of Luristan. The viceroy of ShīṬ (Tabrīz proper (Tarīḵ-e Gūzīdah, p. 537 and 539) had a governor named Naḵḏ al-Dīn Akbar (according to the Madīna al-ʿAṣāb the title Naḵḏ al-Dīn al-ʿAbān was hereditary among the ShīṬ) while the Lur territory under the ShīṬ (probably Kūh-Golū) had a ḥūsūs Naḵḏ al-Dīn Maḵām whose family had been prominent in the country since the Sassānian period; he was one of the Rūshīhān tribes which the Tarīḵ-e Gūzīdah mentions among the Lur tribes. The rest of Luristan was ruled by a family of Lur princes (independent of the ShīṬ) of whom Baḏr ruled in the Great Lur and his brother Manṣūr in the Little Lur. Their dates are uncertain. Baḏr's successor was his grandson Naḵḏ al-Dīn Muḥamad
b. Khâhil b. Badr (according to the Madjma' al-
Anáh, Naṣîr al-Dîn was a nephew of Avarān
[Rang] b. Muḥammâd b. Hîlî), Naṣîr al-Dîn was
deposed by the Pāčławi Kûrsâ who founded the
dynasty of the Ata'bâgs of the Great Lur and
relied for support on tribes who came from outside
Luristan (cf. above under Ethnology). The same
Pāčlawi drove the Shûl out of their settlements.
We know nothing of Manšûr, brother of the
above mentioned Badr. The tribes of Little Lur
were directly under the caliphs and in the north
were subjected to the invaders. The founder
(about 580) of the native dynasty of the Ata'bâgs
of Lur-i Kâkî [q. v.] had disposed of a rival
Sûrkâb b. A'yâr (probably a scion of the dynasty
of Abu 'l-Sâwh which was called 'A'îyâr/Mânûz;
cf. the article Kûrâsà).
The history of the two dynasties of the Ata'bâgs
is filled with feuds, murders and executions but
in domestic affairs the state of the country was
fairly prosperous. The Ata'bâgs built bridges and
madrasas (îmân Bâşûna) and secured a peaceful
existence for the inhabitants (cf. Tarîkh-i Gâzûda,
p. 550). The revenues of each of the two Ata'bâgs
were estimated at a million dinârs while each of
them paid to the Muslim treasury a tribute of 91,000
dinârs only (Naṣîr al-Anâh, p. 760).
In the interval between the Mongols and the
rise of Timûr, the two Ata'bâgs were vassals of the
Mûsâfârâids. In 758 and 759 Timûr ravaged
Little Lur but treated the lord of Great Lur more
kindly. In 785 Timûr passed through Kûh-Gâlû
and Shûlîstân. The Timûâids (cf. the article Bâskâra)
consolidated their power in Luristan and in 837
the last Ata'bâg of the Great Lur disappeared.
Sha'fawî period. The lords of the Little Lur
maintained their position and by intrigue even
succeeded in extending their power over the plain
to the west of the mountains of Pusht-i Kûh.
After the execution of Shâh-wardi Khân, Shâh
'Abbâs installed in his place a wâli descended
from a lateral line of the old family. The posses-
sions of this Wâli, Husain Khân, were, however,
somewhat reduced.
After the disappearance of the dynasty of the
Great Lur the power had passed to the chiefs of
the tribes composing this federation. Under Shâh Tâmahâ-kp we find the title of Sârîr of the local
âdm (a synonym of the chief of the principal
clan, the Astaraki. Tâdî-nur, having neglected his
duties, was executed and replaced by Mîn Djaâhândîr
Bakhiyârî (the Astaraki and Bakhiyârî had come to
Luristan after 600; cf. Tarîkh-i Gâzûda). Djaâhândîr
under the guarantee of Shâh Rustam of the Little
Lur pledged himself to supply annually to the
Sha'fawî treasury 10,000 mules. In 974 the governor
of Isfâhân was sent to remind him of his obli-
gation (Shâraf-nàma, i. 48). Henceforward the Bak-
hiyârî tribe becomes of the first rank and, as usual,
gives its name to the whole confederation.
As to the Kûh-Gâlû territory, it was governed
by Khân of the Turkoman tribe (Shâh-i Kavân) of
Afsâh settled among the Lurs. In 988 (1530) a
dervish impostor claiming to be Shâh Ismâ'l II
had a considerable success among the Džâkî, Džâ-
wânsî and Bânânsi tribes who killed several Afsâh
governors. In 1007 as a result of the excesses
committed by the Afsâh as well as by the Lurs,
the governor of Fârs, Alah-wardi Khân, established
the direct centre of his government in Kûh-Gâlû
(Tarîkh-i Samâ'î, p. 198, 358).

We do not know under what circumstances at
the end of the Sha'fawî dynasty (Fârs-nâma-yi
Nàjîri) the group of Mâmûsâni tribes, who had
migrated into the Great Lur (after 600) occupied
the ancient Shûlîstân (cf. 837). After the Sha'fawîs:
During the troubles provoked by the appearance of the Afgânîs before Iyâhân, the wâli of Luristan, 'Ali Mârdân Khân
Feiîl (a descendant of the Husain Khân appointed
by Shâh 'Abbâs), played a considerable part. With
5,000 of his men he took part in 1135 (1722) in
the defence of the capital. He was even appointed
commander-in-chief of the Persian troops but the
other Khâns refused to take orders from him.
When the Turk invaded Persia in 1725 'Ali
Mârdân Khân abandoned Khurramishâh (which
was occupied by Ahmad Pâshâ) and retired to
Khuzyzstân from which he undertook a diversion
against Bâhådîd. The Turks who had gone through
the Bakhtîyârî country and reached Fârûzân had
Balîflour, London 1831, p. 115, 124, 147, 153,
who was an eye-witness of the events; Hanway,
The Revolutions of Persia, ii. 140, 159, 168, 238;
Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1829, ii. 60-
61; von Fodê, Travels, ii. 281–283; Hammer,
G. O. K., iv. 227.
About the same time several Bakhtîyârî Khâns
(Kâsîm-Khân, Safî-Khân) are mentioned as resisting
the Afgân and Ottoman invaders but they did
not agree well with 'Ali Mârdân Feiîl. In 1137
(1724) 'Ali Muḥammad Husain Khân Bakhtîyârî
recognised as his suzerain a certain pretender
who claimed to be prince Safî Mirzâ. The latter's
headquarters were in Kûh-Gâlû; he was not taken
to Feiîl till 1140 (1727) (Hanway, Tarîkh-i Afsâhî,
p. 178; 'Ali Mârdân Khân, Tarîkh-i Djaâhîn, p. 23);
Tâbra, 1284, transl. into French by Jones, London 1770,
xxvii). The Afgân do not seem to have penetrated
into the Bakhtîyârî country and their expedition
in 1724 against Kûh-Gâlû was a fiasco.
By the treaty of 1140 (1727) the Afgân Aشرف
occupied Luristan to Turkey with other western
provinces. The Turks kept it (nominally) till
1149 (1736) when Nâdîr reestablished the status
quo (Hanway, ii. 254, 347; von Hammer, G. O. K.,
iv. 255, 317). Under Nâdîr a certain Turkoman chief named
Bâhå-Khân Câwûshî (Cawûshî) was appointed
beglerbeg of Luristân-Feiîl. On the other hand
'Ali Mârdân II Feiîl was entrusted by Nâdîr with
diplomatic negotiations in Constantinople. Nâdîr
in 1732 passed through Kûh-Gâlû with his troops
where Muḥammad Khân Balaç (the claimant to
Shîrâz) was defeated. The local Afsâhs had to support Nâdîr, who was one of their tribe. Several
expeditions were sent against the Bakhtîyârîs among
whom a new chief of Afsâh Mamûn-wân (Câhâr-
lang) had collected together the malcontents.
In 1732 Bâhå-Khân Câwûshî was sent against him
for the first time. In 1149 (1735) Nâdîr Shâh
took the field against him in person going via
Djûpâlaç and Bûrûstûd. The Bakhtîyârî country
was several times invaded but the main blow was
directed against the little explored country south
of Shîrûrân-Khân, 'Ali Mârdân Feiîl, captured and
executed. The Bakhtîyârîs were decimated and
exterminated. A little later a Bakhtîyârî detachment distinguished itself in the assault on Kûndâhâr (Mârdân Khân,
The depaited Bakhtiyari returned from Khurasan immediately after the death of Nādir (Tāvārīq-āl hād Nādirīya, ed. Mann, p. 26) and when the dynasty of the latter was extinguished the Bakhtiyari chief Abu Mardan Khān (who is not to be confused with the two Wallis of Luristan-i-Felūk) attempted to play a big part. In 1163 (1750) along with Karim Khān Zand he set up at Isfahān a scion of the later line of the Safawids (Ali Dāvid under the name of Ismā‘īl III). The career of "guardian of the sovereign" acted by Nādir seemed to be certain for him also but Karim Khān gained the upper hand; the troops of Abu Mardan who included Lāk of the tribes of Kālrūr and Zangana were defeated in 1752; he escaped to Diwāndār but died there by the hand of an assassin cf. Mirzā Šāhīk, Tāvārīq-ī qāl- ī gūč, quoted by Malcolm, ii. 61 and note 7, Hamme, G.O.R., v, 757 477, London, The History of the Shahs of Persia, London 1887, p. xxxvii, Curzon, ii. 282.

Karim Khān [q. v.] who had disposed of his Bakhtiyar rival was himself a Lāk of the tribe of Zand, settled in the immediate neighbourhood of Luristan-i Felūk. On the movements of population in his time, cf. the articles KURIR and LAK. In 1200 (1785) when Lūfard Khān Zand had to fall back on Shirāz a number of Laks and of Turks assembled at Isfahān under former partisans of Ali Mardan Khān but the town was soon occupied by Ağa Muhammad Kādir who had nothing better to do than attack the Bakhtiyāris (Abū al-Karim Shīrāzī, Tāvārīq-ī Zanjīda, ed. Beer, p. 29; Malcolm, cf. cit. ii. 179 n.) which injured his popularity among the tribes.

The Lur Bakhtiyāri country was never completely assimilated during the century and a half which the Khājās reigned. A resume of the history of the Bakhtiyāris in the sixteenth century has been given by Curzon in Ch. xxiv. of his Persia. At first the Khājā family, descended from the brother of Abu Mardan Khān (cf. above), came to the front but the expedition of the governor of Isfahān Manuchīr Khān Muḥammad al-Dawla (whose real name was Yenikolopoulos; he was an Armenian from Tihr) in 1841 put an end to the career of the Khājā Muhammad Tāqi Khān and the family did not recover. About 1850 the Bakhtiyāri (or Badawand, a family which claimed to be descended from a shepherd named Tāpi) rose to prominence in the Fāhrāng group and in spite of the intervention in 1852 of its chief Hāsīn Kādir Khān (Hāsīn Kādir) of prince Žīl al-Sulṭān retained its wealth and its importance. The Bakhtiyāris played a considerable part in the Persian revolution which ended in the deposition of Muḥammad ‘Alī Shah Khājā in 1909. The Bakhtiyāri country all this time enjoyed perfect autonomy under the rule of its Sālimān and Bākā.

The centralising efforts of the Khādās had more effect in Luristan-i Felūk (formerly Luri Kūčk) in as much as, as a result of the governorship in Kirmānshāh of the energetic prince Muḥammad ‘Alī at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the old feuds of the actors of Luristan found its relics reduced simply to the possession of Pachī Kat (q. v. and Ėrīkow, p. 237). The Pachī Kat formed the Persian province of Luristan. Muḥammad ‘Alī Mirzā with troops and artillery marched through this province. In 1836 Rawlinson followed him at the head of his Gūrān regiment. After the famous expedition of Manṣūr Khān (1841), his nephew Sulaimān Khān Shahmān al-Dawla, governor of Khūzestān, maintained order in Luristan but for the second part of the nineteenth century Luristan was plunged more or less into a state of anarchy. It was not till 1900 that prince ‘Alī al-Dawla was able to restore order in Luristan and at this time several explorers travelled freely in the disturbed province. But in November 1904 two British officers (Col. Douglas and Capt. Lorimer) on their way to Kirmānshāh were attacked and wounded by Lurs. A considerable agitation was stirred up among the Lurs (and in Persia generally) by the appearance among them of the rebel prince Sālār al-Dawla (several times since 1905). In spite of the efforts of the Persian government Luristan remained closed till 1917, when with the help of foreign representatives several caravan trains were sent to Bārdnjār. About the same time the Persian government confirmed the rank of wālī of Pachī Kat on Nāzīr ‘Alī Khān Amrā (cf. the article LAK.); cf. Edmonds in the Geogr. Jour., 1922.

It is only since the accession of ‘Alī Khān (later Shāh ‘Alī Pahlawī) that the situation in the region inhabited by tribes of Lur origin changed radically and the authority and the Central Government enforced respect for itself through the whole of the south-western provinces.

LUR-I BUZURG, a dynasty of Atābegs which flourished in Eastern and Southern Luristan between 550 (1155) and 827 (1423) the capital of which was ‘Īsdāj (Mālamīr q. v.).

The eponymous founder of the dynasty, also known as Fāglawī, was a Kurd chief of Syria named Faqīla. His descendants (the Dījānār mentions 9 predecessors of Abū Tāhir) migrated from Syria and passing through Meyāsārtīkīn and ‘Ādharbāījān (where they made an alliance with the Amir Dādārī [7] of Gīlān) they arrived about 560 (1166) in the plains north of Uṣūtūrūn-Khū (Luristan).

Their chief Abū Tāhir (b. Abī b. Muḥammad) distinguished himself in the service of the Saljuq Āmūr (543-556) in an expedition against the Shāhā⎡ekā (q. v.). As a reward Šāhā⎡ekā gave him Pachī Kat and agreed to send him to conquer Luristan. He succeeded in this. Abū Tāhir assumed the title of Atābeg and later quarrelled with Āmūr and made himself independent (c. 550). (The Ma‘ṣūr al- ‘Ashīb seems to confuse several individuals under the name Khād ‘Alī, to whom it attributes the following successes: the defeat of the Shīlī [q. v., the deposition of ‘Īsdāj al-Dīl, last descendant of Bādīr, ruler of Luristan, and the defeat of the Khūzestān troops commanded by the Turk Eshek].

Under the son of Abū Tāhir, (2) Malik (sic) Házāras (600-626 or 650), Luristan prospered and new Arab and Iranian tribes flooded into it. Házāras drove out of Luristan the last remnants of the Shīlī and invaded Luristan proper. The Shīlī migrated to Fās. Házāras disputed with the Saljuqs the possession of the fortress of Mālamīr (Mungashi, S. W. of Mālamīr). The possessions of Házāras were extended up to a distance of 4 parasangs from Isfahān. The Caliph
Nasir (575–622) confirmed to Hazerasp the title of Atehbeg. On the other side Haizerasp maintained friendly relations with the Khawarijshah Muhammad and gave his daughter in marriage to his son (Aqma) al-Din (Qudshuqshu, G.M.S., xvi/2, p. 113, 204). [The Qudshuqshu mentions two sons of Haizerasp: 1Mula al-Din (d. 646) and Nasrat al-Din Kalla (d. in 649); the former bound Zarda-Kagh, where several members of the family were afterwards interned.]

(3) Tikla (c. 655–656), son of Haizerasp and his Salghurid wife, successfully withstood four attacks on him by the Salghurid Atehbeg of Faras, who was indignant among other things at the expulsion of the Shii from Luristan. Tikla took from Hisam al-Din Khaliqi (d. in 649) certain lands of Luri-Kaikik. He defeated the generals sent against him from Khuzistan by the caliph. During the Baghda campaign of Hulagu Khan (656), Tikla accompanied him in Khurasa-nomad's division. He did not however conceal his feelings about the treatment inflicted on the caliph and Muslims. Hulagu took vengeance at this and Tikla fled to Luristan and shut himself up in Mandaqsb. Hulagu pardoned him but later changed his mind and had him executed in Tabriz. Tikla was buried at Zarda-Kagh.

(4) Shams al-Din Alp Arghun succeeded to his executed brother and ruled for 15 years. He led a nomadic life. His winter residence was at Ildhadji and at Sis (probably Sisang on the Karun above Shushgar) and his summer one at Djuy-i sard (on the upper waters of the Zanda-rud) and at Bursa (source of the Kuran). His son (5) Yusuf Shah had spent his youth with Abaka-Khan (663–680) and even after appointed in his father's stead remained at the Mongol court with 200 horsemen. He took part in the war against Burak-khan (q.v.) and distinguished himself in a skirmish with the Dulasans. To the possessions of Yusuf Shah Abaka added Khurasa-nomad's region of Khiyibar. He however removed the capital of Firuzan (7 farsakhs above Ifshar) and Djar-bahakhan (Gulpayagan). Yusuf Shah went to Kuh-Giljya and attacked the Shiits settled in the modern Massan ski country east of Kuh-Giljya. After the death of Abaka, Yusuf Shah was forced against this will to go with 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 foot to the help of Ahmad Takalgar. The latter was defeated (653) and the Lurs retreated from Tabas to Natanz across the desert where the majority died of thirst. After the accession of Arghun, Yusuf Shah went to pay him homage and interceded on behalf of the former vizier Khwajah Shams al-Din who had taken refuge in Luristan (cf. d'Olhsson, iv. 5).

His son (6) Afsar-i-yab sent his brother Ahmad to the court of Arghun while he himself remained in Luristan where he put to death the members of the former vizier family. Their relatives having taken refuge in Ifshar, Afsar-i-yab sent his kinsmen in pursuit of them. At this moment arrived the news of the death of Arghun (690). The Lurs killed the Mongol governor of Ifshar, Afsar-i-yab appointed members of his family to govern in Hamadan, Faras and in the territories reaching to the Persian Gulf and even began to march on the capital. The Mongol general Amir Turak was defeated at Khoroud (Kohrud, near Kasjan). Kalikhth Khan sent Mongol troops against Afsar-i-yab and troops from Luri-Kaikik. Afsar-i-yab shut himself in Mandaqsb but after some time went to Kalikhth who pardoned him. Returning to Luristan, Afsar-i-yab massacred his own relatives and a number of the notables. Ghazan Khan (694–703) at first showed himself favourable to Afsar-i-yab but in 696 on the complaint of Amir Hurkudaq of Fars, Afsar-i-yab was tried and executed at Mahwund (5) of Farahin. The rank of Atehbeg was then conferred on his brother (7) Nasrat al-Din Ahmad (from 695 to 730 or 733) who had spent most of his life at the court of the Ilkhans. According to the Madjma al-Asab he introduced Mongol institutions (zayn-i mo'add) into Luristan. Hamdallah Mustawfi praises his able and prudent administration which repaired the damage done by Afsar-i-yab. He was a friend of men of religion and several books were dedicated to him, like the Turshik Madjma fi Ahwi-i Malak-i 'Ad-djam of Taqi Allah Kazwini. The Madjma al-Asab gives him the title of fir. According to Ibn Battuta he built 160 madrasas (thermataghe) of which 44 were at Ildhadji and he had roads cut through the mountains.

His son and successor (8) Rukn al-Din Yusuf Shah II (733–740) was also a just ruler. His lands (Madjma al-Asab) extended from Basia and Khuzistan to Lahamansin (2) and Firuzan. He was buried in the madrasa of Ruknabad.

His successor was his brother (9) Muzaffar al-Din in Afsari-yab II (Ahmad). Ibn Battuta travelling via Majdul-Kamnus-Tustar, visited the capital Ildhadji or Malamir. He found the prince given to wine. The Arab traveller describes the peculiar customs of the Lurs which he witnessed at the burial of the son of the sultan. The latter's possessions included Tustar (Shushgar) and extended to Garwati al-Rukh (the modern Kahvarukh in Carmahal west of Firuzan). During the ten days the Arab traveller took to cover this distance he found shelter every night in a madrasa. At the time of the battle (743) between Abbas and Mustawfi mentions among the possessions of the Great Lur Djahalak (apparently the district N.E. of Luristan and west of Gulpayagan).

Next follows an obscure period. According to the anonymous historian of Muzar Iskandar, the successor of Afsar-i-yab was his son (10) Nowi al-Ward ("rose-bud"), who ruled from 736 (?) to 756 and dissipated the treasures of his ancestors. According to the Qudshuqshu, Muhammad Mufid of Faras (713–760) learning of his dealings with Ali Iskandur had him blinded at Basia in 750. His cousin (the Turshik time) (11) Shams al-Din Ta-shang b. Yusuf Shah II (?) succeeded him and ruled from 756 to 780. At this time Luristan became involved in the civil wars of the Muqafsars. When Shah Mansur, making Shushgar his headquarters began a series of raids on the lands of Pasbang, Shah Shudjat (elder brother and rival of Manur, d. 786 = 1534) came to the help of Pasbang. We have coins of 764 and 764 struck at Ildhadji in the name of Shudjat (S. Lane-Foote, Cat. of Oriental Coins in the Brit. Mus., vol. vi. [London 1881], p. 255, 237). After the defeat of Pasbang a struggle began between his two sons (12) Malik Fir Ahmad and his younger brother (121) Malik Hushang in which the latter was killed. (According to the anonymous historian of Iskandar, if he has been rightly understood by Howorth, Ahmad and Hi-
shang were sons of Nawr al-Ward and the former was the immediate successor of his father). Shah Manṣūr drove out Pir ʿAlī al-Madīnī and appointed in his stead a notable named Malik Uwais. When Timūr passed through Luristan in 795 Pir ʿAlī came to meet him at Rūm-Hormez. Timūr later received him graciously at Shirāz, confirmed him by a decree (al-tamghāt) in his hereditary possessions and allowed him to repatriate 2,000 families of Lurs deported by Shah Mansūr. In spite of this in 798, Timūr took as hostages to Samarkand the brothers of Pir ʿAlī Ahmad Affāsīyāb and Manṣūr-shāh. Timūr afterwards divided Luri Buzurg (7) between Pir ʿAlī Ahmad and Affāsīyāb. After the death of Timūr, Mīrzā Pir Muhammad imprisoned Pir ʿAlī Ahmad in Kuhāndiz. He was restored in 811 but met his end in a popular rising. The son of Pir ʿAlī Ahmad (13) Abū Saʿīd, kept for two years a hostage at the court of Mīrzā Iskander at Shirāz, succeeded his father and died in 820. His son (14) Shāh Hūsain died in 827 by the hand of his relative (15) Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Kāṭūs b. Hūshang (1267). The latter seized the power but the Timūrī Sayf ʿAlī b. Shāhrukh sent troops to expel him and thus ended the rule of the Fāḍlalī family. Later the power passed into the hands of local notables of the Bakhṭīyārī tribes (Sharaf-nāma, i. 48).

Bibliography: Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Quatre-mère; Wāsīf, Taʾṣīyat al-ʿĀmīr, Muṣmālīd, II, history of Yūsūf-shāh and Afrāsīyāb; Tāʾrīḵ-e Ghešāl, with the history of the Muṣaffāris in appendix, G. M. S., p. 537–547, 723, 725, 735, based on Rashīd al-Dīn, and the Zuhdat al-Dīn and Tāʾrīḵ-e Djamal al-Dīn Khashā; Muhammad b. ʿAlī Shāhānḵānī, Muḥājam al-Anwār (in 1743); appendix owing to the liberality of the Royal Asiatic Society I have been able to consult the MS. Cat. Morley, No. xx., which contains the appendix on the Luri Buzurg (fol. 142–145), the author's statements are somewhat confused; Zafarnāma, i. 438, 599: 619, 811; Mīrḵond, Kardar al-Safā, vol. IV: Kāṭūs ʿAlī Ahmad Ghaffārī, Qāvārānā (in 972), MS. British Museum, Or. 141, fol. 137–140 [I owe the copy to Muḥammad-Khan Karimī], contains some useful information; Sharaf-nāma, i. 23–32, based at the beginning on a good text of the Tāʾrīḵ-e Gushāda; Khusraw Abaḵōnī, Fi door-e Tāʾrīḵ-e ʿĀsak, passage on the Great Lur in the transl. of the Sharaf-nāma of Charmūyī, i. 2, p. 328–337; Hādīḵān Khāfī, Qāvārānā, p. 286 (cf. Charmūyī, ibid., v. 100–116); Munadiligīmishlī, n. 597–598; D. Olsón, Histoire des Mongols, ii. 24, 28, 256, 259, 468, 455, 589; iv. 5, 12, 94, 110, 117, 170, 360; History of the Mongols, iii. 140, 497, 751–754, which uses the statements of the anonymous history of the grandson of Timūr Mīrzā Iskandar, written in 815, MS. of the British Museum, Or. 1566; MS. of the Asiatic Museum of Leningrad 566 c. (V. Minorsky).

Luri KÜCİK, a dynasty of Atābegs which ruled in Northern and Western Luristan between 580 (1184) and 1006 (1597) with Khuuramäbīd as their capital. The Atābegs were descended from the Luri tribe of Djangrāsh (Djàngarā). The dynasty is also known by the name of Khuuramāshīd from the name of the first Atābeg. (It remains to be seen if this name is connected with that of Muhammad Khurshid, vizier of the former rulers of Luristan before the rise of the Atābegs of Luri Buzurg). After 730 the power passed to another line which later claimed to be of ʿAllid descent; at this time also the title mālik succeeded that of atābeg.

The ancestors of the Khurshidī had entered the service of Ḥisām al-Dīn (of the Turk tribe of Shāhīl or Shūbīn) who ruled Luristan and Khūr-istan about the end of the Sālṣūq period (c. 550–580). (1) Shūdījā al-Dīn Khurshidī b. Abī Bakr b. Muhammad b. Khurshidī was at first Shīhna of a part of Luristan on behalf of Ḥisām al-Dīn but after the death of the latter (in 570 or 580) became independent lord of the whole of Luri Kükī. He waged war on the Djangrāsh (the tribe in which he had originated, but which was then being ruled by his rival Surkhāb b. ʿAlīyār) and besieged their stronghold Diz-i-Siyāh (in the district of Mārūd and in the “wilayet” of Šamāq). The Atābegs had already been masters over him, but as the caliph ordered Shūdījā al-Dīn to deliver up to himself the stronghold of Mārgar (Mungerge north of Kīlāb). In compensation Shūdījā received the district of Ťarāzak in Khūr-istan. Shūdījā al-Dīn drove back the Bayāt Turks who were ravaging Luristan. He led a nomadic life and spent the summer at Kirtī (in Bālā-Gūrava) and the winter at Dulur (Dīh-i Lūrān in Push-i Kūh) and at Malāh (?). He died a centenarian in 621 and his tomb was venerated by the Lurs. His son Badr was killed by his nephew (2) Saʿīd al-Dīn Rastam b. Nūr al-Dīn who became Atābeg and was a good ruler. Rastam was succeeded by his brother (3) Shāraf al-Dīn Abū Bakr and next (4) Izz al-Dīn Garshāsp. The latter married the widow of Abū Bakr, Malika Khātūn, who was the sister of Sulaimān ʿAlī Ahwa, later commander-in-chief of the caliph al-Mustaʿṣīm (Abūḥ should be altered to Alūw, name of a tribe or a district in the time of the last Sādūqīs; cf. Kāḥat al-Sadūqī, G. M. S., p. 346; Qubān-wugūga, G. M. S., xv/ii, p. 153; Nicat al-Kutlūb, G. M. S., p. 107; Defrémy, Rech. sur quatre princes d'Hama-ｄas, 7. A., 1847, p. 177). When (5) Ḥīsām al-Dīn Khalīlī b. Badr b. Shūdījā al-Dīn became Aṭābeh and was a struggle ensued between him and Sulaimān-šāh (Shūhā al-Dīn). The Lurs took Bahār (near Hamadān) but finally Khalīl was defeated and killed near Shāpūr khwāst in 640 (1242).

His brother (6) Badr al-Dīn Masʿūd went to the court of Mangī and returned in the train of Hūlagū. This devout man, an authority on Šahīf law, ruled till 658. He showed great kindness to the family of Sulaimān-šāh, when the latter was imprisoned at the taking of Bahādūd. The sons of Masʿūd were executed by Abaḵā, who appointed Atābeg (7) Tāj al-Dīn b. Ḥīsām al-Dīn Khalīlī (also executed by Abaḵā in 677).

He had two immediate successors, the two sons of Masʿūd of whom (8) Fatāk al-Dīn Ḥasan ruled a part of Luristan (diṭār, wilāyat) and (9) Izz al-Dīn Ḥusain ruled the crown domains (inkīf). The number of their troops was 17,000. They chastised the Bayāt and reunited under their control all the lands between Hamadān and Shūhtar and between I-fafān and the Arab lands. Both died in 690.
other son of 'Izz al-Din, took advantage of the decline of the Timurids to extend his territory. He plundered Hamadan, Gulpayğer, Isfahan and even undertook an expedition to Shahrizur where the Bahārūl Turku slew him in 871 (or 873). His son (19) Shāh Rūstam supported Ismā'īl I; at this period the lords of the Little Lur had already adopted the theory that they were of 'Alid descent. The son of Rūstam (20) Qōhār (or Oghuz) accompanied Shāh Tāhmasp on his campaign of 940 against 'Ubayd Allah Khān and during his absence his brother (21) Dūstāngīr wired for power. He was executed in 949. The governor (lala) of his son (22) Rūstam Shāh handed over the latter to Tāhmasp Shāh who imprisoned him in Alamūt while Muḥammad, another son of Dūstāngīr, was hidden by the Lurs at Cangula. An impostor in Luristan gave himself out to be Shāh Rūstam Tāhmasp, then released the true Rūstam who recovered his fief but had to hand over a third of it (do dang) to his brother (22b) Muḥammad. At the instigation of the wife of Shāh Rūstam, the governor (of Shāh Rūstam) sent several Muḥammadmads who was shut up in Alamūt. The sons of Muḥammadmads plunged Luristan and the adjoining provinces into great disorder. Ten years later while Muḥammadmads escaped, and conquered Luristan while Shāh Rūstam took refuge at the court of the Shāh. Muḥammadmad established good relations with Tāhmasp and Ismā'īl II but after they declared Shāh Khusābaba after his father's death. At the time of the occupation of Nīhawand by the Turks Shāhwardī showed some signs of independence. In 1066 good relations with Shāh 'Abbās were re-established with whom Shāhwardī made the most of his alleged descent from 'Abbās b. 'Alī and his Shī'ī (tasā'ī) wc 'Abbāsı). Shāh 'Abbās married his sister, gave him a Safavid princess in marriage in 1002. Shāhwardī in a pitched battle killed the governor of Hamadān Oghurlu Sultan Bayāt who was trying to levy taxes in Būrdjīr. Shāh 'Abbās, filled with wrath, left the Khorāsān front and hastened to Khurramābād. Shāhwardī crossed the Saimara (Karkhā) and escaped to Babylon. Luristan was given to Sultan Husain b. Shāh Rūstam. In 1003 Shāhwardī was pardoned and restored but he was not long in relapsing. In 1006 Shāh 'Abbās took the field against a second time. Shāhwardī was besieged and slain in the fortress of Cangula (in Pusht-i Kūh). Sultan 'Abbās b. Manṣūr beg Salwī (?) was given Luristan, except Saimara, Hindma (?) and Pusht-i Kūh which were given to Tāhmasp Kūli I. This may be regarded as the end of the dynasty of the 'Abbāsids. Only (q.v.) claims descent from Sultan 'Abbās who was a cousin of Shāhwardī.
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(V. Minorsky)

LURÎSTÂN, "land of the Lurs", a region in the S.W. of Persia. In the Mongol period the terms "Great Lur" and "Little Lur" roughly covered all the lands inhabited by Lur tribes. Since the Safavid period, the lands of the Great Lur have been distinguished by the names of Kûh-Gîliî and Bakhtiyârî. At the beginning of the viii century the Mamansî confederation occupied the old Shîštîlân [q. v.] and thus created a third Lur territory between Kûh-Gîliî and Shîštîlân.

It is however only since the xvi century that Lurî-Keçî [q. v.] has been known as Luristan (for greater precision it was called Luristanî-Feîîîî). In the xvi century Luristan was divided into two parts: 1. Pîsh-Kûh, "country on this side of the mountains" (i.e. east of Kâbir-Kûh) and 2. Pûshî-Kûh (country beyond the mountains) west of Kâbir-Kûh. At the present day the term Luristan usually means Pûshî-kûh while Pûshî-kûh means the Feîîîî country.

The Mamansî territory and the Kûh-Gîliî form part of the province of Fârs. The capital of the Mamansî is at Fâhlîyân (cf. Sulîhî). Kûh-Gîliî (Kûh-Jûlîyân, Kûh-Gîliî) stretches from Bâîhît (west of Fâhlîyân) to Bâbâbâhân; this last town is the main centre for the tribes of Kûh-Gîliî. To the south the Kûh-Gîliî tribes descend as far as the Persian Gulf. The mountains of Kûh-Gîliî and the frontier between its tribes and the Bakhtiyârî are not yet well known. The chief rivers of Kûh-Gîliî are the Aâv-i Shîštî which is formed by the junction of the Khairâbâd and the Zohra and in its lower course runs via Zâïdân and Hindiyân, and the Aâv-i Kûstān or Djârâkh, one branch of which later runs into the Kâtan [q. v.] and the other towards Daurân. On Kûh-Gîliî see the valuable Fârs-nâmâ-yi Nâsî of Hasan Fârâbî (Tahân 1313), the itineraries of Stocqueler, Hausbuch, (Reisen in Orient, Map iv.), Wells and Herzfeld and the general account in de Bode, i. 251–259; ii. 327–358; Ritter, „Luristan“, i. 132–144 is now very much out of date.

The Bakhtiyârî lands stretch from Câhâmâhâlî (west of Ijâfân) to Şûbî-şahr; to the south the Bakhtiyârî march with the Kûh-Gîliî and to the north they go beyond the northern barrier of Luristan (Shiturân-kûh etc.). They are found at Pâralâdân, Barûhûdî, Fûlapûgh, and in the cantons around Bârûjûr (even before 1850 many villages had been purchased here by Muhammad Tâkî Khan Câhâm-Lang). Roughly speaking the Bakhtiyârî occupy the upper basins of the Zâhârâbâd and of the Kûstân [q. v.] above Şûbî-şahr. The works of Layard, Sawyier, Mrs. Bishop, Carston etc. give a very accurate picture of this mountainous country, in the centre of which rise the Kûh-i Râng (12,500 feet high) which forms the watershed between the Persian Gulf and the central Persia plateau. (It may be asked if the name Kûh-i Râng is not the Mongol kûten, "encampment, lagar", found in Luristan.)

The frontier between the Bakhtiyârî and the Lurs proper follows the western branch of the Aâv-i Dîz, an important tributary of the Kûrân. Luristan (Pûsh-kûh) is bounded on the east and west by the convergent streams of the Aâv-i Dîz and the Kâlkh, while in the north the range of the Cîlîn-nâ-bâlîghân, Garî etc. separates Luristan from Nîwâvad and Sîlâgîr (district of Buregîd). To the west of the Kâlkh Pûshî-kûh begins. In the northwest the frontier of Luristan runs to the southwest of the districts of Huzâlân and Hâsan which belongs to the province of Kirmânshân.

The chief left bank tributary of the Kâlkh is the Kâshgâân (Rawâlîson: Kâshgâhân) which is formed by two arms. The northern arms with its tributaries drains the beautiful plains of Hûr-rûd, Alishâr and Kâhâwâ. The southern arm, separated from the northern one by the Yâfî-kûh range, takes the name of the town of Khurrâmâbâd [q. v.] near which it passes. After the confluence of the two arms, the Kâshgân, running S.W., receives on the left bank the combined waters of the Kâwân and Tâyân, which flow from Kûh-i Hâft Fâhlû (south of Khurrâmâbâd) and the northern slopes of the Kûh-i Girôd. These two ranges are at right angles to the mountains which follow the right bank of the Aâv-i Dûz, which they separate from the valley of the Kâlkh. On the right bank the Kâshgân receives the Mûdîyân-rûd, "river of the mare". Above Kâshgân the Kâlkh receives on its left bank several tributaries of less importance still little known (Rûlûr etc.). Below Kâshgân and also to the left bank, the Kârkh receives the Fânû, Lûlûm (Leulum) and Aû-i Zâl. This last river with its tributaries Amârâk etc. rises in the southern slopes of the Kûh-i Girôd. The topography of the right bank of the Aâv-i Dûz is not very well known. The sources of the Baladûtî and its right bank tributary the Kîr-ûb lie a considerable distance to the north. The Baladût-rûd flows into the Aâv-i Dûz between Dîzûfûl and Sûsâ. The Kîr-ûb receives on its right bank the waters of the Kûh-i-ûb which come down from the high valley of Mûngârâ, which with the peaks that surround it form a kind of natural bastion and separate the basin of the Baladût-rûd from that of the Aû-i Zâl. The Sârâ-yi Lur plain formerly well irrigated lies north of Dîzûfûl and south of Kûbû ("pitch-water") whose naphtha spring has been known since ancient times. It was probably here that Darius set up a colony of Greeks (Ritter, i. 201).

The interior of Luristan presents a series of mountain ranges, which stretch N.W. to S.E., the direction usual in Persia, and rise one behind the other between the plain of Susiana and the northern barrier (height about 9,000 feet).

Ancient history. The lands now occupied by the Lur tribes have been inhabited since the period before the arrival of Iranians in them. This region, being at a considerable distance from Assyria, was mainly under the influence of Elam; Sûsâ, where there have been found traces of occupation going back to the third millennium B.C., lies just at the entrance to the mountains of the Little Lur. The purest traces of the local culture and of this alone are found more to the south-east. Just as the Atabegs of the Great Lur had for their capital Ijâfân (= Mâlamir) so in very early times, the lords of this district, the kings of Kâfîrî (Hâpirî), whatever were their relations with the rulers of Susa had control at least of
the Körün valley. The site of Mālamīr (cf. de Bode, Layard, Jéquier in de Morgan, Dic. en Pers., 1902, ii. 133—143 and Hüsing, Der Zugrers u. seine Völker, Leipzig 1905, p. 49—59) with its purely indigenous (Elamite, non-Semitic) inscriptions and bas-reliefs is an important point. The recent discovery by Herzfeld (Reisbericht, Z.D.M.G., 1926, p. 259) in the Mānasīn region of a bas-relief and bricks bearing Elamite characters (1500—1000 B.C.) is valuable as indicating the extent of Elamite penetration into the Lur mountains. Kūh-Gūll lying between Susiana and Persia may correspond to the still unknown region of Aškan (Aναν) out of which came the ancestors of Cyrus the Great. On the survival of this name near Shūštār, cf. Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 418 (according to Rawlinson: Assān).

The antiquities of the valley of the Upper Körün (the two Susān, Lurdagān, the mounds of Salm, Tūr and Tājad) are insufficiently known (Layard, Sawyer). According to Sawyer, the higher Bakhštīyār lands are "singularly devoid of any ancient landmarks".

For the west part of Luristān in the strict sense of the word see the articles MĀZĀRĀN and PAKHTI Kūl. No monuments of very great antiquity have yet been discovered in Pashābūth except the caves (Median?) of Se-de-rān between Mānmārā and Khurramābd, Čīrīkow, p. 129. The early inhabitants of Luristān were the Kāshāsh = Kōrōla who imposed their rule on Babylon between 1760 and 1650 B.C. The Achemenids paid the Kōrōla for the right of passage by the Babylon—Ecbatana route. These highlanders were temporarily subdued by Alexander the Great. Antiquity, pursued by Eumenes, traversed the heart of the Kōrōla country, according to Rawlinson on the route Pul-i-tang—Keilān pass—Khurramābd (Ritter, Erdkunde, i., p. 335). The Kōrōla (who should perhaps be distinguished from the Kūrtān = ūnāj = Khūz) spoke a language different from that of their neighbours, but in it we already find proper nouns borrowed from Indo-European. Cf. E. Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert., 1/2, Berlin 1913, § 455; Hüsing, Der Zugrers, p. 24 and Atran in Les langues du monde, Paris 1925, p. 283. [The name Kāshāsh has perhaps survived in that of the river Khashīn.]

It is also probable that northern Luristān was more or less dependent on the land of Ellīpī, often mentioned by the Assyrians. This region, which was considerably influenced by Media is now located in the province of Kermānšāh. Cf. Andreas, Alisus, in Pauly-Wissowa 2; Streck, Z. A., xxv., 379; Cambridge Ancient History, 1924, ii., cf. map.

We know very little about the Mathvāi people who (Herodotos, v. 49) were bounded on one side by the Armenians and on the other by the Susians (Reinach, Un peuple oublïé: Les Mathvâis, Revue des Études Grecques, 1894, vii., p. 313—318).

Here we can only call attention to these various ethnic elements buried in the later strata of Iranian invasions. In the name of Parāsād, a canton in the northeast of Khorramābd, we have a reminiscence of the Median tribe of Parātakēnī (Herodotos, i. 110) and of the province of Parātakēnī (Strabo, i., p. 50) which lay between Media and Persia (in Assyrian: Partakā, Partukā; cf. Streck, Z. A., xv., p. 363). The iranization must have been accelerated by the formation of the great empires, Achaemenid, Macedonian, Parthian and lastly Sasanian. There are many Sasanian towns in the valley of the Karkhā. Many Sasanian buildings are attributed by the natives to the Atābeḵī of Luristān, who were certainly nothing more than the restorers. The complicated system of bridges is very remarkable (cf. the photographs in de Morgan, Études Geogr., ii. and Études Archéol., Paris 1896—1897, p. 350—374) and the roads which may still be traced on the upper courses of the rivers of Susiana. The remains of roads, paved or hewn out of the rock, may be seen at Tang-i Sālak (between Bībāhān and Mālamīr) near the Sasanian bas-reliefs (de Bode, i. 353, 364), to the east and west of Mālamīr (de Bode, i. 390, ii. 820: gāddā-yī aštāhān), between Diğıf and Khābū (Rawlinson, A march from Zobāb, p. 93), to the south of Khāwā (gāddā-yī Khurāra, Čīrīkow, p. 216—221). All these works are evidence of a systematic and continuous penetration. But since at the end of the fourth (tenth) century the inhabitants of the plain of Khūzistān had not yet forgotten the Hūz language (Mukaddās, p. 418) colonies of the ancient stocks may have survived in isolated corners of the mountains. The Lardāshīs, who formerly lived in Khūzistān only assumed their present ethnic character under the Atābeḵīs.

The knowledge of the Arab geographers about the Lur country is very summary although they describe the routes between Khūzistān and Fās (cf. Schwarz, Persien, p. 173—180; Aṭṭālān—Sharṣūr, p. 190: Aṭṭālān—Sunnārām), between Khūzistān and Ṣafābān (the road started from Iľājī; Ibn Khuradābīb, p. 57; Mukaddās, p. 407) and lastly between Khūzistān and Dībhāl. As to these last routes, Īṣakhī, p. 156, reckons from al-Lur to Shāpūr-Khwāst 30 farṣakh, from there to Lāchtār (= Ašīlār) 12 farṣakh, from there to Nibāwān 10 farṣakh (the road must be that which follows the upper waters of the Baladāl). A few details of this route are cleared up by Mukaddās, p. 401, who gives the following eight stages: Karad (cf. the article SUTANABAD)—Wafrāwānd—Jārīkān—Khurādī (certainly = Hūrūd, Hūrūd, north of Khurramābd)—Sāhur—Khawwās (certainly = Shāpūr-Khwāst = Khurramābd)—Khīāš (certainly = al-Khan—Razerān—al-Lur. Mukaddas, p. 418 also makes one suspect the existence of a road along the Āb-i Dīz: from al-Lur to al-Dīz, two stages, from there to Rayāgān one stage, from there to Gūlpāygān 40 farṣakh through uninhabited country (māfārc). The inhabited places in modern Luristān may be noted the following: the town of al-Lur, 2 farṣakh north of Dūzūfūl (Kanṭarat An-dānīsh) the site of which should be sought in the plain of Sābīr-yī Lur near Sālīlābād; the town of Lāchtār, now disappeared, was certainly in the plain of Ašīlār and the town of Shāpūr—Khwāst. The exact location of the latter is important for the comprehension of certain events in the fifth (eleventh) century (Ibn al-Aljīr, ix, 89, 146, 211; x, 166; Ṭūrārī—Gusčā, p. 557). Rawlinson had identified Khurramābd with Shāpūr-Khwāst (cf. Le Strange, The Lands, etc., p. 202, p. 668). The combined evidence of Iṣakhī, p. 196 and 201, of the Nūchāt al-Kalīm, p. 76 and 176 and particularly of the itinerary of Mukaddās, p. 401 fully justify Rawlinson's identification (against Le Strange). The change of name, or moving of the site (cf. Schwarz) must have taken
place in the xiith century. The Achašt al-Kullūb (740 = 1340) which does not include Şahār-ḵāš in its enumeration of the towns of the Little Lur is the first source to mention Khurramabad (a town in ruins). It is on the other hand not at all probable that the wāliyaš of Mān-rūd, the alleged ancestral home of the Lurs, is near Khurramabad. It should be sought to the north of the town of al-Lur near Mān-gara (Māngara). Samah, mentioned in the Tu'īrīḥ-i Gūdcha, p. 548, was in Mān-rūd; its fortress Dīz-i Siyāh must correspond to the fort of Dīz which defends the entrance to Māngara and was destroyed by the wāliyaš of Pūšt-i Kūh in 1895 (Mann, Die Mandarten der Lur(stämme), p. 117). Finally the stronghold of Girīt (Tu'īrīḥ-i Gūdcha, p. 549, 542) is mentioned by Girīk, p. 133, among the encampments of the tribe of Pāp; the south of Khurramabad.

Economic Conditions. Apart from the Bakhštīārī districts near Isfahān where there are flourishing villages, the Lur territories inhabited by nomads or semi-nomads only export the products of their cattle-rearing. But the future of the mountainous country which lies like an amphitheatre around the plain of Khūzestān is very promising. The Lur lands are rich in minerals and especially in petrol. The famous wells of Masjud-i Sulaimān (Maidūn-Naftūn), belonging to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company are in the middle of Bakhštīārī territory (between Shīhghtar and Mālamir). The same Company has the concession includes all the petrol-bearing lands in the south of western Persia is putting into operation its claims in the Kūh-Gull region (to the north of the port of Gānūūa) etc. (cf. Schwerer, Die türkisch-pers. Erdölverkommen, Hamburg 1919).


Lut, the Biblical Lot has in Muslim legend, even as early as in the Koran, an important place which he does not have in the Bible. In the Hagada as his story is associated with the downfall of the sinful Sodam (not however mentioned in the Koran) he appears to Muhammad as a prophet of punishment along with Had, Sall, Nuh and Shu’aib as predecessors of Muhammad. When Muhammad is accused of being a liar he can console himself with the reflection that he was chosen by the people of Nuh, to be Thamud, the people of Ibrahim and the people of Lut also called their prophets liars (Sira, xxii. 43). Lut’s people called him Lut, l. 133; ishva Lut are usually located between Thamud and Madyan. Lut in the Koran becomes a nazaral, messenger of Allah (xxvi. 160; xxxvii. 133), a rasul umin, a reliable prophet (xxvi. 162), a participant in wisdom and knowledge (xxii. 74). When Ibrahim warns his people, Lut believes him (xxii. 25). Lut is sent to sinners who forbid hospitality (xxv. 70), waylay strangers and practise sodomy and cruelty such as no other people had before them. They threaten him that they will banish those who lead such a moral life saying: "If thou preachest right, bring God’s punishment upon us" (xxix. 25). God thereafter sends his angels of punishment; Ibrahim’s intercession is vain (xxi. 77, 78). The angels come to Lut. His people demand the visitors for sinful purposes. In vain Lut offers his daughters instead. He feels himself helpless. The angels calm him, saying: "We shall save thee, only no one must turn round; thy wife will do it". The city was turned completely upside down (xi. 84; xv. 74); stelgid stones, marked by God, rained upon it.

The Koran mentions no other name in the history of Lut. The destroyed city is called al-muthallakah (litt. 54) of which the plural is al-muthallakat (ix. 72; ix. 9) corresponding to the Hebrew melpha, which is used in the Bible of Sodom.

The Koran commentators also know the Biblical story quite accurately (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 346, 347). They are able to fill all the gaps and give all names. The sins of Sodom are fully described. Sodam has a king of the line of Nimrod. The inhabitants worship idols. Lut admonishes them for 40 years (al-Kisâi). Then God sends three angels Gabriel, Michael and Israfil (in al-Kisâi al Goul-taker Assrel). De Goeje translates: "Will ye destroy a people among whom there are 300 believers." No. — 300, 200, 100 ..." No. — 14 believers: No. — This number is assured, Ibrahim comforts himself, in the belief that Lut’s wife is one of the believers. The angels must not destroy Sodam until Lut testifies four times to its unfaithfulness. They at once meet Lut, who testifies. After meeting others they encounter Lut’s daughter. She invites them into her father’s house. Lut orders his people to be silent, especially his wife who has disobeyed him for 40 years (al-Kisâi). But Lut’s wife deliberately makes a light to show they have visitors or she ostentatiously procures salt (this is why she becomes a pillar of salt) or she actually says: "Young men have come to stay with us, with more beautiful cheeks and sweeter fragrance than I have ever seen".

The people demand the young men; Lut offers his daughters. "If we wanted thy daughters, we would know where to find them", they reply. Lut bars the doors. At the bidding of the angel he opens them. Gabriel blinds the intruders with a blow of his wand. The women say: "Save yourself!", they cry, "Lut’s house is bewitched." As the hour of destruction is at hand, Gabriel (according to others the Angel of Punishment Michael) turns the town upside down, and lifts it up so high that the angels in heaven hear the crowing of the cocks and the howling of the dogs of Sodam. Stelgid stones fall; on each is marked whom it is to strike. As Lut’s wife looks sympathetically on her people, she is struck by a stelgid-stone. The number of killed varies between 4,000 (Thalabi) and four millions (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 342). All perished, except one who fled to Mecca, brought his stelgid-stone to the haram where it hung for 40 days between heaven and earth, until it finally slew the man who brought it there (Thalabi).

The Muslim legend gives names to everything and explains them all. Lut takes his name from láta, "to attach oneself!", because Ibrahim’s heart was affectionately attached to Lut (Thalabi). Lut’s wife is called Halsaka or Wâlata, his older daughter Kih (i), the younger Karyâ (“Wâlata”), Zughfa (“Vâkî”), or Rawaya (2) (al-Kisâi). Not only is Sodam mentioned, but also other four towns, in whose names may be recognised the Biblical
Amūra, Admā, Şeqaım and Şeqār. Of Şeqār, Theylabi says it was saved (Gen. xix. 20-22) "because it believed in Luṭ.

The Muslim legend has a little in common with the old Haggada (Gen. Rabba, xlix. 1.; Snehedrin, 109b), e. g. the fact that Abraham thinks he is sure of a certain number of devout people. When Ṣirku R. Eliser (xxv.) describes the daughters of Luṭ favourably, when Mīhrāh Haghādī (ed. Schechter, p. 287) calls the angels sent to Sodom, Gabriel and Raphaēl, Muslim legend may have had some influence on the later Mīhrāth.


Luṭ, Yaḥyā. [See Aḥ Muṣḥah.]

Lufṭ Āli Begov Adhar, a Persian poet and biographer of the 13th century. He was born in Ḡaftān on the 2oth Rabī’ 1. 1123 (June 7, 1171) and spent his youth at Kīmān and later at Ṣhaṭrā, where his father lived while governor of Laristan and the coast of Fars under Šadīr Shāh. After the death of his father, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and travelled in Persia, finally settling in Ḡaftān in the service of Šadīr’s successors. He latterly adopted a life of seclusion and put himself under the spiritual direction of Muḥammad Yaḥyā. He died in 1281.

Luṭ Āli Begov is best known for the collection of biographies of Persian poets which he compiled between 1760 and 1779 under the title of Ṣirku-Ḵūdah; in it he gives biographies of poets in Persian in alphabetical order according to towns and districts. The last part deals with 60 contemporaries of the author and is followed by an autobiography. The Ṣirku-Ḵūdah was lithographed at Cāṣpūn in 1299 a. h. and at Bahbā in 1277 a. h. There is a Turkish translation printed at Constantinople in 1599 a. h. Among his poems was a long poem, Poet-ṭā Ṣafīdī, in which the author quotes many verses at the end of the Ṣafīdī. Luṭ Āli Begov was held in considerable esteem by his literary contemporaries; he was particularly intimate with the poet Ἠθμ of Ḡaftān


Luṭ Āli Khān was the last member of the Zand dynasty in Persia. He was born in 1760, the son of DJ̄āfīr, son of the Zand Sultan [i. v.]. Šadīr, who had sat on the throne in 1755, had continued the struggle against the Kāšī Āgha Muhammad, who had forced him to retire to Ṣhaṭrā, where he died on Jan. 23, 1759 from poisoning. During the short period of the reign of his father, Luṭ Āli Khān had been entangled with the conquest of Laristan and Kīmān, which he had successfully carried through. But after the death of DJ̄āfīr he was forced to flee from his own army to Kīmān to seek refuge with the Arab lord Būshīr. With the latter’s help, he was able to make himself master of his capital Shahrūz where a certain Saʿyīd Murād had proclaimed himself king. It was chiefly through the efforts of his father’s minister Hādidjī Ḥārīmī who occupied the position of Ḥażārat (mayor) of the town that Luṭ Āli succeeded in getting himself again recognised as sovereign. After his accession the character of the young man, whose nobility and generosity had hitherto been as much praised as his personal heroism, seems to have changed. His acts of tyranny and cruelty decided Hādidji Ḥārīmī to abandon the cause of the Zands and betray it to the enemy. This he did in 1791 when Luṭ Āli Khān had set out against Āgha Muhammad Khan. Hādidji Ḥārīmī seized Shahrūz and stirred up Luṭ Āli’s own troops to mutiny against him. The latter fled to the coast and succeeded in collecting a small armed force with which he tried in vain to retake Shahrūz. Then followed several years of guerilla warfare waged with incredible vigour by Luṭ Āli against the Kāšārs. He went up and down the whole of southern Persia, being for some time supported by the lord of Taḥbīr and even temporarily taking Yazd. In 1794 being assisted by the chief of the district of Garmsīr, he even took Kīmān. Here Āgha Muhammad besieged him with a large force. After four months the town capitulated; Luṭ Āli Khān succeeded in once more escaping and reaching Būshīr but here he was treacherously delivered over to his enemy who had him taken to Taḥbīr where he was blinded and mutilated and finally put to death. Then came the terrible vengeance wreaked by the Kāšārs on the people of the town of Kīmān [i. v.].

Luṭ Āli Khān, the “last chivalrous figure amongst the kings of Persia” (Brown), probably had the sympathy of most of his contemporaries and it is recalled that even Āgha Muhammad Khan openly recognised his bravery. But as his history was written under the new dynasty of the Kāšārs in Persia, the Persian sources could not show much sympathy for him. European sources give a more faithful picture of the course of events. The more modern Persian historians like Mirza Muhammad ‘Alī Khan (Dzavār-i Muṭaddar-i Tarīḵ-e Pehlī, ii. Tehrān 1326, reproduced in Beck, Niederäsische Kriegs- und Geschichts-Grundriss, Heidelberg 1914, p. 259-256) do not hesitate to describe the action of Hādidji Ḥārīmī as treason, Hādidji Ḥārīmī who some afterwards became minister tried to justify his conduct to Sir John Malcolm.


Lutfi Pasha, properly Ḥādidji Lutfi Pasha b. Abd al-Muṭṭin, an important Turkish statesman, scholar and historian, giant voice in the tune of Sultan Sulayman I al-Kânūnī. He was of Albanian descent. The date and place of his birth are unknown. He was brought up in the imperial saray, which he had
apparently entered through the deveşhrme for the Janissaries. Much may be learned of his career from his own biographical references in the "History" and in the Aşaf-nāme. Even in the serai he devoted himself to theological studies, a fondness for which he retained throughout his whole life. At the accession of Sultan Selim (1512-1520) he passed from the ranks of the pages as a kâşfīr and filled in succession the following offices at the court: taşisnîr (taster), kâşfûdi bâzî, mîr-i İlahm (bearer of the imperial standard). He then became sanâxîk beg of Kaştanah, beglerbeg of Karaman, of Anatolia and in 941 41599 he vacated. He spent a quarter of a century in the foreign service of the Sultan; according to his own account, he was through all the wars and battles in the reign of Sultan Selim who was very favourably disposed to him, usually in his train: in Rumelia and Anatolia, in Arabia, Syria and Egypt; similarly in the reign of Sultan Sulayman he took part in the campaigns against Belgrade, Rhodes, Hungary, Vienna, Tripoli, Bagdad, Corfu etc. In 945 (1538) he took part in the campaign to Kara Boghdan as second vizier. In 946 (1539) he succeeded as grand vizier Ayâs Pasha, who had died of the plague, also an Albanian, at a period when the Ottoman empire was straining its strength to the utmost. (The year 944, which was suggested by Kâtil Celebi's Ta'âlîm al-Tawârîkh, Constantinople 1146, p. 176 adopted by all later historians and so handed down, is incorrect as is proved not only by Lütfi Pasha's own statement but also by an analysis of events). He proved his ability in high army commands, in the fleet and in administrative offices.

He sought to carry through with a strong hand the reforms in internal administration which he had long recognised to be necessary, especially economies in the financial system, the abolition of oppressive institutions (nağa, privileges of couriers), the development and independence of the navy, the importance of which for Turkey his foresight recognised. Earlier than anyone else he saw the beginning of the collapse of the externally so brilliant political system. At the same time he conducted negotiations with Venice, Austria and France with great skill and ingenuity. It is noteworthy that he was the first to recognise the surpassing genius of Mi'yar Sinân, whom he appointed state architect. He was a highly gifted statesman, an energetic inflexible personality, incorruptible and above all intrigue with high ideals and strong religions and scientific leanings. In spite of his violent temper he was regarded as a "good natured Vizier". He was a brother-in-law of Sultan Sulayman, whose sister Şah Sultan he had married. Nevertheless he was summarily dismissed in 945 (1541) when in his rage he used threats to his wife when she reproached him with his inhuman treatment of a Muslim slave-girl. His caginess for reform had naturally gained him few friends at court. It is said that only his rank as a dânmâl saved him from execution. Whether the deeper reason for the matrimonial dissensions lay in his love for boys is not clear.

Lütfi Pasha was banished with a pension to Dimotika where he had a hâşîk. Here he gave himself entirely up to his studies, for which he was well qualified by his constant intercourse with theologians and scholars during his whole political career. After his return from Mecca to Dimotika — his successor Rustam Pasha was successful in preventing a complete reconciliation with the Sultan — he used his enforced leisure to compose numerous works in Arabic and Turkish. He died in all probability after 970 (1562) (so also Munâzârât-âbâ-tii, in any case after 961, in Dimotika. The date 956 (1543) usually given is impossible as he continued his history down to Rama'dan 15, 961 (Aug. 14, 1554) and there is no reason to suppose that any other continued the history; on the contrary there are references in the text to events of the year 961. He only left one foundation, a Medrese in Constantinople, after which the quarter and the Lütfi Pasha mosque take their names; its builder was a dâfârît Ahmed Celebi.

Lütfi Pasha is the author of 21 works, a list of which he himself gives in his "History", p. 2-4 (cf. also the list in Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte des Osman. Reiches, ii. 702; Wiener Handbcher, ii. p. 243; Tschudi, Türkische Bibliothek, vol. xii, p. xvi-xvii). It includes 13 Arabic and 8 Turkish works, to which perhaps may be added the Kâma-nâme ascribed to him which he perhaps does not mention as his own because it was the result of his official activities.

His theological works have not come down to us, so far as we know. According to sources — not however specially blessed in his favour — he had only a moderate knowledge of the different branches of theological study and medicine, which he loved to display with a dilettante's exaggerated opinion of his powers. This is not quite convincing however as not only his perhaps quite medieocre theological works but also his really important historical writings, except for the Aşaf-nāme have been almost unnoticed.

As a poet he is praised by Selîh, who completed his Heçî Küldârî in 945 in the time of his grand vizierate. But the numerous verses scattered through his history are not by him. Verses certainly by him are very mediocre. Besides, he does not show much sympathy with poets as the contemptuous attitude to 'Ali Celebi, author of the Hamûyân-nâme, shows, to whom he addresses that he had spent 20 years on this work instead of dealing with questions of şerîf.

His importance as a historian cannot however be too highly estimated. His Aşaf-nāme, a kind of mirror for ministers, a textbook of ethics for viziers in which he sought to make available for his successors his wide experience of administration, obtained a certain success, as the not inconsiderable number of existing manuscripts suggests (ed. and transl. by R. Tchâdî, Berlin 1910: ed. by 'Ali Amir, Constantinople 1326). But his history Ta'âlîm al-Tawārîkh is still more important. It is now accessible in 2, however, rather medieocre, edition (Constantinople 1341). Lütfi Pasha, trucked, Türkîe-Devletât-ı Muâcetî Bułgolî Muâcetî (Ankara 1911). No. 28) from an incomplete copy found by M. Tahir in Istanbul supplemented by the formerly unique copy in Vienna by 'Ali used by von Hammer (Fugels, ii. 224, No. 1001).

Lütfi Pasha not only models his title on those of the old Ottoman chronicles but he copies this primitive style of historiography in his manner and style, which forms a striking contrast to the elaborate Persianic court style. Down to Sultan Bayazid he is only a copyist. Then however fol-
lows, and this is what makes his history so remarkable, a description of the events of which he himself was an eye-witness in the reigns of three Sultan (Bayazid, Selim and Sulaiman). His account of the reign of Sultan Sulaiman is naturally the most valuable, especially the period of his grand viziere. In contrast to the shahnamadji and the official nask’u muqaddar, he gives an absolutely untouched picture of the situation although he is not absolutely free from bias in dealing with other statesmen. His two historical works are one of the most important sources for our knowledge of the origins of the weakness and corruption of the Turkish empire in the xviith century.


Constantinoople 1285, i. 190 and 256; Sai, Tarikh al-Bunya, Constantinoople 1315, p. 24-25; Ahmad Ta’ib, Hadjiyat al-Mizara, Constantinoople 1271, p. 27; ‘Auj, Tarik, Constantinoople 1293, ii. 10; Pelevi, Tarik, Constantinoople 1285, i. 21; Brusali Mehmed Tahir, ‘Otmani M’melikleri, Constantinoople 1343, iii. 132-134; Sanit, Kamis al-A’tam; Thuraiyli, Sigilli ‘Otmanli; Killi Mu’allim Riaft in the preface to the history of Lutfi Pasha; especially however: Koprul’-zade Fu’ad, Lutfi Pasha in Turkey, Constantinoople 1925, i. 110-150; Hadiji Khaliq, ‘Abd al-Zinna, ed. Flugel; the various Catalogues of MSS.; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte des osmanischen, nother, do., Gesch. der osman. Dichtkunst; do., Staatsverfassung, i. 358-360; Mouradjea d’Ohsson, Tableau general de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1791, iv. 351; Wickerhaus, Chrestomathie, Vienna 1853, p. 81 and 309; Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry. (TH. MENZEL

LUXOR. [See Al-Ugur.
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MA’ AL-‘AINAIN AL-SHINGIT, the name by which the famous agitator in Mauritania [q.v.] at the end of the xviith century and beginning of the xviith century is best known (several explanations of his sobriquet are given; the literal meaning is “the water of the eyes” but the most satisfactory seems to be that which sees in it simply a euphemism, like that in the expression Kurrat al-djin).

Muhammad Musafi Maa al-Ainain was the twelfth son of a chief and marabout of great fame in his own country, Muhammad Faiil Il. Ma’inn, born at Walata at the end of the xviith century and chief of the Moorish tribe of Galagma in the district of al-Hawd in the south east of Shingit group. After breaking off from the Fakaya whose religious head was the chief al-Mukhtar al-Kunti [q.v.] he founded a new brotherhood affiliated to that of the Kailriya [q.v.], to which he gave the name of Faidiya derived from his own. On the death of Muhammad Faiil in 1869, Ma’ al-Ainain left the district of al-Hawd to complete his Islamic studies in Shingit (on this flourishing Moorish centre, see the long and interesting monograph by a native of the place resident in Cairo, Ahmad b. al-Amin al-Shingiti, al-Waif fi Tarhajin al-dhob Shingiti, Cairo 1299 [1911]). Ma’ al-Ainain then settled for several years in al-Adrar [q.v.] but afterwards went further north to the al-Sakijat al-Hamara country, which was his usual residence from 1884. All this region, which now forms the northern part of Spanish Rio de Oro, was being desolated by murder and brigandage. He succeeded in establishing security there, restored the land to cultivation, planted numerous palm-groves and encouraged trade by caravan to Senegal and Shingit in one direction and to Morocco on the other. He chose

Shanara as his permanent abode and later built a kasbah for himself there in the Moroccan style on the Wadi Tarzawa. Like the majority of religious leaders of the Saharan countries of North Africa, he practised commerce, politics and the proselytising activities of a marabout and was not long in gathering round him a considerable number of followers who became widely known throughout Morocco by their nickname of “blue men” an account of their costume, consisting of a djellaba of khanta (a cotton stuff from Guinea), a turban and a burnous, all blue in colour. They were also called ‘Amiya, from the name of their master, and al-Shingiti (Shanatria), “the men of Shingit”.

Ma’ al-Ainain very soon entered into regular relations with the Sultans of Morocco. He had already made a sojourn in the country on his journey to the holy places of Islam, in the reign of Mawlay ‘Abd al-Kahiman b. Hisham [q.v.] (1238-1276 = 1822-1859). Later and especially in the reign of Mawlay al-Hasan [q.v.] (1290-1311 = 1873-1894) he travelled regularly to Marrakush and to Fas and was welcomed by the Sultan, whom he supplied with slaves (in which he also deals). When the young Mawlay ‘Abd al-Arar [q.v.] ascended the throne in 1311 (1894), he sent him his homage and went to visit him in 1896 in Marrakush. The Sultan gave him a gift in his southern capital of a site for a zaitiya of his order and he hired him a steamer to take him with his suite from the Moroccan port of Mogador to that of Tarfaya, the natural harbour of the Rio de Oro for his capital Shanara. This little port henceforth became of some importance: Spanish ships, Greek and Spanish sailing-vessels disembarked there merchandise from Morocco and considerable cargoes of arms and ammunition, all consigned to the agitator to enable him to supply.
his followers and arm the Moorish tribes to enable them to fight French expansion beyond the frontiers of Senegal. For several years Mâ al-'Ainain was able to maintain in all the vast area under his influence an atmosphere hostile to French penetration into Mauritania. He was largely the instigator of the anti-French outbursts, which after the assassination on May 12, 1905, near Tijjîledja of the explorer Xavier Coppolani decided France to occupy Tâgant in 1906.

After these happenings, Mâ al-'Ainain, having assembled the chiefs of the great Moorish tribes who were in alliance with him, took them to Fâs to demand the alliance and assistance of Morocco against France in Mauritania. He was favourably received by Mâlayâ 'Abd al-'Azîz and succeeded in getting a cousin of the Sultan, Mâlayâ Idris, sent to al-Adrâr as representative of the makhzen. At the same time Mâ al-'Ainain was authorised to install himself in the Moroccan kasba of Tiznit, to summon to the holy war and to rally around him all the warriors of the Sahara from al-Sûs to the region of Sâkiyat al-Hamrâî. The hopes that Mâlayâ 'Abd al-'Azîz had based on the plans of Mâ al-'Ainain were soon dashed. After the occupation of Uqdat and the destruction of Shâwîya by the French he had to disown Mâ al-'Ainain. The latter had no longer a chance even in his own country, where a fatal blow was struck at his power as a result of the al-Adrâr expedition in the course of which French troops led by Colonel Gouraud completely scattered his forces. Mâ al-'Ainain had however not lost all hope of regaining his former influence in his old territory. He aimed even higher, when in May 1910 he did not hesitate to proclaim himself Sultan and to attempt the conquest of Morocco, which he thought had been sold to the infidels by the Alawid sovereigns. Having united around him all the tribes of the Anti-Atlas and of al-Sûs as well as his own followers, he reached Marrakûsh and from this town tried to take Fâs by surprise, taking the road through the Central Atlas. But he was checked in his advance near Tâdlti [q. v.] by a column under General Moinier which routed him completely on June 23, 1910. He just managed to escape and reach al-Sûs where he was abandoned by all his followers and had to sell his slaves and flocks in order to live. He retired to the kasba of Tiznit, where he died on 17th Shawwâl 1328 (Oct. 28, 1910).

Two years later, the son of Mâ al-'Ainain, Ahmad al-Hiba, in his turn attempted to proclaim himself Sultan. Proclaiming himself the Mahdi, he set out from Tiznit and entered Marrakûsh on Aug. 18, 1912, while he had himself proclaimed, while his troops put the city to fire and sword. But on Aug. 29, al-Hiba was defeated at Benguerir by Colonel Mangin, who after a second encounter at Sidi Bî U'mânan entered Marrakûsh on Sept. 7 following.

Mâ al-'Ainain, who had very many open or secret followers in Morocco has left in the country the reputation of a true ascetic and a great doctor in the Sufi doctrine. "The hair shaved, the face veiled, always clothed in white, he only appeared in public on Fridays to go to the mosque. Mâ al-'Ainain led an austere life, lived exclusively on milk, dates and mutton. A well read man, he composed many pious works, books on theology, mystic Sûfism, astronomy, astrology, books full of contemplative reveries, on theological and dogmatic controversies, on metaphysical theories, and of magical formulæ to acquire riches and power by occult means. Like his father and his brother, he loved to spread among his disciples a reputation as a worker of wonders and a thaumaturgist. These magical practices much increased his prestige in Seguillet (al-Sâkiyâh al-Hamrâî) and in Morocco (E. Richet, La Mauritania, Paris 1920, p. 126–127).

MA'ADD, a collective name for certain Arab tribes, in the traditional usage for the Kurds of North Arabian origin (Mudar and Rabi'a) in contrast to the Yemeni tribes. This contrast said to be inherent in the name Ma'add seems already to be found frequently in the early poets, always presuming the genuineness of the passages in question. Thus in a verse of Imam al-Kaysi (Abulwardi, No. 41, l. 5) the term Ma'add is used apparently in the sense of excluding the Udaiy, Taiy and Kinda, and in Khabigha (Abulwardi, No. 18, l. 1, 2), the Ghasan. Tradition also records fighting between Ma'add and Yemeni in the pre-Muhammadan period (cf. Yakkut, ii. 434; Ibn Badhān, p. 104). At a later period the genealogical term Ma'add is even more sharply contrasted with Southern Arabia, and the Northern and South Arabian had become the dividing political element in the fighting of the Omayyad and 'Abbasid period (passages quoted in Goldziher, see below). The fact that the name Banū is not found combined with Ma'add as well as the form of the word itself suggests that Ma'add may originally have been of similar foundation and meaning to Ma'dhari, a general name for "people" of people. Ibn Duraid (Ihtisāb, p. 20) long ago suggested the derivation from the root "idd", "to count, number", rather than without adding other very different attempts to interpret it. The usual genealogical scheme of Arab tradition has inserted in it the name Ma'add as the name of an ancestor of an eponymous series, namely a son of the traditional founder 'Adnan. Ma'add is brought into connection with the history of Mecca by the legend that he married 'Ummā, a daughter of the Hajarumite. From this marriage were born Nizar, father of the tribal eponym Mūsar, Kā'ab and 'Yazd. According to Abu 'l-Fida', Hist. Ant. Islamica, ed. Flei-cher, p. 72 Ma'add is even said to have been a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar.

Bibliography: Tabari, i. 671 n.; Majlis (Pfundstein), ed. Huart, iv. 101 ff. on the origin and history of the feuds between North and South Arabia cf. Goldziher, Muhammadanischen Studien, i. 1 f. cf. on the genealogy, ibid., p. 179. (H. H. Brat.)

MA'ARRAT MAŠRĪN or MIRSIN, capital of a nāhiya of Halab. The name is also written Ma'arrat Maṣrin which has been wrongly taken as an abbreviation of Ma'arrat Kinnsar (Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 471). In Syrian manuscripts of the eighth century, the town is called Ma'arrat Māsrit (Wright, Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Brit. Mus., p. 454); dated 745 in a Armenian translation of St. Gregory Nazianzen's Enchiridion damascense (London 1910); a palimpsest under a collection of biographies of holy women, written by a monk Yohannan Stylet of Beth Mari Kānān, a monastery of the town of Ma'rara in the Kūra of Antioch.

In the year 16, Abu 'Ubaidā defeated a large Greek army which had assembled between Halab and Ma'arrat Mašrin and then took this town, which capitated under conditions similar to Halab (bal-dhadhūr, Fustāḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 149). In the reign of the Caliph Mutawakkil, 'Amr b. Hawwar, a native of Māšrin al-Buraidiya (cf. Yākūt, Mashārīk, p. 400) near Ma'arrat al-Nu'man, was governor of the town; Kamāl al-Din (Freytag, Selecta ex historia Halabi, Paris 1859, text p. 24; transl. p. 18) quotes the beginning of a lampoon composed on him by Abu Ḫusb b. Djiyānā (cf. 231). Nicephorus Phocas took the town in 537 (968) and deported its 1,200 inhabitants to Bilād al-Rūm (Kamāl al-Din in Freytag, Z.D. M. G., xi. 228). After the truce of Sāfar 359 (969-970) between the Greeks and Karkhūya, the town passed to the territory of the latter (cf. cit., p. 232). In 415 (1024) the Kilib leader Sāliḥ b. Mirdas on his march against Halab sent his follower Abu Manṣūr Sulaymān b. Tawāk against Ma'arrat Mašrin; the latter took the town and made its governor prisoner (J. J. Müller, Historia Meridio-darum, Bonn 1829, p. 14; Rosen, Zapiski Akad. Nauk., xiv. 379). Shortly before the death of Tūmān (454), the Byzantines took the town. Kamāl al-Din (ibid., p. 52). While the Ma'arrat Mašrin advanced on Balaib (cf. Halab), his uncle 'Atiyān advanced with the command of Amāriyā and a Byzantine army against Ma'arrat Mašrin, burnt its outskirts and killed a large number of inhabitants. In 491 Yaghib-Basān, prince of Anṭākiya, died in Ma'arrat Mašrin, which was taken in the same year by Muḥarram 492 by the Franks (Hist. Ord. des Crois., ii. 483). They advanced on the town via al-Rūj, slew all its defenders and destroyed the pulpit of the mosque (minbar) (cf. cit., ii. 579). After the capture of Baldwin of Edessa, the Franks took the district of al-Djarar, in al-Faw, Samin and Ma'arrat Mašrin were surprised and slain in 497 by the inhabitants (cf. cit., p. 592). In 507 (April 1114) a body of Ismā'īlīs (Bātiniya in Kamal al-Din) who lived in Fāmīya, Ma'arrat Nu'man and Ma'arrat Mašrin (so written here) tried to surprise Ṣaḥīz while the Christians were celebrating Easter. But they were driven off by the Banū Munkūl (cf. cit., ii. 548). When Baldwin II approached in 533, the towns of Sarmin and Ma'arrat Mašrin (cf. cit., iii. 623) capitulated. Tāghslūnān and Ilghār in 544 besieged the Franks in this town into which they had retreated. When Baldwin came to their relief, a treaty of peace was concluded by which the Christians were allowed to retain Ma'arrat Mašrin, Kaftānāb, al-Djarā, al-Darā and other fortresses (Ibn al-Athir, Tacnoil Hist. Ord. et. Civis, i. 332; Kamal al-Din, cf. cit., iii. 624). When Aksūnqor of Mas-wāl in 529 invaded the country of Sarmin, al-Fawā and Dānīth, the Franks encamped across his path at the reservoir (ḥisāf) of Ma'arrat Mašrin, until they withdrew in the middle of Rājāb for want of supplies (cf. cit., iii. 653). The Athābāb Imād al-Din Zanjī in 544 attacked the suburbs of al-Āṭārīb and Ma'arrat Mašrin. When Ache, the daughter of Baldwin II and widow of John, rebelled in Anṭākiya against her husband (cf. cit., ii. 661). Sawār (or Aṣwar) of Ṣalāḥ in 537 made a raid on al-Djarar and the castle of Zardānā, surprised the Franks at Halab and invaded the territory of Ma'arrat al-Nu'man and Ma'arrat Mašrin from which he returned to Halab laden with booty (cf. cit., iii. 667). In Qumāda I of the year 619 al-Malik al-Saltah, the son of al-Malik al-Zābīr, received the lands...
of Shughr and Bakās, al-Rudj and Ma'arrat Ma'āria, which he exchanged about five years later for 'Aintāb, Rawandān and Žub (Kamāl-al-Din, transl. Bloeche, R. O. L., v. 64, 72; Abu 'l-Fidā', Anuša Muslawi, ed. Reiske, iv., Copenhagen 1792, p. 312).

The town has not been much visited by modern travellers. Jullien describes Ma'arrat Ma'āria as a large village, lying among sesame fields and olive trees in a rich plain. Garrett is enthusiastic about the country and says 'when the soil there is unusually fertile, fig trees are numerous and roses are growing by roadside'. In modern times the name of the town is often written Ma'arrat el-Misrīn (with the article) e.g. by J. B. L. J. Rousseau (Description du Pachalik de Halep, in Fundgruben des Orients, Vienna 1814, iv. p. 11), Ritter (Erkundige, xvi., p. 1576), Garrett (Publications of an American Archaeol. Expedition to Syria, New York 1914, part i., p. 119) etc.

Not to be confused with our town is Ma'arrat al-Aghwān (also called Ma'arrat al-Akhwān) east of it, sometimes called al-Aghwān, e.g. by Seifl (Zeitschr. f. Erdk., 1875, xiiii., p. 24; Ma'arrat), according to which al-Rudj 'is not without a well, on the surface it is bare and exposed with its white [c. sugar-cane like] roofs on a wide plain'. According to al-Djburi of Ḥalab (d. 843) and Ibn al-Shīja (edited by Abu 'l-Yumn al-Bahtrāni in the eleventh century), Ma'arrat Ma'āria was earlier called Ḍhāt al-Kuṭūr (Z. D. M. G., xxiiii., 182; Ibn al-Shīja, ed. Cheikho, Bāirūt 1909, p. 164 sqq.; Lammenes, M. F. O. B., 1906, i., p. 240). But this statement is due to confusion with Ma'arrat al-Nūmnān (cf. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, Paris 1927, p. 213, note 4).


(E. Homsman).

MA'ARRAT AL-NūMāN. Town in northern Syria, often called simply al-Ma'arrā. It is celebrated as the birthplace of the poet Abu 'l-ʿAli Ahmad al-Ma'āria [i.e.]. According to al-Ṣamʿānī (Kātib al-ʿAnām, reproduced by D. S. Magoulithou, G. M. S., xx, 1912, fol. 336, l. 4) the nisba from the place-name was Ma'arrān to distinguish it from that of Ma'arrat Navrān, Ma'arratasi. The town probably lay on the site of the ancient Arra which is called Kārān (Arably 'āṭār ibn ʿāṭār) in an inscription. Yākūbi says that Ma'arrat al-Nūmnān is an old town in ruins. Nāṣir-i Khusrāw in 438 (1047) found in the town wall a stone column with a inscription in some language not Arabic and Ibn al-Shīja also talks of old pillars being dug up in the town. Van Berchem notes the remains of Greek inscription in the Madrāsa (Voyage, p. 203, note 1).

The town received its new epithet, to distinguish it from the numerous other Syrian towns of the same name, from the Companion of the Prophet, al-Nūmnān b. Bāṣir, who was governor of this district under Mu'āwiyah and whose son died there. According to another tradition it is called after al-Nūmnān b. ʿAbd al-Sātī of the tribe of Tanūkh. An earlier name of the town according to Ibn Baṭṭūta and Kahlil al-Zahiri (ed. Rawani, p. 49) was Ḍhāt al-Kuṭūr, according to al-Dīnārī Ḍhāt al-Kuṭūr; al-Dubrōn and Ibn al-Shīja strongly give the name 'Alī b. ʿAbd al-Fidā'ī (I. v., p. q.v.). The site of a citadel still bears the name of al-Nūmnān (see below). We have much earlier evidence from another older name, Ma'arrat al-Hum (al-Iṣṭakhri, ed. de Goeje, p. 131; Abu 'l-Fidā', Anuša Muslawi, ed. Reiske, i., Copenhagen 1780, p. 226 etc.) The district of this town originally formed an illūn (ṣināa) of the jūnūd of Ḥum (Ibn Khurādhībīh, B. G. A., vii. 75) cf. also — but this is an anachronism, — al-Kalāqāni, Yāḏī al-Aṣṭārī, iv. 142, transl. Guadelfoy-Dembyns, La Syrie, p. 109; The Huns gate (see below) is probably also a memory of this. It was only from the time of Ibn ʿAbīnā al-Ḵāṣṣū that the town belonged to the jūnūd of ʿImārān, the capital of which at a later date was Ḥalab (Le Strange, Palestine unter den Moslems, p. 36, 39).

As early as 278 (919—920) we find Yākūbi giving the name Tanūkh as the inhabitants of the town. The district around it was one of the parts of Syria most strongly settled by Maronites (al-Maṣṣāḥ, Kātib al-Tanūkh, ed. de Goeje, p. 153). As there was no running water near the town, its inhabitants had to collect rain-water in cisterns. But the country round was rich in olive, fig, pistachio and almond trees; wine was also made here as in the ancient Arra. According to Ibn Ḍubrōn the orchards stretched for nearly two days' journey from the town and formed one of the richest and most fertile areas in the world. South of Ma'arrat al-Nūmnān, just beside the town wall was a gate to local tradition, the tomb of Joshua son of Nūn; but Yākūbi says his grave was really at Nūdlūs (cf. Goldziher, Muhammadianische Traditionen über den Grabort des Jesu, in Z. D. P. F., ii. 13-17). The Djas'īn b. Nūh Allāh Vēshī in Ma'arrat al-Nūmnān still bears the name of Jo-hān and has an inscription dated 604 (1207—1208) (van Berchem, Visages en Syrie, p. 202, note 4).

When Abu 'l-ʿAbīd came to Ma'arrat Ḥum, in the year 16 (537), the people came out to welcome him and promised to pay some gold to his people. (al-Iṣṭakhri, ed. de Goeje, p. 131; Caetani, Annales dell'Islama, ii., p. 794, § 584). The Caliph 'Umar II was buried in 161 in the monastery of Simeon (Dair Simeon) at al-Nakha (Snékta) not far from Ma'arrat al-Nūmnān (Homsman, Z.S., i., 1922, p. 17; Dussaud, Topographie historique de...
occupying Ḥalab in 457 allotted Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān to the Turk chief Hārūn; on Shawaṭīl 17, 458, the latter entered the town with Turks, Dailamis, Kurds, and men of the tribe of al-Awdāj, about 1000 fighting men besides camp-followers. They pitched their camp before the gate at which public prayers were said. Although excellent discipline prevailed among them and no one injured the olive-trees and vineyards or even took water for the sheep and camels, they kept the inhabitants there more freely when they left the town again to assist Maḥmūd on his campaign against the Khalīfs. In 462 Turks in large numbers came out of Byzantine territory against Ḥalab, went via Urṭūz to al-Dżar, Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān, Kaftarīb, Ḥamām, Hims and Rafanīya, and laid Syria waste in dreadful fashion. The Turk Tūtugh in 472 undertook a campaign from Damascus against the north of Syria; he burned the region of Dżabal al-Summaq and Dżabal Bait Ḍīmam, extorted enormous sums from the people of Sarmin and Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān and plundered the country east of Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān; he laid siege to Tall Ḥalab but by mid-June had burned Maʿarrarathā (the ancient Māqarārāt ḍawr) in the district of Kafarjāb. His son Riḍwān in 488 gave the town of Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān with its lands to Suqmān b. Urṭūz. Soon after the taking of Antiqīya (491) the Franks advanced on our town, supported by the people of Tall Mannās, and all the Christians in Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān itself but they were defeated between these two towns. In the beginning of 492 they again besieged the town with a large army (then an urbs munitionum, Will. of Tyre, vii. 9) and took it, killing almost the whole population, 20,000 men, women and children (Hist. or. des. Croisades, ii. 452 sq.). Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān was, like Jerusalem in the same year, completely sacked and the walls and mosque destroyed. During the siege the Franks had destroyed all the gardens round the town and the Kūlibb, who had come to the help of Riḍwān consumed all the supplies of the district so that the country was completely starved. In 496 Riḍwān reconquered the lost fortresses. At the end of 514, he concluded a treaty with the Franks by which the latter were allotted Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān, Kafarjāb, al-Bāra and and a part of Dżabal al-Summaq. In 531 (1137) the Aṭḥābī Zangi regained Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān. When the inhabitants asked to have re-possessed to them the estates for which the Franks had deprived them, he demanded the original charters of ownership from them but they had been destroyed. He therefore had search made in the books of the office of the financial department of Ḥalab (Daftarīt Dāwān Ḥalab) and found from the old payments of khorūd what families had owned property and restored them (Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, xi. 34 = Hist. or. des. Crois., i. 423; Abu Ṭ-Ṭīdī, Annals Moslem., ed. Reiske, ii. 470; v. 274). Zangi razed the walls. While King Pulco of Jerusalem was putting down a rising in Antiqīya, Turkoman troops entered the district of Maʿarrat al-Nuʿmān and Kafarjāb but were driven out again by the Franks who thereupon conquered Kūlibb b. Maʿṣūm b. Kāmil al-Dżar, Hist. or. d. Crois., iii. 667, where our town is meant by al-Maʿarrāt, not Maʿarrāt Maqra as Robichet, Gesch. d. Konigre. Jerusalem, p. 197 assumes.

The Byzantine emperor John II Comnenos in 532 (1138) invaded the district of Maʿarrat al-
Nu'mān and then turned suddenly against Shaizar [q. v.] which he besieged in vain. The earthquake of 552 (1157–1158) wrought great havoc in Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, in K. R. O. L., iv. 529).

Shāb Ṣafidī al-Dīn in 584 (1188) went from Halāb to Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān from which he made a pilgrimage to the Shāhīd Abū Zakariyyā' al-Maghribī who lived at the tomb of the Caliph 'Umar. Towards the end of the reign of Salāh al-Dīn (C. i. 1191) the town formed part of the Syrian possessions of Taqī al-Dīn (Hist. Or. d. Crois., v. 14). Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān is several times mentioned in the wars between Salāh al-Dīn's sons. About 589 it belonged to al-Malik al-Muṣafar b. Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar. Later we find its possession alternating between Hamā and Halāb. An old Shābī madrasa was built, according to the inscription on its gateway, in the reign of the Aiylūd Sulṭān of Hamā, al-Malik al-Mansūr Muḥammad (plan in Creswell, F. I. F. A. O., xxi. 13); it is by the same architect as the lofty square minaret of the great mosque. Ibn al-Muṣafad in 596 (1159) owned the towns of Fāmiyya, Kafartāb and 25 estates in the district of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān. In 597 the town was sacked by Sulṭān al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzi of Halāb and seems to have belonged to him for a period. An inscription dated 604 (1207–1208) still bears his name. Al-Malik al-Ādil in 598 went from Damascus via Hamā to Tall Safrūn where al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hamā joined him. His opponent al-Malik al-Zāhir of Halāb concluded a treaty with him by which he was to cede Kafr al-Nadīm to Afdal and the part of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān which he held to al-Malik al-Mansūr. About 619 and 620 the town was still under the lord of Hamā, al-Malik al-Nāṣir; it then passed temporarily to al-Malik al-Muṣafar b. Isā of Damascus which placed a governor in it. (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, K. R. O. L., v. 65; Malikzāde and Ibn Wasi, K. R. O. L., ix. 497 sqq.; Abu l-'Fredī, Annal. Medit., ed. Reiske, iv. 312). During this fighting the lands of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān and Hamā were ravaged by a horde of Arabs under Mānsūr (K. R. O. L., v. 68). On the advice of Saif al-Dīn b. Abī 'Ali al-Hudhāsī, al-Malik al-Muṣafar of Hamā in 631 (1233–1234) had the citadel of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān rebuilt, but by 635 al-Malik al-Nāṣir of Halāb seized the town again and after a brief siege the citadel also. The news of its fall was brought to Halāb by a carrier-pigeon (K. R. O. L., v. 100, 105; Abu l-'Fīda, ep. cit., v. 404, 434, 596). The Khwārizmīs, ruled by Čingis Khān, entered Syria over the Fūrat and advanced via al-Dibābīl, Tall A'zāz and Sarmin to Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān which then belonged to Halāb. The geographer al-Bakrī also crosses the town to Halāb. After the victory of Bahrām over the Tatars at 'Ain Dūlūt where the Mongol general Khobbog who had been left behind in Syria by Hulghū fell, Khosrawšāh the Tatar lord of Hamā left Syria. Sulṭān Kūṭur thereupon restored this town along with Bārin and Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān, which had belonged for 23 years to Halāb in 658 (1259) again to its original owner al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hamā.

Henceforth with slight interruptions Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was in the possession of the lords of Hamā. In the year 713 (1313) Sulṭān granted Bārin and our town to Abu l-'Fīda as a fief but he had to return them to Halāb by 713 (1313) as the conditions of ownership had become ex- tremely obscure on account of the frequent changes in the land-books and repeated grants by the Sulṭān (Abu l-'Fīda, Annal. Medit., v. 274). A journey by the prince to Egypt in 716 resulted in the restoration of the town and citadel to him and a charter of presentation was prepared (ep. cit., v. 302, 304). Abu l-'Fīda quotes a portion of a poem which the Ayyubid scribe (farāk al-Ingāl) Shūhīd al-Dīn Mahmūd composed on the event (ep. cit., v. 306). But by the same year he had again to cede the town to Muḥammad b. Isā (ep. cit., v. 310).

The district of Hamā was confiscated in 742 and placed under the Egyptian governor as a separate province (perāma); henceforth Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān formed a wilāya of this province (al-Kalḵashandī in Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Manœstûs, p. 233). In the Mamlūk period the town had seven gates (according to the al-Raṣūl al-Muṣā'fār fī Ajārā' al-Muṣā'fār, quoted in al-Kalḵashandī, Cairo, iv. 142): the Halāb gate, the great gate, that of Shīth, called after the adjoining tomb of Seth, the garden gate, the Ḥim Gate and the lake gate (lāqāy probably a double gate of Ḥim). Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān was a station of the Egyptian pigeon-post (al-mārāj, Tūṣîf, transl. R. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., lxx. 501; al-Kalḵashandī, iv. 393).

After the battle of Marāj Dūlīk in 922 (1516) the town passed to the Ottomans. Delia Valla a century later found here (1616) a native chief under Turkish suzerainty and the Agha who lived there in Pococke's time while paying tribute to the Porte retained complete independence. Trollo found in the town "zwey scheue Wirths-Hausen, das eine war ziemlich bauvoll, das andere aber noch wohl zugerichtet, umb und umb mit breiten langen bleyern Taffeln bedecket". Seetzen describes Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān as the most northerly place in the Paşalîk of Damascus (Sūriya). Walpole was a guest of the mutaarrif of the town. The district of the town later became a kaṭa' of the livā of Halāb. When Szachau passed through it in 1879, a kā'imkānak was living there, the frontier with Hamā was at Khan Shākhūn. After the world war the town was included in the territory under French mandate According to Szachau it has about 40 well built houses and with its well cared for gardens and fields looks a peaceful and prosperous country town, while van Berchem calls it "a large village of rather dismal appearance"; it lies in a monotonous but well tilled plain at the foot of the eastern edge of the plateau of the Djebl Rifā. In the north-west it is commanded by the high hill on which stand the ruins of the mediaeval citadel (the town by R. Gariff and C. A. Norris, in Arabic, Archæol. Exp. to Syria, i. 50 and Princeton Exp., Dībūs, ii. Sect. B, part 3, Kafr in-Nu'mān is wrongly placed north-east of the town, cf. however also van Berchem, Voyage, p. 202 and Eli Smith in Ritter, Erdk., xvii. 1067 and Szachau, Reise, p. 94). Among the architectural features of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān the most notable, next to the great mosque, is the already mentioned Shāfī Madrasa (built in 955). A notable building of the Ottoman period is a large square caravanserai on the south side of which is a high gateway with an inscription of the date 14 (1566–1567). Sykes was shown by the Kā'imkānak as one of the sites of the place (the alleged) tomb of the poet Abu l-'Aṣāl.

MA’BAD. Abū ‘מOAD Muḥammad b. ṬA’l Wain, was one of the great singers and composers of the early Umayyad period. He belonged to Madina and was a client of Abū al-Rahmān b. Қaṭan (cf. Aḥkām, i. 19) of the house of Walīya of the Banū Makhdūm. He was a half-caste, his father being a negro. In his youth he was an accountant, but having taken music lessons from Sāʿīb Khiṣṭīr, Nasīḥt al-Fārisi and Djamila [q. v.] he adopted music as a profession and soon made a name for himself. During the reign of Abū al-Malik (655–686 = 685–706) he carried off the prize of singing being organised by Ibn Ǧanab al-Makka. He sang at the courts of al-Walad I (66–696 = 705–715), Yazid II (101–105 = 720–724), and al-Walid II (125–126 = 733–744), the second of these treating him with unheard of favour. On the death of Ibn Surajjī [q. v.] about the year 107 (726), Ma’bad became the leading singer, and when al-Walid II was called to the throne, Ma’bad, although an old man, was invited to his court at Damascus. Here he was honourably treated and received a gift of 12,000 pieces of gold. Shortly afterwards he was again commanded to appear at court, but he was very ill when he arrived. Paralysis intervened, and although he was lodged in the palace itself, and had every possible attention, he died (125 = 743). At his funeral, the caliph and his brother al-Ghaur, walked in front of the bier, whilst the renowned songstress Sallāma al-Kass, one of Ma’bad’s pupils, chanted one of his elegies.

Ma’bad must undoubtedly be counted among the “four great singers” (Aḥkām, i. 98, 151; ii. 127) whatever opinions may be held as to the others. A poet of Madina said: “Fawzas, and after him Ibn Surajjī, excelled in song; its eminence belongs to Ma’bad” (Iṣhāk al-Mawṣili (cf. ii. 439) said: “Ma’bad was a consummate singer, and his compositions reveal a superior talent to all his rivals”. Poets like al-Buṭṭurī [q. v.] and Abū Tammān [q. v.] have shown the worth of Ma’bad in Arabian musical history. Among the compositions of Ma’bad his most famous were the seven known as the “Cities” (Ma’dun) or “Fortresses” (Ḫayṭān), whilst five others were celebrated as the Ma’badī. His fame was made by his adoption of a grandiosu (kūmil ṣāmu) style of composition in the rhythms (iṣṭār) called ḩayṭān or “heavy”. Among his pupils were Ibn ʿAṣīḥa, Malik al-Tāṣ [q. v.], Yūnus al-Kāṭib [q. v.], Siyaṭ, Sallāma al-Kass and Habbābā.


(H. G. FARMER)

AL-MA’BARI, ZAIN AL-DIN wrote about the year 985 (1577) for Sultān ʿAli ʿAdil Shah of Bijapur (d. 987 = 1579) a brief history of the spread of Islam in Malabar, the coming of the Portuguese and their campaigns against the Muslims from 908 to 985 (1498–1578). The work is preserved in Brit. Mus. MS., N°. 94, India Office No. N°. 714 and 1044. 5 and in Morley, Catalogue of Historical MSS., N°. 13 and is entitled Tafsīr al-Muṣṭaṣab; extracts were given by John Bunyan in Viscita, History of the rise of the Mahomedan power in India, London 1829, p. 511 sqq., and it was translated by M. I. Rowlandson, Tafsīr al-Muṣṭaṣab, an Historical work in the Arabic language, London, Or. Trans. Fund 1833 and ed. by D. Lopez, Historia dos Portugueses no Malabar, por Ziasimão, manuscrito arabe do século XVI publicado e traduzido, Lisbon 1898.

(C. BROCKELMANN)

MACASSAR, an important seaport on the island of Celebes, on the Bay of Macassar; it is the capital of the administrative district of “Celebes on Onderhoorigden” and also of the division of it of the same name administered by an assistant-resident. By the native population the town which has made very great
progress in the last few years, is still often called by its original name of Udjong-pandang (Djum-pandang). The Dutch gave it the name Macassar from the kingdom of the same name. The heart of the Macassar country is the former principality of Tello, which has a direct rule of the Dutch East India government in 1914 and is a remnant of the once very powerful kingdom of Macassar. The area inhabited by the Macassars in the wider sense stretches over the whole southern part of the southwestern peninsula of Celebes, as well as over the island of Saleier and several groups of island in the neighbourhood.

The remainder of southern Celebes is inhabited by Buginese who are closely related to the Macassars and whose language, manners and customs are very similar.

The Macassars do not differ much in physical appearance from the Javanese; they are of above medium height and in general well built. Their mode of life, dress and dwellings are simple. The main industry is agriculture which is very successful on the generally fertile soil: in the plains rice is grown, often on wet fields, in the mountains maize particularly, but also vegetables and leguminous plants and cocoa-nuts. The cattle-rearing also is not unimportant. The native industries which are carried on in the houses of natives are not on a very high level; the work of the gold and silver-smiths is relatively good. An unfavourable verdict has often been passed on the character of the Macassars but this seems to be exaggerated; they find it difficult to submit to a regular life but for the rest they are not difficult to govern. Among their vices are their fondness for dice and cock-fighting. Originally three classes were distinguished in Macassar society, the princes and nobles, the people, and the slaves. Slavery has now been abolished even in the districts under independent rule.

The population generally professes Islam and its laws are on the whole conscientiously observed and the Muslim principal feasts faithfully celebrated. But one cannot of course say that Islam regulates the whole of their social and religious life. The custom which has been exaggerated is that the women, very numerous and form a striking contrast to the ideas of Islam. In every village there is still to be found a little building which is used for the worship of the spirits of the animistic period (the chief of whom is Karaeng Lowe, i.e. the "great prince") and where heathen priests offer sacrifices. There can therefore be no question of fanaticism and the very simple mosques are in general in disrepair. The highest Muhammadan office is filled by the keli, usually a man of princely descent, who used formerly to be appointed and dismissed by the king. He had control of all matters relating to worship and he also gave legal decisions in questions of inheritance and played an official part in marriages and divorces. There were lower officials under him who acted as preachers and preceptors, performed the offices of a sexton and gave elementary religious instruction. Their knowledge of Islam is usually very slight. The revenues of their clergy consists of the sakko (zakat), the pitara (fitra) and of presents on all sorts of occasions at which they take part, and of a certain percentage (zynki) on the division of inheritances. The zakko is irregular and unsatisfactorily paid, the pitara much better.

No particulars are known of the earlier history of Macassar and of the regions inhabited by the Macassars in general. In the middle of the sixteenth century they were under the rule of the Hindu-Javanese kingdom of Madjapahit. According to the native chronicles of the royal houses of Gowa and Tello, which, at least so far as the earliest period is concerned, were nearly the same, the Gowa originally consisted of an alliance of nine small districts each under a noble; after the government had passed into the hands of one man and the kingdom had expanded, to include for example the lands of what was later Tello, Gowa is said, after the death of the sixth king (at the same time the first whom the chronicles represent to us as an ordinary mortal), to have been divided between his two sons; the one became ruler of Gowa and the other of Tello. It is certain that, so far as our knowledge goes, there were always close relations between these two kingdoms and that there was a certain degree of unity about them; they were known together to Europeans as the "kingdom of the Macassars". About the year 1512 Malays from Sumatra were given permission to settle in Macassar and it was perhaps they who first brought Muslim ideas to South Celebes. When the Portuguese appeared there in the middle of the century, they found only a few foreigners there, who were Muslims; it was not till the beginning of the sixteenth century that the Macassars in general adopted this new religion. During the reign of Tunjilgallo (1565-90), Babullah, king of Ternate, came to Macassar, concluded a treaty and at the same time attempted to introduce the Muslim religion into South Celebes. In 1603 Sultan Aliuddin and one of his brothers became converts to Islam, which thereafter spread rapidly over Gowa and Tello, chiefly through the influence of Karang Matawaiya, administrator of Gowa and prince of Tello. We find traditions about the first preaching of Islam in South Celebes, similar to those of other parts of the archipelago. There they are particularly associated with a certain Dato-ri-Bandang; a Minangkabau peasant from Kotoingah, who is said to have landed about 1546 in Tello and to have preached the Muslim faith at the same time performing all kinds of miracles. Next to him, the two main apostles of Islam are said to have been his contemporaries Dato-ri-Tiro and Dato-Patimang. Their tombs are still much visited.

In the first half of the sixteenth century the kingdom of Macassar extended very much, so that it brought under its suzerainty almost the whole of Celebes, Buton, Flores, Sumbawa, Lombok and the east coast of Borneo. The Dutch East India Company, which had a good deal of trouble with the Macassars, did not succeed till 1637 in concluding a treaty with them which permitted freedom of trade but allowed them no permanent settlement. But as Macassar caused the Company further difficulties in the Moluccas, a war resulted in which the town was burned. By the peace concluded in 1660, the king lost a portion of his territory; the Portuguese were forbidden to remain in the kingdom while the Company were allowed to settle and trade freely in Macasar. Peace was again broken in 1665; the Admiral of the Dutch East India Company, Speelman, sailed with a large fleet to Celebes, destroyed the Macasar fleet and forced the king to sign a treaty of peace ("Bongraisch Verdrag", 1667; confirmed in 1669), whereby
the sovereignty of Macassar over Celebes was finally destroyed. Even after this, the relations of the Company and later of the Dutch government with the kingdom were not good. Telo was incorporated in the government territory in 1856 and leased to the prince of Gowa. In 1905 an armed expedition was sent to Gowa; since 1911, it has been under direct rule.

dom, subjects" (phonetically: vahwako), which is a plural Bantu form (wa-Biki) malagascified va-
< Bantu plural form, wa-~ euphonic intervocalic Malagasy h- ≈ tuh. This radical is identical with the
re-duplicated form used by the Arab geogra-
phers, Wukuri or Wukiri [g. v.] and phonetically
equivalent to the Biki of the early travellers and
the Eastern Bantu wa-Biki, "the Malagasyes" and
Bukini, "Malagascars". This explanation seems
preferable to that which I had proposed in 1904
in J. A., vol. iii., p. 496 sq. I think we must
agree that the Malag. vahikiki comes from wa-
Biki and recognise a Bantu substratum in the
Malag. word.

The present name of Madagascar is given by
Marco Polo in the form Madigeascar (cf. The
Book of Ser Marco Polo, ed. Sir Henry Yule
and Cordier, ii., p. 411 sqq.). Yule long ago
pointed out that Marco Polo had not visited Madagascar
and only knew it by hearsay, and that the
information he gave about it really related to the
adjoining east coast of Africa. The origin of this
name is as follows: As I have already pointed
out in studying once more this chapter of Marco Polo,
Madigeascar is undoubtedly a slightly er-
roneous formation of the form Zang-bar and should
be corrected to Madigeascar (=land of the Mal-
agasy), just as Zang-bar means "land of Zang or
of the Zangs" (cf. Mémoires Soc. de Leng. de Paris,
vol. xiii., 1905–1906: Trois étymologies malagaches,
p. 418–422), where زنج is to be corrected
to زنجبار). This correction is justified by the fol-
lowing facts: In the Travels already quoted, Father
Luís Mariano mentions a kingdom of the S. E.
of Madagascar which he calls Matacasi, Matacasi,
Matasisi (or Matakasi). Three years later in 1616,
Father D’Almeida, travelling in the same country
also mentions a kingdom of Matasasi. Cauche
in his Relation, published in 1654 by Morison
(Relations vivables et curieuses de l’Ile de Madig-
ascar et du Brésil, p. 10, 49, 99, 124, 127, 134),
mentions a province called Madigache by some
and by others Malagasy, the inhabitants of which
he calls Malagases and Malagasies. He also uses
the term Madagasoras, but with the wider sense
of the whole island and its inhabitants. Flacourt
(Histoire de la grande île Madagascar, 1661, p. 1)
says: "The island of Saint Laurens is called
Madagascar by the geographers, by the inhabitants
Madagascar, by Ptolemy Manethion, by Pliny, Cern...,
but its real name is Madaoces." Later writers are
all more or less inspired by the work of Flacourt
and need not be quoted here. All these different
readings go back to two forms: Madagascar
and Malagasi which correspond exactly to two main
categories of dialects: those with dental d
and those with liquid l. It is the latter form that came
to prevail over the whole island, sometimes with
the sibilant: Malagāsī and sometimes with the
palatal: Malagāsii. Both are paroxytons. The modern
vocabulary frequently uses the abbreviated form gāsī
and even gā. These facts seem to justify the
explanation suggested above for the name Madig-
ascar which we owe to Marco Polo.

The doublet, Malagāsī-Madāgāsī, Malāgāsī-
Midadagari is obscure. According to the morphology
of the language it may represent a form *mada
or *mada + gāsī which recalls nothing, whether we
take the form with soft letters mada-gāsī or that
with hard noted by the Portuguese: mato-kāsī. Nor
do we know whether we have to deal with a
western Indonesian root or a Bantu stem. In any
case it is probable that we have to deal here with
a foreign tribal name, the eastern or western origin
of which can no longer be explained from an
ancient or modern language.

In the Arab geographers the first detailed account
of the island of Komr-Madascar is found in the
Kitāb Nuṣḥat al-Muḥātir al-Aṣfāh (1154) of al-Ifrīsī who included the large African
island in the country of the Zangs. "The people
of the island of Zābag = Sumatra", he says, "in
the seventh section of the first clime come to the
country of the Zangs in large and small ships and
use it as a centre for trading in their merchandise
as they understand one another’s language" (MS.
This passage is very important as it shows that
in the 13th century, Madagascar, wrongly located
in the country of the Zangs, had been long before
colonised by immigrants from Sumatra who had
introduced their language into the island and
Malagasy was derived from it. In the eighth section
of the same clime the island of Komr-Madascar
is situated seven days’ sail from the Maldives. Its
king lives in the town of Malý. This is an island
four months’ journey in length. It begins near the
Maldives and ends in the north opposite the islands
of China. The geographer of Roger of Sicily, as
his map shows, has combined into one huge island
Madagascar, Ceylon and a part of Sumatra. In the
ninth section, we are told that the people of Komr
and the merchants of the land of the Maharāḍa
(= Sumatra) come to the inhabitants of the east
coast of Africa and are welcomed by them and
trade with them (cf. my Relations de Voyages, Index,
s.v. Komr and Komor).

Yākūt in his Muḥjam (completed in 1224) says
simply (vol. iv., p. 174): "al-Komr is an island in
the centre of the large island of the Zangs, which con-
tains no larger island than this. It contains a
large number of towns and kingdoms. Each king
makes war on the others. Amber and the leaf al-kumari (sic) are found on its shores. This is a
perfume; it is also called betel flower. Wax is
also obtained from it". The Kitāb al-Muḥātirik
of the same author contains identical information
taken from the Muḥjam (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 358)
but the latter text has more correctly "the leaf
al-kumrī".

Abū Ḥasan 'Ali b. Sa'id al-Maghribī, best
known as Ibn Sa'id, was born in 1208 or 1214
near Granada and died at Damascus in 1274 or
in Tunis in 1286. The Bibliothèque Nationale in
Paris has a copy catalogued as Ms. n°, 2234, a
treatise on general geography which runs from
f. 1 to 117 and is entitled: "The book collected
and epitomised by 'Ali b. Sa'id al-Maghribī the
Spaniard of the Book of the Geography (of Pto-
lemies) in seven climes; and he has added to it
longitudes and latitudes from the book of Ibn
Fāmīma". This copy of the original manuscripts
was dated 714 (1314–1315) and belonged to the
celebrated geographer Abū 'I-Ṭ addī. The text con-
tains in a few lines information of the highest
importance to the following effect: "The Komr
who have given their name to the mountain of
this name situated in eastern Africa are brothers
of the Chinese. They originally lived with the
Chinese in the eastern regions of the earth, i.e.
in the interior of the Asiatic continent. Discord having broken out between them, the latter drove the Korm to these islands. After a certain period of time, dissen-sions broke out among the Korm who had migrated into these islands, the king and his family migrated once more and went to the large island of Korm in Madagascar and the Korm settled in a town of this large island, called Komnya. These Korm immigrants to the large island increased in numbers and spread through the different centres of the island; but new dis-sensions broke out and provoked a new exodus and many of them went to settle in the south at the beginning of inhabited land along the mountain which bears their name (cf. Relations des Voyages, ii. 3 16 of). If we translate these successive migrations into terms of modern geography, we get the following: The Korm, related to the Chinese, originally inhabited Central Asia, migrated from the interior of the continent where they were neighbours of the Chinese to the adjoining maritime lands and islands of the Malay Peninsula and Indonesia; in Decade ii., Book iv., Chap. iv. of Pala-is, p. 352 of the little edition of 1777, the Portuguese historian João de Barros says that the Javanese claim to have originally come from China). They later migrated from Indonesia, more accurately from Sumatra (cf. my Empereurs indiens et javanes in J. A., 1922, vol. xx.) to the large island which bears their name, the island of Korm = Madagascar and from there to the mountain of Korm, the famous mountain in which the Nile was thought to = East Africa.

The first migration, that from Central Asia to the coasts of the Malagatick Island certainly took place long before our era. Several centuries must have passed between the departure of the emigrants from the plateau of Eastern Tibet, their expansion in the region of the coast, from Burma to Indo-China and their crossing to Indonesia. Ibn Sa'd lived in the 8th century. How then could he have known of events that took place several millennia before his time and are not recorded elsewhere? Neither the history nor legends of the Far East knows anything of such happenings. The Indians, Sinhalese, and Indo-siamians who I have consulted cannot think of any text or inscription directly or indirectly referring to them. I am surprised at such a question being raised by a comparatively late Arabic text and I know no satisfactory answer. I was prepared by my studies on Madagascar to accept Ibn Sa'd's statement that the large African island was colonised by Sinhalese whose ancestors had come in the Asiatic continent; but this is exactly what Ibn Sa'd says of the Korm. The agreement between the Arabic text and historical events is striking; but the undeniable agreement is irreconcilable for we do not know as well as we ought, how and where such information could have been obtained in the 8th century. I put toward the hyp thesis (Rés. d l'Ind., 1930) that Ibn Sa'd might have got the information at the court of Heliopolis (cf. Relations des Voyages, ii. 3520) that Ibn Sa'd might have got the information at the court of Heliopolis where he spent some time in the 9th century. But we know from his biographers that the Syrian traveller lived in Bagdad, studying astrol-oby at the 56 libraries of that city and making extracts from manuscripts. He may have had in these works the statements he has fortunately preserved for us.

A contemporary of Ibn Sa'd, Li'mār or Nağm al-Din Abu 'l-Fāth Yūsuf b. Yağit b. Muḥammad, better known as Ibn al-Mudafār al-Shabāni of Damascus, prepared his Tarikh al-Mustawfi (Cod. al-Mustawfi) in 1250 (RS. 6021 of the Bibl. Nat. in Paris). In the 25 folios devoted to the history of 'Aden, 72 a. b. deals with the voyages of the Korm from their original home to 'Aden and gives dates (1262, 1279) from Madagascar to the African coast and to 'Aden (cf. J. A., vol. 13, 1919, p. 469–483).

The following geographers: Shams al-Din Abū 'Abdallāh Sulṭān al-Dumāshiqī (d. 1325), Abu 'l-'Abbās Ahmad al-Nuwaiti (d. 1332), Abu 'l-Fida' (1273–1313), Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1375), Maqrizi (1565–1442) tell us nothing particular about the island of Korm. The towns, which some of them locate in the great African island, are really in Ceylon or farther east or cannot be identified (cf. Relations des Voyages, index, s. v. Kormor and Korm).

In the 18th century Ibn Majdīj (cf. Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. Majdīj) in his Kitāb al-Fawa'il (cf. Instrucions marítimes i encontres arábex et portuguès, vol. i., p. 668, 6), identifies the island of Korm among the ten large islands of the world and mentions it after the Arabian peninsula: "The island which is the second in size", he says, "is the island of Korm. It is now an island (sic)."

The information I have collected orally does not agree about its length or breadth for it is quite apart from the world and the inhabited climes of the earth. This is why there is doubt on the subject. In the large books on geography it is said to be the largest of the inhabited islands. Between it and the land of Sofala and the islands dependent on it (the Mozambique Channel) there are lands and reefs. In spite of this sailors are able to pass among the islands and reefs. The island of Korm takes its name from that of Kormūn, son of 'Amur son of Shem son of Noah. To the south it has the sea which the Greeks called Ogyynas, this is the ocean surrounding the world (al-Malik in Arabic). It is the beginning of the southern darkness, which is to the south of this island of Korm). Ibn Majdīj frequently mentions the island of Korm in his other Nautical Instructions and it undoubtedly is Madagascar.

With Sulaiman al-Mahri (cf. below) our information becomes more definite. In his al-Undat al-ma'ārif, Chap. iv., dealing with the islands and sailing routes along their coasts (cf. Instrucions marítimes i encontres arábex et portuguès, vol. ii., p. 220), he says: "Let us begin with the island of Korm because it is a large island which stretches along the coast of Zang and Sofala. Its northern extremity is called Râs al-Millâ (Amber Cape); it lies in 11 3 26 of North; at the Bear = 8° 37' South; the true latitude is 11° 57'. Its southern extremity which is called Hifa (= Cape Sainte Marie) is in 3 36 of North (21° 37' south; the true latitude is nearly 25° 38'; according to some, in 3 26 of North (24° 51' south) according to others. This latter latitude is the more accurate. There is a difference of opinion about the direction of the sea-routes along its coast; because this island is remote from the inhabited earth. There are two opinions regarding the direction of the route along its east coast: according to some one should sail S.W. according to others S.W. There is a third opinion that one should go W.S.W. from one end to the other of the island. This last view is that of the older sailing
In my opinion, adds Sulaiman al-Mahri, it is possible that the route should be W.S.W., then S.W. \( \frac{1}{4} \) W., then S.W., and in another direction still for two reasons: the first that it is a large island, that its coast is long and the route is also long. The second reason is that the directions given have not been verified on account of the fewness of the voyages made to this island and the insufficient nautical knowledge of those who have been there. Sailing-masters (mawallim) of Zang have told me that the route on the east coast from Raas al-Milhi to the place where Nāsh is 8 ica’ (\( 15^\circ \ 30' \) S.) south is to the south and from this place to the south end of the island is S.-\( \frac{1}{4} \) S.W. I have recorded that the route on its west coast from Raas al-Milhi to the place where Nāsh is 8 ica’ (\( 15^\circ \ 30' \) S.) is to the south; and from this place to the south end of the island S.-\( \frac{1}{4} \) S.W. On the west coast from Raas al-Milhi to the place where Nāsh is 6 ica’ (\( 16^\circ \ 44' \)) the coast is perfectly safe; from 6 ica’ to its south end there is a rīkk ("bank" or "shallow") about 2 ical (\( 6 \) hours) sail or more in length to the neighbourhood of the coast. Between the island of Kom and the coast (east coast of Africa) there are four large inhabited islands, near one another, to which the people of Zang go. The first of these islands is Angazidya (Great Comoro). It is in 11 ica’ \( \frac{1}{2} \) of Nāsh (\( 9^\circ \) S. approx.; Moni, the capital of Angazidya, is in exactly 11° 40' South). Between it and the African coast it is 16 ical (\( 48 \) hours) sailing. The second, Mullah (our Mahali), is in 11 ica’ of Nāsh (\( 8^\circ \ 37' \) S., true Lat. about 12° 20’); the third Dumani (capital of Anjouan) which is in 11 ica’ of Nāsh (\( 8^\circ \ 37' \) S., true Lat. 12° 15’) is to the east of Mullah; the fourth Mawatta (our Mayotte) is in 10 ica’ \( \frac{1}{4} \) of Nāsh (\( 9^\circ \ 25' \), true Lat. 12° 46’ 55”). To the east of these islands lies a great reef of rocks, about 4 ical (\( 12 \) hours) sail, usually called ‘Ali al-Bahr ("eye" or "source of the sea"). The harbours of the east coast of Kom are Langanei (15° 17’ S.), Sa’da (true Lat. approx. 13° 54’) and Manzilal (the bay of Mahadamba, whose west point is in approx. 15° 12’ Lat.). Those of the west coast are Bander Bani Ismā’ (in the same latitude as Langanei on the west coast), and Bismā’ (Vobemar in 15° 21’ 15”). All these ports are dangerous (for ships) except Langanei. Know that between Raas al-Milhi and the coast of Zang, there are 50 ical (\( 150 \) hours) sail; and 20 ical (\( 60 \) hours) to the east of Raas al-Milhi there is an inhabited island called Munawarā (one of the southern Maldives). To the southeast of the island of Kom lie numerous islands called Tirakha (the Mascarene Islands); they are 12 ical (\( 36 \) hours) sail from the island of Kom’. In his Kitāb al-Munawarā al-Tafsir (f. 73b of the same MS.), Sulaiman al-Mahri gives another description of the island of Kom which does not differ from the one given above. Four pages earlier on f. 71a he mentions several other harbours of the island of Kom with their latitude calculated from the altitude of the Great Bear.

Island of Munawar in 11 ica’; Bander Ismā’ or Bani Ismā’ on the east coast and Lālangān or Langān on the west by 10 ica’; Bimarsh on the east coast, Anāmil on the west by 9 ica’; the island of Amber (Djarāt al-Ammār) on the east coast and Bander al-Nūb on the west by 8 ica’; Noshim (\( ? \)) on the east coast and Malawin (\( ? \)) on the west by 7 ica’; Manakāt on the east coast (true Lat. 22° 08’ 50”) and Bender al-Shū’un, "port of the banks", by 6 ica’; Bender Hadīdī on the east coast and Bender Kūrī on the west by 4 ica’; Wabaya (according to the Turkish text of Sidi ‘Ali; the name is illegible in MS. 2559) on the east coast and Bender Hit (or Hait) on the west coast by 3 ica’; Bender Hadīdī (sic) on the east coast; no name known on the west coast in this latitude by 2 ica’; Bender Kūs (or Kaus) on the east coast and the bay of Kūrī on the west coast by 1 ica’; the majority of the names of harbours, which are sometimes found on both coasts recall nothing known elsewhere.

Malagasy undoubtedly belongs to the western Indonesian group of the Malayo-Polynesian family. Down to the adoption of the Arabic alphabet, the language was only oral and, so far as we know, never written down in any alphabet. The lack of epigraphic material on the one hand and of ancient monuments on the other deprivest us of any chance of regaining the past history of this vast island. Before the xvii century, a few Arabic and Chinese texts would constitute our only documents, if the linguistic substrata did not yield us some valuable information. These substrata are of two kinds, Bantu and Sanskrit.

These former are divided into three categories:

1. The borrowings of relatively recent date from Swahili, which in turn got them from Arabic, of the type: Malag. bahari, "sea" < Swahili bahari < Arabic bahār; Malag. komba, "coconut fibre rope" < Swahili komba < Arabic kihār; Malag. sukari, "rudder" < Swahili sukrō < Arabic 'abādūn. These loanwords are practically only found in the maritime dialects of the N.W. and W. coasts.

2. The borrowings from Swahili of the type: Malag. bitu, "baobab" < Swahili milaia; Malag. kōnina, "master", "sir" < Swahili kivonina; Malag. kibōba, "measure for rice" < Swahili kibāba, "measure of about a quart", etc. Like the preceding, these loanwords are found almost solely in the maritime dialects of the west coast; they may therefore be assumed that they also are of recent introduction.

3. The following words are, on the other hand, used either in the old and modern coast dialects or in the dialects of the centre and east, that is outside of the zone frequented by the sailors of the west coast of Africa, Zanzibar and the Comoros. They are found in manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale and in old records of travel; they are not borrowings, but belong to an old substratum of the language:

Malag. amba "dog" < Bantu mowu; Malag. akōnna "guinea-fowl" < Bantu kanga; Malag. amfondrə "ass" < Bantu munda; Malag. ahonambika, ahonambika, "two ox" < Bantu ngombe; Malag. aminana "tale, fable" < Bantu ngana; Malag. amhendri, amhendri "sheep" < Bantu mūnili; Malag. fmũnna, fmũnna "green pigeon" < Bantu ningen; Malag. gidru "kind of lemur" < Bantu ngedere "little black monkey"; Malag. kōni in the tribal name Kasi-mambika "madame" < Bantu mɔnisi "woman, wife";
Malag. kúnguna “boy” < Bantu kunguni;
Malag. kúlù, kúkó “mangrove” < Bantu mboko;
Malag. kómbe “paroquet” < Bantu kwara;
Malag. mina, malángo, mañágo “manioc” < Bantu malongo;
Malag. manjará, musávi “sorcery” < Bantu mêsivi “sorcerer”;
Malag. munyavana “poison” < Bantu unyavana “vegetable poison in which arrows are steeped”;
Malag. ási “goat” < Bantu mbázi;
Malag. pànga “milus agyptius” < Bantu punga, kwàngá “falcon”;
Malag. samba “ship” < Bantu čombo;
Malag. zàkini “stranger to the country or place where one is” < Bantu zvini “foreigners”;
Old Malag. zàká, modern Malag. zàká “stranger (means particularly foreigeners of white race)” < Bantu wàngùna “white stranger, European” etc.

The place-names of Madagascar further show a certain number of names of villages on the coast and of rivers running into the sea which are also Bantu or some Swahilis and others ordinary Bantu. They are referred to in my memoir on L'Origine Africaine des Malgaches, F. A., 1908, vol. II.

The Sanskrit-subtratum contains many words of various classes:

1. Names of gods, spirits and of caste:
   Old Malag. Ran in the expressions ham-nam, lit “enten by Rahu the moon” = eclipse of the moon; ham-nam-ia-matu, lit “obscured by Rahu the sun” = eclipse of the sun.
   Malag. andián, andiana, “noble”, “of royal or noble caste” < Kawi árjya < Sanskrit árjya, etc.

2. Names of the months:
   The names of the months in the Indian calendar are found in the dialects of all the tribes of Madagascar. They have not however been preserved in the original order and a month that is placed at the beginning of the year by one tribe is put at the middle or end by another. On the other hand, Bézina and Bančóns are not found in the Malag. lists; they are replaced by two ásins (large and small), two fénta (large and small) and a month called tíaqó:

Skt. yóné > Malag. fénta, bióna, réna, réka, fána;
Skt. nyóna > Malag. mía;
Skt. cóna > Malag. ásina, ásita, ásó, ásí;
Skt. cóná > Malag. fána, fáka, fáka, fáka;
Skt. yóna > Malag. bióna, bióna, bióna, bióna;
Skt. bóna > Malag. ásina, ásita, ásó, ásí;
Skt. tuqá > Malag. hátáka, háčina, háčina;
Skt. bónina > Malag. sóna, sóna, sóna, sóna;

“A Common words:
Skt. tén “10 millions” > Malag. “10 millions”;
Old Malag. “100 miles” > modern Malag. “100 miles”;
surmounted by a vertical ṭashdīd, then by ﭙ. Contrary to Malay each letter is vocalised, which renders the reading of Malagasy-Arabic texts easy in spite of the variations in orthography, which are too numerous to be given here.

The Arabic-Malagasy alphabet was once used over a very considerable area; at the present day, it is only used on the S.E. coast where very many natives were still using it at the end of the sixteenth century. The Malag. Muslims of the N.W. and W. prefer to use the Arabic-Comoro or Arabico-Swahili alphabet. The latter renders by ﭙ a ṭ identical with the Malag. ṭ but this form is only used in the island of Anjouan. The dialect of this island which has a ṭ transcribes it by ﭙ, the ʿ of Persian and Turkish. The Arabic letters ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, and ﭙ are only found in Malagasy, when Arabic words are quoted and they are pronounced respectively ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, ﭙ, and ﭙ.

Malagasy manuscripts in the Arabic character bear the generic name of shura-ba "great writing", i.e. "sacred writing". They used to be difficult to obtain; the owners gave them an esoteric character which did not allow their contents to be communicated to a stranger. I was able to get some copied and to acquire a few others between 1890 and 1894. The Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has ten, of which eight are undoubtedly old. MSS. 2, 3, 4 and 5 came from the old Abbey of St. Germain des Prés; No. 6 is also old, although it was only acquired in 1820. Thanks to an interlinear transcription and Latin translation by a European, which can be dated on palaeographical grounds between 1595 and 1620, it may be presumed that No. 7 reached Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century and must therefore have been written before that date. According to an MS. note by Langle, "MS. 8 seems to have been brought to France in 1742"; the MS. 5132 wrongly classed with the Arabic manuscripts is also an old Malagasy manuscript. MS. No. 1 given by the Duc de Coislin to the Abbey of St. Germain des Prés has coloured drawings, coarsely executed of men, animals, trees, and cabalistic figures but not a single line of text. MS. No. 13 is a copy of four short modern manuscripts. With the except of 1 and 13, all the manuscripts are on native paper, written with the kalum with native ink. Flacourt gives a detailed description of them in his Histoire de la grande ile Madagascar (p. 194 sqq. of the edition 1661). The subject matter of the manuscript is very varied. There does not seem to have been a shura-ba prototype out of which all the others proceeded. In an apparent disorder, the result of the fancy of the author or the copyist, we find collected suras of the Koran, interminable lists of the names of Allah, and of names of angels, Arabic religious texts with interlinear Malagasy translations (cf. the facsimile publ. in N.E., vol. xxxviii., 1904, p. 457); Arabic-Malagasy glossaries, magic texts, and invocations in large numbers, magic squares and formulae, texts showing the magic influence, good or bad of the planets, signs of the zodiac, lunar mansions, months, and days of the week, of the male and female character of the twelve Muhammadan months (Mahuaram is male, Safar is female, and so on, in MS. No. 2 sqq., 269), of patterns for amulets (kiri in Arabic ﭗ),

The suras of the Koran are not reproduced in the order which was settled at the revision ordered by the Caliph Othman. MS. 6 gives them in the following order: ṣāfīḥa, cīvīx, cīlix, cīxii, and so on to xcvi. (f. 2a etc.). Then come verses 1—4 of Sūra xciv., verse 256 of xi., verse 16 and beginning of verse 17 of iii. The same MS. also contains Sūra xxxi. (f. 136b) and f. 136b—138b, verses 158—159, 137, 256—259, 284—286 of Sūra ii. and verses 25—26 of Sūra iii.

Here we may mention several texts of particular importance, one of which is certainly unexpected. MS. 3 contains a bilingual glossary of 36 common words, Malagasy and Dutch, the two languages being transcribed into Arabic characters. It was published in B. T. L. V., vol. xi., 1908. I have suggested that it must have been compiled by the interpreter of Frederic de Houtman, "who had spent four years with the Dutch and spoke their language well". He had supplied Houtman with "his collection of Malagasy words".

MS. 5 contains from f. 85a to 88a an Arabic poem with Malagasy translation in honour of a certain Lailā (I have not yet been able to ascertain if this is the lover of Maganin, or of some Laila in Arabic literature). The piece begins "The poets said..." and ends "...the girl who possesses beauty and kindness". The Arabic verses are of an unusual inaccuracy and show that whoever reproduced them had a very superficial knowledge of the language and poetry. MS. 8 (f. 52b to 56b) preserves a ḥṣūba in Arabic entitled Aladua ra-labatiibā (ra is the Malagasy article, "the Khaṭṭib's prayer". Not a line in it is correctly written and some words are absolutely unrecognisable. Under the transformations they have undergone however we still find the formulae used in this same sense. The following are successively mentioned in the ḥṣūba: the Prophet and his family, the first four caliphs, 'Aisha, Fatima, her sons Hasan and Husain, the two uncles of the Prophet, Hamza and al-'Abbas; then the Caliph Abū Ahmad 'Abd Allāh al-Mustafa b'līlah (the text has bi-līlah Allāh) Amir al-Mu'minin. Further on there is a reference to Sulṭān ʿalī, son of Sulṭān Othman.

The mention of the last of the 'Abbasid caliphs seems to indicate that the Malagasy converts to Islam, among whom this ḥṣūba was in use, had been converted by Arabs who had left Baghda or a country under al-Mustafa in this caliph's reign, i.e. between 640 and 656 (1252—1258). We cannot explain otherwise how this name happens with the title "Commander of the Faithful" in a ḥṣūba used in Madagascar. As to the Sulṭān ʿalī (perhaps we should read ʿalī and translate "Sulṭān ʿalī who is here", the khaṭṭī then indicating the Sulṭān in question), I have not been able to identify him. As it is written, the name is neither Arabic nor Malagasy. MSS. 7 and 8 contain two identical versions of a religious text which I published in N.E. (xxviii. 449 sqq.). In a passage devoted to the glorification of the month of Ramāḍān, the anonymous author succes-
sively invokes the prophets of the Old Testament; Jesus and Mary, the Prophet Muhammad, the first four caliphs, Ḥasan and Ḥusain and finally Abū Hanīfa al-Naṣīr, the great Ṣunny Imām, and Muhammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī, the founder of the Ṣunnī school which bears his name. The mention of these two learned men and the Ḳhatīb already mentioned are evidence of the orthodox character of certain Muslims of Madagascar and perhaps one may say of the generality of Muslims on the southeast coast. But the same manuscript No. 8 contains a Persian text which prevents us putting forward this conjecture. This latter text which is still unique is found on ff. 252—276. The last lines invoke the ʿabara muḥābāhāna, then, the first eight imāmi’s of the Shiʿa sect of the “Twelveers” (cf. ʿAṣIR; ʿAṢIRIYAH) to whom the author has added ʿAli Aklar (“Ali the elder”), son of Ḥusain and half-brother of ʿAli Zain al-ʿĀbidīn. The mention of these imāmi’s of whom the last named, ʿAli al-Kīlī, reigned from 135 (800) to 202 (818) is valuable, for it implies that the writer of this text belonged neither to the schismatic sect of the Zaidīya founded in 695 A. H. nor to the schismatic Shiʿa sect of the Ismāʿīliya which dates from 765 A. D., but to the orthodox Shiʿa sect of the “Twelveers.” This is important, for the Persians whom the historical tradition makes come from ʿAṣūr and colonise Kilwa on the east coast of Africa and the island of Anjouan in the Comoro Archipelago were Ṣalṭis (cf. A. R. Ferrand, Les Saluts de Kīla, in Memorial Henri Basset, in the press) who cannot come into consideration in the present case. The Imāmīya, whose presence in Madagascar is evident from MS. No. 8 thus form a separate group different from that of the Persians who had immigrated to the adjoining coast of Africa.

The Arabic-Malagasy manuscripts which I possess, those of the University Library of the Faculty of Letters in Algiers and others which we are able to see are, as a rule, similar in contents to those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with the exception of the Ḳurʾān and the Persian text, which so far as I know are found nowhere else. Quite a considerable number of manuscripts like MS. 13 contain genealogies of kings of the Southeast, from which all these documents come, and local histories. One of them gives details of Ra·sa’s campaign in the Imara of 1659—1663 (cf. A. F. P., 1877, xxxvii). The majority of the religious texts which are found in the Arabic Malagasy MSS. of the Paris Nat. are translated into Malagasy. The Arabic part is very incorrect and the Malay translation shows that the exegesis of Magadagasy undergraduates very little of it. The illustrations and illuminated folios, to whom nothing ʿIsmāʿīli a foreign, was interested in the texts which I published. Comparing three translations of the Malagasy text with the Arabic text he concluded that “the meaning of the fundamental ideas was most gravely misunderstood” (A. G. LEcH, Information sur les lettres et les Mānasik d’Africa au XIVe C. in les Oeuvre, R. R. H., 1895).

The borrowings of the Malagasy from the Arabs who converted to Islam are many and are found through all the tribes of the island without exception. The most notable are the names of the days of the week, which are: les, ʿalāʾ, ʿalāʾ, ʿalāʾ, ʿalāʾ and ʿalāʾ. We may note that the Arabic article has been retained for Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday and Sunday but dropped for Tuesday and Friday. The names of the days are here given in the Merina dialect; the forms of the other dialects show the regular phonetic variations.

2. The names of the twelve months in Merina and in the dialect of some other tribes reproduce the Arabic names of the twelve signs of the Zodiac: al-kāhid, ad-dāʿa, ad-ḥāṣtān, an-nūrān, al-ṣaʿāba, al-nawād, al-aṣāf, al-ṣaḥr, al-ṣaḥr, al-ṭaf, al-ḥāj, and al-ḥāj. Quite a number of tribes do not know the Merina series, but still use the names of Sanskrit origin given above (p. 68, col. a).

3. The names of the 28 days of the month (the S. E. Malagasy however once had a year of 366 days) which are recorded by Flacourt (Histoire, 1661, p. 174) recall those of the 28 lunar mansions of the Arabs. According to the empirical method adopted by al-Shāfiʿī and other writers, i.e. dividing the 28 mansions by 12 the latter are evenly distributed among the signs of the zodiac. “Know,” says al-Shāfiʿī, “that each of the signs of the zodiac has two mansions and a third” (A. C. de Moutylini, Les Mansions initiales des Arabes, texte de Mouhammad al-Mogri, transl. and annot., Algiers 1899, p. 68). In Madagascar to get rid of the fractions, three mansions have been attributed to the first, seventh and ninth signs, and two to each of the eight others:

**Signs of the Zodiac**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Malagasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Alahamadi</td>
<td>1. Asharataini &lt;al-ṣaḥrāʾin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alabutaini &lt;al-ḥutāʾin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Azuriza &lt;al-ṭaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. adelbar &lt;al-dabar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. alaha &lt;al-ḥaṣa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. alahama &lt;al-hanāʾ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. azra &lt;al-dhiraʾ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. anasara &lt;al-naṭha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. atara &lt;al-ṭaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. aljazba &lt;al-djabha, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arabic names of the lunar mansions thus become the names of the 28 days of the Malagasy months. Mentioned along with the day of the week, they take the place of the ordinal which the Arab-Malagasy texts rarely indicate by a figure. This method seems to have now fallen into disuse for ordinary purposes and is hardly used except in sorcery.

4. The *ṣikhl* (dialectical variants: *ṣikhl*, *ṣikkha* <ṣīkhl, “figure”) is the art of divination; its object is to find out what is not known and the means of discovering a remedy against it. Used throughout the island with slight variants from one tribe to another, *ṣikhl*, to take the form generally used, is a direct derivative from the *ṣikhl* “test” in the science of sand or Arab divinity (cf. the *ṣikhl* of *ṣikhl* “test” *ṣikhl* al-Kāhid of the Maḥmūd al-Zanātī, līth., Cairo, n.d.). Shīkh al-Zanātī’s table from which is derived all these tables in Madagascar comprises the following 16 figures:
Each figure of the table bears a name of its own and is composed of a certain number of dots, maximum eight (IV) and minimum four (XIII). Four figures have five dots (V, VII, XVI and XVII); six have six dots (II, III, VI, X, XI, XIV) and four have seven dots (I, VII, VIII, IV). Each figure governs a certain number of things or beings; according to the question put to the diviner, the latter considers very carefully the figure relating to the question asked. The influence of each of the figures comes from the sign of the zodiac, planet, day, Arab month and from one of the four elements to which it corresponds. It is also lucky or unlucky, male or female, fālīb (applying to the person consulting the fates) or maṭlūb (applying to the question asked); it is more or less strong and powerful in such and such conditions, and it also shows in what state the thing asked shall be realised. The 16 figures of the table are divided into different groups each bearing a particular name:

- the ḏawākhīl, "those who enter" which number three (XI, II, XV). If they are present in a large number in the sīdīkī effected by the diviner, it is a very auspicious sign and the questioner will certainly obtain what he seeks. If one of the ḏawākhīl proves to be the first figure, the object sought enters, i.e. is obtained;
- the khawārījī, "those who go out" are three in number (I, X, XII). If they are several times represented in the sīdīkī effected by the diviner, it is an unlucky omen and the object sought will be unattainable; one of the khawārījī proves to be the first figure, the object "goes out"; i.e. is lost to the seeker;
- the muḥkālīs, "those who return" (IV, V, VI, IX, XIV, XVI) are sometimes lucky, sometimes unlucky, according to circumstances. If one of the muḥkālīs is the first figure, the operation will remain without a definite result;
- the ṣawābīt, "those who are fixed, who do not vary" are the figures I, II, X, XI, XIII, XV. They are lucky and assure that the seeker will gain his end;
- the muqānāt, "the dismal" are figures III, VII, VIII, XI. If the first figure is one of the muqānāt the questioner will not obtain what he asks, or will not escape the misfortune he fears.

The figures I, IV, VII, X are called awtūd "the pious". If the four figures found in it are similar, success is assured.

Figures II, V, VIII, XI are called mūḍālī al-awtūd, "what concerns the pious". If the four figures found in it are similar the desire expressed, will be realised.

Figures III, VI, IX, XII are called sa'ilat al-awtūd, "the end of the pious". If the four figures found in it are similar, the object desired is coming and will arrive or the desire is completely realised at the moment of consulting the diviner.

The sixteen figures are also divided into two groups of eight; one is called sīkīl al-maṭlūb, "figure of him who asks"; these are the eight who represent him who is consulting the fates; the other sīkīl al-maṭlūb, "figure of the thing sought", i.e. those who have to answer the request. If the first figure of the sīkīl is among the eight fālīb, and the seventh among the eight maṭlūb, it is a very good omen. If on the other hand, the first figure is maṭlūb and the seventh fālīb, it will be impossible to avert the evil fate. It must also be enquired if the fifteenth figure of the operation of the diviner is fālīb or maṭlūb, if fālīb, it is lucky and if maṭlūb, unlucky.

If the sīkīl is consulted on behalf of a sick man the presence of figures VII, VI, V, XIV, IX, IV, XIII indicates his approaching end.

The four first figures of the table are also called buṣīt al-aḥāyūm, "hours of the days". Repeated several times they indicate that the thing sought will be realised in the course of a day. The four following (V—VIII) are called buṣīt al-qamās, "houses of the weeks" and indicate an interval of a week; the four others (IX—XII) buṣīt al-qalāb, "houses of the months" indicate an interval of a month and the last four (XIII—XVI) buṣīt al-sinām, "houses of the years" indicate an interval of one or several years. If one of the houses of the days occupies a position other than the first four, the interval increases in proportion as it is remote from the first four places. On the other hand if one of the houses of the weeks, months or years is found before its place, the interval diminishes in proportion to its nearness to the first figure.

The figures I, III, V, and X mark the direction of the east; VIII, XII, XIV and XV, the direction of the west; II, IV, VI and VII, the direction of the north, and IX, XI, XII and XVI, the direction of the south.

Figure I of the preceding table is called al-aḥāyūn or ṣāḥīka. The first of these names has passed into Malagasy in the form māhizani. It represents the person who comes to consult the diviner; its zodiacal sign is Pisces; its planet Jupiter; its day Thursday and its element, the sea. The corresponding figure is the fifteenth. It is lucky, male and fālīb; i.e. it is one of the eight figures representing him who consults the fates. Its month is Dhu ‘l-Hijja. If in the preparation of the sīdīk it occupies the first place, the thing demanded will be realised after an interval of three days. The amount of happiness and success which it brings will be greater if it occupies the first place.

Figure II (labīt al-maḍżīlāt, Malag. albashu) is that of wealth, riches, possessions and estates, and merchandise of all kinds. Its sign of the Zodiac is Sagittarius; its planet, the Sun; its day, Sunday; its element, fire. The corresponding figure
is the tenth. It is lucky, feminine and matlıb, i.e. it is one of the eight figures which represent the thing sought. Its month is Dişmâdlâ Al-Awâl. If it occupies the fourth place, the desire of the seeker will be accomplished after an interval of 55 days; if it is in the fifth place, it is still propitious; if in the fourth it indicates greatness.

Figure III (kâfâr al-khârîqâ, Malag. adâla) is that of the family, especially brothers and sisters. Its sign of the Zodiac is Kâs Dişmâwlâh (Pers. gâwâr-zârâr: "the head of the Dragon"); its planet Saturn; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the tenth. It is unlucky, male and fâlîb. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval necessary for the accomplishment of the desire formulated is 150 days. It reaches the maximum size in the ninth place and strength in the third. Its metal is gold.

Figure IV (al-duqmaâ > Malag. dâma, zuma) is that of the country, gardens and barriers of the dead. Its sign of the Zodiac is Virgo; its planet Mercury; its day, Wednesday. The corresponding figure is the fourteenth, its element black earth. It is good or bad according to circumstances and matlıb. Its month is Dişmâdâ Al-Akhir. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the realization of the desire expressed is 20, 55 or 130 days. It is large in the sixth place and strong in the fifth and tenth. Its metal is silver.

Figure V (al-kâfâr al-khâlîq > Malag. akhâlîq, Malag. akhâlîq) is that of children and bearers of news. Its sign of the Zodiac is Libra, its planet Venus, and its day, Friday. The corresponding figure is the twentieth. The south wind is its element. It is neither good nor bad; it is fâlîb and female. Its month is Kalâbâb. If it occupies the fourteenth place the desire expressed is satisfied the day following. It is large in the twentieth place and strong in the fourth, eighth and eleventh. Its metal is gold.

Figure VI (al-kâfâr al-khâlîq > Malag. akhâlîq, Malag. akhâlîq) is that of the sick, of cries, of war, of slaves, of loss of property, of remedies and of ships sending ships of the Western Indian Ocean. Its sign of the Zodiac is Aquarius; its planet, Mercury; its day, Saturday. The corresponding figure is the seventh. Its element is the west wind. It is good or bad according to circumstances. It is fâlîb or matlıb. Its month is Dhu'l-Ka'dâ; it is female. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before accomplishment of the desire expressed will be fifteen days. It is large in the ninth place and strong in the eighth, eleventh and twelfth. Its metal is silver.

Figure VII (al-kâfâr al-khâlîq > Malag. akhâlîq) is that of marriage and of sexual relations. Its sign of the Zodiac is Capricorn; its planet, Saturn; its day, Saturday and its element earth. The corresponding figure is the sixth. It is unlucky, fâlîb or matlıb and male or female according to circumstances. Its month is Shawwâl. If it is in the fourteenth place, it indicates an interval of 55 days before an answer to the question asked the diviner is obtained. It is large and strong in the second, ninth and twelfth. Its metal is silver.

Figure VIII (al-kâfâr al-khâlîq > Malag. akhâlîq) is that of death and removal. Its sign of the Zodiac is the Ram; its planet Mars; its day, Tuesday. Its corresponding figure is the sixteenth, its element fire. It is unlucky, fâlîb and male. Its month is Muḥarram. If it is in the fourteenth place, it indicates an interval of 21 days. It is large in the first and strong in the fourth. Its metal is iron.

Figure IX (bayâa > Malag. alâhâra, adîhîdâdî) is that of departure and of those who clothe the dead in white linen. Its sign of the Zodiac is Cancer; its planet, the moon, its day, Monday. Its corresponding figure is the thirteenth and its element is water. It is neither lucky nor unlucky but may be one or other according to circumstances. It is fâlîb and female; its month is Djuimâdâ Al-Akhir. In the fourteenth place it indicates an interval of ten days for the accomplishment of the desire expressed. It is large in the ninth and strong in the eleventh. Its metal is copper.

Figure X (nâsraât al-khâlîq > Malag. adîhîdâdî) is that of strength and of rulers. Its Zodiacal sign is Leo, its planet is the sun; its day, Sunday; its element fire. It is male, fâlîb and very lucky. Its month is Dhu'l-Ka'dâ. In the fourteenth place the interval before the accomplishment of the desire is 32 days. It is large in the tenth and strong in the thirteenth. Its metal is gold.

Figure XI (nâsraât al-dâhâkîn > Malag. asurâwâyî, asurâwâyî) is that of life in towns, of return to the domestic hearth, of ambition, friendship and of children. Its sign of the Zodiac is Taurus, its planet Venus, its day Friday, its element, black earth. The corresponding figure is the fifth. It is male, lucky and fâlîb. Its month is Râmâdîn. If it is in the fourteenth place, ten months will have to pass before the realization of the desire. It is strong in the fourteenth place and large in the eleventh. Its metal is copper.

Figure XII (sâbat al-kâfâr idâa > Malag. karbâda) is that of enemies, cunning and ambushes. Its sign of the Zodiac is Dhîl al-Djuamâwlâh, "the Dragon's tail", its planet Saturn, its day Saturday. The corresponding figure is the third, its elements are water and terra firma. It is unlucky, matlıb and feminine. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before the accomplishment of the desire is 66 days. It is large in the twelfth and strong in the thirteenth. Its metal is iron.

Figure XIII (fârîk > Malag. tarâkî) is that of the road which leads to the house of death, to the cemetery. Its sign of the Zodiac is Cancer; its planet, the Moon; its day, Monday. The corresponding figure is the ninth, its element is water. It is lucky, matlıb and female. Its month is Dhu'l-Ka'dâ. If it is in the fourteenth place, the interval before accomplishment of the desire will be 50 days. It is large in the fourteenth and strong in the twentieth. Its metal is copper.

Figure XIV (al-îdâa > Malag. adîhîdâdî, adîhîdâdî) is that of learned men, of remedies, of knowledge, arms and medicine. Its sign of the Zodiac is Gemini; its planet, Mercury; its day, Wednesday. The corresponding figure is the fourteenth. Its element is the wind. It is lucky or unlucky, male or female. fâlîb. Its month is Djuimâdâ Al-Akhir. In the fourteenth place which is its own, it indicates an interval of 6 months before the accomplishment of the desire. It is large in the fourteenth and strong in the fifteenth. Its metal is iron.

Figure XV (asbah al-dâhâkîn, Malag. alâhâra) is that of the judge. Its Zodiacal sign is Pisces; its planet: Jupiter, its day, Thursday and its element water. The corresponding figure is the
first. It is lucky, male or female and gālūb. Its
month is Ṣawwahāl. In the fourteenth place the
interval before accomplishment of the desire will
be 55 days. It is large in the fourth and strong
in the eleventh. Its metal is iron.

Figure XVI (naši al-kadd > Malag. kisu) is
that of the end of all things and the last of the
sikidī. Its sign of the Zodiac is Scorpio; its planet
Mars, its day Tuesday and its element water. The
corresponding figure is the eighth. It is lucky or
unlucky, male or female and maṭāfī; its month is
Ḍujmādā al-Awwal. In the fourteenth place it
indicates an interval of seven days before the
realization of the desire. It is large on the four-
teenth and strong in the sixteenth which is its
own. Its metal is copper.

These are the sixteen figures of the sikidī and
the signification given them in Madagascar.

As its Arabic name shows, this “science of the
sand” was first practised by tracing lines or dots
on the sand; in Arabic one says darab al-rāmī.
“to strike the sand”, to describe the preparation
of the ilm al-rāmī. On the east coast of Africa
in Swahili the same operation is called kūpiga
baa, lit. “to strike the planchette” (which implies
that the dots forming the sixteen figures are in-
scribed on a planchette) or ramī, a Bantuised
form of the Arabic rāmī “sand”. At the first the
lines or dots were traced on the sand, then on a
planchette of wood and lastly as in Madagascar
on paper. According to another Malagasy method,
the diviner also uses grains of sand, or seeds,
especially those of the sanu tree (Piptadenia
chrysostachys, Bth.).

When requested to consult the fates by the
sikidī, the diviner first of all pronounces the in-
vocation: “Awake, O God, to awaken the Sun!
Awake, O Sun, to awaken the Cock! Awake, O
Cock, to awaken Man (ulambelulunto)! Awake, O
Man, to awaken the sikidī; not that it may lie, not
that it may lead us to error, not that it may make a
laughing stock, not that it may say foolish things,
not that it may deal with any matter of no im-
portance, but that it may search out secrets, that
it may see what is beyond the mountains and
the other side of the forest that it may see what
no human eye can see. Arise! for thy skill which
comes from the Muslims with long hair (ṣīlām
be vohī), from the high mountains, from Raburubuka,
from Tapelaketiketsika, from Zafti-
simaitu (eponym of a tribe of the south-east con-
verted to Islām), from Andriambavitaaahī, from
Rakelihuranna, from lanakara (eponym of another
south-eastern tribe, converts to Islām), from And-
riamoni-Sulanastra, from Vazimba (a dwarf tribe,
of African origin as the name shows; the old
owners of the soil), from Anankandrianaahītra, from
Rakelihavavuli (lit. the little man with long hair).
Arise! for we do not have thee for nothing; for
thou art dear and cause expense! We have taken
thee in exchange for a fat zebu cow with a large
hump. And for money on which there was no
dust (i.e. coins which are still circulating). Awake!
for thou hast the confidence of the ruler and thou
expressest the judgment of the people. If thou
art a sikidī that can speak, a sikidī that can see
and that does not repeat (only) the gossip of people,
the hen killed by its owner, the ox killed in the
market; the dust which clings to the feet (i.e. a
sikidī who does not repeat what everyone knows);
awake, on the mat which is on this very spot!”

(cf. Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Maga-
nice, 1886, p. 221). If the diviner operates with
seeds, he takes up a few at random and counts
them two by two until at the end he has one or
two which are placed at the top of the figure.
The operation is repeated four times which gives
the four rows of dots of the first figure.

When the diviner works on paper, he traces
with the ḫalam a line in the form of the arc of
a circle, the centre of which is indicated by a
dot. The sum of the dots and initial and final
curves (each of which counts as a dot) must not
exceed 14, although the ṛpīsikidī is understood to
make the dots without counting them. He then
draws three other concentric curves in the same
way. This done, the dots are counted two by
two and line by line from left to right. A vertical
line separates the groups of two dots from one
another. After the last vertical line there remains
either the final curved line which counts as a
dot, either a point or a line, i.e. two dots. This
or these are written opposite each line and given
figures I, II, III, IV:

The four first figures are called in Arabic, um-
maḥāt “the mothers”:

Figure V is obtained by transcribing vertically
from right to left the line u a’, b v, c’ and d’
give in the same way figures VI, VII and VIII.
These four new figures derived from the four first
are called al-hamāt “the daughters”:

Figure IX is formed by adding horizontally
the dots of I and II (in the addition ● ● ● = ● ● ●
● ● ● = ● ● ● ● ● ●). All the other
figures are similarly formed: III and IV give X;
V and VI give XI; VII and VIII give XII; IX
and X give XIII; XI and XII give XIV;
The eight last figures are called *banāt al-banāt* "the daughters of the daughters":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
<th>XII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII</th>
<th>XIV</th>
<th>XVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sixteen figures contain the fate of the inquirer and the diviner has to give him the meaning of each of them by interpreting them from the table of Shukh al-Zanāṭ, which was given above (p. 712). We may therefore imagine what a high place the *zikādi* occupies in Malagasy life, and the very numerous circumstances in which recourse is had to it. The diviner was and undoubtedly still is the true manager of it. In practice it is consulted for every act of private and public life whether of the individual, family, clan or tribe. I have not been able to learn how one becomes a *mptikiddi*. It is the specialty of certain individuals without distinction of sex or birth. A diviner or a sorcerer may be man or woman (I have never known a woman sorcerer but have heard that there are such). The sorcerer may be of royal birth, noble or freeman (I have never heard of a sorcerer or diviner who was a slave, although slaves have been executed on charges of sorcery). The diviner or the sorcerer is very often the son or daughter of a diviner or a divinestar, who assists him an extensive clientele, for he or she is supposed to inherit the paternal (or maternal) secret. The sorcerer or diviner may be either native or foreigner. I was taken for a diviner during a stay of fourteen months at Mmanjāny (S. E. coast) by the Muslim *mpet tid* of the district, who treated me a colleague after I had shown them my knowledge of Islam. It was in this way that I was enabled to be initiated gradually into the practice of *zikadi* and appeal was sometimes made to it.

The area of dissemination of the *zikadi* devoted in Africa is considerable. It is found in Difīrī and the *zikadi* of Bora in Tahomey reveal the existence of practices closely allied to it among a West African people who are however not Muslims. G. Ferrand, *Mauritania* (*Molière* 1894. p. 344. et seq.)

The great annual festival of the *zikadi* of the lamb is only a survival under another form of the old *zikadi* (p. x). On this identification of G. Ferrand, *Mauritania* (*Molière* 1894. p. 344. et seq.)

According to the Portuguese discoverer and especially of Hacen, the Muslime Malagasy of the 18th and 19th centuries lived during Ramañān, rested the obligatory prayers, read the Qurān, and drank fermented liquids and ate pork. There were *zikadi* in the 18th and 19th centuries. The collections of the faithful took place; but there is no mention of the existence of a presiding officer in the early travellers and Hacen describes definitely in his preface that the nation of which he is speaking has no *zikadi*. As in *zikadi* (p. v), the success of Islam was only mediocre in Madagascar. Malagasy does not readily assimilate foreign beliefs and customs and the latter do not profoundly modify native beliefs and customs. His whole philosophy is contained in the proverb *maiti ni isina*, "life is sweet"; he thinks it good to believe; the strict observation of the Qurān, prescriptions would have upset too much his usual life and customs. Allah proscribe fermented liquids, standing stones, games of chance and consulting the fates as abominations invented by Satan. But these abominations are particularly dear to the Malagasy; they are particularly devoted to alcoholic liquors and to gambling, believe firmly in soothsaying and standing stones (*tangambata*) are held in honour throughout the whole island. No doubt they venerate Allah, the Qurān, the Prophet and saints of Islam but it is a purely verbal reverence and they are not really islamised to the degree, that for example are the negroes of the adjoining east coast of Africa.

The conversion of the Malagasy to Christianity was also a failure. At the time of the conquest of the island in 1895 they were quite disposed to be converted en masse to Roman Catholicism, thinking it would please us; they had to be warned that the French government only attached importance to respect for the laws and respected the religious convictions of every one whatever they were. This fact of which I was a witness is more eloquent than any other and throws an illuminating light on the past.

The evidence quoted above and especially that of comparative philology enable us to draw up the following scheme of the settlement of Madagascar so far as our knowledge at present goes:

1. Many legends give the old Vazimbas, now disappeared, as *tanju-tanju* or ancient masters of the oil i.e. the autochthons. The name which is found in East Africa is clearly Bantu and represents an older *va-zimba* Malg. *va-zimba*. They are said to have been of small stature. They were perhaps negroes.

2. There was an important immigration of African Bantu prior to our era of which we have an evidence in a certain substratum of African words which has survived in the modern language.

3. There was next an important immigration of Hindoos from Sumatra (cf. G. Ferrand, *L'Empire sumatranas de Crevjaya* in the second—fourth centuries A.D. A word like the Malag. *kiti* < old Malay. *kitti* = 100,000 < Malay *kit* 100,000 < Sanskrit *koti* 10,000,000 is over many others testifying to this fact. These Indonesians modified the *sonatological*, cultural and linguistic type of the negrito Bantu who peopled Madagascar.

4. Arrival of Arabs in the sixth—ninth centuries and conversion of the Malagasy to Islam. These Arabs probably came from the Persian Gulf and belonged to the Sunna.

5. Another immigration of Sumatrans at the end of the tenth century. I consider the *Wakwak* to be western Indonesians, as I shall explain in the article *Wakwak*. The Book of the Wonders *Inzur* (*Algiz* al-Hind, ed. by van der Lith, and trans. by M. Deren) mentions a piratical campaign by these *Wakwak* in 534 (945) in the Western Indian Ocean. It is probable that we have here a reference to the migration led by Ramini the

(GABRIEL FERRAND)

AL-MADĀ‘ĪN: a mediaeval Arab town or rather a group of towns in al-‘Īrāk (Babylonia) about 20 miles S. E. of Baghdad lying on either side of the Tigris in two almost equal portions. The name al-Madā‘īn (plur. of al-Madīn) “the towns” is explained from the fact that the two capitals situated opposite one another, Seleucia on the west, the Greek colony founded before 312 and 301 B.C., and Ctesiphon on the east (the first reference to which is in 221 B.C.), the winter residence of the Parthian and Sasanian kings, with several other places close at hand were regarded as forming a whole. The Semitic Aramaeans who formed the bulk of the population under the Arsakids and Sasanians comprised the whole group under the name Māḥūr or Mardabūhī “the towns”, which latter word the Arabs adopted in the plural form al-Madā‘īn peculiar to their language. Following the Sasanians, the Arabs reckoned seven towns in al-Madā‘īn, the official names of which they partly arabized.

On the west bank lay Wēh-Andeshir, corrupted by the Arabs to Behirsarfs (often wrongly read Baharsar and Nahr Shīr or Sir; cf. Streek, Babylonien, p. 262, note 3). The name does not mean “good” (is) Ardeṣīr as it is often explained but “house (i.e. foundation) of Ardeṣīr” (cf. thereon, Ndileke, W. Z. K. M., xvi., 1902, p. 7: Wēh = Aram. Bē): In Syriac and Talmudic literature Behirsarfs is usually called Kēbeh (= Kohe of the late classical writers) and Māḥūr (= the town”). It occupied the lower southern half of the former Greek town. A parasang (c. 3 miles) north of it was the village of Darzandān (al-Darzān), and later, Darzān. On the east bank stood Ctesiphon. The Arab historians and geographers usually reproduce this name, which is not Greek but very probably indigenous (Iranian) by Taṣfūn; but we also find Ṭuvfūn and Taḫūn corresponding exactly to the presumed Pahlavi form (Ta-fun, Taštun). On these place-names cf. the very full discussion by Streek in Pauly-Wissowa, l.c., Suppl. vol. iv. 1102 sq. Not uncommonly the town on the east bank, much more important for the Muslims, is called al-Madīn (e.g. in al-Iṣāqātī, B.G.L., i. 87. 1). About an hour’s journey away, south of Ctesiphon stood Wēh Antioch-i Khosra (Khosraw). The Arabs usually called this city founded by Khosraw I Anusharwān, which was settled with the deported inhabitants of Antioch ad Orientem destroyed in 540 and is said to have been planned on the model of the Syrian capital,
Rumiya = Rome or (New) Rome or Byzantium. The Syriac sources distinguish this new foundation from the older towns by the name Māhāzā ḫidhatā = "New town".

We know nothing further about the three other towns of al-Madā'in, which made up the number seven so popular in the east and was here no doubt deliberately chosen. The exact forms of their names are not even known.

As early as the Parthian period there was a stone bridge to convey the traffic between the two thickly populated banks of the Tigris, which the historian Ḥamzah al-Iṣfahānī (cf. his Ta'rikh, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 31, 10) describes as a marvel; but already in his day (beginning of the fourth = tenth century) there was no longer any trace of it. Under the Sāʿānians a second bridge (of boats?) was erected. In the Muslim period however there was still only a bridge of boats.

In Taṣṣufīn-Ḳtesiphon two main quarters are distinguished, the northern "old town". Arab. al-Madā'in al-ʿaṣa'a and the southern, Ḥanāfār (Asāfār, Ḥanāfār, and other variants of the name).

The "old town" probably represents the oldest settlement on the east bank, the foundation of the Parthian period. In it was a royal palace which the Arabs called al-ṭūhr al-ḥayyāf = "the white palace" (there were other palaces of the same name elsewhere; cf. the article Kālīm-e Samānī), probably the residence originally of the Sāʿānian kings built by one of the last Arsakids or first Sāʿānians. The southern quarter Ḥanāfār also included a royal residence, the Ṭūmān (= pillared hall, palace), usually described more definitely by the Arab authors of the middle ages as Ṭūmān al-Ḥār (cf. Khusraw). Chorezos, the general title of the Sāʿānian kings among the Arabs; cf. Streck. Seleucia u. Ktesiphon, p. 37, note 1) Its builder is known with certainty to have been Sapor (Sahār) I (241—272 A.D.). It may be noted that later Arab historians often confuse the "white palace" and the Ṭūmān.

It can hardly be supposed that the site of al-Madā'in, so favoured by nature, at the point where the Euphrates and Tigris most nearly approach each other, was without any considerable settlement even before the time of Seleucus I. There is on the contrary every indication that the town of Ṭūmān (written geographically Ṭūmān) dating back to remote antiquity like its successor Ṭūmān, the Ṭūmān of the classics, could not be located anywhere else than on the site of the same town of Seleucia and Ctesiphon or in the immediate neighbourhood. What the Arab writers say about the founder of al-Madā'in is worthless. They ascribe the foundation to mythical kings of the old Iranian epic like Ḥamshad and Tahmārash or other celebrated rulers of the east like Nirmāl or Iskandār-Alexander, for Nirmāl (see Abu’l-Farābī-Iskandar-Bahreinwānis, Ta’rikh-Muṣḥāf, Beirut ed., p. 20,2).

For the pre-Islamic tradition of al-Madā'in which does not fall within the scope of this work cf. Streck. Seleucia und Ktesiphon, and the pertinent articles in Paulus Miss ions. The Arab sources contain much valuable information for the Sāʿānian period: the most notable is Tabari’s history (cf. Noldeke. Gesch. des Islam. i, 65. 1879). We may here mention that under the later Sāʿānians, Gogus, to some extent lost its popularity as the winter capital, for they, especially Khosrow II Parvēz (590—628), preferred Dastagerd to it, three days journey to the north on the very old "royal road" (cf. Dastān-e Rād).

We have fairly full information about the conquest of al-Madā'in by the Arabs, especially the great chronicles of Tabari (l. 2426—2456) and Ibn al-Aṯir (ed. Torn bare, ii. 396—403; cf. also Caetani. Annali dell’Islam, iii. 732 sq.; Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, vi. 68 sq., and Streck. Seleucia u. Ktesiphon, p. 38—41). After the glorious battle of al-Kālidāsya, which made the Arabs masters of ʿIrāk west of the Tigris (cf. above, ii, p. 612b), the Caliph ʿOmār ordered Saʿd b. Abī Waḵša, who was then in command of the Muslim troops operating in the ʿIrāk, to march upon the Persian capital. Saʿd advanced, fighting several battles on the Tigris and appeared before Behūrūn in the first half of January 637 (= end of 16 A. 11). The strongly fortified town which was bravely defended was besieged and stormed in vain for two months. In the end the Persians whose supplies were exhausted fled by night unnoticed over the river so that when the Arabs stormed the town soon afterwards they found it quite deserted. A few days later the invaders were able by using a convenient ford to cross the Tigris, much swollen by the spring floods. This almost miraculous crossing effected without any loss is a much celebrated event in Muslim history; it is one of the famous "days" of the period of the conquest. The Persians had not expected that the Arabs would win their way across. The king had taken refuge with his family and court in Huwān (q.v.); the army had retired to ʿĪjār Nahrāwān (about 24 miles north of Ctesiphon). Only a few regiments remained at the palace in the capital. At the end of March 637 Saʿd made his triumphant entrance through the deserted streets. The progress of the Arab operations had not given the Persians sufficient time to carry off the vast treasures accumulated in Ctesiphon. These all fell into the hands of the victors. The Arab sources give many interesting details of the very valuable objects which were captured not only in Ctesiphon but in the pursuit of the Persian army. The total value of the booty taken in Ctesiphon was estimated at 900 million dinārs (of a nominal value of nine pence but it varied a great deal).

The occupation of the Sāʿānian capital, the greatest royal city in nearer Asia, may be said to be the most important event of the period of Islam’s splendour, the period of the great campaigns of conquest. In the "old town" the victorious Saʿd built the chief mosque – the first Muslim place of worship to be built in the ʿIrāk.

Al-Madā'in was not destined to be the residence of the Arab governor of the ʿIrāk; on the contrary it sank under Muslim rule to be a mere provincial town. It was soon over-shadowed by the newly founded Arab military colonies of Kūfa, to which the gates of Ctesiphon were transported, and a symbolic custom found elsewhere in the Arab east – Bilād ʿArab and Jūzayj. Basra and Kūfa now became the political and intellectual centres of Mesopotamia until the Caliph al-Mansūr built Baghdad and the political and cultured centre of gravity of the land gravitated thither. The foundation of Baghdad dealt al-Madā'in its death blow: it was now called upon to yield the building material necessary for the new capital of the caliphate,
just as Babylon had done for Seleucia centuries before.

In the history of the Umayyad and ‘Abdāsid periods al-Madā’in was as a rule no longer of any prominence. It only played a part of some importance in the civil wars of the first two centuries of Islam, those provoked by the Khāridjīs as well as those provoked by the ‘Alids. The Muslim inhabitants of al-Madā’in were, it seems, always strong supporters of the Shi’ā. They were also hostile to the Khāridjī movement. As early as 658 there was fighting around al-Madā’in between the ‘Alids and the Khāridjīs. An attempt by the latter (in 664) to seize Ctesiphon from Behrāsr was thwarted by the commander there who had Shi’ā sympathies, by destroying the bridge of boats. The Khāridjīs however later succeeded in twice gaining temporary possession of al-Madā’in, e.g. in 688 when the Khāridjī group of the Azariyān [q.v.] wrought great slaughter among the Muslims who did not belong to their party. The second occupation of al-Madā’in in 696 was achieved by the Khāridjī leader Shāhib b. Yazid. On these events cf. J. Wellhausen, *Die religions-polit. Oppositionsparteien im alten Islam* (= Abb. G. W. G., N. F., vol. v., No. 2 [1901]), p. 21, 56, 43, 45; R. Brunnow, Der Islam in der vorchristlichen Zeit*, p. 91, 69. The western part of the state (in modern ‘Alamdar) Leyden *1884, p. 22, 92.* With the death of Shāhib b. Yazid, the power of the Khāridjīs was broken, but as late as 751 ‘Abbāsid troops had to be sent to suppress a leader of these rebels; cf. A. Muller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande*, i. 440.

As regards the ‘Alid wars in the Ḳaṭṭ the most important campaign was that of Ḥasan to al-Madā’in in the year 661. Ḥasan lived there in the “white palace”. Cf. on this expedition, the Arabic accounts of which differ not inconsiderably: Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, i. 244; Flügel, *Gesch. der Araber*, Leipzig 1867, p. 158—159; A. Muller, *op. cit.,* i. 336 and especially J. Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, Berlin 1902, p. 69. From the year 696, when the ‘Abdāsid conqueror al-Madā’in appears in 684—686 and 744 as supporting the ‘Alids; cf. Wellhausen, *Die religions-polit. Oppositionsparteien*, p. 72, 73, 80, 98. The importance of al-Madā’in as an objective in these civil wars is evident from the fact that in those days the military road from Ḍaṣṭa to Khūfa did not go through the desert along the Arabian bank of the Tigris but went across the canals to the Tigris at al-Madā’in and from thence over further canals to the Euphrates; cf. Wellhausen, *Die religions-polit. Oppositionsparteien*, p. 85, note 3.

The Caliph al-Ma’mūn was repeatedly forced to lend his army against al-Madā’in: in 811, when in the troubles that followed the later ‘Abdāsid succession after the death of Hārūn al-Rašīd the Barmecide ‘Īmān b. Mūsā defended the town against Ma’mūn (cf. i., p. 605) and in 815 when an ‘Alid rebel Abu ‘l-Saṭāyā (al-Sarī b. Māsūr, cf. iv., p. 170) who had seized the town was besieged in it. For the rest we do not hear much more of al-Madā’in in the ‘Abdāsid period; its two main components, Tašafūn and Behrāsr, continued for several centuries more to enjoy the modest existence of small country towns. As regards Rūniya which was included in the system of towns forming al-Madā’in, the Caliph al-Muṣār had temporarily held his court there in 754 and had caused Abū Muslim [q.v.] to be treacherously murdered there (Yākūt, ii. 867, 2; Streck, *Babyloniens*, ii. 268). But about the middle of the tenth century this place according to al-Ma’mūn’s *Muḥāfaẓ al-Makāba*, ed. Paris, i. 200) was already completely deserted; the wall round it built of thick bricks was the sole relic of it left. When Yākūt wrote in the early decades of the xiiith century (cf. his *Maḏa‘īn, i. 768; v. 447, 7*) the whole of the east side of al-Madā’in, i.e. Tašafūn in particular was already completely deserted; on the west bank still stood Behrāsr, a small town, practically a village, inhabited by peasants who practised only agriculture. It was now known as al-Madā’in.

When Khālid Ibn al-Walīd with his Mongol hordes was advancing to conquer the Caliph’s capital in 1257, he pitched his camp in the ruins of the Iwān and in the following year, after he had been joined by the troops of the Mongol princes, he marched on Baghdad; cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, ed. Quatremère, Paris 1836, p. 266.

The author of the *Muḥāfaẓ al-Makāba* (ed. Juyboll, iii. 62) who wrote an epilogue of Yākūt and died in 1328 is also acquainted with Behrāsr as a little town inhabited exclusively by Shi’īs, as is also Bākūwi who about 1403 prepared a synopsis of the geography of al-Kaẋwāni [q.v.]; cf. the French translation of the latter *Tawḥīd al-Ashūr* by de Guignes in N. F., ii. 1789, p. 472. When Behrāsr became deserted is unknown. Presumably the disastrous invasion of the Mongols under Tīmūr at the beginning of the xvth century which was so fatal to so many once flourishing towns of the lands of the Euphrates and Tigris also caused the collapse of this last settlement in the territory of al-Madā’in.

It was not till the xiiith century that a modest village arose on the site of Ctesiphon, a little north of the ruins of the Iwān Khūfa, in sight of the highly venerated sanctuary of Salmān Fāk and called after him. This consisted on my visit in 1927 of a single street of mud-houses and Khāns where the numerous Shi’ī pilgrims who pass through here are provided with food and shelter. Behrāsr is mainly supplied by the ruins of the Iwān especially of the north wing of its great hall which collapsed in 1888; cf. Herzfeld, *op. cit.,* ii. 65.

In the Great War the site of al-Madā’in was the scene of desperate fighting, momentous in its results. This is usually called the Battle of Ctesiphon. When the Anglo-Indian army under General Townshend in the late autumn of 1915 began an advance from the fortress of Kūth al-ʿAmāra along the Tigris to the north to try to take Baghdad, it was defeated on the 22nd and 23rd November 1915 in the district of the ruins of al-Madā’in by the Turks. The fighting took place mainly on the right bank; the British line of battle ran on the east of the ruins of the Iwān and the little village near it. This reverse forced Townshend to retire to Kūth al-ʿAmāra, which was soon afterwards surrounded by the Turks and capitulated after a five months’ siege on April 29th 1916. For further particulars of this battle, the greatest on the Mesopotamian front in the world war, see the works on this subject; cf. especially General Townshend’s *My Campaign in Mesopotamia* (London 1919), p. 103 sqq., 171—184, with plan of the battle (map 7).

In connection with this brief sketch of the history of al-Madā’in it may be mentioned that one of the most distinguished scholars in the
field of Arabic history was born here, namely ‘Alî b. M. al-Madâ’inî (cf. the next article), born 753, d. between 830 and 845. His work itself has not survived but may be partly reconstructed from the numerous extracts in Baladhuri, Tabari, Yâkût, the Kita‘ al-Khazini etc., so that we have an idea of its contents; cf. Bröckelmann, G. A. L., i. 140—
141; and J. Heer, Die hist. und geogr. Quellen in ‘Abd al-‘Abbas’s Geogr. Worterbuch (Strasbourg 1898), p. 5—6, 67—68 (on the chapter al-Madâ’in in Baladhuri). Daranzîn (Darâzîn), already mentioned above and included in the heptapolis of al-Madâ’in, was the birthplace of the famous traditionalist and historian al-Khâji‘ib al-Baghâdâdi (d. 963 = 1071); on him cf. ibid. ii, p. 929 ff.; and Bergstrasser, in Z. N., ii, 207—208. In the introduction to his biographical lexicon he gives a brief sketch of the history of al-Madâ’in, making a special point of noting the companions of the Prophet who came to this town and took part in its conquest; cf. L. Salimon, al-Hajjib al-Bagdâdi, Introduction topographique à l’histoire de Bagdad (Paris 1904), p. 13, 25, 175—181, or p. 85—93 of the Arabic text.

As to the mint history of al-Madâ’in, neither the name al-Madâ’in, nor as we might perhaps expect, Ta’if or Behrasir is found on the coins of the Muslim period; on the other hand we have a considerable number of pieces with the inscription al-bâb “the gate” which undoubtedly belong to our city. The Arabs adopted the custom of the Sassanians who gave their coins struck in Ctesiphon the mint name Pâwā “the gate”, which is to be interpreted like “Sublime Porte” as an official epithet of the royal capital (cf. the official designation of Constantineople as Darnî Sâhi‘ “Gate of Bliss”). We have not only a series of Arabic coins with the mint name al-bâb down to the end of the Umayyad period but also a few pieces of Sassanian type with the legend Râhâ on the latter (specimens of the year 67—68) cf. Nutel, Katalog der oriental. Munzen in den kgl. Mus. zu Berlin, ii (1898), p. 102. Coins are also found occasionally with the mint al-Madina al-‘Anisiya, the name of the northern quarter of Ctesiphon (with the Sassanid royal palace: cf. above). For the Arab coins of this mint al-bâb cf. articles of various writers in Z. P. M. G., xxv. 1904, 148 ss.; xxxiv. 691; xxxvii. 52; xxxviii. 702; cf. also Streck, Sel. und Ktes., p. 37—
58 and the references there given.

Here we can only refer briefly to the important part which al-Madâ’in played in the church history of the east independent of Rome, especially Nestorian Christianity. The see of Seleucia, said to have been first erected in the time of the apostles, was the premier diocese in the east. As supreme head of all the Nestorian bishops, in the Sassanian period as well as in that of the Caliphs as patriarch of the east the occupant of the see of Seleucia bore the title Khi‘b al-Muhâd, a number of important synods were held at his official residence in the course of centuries. The episcopal cathedrals were in Behrasir (New Seleucia) which the Syriac sources usually called Khi‘b (cf. above); hence the official title of the patriarchate, “Church of Khi‘b”. Besides the official church of the bishop there were in al-Madâ’in in the quarters on either bank a whole series of other Christian churches, the names of which are occasionally found in Syriac and Arabic texts. From Seleucia the Nestorian church developed considerable missionary activity, extending even to the Far East and reaching its zenith in the period from the sixth to the ninth century. Under the ‘Abbâsids 25 metropolises — the first in rank after the Katholikos was the bishop of Kaskar [q.v.] — each of whom in turn had 6—12 suffragans under him, acknowledged the authority of the see of Seleucia. All the metropolises received their investiture in the cathedral of Khi‘b. Soon after the foundation of Baghdad (762) the Katholikos also moved from Behrasir (Khi‘b), now declining politically and commercially, to the new capital of the empire in order, as religious and political head of the Christian community, the more effectively to champion the interests there at the court of the Caliph, where he usually enjoyed considerable prestige. But each new patriarch continued to be ceremonially installed in the mother church at Khi‘b (probably down to the end of ‘Abbâsid rule). For further information on the significance of al-Madâ’in in oriental church history cf. Streck, Babylonien, ii. 274—275; do., Sel. und Ktesiph., p. 42—7, 64 (sources in Syriac literature); J. Labourt, Le christianisme dans l’Empire perse, Paris 1904.

That al-Madâ’in was also for some time an important centre of the gnostic sect of the Manichaean may be mentioned here; but it is doubtful whether their founder, Mani (Manes), as is often supposed came from Ctesiphon itself; cf. thereon most recently Schaefer, in Ist, xiv. 23.

Finally it may be briefly recalled that al-Madâ’in possesses considerable interest for the history of Judaism, especially for the Talmudic period of it. As in the Hellenistic period, the Jews under Sassanian and Arab rule had also their main settlement on the west bank in Behrasir which in Jewish sources is usually called Mâhâzâ, “the town”. There, as in the Greek Seleucia (cf. Streck, Sel. und Ktes., p. 10, 21), they formed an exceedingly high percentage of the inhabitants, indeed at times they seem to have been in the majority. That they are described as very rich is not surprising in view of the great importance of al-Madâ’in as a trading centre down to the time of the rise of Baghdad. At the same time their character is unfortunately described by the Moslems; it differed from that of the other Jews of Babylonia which is perhaps mainly to be explained by the fact that there were many proselytes among them. That they had also a famous college, which was however only the intellectual centre of Babylonian Judaism under Râbî’ bar Joseph (b. 229 A.D.), a native of Mâhâzâ, and at other times was inferior to the other Jewish centres of learning in Babylon. Nehrâda, Sûra and Pombeditha. For further Jewish accounts of al-Madâ’in, cf. A. Berliner, Histoire des Evêques, et Ethnogr. et Ethnogr. Babyloniens im Talmud und Midrash, Berlin 1883, p. 13, 25—
24, 39—43; 61—62. See also Streck, Sel. und Ktesiph., p. 178 (Bibliography).

Apart from the wretched remains of the modern village of Salmân Pâk the whole of the area of the town of al-Madâ’in measuring about 60 square miles is quite uninhabited. It is only from the middle of the xviith century that we have more or less full accounts of it by European travellers: cf. Streck, Sel. und Ktes., p. 27—8. The first systematic topographical and archaeological examination of the extensive ruined site was made by E. Herzfeld, who visited it five times between 1903 and
1911. He dealt fully with the results of his examination in 1914 in the second volume (not published till 1929) of his and Sarre's Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet; cf. ii., p. 46—76 and the pictures on Plates xxxix—xliv (Vol. iii.) and xxxii—xxxviii (Vol. iv.). Herzfeld gives (ii. 51) the first plan of the whole area prepared by him in 1911; cf. this reduced to 3/4 of the original also in Streck, Set. u. Baby!., p. 50 and in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., Vol. iv., 1106.

Of the towns on the west bank, notably Seleucia, there has survived from the Hellenistic period only remnants of the old city wall (al-sir), a double wall of gigantic dimensions, on the north and (less considerable) south side. The whole west side of the old city is now sunk in a perpendicular swamp (kind) formed since 1900 of the annual inundations. Within the south half of the ancient city walls, there now rise from the otherwise flat plain two mounts of rubble about 15 feet high (dira't, which in the Irāk is practically synonymous with tell), namely the Dirā'at al-Bārīdā and the Dirā'at bin at-Kādī. The former which takes its name (powder-millhill) from a powder-mill which used to stand there to supply the Turkish troops, may, from the finds of pottery, conceal an important part of the Sassanian foundation of Behāsir. The second and with the legendary name Dirā'at (or Kar)[e] behind the city and near the Ka'sr of the Kādī's daughter” may very well mark the site of one of the several times mentioned citadel of Seleucia-Kokhā. Beyond the above mentioned permanent swamp, further hills and walls may be seen: — Tell Umair (or Dirā'at Umār), Khasāf or Abū Hulāisiyta, al-Susīyta, al-Khāyāmīyta and Tell al-Dhahab. They perhaps all fell within the area of Seleucia, and probably come from suburbs of it.

The ruins on the east bank, those of Ctesiphon, begin about a mile above the village of Salāmān Pā'k. After isolated wall-like ruins of walls and canals, the first considerable unit we reach is a large open space (part of the town running for a mile along the Tigris opposite the High School of Ctesiphon). Traversing 400 yards in breadth enclosed by a primitive much destroyed wall of clay: — hence the name at-Tuwāibā, “the little clay-wall”. Within this area lie a few farmplaces with palmgroves, mulberry trees and fields. At-Tuwāibā with its immediate vicinity must mark the site of Madina al-Atiqa, the northern quarter of Ctesiphon. A second area filled with ruins is found around the village of Salāmān Pā'k and around the Iwān.

The village street of Salāmān Pā'k leads in a straight line to the much venerated tomb of Salāmān (Ali-Fāris) (the Persian, or, as it is usually called locally, of the Persian Pure). He is said to have been the first Iranian to have adopted Islam and as “Apostle to the Persians” is one of the most popular Shi'i saints. According to Muslim tradition he died at an advanced age in 656 or 657 in al-Mada'in, where the Caliph 'Umar appointed him governor; it should be noted however that the Arab stories of Salāmān's share in the conquest of the Irāk and in the government of al-Mada'in are little credible. Cf. on Salāmān vol. iv., p. 116 and Streck, Set. und Kreis., p. 53—54. The mausoleum with the alleged grave of Salāmān which is crowned by a dome (it used to be shown in the vicinity of Isfahān) stands on the south side of a court enclosed by a white high walled wall and in its

present form may date from the first half of the 11th century, when it was renovated by Sulān Marād IV (1323—1340). In 1901—1905 the building was restored. A description of the interior by Kāzim al-Du'aliya is given in Herzfeld, op. cit., ii., p. 262, note 1.

South-west of Salāmān Pā'k about 1,000 yards from it close to the bank of the Tigris is a second Muslim tomb with a dome, that of Ḫudayfah ibn Yūnūs, one of the “councillors” of Muḥammad. The latter, an ardent champion of the ‘Āṣir, was given, according to the later, great merit by building the first mosque in al-Mada'in and died in 657 in Kūfah, on him see Baldhūrī, p. 289; Tabarī, i. 245; Streck, Babylonien, ii. 262; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii., 59.

The tradition that these two companions of the Prophet are buried here is old and goes back to the third (ninth) century — the earliest reference is in Yaqūbī, B. G. A., vii. 320. Of the thousands of Persian pilgrims who annually visit the great Shi'a shrines of the Irāk (Kerdī, Nadjaf, Kāzar and Sämarrā) many chose to visit Salāmān Pā'k as one of the stages on the way out or home. K. Niebuhr (cf. his Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, Copenhagen 1778, i. 306) heard of a tomb of a third companion of the Prophet in al-Mada'in, namely that of 'Abd Allāh ibn Salām, (q.v.) a few of al-Mada'in. The latter — a strenuous opponent of 'Ali — never came to the Irāk so far as we know. The Salmān-i Burjādī of 1317 (1906), p. 256 (according to Herzfeld, op. cit.) mentions in addition to Ḫudayfah a certain ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī, buried in al-Mada'in, but I think his statement like that of Niebuhr (or rather his informants) is not to be relied upon. There is possibly some confusion with 'Abd Allāh b. Sabā, who is said to have been of Jewish origin and accompanied the Caliph 'Ali to the Irāk, but was there banished by him, as his extravagant enthusiasm for him made him a nuisance to al-Mada'in, where he may have died. Details of his end are not known. Another Allāh b. Ḥulābī, who, according to Māšiddī (iv. 410), was murdered by the Khāridjīs in 38 (658) while acting as 'Ali's representative in al-Mada'in. As the interior of Salāmān's sanctuary is said to contain two graves, the second may be claimed as that of this uncertain ‘Abd Allah and not as that of the last Caliph Musta'sim executed by Ḫulāgū, as Mignon, Travels in Chaldæa, London 1829, p. 78 says: he is followed by W. Ginsworth, Narrative of the Explorations, London 1888, ii. 276. For the existence of a tomb of a Caliph at al-Madina there is no literary authority.

As to the second site, south of Salāmān Pā'k, its centre is formed of the great hall of Tāk-i Kītār (= “chapel of Kītār”), the glory of the celebrated Iwān, which will be dealt with briefly below. In the immediate vicinity of the Tāk, four groups of ruins may be distinguished of which the most notable is an oblong mound 20 feet high in the south, called locally Ḩarīm-i Kītār or “the harem of Kītār” or al-Dhār, “the hyena-hill”. It certainly conceals a single building. All these groups of ruins which fringe the Tāk on the four sides undeniably belong to the palace of the Iwān, which must have covered an area about 400 yards long and 300 broad. Some 500 yards S. E. of the ruins of Tāk, behind an irrigation canal the surface shows fewer but continuous remains.
of buildings, which stretch to a corner of the wall, called Bâstân Kišrâ, "the garden of Kišrâ", which perhaps enclosed a park for animals. A thousand yards S.W. of Bâstân Kišrâ rises another mound, 20—25 feet high, almost square at the base, Tell el-Dâhab = "Gold-hill" or Khâsnat Kišrâ = "Treasury of Kišrâ". It is apparently one large building, perhaps the treasure-house built by Khosraw II (cf. Tabari, i. 1042).

In conclusion it must be emphasised that, for the proper appreciation of the ancient mediaeval and modern topography of al-Madâ'in, the important fact must not be overlooked that the configuration of the whole country round was radically altered when the Tigris, since the end of the middle ages, completely changed its course here and now leaves its bed immediately south of Ctesiphon for a stretch of 3 miles and describes a curve five times this length. We must further consider the possibility that not only has a considerable part of Belucina disappeared in the Tigris, but smaller pieces of Ctesiphon have been gradually swallowed up by the floods of the river.

The most impressive memorial to its great past is now the Tâk-i Kišrâ, which stands in the centre of the ruin of al-Madâ'in. The surviving portion consists of a gigantic façade 102 yards long divided into two unequal portions by an arch 80 feet in width thrown boldly across. This, the front wall, originally over 100 feet high, divided into three stories — effectively relieved by open and articulated doors, arcades, pilasters, and half-columns. Through the gigantic archway one reaches a spacious hall 150 feet deep, on either side of which are five parallel side-chambers. A wide door in the back wall of the hall leads into a wide court apparently square in plan.

For the place of Iwân in the history of art and the date of its origin, the reader may be referred to Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 74 sq. According to him the building shows a mixture of Oriental and Hellenistic styles. Sapor (Sabur) I (241—272) is the only possible builder; Khosraw I (531—579) seems to have undertaken a considerable restoration of the whole. The most characteristic part of Iwân, which clearly shows it was mainly intended for a palace of audience, is the great hall, in the Sassanian period the scene of ceremonial public audiences and receptions by the sovereigns. Nothing has survived of the architectural details of the Iwân, and the stucco or mortar coating in which these found expression has fallen off. The Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin possesses stucco rosettes, which Herzfeld (Z. d. M. G. i. xxxv, 1927, p. 226) identified as ornaments from the Iwât. In the interior, the palace, as we know from the accounts of the Arabs, was adorned with pictures and images in gilt relief. When the Muslims, pending the building of a mosque of their own, used the great hall of the Iwân provisionally after the capture of Ctesiphon, the paintings remained there intact and were still to be seen two centuries later. For example in the ninth century we find the poet Abû 'Ubayd al-Muhûtiri (cf. i. p. 773), who was very fond of describing palaces, describing the Iwân in a famous poem from his own observation: see this poem in the edition of his Diwân printed at Stamboul in 1300 (1882) (Vol. i. 108 sq.). Almost the whole text is also given in Yahkût, i. 427—429; pieces of it in al-Kharî ibn al-Daghâdî (ed. Salmon, p. 90—91) and in Kârvin, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 304.

The majestic remains of Ctesiphon, which from early times have always made a deep impression on the Oriental mind, very soon inspired the imagination of the poets. The Persian poet Afdâl al-Din b. 'Ali Khâkânî (d. 595 = 1200 [q.v.]) wrote an elegy on al-Madâ'in, one of his best works; cf. Ech, in Grundrisse d. iran. Phil., i. 264. This was printed in Stamboul in 1330 (1912) and in Berlin 1343 (1924). This latter edition entitled Aʻrawâni-Madâ'in, a poème de Khâkânî, adapté et augmenté par quelques poêtes contemporains (publ. No. 5 of the Iraneshahr press) has a critical historical introduction by Dr. Riča Tetwît and a commentary by the modern Persian writer Husain Dânhis; on it, cf. E. G. Browne, The Persian Poetry of Modern Persia (Cambridge 1904), his 307.

Muslims regard the abandoned and ruined remains of the Persian royal city as monuments of the victory of their religion (on the alleged omen of the collapse of 14 pinacles of the Iwân in the night of Muhammed's birth, see Streck, Sel. uma Bahíyâ, p. 6) and as impressive symbols of fallen greatness. Like the pyramids, we find them in Arabic poetry as the regular symbol of the transitoriness of worldly power: cf. for example the verses of al-Tîfishî in Makrizi, al-Khajût; the chapter on the pyramids, ed. by E. Graefe (Leipzig, 1911), p. 47 and 88 (and 94). The Bûyûd Sulamî al-Dawla (1025—1045) recorded his visit there by inscribing on the wall of the Iwân two verses proclaiming the transitoriness of worldly things (see Yahkût, i. 429, 5); cf. also Streck, op. cit., p. 61. The Arabs reckoned the Iwân, like the pyramids, among the wonders of the world (cf. e.g. Ibn al-Fâkhî, B. G. A., v. 255): indeed it was held to be not the work of man but of the demons, the Djíjan [q.v.]. Quite early many legends became associated with the Iwân, most of which centre round the figure of Khosraw I Anûshwarwân, still proverbial in the east for his generosity: e.g. the story of the old woman's hut which the king tolerated within the precincts of the palace (see Streck, Babâlîyân, ii. 256—258; Streck, Sel. und Ketz., p. 56 and J. A., 1831, Vol. 15, p. 489) which Herzfeld (op. cit., ii. 68) traces to the lack of symmetry in the façade; also the story of the "chain of justice" to which petitions were attached (imitated by Ilkhân in Tabûrz; cf. J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Íkhâne, Darmstadt 1843, iii. 339) which according to Berumont still seem to be known among the people around al-Madâ'in: cf. the legend published by him in Le Liban, La Revue de Dom. May 1926, p. 10—11: La Légende du Meût d'eau taken down from the lips of a Bedouin there.

Down to the accession of the 'Abhâsids the Iwân seems to have been practically intact; then they began to use it as a quarry but this was abandoned as too costly, the yield being far below the cost of obtaining it. As to the Caliph who ordered it to be taken down, authorities differ. Al-Mansûr is usually given (754—775) but very often Harûn al-Rashîd also (788—809). In any case the partial destruction of the Iwân under the early 'Abhâsids is an assured fact; cf. Streck, Babâlîyân, ii. 255—256, 259; cf. Sel. and Ketz., p. 61—62; Herzfeld, ii. 63. The Iwân with the exception of the Iwân itself and two wings of the façade had been destroyed by this time; for the part that was spared, the name Tâk-i Kišrâ — now popularly pronounced Tâk-i Ksaré as a rule —
came into use, first, I believe, in Rashid al-Din (Hist. des Mongols de la Perse, ed. Quatremère, p. 266). Yākūt (s. 425), as well as Bākūwī (c. 1400) after him, know only the arched hall flanked by two wings as remains of the Iwān. The building remained in this state practically unaltered till 1888 when on April 5th on the occasion of a high flood the northern front wing collapsed, probably undermined by the ruthless robbing of bricks. An attempt was made a few years ago to save the threatened south wing by securing its foundations. Pictures of the Tāfī-khānā before and after 1888 may be found in Fr. Langenegger, Die Baukunst des Irān (Dresden 1911), p. 16.

Also Kāshān al-Abayd, the “White Palace”, has completely disappeared. The case of Cheshme was only spared by the Arabs like the Iwān. The Muslim general Sa’d took up his quarters in it. It met its fate in the reign of the Caliph al-Mulk al-Jadāf (902–908) who had it destroyed to provide building material to complete the al-Tādji palace on the east side of Baghad; cf. Streeck, Babylonien, i. 122; ii. 259; Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 63.

Systematic excavations have never been conducted on the site of al-Madā’in. The antiquities found here come from isolated chance finds; for a list of these see Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. iv., p. 1166–1167. The Deutsche Orientgesellschaft has just (the autumn of 1924) finished the excavations at Sabīnān. The enterprise, which is on a considerable scale, will yield valuable results for the archaeology, history and topography of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, especially on disputed points which can only be decided by the spade.


MADĀ‘IN ṢALIH. [See al-Ḥiddir]  

AL-MADĀ‘IN, ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. ’Abd al-Ḥākim b. Ḥāfiz b. ‘Abī Ṣafī b. Ḥasan, an Arab historian and writer, a client of the Kushait family of the ’Abd Ṣāms b. ’Abd Manāf, was born in 135 (752) in Baṣra, where he was a pupil of the theologian Muʿammad b. al-Asḥāʾ, but he became interested in Adab and history; he lived for a time in al-Madā’in but moved from there to Baghad, where he was closely associated with Ishāk b. Ibrāhim al-Mawsīlī in whose house he died in 225 (840), according to the Fihrist in 215 (830), according to others not till 231 (845). His literary activity was very extensive and included works on the history of the Prophet, of the Kushait, of the conquists and the caliphate as well as the history of poets and lighter literature (adab). Tin Fuʾqāʾ al-Qawāʾid (396) is one of his works from his pen but this includes the Kiṭāb al-Dhawābāt twice and many of the works may have been quite short. On the other hand this list is not complete. Although later writers using his works only rarely give their titles, we can add the following to the list in the Fihrist. Among historical monographs omitted is the Kiṭāb Aḥkār Zafar b. al-Hārīshī used by Yākūt (Muǧīm, iv. 369) following a MS. of Sukkari (cf. Heer, Die hist. und geographischen Quellen in Yākūts geogr. Wö., Strassburg 1898, p. 5.). Among adab works is omitted especially the K. al-Fawārid b’dal ʿAbī Ṣafī (cf. Wiener, Isr., iv. 370 sqq.), often used by al-Tanbūkhi, also the K. al-Samīr, cited ii. 174, 2 by the same, the K. al-Muḥarrīrīn used by al-ʿĀbd al-ʿĀdīr al-Baghadādī (cf. Khānān al-Adab, ii. 109, 1). The titles of his works seem to have varied often. Thus the K. al-Nisāʾ al-Fawārid cited by ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr, Khānān al-Adab, i. 408, 15, is doubtless identical, one may say, with the K. al-Nisāʾ al-ʿĀḏīrīb cited ibid., iv. 365, 1 below and 479, 15 and the K. al-Nawābādīb wa l-Nawābātīb of the Fihrist, 102, 1, as doubtless is the K. Zākāt wa in al-Maḏāʿin, i. 220, 15 with the K. Aḥkār Iyās b. Muḥāwīya in Fihrist, 104, 15 and the K. Aḥkār al-Kūlīb in Maḏāʿin, ii. 70, 2 with the K. al-Kūlīb wa...
The fourfold division of matter is very common, e.g. in the ḡawān al-ṣafā': 1. prime matter, either directly or indirectly an emanation from the divine being, i.e. an intelligible matter conceived, according to Pseudo-Empedocles, as the first emanation but usually explained as in neo-Platonism as the last in the series (spirit, soul, nature), often defined as the efflux of light from the light of God; 2. the matter of the universe as a whole, especially and permanently, of the heavenly spheres, which first of all adopts the indefinite form of corporeality (extent) or at once the three definite dimensions; 3. the matter of the four earthly elements, fire, air, water and earth; 4. energy, which is already formed in some way, but can be used for definite purposes, e.g. wood, stone etc.

In agreement with Aristotle the philosophers regard God as pure immaterial form. Only an extreme mystic like ʿAbd al-Karim al-Djilli, can call Him the ḡayūlā of the world. As regards the lower spirits (spirits of the spheres, angels etc.) opinions differ, but most thinkers find it easy to assume an intelligible matter, and even to recognize in the first created, the highest world spirit, a material principle; next however they are fond of distinguishing this intelligible matter as receptive and the earthly sensual matter as passive. — Different opinions are expressed regarding the principium individuationis: in the comparatively speaking purer Aristotelians we find the tendency to seek it in matter and in those who are more inclined to Platonism in form. All insist, although with varying emphasis, upon the desire of matter for form more than the love of form for union with matter.

As to logical matter, it may be noted in conclusion that the three modalities of judgment (necessity, possibility and impossibility) are described as "matters" (Ibn Sinā). — Cf. also the article ʿunṣūr.

(TJ. DE BOER)

MADHANA. [See MANĀRA.]

MADHAB. [See FĪGH.]

MADHIDIJ, an Arab tribe of Yemen origin, traced by the genealogists to Malik b. Uadād, who is said to be descended in the fourth generation from Khaṭṭān and to have received his name Madhidi from a hill of this name on which he and his brother Ṭaqi were born. His sons are said to have been: Saʿd al-ʾAṣhira, Djail, Yuhābir called Murād, and Zaid called ʾAnz. The Madhidijs whose tribal lands are said to have lain near Tarājd "on the road to Yemen" (Yākūt, s.v.) and whose brother tribes were Khāṭham and Murād, were, according to tradition, at war with the ʾAmr b. Saʿaṣa about the time of the appearance of Muḥammad; in the course of this war was fought the battle of Fisf al-Riḥ. In the Muslim period, families of the tribe of Madhidi were predominant in Kūfā along with those of Kinda and Ṣumānāt.


MADID, the second metre in Arabic prosody, very little used on account of a certain heaviness in its rhythm. In theory it consists of four feet in each hemistich and the prosodists quote in support of this several anonymous verses. In practice there are only three.
There are three 'arûd and six darb:

First road: Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun

Second road: Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun

Third road: Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun Ḟaṣîlitun

Ḥadîth may become Ḟaṣîlitun; it only changes into Ḟaṣîlitun (without n) if Ḟaṣîlitun which follows it retains its long vowel. Ḟaṣîlitun, except in the second 'arûd with its third darb, only changes into Ḟaṣîlitun when Ḟaṣîlitun preserves its n.

(M. Owen Cheneb)

AL-MADĪNA, a town in Arabia, the residence of Muhammad after the Hijra, and capital of the Arab empire under the first caliphs. The real Arabic name of the town was Yathrib, Jathribba (this is the correct reading) in Ptolemy and Stephan Byzantinus, Ẓūb in Minaean inscriptions (M. Hartmann, Die arabisch-phrase, p. 253 sq.). Al-Madina on the other hand is a descriptive word in the plural al-Madīnā, while in the Madīna Sūras al-Madina is used as a proper name for the new residence of the Prophet (ix. 102, 121; xxxiii. 60; Ixiii. 8). The old name Yathrib on the other hand is found only once (xxiii. 13). It is evident from these references that the usual explanation of the name as "the town" (of the Prophet) is a later one. It is rather to be supposed that it was a result of the existence of a strong Jewish element in Yathrib that the Arabian loan-word became the regular name of the town. It is analogous to the originally South Arabian Hadjar [q. v.] "town", which is applied to the capital in Baṭrain. Of the Madīnese poets, Ẓāfī b. al-Ḳalṣīm uses the name Yathrib exclusively while Ḥassān b. Thābit and Ka'b b. Mālik use both names, which is also the case with Muhammad's ordinance of the community (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 341 sqq.).
to Samhūdī (Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, p. 37) was especially associated with a place west of the tomb of Ḥāmzah where the Banū Ḥārīma settled. The town which arose in this way was not surrounded by a wall so that its defences were the thick groves of palms and the orchards which surrounded the houses. As they were less thick on the north and west sides, these were most exposed to hostile attacks. The little forts (ṣīquṣ, plur. ʿāṣām or ʿudjam, plur. ʿājdām) which were built in considerable numbers formed a substitute for a wall and the inhabitants could retire into them in times of trouble.

There were in later times no reliable traditions regarding the origin and earliest history of Madīna and the historians endeavoured to fill the gap themselves and as elsewhere made the Dījarhum (q. v. and also Krauss, in Z. D. M. G., lxx. 352) and the quite unhistorical 'Amalakites play a part (cf. also Hassan b. Thābit, ed. Hirschfeld, N°. 9, verse 6). It is only with the coming of Jews to Madīna that we are on surer ground, but the historians know so little of the exact period of these settlements that they connect them sometimes with Moses, sometimes with the deportation of the Jews under Nebuchadnezzar, and sometimes with the conquest of Palestine by the Greeks or by the Romans. According to various references in the Talmud there were Jews in Arabia in the early centuries of the Christian era and this certainly means North Arabia in the main (see Hirschfeld, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Koran, p. 49 sq. and that they were numerous is evident from the existence of Jewish communities in Ta'īma, Ḥijr (Javaasen and Savageac, Mission, p. 150, 242), Khāibar, Wādī l-Ḳura, Fadak and Maknā, to which may be added that in Madīna. Everywhere in these cases they took over and developed the cultivation of the soil, and it was probably due to them that these scattered settlements each developed into a kind of town; evidence of this is found in the Aramaic name Madīna for Yā'qūbit. According to the definite statement of Hassan b. Thābit (N°. 9, verse 8 in Hirschfeld) they built a number of small forts in this town. But that they were not the first to do this may probably be concluded from the fact that the earliest inhabitants were not pure Beduins (according to Lammens, Ṭa'īj, p. 72, these forts were built after the model of those of the Yemen). The Jewish tribe of Kainukāī played a prominent part in the immigration, as at a later period one of the principal markets in the western part of the town was called after it. But gradually the tribes of Kuraīza and Naḍīr came to be the leading ones in Madīna Jewry. The former dwelt with the Bahdāl on the W. Mahzūr, the Naḍīr on the W. Buṯān (Kittāb al-ʿAtgānī, xix. 95, where the Jewish tribes and the jədāda Arab tribes are detailed). While in this passage, as usual, the Kuraīza and the Naḍīr are numbered among the pure Jews, according to a notable statement in the historian Yaʿqūbī (ed. Houtsma, ii. 49, 52) they were not pure Jews but jədāda clans of the Arabīc tribe of Dījarhum, which Noldeke has repeatedly emphasized as a genuine tradition. Now it is historically certain that at that time there were many Jewish proselytes (cf. Ibn Kūtaiba, Kittāb al-Maʿārif, p. 299) but in spite of this there are decisive reasons for believing that the Jewish element in Madīna did not arise in this way. It is of special significance that the Kuraīza and Naḍīr are frequently called the Kūḥānīnī, the *two (tribes of) priests*, which shows that the Jews knew their genealogy and laid stress upon their descent (cf. e. g. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 660, 18: "thou revilest the pure of the two tribes of priests").

The same thing is seen from the fact that Naḍīrī Sāfaṣya married by Muḥammad is described as belonging to the family of Aaron (Ibn Saʿd, viii. 86, 1). But the decisive fact is the way in which the Prophet speaks in the Madīna sūras to the Jews there. He apostrophises them as sons of Israel and reminds them that God has raised them above all men (II. 44, 116); he brackets them with the ancient Israelites as if they had taken part in the Exodus from Egypt (II. 46 sqq.); Allāh gave Moses the scriptures so that they might be rightly guided (II. 50); they break the laws which he bound them to observe at the treaty of alliance (II. 77 sqq.) etc. Such passages suggest as clearly as possible that he regarded them as true descendants of the ancient Israelites. There must therefore have been in addition to the jədāda Arabs a stock of true Jews, and indeed it is obvious that without such there could have been no proselytes. Wellhausen moreover has aptly pointed out that the Arabīc Jews by their language, their knowledge of the scriptures, their manner of life, their fondness for malicious mockery, secret arts, poison, magic, and cursing, and their fear of death, make an unusual impression which cannot be explained simply by the jədāda of pure Arabs. But on the other hand it must not be forgotten that the Jews in Arabia were very much influenced by their surroundings and had assumed a character of their own. For example we find among them the division into tribes and families, characteristic of the Arabs, with the obligations associated with this. The names of these tribes cannot be traced to old Jewish names but are thoroughly Arabīc in appearance, which is also true of their personal names among which true Jewish names like Samawal and Sārā are rare. The arabisation of these Jews is particularly notable in the poems which are ascribed to Jews and which might have been equally well written by Beduins (see Noldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der alten Araber, p. 52 sqq.).

While the Jews were supreme in other places like Khāibar, al-Fadak etc., the position was changed in Madīna as a result of a new immigration which the Arabs associate with the bursting of the dam at Maṣīb [q. v.] and the migrations of South Arabian tribes produced by it. In this way the two so-called Kaila tribes, Awīl and Khaṣraḍ [q. v.], came to Madīna. The particulars of their culminating recorded, but from an interesting verse in Ibn Khuraṣānī (B. G. A., vi. 128) and Yāqūt, iv. 460, it is evident that they were for a long time subject and tributary to the Jews and that this part of Northern Arabia was at this time under Persian rule, in keeping with the usual Jewish policy of maintaining friendly relations with Persia. Later the Kaila Arabs however succeeded in casting off the Jewish yoke and bringing the Jews under their rule. According to tradition the occasion of this was that a powerful Jewish king named Fitiyaun, who exercised the jus primae noctis, was murdered by a Kharaṣṣa Malik b. al-ʿAddālah to save his threatened sister — a widely disseminated motif (cf. K.
Schmidt, *Fus primae noctis*, 1882, and also *R. E. F.*, 1883, p. 156 sqq.) on which too much stress should not be laid. As to later events there are two different traditions: some make Malik after his deed seek the help of a Ghasanid ruler, Abu Djabala (cf. the name Djabala among the Ghasanids), others of a South Arabian Tubba, Asad Abikibri (c. 430; M. Hartmann, *Die arabische Prage*, p. 482, 497). In this second story, Wellhausen finds some support in some old verses and assumes that Tubba is here an erroneous popular name for a later Abyssinian viceroy. There is however nothing in these verses about an attack of the South Arabs on the Jews of Madina alone but on the inhabitants of the town together, so that Wellhausen further supposes this attack may have some weakened the Jews hitherto predominant that the Arab inhabitants succeeded in breaking their supremacy; but this is of course no more than an attractive hypothesis. In any case the name Abraha in Kais b. al-Khațim, N° 14, verse 15, cannot be used as a basis for further hypotheses for it is certainly not the celebrated Abraha [q. v.] who is meant. Besides, these stories contain legendary allusions to Muhammad’s future appearance in Madina, which betray at least a later recasting by Muslims.

The new lords of Yathrib took over the forts occupied by the Jews and built several more (Samhudi, p. 37). They also learned “Nabataean” arts from them and began to cultivate palms and pursue agriculture. The Khazrajids, whose principal family was Nadjdjar (or Taim al-Lat), as the most powerful tribe assumed the leadership and occupied the centre of the town where the modern Madina lies. West and south of them lived other Khazrajid tribes while the territory of the Hārīth ran to the east. The Awsis, who also comprised several families, settled south and east of their brethren, the Nabit in the northeast separated by the Hārīth from their kinsmen. The two principal Jewish tribes Naḏ르 and Kuraţiţa preserved a certain amount of independence and retained their lands under the Awsis while the Ḥa[js] retained their lands in the southwest although their main industry was practising the goldsmith’s art. Further details of the parts occupied by the tribes and families are given in Samhudi (Wüstenfeld, p. 29 sq., 37 sq.) but these can only now be partly identified. Besides there were in Madina, in addition to the Jews and the immigrant Kaila tribes several Arab tribes, some of which were already there when the former came. They were closely connected with the Jews and were partly judaised. The settlement of affairs reached in this way gave the town a period of peace, which was however gradually broken as an increasing enmity arose between the two Kaila tribes, as was not infrequently the case with Arab brother-tribes. At first it was individual families that fought one another but the conflagration gradually spread until the existence of the whole town was threatened. The quarrel began with the feud of Sumair, so-called after an Awwsi named Sumair. This was settled by an arbitrator but it was not long till renewed friction led to renewed hostilities, of which the so-called feud of Ḥātib was the most serious. We are introduced to this second period by the poems of Kais b. al-Khaṭim of the Awwsi family of al-Nabit. The fighting throughout ended unfavourably for the Awwsi and the Nabit were finally driven from their possessions. In their need the Awwsi appealed for help to the two principal Jewish tribes. They at first refused it; but when the Khazrajids had foolishly slain some Jewish hostages, they concluded an alliance with the Awwsi and declared themselves ready to assist them. It was no longer a fight between a few families but a struggle between the two great rival tribes in their full strength and other inhabitants of Yathrib, even the Beduins of the country round also took sides. At Bu’āth [q. v.] after long preparations a decisive battle was finally fought. It at first looked as if the Awwsi were again to be defeated. The tables were turned and the Khazrajids suffered a severe reverse. It is interesting to note that ‘Abdallāh b. Ubayy of the Khazrajids on this occasion displayed the irreolution that he did later in his opposition to Muḥammad; he took the field with the others but did not enter the battle. On the day of al-Sa[ra]a he actually ran away. The battle of Bu’āth restored the equilibrium between the principal tribes, but the continual fighting had sapped the strength of the town and the bitter feeling which continually revealed itself made the lives of the inhabitants more and more unendurable. Then a momentous change took place when the people of Madina, who required a leader with a strong hand, and Muḥammad, who had only to a slight extent succeeded in winning over the Meccans to his religious views, came into contact with one another.

The Kaila tribes at the time of their immigration to Yathrib had been heathens like the great majority of the Arabs. The principal deity they worshipped was Manūt [q. v.], after whom the Awwsallāh were originally named but they also reverenced among others al-Lat (cf. the name Taim al-Lat already mentioned). Through living alongside of Jews they became influenced by their religious and moral ideas, but unfortunately we know very little of their spiritual outlook before the coming of the Prophet. The poet Kais deals in the Beduin style mainly with the quarrels between the tribes and families and rarely refers to religious matters. He nowhere mentions the local deities but refers to Allāh (No. 6, verse 22) whom he calls the creator (5, 6; cf. Goldziher, *Z. D. M. G.*, lvi. 358), which is in itself sufficient to prove Jewish or Christian influence. Of him he says in No. 11, verse 8: “Allāh will only what he will”; verse 13, 12: “Praise be to Allāh, the lord, the lord of the building” refers to the Ka’ba in Mecca, the *madjjid* covered with carpets (5, 14). The three days in Mina are mentioned in 4, 4 which shows that they then as later in the Muslim poets gave the young men an opportunity for love-affairs with women of other tribes. In rejecting a life after death, 6, 22, he is quite on a level with the pagan Meccans. Alongside of such representatives of a mixed religion there were others whose conceptions had developed farther through contact with Jews or Christians, so that they were reckoned Ḥanifs [q. v.] as they definitely rejected the popular deities and had assumed a tendency to asceticism. Abu ‘I-Haṭīm and Asad b. Zara‘a for example professed monotheism before they became acquainted with Muḥammad (Ibn Sa’d, III/II. 22, 139). A Khazrajid, Abu Kais Sirma b. Abi Anas, wore sackcloth and laid stress on levitical purity; he actually thought of becoming a Christian but gave up the idea and adopted Islam when an old man (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 347 sq.). A man of the Awwsi tribe,
Abū Āmir ‘Abd ‘Amr b. Saifīt was known as “the monk” from his ascetic mode of life; he later became an enemy of the Prophet, left Mādīna and fought against him on the side of the Meccans; he is also said to have supported those who built a rival mosque at the time of the Tabūk campaign (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 411; Ibn Sa’d, III/ii. 90, 7; Wālidī-Wellhausen, p. 310). In evidence of such influence of Christians in Mādīna one might quote a verse of Ḥassān b. Thābit (ed. Hirschfeld, p. 133, 77), but this probably refers to a later period and opportunities of mixing with them were to be found in many places in Arabia. One result of living alongside of Jews in Mādīna was that the art of writing was quite well known also (cf. Ibn Kutaiba, Kitāb al-Ma‘rāf, p. 132 sq. 166; Ballādhūrī, p. 473 sq.; Ibn Sa’d, III/ii. passim).

The spiritual influence of the Jews on the Arab inhabitants of Mādīna became an important factor in the relations between them and Mūḥammad, for it made them receptive to his religious ideas with which they became acquainted by visits to Meca and in other ways. How finally a treaty was concluded between him and several representatives of the Madinese, by which the latter pledged themselves to take him into their community and to defend him as if he were one of themselves and how and those of his followers who were still faithful to him thereupon migrated to Mādīna is related in the article Mūḥammad. After a brief stay in the southern suburb of Kūbā he entered the town and took up his abode with a Khārazdī, Abū Ayyūb Khalīl b. Zayd, with whom he lived till a dwelling was arranged for him. He is said to have left the choice of the site to the movements of his camel — if the story is true, a very clever move not only from the religious but also from the political point of view. In any case it is certain that hardly anything ever showed so clearly his gift, based on his unshakeable belief in his prophetic call, of leading men to follow his will, as the fact that he succeeded in a very short time in bringing some kind of order into Mādīna, hopelessly split up by feuds, and making a kind of unity out of the heterogeneous elements in the town, the earlier Arab inhabitants of Yathrib, the later immigrants, now predominant Kāila tribes, the Muhājirūn from Mecca and the, Jews or Judaized Arabs. We get a glimpse of the first step towards this goal from the ordinance of the community preserved in Ibn Hīṣām, p. 341 sqq. (*Book of the fines*); cf. Ṭabari, Glossary s. v. *khāb*, which Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iv 67, 69, following him, Caetani, *Annali dell’Islam*, i. 395 sqq. and Wensinck, *Mohammed en de Joden*, p. 78 sqq. have discussed.

It is most interesting for its omissions and it lacks to a marked degree clear and logical fundamental ideas, because Mūḥammad was content temporarily with what could be attained and avoided everything that might cause strife. In it he calls himself the messenger of Allāh, but there is no reference to his divine inspiration. His object is to form a unified umma out of the inhabitants of Mādīna and this is defined from the religious side as the community of believers from Mecca and Yathrib. But the non-believers are not excluded, for the umma coincides rather with the town of Mādīna which included also Jews and heathens, of whom it is not demanded that they should adopt Islām. The tribes retain their autonomy as regards blood-vengeance and ransom of prisoners, but against the rest of the world generally the affording of protection was obligatory on every member of the community without exception and no one could conclude peace separately with the enemies of the community (particularly the Kūrain). All important matters, out of which misfortune might befall the community, were to be brought before Allāh and Mūḥammad.

The valley of Yathrib was to be haram (or haram) for all who were bound by this ordinance. The whole document thus alternates continually between religious and purely political clauses in a very opportunistic fashion. It never became of great importance and it soon fell into oblivion as it was rendered obsolete by the rapid progress of events, certainly not against the wish of Mūḥammad whose plans went far beyond what was laid down in it. The main cause of its loss of importance was the breach which soon occurred between Mūḥammad and the Jews, which the latter provoked by their scornful criticism of Mūḥammad’s revelations, especially of the weak points revealed in his reproduction of stories from the Old Testament. This meant a serious threat to his authority and in addition the Jews endeavoured to destroy the agreement reached in Mādīna by endeavouring to revive the old hostility between the two Kāila tribes (Ibn Hīṣām, p. 385 sqq.; cf. Stāra, iii. 114 sqq.). To meet these difficulties, which of course were very welcome to his enemies in the town, Mūḥammad worked hard to unite his followers for a common object, the war with the Meccans, by which he could at the same time avenge the resistance offered him there. He was at first difficult for him to arouse enthusiasm for this war among the Muhājirūn and even more the Aṣnāb but finally, when a fortunate accident occurred to help him, he succeeded in bringing about a war with the Meccans which led to the momentous victory at Badr. On the further fighting of this campaign, the battle of Uḥud and the capture of the ditch, cf. the article Mūḥammad. The latter campaign gave its name to the ditch (KHANDAK ḥ.-q.) which Mūḥammad on the advice of a Persian (Salmān) had dug around the two protected parts of the town and which, in spite of its modest dimensions (it is said to have been a fathom broad), formed a serious obstacle to the enemy. Ibn Dījbar in the xiith century still saw traces of it, an arrow-shot west of the town.

On its further course cf. Wensinck, *Mohammed en de Joden*, p. 26, 31. The Meccans in this fighting gave him very material assistance by their lack of warlike ability and energy, and the war contributed to consolidate his position in Mādīna, aided not a little by the lack of resolution among the Munāfiqūn who never managed to seize opportunities favourable to them. He was thus not only in a position to continue the war against his native city but also to repay the Jews in ruthless fashion for all the annoyance they had caused him. After the battle of Badr, the Kainūkṭi were driven out of the town and after the battle of Uḥud, which went against the Prophet, the same fate was meted out to a Kāhin tribe, the Naḍīr. But the worst lot was that of the Kuraizā, whom in spite of the intercession of the Awsīs he had massacred. These events however do not show the Jewish tribes in a favourable light as they made no attempt to help one another but left each other...
in the lurch in most cowardly fashion. The Kurish alone at the massacre showed a courage which to some extent atones for their previous attitude. In this way Muhammad succeeded in disposing of the danger that threatened him from the Jews, for the Jews who were left in Medina were of no importance and caused him no serious difficulties. With the treaty of Hudaybiyya in the year 6 A.H., [cf. MUHAMMAD] the war with the Kurish was practically finished, for in it the genius for diplomacy succeeded in bringing them to recognize Medina as a power equal in importance to Mecca. The official conclusion of the struggle was the bloodless occupation of his native city in 8 A.H. However great a triumph this was for the Prophet, it produced a new feud which was to prove fateful for Islam after the death of Muhammad. Even before the decisive turn in the struggle with Mecca, in the campaign against the Banu Mushtilik, the ill feeling between the emigrants and a section of the people of Medina came to a head, threatening fresh bloodshed. Thus, Abu Bakr, the first to deliver some boastful speeches and threatened to expel the troublesome intruders (cf. Sura, Ixiii. 8), which he naturally denied when the Prophet later took him to task. But when Muhammad had entered Medina, his faithful followers in Medina became anxious, as they feared he would now abandon their town and return to his native place. He calmed them however and declared that he would live and die with them (Ibn Hisham, p. 824). But when he began to treat the Meccans with great clemency and after the battle of Hunain was striving to win them over to his religion by rich gifts, the Ansar with justice felt that their lives were slipping away once again feared that he would abandon them. But he delivered them a speech in which he reminded them how he had united them when they were living in hostility to one another and declared his gratitude for all that they had done for him, and when he concluded by asking them to be satisfied if others went home with captured herds but they with the messenger of Allah, they burst into tears and withdrew satisfied (Ibn Hisham, p. 885 sq.). While in such stories there may be an echo of the later antagonism between the Ansar and the Kurish, they undoubtedly give a not inaccurate idea of the feelings which found expression at this time. It is all the more remarkable that according to various indications there must have been an opposition to Muhammad at the time of the Tabik campaign in Medina. His orations against the Munafiqun in the ninth Sura sound unusually excited and recall those of the Meccan period with their threats of punishment. There is also the notable, but unfortunately not quite clear story of the Masjid al-Dirar (cf. also Lammens) which some men had built south of the town in the land of the Amr b. ʿAwf and which he sanctioned until he saw that its object was to provoke disension among the believers for the benefit of his former enemies (Sura, ix. 108 sqq.), wherefore he had it pulled down. Attached to this one story, there is another which has already mentioned Hani b. Abi Amr, the most spirit in it, (Ibn Hisham, p. 906 sq.; Wakidi-Wellhausen, p. 410 sq.; Tabari, i. 1704 sq.; Ibn Saʿd, iii. 36, 59, 66, 13). In any case Muhammad succeeded in again restoring peace, probably assisted by the fact that the leader of the Munafiqun died soon afterwards.

Faithful to his promise, the Prophet remained in Medina till his death on June 8, 632. According to a reliable tradition (Tabari, i. 1817; Ibn Saʿd, ii/l. 57, 9, 58, 88, 59, i, 71, 6), his corpse lay unburied for a whole day, so that its putrefaction was far advanced when it was finally buried under ʿAisha's house, apparently a result of the great confusion into which his death threw the town. The unity created by his strong hand at once fell to pieces; the Ansar assembled and chose the Khazzadj Saʿd b. Ubdxa as their chief, while others proposed that the government should be shared between the Ansar and the Mubahjīrin. ʿUmar's rapid and vigorous intervention however succeeded in thwarting these plans so threatening to Islam and carrying through the election of Abū Bakr as Caliph. He and his two successors resided in Medina which thus became the capital of the rapidly growing empire. Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, like the Prophet, were buried under the house of ʿAisha, while ʿUthman's body was brought in the darkness on a bed to the Jews of Medina. Abū Abdullāh delivered several boastful speeches and threatened to expel the troublesome intruders (cf. Sura, Ixiii. 8), which he naturally denied when the Prophet later took him to task. But when Muhammad had entered Medina, his faithful followers in Medina became anxious, as they feared he would now abandon their town and return to his native place. He calmed them however and declared that he would live and die with them (Ibn Hisham, p. 824). But when he began to treat the Meccans with great clemency and after the battle of Hunain was striving to win them over to his religion by rich gifts, the Ansar with justice felt that their lives were slipping away once again feared that he would abandon them. But he delivered them a speech in which he reminded them how he had united them when they were living in hostility to one another and declared his gratitude for all that they had done for him, and when he concluded by asking them to be satisfied if others went home with captured herds but they with the messenger of Allah, they burst into tears and withdrew satisfied (Ibn Hisham, p. 885 sq.). While in such stories there may be an echo of the later antagonism between the Ansar and the Kurish, they undoubtedly give a not inaccurate idea of the feelings which found expression at this time. It is all the more remarkable that according to various indications there must have been an opposition to Muhammad at the time of the Tabik campaign in Medina. His orations against the Munafiqun in the ninth Sura sound unusually excited and recall those of the Meccan period with their threats of punishment. There is also the notable, but unfortunately not quite clear story of the Masjid al-Dirar (cf. also Lammens) which some men had built south of the town in the land of the Amr b. ʿAwf and which he sanctioned until he saw that its object was to provoke disension among the believers for the benefit of his former enemies (Sura, ix. 108 sqq.), wherefore he had it pulled down. Attached to this one story, there is another which has already mentioned Hani b. Abi Amr, the most spirit in it, (Ibn Hisham, p. 906 sq.; Wakidi-Wellhausen, p. 410 sq.; Tabari, i. 1704 sq.; Ibn Saʿd, iii. 36, 59, 66, 13). In any case Muhammad succeeded in again restoring peace, probably assisted by the fact that the leader of the Munafiqun died soon afterwards.
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went with him (Wellhausen, *Die Oppositionspar-
teien*, p. 69). When he was slain, his wives and
son were brought to Madina, where they lived in
peace and took no further part in the fighting.
'Alī’s son, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya, resided in
Madina (Dhawarī, p. 308). It was not however
only relatives and ardent followers of the Prophet,
who preferred to live here in his city, but several
of his former enemies, the Umayyads, also felt
attracted thither by the quiet and easy life and
would not go to Damascus (Lammens, *Études sur
le califat de Mōwajja*, p. 35). In this way Madina
gradually became the home of a new population,
consisting of people who wished to enjoy un-
disturbed the great wealth which the wars of
conquest had brought them. Life there became
more and more luxurious until finally the holy
city became so notorious (*Ḳiṣāʿ al-Āğānī*, xxi.
197, 19), that during a rising in the year 127 (745)
the last Umayyid Caliph Marwān II could ask
one of the participants in it how it was that the
wines and singing-girls of Madina had not held
him back from taking part in it (Ṭabārī, ii. 1916).
Such was the social position of the present inhabi-
tants of Madina (*Travels in Arabia*, 3rd ed., p. 151: “cardiac, playing, tippling in
arab, bruitish hemp smoking, ribald living”).
This was the golden period of Madina about the
glories of which the poets sang. Flourishing, well-
watered gardens and meadows surrounded the
town, and there were a number of splendid palaces
built by wealthy Quraish, especially in the Wādī
‘l-Akīk of which traces still can be found (cf.
p. 228).
A later section of the people of Madina was
attracted thither by the quiet life, although for
other reasons. Their object was not worldly enjoy-
ments but they devoted themselves to the memories
in the town of its sacred past, by collecting and
studying the legal and ritual enactments dating
from the Prophet, in so far as they were based
on the *sunna* of Madina and the *ijma‘* there.
The most distinguished representative of this group
was Mālik b. Anas (d. 179 = 795), the author of the
*Mawāqif*, who as founder of the Mālikī school
gathered many pupils around him (Goldziher,
*Mukhwamedelischen Studien*, ii. 213 sqq.). One
of them, Ibn Zabālā, composed the first history of the
town of Madina (199 = 814) but it has not survived.
Madina was now ruled by governors appointed
by the Caliph, lists of whom are given by Ṭabārī
and Ibn al-ʿAṯīr. The town was however not
totally unaffected by the wars of the first cen-
turies after Muḥammad. In the reign of Yazīd,
feeling in Madina, even among the Umayyads,
was more or less hostile to the Caliph and many
took sides of his rival ‘Abd Allāh b. Zubayr in
Mecca. The expedition of the governor ‘Amr
b. Sa‘d, which Yazīd ordered, was a failure. In
63 (682/3) the Madinense rebelled openly, appoint-
ing ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥanazla as their leader and
building a wall with a ditch to defend the town
on the north. The Caliph sent an army under the
leadership of Muslim b. ‘Uqba which took up
its quarters on the Ḥarrā N.E. of the town and
fought the battle of the Ḥarrā, which ended in
the defeat of the Madinense — according to the usual
story, a result of the treachery of the Banū Ḥārīma.
That the inhabitants were abandoned to the ill-
treatment of the Syrian troops is probably a malicious
libel (Wellhausen, *Das arabische Reich*, p. 98 sqq.).
Towards the end of the Umayyad rule, in the year
130(747/8), the Khārijīs under Abū Ḥanīfa defeated
the Madinense at Kubāīd; but he was surprised by
Marwān’s troops and slain (Ṭabārī, ii. 200 sqq.;
*B. C. A.*, viii. 327). When the ‘Abbāsids became
supreme, two ‘Alīd brothers, Muḥammad and Ibrā-
him, sons of ‘Abd Allāh, made an attempt to
fight for their rights. Muḥammad who fled to himself al-Madhī appeared in Madina in 145 (762/3)
where he found not a few adherents, among them
Mālik b. Anas and Abū Ḥanīfa. He endeavoured
in various ways to imitate the example of the
Prophet, used his sword, had the ditch dug by
him round the town restored (see above) etc. The
Caliph sent his relative ‘Īṣa b. Mūsā with 4,000
men against him and when he bridged the ditch
by throwing a couple of doors over it and entered
the town, most of al-Madhī’s followers lost heart,
as was usual with the supporters of the ‘Alīd
party, and when he renewed the hopeless struggle,
he was mortally wounded. About 20 years later (169 =
786) another ‘Alīd arose, Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī, against
the ‘Abbāsids’ decision to execute the present
ruler of Mecca al-Madhī. He was driven out and slain at Fākhrī near Mecca. In
spite of the harm he did to the town of
the Prophet, he was celebrated by the ‘Alīd party as a
martyr (Ṭabārī, iii. 551 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, vi.
60 sqq.). In the caliphate of Wāḥib, Madina suf-
fered severely from the attacks of the Sulaim and
the Banū Hilāl. Boghā the elder [q.v.] came to
their assistance in 230 (844/5) and imprisoned the
Beduins. When he left the town again, the
latter succeeded in breaking out of prison; the
Madinense however discovered their escape and
put them to death (Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, vii. 12). The
love for Wāḥib was shown by their lamenting
him every night after his death (*ibid*., vii. 21).

In the centuries that followed, Madina is only
rarely mentioned by the historians, and what they
tell us about it is of little interest as a rule. When
the Fāṭimids became lords of Egypt and were
threatening the holy cities in the Hijāz, a wall
was at last built round Madina. This was erected
in 364 (974/75) by the Būyid ʿAbd al-Dawla but
enclosed only the central part of the town. It was
restored in 540 (1145/1146) by a vizier of the
sons of Zangi. But as a considerable proportion
of the inhabitants lived outside the wall without
protection from the attacks of the Beduins, the
Anti of Syria, Nūr al-Dīn Māḥmūd b. Zangi, in
557 (1162) built a second wall of greater extent
with towers and gateways. The present wall, 35–
40 feet high, was built by the Ottoman Sultan Sul-
aimān b. Salīm the Magnificent (1520—1566) of
baalt and granite (Sahme-Wustenfeld, p. 126).
A trench was dug around it. The same Sulīm
brought a covered aqueduct from the south into
the town. Finally the wall was raised to a height
of 80 feet by Sulīm ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, which height
it has retained.

A feud between the governors of Mecca and
Madina with a battle at Ḫub al-Ḥalab is recorded
for the year 601 (1203). The Meccan leader who
had set out to besiege Madina was put to fight
but obtained support from other amirs, whereupon
the Madinense abandoned further hostilities
(Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, xii. 134).

In 654 (1256) Madina was threatened by a
volcanic eruption, known as the fire of Hijāz.
It began on the last day of Djuumādī I with a
slight earth-quake which increased in vigour each succeeding day. Then a glowing stream of lava burst forth which, as the chroniclers tell us, devoured rocks and stones but fortunately flowed to the east of the town and then continued its way northwards. The inhabitants sought protection in the Mosque of the Tomb, praying and confessing their sins. The belief in the latter's inviolability, which had been sought to be shattered by the conflagration described below, Under the rule of the Turks Madina continued to lead a quiet life, little heeded by the outside world, and it is rarely mentioned, a circumstance much facilitated by the fact that the holy city could not be entered by non-Muslims. Radical changes only came about in the sixteenth century. In 1804, the Wahhabitaki took the town, plundered its treasures and prevented pilgrimages to the Tomb of Muhammad. An attempt to destroy the dome over the tomb failed, but the great treasures in pearls, jewels etc., presented by pious visitors to the mosque were carried off. It was not till 1813 that Muhammad bin Ali began the relic of the town and its vicinity. At a moment of peace, 'Abd Allah b. Sa'ūd recognised Turkish suzerainty over the holy places in the Hejaz. Muhammad 'Ali however paid no attention to this, but sent another son Ibrahim to continue the war against Ibn Sa'ud and in 1818 he took Dar'ya and razed it to the ground, whereupon he returned to Madina. The sacred cities once more belonged to the Turks and the Grand Sharif of Mecca even forbade pilgrims from Ibn Sa'ud's territory to enter Mecca. This restoration of Turkish rule brought at least one important innovation: the building of the Hejaz railway from Damascus to Madina in 1903. It was primarily intended for pilgrims but was also of military importance and therefore suffered severely in the world war. Through the intervention of the Grand Sharif Husain b. 'Ali b. 'Abd al-Mu'tin, the fighting and the intrigues in North Arabia became more and more involved. He first posed as a faithful servant of the Turkish Sultan but later he rebelled and on Nov. 6, 1916 he himself proclaimed king of the Hejaz and joined the English. After the peace which ended the world war the Turkish troops evacuated Madina in 1918. In the meanwhile a stronger opponent to Husain had arisen in 'Abd al-Aziz b. Sa'ūd, who had once more raised the Wahhabis to a position of supremacy. Husain's bold move in assuming the title of caliph found no support among the Arab chiefs, and the people of the Hejaz forced him to abdicate. Ibn Sa'ūd seized this opportunity, entered Mecca in October 1924 and forced Husain's son 'Ali to leave the town. The two holy cities are therefore now both in the hands of the Wahhabis, who are however now more tolerant and permit visits to the Mosque of the Tomb and other holy places and only forbid actual worship there. In spite of the inaccessibility of Madina to all non-Muslims the reports of various modern travellers enable us to form a fairly clear picture of it, which can only be briefly outlined here. In keeping with the configuration of the ground, the plain on which Madina lies is divided into an upper southern part and a lower northern part, al-Zayla and al-Shāfiia, names found even in the earliest writers. Al-Zayla is reckoned to run to the above mentioned village of Kubā', 3 miles away, al-Shāfiia to the hill of Uḥud. The older wall encloses the town proper; the already mentioned later wall which is now partly in ruins encloses the western larger suburb of al-Anbariya and "camp of the camels", barr al-munāshā, 400 yards broad lying between it and the town. Here is pointed out the traditional site of the muqāla, the Prophet's place of prayer, a tradition probably worthy of credence, as otherwise it would have been natural to locate it in the great mosque mentioned below. Along the northern side of the wall runs the road of the funeral processions, Darb al-Dhānā, which leads to the old general burial-place, Bab al-Gzarād (so called after the plant nitaria retusa) in the east of the town. Among the thousands who are buried here are the little son of the Prophet, Ibrahim, his wives (whether also his daughter Fatima is disputed: see below), many of his companions, al-Abbās, Muḥammad al-Bākir, Dā'far al-Ṣādik, the already mentioned jurist, Mālik b. Anas, and many others. At the north-west corner of the town stands the castle built on to the town wall. There are several gates in the walls, including the Bab al-Ḥamī in the north, the Bab al-Thawrī in the east, and the Bab al-Anbariya in the west. From a spring of fresh water in the village of Kubā' an aqueduct runs into the town, first laid by Marwān when governor of Madina. It frequently fell into disrepair and was restored for example by several Ottoman sultans, on the last occasion by 'Abd al-Ḥamīd after the Wahhabis had destroyed it. The damage not infrequently done by floods has already been mentioned. In 734 the Madinese were prevented for six months by an inundation from visiting the grave of Ḥamzah. The streets of Madina are clean but narrow and only the main streets are paved. The houses are well built of stone and a number have two stories. Several of them are surrounded by gardens, but the houses with gardens are mainly found outside the north and south wall, especially towards the south where vegetable gardens and orchards alternate with palmgroves and cornfields. The dates of which there are 70 varieties are, as in ancient times, one of the principal products. The pilgrim traffic is however the most important source of revenue for the inhabitants, who let their dwellings to the strangers and guide them to the sacred places and instruct them about ritual duties. The musawwarīn here play the same role as the musawwarīn in Mecca. Burton (ii. 189) gives the number of inhabitants as 16,000-18,000, in addition to 400 men in the garrison. Wavell (p. 63) in 1908 put it at 30,000, excluding soldiers and pilgrims, while Batanini gave 60,000 including many foreign visitors. The results of the world war have of course altered these conditions in many ways. The population used to increase gradually by visitors settling often permanently in the sacred city. Of descendants of the old Ansar there are very few left in Madina; according to Burckhardt there were only ten families in his time. There are a number of Shias in the suburbs. Madina possesses no sanctuary venerated from remote times like the Ka'ba; on the other hand it possesses compensation for this in its sentimental value in Muslim eyes in the mosque which encloses Muhammad's grave and is the goal of countless pilgrims. Some teachers even put this sanctuary higher than the Meccan one, but this view is not general, and the visiting of this mosque is not obligatory like the pilgrimage to Mecca.
and also may be undertaken at any time. According to unanimous tradition the Prophet was buried under ʿAʾṣiba’s house, where also the two first caliphs found their last resting-place. Further, all the earlier stories agree that Muhammad soon after his arrival in Madina had a mosque built, which he enlarged after the taking of Khairāb, and they are also agreed that the dwellings of his wives were close by so that ʿAʾṣiba’s house with the grave could easily have been taken into the mosque. That there is nothing improbable in itself in a mosque having been built in the time of the Prophet is shown by the mention of a rival mosque, Sūra ix. 108 sqq.; cf. xxiv. 36. But Cæcani, Annali, i. 432 ssq., has disputed with important arguments the correctness of the tradition and from various statements drawn the conclusion that originally on the site of the later mosque there was more probably only the dār of Muḥammad with a courtyard and various dwellings. If this is right, it is not known who built the mosque; but probably it was erected not long after Muḥammad’s death, for the rapidly increasing reverence for the Prophet must very soon have aroused the desire to bring his resting-place into touch with his religion. To this mosque, early built, can then be referred what tradition tells us of Muḥammad’s mosque: — a simple building of brick with pillars of palm stems and a roof of brushwood. To the same tradition, ʿUmar had it extended and after him ʿUṯmān who replaced it by a building of stone and mortar with a roof of teak. When Marwān was governor of Madina, he had a māḵsūra of coloured stones erected; but no important advance was made till the reign of Walīd, who commissioned the then governor, afterwards caliph, ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, in 87 (706) to adorn the building in greater splendour. For this ʿUmar used Greek and Coptic builders, and the Byzantine emperor is said to have contributed a ʿamāq of gold and a large quantity of mosaic stones towards it. On this occasion four minarets were placed at the corners of the sanctuary and the roofs covered with plates of lead. The mosque remained unaltered till the reign of al-Mahdi. After this Caliph had visited Madina, it was rebuilt and extended in 162 (778—779) and its length was now 300 and its breadth 200 ells. In the following century another restoration was necessary and was carried through by al-Muṭawakki‘l in the year 247 (861—862).

Of the mosque which thus came into existence there are very full descriptions by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih (d. 328 = 940), Muḥaddas (375 = 985), Ibn Ḥūbair who travelled in the east in the years 578—581 (1183/83—1186/87), and also Yākūt. Of the many details given by these authors only a few can be quoted here. As is quite evident from several of these descriptions, the mosque had the form, always retained later, of an open courtyard covered with sand or gravel, ʿabān, which was surrounded on all four sides by rows of pillars. In the eastern part of the southern pillar hall was the holy of holies, the tomb of the Prophet, with the tombs of Abū Bakr and of ʿUmar. It is described by Yākūt (iv. 458) as a high building, separated at the top only by a space from the roof of the pillar hall. Regarding the relative positions of the three graves there were in his time different views. North of them, according to some traditions, was the tomb of Fāṭima while according to others this was in the general burying ground. The part of the pillar hall lying west of the graves bore the name al-Rawḍa, the garden, from an alleged utterance of the Prophet. The total number of pillars is said to have been 290; those in the southern part were stuccoed, with gilded capitals, the others were of marble. The walls were adorned with marble, gold, and mosaic. Along the southern border of the Rawḍa ran a barrier, with which several highly venerated relics were associated: — the remains of the trunk of a tree, on which Muḥammad used to lean, and especially his minbar or pulpit. According to tradition Muḥawīya wished to remove this; but immediately a vigorous earthquake began and he abandoned the idea and instead raised it by an upper structure five steps higher. Al-Mahdi later wished to remove this addition, but he was dissuaded from doing this as the nails had been driven into the old minbar (Yaʿkübi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 283; Tabātibī, iii. 483; Muḥaddas, ed. de Goeje, p. 82). According to the descriptions it had 8 steps and there was a slab of ebony over the seat which visitors might touch. The remains of the tree-trunk were kissed and stroked with the hands, an interesting imitation of ancient Arabian religious customs. Among the various treasures of the mosque was the Madina standard manuscript of the canonical text of the Kur’ān prepared by ʿUṯmān. The mosque had 19 doors of which only four, two in the east and two in the west, were opened. There were three minarets, two at the corners of the north side and one at the southern corner.

While the Mosque of the Tomb escaped the volcanic eruption already mentioned (654 = 1256) it suffered in the same year from a fire due to the carelessness of a caretaker, which destroyed a part of it. An appeal to the caliph of Baghdād for assistance to rebuild it remained unanswered as the ʿAbbasid dynasty was then tottering before its fall, which was to take place two years later. Only the roof was repaired in the year after the fire in makeshift fashion; the rubbish was not cleared away from the tombs but remained there for over two centuries. Several of the Mamlīk Sulṭāns showed some interest in the sanctuary, among them Baibars I, who, according to Muṣir al-Dīn (Cairo 1283, p. 434), placed a railing round the tomb of the Prophet and had its roof gilt, while others sent workmen and materials, and notably al-Mansūr Qālanūn in 678 (1279) to mark the site of the tomb built a dome over it covered with plates of lead. ʿAṣḥaf Saif al-Dīn Kātib Bēy (873—890 = 1468—1495) was however the first to deal with the mosque in really energetic fashion and he had the minaret at the southeastern corner, al-Rāʾisīya, taken down and rebuilt. A great calamity then fell upon the mosque for, in a terrible thunderstorm in 886 (1481), it was struck by lightning and partly destroyed, and the library with its valuable manuscripts of the Kurʾān perished. Samhūdi, who lost his own library on this occasion, gives an account of the conflagration. The indefatigable Sulṭān however sent a large number of workmen with tools and materials, and in 889 (1484) the building was restored and among other alterations the dome over the tomb was enlarged; he also presented the brass railing which surrounds the māḵṣūra. On this occasion, the Sulṭān also presented to the town baths and a hypocaust for
them, an aqueduct and a water mill, as well as a large number of valuable books to replace those destroyed. Its misfortunes however were not at an end for in 898 (1492) it was again struck by lightning; the Râsîya at the southeast corner was destroyed and had to be rebuilt. The mosque received its present form by an extension to the north, made by 'Abd al-Majîd in 1270 (1853—1854) which Burton saw before its completion. The many inscriptions which cover the walls, include various Sûras and formulae and the mystic prayer al-Burda.

In modern times we have descriptions by Burckhardt (unfortunately incomplete, as he was ill during his stay), by Burton (1853), a brief one by Wavell in 1908—1909 and a good one by al-Batânînî (1910). In their main outlines they give much the same picture as the older ones. The mosque stands in the centre of the town proper, a little to the east. Al-Batânînî gives the length from north to south as 385 feet, the breadth on the north side as 285 feet and on the south side as 220 feet. The court (al-ṣāhn or al-hawâ) is covered with sand or gravel and enclosed on all four sides by pillared halls of which the largest on the south side encloses the actual masjîd. The pillars in this part are covered with marble with gild ornamentations. All the pillars in the mosque, 327 in number, support arches on which rest little domes like divided oranges. Of the pillars 22 are in the eastern part of the southern hall (the maṣjûra), the sanctuary proper with the tomb of the Prophet. "The Garden", i.e. the area between the tomb and the minbar, is 70 feet long and 50 broad. The maṣjûra is enclosed on the south, where the mosque is extended by a row of pillars, by a brass grille with the relics already mentioned and the beautiful mihrâb of the Prophet with an indication of the direction of prayer. The present minbar is of marble with gilding, a gift of Murâd III in 1598 (1599). The maṣjûra, the holy of holies of the mosque, a quadrangle 50 feet long from north to south and 47 feet broad, is surrounded by a green polished brass railing through which a door, Bâb al-rafta or Bâb al-Wûsûf, leads to al-Rawâd. It encloses an area which is called al-hudja, in allusion to 'A'sha's house. It cannot be accurately described as it is covered with green silk and is not seen by visitors. The covering, which recalls the covering of the Ka'ba, is said to have been first presented by the mother of Hâfiz al-Raṣîl. Nûr al-Dîn Zangi is said to have cleared a new area around the older hudja to protect the tomb. In the hudja are the tombs of the Prophet and of the first two caliphs, according to the usual belief in the following order: the most southern is the tomb of Muhammad with the head to the west, next him Abû Bakr with his head beside Muhammad's feet and on the north 'Umar with his head beside Abû Bakr's shoulders. A fourth, empty grave is said to be intended for Jesus after his parousia. On the north side of the large maṣjûra, another smaller one adjoins it, which, according to an assumption still disputed by many, contains the tomb of the Prophet. Two doors on the east and west side connect it with the maṣjûra. In the wallpaper hanging lamps are placed in this, the most sacred part of the mosque, and in addition in the Rawda there are candelabra of crystal. In the courtyard of the mosque, approximately east, is a quadrangular area shut off by an iron grille, which is called Frurma's garden. Of the 15 palms which grew there in the time of Ibn Djuibair, Burton saw only 12; al-Batânînî mentions several small palms planted round a high one. Behind the boundary is the so-called "Prophet's well". The mosque has four minarets at the four corners and according to Burton a fifth in the centre of the west side, but this is not mentioned by al-Batânînî. Five doors give adittance to the sanctuary: on the west the Bâb al-Salîm and Bâb al-Raîma, on the north the Bâb al-Majîdî, on the east the Bâb Djubrâ'il and Bâb al-Bakîrî and Bâb al-Nâşîri. They are all closed at night. From the descriptions already quoted, the mosque was not impressive when seen from the outside, as the houses were built so thickly round it that an open view of it could not be obtained. Even the richly ornamented Bâb al-Salîm only looked like the termination of a street running from the west. But this seems now to have been altered, as according to Musil, Zur Zeitgeschichte von Arabien, p. 34, all the houses in the immediate vicinity of the mosque were removed in 1916.

The immediate vicinity of the city of the Prophet is of course very rich in places with which are associated anecdotes and traditions of him. The most important of these is the hill of Uhad [q.v.] with the graves of those who fell for the faith there. It is rivalled by the village of Kubâ where Muhammad on his arrival in his new home stayed from Monday till Thursday (Ibn Hishâm, p. 335). The village, which was at that time occupied by the 'Amr b. 'Awf, is according to the Arab geographers 2 miles, according to Burckhardt, 3—4 hours from Madina; to be accurate it is about 3 miles. The surrounding gardens which are exceedingly rich in all kinds of fruit and vegetables extend for 4 or 5 miles (Burckhardt). Burton describes how the village appeared to him as he approached it: "a confused heap of huts and dwelling-houses, chapels and towers, with trees, between foul lanes, heaps of rubbish and yelping dogs".

Tradition marks the spot where the Prophet's camel knelt (al-nabâk) and here also was the mosque mentioned in Sûra, ix. 109 built out of piety, as well as its counterpart, the Masjid al-Dirâr, destroyed by Muhammad's orders (cf. Wâkitî—Wellhausen, p. 411; Ibn Sa'd, nişâr 32, 5; and above). The mosque of Kubâ with its simple minaret was in ruins in Burckhardt's time, but has since been replaced by a stone structure.


AL-MADINAH AL-SALAM. [See BAGHDAD.]

AL-MADINAT AL-ZAHRA', the capital founded near Cordova by the famous 'Abd Allah bin Abi 'Amir ibn Muqim al-Sanjur [q. v.] in 976/977—979. Because he did not wish to deal with state affairs in the palace of the Umayyad Caliphs in Cordova nor at the royal palace at Madinat al-Zahra', al-Mansur decided to build a town which should rival in size his palace and those of the principal court dignitaries. This town was built a short distance from Cordova on the banks of the Guadalquivir [q. v.]. Since the exact site of al-Madinat al-Zahra has not been discovered, one must be content, when trying to locate the site, with the very vague indications given by the Arab historians; indeed not one of the Arab historians has left any description of the 'Amirid town. According to Ibn Hazm, in a passage of his Ta'rik al-Hamama (ed. Petrov, Leyden 1914, p. 104), it lay to the east of Cordova, but on the other hand some Spanish archaeologists think they have identified it by the south-west of this town. Al-Madinat al-Zahra must not be confused with the palace, al-'Amiriyah, the name of a musalla or villa outside the city-walls which was given to al-Mansur by one of his Umayyad masters, the site of which seems to have been identified.

According to Ibn 'Idhari, the greater part of al-Madinat al-Zahra was finished in two years. Al-Mansur settled there in 370 (980—981). He transported thither the different administrative offices and the treasury, and gave land round his palaces to his courtiers, so that Madinat al-Zahra, the town of the Umayyad Caliphs, was almost supplied and practically deserted. The merchants also came to trade there; a few years after its foundation, al-Madinat al-Zahra had become a large town.

After al-Mansur, al-Madinat al-Zahra was the capital of his son and successor 'Abd al-Malik, who had a new palace built there. After his death his brother 'Abd al-Rahman, known as Sanchol, installed himself as well there. But he was soon deposed, according to Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Djabbar al-Mahdi [q. v.]. This usurper occupied the 'Amirid town and seized the treasures which were there. For three days he gave it over to the most thorough pillage. Having sacked the town he gave orders to fire it and to destroy it absolutely (Djumâda II, 399 [January 1000]).


AL-MADINAT AL-ZAHRA, the ancient capital of the Umayyad Caliphs of Cordova, the ruins of which are still in existence about 5 miles to the west of this latter town, at the place called Cordea la Vieja, on one of the last spurs of the Sierra Morena overlooking the valley of Guadalquivir [q. v.].

The western Arab historians give us a great deal of information on the foundation of this royal town, upon the period which marked its prosperity and upon the causes which led to its fall. It was the great Caliph 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nâşir [q. v.], who decided upon building it, and its construction was begun during the reign of this sovereign at the end of the year 325 (936). The chronicles say that on one of his rounds by the province left him a large sum of money, al-Nâshir wished to utilize this sum for the payment of the ransoms of the Spanish Muhammadan prisoners of war in the kingdoms of Leon and of Navarre. As the envoys who had been sent for this purpose failed to find any prisoners whom they could ransom, the Caliph's favourite al-Zahra is said to have advised him to employ the labour to build a town to which she would give her name. This anecdote is without doubt legendary, at least in several points. The work of building the town was carried on for many years (from 325 to 40 years according to 'Abdallah ibn 'Idhârî), it being about the palace of the Caliph. Six thousand hewn stones were used every day, not to mention other materials; the necessary marble was chiefly imported from Ifrikiya, and no less than 4,313 columns were required, if we may believe Ibn 'Idhârî. According to the same author it was the crown prince al-Hakam himself who directed operations. The name of the chief architect, Maslama b. 'Abd Allâh, has also been preserved.

The building of Madinat al-Zahra engaged not less than 10,000 workmen. Account was taken in the planning of the town of the very steep slope of the site and al-Idrisi gives a clear account of how this slope was utilized. The town was built on three terraces; the upper part was set aside for the palace and its appurtenances; the middle one was devoted to gardens; the lower one contained private dwelling-houses and the Great Mosque. 'Abd al-Rahmân removed with all his court to Madinat al-Zahra, as he felt the Caliph's palace of Cordova which faced the cathedral mosque and overlooked Guadalquivir too small, and this became his favourite residence. His successors al-Hakam II and Hishâm II lived there for the most part during their reigns, and further embellished the town of al-Nâsir. It appears, however, to have very soon fallen into decay, especially from the time when it had as rival the residence of the 'Amirid Fâdîb, al-Madinat al-Zahra [q. v.]. It was pillaged on several occasions by the Berber mercenaries who had rebelled against Cordova. The year 401 (1010) marked its final fall. A century and a half afterwards in the time of al-Idrisi, the walls alone remained and vestiges only of the palace. A few inhabitants still lingered in it.

A beginning was made in exploring and systematically excavating the ruins of Madinat al-Zahra..
about the year 1910, under the direction of the Spanish archaeologist, R. Velázquez Bosco. The first work done was the excavation of the double rampart dividing the upper terrace of the town from the middle terrace and from certain parts of the palace. A large number of carved stones have been brought to light.


### Al-Madjarra, the Milky Way

1. **AL-MADJARRA, the Milky Way (the place, path, road of moving).**

   **The Name.** It is probably taken in the first place from the Greek γαλακτίζων: *al-dā'ira al-labāniya* or *al-darb al-labāni,* the circle or path which looks like milk. Other names are *ṭarīk al-ḥašīl,* the path of milk, as it has the color of milk; *ṭarīk al-tabāšīna,* the road of the place where there is milk, and hence metaphorically *umma al-samā'ī,* mother of heaven, who feeds the heavens as with milk; *ṭarīk al-tābn,* path of straw and *darb or darbī al-tabāsnī,* path of the place where there is straw. Similarly the Milky Way is called in Persian kāḥkēshan, straw-puller, or kākhenγan or rāk-i kākhenγ, path of the straw-puller; in Turkish *saman ughrīt* or *saman kūfan,* straw or fodder-thief. Whether names connected with straw go back to Greek or Oriental ideas is uncertain. Gundel (*op. cit.*) holds the latter view. In the East the Milky Way is the hay, straw, and meal, which Peter or Saint Vinir (Venus) lost and blessed by God flew to heaven. Another Turkish name is *hādīdieter,* path of the pilgrims.

   Other Arabic names are *khāṣṣ al-samā'ī,* gate of heaven, and *al-tahrīdī* or *al-shrādī,* gap, probably from the idea that the Milky Way corresponds to a gap or split through which one can see the shining heaven. Another name is *umma al-nudjūn,* mother of the stars, because no part of the heavens is so rich in stars. The stars are also to have leprosy (*ṣṭarīt al-nudjūn*). Among the Kazan Tatars the Milky Way is called "Path of the Wild Goose" and by Altai Tatars ("Path of Hoar-Frost" (frosted way).

   The name *nakr al-madjarra,* River of the Madjarra, is noteworthy. The Milky Way is regarded as a river; this is evident from the passages in

## Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfi in his work on the constellations, in al-Birūnī in his Kitāb al-Tajhīm towards the end and in the Chronology (*text, p. 345; transl., p. 348*), in the Karwini in the Cosmography (*text, i. p. 37; transl., p. 18*) and in many others. In these passages the constellation of Sagittarius or the eight stars forming the 20th station of the moon which are called the Ostriches *al-mā'ūm* are described. Four of the stars which lie on the Milky Way are called *al-mā'ūm al-wārid,* the ostrich going to drink; the other four lie at the side of the river of the Milky Way and are called *al-mā'ūm al-ṣūdār,* the ostrich returning from drinking (cf. e.g. L. Ideler, *op. cit.,* p. 184 and Hyde, *Unsch Biz's Tabulae,* Oxford, p. 23).

### Description of the Milky Way

A description of the Milky Way, the stars and constellations in it, is given by Ptolemy in the Almagest (Bk. viii., Ch. 2) and the Muslim translators have borrowed from this. The editors have treated it in different ways. Al-Ṭust for example in his edition of the Almagest gives the description as fully as in Ptolemy; but he does not use the translation by al-Hadrīdādī, as I was able to show. Ibn Sinā on the other hand, who gives a brief synopsis of the contents of the Almagest in the *Ṣhīfā* (Healing) gives no such description; he deals here in the same way as he does with the Tables which he omits.

The very full treatment of the Milky Way is followed in Ptolemy by a description of the method of making a globe of the heavens on which the Milky Way is represented. Ibn Sinā, for example, took over this section word for word in a form which we also find elsewhere. It is therefore exceedingly probable that the Milky Way was represented on one or other celestial globe, of which a whole series is recorded. It does not seem to be on the extant globes (cf. H. Schnell, *Die Kugel mit dem Schmett*).

An independent description of the whole Milky Way as full as that in Ptolemy, I have not been able to find in Arabic works. A brief description is given by Abu Ḥanifa al-Dinawarī (in al-Maẓūkī, *Kitāb al-Asma wa-l-Jamāka,* Haidarābād 1322, ii. 9–12). The description of al-Dinawarī leaves much to be desired and the text is not quite correct. The former is in keeping with *Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī* (cf. *op. cit.*), and the latter with al-Dinawarī was very well acquainted with the verses on the Milky Way but his astronomical knowledge was insufficient (it may be noted that *Abd al-Rahmān mentions an Ibn Kunāza, while there is a Muhammad b. Kunāza in al-Maẓūkī*).

The anonymous writer mentioned in the *Bibliography* gives a brief description of it.

1. *Abd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī* unfortunately only gives a description of one part of it. He mentions the part of the Milky Way between the great, bright Milky Way (al-madjarra al-ażīma) and the falling Eagle (Lyra) (ṣīḥat al-madjarra, here at γ Cygni the Milky Way divides). *Abd al-Rahmān* follows this stretch up to η Scorpii. In many cases the position of stars e.g. in the Ship is given from their position with respect to the Milky Way. Schillerup has given details in the tables appended to the synecodic account, p. 5 sqq.

In the *Kitāb al-Tajhīm* of al-Birūnī we read *al-Madjarra of the Arabs, Kākhēshan of the Persians and Rāh Bihisht of the Hindus is an aggregation of a very large number of small stars.*
They form an almost perfect large circle, which runs between Gemini and Sagittarius, sometimes narrow, sometimes wide, in some places it is dense, in others not. Aristotle thinks that the Milky Way consists of stars surrounded by vapour like the halo round the moon and the mist (in the sky) and the comets. 1

Theory of the Milky Way. On the nature of the Milky Way and the cause of its shining there are a number of views, which follow the same lines as those of the ancients (cf. O. Gilbert, *Die meteorologischen Theorien der griechischen Altertums*, Leipzig 1907, index, s. v. γάλα). I now give Al-Karâfi’s account of it.

Al-Karâfi (d. 1285—1286) who wrote a work on Optics (*Noteworthy consideration of what the eyes grasp in 59 questions or problems*), says in the 49th question: "Why do we see a black haze on the moon? Is this an illusion or reality?" and continues:

"Connected with this question is that of the Milky Way which looks like a road in the sky. We are told: 1. It is the gate of heaven. 2. It consists of small stars which are crowded so closely together that the eye cannot distinguish one from the other. 3. It is said to be a vapour, which has risen from the earth and solidified under the cone of the fixed stars. One part forms a black burned body. This is the case in the centre of the Milky Way. A part lies in places which are far away from those in which there is burning; these are the two sides of the Milky Way. These places appear white. 4. Finally we are told that the Milky Way consists of something whose shape is inserted in the heavens and which is in some part of the earth, to which the way cannot be found and which cannot be reached."

Of these four views the second is nearest the truth.

The anonymous author of the Berlin manuscript also tells us very fully about the different views and the nature etc. of the Milky Way; here is the passage in question: "Learned men have many and varied views on the nature and substance of this belt. Some say that it is a part of the upper sphere and thicker and coarser than the rest of it. It is therefore visible, while the rest is not, as the latter is exceedingly fine. This corresponds to the opinion of the philosopher Diodorus (Di-yûdûrs)."

"According to Aristotle this belt consists of vapours which have collected together and ascended into the sky through the intermediary of the stars. As vapours are continually rising, they retain their shape. There is a contradiction in this. If we assume that the belt is formed by rising vapours, they cannot possibly be always seen at one and the same place in the sky; nor can they be seen from all places on earth and they cannot maintain one and the same distance from the stars and the ascendants."

If the belt is always seen in the same way and has permanently the same form, if it is seen in all climes, if its distance from the stars and the ascendants is always the same, this is a sure indication that the belt does not originate in vapours as these completely lack these qualities."

"Some learned men are agreed that the Milky Way, al-Madjarra, has its origin in the fact that small stars have become combined in this figure (ãûtâr) and offer themselves jointly to the view.

On account of their smallness they do not look like shining stars as they are joined together and give their light together (the light of the single stars forming one whole). This is the origin of the shining and the figure which we see. This view is one which is intelligible and men adopt it."

"We say that the Milky Way is a limb of the sphere of the fixed stars. As it is a thick limb, which is thicker than the other limbs, it completely absorbs the light of the sun, corresponding to what the other limbs take up, i.e. as the stars do. This corresponds to the view of him who says that the latter are thick limbs of their sphere. Each limb takes up light in proportion to its density. But this density is the cause of light being reflected to us."

"Many learned men attack the Aristotelian view — as was done even in ancient times — and regard the latter view (*) as the most probable."

The anonymous writer therefore lays it down quite generally that the Milky Way cannot be in the ether; it has always one and the same form quite independently of the position from which it is seen and does not alter its position. Abu l-Faradj (Bar Hebraeus) in his work (*Elevation of the spirits; on the shape of heaven and of the earth*); transl. by F. Nau, Paris 1899, p. 92 sq.) has a section on the "vapour-stars" (kawkâb saâdi) and the Milky Way. He says:

"In the heavens there are some white patches, vapour-stars. Some think these are a part of the Milky Way as like it they resemble clouds. They also think that they consist of a very large number of very small stars lying very close to one another, like the mane below the lion which is in the shape of an ivy leaf. Those who believe this also say that the whole Milky Way consists of very small stars joined together. The Milky Way is obviously neither smoke nor vapour in the air, as the Peripatetics say, since the moon and the planets experience no change in their light as they pass through the Milky Way (it must therefore lie outside the sphere of Saturn) but on the contrary rather affect the Milky Way."

The following note may be added on patches of nebulae:

Among the nebulae known to the Muslims are the Magellan clouds which were observed by merchants in Makdãshîh. They saw there a white patch of cloud which never came down and never changed its position (al-Kazwînî, *Aḏâ’îb al-Makhdûsât*, vol. ii., p. 40).

At quite an early date Ibn al-Haitham thoroughly and fully proved that the Milky Way is not in the air, but in the heavens and at a distance which is very great in proportion to the diameter of the earth, from the absence of a parallax, e.g. from the fact that it has the same position with respect to the fixed stars at different points on the earth. The anonymous writer also points this out (E. Wiedemann, *Über die Lage der Milchstrasse nach Ibn al-Haitham, in Sirius, xxxix.*).

1) According to this, the anonymous writer would believe that the fixed stars, the Milky Way etc., receive light from the sun, a view that is contradicted by Ibn al-Haitham and others: cf. below.
2) In the tables and astronomical works only the vapour-stars (nebulae) mentioned by Ptolemy are given.
3) There is an error here: The Milky Way would have to be below the sphere of Saturn but above the atmosphere like the planets. — The alterations in the brightness of the Milky Way are phenomena caused by dazzling.

The Milky Way is mentioned in a whole series of verses, particularly by modern poets. I have published 22 of these in the S.B.P.M.S. Erlangen with the help of A. Fischer (Leipzig), Kowalski (Cracau), Hell (Erlangen) and Krenkow (Beckenham).


(M. H. EMS.)

MAJDAL AL-DWALWA, Abû TaLib Rustam b. Fakhri al-Dwala, a Bûyid. After the death of his father Fakhri al-Dwala [q. v.], Majd al-Dwala, who, according to the usual statement, was then four years of age, according to another eleven (while Ibn al-Áthir, al-Kamili, ix. 48 says he was born in 379 [989/990] which does not agree with either of these statements) was proclaimed as successor under the regency of his mother Sajida. In 388 [998] Kābus b. Washmîr [q. v.] seized the two provinces of Djurdjâr and Tabariyân, to which was added by the treaty of peace Mazandarân also, and later he brought Gilân also under his rule. In 397 (1006-1007) Majd al-Dwala with the help of the vizier al-Khaﬁj Abû ‘Ali b. Abû al-Kasim attempted to overthrow his mother but he was taken prisoner by his brother Shams al-Dwala [q. v.] and the Kurd chief Badr b. Hasanawi, whereupon Shams al-Dwala took control of the government. His rule did not last long, however; after a year Majd al-Dwala was released and again recognised as ruler, while his brother retired to his governorship of Hamadân. In 405 (1015) the latter succeeded in seizing the town of al-Raii; Sajida and Majd al-Dwala had to take to flight, but were soon able to return because Shams al-Dwala was prevented from following them by a mutiny in the army and had to leave the Sajida held the reins of government till her death (412—1022), while Majd al-Dwala, who although extremely interested in learning, otherwise cared only for his numerous harem, paid no heed to affairs of state. After Sajida’s death complete chaos reigned. In the beginning of the year 420 (1029) Sultan Mâhmand b. Subuktug [q. v.] undertook a campaign into the Trîk. When Majd al-Dwala wrote to him and complained of the rebellious spirit of his army, the Sultan sent a considerable body of troops against Raii and ordered the commander to seize Majd al-Dwala. When the troops appeared the latter went to them and was at once seized along with his son Abû Dulaf. The Sultan himself then set out against Raii, seized the town and had Majd al-Dwala sent in chains to Khordasân.


(K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

MAJD AL-DIN. [See Hibat Allâh b. Muhammad.]

MAJDAL AL-MULK, Abû l-Fadîl As-Sad, Muhammad al-Barkhâwî, Finance minister of the Salûkij Sultan Barkîyârûk. As early as 485 (1092—1093) we find Majd al-Mulk mentioned among the officers of the Salûkij Sultan. As time went on and he became more and more powerful, while Barkîyârûk’s weakness and incapacity became more and more obvious. But as a Shî’i Majd al-Mulk became suspected of being the real instigator of the murders committed by the Isma’îlîs and after the amir Bursuk [q. v.] had fallen a victim to Isma’îlî fanaticism, the troops mutinied (Shawwâl 492 = Aug./Sept. 1099) and demanded that Majd al-Mulk should be handed over to them. He offered to sacrifice his life and proposed that the sulûk should have him executed to satisfy the soldiers. But Barkîyârûk refused to save him. After the soldiers had sworn not to slay Majd al-Mulk, but only to imprison him, he was handed over. In spite of their oath, the soldiers fell upon him and at once hewed him to pieces. — His nisba is derived from Baravîstân, a village near Kam; cf. Ya’kût, s. v.


(K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN)

MAJDHUB (a., “attracted”) denotes in the terminology of the Sûfis a person who is drawn by the Divine attraction (diqâh), so that without trouble or effort on his part he attains to union with God. In other words, the madjdhab experiences the ecstatic rapture of losing himself in God, and is thereby distinguished from the sâlik ("traveller"), who makes the journey to God, stage by stage, with conscious endeavour and purpose. The opinion favoured by antinomian derivations, that the madjdhab is superior to the sâlik finds expression in the saying: "One diqâh (act of drawing) from God is equivalent to all the (devotional) work of mankind and dînh (‘amal al-ta’lîm), but it is generally recognised that whether diqâh or sâlik [q. v.] preponderate, both are needed in order to reach perfection. Those in whom diqâh precedes sâlik and constitutes the predominant element in their spiritual life are called madjdhab-i sâlik, while conversely those with whom sâlik comes first are known as sâlik-i madjdhab. Although the terms madjdhab and sâlik are employed by Halladay (Massignon, Passion, ii. 905) and occur
frequently afterwards, their application in a narrower sense to those who repudiate or acknowledge the moral and religious law is characteristic of the dervish fraternities, which, as is well-known, differ widely from each other in their theory and practice concerning this matter.


(R. A. Nicholson)

MADRĪD (L.). [See Allâh.] MADJNûN. In Arabic, Persian and Turkish literature the epithet al-madjnûn, i.e. 'the man possessed by a djinn', 'the madman', is pre-eminently associated with Kâsî b. al-Mu'allî wa-ârî (according to others, the name of his father is Mu'âshî), the magjon of the Banû 'Amîr b. Sâ'a, the story of whose passion for Lâlî, daughter of Sa'd, a woman of the same tribe, is celebrated throughout the Muhammadian world. Kâsî is said to have died about 80 A.H. (Fawâtî, Bûlûk 1283, ii. 172), but it seems doubtful whether he can be regarded as a historical person, and this view is supported by the statements of early Muslim authorities (Aghâni, i. 157-169; cf. Ibn Khallîkîn, ed. Wustenfeld, No. 101, p. 150, B. 8, and Ibn Khâlidîn, Makaddimah, ed. Quatremere, ii. 196, 2 fr. foot; Aghâni, i. 169, 4 fr. foot, where magjon is described as one of three persons who never existed), while Ibn al-Kâlîb declared that the story of Madjnoun and the poems attributed to him were fabricated by a man of the Banû 'Umayya (ibid., i. 167, 4 fr. foot). Stripped of the picturesque details with which later poets have embellished it, the story is a simple one: Kâsî meets Lâlî amongst a party of women, falls in love at first sight and slaughters his camel to make a feast for her. His love is returned, but her father refuses to give her to him in marriage; and soon afterwards she becomes the wife of Ward b. Muhammâm al-'Kašî. Kâsî, crazed with despair, passes the rest of his days in solitude, wandering half-naked in the hills and valleys of Najd, making verses on the subject of his unhappy love, and only seeing Lâlî at rare intervals until his death. The development of this love-tale of the Arabian desert into one of the popular themes of Persian romantic and mystical poetry was begun by Nâsîmî of Gandja, in whose Khamsa the Lâlî al-Madjnûn occupies the third place. Of other poems bearing the same title, the best-known in Persian literature are those by Amir Khusrâw of Dîlî, Djamî and Hâtîf; and in Turkish, by Hämîd (see the abstract in Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, ii. 175-190) and Fu'nî (ibid., iii. 85-88; 100-104). — Sûfî writers find in Madjnoun a type of the soul which through tribulation, self-devotion and self-abandonment aspires to be united with God.


(R. A. Nicholson)
Vazadžirdj into tables based on the Muḥammadan era. He also to some extent replaced the meridian of Arin by that of Cordova, and he also gave the approximate positions of the planets for the beginning of the Hijra. On the other hand, he did not notice a series of errors in the older books, which might be made of some other astronomical works of his: a work in which he gives a short method of equating the stars (Ta'dil at-Kauākib) in the tables of al-Battānī; a work on the astrallog which survives in Latin; a translation of the planisphere of Ptolemy; the latter was translated into Latin in 1143 by Hermann Secundus of Tolosa. His interest in astronomy led al-Maḏrīṭī to deal with the principle of the transversal, in which he developed the views of Thābit b. Qurra. His Fī Ṭau'amā 'ilm al-'Adād (On the Perfection of the Doctrine of Numbers) or al-Muṣlāmāt On Business-calculation is mathematical. Whether the Kitāb al-'Adādār (on stones) and the work on the procession of animals are genuine, need not be discussed here.

It has also been suggested that al-Maḏrīṭī wrote the Ḥikawān al-Safā; but his supposed occupation with a work of this kind may be traced to the fact that he either wrote a similar work or a supplement to it or that he edited it and then he or his pupil Kirmānī introduced it into Spain. Whether he inserted separate sections like those on minerals, plants and animals seems to be doubtful.

Two other works belong together in subject matter, Kūbat al-Ḥakīm fi l'-Kīmīyā and Ghāṣyāt al-Ḥakīm fi l'-Ṣīhār, "the Goal of the Learned in Magic", which are ascribed in the manuscripts to al-Maḏrīṭī, although he never mentions himself in them. E. J. Holmyard after a thorough study of the question does not believe they are by al-Maḏrīṭī, the main reason being that al-Maḏrīṭī died before the fatīma, while these works were not written till after this period. The earlier biographers do not mention them among the works of al-Maḏrīṭī. It may be doubted whether works of this kind were in keeping with his mental attitude. Both the works deal with occult subjects. The Ghāṣyā treat of talismans, amulets, etc. Hājjāj Khalīfa, iv. 166, in dealing with the science of talisman (ilm al-tālīmāt), says that in it al-Maḏrīṭī expounded very fully but not always intelligently the principles of the science. The Rūṭa is of an alchemical nature; Hājjāj Khalīfa, v. 230 sq. also quotes al-Maḏrīṭī among the alchemists. Holmyard, op. cit., gives the gist of the book.


MA Declarations. [See W. W. MA.]

MAḏūs (A.), the Zoroastrians. The Greek word μαῦσως (which itself renders an Iranian word, cf. old-Persian magus, new-Persian magū) passed into Arabic through an Aramaic medium. According to the Arabic lexicographers, Maḏūs is a collective like Yāhūd; in the singular Maḏūs is to be used; the religion of the Maḏūs is called al-Maḏūsiya. The lexicographers cite from the root ṣ-md-고 a 3rd form (maḏūsagā) and a ṣth (maḏūsagā). In a poem, cited in the Līsān and the Tūṣ al-Arūs the phrase nār maḏūsagā is found; if we only could be sure, that this poem is really (as is asserted in the Līsān) a composition of Imru 'l-Kais and al-Tawām al-Yāshkuri conjointly, the word would already occur in the oldest Arabic literature extant.

In the lexicon, the word Maḏūs is derived from a proper name, Minḏū Čū, which name, according to them, is the Persian equivalent for Arabic مسح al-adwain ("with little ears"). This man, named Minḏū Čū, they say, is not the same as Zoroaster, but lived before him, and was the first who proclaimed the religion of the Magians. This is one instance of the many etymological and etiological enormities of Arabic antiquarians (cf. Līsān, viii., 98 sq.; Tūṣ al-Arūs, iv., 245; Lane, Lexicon, s. v.). Incidentally, it may be noted that in Arabic literature the word Maḏūs is also used to denote the peoples of Northern Europe, viz. the Scandinavians (cf. Dozy, Recherches, ii., 250 etc., Appendice No. xxxix., p. lxxv.; Rerum normannarum fontes arabici . . . . collegit et ed. A. Seippel, i., Christiania 1896).

In the Kūrān the word Maḏūs occurs once (xiii. 17); with this verse, i. 59 and v. 73 are to be compared. In these three places the Akl al-Kītāb [q. v.] are mentioned, but it is only in xiii. 17 that the name Maḏūs is also found. In this same verse, however, the Maḏūs's also are mentioned, who, of course, can by no means be included in the term Akl al-Kītāb, now, in Muslim law, the Zoroastrians are, it will be seen, treated as if they belonged to the Akl al-Kītāb, but this conception cannot be based on the Kūrānic verse xiii. 17. Also, the commentators (al-Baṣfī, ed. Fleischer, p. 629; al-Zamakhshari, Kudūsh, p. 901; al-Rāzī, Muṣṭāfī al-Qātī, iv., 554; al-Naṣībīnī in marg. al-Ṭabari, Taṣfīr, ed. Cairo, xvii., 74 etc.) give nothing that can point to the fact of the Maḏūs being, theoretically, Akl al-Kītāb. The words of al-Rūzī, who states that the Maḏūs are those who follow a real prophet, but only a mutanabbi, might suggest, that he takes Maḏūs to be a sect intermediate between the real Akl al-Kītāb and the maḏīrī's, the heathens. Al-Naṣībakī also says that the prophet of the
Madjūs — who, moreover, are dualists — is no real prophet but a mutanabbi; the mutanabbi's, on the other hand, have no prophet at all, nor a sacred scripture. In Arabic historical literature the Zoroastrians are themselves occasionally called mafrīk, e.g. al-Balādhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 302, 303, 350, 357 (mafrīk); p. 407 (kuffār). Finally it must be added that the Kur'ān-verse xxii. 17 seems to be a later addition to this Sūra (cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Gleich. des Qurāns, i. 214; the verse must be Madzinie).

In the Ḥadīth, which represents the theory of Muslim law, there is not very much to be found on the Madjūs in particular (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition, s. v. Madjūs). The substance of the Ḥadīth concerning the Magians is, that they are to be treated like the Ahl al-Kitāb, and, in consequence, are bound to pay the diyya. Practically, the existing Muslim state power could not follow any other way. The subjection of Iran would have become impossible, had the Arabs considered the Zoroastrians as mere heathens, who were to be given the choice either of Islam or the sword. And, even before that time, dealing with the Zoroastrians of Bahrāin in this rigorous way, would have been a grave political fault. Thus tradition, though it also hands down an account of how the prophet gave the Zoroastrians of Bahrāin the choice of either Islam or death, reports that 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf stated that the prophet had accepted the diyya from these Madjūs. This tradition was regarded as authoritative afterwards, and, the other, stating that the prophet refused to consider Madjūs otherwise than as mafrīk's, was abandoned (cf. Abū Dawūd, xix. 29 = vol. ii. 30). 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf is said to have delivered his statement on an occasion when the Kāhīna 'Umar felt doubtful whether he should accept the diyya from the Iranians, or not (cf. al-Balādhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 267: the prophet, according to 'Abd al-Rahmān, had said: „sunūn bikhīm sunūn ahl al-kitāb”). There is a tradition relating that 'Umar, a year before his death, wrote to Dīja' b. Ma‘ūya, regarding the Madjūs, instructing him, to put to death every sorcerer (saḥrī), to separate each Madjūs from his wife and children, and to forbid the practice of samzama (the muttering of Zoroastrian prayers, new-Persian kādī or kādī). Dīja' began to execute these rigid orders, and 'Umar refused to accept the diyya from the Madjūs, until 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf asserted that the prophet had accepted it from the Madjūs of Bahrāin (Abū Dawūd, loc. cit.; Ibn Hānbal, Musnad, i. 190, 194; al-Bukhārī, Saḥīh, Cairo 1304, ii. 144 sqq.). Al-Bukhārī, moreover (ii. 135) cites the following answer given to a Persian ambassador: “Our prophet has commanded us to fight you, until you serve God, and Him alone, or until you pay the diyya”. So here likewise the Madjūs are put on the same level as the Ahl al-Kitāb. The determination of the position of the Zoroastrians in respect of the Muslim state, is the main point of the Ḥadīth concerning them. Moreover, there is a tradition in al-Dārmī, Fārābī, bāb 42, regulating the hereditary portion of Zoroastrians (not altogether clear, however). Other, not very important traditional matter respecting the Madjūs is cited: Liānān, vii. 99; Lane, Lexicon, s. v. fiṣṭa; the article Kādīkānā.

The traditions of the Muslims about Zoroaster are in accordance with their idea of the Zoroastrians being a kind of inferior Ahl al-Kitāb. Al-Ṭabarī relates, that Zarādūsh b. Ismā‘īl (Ismā‘īl is an adaptation of the Avestic Spītanā, the name of the ancestor of the family to which Zoroaster belonged) laid claim to the title of a prophet, after three years of the reign of king Bīsthāb (the Avestic Wīštāspa) had elapsed (i. 675 sq.); the same historian reports, on the authority of Hīshām b. Muhammad al-Kalbī, that Zarādūsh, who by the Madjūs is said to be their prophet, was, according to the learned men of the Ahl al-Kitāb an inhabitant of Palestine, and a servant of one of the disciples of the prophet Yahwīsh. He committed a fraud against his master, who cursed him, so that he became leprous. Zarādūsh then went to Adharbājījān and began to promulgate the religion called Madjūsīya; afterwards he proceeded to Balkh, where Bīsthāb resided. This king became a convert to the religion of Zarādūsh, and compelled his subjects to embrace that religion also (i. 648; cf. al-Tha‘alībi, Histoire des rois des Perse, ed. Zotenberg, p. 256).

Another tradition, likewise preserved in al-Ṭabarī’s work, brings Zarādūsh together with a Jewish prophet (vocalisation uncertain), who was sent to Bīsthāb, and, at his court, met with Zarādūsh, and the sage Dīāmās (Avestic Dīāmāspa, the minister of Wīštāspa and son-in-law of Zoroaster). Zarādūsh is said to have noted down in Persian the teachings which the Jew delivered in Hebrew. Bīsthāb, and his father Lhrābās (Avestic Arvārāspa) had been Sūbians before and Zarādūsh proclaimed their religion (Ṭabarī, i. 681, 683). These traditions aim at bringing the Zoroastrian faith into a certain connection with the Jewish religion: in the one, Zoroaster is an apostate Jew, in the other, he acts in agreement with a Hebrew prophet. In the Ḥadīth there is a saying of Ibn ʿAbbās: “when the prophet of the Persians had died, Bilav wrote for them the lore of the Madjūs” (inna ahl Fāris lamā māta mīlaḥnahm kastā  laḥamī bilis al-Madjūsīya: Abū Dawūd, Kāhīna, bāb 29 = ii. 30). This isolated tradition might perhaps in some way be connected with the reports about ʿAwf.

Some Arabic authors, of course, had a better knowledge of Zoroaster and his religion, cf. for instance al-Balādhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 331, where it is stated, that according to the Madjūs, Zarādūsh came from Urmia, and, especially, al-Shahrastānī, Kītāb al-Mīda (ed. Cureton, p. 182 etc.), whose scientific treatise, however, contributes nothing to the knowledge of the ideas about Zoroastrianism prevalent among the Šakīfs. It is enough to say, that al-Shahrastānī whose, information goes back to Iranian sources, gives a succinct, but, in general, correct account of Zoroaster and the Madjūs, whom he subdivides into three principal sects: the Kayyāmārthiyā, the Zarwānīya and the Zarādūshiyā, the latter, according to him, properly the followers of Zoroaster.

The Madjūs are, he rightly remarks, not Ahl al-Kitāb, but, like the dualists, only possessing something like an inspired scripture (zhubhāhu kitāb, p. 179); before the rise of the Madjūsīya, the Persians professed the religion of Ibrāhīm (p. 180).

Respecting the treatment of the Zoroastrians during the Islamic conquest, the following data may be given:
1) al-Yaman. Muhammad had sent envoys to that country, who, among other things, had to collect the diya from those who preferred to remain Christians, Jews or Madjus (al-Baladhuri, p. 69). The Zoroastrians of al-Yaman (the so-called Abna') were said to be descendants from the Persians who had entered the army of Wahiz, who, by order of Khusraw I, carried back Saif b. Dhi Yazan to that country. Muhammad, when sending an army to al-Yaman against the pseudo-prophet al-Aswad, recommended its general, to try and win over to his side these Zoroastrians, who were treated tyrannically by al-Aswad. One of these Madjus, Fariz b. al-Dalaili, had already embraced Islam; the most distinguished man among the Abna', Da'dhawahi (Da'dhuya), also became Muslim, and, at his advice, the remaining Abna' followed. They helped energetically to put down al-Aswad. So we see, that in al-Yaman the Madjus were treated like Abni al-Ki'tab, after which followed their spontaneous conversion to Islam.

2) U'man. There was a tradition that the prophet commanded Abi Za'id to take the zadeka from the Muslims of U'man, and the diya from the Madjus of that country (al-Baladhuri, p. 77).

3) Bahrin. In the year 8 (629/630) Muhammad sent out al-Abi b. Abdallah al-Iwadi to Bahrain; most of the Arabs of that country embraced Islam, and so did Saba'ki, the Persian marzaban of Hadjar (the capital), and some other Zoroastrians. The most part of the Madjus of the country, however, remained faithful to their religion, and had to pay the diya, like the Jews and the Christians, who, in Bahrain, did not embrace Islam. Some Arabs criticized Muhammad, because he pretended to accept the diya only from the Abni al-Ki'tab, and now accepted it from the Madjus of Hadjar. On that occasion Sura v. 104 was revealed (al-Baladhuri, p. 78 etc.). Here it can be seen, that in the oldest Islam it was by no means regarded as a matter of fact that the Madjus were to be reckoned under the Abni al-Ki'tab. During the Khalifate of Abi Bakr and the insurrection took place in Bahrain, the Madjus refusing to pay the diya. This rebellion was not put down before the Khalifate of 'Umar (ibid., p. 85).

4) Irân. Before entering upon the particulars of the state of the Madjus in Irân, it may be remarked that in Armenia the Madjus were treated like the Jews and the Christians. They were obliged to pay the diya, but enjoyed security for their persons and their possessions. In the capitulation of the town of Dabi (Dwain) to Habib b. Maslama, the Christians, Jews and Madjus are comprised alike under these conditions. The kanati and beya' are also mentioned as remaining in possession of their old masters; it may be presumed that here under these words, which properly designate Jewish and Christian sanctuaries, the fire-temples of the Zoroastrians are understood also (al-Baladhuri, p. 200).

In Irân, the regular treatment of the places which surrender themselves is the imposition of the diya and the kharaj (which, at this time, in most cases were identical terms for "tribute" in general, cf. diya and kharaj, but cf. al-Baladhuri, p. 314, where diya = capitulation and kharaj = ground-tax). Thus, the inhabitants are reduced to the state of dhimmi, as if they really were Abni al-Ki'tab. This is the case e.g. on the subjection of Mahruq, Bandanijain (al-Baladhuri, p. 265), Hulwân, Karmain (ibid., p. 301), Nihawand (ibid., p. 306), Dinawar, Sîrwan, Sarmara (ibid., p. 307), Hamadhân (ibid., p. 309), Işfahân (ibid., p. 312 sq.), Ahwâz (ibid., p. 377): here the prisoners of war were released by order of 'Umar, to cultivate the land. Under the old law the pay kharaj (there being not enough Arabs for the purpose), Djuand Sâbîr (ibid., p. 382), Djurma, Ardâdji, Shurâ, Darâbji (ibid., p. 388): at Dârâbji, the chief authority in the town was a Zoroastrian priest, a kirvââ, Tâbas and Kurîn (ibid., p. 403): they concluded a treaty with 'Umar, which later was confirmed by U'îman b. A'dfân, Naisâbûr, Nasâ (ibid., p. 404), Tûs (ibid., p. 405), Harânt, Badghis and Bûshândj (ibid., p. 405), Marw (ibid., p. 405 sq.). The term jahâbâna'a ala ... (dirham), often occurring in our source, must be understood as meaning a tribute; this appears from the last mentioned passage, p. 405 sq.

Not always, however, did the subjugation of the Irânian places come to pass without bloodshed. In Irân a massacre ensued, but there seem to have been no religious motives for it (al-Baladhuri, p. 317). If a town had offered a strong resistance, it might happen, that only a limited number of persons were included in the amân. This was the case at Sârâsh, where, according to the treaty, only 100 men were spared; the marzabân had not included himself in the number, and was, accordingly, killed, while the women were made captives by the conquerors (ibid., p. 405). At Sûs a similar event occurred; here the number of men, comprised in the amân, was 80, as others said, 100 (ibid., p. 378 sq.). At the conquest of Manadhîr all the men were killed, and the rest of the population was taken captive (ibid., p. 378). But another stronghold, though resisting the Muslims vigorously, obtained a capitulation, by which its inhabitants became dhimmîn (ibid., p. 317 sq.). A great slaughter was made at the conquest of Ištārâk, where 40,000 Irânians lost their lives; most of the nobles belonging to the abni al-bayyâtât and the asâvac were perishèd there, as seems, not in the defence of the town, but after its capture (ibid., p. 389 sq.).

When the Zoroastrians were received as dhimmîn, their religious practices must, of course, be respected. Thus al-Farrâûghân paid the Muslims, on behalf of the inhabitants of Irân and Kumis, 500,000 dirham, while the Muslims promised, among other things, not to destroy any fire-temple (ibid., p. 318). When Adharâbadjân was subdued and made tributary, the treaty, which its marzabân concluded with the Arab commander, contained also the stipulation, that no fire-temple should be destroyed, and that the people of Sîs should not be hindered in their dancing-festivals and other practices (ibid., p. 326). It goes without saying, that in the countries, inhabited by Zoroastrians, soon after the appearance of the Arabs, mosques also were built, destined in the first place for the religious worship of the conquerors; the masjid djami' which Sa'd b. Abi Waqâs constructed at al-Ma'dâin, was the earliest building of that kind in al-Sawâf (ibid., p. 289). Under the Khalifate of U'îman, a masjid was built at Ra'în, in which town later on, under the Khalifate of al-Mansûr, a masjid djami' was erected by order of the future Khalif al-Mahdi, in 158 (775) (ibid., p. 309). At Tawâwdjî, its conqueror U'îman b. Abi
Fire-temples in ‘Irāk, Fārā, Kirmān, Sīджistan, Khurāsān, Tabaristān, al-Dībāl, Adharbadhān, Arān” (he adds also: “in Hind, Sind and Sin”. This general statement of al-Mas‘ūdī is fully supported by the mediaeval geographers, who make mention of fire-temples in most of the Iranian towns. The toleration, then, from the part of the Muslims, must have been greater in mediaeval times than in modern ones. That, however, not all Zoroastrians felt happy under a non-Zoroastrian government, appears from the fact, that a number of Madjūs, the ancestors of the Parsis of to-day, emigrated to India. Their landing on the coast of Gujarāt is said to have taken place in the year 716 of the Christian era.

Conversion to Islam may have been, in many cases, “peaceful and to some extent, at least, gradual” (Arnold, loc. cit., p. 181). On the other hand, it is evident, that for a Zoroastrian, desirous to attain to some prominent position, conversion to Islam was indispensable. Among the well-known converts from Zoroastrianism may be cited Ibn al-Mu‘akkala [q.v.], Simān Khudā, the founder of the dynasty of the Sāmnāids [q.v.], the poet Dājīk [q.v.], etc.

Occasionally, the Muslim magistrates, it seems, assisted the Zoroastrian clergy against heretics: al-Shahristānī (K. al-Mīlād wa’l-Mīḥāl, ed. Cureton, p. 187) relates, how Abū Muslim of Naštūb, on an accusation from the part of the mutaqā of the Zoroastrians, caused a sectarian to be killed. It seems, however, that this man, who had been a Zoroastrian, and now proselytized a new creed, held tenets calculated to cause disturbance.

A history of the relations between the Muslim state and the Persian Zoroastrians (for neither the Indian Zoroastrians, the Parsis, nor the internal history of the Zoroastrian community concern us here) can only be written, when the mass of Persian historical literature of the Middle Ages and modern times will be completely accessible. The position of the Zoroastrians has been worse in course of time. Their number seems to have greatly diminished by the disturbances which ensued after the death of Nādir Shāh (1160 = 1747), when the Afghans destroyed the Zoroastrian quarter at Kirmān, and by the war between Aga Muhammad Khan Kādjar and Luṭf ‘Ali Khan (see also Kirmān). In modern times the number of Zoroastrians in Persia is estimated by v. Houtum-Schindler (1879) at 8,499 at all; by Browne (1887/1888) at 7,000–8,000 for Kirmān, Yazd and environs alone [but elsewhere (A year among the Persians, p. 370) he gives for Yazd and its environs alone 7,000–10,000] and for Bahramābād 20–25. The Encyc. Britannica (1911) has the number 9,000 for the whole of Persia.

In 1834, there were in Yazd and its environs 6,658 Zoroastrians, of whom 25 merchants, and the rest small husbandmen and labourers (Karaka, History of the Parsis, i. 55). The same author gives for Kirmān (in 1884, the date of the book) no more than 450; for Yihār 50 merchants, and a small number of numberless position, who were employed as gardeners in the palace of the Shah. At Shiraz, some Zoroastrian families were found, who exercised the trade of shop-keepers. Further more, there are Zoroastrians at Kāshān and Esfahān (v. Houtum-Schindler). The Gegers of Baku are Indian Parsis (cf. BAKT).

According to Browne, there are in Persia 5
on Oct. 1, 834. It was not till November that they were forced to seek the shelter of their vessels by the Muslim armies sent against them. Other bands at the same time ravaged with fire and sword the whole coast from Lisbon to Trafalgar and one of them reached a point in Africa where they captured the town Aljāla (Arrilà [q.v.]) was founded soon afterwards, but took to flight on the approach of the Berbers of the region.

After this invasion, the leader of the Norse hordes seems to have sent an ambassador to the Caliph 'Abd al-Rahmān II to propose a peace. The Umayyad sovereign agreed to his request and sent to discuss the terms of the treaty a diplomat of his entourage, Yahyā b. al-Hashām al-Bakri al-Dāisiyānī, known as al-Ghāzal. The latter reached Silves, where he entered a ship which after various adventures took him to the Norse leader. Al-Ghāzal returned to his master after an absence of 20 months. The account of his ambassy has been preserved for us by Ibn Dārī, who got it from the viziers Tamām b. Alkama, a friend of al-Ghāzal.

Fifteen years later, in 244 (858), Spain and the Maghrib again suffered a Norse invasion. We have accounts of it by Ibn al-Kūtīya, al-Bakri and Ibn Idhārī. It lasted several years, at least till 247 (861). The Northmen began by seizing the town of Nūkūr in Morocco. They then appeared at the mouth of the Guadalquivir but without success; they then seized Algeciras where they burned the great mosque. They appear to have then had an encounter at sea with the fleet of the Caliph Muhammad b. Abd al-Rahmān.

We have fuller details of the invasions which followed. In 255 (960), the Danes, who had come to the assistance of the first Duke of Normandy, made an expedition against Muslim Spain, on the interested advice of Richard I. This lasted three years. The invaders, always called Madjās by the Arab historians, appeared first at Kāsr Abī Dānis (Alcacer do Sal) and landed in the country round Lisbon which they laid waste. The Caliph al-Hashām sent against them a fleet from Seville which met theirs in the estuary of the Tagus. At the same time a battle was fought on land near Lisbon in which the Muslims were defeated. The Danes then extended their efforts to Galicia and in 970 seized St. Iago da Campostella. In the next year, they again attacked Muslim Spain but they were much weakened by the losses they had suffered in the north of the Peninsula and they do not seem to have dared to land anywhere.

It is also to the Madjās (the name being accompanied by the more precise one of اردومنیون = Arudomani) that the Arabs attribute the celebrated taking in the following century of the town of Barbastro (Barbúshar) to the N.W. of Saragossa, on the borders of Aragon. The historian Ibn Ḥajān wrote a detailed account of it, which is preserved by Ibn Idhārī. A Norman expedition, in which French knights shared, was evidently led by Guillaume de Montreuil, succeeded in capturing Barbastro in 1064 (456). This success and the barbaric treatment inflicted on the population made a deep impression on Muslim Spain. In the next year the king of Saragossa, Aḥmad b. Sulaymān Ibn Hūd al-Muṭādārī, with an army reinforced by a contingent of cavalry sent by the Seville ruler, al-Muṭādād Ibn ‘Abdād, recaptured Barbastro, where a weak garrison left
by the Normans on their return to France could offer only a brief resistance and was almost entirely wiped out.


**Madmun** is the legal institution of the *gānâ (*q.v.*), "debt", a term which occurs in the following connections: *madâmân 'anahu "debtor"*, *madâmân lâhu or 'alâki "creditor", madâmân (fikr) "pawn"*. For the parties to the agreement and the article in question in a bond, the rules hold which apply to all other contracts.


I. In the chapters of the Fiji books which deal with the law of obligations, *madâmân* is used for the thing for which one is liable or responsible, i.e. is bound to replace. In this way *gānâ* comes to mean in the wider sense, "liability, obligation to restore" in contracts. This liability consists either in the producing of something identical (*mîthâl*) i.e. of a thing of the same quality and quantity (*qâsâs wa-ta'âsâs*), e.g. in edible things (*mîthâl mîthâl*) which are measured by quality, weight, or number (*mawâṣṣ wa-makhlîk wa-mâdîd*) or in the value of the thing (*ṣîma*) e.g. in non- edible things (*mâkarâs mîkât*) which have a special individuality, and are therefore *āin = species*.

**Bibliography:** The chapters on the conditions of legal agreements in the Fiji books.

---

**MADRAS** Presidency, the southernmost province in British India, occupies the whole of the southern portion of the Peninsula, with an area of 142,260 sq. m.; total population (1921): 42,318,955, of whom 2,843,885 (nearly 7%) are Muhammadans. The majority of these are Sunnis, 2,651,045 (93.60 per cent.); Shi'ites: 54,114. The only Native State with a Muhammadan ruler is Banganapalle (255 sq. m.); population 36,632, of whom only 16% are Muhammadans. The language spoken by the majority of the Muhammadans of the province is Malayalam (1,168,865 i.e. 357 per 1,000, including almost all the Mappilas; *q.v.*); Hindustâni, 335 per 1,000; Tamil, 209 per 1,000.

*History.* Southern India began to suffer early in the 16th century from plundering raids—carried out by the Muhammadans established in the north, until the rise of the Hindu kingdom of Vidyjnagar in 1536 erected an effective barrier against the southward expansion of Muhammadan power for more than two centuries. When in 1564 the four Sultans of the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan,—Bidjâpur, Bidar, Ahmadnagar and Golconda,—joined forces against this powerful Hindu state, in a single decisive battle (Tâlikota, January 1565) they effected the ruin of Vidyjnagar and utterly destroyed the capital, and its territories were for the most part incorporated in the kingdoms of Bidjâpur and Golconda. In 1656 and 1657 Awrangzeb (*q.v.*) conquered these two kingdoms and made them part of the Moghal empire. After Asaf Dîlah, the first Nişām of Haidarabâd, had made himself independent, in 1724, the Nâwâb of the Carnatic (*q.v.*), also styled the Nâwâb of Arcot (Arkât) from the name of his capital, became his chief subordinate in the South of India. When in the middle of the xviiith century the English and the French were in conflict with one another in Southern India, each espoused the cause of a different claimant for the office of Nâwâb of the Carnatic. The support of British troops under the command of Robert Clive assured the success of Muḥammad 'Ali (*q.v.*), but papers seized at Siringapatam after its capture in 1799 having proved that both he and his son and successor, though nominally allies of the British, had been in secret correspondence with Tipû Sultan (*q.v.*), Lord Wellesley, then Governor-general of India, declared them to be public enemies of the British Government, and in 1801 concluded a treaty with a grandson of Muḥammad 'Ali, named A'jam al-Dawla, according to which he resigned the government of the Carnatic into the hands of the East India Company, but retained the titular dignity and received a considerable pension. The present representative of the family bears the title of Prince of Arcot and has the position of the premier native nobleman of Madras. The greater part of the existing Presidency of Madras consists of the territories annexed by Lord Wellesley.

**MADRAS City,** on the shore of the Bay of Bengal, in 3° 4' N. and 80° 15' E., is the capital of the presidency of the same name; population (1921): 528,911, of whom 113 in every 1,000 are Muhammadans.

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer of India (Provincial Series) Madras (Calcutta 1908); W. H. Hutton, *The Marquess Wellesley* (Oxford 1893); Prosper Cultru, *Dupleix* (Paris 1901).

**MADRASA.** [See Masjid.]

**MADRID.** The present capital of Spain has kept the name it had in the Muslim period: *Madrid* (ethnic *al-Madhrîj*). Arab geographers describe it as a little town grouped round a strong fortress, with a khâba mosque, at the foot of the Djîbal al-Sharâs, the Sierra de Guadarrama, and a dependency of the province of Toledo. It was especially known for its potteries. It had only an unimportant history, but gave birth to several famous Muslim scholars, among whom the most important was Abu 'l-Kâsin Maslama b. Ahmad al-Madhrîj, who lived in the second half of the fourth century and on whom cf. Brockelmann, G. *A. Z.*, i. 243. Madrid was taken in 1476 (1083) by King Alphonso VI. According to a Christian tradition, Ramiro II had previously held possession of it for a short time during his campaign against the Muslims in 327 (930). It was on the site of the old cathedral (*qâmi*) of Madrid that the king
of Castille had the church dedicated to the Virgin of the Almudena built.


MADURA, an island north of Eastern Java, with the sea of the north and the strait of Madura on the south; a narrow strip separates it from the residency of Surabaya. For administrative purposes it forms a separate residency along with several small adjoining islands. From the geological point of view Madura is a continuation of the limestone hills of the residences of Rėmbang and Surabaya in Java; it is doubtful whether the statement in the Nāgarakṛtākrama (Ballad XV, verse 2; also the earliest mention of the island) that Madura only became separated from Java at the beginning of the third century A.D. is of any historical value. The ground is hilly; large parts of the country are not at all fertile. Although agriculture is beginning more and more important with the completion of irrigation works, the quantity of rice grown is quite insufficient for the wants of the dense and still rapidly increasing population; they have frequently to live partly or completely on maize. Every year many Madurese leave their land for a certain period to seek work in various ways in Eastern Java; the comparatively unfruitful nature of the soil has always forced the inhabitants to emigrate permanently to the Eastern residencies of Java and these are therefore with the exception of a few districts inhabited by a population which speaks Madurese. Of more importance for the Madurese than agriculture is the rearing of domestic animals (cattle, horses, goats and sheep). The Madurese cattle are probably the best in the whole archipelago; many draught animals and fat stock are annually exported. A very popular sport is bull racing; the beasts used for this are bred and looked after with the greatest care. The Madurese have a certain preference for the trade of a wandering pedlar; on the coast and on the islands the main source of livelihood is fishing and fish-breeding.

The population is closely related to that of Java; the customs at birth, marriage and death agree in general with those that prevail there. There are however striking differences. The Madurese are more heavily built, more energetic and enterprising than the Javanese; he is also less sophisticated. He is said to be faithful, reliable, economical and even avaricious. Dress, houses and farms of the Madurese look less cared for than those of the Javanese; the houses are not as in Java close together in settlements but are scattered. The Madurese are specially fitted for hard heavy work and less for occupations which require skill and application. Alcoholic beverages are much drunk; the little opium is taken. The language is also related to Javanese but much influenced by it; the literature consists mainly of translations and versions of Javanese works.

ISLĀM is the generally prevailing religion. The Madurese have no tendency to fanaticism but as a rule they faithfully perform the principal duties of their religion; the great Muslim feasts are duly observed. All receive the usual elementary religious instruction and many are not content with this only. We have no exact or reliable information as to the period of their conversion and the manner in which it came about; the stories given in the native sources do not agree. But as Madura has politically always been closely connected with Java (in the Hindu period it was subject to the kingdoms of Tumapēl and Madjapahit; at a later date it was under the adipati of Surabaya and then under the Sulītūn of Mataram) and as it is quite close to the district through which the new religion entered Java, it may well be assumed that between the first disembarkation of Muslim ideas on Java and on Madura not a great deal of time passed. The complete conversion of the island to ISLĀM seems to have taken place quickly and without difficulty. Hindu rule had never made a deep impression. According to native tradition Madura belonged to the Mughalishan coalition which overthrew the Hindu Javanese kingdom of Madjapahit. Until 1625 Madura (which was divided into five small states) formed part of the territory of the adipati of Surabaya. In this year it was acquired by Mataram and a Madurese prince appointed governor. When in 1678 a faction of his, Trunja Djaya, rebelled against Mataram, endeavoured to make Madura independent and even aimed at rule over Java, the ruler of Mataram sought the intervention of the Dutch East India Company. In 1679 Trunja Djaya was taken prisoner; in 1705 Mataram recognized the suzerainty of the Dutch East India Company (which had existed in reality since 1653) over the eastern part of Madura and in 1743 over the whole island. The Company and after them the Dutch government for a considerable time always avoided intervention in the internal affairs of the island; as the rulers of Madura had repeatedly performed important services, they were treated — often to the injury of their subjects — less as servants of the Company than as independent allies. From the middle of the 16th century the power of the rulers was gradually limited; since 1885 the whole island has been directly under Dutch rule.

MADUWA — MADYAN SHU'AI'B

MADYAN SHU'AI'B, a town on the east side of the Gulf of Akaba. The name is connected with that of the tribe of Mehalite, known from the Old Testament (xxviii: Sha'ail, Meadum, in Josephus Malum or Madum). It perhaps is of some importance to weigh the name of this tribe, as the town might be a later Median settlement; but it is difficult to fix the real home of such wandering tribes in the Old Testament. The town of Madian (xxviii: Shu'ail, Lidd.) is not mentioned in the Kings, vi. 18 where Madan should probably be read. The town may be a later Median settlement; but it is difficult to fix the real home of such wandering tribes. In the Old Testament a town of Madian is not mentioned (and even in 1 Kings, vi. 18 where Madon should probably be read). On the other hand Josephus (xxviii: Shu'ail, Lidd.) speaks of Madiane as a town on the Erythraean Sea as do the Ptolemists (Onomast., ed. Lagarde, p. 276); in Pudim (xxviii: 7) it is mentioned as a town on the coast and called Madiana or Maduma while in another passage it gives itself as an inland town under the name Madima, a difference which is explained by the actual position of the town. In Muhammad's time there is only one reference in Ibn Isshak to the town of Madian, when the Prophet sent an expedition under Zaid b. Harihth the thither. There are occasional references in the poet Kuthayyir (in Yaqut, d. 723) who speaks of the monks there and in the record of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya's journey to Aila. In the geographers we find Madian only as a town near the coast, six days' journey from Tabuk; it was the second station on the pilgrims' road from Aila to Madina and was a dependency of Madina. In the sixth century Madian is called the undulating and rich in springs and cucumbers, gardens and date groves and of its mixed population. Iskakhtir says it is larger than Tabuk and describes from his own observations the spring there, from which Moses watered the flocks of Shu'ail (see below), it was now covered by a house which had been built over it. The town then began to decline gradually. In the xiiith century Idrist says it is an unimportant little trading centre with scanty resources; in the xivth century Abu al-Fida says it was in ruins. Only in recent times has it been visited e.g. by Rappell, Burton and Musil. The extensive ruins, which the Arabs call Maghira Shu'ail after the caves-ruins, lie about 16 miles east of the port of Makina in 28° 20' N. Lat. In the southern part of the valley of al-Bud is which is rich in streams and palms and other trees. According to Burton the whole district between 29° 28' and 27° 40' is called Ardi Madyan.

In the Kur'an following the Old Testament there are several references to Madian as a people: for example in the stories of Moses' stay with them (xxvii: 42; xxviii: 21 sqq., 45), where his father-in-law (Jethro in the O. T.) is still anonymous, or in one of the stereotyped legends of prophets in which the Madian are punished because they would not believe their prophet Shu'ail (vi: 83-91; xi: 85-98; xxix: 35 sqq.). Shu'ail was later identified with the father-in-law of Moses, for which there is no authority in the Old Testament. But perhaps the real truth is that Shu'ail had originally nothing to do with Madian. In the older Suras (xxvii: 76 sqq.; xxviii: 12; l: 13) it is not the Midanites but the Agib al-Sha' (the people of the thicket) who are his enemies and it is therefore very possible that Muhammad only later combined an indigenous story of the people of the thicket and their Shu'ail with the Midanites of the Old Testament.


(FR. BUHL)
MAGNATIS, MAGNA\NIS, MAGNITIS, Lode\nstone and Compass.

I. The Lodestone and Magnetism

The lodestone is a widely disseminated mineral, and is therefore frequently mentioned by geographers and cosmographers, for example in the pseudopeigographical Petrolgy of Aristotle, by al-Dimishki, al-Kazwini, Ibn al-Fakhir, al-Kalkashandi, etc. Of Amid and Hashadji, it is said that the lodestone is found there in a hard rock. According to Ibn Sin\n, the Indian is the best and al-Kazwini makes it come from India. Like the Greeks and Romans, the Arabs also discussed the properties of the lodestone and its effects on iron. They found that the lodestone can hold an iron needle (a ring), this a second, a third and so on, so that a chain is formed.

The power of attraction of the lodestone was defined. Most writers say that a lodestone can lift double its weight in iron, and one from Hashadji three times. Djahir b. Haiyan al-Sufi, owned a particularly strong one. Djahir b. Haiyan ascertained that it could work through metal. Other information is given by Shams al-Din al-Dimishki, p. 73, or 85 of the work mentioned below (cf. also E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, ii. 3: Uber Magneti\nmus, S. B. P. M. S. Erlangen, xxxvi, 1904, p 322).

Knives and swords rubbed on lodestone, according to Ibn al-Fakhir and al-Kalkashandi, became themselves magnetic. They consist also, like needles, of iron which contains carbon, i.e., steel. They are stronger than the lodestone and do not lose their power of attraction as the former does.

It was noticed that in needles which floated on water the end rubbed pointed sometimes to the north and sometimes to the south, apparently according as it was rubbed with one or the other pole of the magnet; there appears to be no suspicion that the end not rubbed had also changed. Ufarid al-Hassabi's statement that there are three kinds of lodestone is probably connected with the effects on the magnetised needle: one he says attracts, the second, the repels, and in the third one side attracts and the other repels.

The Arabs devoted much attention to the theory of these phenomena — with how little satisfactory results is evident from the remark of Ibn Butla: — "It is very annoying for us to feel that we do not know this with certainty (the cause of the attraction of iron), although we perceive it with the senses". Djahir b. Haiyan explains the power as a spiritual one, classing it with scents. Al-Tughiti includes the lodestone among the stones which contain spirits (see E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxiv: Zur Alchemie bei den Arabern, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., xlii, 1911, p. 82). Al-Razi seems to have dealt with its attraction through vacant space in a work which has not survived, entitled Kitab ilma Lakhdo Haqiqat al-Maghazati Rihidawd wa-Tafi Qalum Kafir il-Adora' i.e. "Book of the reason why the magnetically attracted iron: in it there is much discussion of empty space" (see Ibn Abi Usha\n, i. 320). Ibn Sin\n develops views which are very obscure in his Kitab al-Shif\n (Ma\nala 2); Ibn Hazin is more lucid in his Kitab Tawwq al-Hamima f\'l-L\n\n, f\'l-Ullaf, Al-Kazwini traces the attraction to a similarity of natures, through which love and at-raction between them arose at the beginning of their existence. The Arabs are very fond in poetry and prose of comparing the effect of the magnet on iron to that of the lover on the beloved.

That there are many fables associated with this power of attraction is to be expected. Idols etc. of iron are said to be kept suspended in the air by lodestones (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitr. xi: Uber Lampen und Uhr, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., x, 1907, viii, p. 207). Nails were drawn out of ships and they were thus caused to sink, as was the case with Sindbad's. According to al-Kazwini (A\n\n'ab al-Maghi\n\n, i. 172) there are submarine mountains at Ka\n\n\n which have this effect. Therefore, he says, the beams of ships in the Red Sea were bound together with ropes. The lodestone is said to be especially effective if it is kept for a time in goat's blood, which is of course false. The lodestone is occasionally used in medicine (cf. Ibn Sin\n and Ibn al-Baitar, s.v.). In alchemy its name means "lion" and "with the brilliant eye".

Besides the lodestone, which attracts iron, quite a number of other stones are given, which have the same quality with respect to other bodies, for example, gold is the magnet of quicksilver, etc. Numerous statements about such attracting bodies, which include a number of plants, are given in the A\n\n'ab of Shams al-Din Dimishk\n (cf. the Bibliography) in the Arabic text p. 73—77, in the translation p. 85—89. Al-Kazwini also gives a number of such magnets under the word L\n\n ("picking, collecting") among the minerals.

II. The Compass

The Arabs of the East became acquainted with the compass through Chinese sailors, without however at first giving it a special name; there was considerable traffic between the Persian etc. ports and Southern China. Thence it came to Syria and then to the Mediterranean ports of Europe. The compass had probably however already reached the north of Europe by the trade-route of the Russian rivers as early as the eighth or ninth centuries. This explains why the compass was known earlier in the north than in the south of Europe and perhaps explains also why the Norsemen were able to undertake long voyages by sea (cf. R. Hennig, Verhantl. der Geol. d. Naturforser etc., 84th Versammlung 1912, p. 95).

In deciding the direction by means of a magnetic needle, the Muslims used the word which pointed to the south; as Mecca lay to the south of most places in Syria etc. the Kit\n (s.v.) corresponded almost exactly to the south.

The oldest passage in which the word karamid or karamid corresponding to "magnet" (alam\n\n) occurs is given by Dozy for the year 759 (854) in Supplement, ii. 337 who found it in al-Bay\n\n al-Maghrib (Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne) edited by him. Serious objections have however been raised to interpreting the word as compass in this passage (M. S. O. Berlin, x. 1—2, 1900, p. 268). From the fact that in narratives of travels of the ninth century A.D. and that in al-Mas\n\n (923) the directions are given in the same way as on compasses, G. Ferrand concludes that the compass was already in use then. The next earliest absolutely certain reference is in the Djaw\n\n al-Hikayat of 'Awf; it is in his Lib\n\n al-Al\n\n (ed. Browne and Mir\n\n Muhammad Kazwini). A


In the Beiträge ii. the earlier literature is collected. This is also done in other works e.g. by Clément Mullet on the Compass. Of special importance are the works of A. Schück (Der Kompass etc., Hamburg 1911, 1915 sqq.), which also deal with the Boussole in China. (E. Wiedemann)

MAGHRĪBA, a large confederation of Berber tribes, belonging to the Zanāta group and related to the confederations of the Banū Ifran [q. v.] and Banū Injīyān. These tribes, who led a nomadic life, in the middle ages roved over the country between the valley of the Chelif as far as Tlemcen and the mountains inhabited by the Madyūna. They were successively converted to Islam and their chief Šāīūt b. Waṣāmīr is to have gone to Madina to the Caliph ʿUthmān and been confirmed by him in his rule over the Maghribī. This is why this confederation came to consider themselves clients of the Umayyads of Spain and supported, sometimes by force of arms, the cause of this dynasty in the Maghrib. This chief Šāīūt was succeeded by his son Hāfīs and he by his son ʿAbd al-Kairawān, and he was the Arabian amir of al-Kairawān and had to deal with the time of the rebellion of Māisara in 122 (739). On his death his son Mu-
In 573 (983–984) the Maghrāwa, after the departure of the Spanish governor Ibn ʿAskulāda, were chosen by al-Manṣūr to rule Morocco in his stead. In 577 (987–988) the ḥādjīb appointed as his vassal to rule the western Maghrib, the amir of the Maghrāwa, Zīr ibn ʿĀṭiya b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Khazar. The latter made Fās his residence and settled his tribe around the town. By orders of al-Manṣūr he waged war on the Ṣanḥāja and notably increased his dominions towards the east. In 582 (992) he made a journey to Cordova on the invitation of the ḥādjīb. In spite of the assertions — frequently contradictory — of the historians, it seems that the reign of Zīr ibn ʿĀṭiya was rather troubled and that changes of fortune placed on the throne of Fās sometimes the Maghrawīd prince and sometimes his Ifrīdīn rival Yuddū b. Yaʿlī. On his return to Fās, Zīrī found his place occupied by Ibn Yaʿlī and it was only after a murderous struggle that he succeeded in regaining his throne. But, finding Fās not sufficiently central in position, he decided, like his Spanish suzerain, to build a capital for himself and the principal chiefs of his confederation. In 584 (994) he laid the foundations of the town of Wajdāja (Oujda) and came with his court to live there. At the same time he tried to throw off the suzerainty of Cordova and relations were finally broken off between him and al-Manṣūr. Ibn ʿĀmir sent against him an expedition under the freeman Wādiḥ: a battle was fought on the banks of the Wāld Kāṭ and the Spanish army defeated. The ḥādjīb then sent another force under the command of his own son ʿAbd al-Mallīk al-Muẓaffar. On this campaign Zīrī was twice routed in 587 (997). He sought to take refuge in Fās, but the inhabitants prevented him entering it and ʿAbd al-Mallīk soon afterwards entered the capital. Zīrī had to go to the Sahara; later he tried to create a principality for himself in the land of the Ṣanḥāja. He laid siege to their capital ʿAṣhir [q. v.] but before he could take the town, he died of the consequences of an old wound in 591 (1000–1001).

On the death of Zīrī ibn ʿĀṭiya, the Maghrāwa proclaimed his son al-Muʿizz; he began his reign by endeavouring to regain the favour of al-Manṣūr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Khazar in Fās. His father, and his successor ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muẓaffar appointed him governor of Fās and western Maghrāwa in 593 (1002–1003). He received from Cordova letters of investiture for all Morocco, except the land of Sidjilmāsa, which was kept for the Banū Khazar. Morocco seems to have had peace and a certain degree of prosperity in the reign of al-Muʿizz, who died in 617 (1026) or 622 (1031).

His successor was his cousin on the father’s side Ḥanāma b. al-Muʿizz b. ʿĀṭiya. He took advantage of the anarchy then prevailing in Spain to strengthen his position. He surrounded himself with literary men and legal authorities. But in 624 (1032–1033) the pretender of a rival dynasty Abu ʿl-Kamīl Ṭamīm b. Zīrī al-Ifrānī marched from Salē on Fās. Ḥanāma took the field against him with the Maghrāwa but they were defeated. Tamīm entered Fās the same year and persecuted the Jewish population. As to Ḥanāma, he reached Wajdāja (Oujda) and Tenes and gathered there considerable forces, with which he marched on Fās in 629 (1037–1038). Tamīm had to withdraw from Fās and returned to his own capital, ʿIsha [q. v.],
Hamzâna then continued to reign till his death, which probably took place in 431 (1039—1040).

After him the power passed to his son Dûnâs, quickly suppressing a rebellion by one of his cousins, he devoted his reign to the embellishment of Fâs which was then beginning to become a great city, with a large population and a busy trade. This prince died in 452 (1060).

The successor of Dûnâs b. Hamzâna in Fâs was his son al- Futuh, but on his accession his right to the throne was disputed by his brother A’dîjsa. He made himself master of part of the capital, the “bank” (tâbâa) of al-Karawiyân, while al-Futuh established himself on the opposite bank, that of al-Andulâns. The two brothers fought in the town itself and the inhabitants were divided into two camps. Morocco was engulfed in anarchy and it was only after three years of fighting that al-Futuh was able to reign undisputed in Fâs, after A’dîjsa had been killed. A gate of this city perched in the south-west wall still bears his name; another in the north wall bears the name of his brother in a slightly corrupted form (bi’tîq Gisr).

Al-Futuh was driven from his capital in 454 (1062) by the Hammadid sovereigns Bologgin b. Muhammad. This was the time when the Almoravids were beginning to invade Morocco. After the departure of al-Futuh, the Maghrâwa appointed one of his relatives to succeed him, Mu’âllânzar (or Mu’âllannzar) b. Hammad b. al-Mu’izz b. A’tijsa, who was proclaimed in 455 (1063) and took up the struggle against the Saharan invaders. He succeeded in defeating one of the lieutenants of Yusuf b. Tadhin and retaking Fâs, which he had lost. The Almoravids having laid siege to the city, the amir of the Maghrâwa attempted a sortie in the course of which he met his death (25 June 1067—1068). The people of Fâs then proclaimed his son Tamim. But the capital was taken by Yusuf b. Tadhin two years later and the young ruler put to death along with a large number of Maghrâwa and Banû Ifran. This was the end of the dynasty of the Maghrâwa of Fâs. This city, which had enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity under the early members of the dynasty and had been extended by them, later suffered a great deal, according to western historians, from their tyranny and exactions.

According to Ibn Khaldûn, in the period of the decline of Maghrâwa power in Fâs, there was at Aqhmâr, at one of the entrances to the Great Atlas on the plains of Marrâkush, a little dynasty of amirs belonging to the same confederation. The last of these chiefs who flourished about 450—460 (1058—1067) was called Laggût b. Yusuf b. A’dijsa. He was defeated and slain by the Almoravids when they made their successful thrust to the north of Morocco.

The Maghrâwa of Sidjilmâsa (Banû Khažrûn). At the instigation of the hadjib of Cordova, al-Ma’nûsr b. Abi ‘Amir, a Maghrâwa chief in 360 (976/7), had taken Sidjilmâsa (q.v.) which for over two centuries had been governed by amirs of the Mîkâns branch of the Banû Mîrâr. This chief who was called Khažrûn b. Falîfî b. Khažrûn proclaimed the suzerainty of the Umayyads of Spain in Sidjilmâsa and sent to Cordova the head of the last Midrârî ruler al-Mu’tazzi b. Lîlâh. Khažrûn received from al-Ma’nûsr the governorship of the town and kept it till his death. He was succeeded by his son Wânûdîn. The latter had to defend himself against the invasion of the Sâhâda in western Maghrâb and in the end was confirmed in his governorship by the Umayyads in 390 (999) after a period of disgrace. On the fall of the Spanish caliphate he proclaimed himself independent, seized the region of Dra (Darâ) and in 407 (1016—1017) took Sufriyâ (Sefrou [q.v.]) and the valley of the Wâdî Malwiya (Molouia). His son and successor Mas’ûd was defeated, deprived of his lands and slain by the Almoravids in 445 (1053—1054). Ten years later, the last of the Banû Khažrûn, who still held out in Sufriyâ, were in their turn scattered.

On the Maghrâwa dynasty of Tripoli in Barbag. cf. TRIPOLI.


(E. LÉVY-PROVENÇAL)

MAGHRIB, the name given by Arab writers to that part of Africa which modern writers on geography call Barbary or Africa Minor or which includes Tripolitania, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. The word “Maghrîb” means the West, the setting sun, in opposition to “Maghrîk”, the East, the rising sun (Levant), but as Ibn Khaldûn remarks, the general denomination was applied to a particular region. The extent of this area, moreover, varies according to different authors. Some Oriental writers include in the Maghrib not only North Africa but also Spain; the majority, however, reserve the name Maghrib for the first of these countries. But they are not in agreement upon the boundaries to be assigned to it on the East. On the other hand they are in agreement about the Northern, Western and Southern boundaries. To the North, Maghrib is bordered by the “Roman Sea” (Mediterranean). To the West it extends as
far as the "Surrounding Sea", also called the "Green Sea", the "Sea of Darkness", and by foreigners called, according to Ibn Khaldūn, Okeanos or Atlant (Atlantic Ocean), which stretches from Tangier to the desert of Lemptūn (Abu ‘l-Fidā’ī) or only, according to Ibn Khaldūn, as far as Asāfi (Saffī) and Deren (Great Atlas). To the South it stretches as far as the barrier of moving sands, separating the country of the Berbers from the land of the Negroes, that is to say the Erg [cf. ‘Ararf] and as far as the rocky region called "hamnadā" (Ibn Khaldūn). Some districts situated outside this limit, such as Būda, Tamentit, Gītara, Ghdames, Fezzān, Wāddīn, are sometimes considered as belonging to Maghrīb although they are in reality countries of the Sahara. As regards the Eastern boundary, certain authors made it extend as far as the sea of Kūlum (the Red Sea) and thus include in the Maghrīb, Egypt and the country of Barga [see the article BARKA]. Others, whose opinion is adopted by Abu ‘l-Fidā’, maintain it coincides with the actual frontier of Egypt, from the oases as far as the "Akbār" which is on the sea between Barga and Alexandria (Akbat al-Kabīra). Ibn Khaldūn does not accept this delimitation, because, he says, the inhabitants of the Maghrīb do not consider Egypt and Barga as forming part of their country. The latter commences only at the province of Tripoli and encloses the districts of which the country of the Berbers was composed in former times. Ibn Sa‘d and the later Maghrīb writers such as al-Zīyānī and Abu Ra‘s limit themselves to reproducing with a few variations in detail, the boundaries of Ibn Khaldūn. As to Yākūṭ he confines the Maghrīb to the country stretching from Milanīa to Sūs (ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 513).

Confined within the sixth "clime" the Maghrīb is divided into several regions. Ibn Hawāil (Description... transl. de Sélane, f. A., 1841) distinguishes two of them: the Eastern Maghrīb from the frontier of Egypt as far as Zuwila in Tripoli and the Western Maghrīb from this point to Sūs al-Aksā; but the division commonly accepted is that into three regions, Irīkiya, Central Maghrīb and Farther Maghrīb (Abu ‘l-Fidā’, al-Khālidīn etc.). Ibn Sa‘d adopts a slightly different division: Irīkiya, outer Maghrīb, and further Sūs. Irīkiya stretches from Kāsh Almāh near Misrāt (Ibn Sa‘d) to Bougie, Central Maghrīb from Bougie to Mulūya (Ibn Khaldūn), Farther Maghrīb from Mulūya to Asāfi and to Deren, to which must be added al-Sūs which forms as might be said, according to Ibn Khaldūn, an island or country detached from all others and surrounded by seas and mountains.


1. ‘Ali b. al-Husain, Abu l-Hasan. Like his father, ‘Ali was one of the intimate friends of the Ḥamdānī Sa‘īd al-Dawla of Ḥalab. He had also great influence with his son Sa‘īd al-Dawla, but when a cloud came over their friendship, ‘Ali left Ḥalab and went to al-Ra‘ṣafa to Bakdūr, who had been one of Sa‘īd al-Dawla’s Mamūs and persuaded him to enter into negotiations with the Fāṭimid caliph al-A‘zīz bi‘l-Tāh [q.v.] with whom ‘Ali had had relations for a long time. When Bakdūr had been given the governorship of Damascus by al-A‘zīz, at the suggestion of Sa‘īd whom he had made his vizier, he set out against Ḥalab but was defeated in Safār 389 (April 991) whereupon ‘Ali fled to al-Ra‘ṣafa. When Sa‘īd al-Dawla took this town, ‘Ali fled to Kūfā, from whence he wrote to al-A‘zīz and asked permission to come to Egypt. In Dju‘amā‘ I of the same year (July–Aug 991) he reached Egypt and by his advice the caliph sent an army in 383 (993–994) under Mangútegin, then governor of Damascus, against Ḥalab where Abu ‘l-Faḍā‘l, son of Sa‘īd al-Dawla, had now succeeded his father ‘Ali, who took part in the campaign against the caliph’s envoy. The caliph, who was at Muhūr, was at first, on the contrary, bedside, Mangútegin and persuaded Mangútegin to retire, pretending that he lacked supplies. When the Caliph heard of this, he ordered Mangútegin to assume the siege without delay and dismissed ‘Ali at once, who therefore returned to Egypt. ‘Ali made himself very popular with the caliph al-Ḥākim, who succeeded his father al-A‘zīz in 386 (996) as did his son al-Ḥasan also. After a few years, however, he was sacrificed to the suspicions of al-Ḥākim and on the 2nd of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 400 (June 18, 1010) ‘Ali was executed along with his brother Mūhammad and two sons.


2. al-Husain b. ‘Ali, Abu l-Kāsim, called "al-‘Azīr al-Maghrībī"; son of the preceding, was born in Egypt on the 13th of Dhu ‘l-Hijja 370 (June 19th, 981). In 400 (1010) when his father was executed, al-Ḥasan fled from Egypt to al-Ra‘ṣafa to Ḥalab, and then to Ḥasān b. al-Mansūr, emir of the Banū Ṭājīy, and induced him to forswear his allegiance to the Caliph al-Ḥākim and pay homage to the ‘Ālid amir of Mecca, Abu ‘l-Futūh al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḍafā‘. The latter came to al-Ra‘ṣafa and was proclaimed caliph. But when Ḥasān was bled by al-Ḥākim Abu ‘l-Futūh had to return to Mecca while al-Ḥusain sought refuge with Fākhr al-Mulk, vizier of the Būyid Bihār al-Dawla. Although as an Egyptian he was subject to the ‘Abbasid Caliph al-Ḳādir, he was permitted to accompany Fākhr al-Dawla to Wāṣit and remained there till his death. He then went to al-Mawsil where the ʿUkālid Karwāsh took him into his service as secretary. In 414 (1023) the Būyid governor of Irīk Şāfīrī Hilal al-Dawla appointed him vizier. But the very next year he quarrelled with the Turkish mercenaries and fled to Karwāsh. But as he quarrelled with the ‘Abbāsid Caliph on some trifling matter, he had to leave al-Mawsil in the same year. He then went to the court of the ruler of Fīyār Bakr, Naṣr al-Dawla [cf. MARVĀNIŠ], who gave him a sanctuary. Al-Ḥusain died at Mayyāfirān on 13th Rā‘ṣafa 418 (Oct. 17, 1027) and was buried in Kūfā.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt,

3. Muhammad b. ‘Amir b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali, Abu ’l-Faraj, grandson of a brother of the preceding. When Abu ’l-Faraj grew up, he left Egypt and went to the Irak where he lived for a time. After various vicissitudes he returned to Egypt and was appointed head of the Divan al-Qasid by the vizier al-Barizi. He held his office till the dismissal of al-Baziri; the latter’s successor had him arrested. While Abu ’l-Faraj was still in prison, he was himself appointed vizier on 25th Rab‘a‘ II, 450 (June 21, 1058) and given the titles “al-Wazir al-a‘bâl al-kunf al-‘an-dhah fiyyi Amir al-Mamluk wa-al-Hajjajib ‘Ilahiyya.”

After a few years (9th Ramadan 452 = Oct. 7, 1060) he was dismissed and given the control of the chancellery (Divan al-Qasid). He died in 478 (1085—1086).

Bibliography: al-Makrizi, al-Khitat, ii. 158; Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Fatimidendenistan. (K. V. Zettersten)

MAGES. [See MA‘C DIS.]

MAGNISIA (MAHNSIA, MANIS-A), the ancient Magnesia ad Sipyrum, the capital of the Sandafak (now wilâyet) of Sarakhsin in the wilâyet of Smyrna, on the northern slope of the Magnia or Pityusus mountains, and two miles to the south of the river Gediz and 20 miles N. East of Smyrna. The town, celebrated in Greek and Roman antiquity, was occupied by the Turcoman Amir Sarakhsin in the year 713 (began 28th April 1313) and was the capital of his principality and of that of his son Sulaiman, who was buried there with his father in the tube of the family.

Yildirim Sultan Bayazid seized it in the year 702 (began 20th Dec. 1309). Tamerlane collected his treasures there in the year 1402; after the restoration of the Ottoman power, the town saw the rebellions of Barklidje Magusa, a person of the Sandafak. In the war of 1426 Murad II made it one of the first towns in his kingdom and built a palace there in 1444 which is now in ruins. Murad III also contributed to beautifying Magnesia with the Muradiya mosque built in 1591. In 1633 the town was sacked during the rebellion of Elidj Pasha. In 1890 Cuniet put the population at 35,000.


MAHALLA, an Arabic word which, like mahalla from the same root, originally means a place where one makes a halt. Mahalla thus came to have the special meaning of a quarter of a town, a meaning which has also passed into Turkish (e.g. the Yori Mahalla quarter in Constantinople), into Persian and Hindustani (where the popular pronunciation is mahalas); the term formerly applied to a quarter of a town used to be dör (as in old Baghdad). The mahallas are often under the administration of a special official called muhtasir. In Egypt the word mahalla is frequently found as the first element in the names of towns and villages. Here the primitive meaning of place, locality has been preserved, while quarters of a town are rather called khita especially in al-Fustat and Alexandria. According to the Muqaddimah al-Buldan, there are about 100 places in Egypt called al-Mahalla; ‘Ali Pasha Mubarak gives over 30 in al-Khitat al-dajdula (xx. 21 sq.) in addition to the large town of al-Mahalla al-Kubra [q. v.].

(J. H. KRAMERS)

MAHALLA AL-KUBRA or MAHALLA KABIR is the modern name of an important town in the Delta of the Nile at some distance to the west of the Damietta arm, north-east of Tanta. It lies on the Tor‘at al-Milah canal, a branch of the Bahir Shbibin.

In view of the large number of Egyptian geographical names compounded with Mahalla, the identification of the town with the names mentioned by earlier Arabic writers is a matter of some difficulty. Maspero and Wiet indentify it with the Coptich Tha‘r (Amélineau, La géographie de l’Egypte à l’époque copte, Paris 1893, p. 262), but this identification is rendered doubtful by the fact that al-Mahalla is a purely Arabic name (and it also remains to be proved that it is a rendering of the Coptic name just mentioned), and because the work of Abu ‘Ali in the Christian buildings of Egypt makes no mention of this town. The earliest author who knew a town called al-Mahalla or al-Mahalla al-Kubra is al-Ma‘kri (p. 55, 194, 196, 200); he tells us that it was a town of al-Rif built in two parts, one called Sandafa (or Sandafah), but the statement that the town was situated on the river by Alexandria (p. 200) seems to be an error. Al-Bakri seems to know the same town under the name Mahṣalṭ Mahru (Kitāb al-Ma‘alik wa-l-Ma‘allik, Brit. Mus. MS. Idri‘, Description de l’Afrique, p. 158, calls the town simply al-Mahalla and knows a canal called after it. Yâ‘qûb’s statements are confused, for he speaks of a town called Mahallat Daqalah and of another Mahallat Sharqiyin (iv. 428), both of which seem to refer to the same place. Mahallat Sharqiyin in Yâ‘qûb—which he also calls Mahallat al-Kubra—forms one town, the Nile and Sandafah, and on the other hand he says that Mahalla Daqalah between al-Khira and Dimyat is the largest of the Mahallas that he knows (cf. also Abu‘l-Fida‘, ii. 160), while the geographer al-Dimishkî (p. 231) knows Mahalla Daqalah as the capital of the Kura of Daqalah; Ibn Dhu‘ayb (v. 82) says that the governorship of this town was regarded as “the little vizirate” (al-wizira‘ al-saghirah).

The name Mahallat Sharqiyin is again found in al-Makrizi (ed. Wiet, iii. 207). It is clear from these writers that the town was an important commercial centre from the tenth century onwards. It does not seem however to have played any considerable part in history, although ‘Ali Pasha Mubarak quotes some events that took place there, from al-Ma‘kri and al-Djasbati. In Egypt in the sixteenth century the town had to give way to Tanta, which became the capital of the mudhiry of al-Gharya, while al-Mahalla became the capital of a smaller administrative area; ‘Ali Mubarak estimates its inhabitants at 50,000, while the 1928 Baederker only gives it 33,500. It is at present a centre of the cotton trade; raw cotton is there cleaned in the factories. Of the many individuals who bear the nisba al-Mahalli, the most celebrated is Djalal al-Din al-Mahalli [q.v.] who was born here.

Bibliography: Maspero et Wiet, Ma-
MAHALLA AL-KUBRÁ — AL-MAHDI

térieux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, Cairo 1919, p. 164 and the bibliography there given; ‘Ali Pasha Mubarak, al-Khitāf al-dājdida, XV. (Bulaq 1305), p. 15 sqq.

(J. H. Kramers)

MAHARI or MAKARI, a negro tribe also called Kotoko, living on both banks of the Lower Logone below Musgum and on both banks of the Lower Chari from Lake Chad to Fort Lamy and Kusseri.

They are usually divided into three groups: the Lagwere on the Logone, where they are mixed with Musgu, the Semsir at Kusseri and the Sungwal Kwe at Guelfi. These natives do not seem to be autochthonous; the first occupants of the country according to tradition were the Kerebina, who are perhaps related to the ancient people of the Sao or So. As a rule, tall and slim, lank and bony, they have a narrow head and dark skin; they make three parallel cicatrices on the forehead, the middle one of which runs from the top of the nose to the roots of the hair. They speak languages akin to the Sao, Kuri and Buduma. They are nearly connected with the Musgu, with whom they form the Massa group. The Kanuri have passed on to them the Muslim religion and a certain degree of civilization.

The Makari or Kotoko are agriculturists and fishermen; they grow different kinds of millet, maize earnuts and grind their corn with a quern. Fishing provides them with an abundant supply of food; they follow it in large pirogues, about 40 feet long and two to four feet wide. These crafts which are propelled by poles or paddles, have a flat-bottom and a raised bow and stern; they are built of strong planks bound together with fibre passed through holes which after being tied, are caulked with various barks. This is how they come to be described as sewn. They carry 25 to 30 persons. The Kotoko fish with a large net mounted on two places forked in different directions at the front and manoeuvred by a lever. This net is lowered to touch the bottom by a little pirogue rowed by children drives the fish towards the fishing boat by striking the water with poles. The apparatus is lifted as soon as the fish have entered it.

The homes of the Makari are built of clay, are fairly large and comparatively comfortable. The walls are about 6 feet high; they have an elliptical door about 5 feet high; the roof is of straw and hemispherical in shape. Inside is a bed of clay, shelves of clay to hold household utensils and the fireplace. Sometimes there is also a bed made of thongs of hide laced round a framework. There are a few related to the Makari country; they are generally grouped in villages of which the most important are Logone, Gana (Little Logone), Kannak Logone or Logone Berni (Great Logone) and Kusseri. They used all to be surrounded by circular ditches and clay walls pierced by several narrow gates. These defences were intended to protect the inhabitants from the frequent attacks of their neighbours.

The population includes smiths, potters, weavers and a few traders. There are a few Arabs among them. Politically the Makari belonged to the ancient empire of Bornou [q.v.]. They were divided into several small vassal states; that of Karnak Logone showed more independence.


MAHDUB, the name given in North Africa and Egypt (cf. Dozy, Supplement, s. v.) to the Turkish gold sequin, contraction for ZERMAYE

(Mahdawis, the followers of Sayyid Muhammad Mahdi, of Djawnpur, near Banaras, 847–910 (1443–1504), who declared that he was the promised Mahdi [q. v.] and by his preaching gained a number of adherents in Ahmadabad [q.v.] and other parts of Gujrat. His followers credited him with the power of working miracles, raising the dead, healing the blind and the dumb, etc. For a time they were allowed to profess their faith unmolested and add to their number by proselytising, but in the reign of Mquisites I. Sultan of Gujrat (1513–1526) they were persecuted and many of them put to death. Awanzebe [q.v.] also persecuted them when in 1645 he was governor of Ahmadabad. In consequence of these persecutions, the Mahdawis to the present day practise tâziya [q.v.] and wish to pass as orthodox Muslims; their exact number is therefore uncertain, but they are found in small groups in mo-t parts of Gujrat, in Bombay, Sind, the Dakhan [q.v.] and Upper Hindustan. They believe that Sayyid Muhammad was the last Imām, the promised Mahdi, and in consequence of his having come, they are said by their religious opponents neither to repent for their sins nor to pray for the souls of their dead. They observe certain ceremonies peculiar to themselves at marriages and funerals. By their enemies they are styled Ghar-Ghadhis, i.e. those who do not believe in a Mahdi who is still to come; but the Mahdawis themselves apply this designation to other Muhammadans as having failed to recognise the Mahdi who has already appeared.

Bibliography: Sikandar b. Muhammad, Mirāt-i Sibandi, p. 136–138, Bombay 1891 (English transl. by Fazulullah Lutfullah Faridi, p. 90–91); H. Blochmann, Translation of the Aʿin-i Akbari, Introduction, p. iv–v, Calcutta 1873; Dāʾfar Sharif, Qanoon-e-Islam, 2nd ed., p. 171–172, Madras 1863; ed. W. Crooke, p. 208–209, Oxford 1921; Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, vol. i., part ii., p. 62–64, Bombay 1899; Hastings’ Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vi. 189 (Goldzirer on Ghair Mahdi); Goldzirer, Vorlesungen über den Islam, Heidelberg 1925, in the Makari country; al-Mahdawī (A.), means literally “the guided one”, and, as all guidance (khdā) is from Allah, it has come to mean the divinely guided one, guided that is, in a peculiar and individual way. For Allah, in the intense and immediate theism of Islam, is guiding every one and everything in the world, whether by the human reason or by the instincts of the lower animals, to a knowledge of Himself and to what is needed for their existence and continence (Lisān, x. 228, 290). One of His names is al-khátī, “the Guide” (Kurān, xxii. 53; xx. 122), and the idea of His guidance is reiterated in the Kurān. For a statement of its different kinds see Baidawi on Kurān, i. 5 (Fleischer’s ed., i. 8, ll. 21 sqq.); Musnad
of al-Râghib al-Iṣfahânî, p. 560 of ed. Cairo 1324; al-Maqrîzî al-sani'î of al-Ghazâlî, p. 580 of ed. Cairo 1324. But it is singular that the word mahdi (the passive participle of the I Stem) never occurs in the Kur'an and that the passive of that stem occurs only four times. In the usage of the Kur’an, the VIII stem, ma'dûd, strictly “he accepted guidance for himself”, is used as a quasi or reflexive passive. Thus the man whom Allâh guides is not simply “guided” but reacts himself to the divine guidance.

There seems to be no original authority for the vocalisation al-Mahdi which Edward Pococke gave as Nî, xvi, of the Sigils in his Porta Mecâni, ii, 203 of ed. 1655, with the meaning “director”; cf. Lane’s note in the Supplement to his lexicon, p. 3042 c Margoliouth (article cited below, p. 337a) suggests that it may mean “the giver” and refers to traditions (see below) of the Mahdi bestowing uncounted wealth; but there does not seem to be any oriental authority for this epithet. Also, the verb used in these traditions is di'mâ, who is mahdi, or al-mahdi, is in a different position; he is absolutely guided. It is used of certain individuals in the past and of an eschatological individual in the future. Thus the iṣâ’ (sx. 229, 1. 9 from below) quotes from a tradition “the usage of the Khalifs who followed the right way and were guided” (summa't ushkalajī a'srâ’ all-mahdiyin), meaning the first four Khalifas, and goes on to state that it is applied especially, as a name, to the Mahdi of whom the Prophet gave good tidings that he would come in the Fm of Time. There are many other instances of the non-eschatological application of the term mahdi to historical personages. Goldziher (Fortunaten, p. 267, n. note 13, 7) has gathered a number of such cases: Thus Djârîr (Nâhî’î, ed. Rivâ, Noh. 104, v. 29) applies it to Abraham and Hasan b. ‘Abbâs (Dâ’ûn, ed. Tanis, 24, 1) to Muhammad; see, too, Ibn Sa’d (xi, 94, 4). It is often applied by Sunnîtes to ‘Ali, in distinction even to the other three Khalifas; thus in al-Ǧâba’a (iv, 31. 2) he is khâlid us-mahdiyin, and Sulamân b. Naufal calls ‘Abd-Allâh, after his death, “Mahdi son of the Mahdi” (Tâbarî, Tārikh, ed. Leydon, Ser. ii, p. 546, 11). Farâbî and Djârîr applied it as an honorific to the Umayyad Khalifas. As applied by the pious to ‘Umar II, the Umayyad (Ibn Sa’d, v. 245, 1), it seems to have been more than an honorific; he was regarded as a real muṣâhidh [q. v.] and under peculiar divine guidance. In the view of later Islam he was the first of these “renewers” of the Faith and the eighth and last of these would be either the Mahdi, a descendant of the Prophet, or Ikh (al-maṭbî al-muṣkatî), according to the two positions; cf. article Ikh. See on the whole question of the Muṣâhidh and his relation to the Mahdi: Goldziher, Zur Charakteristik der nabi’îns, in S. B. d. A., Wien, lxix, p. 10 sgg. It is characteristic of Islam to take a very pessimistic view of human nature: men always fall away from the faith and have to be brought back. This will be so especially towards the end of the world. Men will become thoroughly secular and Allâh will leave them to themselves. The Ka’bah will vanish, and the copies of the Kur’an will become blank paper, and its words will vanish also, from the memories of men. They will think only of poems and songs. Then the end will come.

In a similar heightened sense the term Mahdi was applied by Ibn al-Ta’awwîd (Divân, ed. Margoliouth, p. 105, 5, 6) to the ‘Abbâsî Khalifa al-Nâṣir (A. H. 575—622); he is the Mahdi and no other eschatological Mahdi need be looked for. In a narrower but more true etymological sense it came to be applied to the converts to Islam: Allâh always guided these to the right Way. For such, Turks use the more Kur’anic term muḥâdî; see above for the distinction. Goldziher (p. 268) gives cases. In a heightened sense, also, the term was applied very early (A. H. 66) to Muhammad b. al-Ḥanâfiya, a son of ‘Ali by another wife than Fâṭima. After the death of ‘Abd-Allâh b. Mâ khuṭîr b. ‘Abî ‘Uchâd put forward this Muhammad as a claimant of the Khalifate and called him “the Mahdi, son of the legatee (al-wâfi)”, a term applied to ‘Ali by those who asserted that the Prophet had bequeathed the headship of the people to him (Tâbarî, Ta’rikh, ii, p. 534). This was after the deaths of Hasan and Husain; the two sons of Allâh by Fâṭima, the daughter of the Prophet, and shows a different drift to the inheritance of the Imâmîte from that of the Shi’ite legitimists. This Muhammad was heir as the son of ‘Ali and not as possessing the blood of the Prophet. He seems himself to have declined the dignity thus thrust upon him but, muṣâhid ‘îs, he became the founder of the Kâsîniyya sect which looked for his return from his grave in Mount Râdâw, where he remains undying. This was maintained by the poet Kuṭbâhirî (d. 105 = 723) and by the Sâyi’î al-Ḥimyârî (d. 173 = 789; Aghâhî, vii, 32; cf. Mâṣîhî, Paris ed., v. 180 sgg.). Muhammad thus had become an “eschatological Mahdi munir” like the Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi’ites. For the position of the Kâsîniyya see Shahrârâni’s Milâl wa-Nihâl, ed. on margin of Ibn Ḥazm, i, 196: Mâ khuṭîr, disgusted with Muhammad, eventually founded the Mâ khuṭîrîyya sect which was strict Shi’ite and upheld Fâṭima b. ‘Ali (Shahrârâni, p. 197). The whole episode is interesting as showing the extreme fluidity of the religious-political parties at the time. It also shows very clearly how the term mahdi gradually hardened from being a general honorific to a special designation, and even a proper name, for a restorer of the faith in the last days.

The Hidden Imam of the Twelve Shi’ites, whose return (ruḍ’î) is awaited, is also called, by the Shi’a, al-Mahdi. But his status is entirely different from that of the future restorer looked for by the Sunnîtes. The very essence of Sunni Islam is that the Muslim people shall rule itself and can attain truth and certainty by its own exertions. When, at any time, its qualified scholars (muâjjihâd’s) have applied the three ni’āl — Khâriq, Sunna, A’zîr — to any point of Islam and have come to an agreement (lîqâ’î) on it, that point is assured and the acceptance of it as of faith is binding on all Muslims. The idea of an absolute Mahdi, there being an infallible guide, suggests too much that tekhîl [q. v.], which the later Sunnî theologians rejected. Sunni Islam, as Goldziher has taught us, is a recoil against the idea of blind submission to any human teacher. Even Iṣâ, as restorer, is called muḥâdî, which is much less emphatic in its suggestion of infallibility. Yet the masses demanded an absolute restorer and it was among the masses that the belief in a Mahdi was, and is, strong. To return — the
Mahdi, or ʻIsa when he comes as a restorer and ruler, will restore and apply that Consensus of Islam which has been reached by the successive generations of mufaddalīs. Thus the Muslim people not only rules itself but is also the ultimate and infallible interpreter of the revelation through the Prophet. The Shi‘ites, on the other hand, admit no such authority either in the Muslim people or in their own mufaddalīs; by Kūrān, Sunna, [hlīyā and ʻIbtāl] certainty can only be gained from the instruction (ʿaṣlīm; cf. Goldziher’s Straitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Bāṭinīyūn, Sects, of the hidden Imām who is divinely protected (maqūṭūn) against all error and sin and whose function it is to interpret Islam to men. The mufaddalīs of the Shi‘a are his intermediaries with men; but they in their intermediation may err. When the Hidden Imām returns he will rule personally by divine right. He is called a Mahdi, but it is in a different sense from any Sunnite use of that term. The idea of protection against error and sin (ʿīnā; see article above, ii., p. 543) seems to have been introduced into Sunnite Islam from the Mu‘tazīite system by Fāṭḥi al-Dīn Abū ʿUmar al-Rāzī (d. 606 = 1209; see, further, Goldziher in Ḥṣ., iii. 238–245), but there it has been limited strictly to prophets. No “successor” (khāṭīf) can enjoy it and the Mahdi, for those Sunnites who expect him, is strictly an ultimate khalīfa of the Prophet. For those Sunnites who look to ʻIsa to play the part of the Mahdi he will not return as a prophet in his own right. It will not be a return (raḍḍū) in his case but simply a “descendent” (nāfīl) and he will rule according to the law (ṣaḥī’a) of Muhammad; see article ʻIsa above, ii., p. 525. As all Shi‘ite sects agree on this status of their Imām it is unnecessary to go into further details on them; see in general, article ʻIsa.

Another important point of difference between Shi‘ites and Sunnites as to the Mahdi is that he is an essential part of the Shi‘ite creed but not of the Sunnite. That there will be a final restorer of the faith all Sunnite Islam believes as a part of its eschatology, but not that he will be called Mahdi. There is no mention of the Mahdi in either of the two Sahīh’s, of Muslim or of Bukhārī. Similarly Sunnite systematic theologians do not deal with him. The Mutawwābi of al-Iṣāqī has nothing on him; nor, indeed, on any of the Signs of the Hour (ayrāt al-sī‘a; cf. article Kullama). Nasa’ī in his Ṣajjīl has, of these, only al-Daḍidjal (see article above, vol. i., p. 880) and the Descent of ʻIsa; Taltāzanī, in his commentary, gives ten Signs but not the Mahdi. Even al-Ghazālī, a popularizing theologian, has nothing on the Signs in the last Book of his Ḥikāya, that on eschatology, and has only a slight allusion in the Book dealing with the ʿHadīq (ed. 1334, i. 218; Ḥift, the commentary of the Saṭayīd Murtuḍā, iv. 279) to the coming of al-Daḍidjal, the descent of ʻIsa and his slaying of al-Daḍidjal; there is no mention of the Mahdi either in the text or in the commentary. Al-Ghazālī’s whole point in this passage is to stress the final falling away from the faith of all men to which reference has been made above.

It was, then, in the hearts of the Muslim multitude that the faith in the Mahdi found its resting-place and support. In the midst of growing darkness and uncertainty — political, social, moral, theological — they clung to the idea of a future deliverer and restorer and of a short millennium before the end. This belief is, therefore, expressed in a multitude of later traditions, often expansions and expositions of better authenticated and older traditions, and often linking themselves to old stories of inter-tribal and inter-dynastic conflicts in the civil wars after the murder of ʿUthmān. We, therefore, find among them references to historical movements and sects which had failed in their time but had left remains, if only a name, to add to the confusion of this eschatological lore. These are gathered up in later edifying collections, such as the Tadhkira of Abū ʻAbd Allāh al-Ḵūṭūbī (d. 671 = 1272; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 415) which we have in a Muhktarār by al-Shārīnī (d. 973 = 1565; Brockelmann, ii. 335; ed. Cairo 1324) and the Muhktar al-Anwar of a modern writer, Ḥasan al-Iddi al-Ḥamāzī (d. 1303 = 1886; Brockelmann, ii. 486; many editions).

But the clearest presentation of the alleged basis for this belief is given by Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808 = 1406) in his Muqaddima (ed. Quatremère, i. 142 sqq.; Būlāq, folio ed., 1274, p. 151 sqq.; transl. by De Slane, ii. 156 sqq.). “A section on the descendant of Fāṭima and what will be said as to him and on clearing up the obscurity as to that. It has been commonly accepted (mahktūr) among the masses (al-qāṣī) of the people of Islam, as the ages have passed, that there must needs appear in the End of Time a man of the family of Muhammad (mas‘ī al-bi‘r) who will aid the Faith (din) and make justice triumph; that the Muslims will follow him and that he will reign over the Muslim kingdoms and be called al-Mahdi. The appearance of al-Daḍidjal and of the other Signs of the Last Day (ayrāt al-sī‘a), which are established in sound tradition (al-qasāb) will come after him. ʻIsa will descend after his appearance and will kill al-Daḍidjal or will descend along with him and aid him in that killing; and in Worship ʻIsa will follow the Mahdi as his Imām. In support of this position traditions are used which some authorities on tradition have alleged and which others have disputed and often opposed with other narrations. The later Ṣafīs have followed another course and method of proof in the case of this descendant of Fāṭima and often seek support, as to that, in the mystical “unveiling” (kasāf) which is the basis of their method.”

This is a very careful statement of the strictly popular drift in Ibn Khaldūn’s time, a drift with which he evidently had no sympathy. He goes on to give formally 24 traditions bearing upon this restorer and adds six variants, criticizing the authenticity of them all. In only 14 of these is this restorer named Mahdi. For references to traditions on the Mahdi in Ḥanbal’s Manṣūr, Abū Da‘ūd’s Sunan, Tirmidhī’s Sahīh and Ibn Mādīja’s Sunan, see Wensinck’s Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition under Mahdi; in the Majābī al-Sunna of al-Baghawi, see ii. 134 of ed. Cairo 1318 and in the Murṣī al-Maṣūḥā, see p. 399–401 of ed. Dīhī 1327. All these, however, have only a certain number of the mass of traditions quoted by Ibn Khaldūn. In the Tadhkīr of al-Ḵūṭūbī, on the other hand, there are (p. 117–121 of ed. Cairo 1324) a further mass of luxuriant detail which Ibn Khaldūn had evidently disdain engaged to incorporate; cf. his later reference to the town Mūṣa, p. 173, l. 7. In the Tadhkīr the Prophet, for example, foretells the future conquest and re-conquest of Spain by name. Al-

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
Kurtubī died in 617 (1272) in the first years of the Nasirids of Granada when Granada was the only part of Spain left to the Muslims. He and those around him felt grievously the need of such a restored and Mahīdī, and detailed traditions sprang up as to his coming. The situation called for a mightier and more specific champion of Islam than ʿIṣā whose business strictly was to kill al-Dadīdī. Devotion, also, to the blood of the Prophet, of whom the Mahīdī was to come, and which was so strong even in the Sunnite Magribī, may have helped the al-Kurtubī's Mahīdī to come from the Magribī as opposed to the earlier ones who were to come from Syria or Khurāsān. He will come from a place in the Dījāl of the Magribī, on the shore of the sea, called Māsā; they will swear allegiance to him there and again, a second time, at Mecca. Here the tradition joins and attempts to explain an earlier one, given by Abū Daʿūd and quoted by Ibn Khaldūn (p. 143; see, also, below), telling of an expedition against Kahlī and of the booty of Kahlī, thus linking up with the earliest inter-tribal conflicts. This Western Mahīdī will also kill al-Sufyānī who is supported by Kahlī. This is not the place to enter upon the history of the Marwānīs, how the Umayyads supplanted their cousins, the Sufyānīs. But from the early history of Islam there is the mystery connected with the voluntary abdication and speedy death of Muʿāwiyah II, the successor of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam and the sudden death or assassination of Wālid b. Uthmān b. ʿAbd Sufyān (fuṭūna wa-sirājat maṣṣūla, Masʿādī, Paris, ed. v. 170) at the burial of Muʿāwiyah II, there seems to have sprung an Imāmī party among the Umayyads (ṣaḥāḥ b. b. al-ʿImāmīyā min al-ʿImāmīyā, al-Ghāzālī in Goldscher's Streitschrift, p. 14 of the Arabic text); yet this Wālid appears later alive in Tabārī’s narrative. In the account of Khālid b. Yazīd in the Aṣḥābī (xvi. 58) there is a story that he was the first to start this (ṣaḥāḥ khābār al-Sufyānī wa-khābār al-ʿImāmīyāy) although that is also denied and a more general and earlier origin is asserted. In the civil war at the rise of the Abhābīs, one of the “white”, i.e. Umayyads, revolted in support of the claims of the “Sufyānī of whom there used to be mention” (ṣaḥāḥ khābār b. b. al-Ṣufyānī b. b. Khābār as-suḥābā b. b. al-ʿImāmīyāy), although that last origin has never been heard of; the earth will bring forth its fruits and the heavens shall not pass away; the Hour shall not come until then. He will be of the People of my House (min ash-hāṭī); of my kindred (min ʿinārī); of my Nation (min ʿummatī), of the offspring of Fāṭima (min waḥāl Fāṭima); his name will be my name and his father’s name my father’s name. He will resemble the Prophet in disposition (ṣaḥāḥ) but not in appearance (khalil); this is put in the mouth of ʿAli. He will be bale of the forehead, hook-nosed, high-nosed. He will find the world full of evil and oppression and ungodliness; if a man say: “Allāh! Allāh!” he will be killed. He will fill the world with equity and justice; he will beat men until they return to Allāh (al-khaṭīb). The Muslims will enjoy under him prosperity, the like of which has never been heard of; the earth will bring forth its fruits and the heavens will pour down its rain; money in that day will be like that which is trodden under foot and will be uncounted; a man will stand up and say: “O Mahīdī, give to me,” and he will say: “Take!” and he will pour into his robe as much as he can carry. It is suggested that this is a tafsīr, legitimate or illegitimate, of a tradition in the Sahih of Muslim: “There will come in the end of my nation a khalīfa who will scatter wealth, not counting it!”. See many references for this munificent khalīfa and the abundance of money in the last days in Wensinck, Handbuck of Tradition, p. 1068. But in this tradition, as in all Muslim and Bukhārī, there is no mention of the Mahīdī. Again: the Mahīdī is of us, the People of the House. Allāh will bring him suddenly and unexpectedly (ṣaḥāḥ bi-luḥūm wa-l-ṣaḥāḥ fi ṣīlahu); he will rule five, seven, nine years. There are frequent allusions to his coming in a time of dissensions (ṣīlah). These will be such that it will take a voice from heaven to still them, saying: “Your Amir is so-and-so” (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 162). This is very likely an ironical comment, but it is cited as a simple foretelling. In the earlier traditions he will come from the East (al-Mahīdī, Khurāsān), from beyond the River (Oxus); in later times (e.g. Kurtubī
and Ibn Khaldūn, p. 171—176) he was to come from the wide, unknown, lands of the Maghrib. The original Black Banners (ra'yāt šāb) tradition about the ʿAbbāsids, apparently forged to lead them to support the ʿAlids, does not mention the Mahdi (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 153), but in an evidently later form there is added, "for he is the khalifa of Allah, the Mahdi" (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 159). One long tradition (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 148) may be given entire as an illustration of a type and because of the later expansion and use of it by Kūtubi: "There will arise a difference at the death of a khalifa and a man of the people of al-Madinah will go forth, seeking to Mecca. Then some of the people of Mecca will accept him and make him go out (apparently rise in insurrection) against his will and they will swear allegiance to him between the Rub'a and the Maṣjīm. And an army will be sent against (or, "to", ill.) him from Syria but will be swallowed up in the earth in the desert (al-baṣārah) between Mecca and al-Madinah. Whenever the people see that, the ʿAbbāl ("Substitutes" or "Nobles") of Syria and the ʿAṣāʾir ("Companions" or "Sectaries"; see Lane, p. 2059b) of al-Irāq will come to him and they will swear allegiance to him. Thereafter there will arise a man of Kūrāsh with maternal grandfathers of Kūrāsh, and they will accept him as the Mahdi, and it will overcome them and that will be the expedition (baʿth) of Kūrāsh. And oh! the disappointment of some of those who will not have part in the booby of Kūrāsh! He will divide the wealth and rule over the people according to the sunna of their Prophet and he will subject himself to the support of ʿAlām. He will remain seven or nine years and then die and the Muslims will pray over him. This is evidently an echo of the early ʿAlid conflicts and is not eschatological nor does it mention the Mahdi. But its motifs of the ʿAbbāl and of the earth swallowing up in the desert (al-baṣārah) re-appear in other traditions which are connected with the end of the time (p. 156, 161) and it is worked into al-Kūtubī's tradition about the Mahdi from the Maghrib. Again, in a tradition evidently eirenics between the ʿAbbāsids and the ʿAlīds, the Muslims are exhorted to "turn to the youth of the tribe of ʿAzmān (ʿalakum bi ʿl-fata ʿl-tamimī) for he will come from the East and will be the standard-bearer of the Mahdi!" (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 162). But it is plain, too, that the doctrine of the Mahdi arose late and was not generally received. Thus the doctrine of al-Daḍḍīdī is fixed in all Muslim eschatology, official and popular, but a tradition tries to assert that belief in the Mahdi is more of Faith than belief in him: "Whether he denies the Mahdi is an unbeliever but whoever denies al-Daḍḍīdī is only denied" (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 144). On the other hand a tradition asserts that there is no Mahdi but ʿIsa. The upholders of the Mahdi tried to turn this by saying that it means that no one ever spoke in the cradle (mahdū; Kurāsh, iii. 41) except ʿIsa (Ibn Khaldūn, p. 163; Kūtubī, p. 118). For al-Kuṭbī, another restorer who is not mentioned in any of the collections of traditions used above, see article ʿAṣāʾir, above, vol. ii., p. 630a and Snouck Hurgronje's article Der Mahdi, p. 12 (Ver. Geschr., i. 156).

The later, therefore, we go and the more popular are our sources the more fixed do we find the belief in the eschatological Mahdi. The more, too, the Muslim masses have felt themselves oppressed and humiliated, either by their own rulers or by non-Muslims, the more fervent has been their longing for this ultimate restorer of the true ʿAlām and conqueror of the whole world for ʿAlām. And as the need for a Mahdi has been felt, the Mahdi has always appeared and ʿAlām has risen, sword in hand, under their banner. It is impossible here to give the history of these risings. See for details upon them the article Mahdi by Margoliouth in Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, viii. 336—340 and Goldziher, Vorlesungen, p. 231, 268, 291. For the Sudanese Mahdi, see especially Snouck Hurgronje's article Der Mahdi, reprinted in Ver. Geschr., i., p. 147—158. The condition, also, a fundamental discussion of the origin and history of the idea of a restorer in ʿAlām; see also beneath, s.v. MUHAMMAD AḤMAD.

Bibliography: has been given in the course of the article. The three important treatments of the subject are undoubtedly those by Snouck Hurgronje, Goldziher and Margoliouth.

(D. B. Macdonald)

AL-MAḤDĪ, ʿABD ʿABBĀS ʿABD ALLĀH MUḤAṢ̣-MMAD, a m ʿABBĀSĪD CĀLĪPḤ. His father was the Caliph al-Manṣūr, his mother was called Umma Mūṣā bint al-Manṣūr b. ʿAbd Allāh and belonged to the family of the Ummayyids of Syria. He became heir to the throne on the death of his cousin, the governor of Khurāsān ʿAbd al-Dāḏīdī b. ʿAbd al-Qāḥṣān [q.v.] rebelled, the Caliph sent his son Muhammad al-Mahdi with an army against him; the real commander was Khāzīm b. Khāzīm. After taking ʿAbd al-Dāḏīdī prisoner, al-Mahdi by his father's orders undertook an expedition against Tabārisīn which had to submit to him [cf. ʿABŪ G.], In 144 (761—762) he returned to the Ṭrāq where he married Rawāt, the daughter of the Caliph Abū ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Ṣaffāh. For the next few years he lived in al-Rayy. ʿIssa b. Mūsā had long been designated as successor to the throne but he was persuaded by al-Manṣūr to waive his rights in favour of al-Maḥdī, and after the defeat of al-Manṣūr in Ibn ʿUthaimīn’s Revolt (Oct. 79) al-Mahdi was recognised as Caliph. He made himself very popular by his liberality and gentleness, although several cruel deeds are credited to him. For example he had the son of the vizier Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥāṣ̣-āy[a b. ʿUṭmah Allāh [q.v.], executed on a mere suspicion and another vizier Yaḥyā b. Jāwūd who had fallen into disfavour with him was thrown into a prison so dark that he lost the use of his eyes. In 160 (776—777) a rebellion broke out in the always unruly Khurāsān; the leader of the rebels, Yūsuf b. ʿIbāḥīm, was however defeated and taken prisoner whereupon the Caliph had him executed in the most brutal fashion. The war against the Byzantines was continued under al-Mahdi. In continual raids to plunder and devastate the marches, the two opponents sought to do each other as much harm as possible; there was however never any thought of permanently occupying any territory temporarily conquered. On the whole the advantage lay with the Muslims and in the early stages they advanced as far as Angora. Michael Lachanodrakon however with a Byzantine army advanced against them, destroyed the fortress of al-Ḥadāth [q.v.], which however was soon rebuilt, and had the land waste as far as the Syrian frontier (162 = 778/779). In the following year al-Mahdi equipped a great expedition in which his son Hārūn took part against
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the Byzantines and in 165 (782) Hārōn took the
field again, accompanied by the Caliph's favourite
al-Kābi b. Vūnus, later vizier. This time the
Muslims penetrated to the Bosphorus and the
Empress Irene was forced to make a three years'
truce and to promise to pay an annual tribute.
In Ramadan 168 (March/April 785), however,
the truce was broken by the Byzantines and
hostilities lasted till the death of al-Mahdi,
without however any decision being reached.
In his reign appeared the sectarian fanatic al-
Muhanna, who gave the Caliph's troops much
trouble and sustained a long siege in a fortress
in the region of Kāshā, till finally he poisoned
himself in 165 (779/780) in order not to fall alive
into the hands of his enemies. In other parts of
the empire also, heretics, especially real or alleged
Manicheans (Zindī), were treated with the utmost
severity. Al-Mahdi acquired great merit by his
work for the peaceful development of his empire;
new roads were laid down and the postal system
improved; trade and industry reached a prosperity
hitherto unknown and scholars were richly rewarded.
At the same time there appeared an undesirable
tendency to extravagance, which in the end was to
prove really fatal, and with al-Mahdi began
that expenditure of the revenues on useless luxury,
which contributed not a little under his succe-
sors to the ruin of the 'Abbāsid empire. In time the
Caliph fell under the control of his courtiers
and in particular allowed himself to be guided by
his chamberlain al-Kābi b. Vūnus and especially by
his wife al-Khaizūrān, formerly a slave who was
the mother of two sons, Mūsā and Hārūn. As
early as 160 (776) honours had been paid to the
former as successor designate under the name of
al-Hādī in place of 'Uth b. Mūsā [q. v.] and six
years later al-Mahdi had his younger son Hārūn
proclaimed as successor to al-Hādī. But as Kha-
izūrān preferred Hārūn and he was also supported
by the Banūmūsids, the Caliph decided to alter
the succession in favour of him: al-Hālī, who
was then in Dūr̄ān refused to agree. Al-Mahdi
thereupon set out to discuss the matter with him
in person, but died suddenly on the 22nd Muharram
169 (Aug. 4, 785) in Māsāchānān at the age of
43. As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the best
among the 'Abbāsids.

(See Ibn Tūmart.)

AL-MAHDI [See Muhammad Ashhad.]
and his Christians. In spite of all the efforts of al-Mahdi, the blockade of Cordova became more and more strict. He then tried to put on the throne the caliph Hishām II b. al-Mu‘ayyadh whom he had himself deposed and then given out that he was dead, but this was in vain. On 16th Rabi‘ I, 400 (Nov. 7, 1009) the palace of the caliph was in the hands of the besiegers. Al-Mahdi’s only hope was to hide himself. The pretender of the Berbers, Sulaimān, received the oath of allegiance at al-Cordova and assumed the honorific title of al-Mahdi b. Sulaimān.

In the following month al-Mahdi was able to leave Cordova secretly and seek refuge in Toledo where he was well received by the inhabitants. He then sought and obtained an alliance with the Catalans (Ifrāqī) who marched with him on Cordova in Shawwāl 400 (May–June 1010). The town was taken and the second reign of al-Mahdi began with a bloody persecution of all the Berbers in Cordova. To avenge the wrongs of their fellow-countrymen in the capital, the Berbers in the army of Sulaimān al-Mustā’in returned to besiege the city. Al-Mahdi, betrayed by his servants, was slain during the siege in the palace of Cordova by the hands of al-Mu‘ayyadh, al-Dhul-Hajjāj 400 (July 23, 1010). His first reign lasted nine months, the second less than two.


**MAHDI KHAH, MILZA MUHAMMAD MAHDI ASTARKHOS B. MUHAMMAD, HISTORIAN OF NADIR SHAH OF PERSIA, whose deeds he recorded in the Ta’rikh-i Djahan Gushayi-i Nādiri; this work written in Persian is an excellent complement to those by James Fraser and Jonas Hanway on the conqueror. In it Mahdi Khān details the life of Nādir from his birth to his death while other Persian writers only deal with periods of it (e.g. Mahsīn b. ʿImānī records only the expedition to India in his Dīnawar-i Şammmā; Abd al-Karim Kashmiri in his Bayān-i Vahlī conserves himself to the period from this expedition to 1784). W. Jones in his introduction to the Ta’rikh of Mahdi Khān says that “the narrative of these perpetual rebellions... is somewhat dry and fatiguing”; as to the boundless praise which he bestows on the author’s style, especially the descriptions of spring at the beginning of each year, it is exaggerated; in these descriptions all the images used had been employed to satiety for years before. It is true that some works of the period are still more hackneyed. Mahdi Khān himself gives free train to this vexatious tendency in another version of his Ta’rikh which he published in 1748 only: Durvar-i Nādir, in a style uniformly artificial and elaborate. Malcolm (History of Persia) reproaches Mahdi Khān with having been too flattering to Nādir; he recognises however that the historian has spoken frankly of the cruelties which were a blot upon the latter part of the reign. Mahdi Khān was Nādir’s secretary. This is revealed not only in the accuracy of his details but in certain statements also. Mahdi, for example, says that he was with the prince when the latter received news of the birth of a grandson (transl. Jones i. 191); at the end of his reign Nādir sent him on a diplomatic mission to the Sultan of Turkey (ii. 179). H. Brydges (Abd-er-Kazzak, History of the Kajart, London 1833, p. clxxxi, note) also credits him with secretarial duties. Besides his historical works, Mahdi Khān contributed to his celebrated Eastern Turkish-Persian dictionary entitled Sanzkhā (1717 = 1760) a valuable thesaurus enriched with examples taken from the Turkish classics (Mir ʿAlī-Shīr, Bābūb-Nāma etc.); the publication of this work of which there are two abbreviations is highly desirable.


**AL-MAHDI LI-DIN ALLAH AHMAD**, a title and name of several Zaidi Imāms of the Yaman.

About 250 years after al-Hādi Yahyā, the founder of the Zaidiya [q.v.] dynasty of the Yaman, his direct descendant, the Imām al-Mutawakkil ʿAlī Ilāhem b. Sulaimān had, between 532 and 566 (1134–1170), restored the kingdom to its extent in al-Hādi’s period, with Sa’d, Nadjān and for a time also Zabid and San‘ā’. A generation later (593–614 = 1197–1217), the hill country from Sa’dā to Dhamār was again ruled by one man, al-Manṣūr b.ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥanāţa, not a descendant of al-Hādi but of a Rassid, i.e. one of the family of al-Hādi’s grandfather, al-Ḵāṣim b. Tabatabah, the spiritual founder of the Zaydiyyas of the Yaman. Al-Manṣūr was twice able to enter San‘ā’; he was also recognised as Imām by the Kāspīd Zādīs, the Ṣuḵtāwī; but even before his death his power had become restricted by the last Ayābūd Sulṭān of the Yaman, al-Malik al-Muḥammad once more to the land of Kawāḥīn. After his death his sons, first Muḥammad ʿĪsā al-Dīn, then the Imām Āḥmad al-Mutawakkil tried their fortune in the south, while one of al-Hādi’s descendants and his name-sake al-Hādi Yahyā b. al-Muḥsin created a petty imāmat around Sa’dā. An attempt to unite the divided forces of the dynasty was made by a. AL-MAHDI LI-DIN ALLAH: his full official title, one previously met with among the Zaidis, was al-Mahdi li-Dīn Allāh, Āḥmad b. ʿAlīshān b. Ahmad b. al-Ḵāṣim b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ḵāṣim b. Āḥmad b. Ismāʿīl Abu ʿl-Barakāt. The uncertainty about his genealogy, that occurs may be explained from the fact that, as is also found in the superscription to his Kitāb al-Ḵurūf (see Bibli.) there is a jump from Ismāʿīl Abu ʿl-Barakāt to Ismāʿīl al-Dībāḏ (cf. de Zambur, Table B); he himself expressly says that his genealogy meets that of al-Manṣūr in al-Ḵāṣim b.
Ibrahim, i.e. that he was a Rassid. His reign of ten years during which the Yemen was harassed by plague and famine does not reveal a great ruler nor even any real and consistent authority, but gives a remarkable picture of conditions in South Arabia, when for want of a definite line of succession, success alone decided how far an ‘Aliid pretender was able to hold his own among his kinsmen and with any forces he could gather to make a stand against foreign foes. In 646 (1248) Aḥmad had himself proclaimed Imam in the fortress of Ṭhula in the highlands of Ḥadīr, north-west of Ṣan‘ā’, by arrangement with the Banū Ḥamzah, with the benevolent tolerance of Aṣad al-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, the brother’s son of the first Ṣaḥīḥi Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Ṣa‘d. But he was defeated by Nūr al-Dīn and besieged in Ṭhula, and in 647 (1250) we find him having to fight with the Banū Ḥamzah who had again deserted him. He was saved by the death of Nūr al-Dīn who was killed by his own Mamluks in Ḥāzib, an event which is probably connected with contemporary Mamluk attempts on the Egyptian Arayḥā; Aṣad al-Dīn who wished to make his government in Ṣan‘ā’ independent, is also accused of this thankless task. The last mentioned active under Nūr al-Dīn’s son and successor al-Muḥammad Ya‘ṣīr, rebelling and suing for peace alternately, sometimes on the side of the Imam and sometimes intriguing against him. Al-Maḥdī, who in the meanwhile had bound Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad, son of the late Imam and chief of the Banū Ḥamzah, to joint action with him, took Ṣan‘ā’ in the beginning of Dhmādah 1648 (July 1250); although harassed by Aṣad al-Dīn who held the fortress of Birāsh, he was able to extend his rule to the south as far as Ḡanār. But before a year had elapsed al-Maḥdī had to abandon Ṣan‘ā’. Aṣad al-Dīn indeed sold him the fortress of Birāsh but it was just an arrangement of this that the final breach occurred between them. Aṣad al-Dīn again went over to al-Muḥammad who had the government of the Yemen granted him by the Caliph al-Mustaṣim, who is even said to have sent assassins (Sirah, see Ref., fol. 237a) against the Imam. In a thoroughly Zādī fashion, however, his fate was decided not by foreign foes but by the Zādid themselves He quarrelled with his ablest and most ardent supporter, Shāhīd Aḥmad al-Raṣās. With the help of the Raṣāsid, Shams al-Dīn made himself Imam of the Zādīs in 652 (1254) in the old capital of Ṣa‘dīa. Al-Maḥdī was again confided to his original territory. The very next year a Zādī ascended the throne, an event which was to bring about a rivalry between the Zādīs and the Ṣa‘dīs. In the decisive battle of Wadi Shu‘wāh, which runs from Ṣa‘dī parallel in the northwest to the Wāḥi Khārdī, he was slain at the age of 42, his head sent round as a trophy and treated shamefully but finally burned with his body in the little Wāḥi of Dhu Bin (Dhelelān). His inglorious end did not prevent his tomb from becoming a wonder-working abode of grace; his biographer calls him the “martyr on the path of Allah and the commander of the faithful” and many miracles are recorded of him even from his lifetime. His assassination at the beginning of 655 (1258) falls in the same year as the execution of his old enemy, the last Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Mustaṣim. Legend says that the messenger who was to carry the news to Ḍūlārīd learned on the way that the caliph had met his fate on the same day.

While in his Dā‘uq (see Bihāj, al-Maḥdī collected the usual Zādī arguments with the regular sayings from the Qur’ān and Ḥadīths practically in the traditional form as a general appeal to support the Zādī cause and himself, his Ḥalīf is a passionate personal protest against his deposition and an attempt to bring back his enemies especially Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad to the loyalty they had sworn to him. This, he proclaims them, was as unrighteous as the recognition of Muḥammad’s authority as a Prophet by the Umayyads.

The Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad above mentioned, who adopted the official title of al-Muṭawakkil and recognised the Rasūls as his overlords, was at once challenged by a rival Imam in the person of Ṣa‘dī Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. al-Wahhāb. The position remained the same for the next 50 years. The Tatimmah gives nine men, the last being al-Nāṣir Ṣa‘d al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Ali, who succeeded in obtaining some recognition as imāms in the period between al-Maḥdī Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn and al-Ṣa‘dī Muḥammad al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Yahyā b. al-Muṭarṣaṣ b. Ahmad b. al-Muṭarṣaṣ b. al-Muṣafalb b. Mansūr b. al-Muṣafalb b. al-Muṭarṣaṣ b. ‘Ali b. Yahyā b. al-Ḵāsim b. ‘Abbās b. Al-Dīn b. Yahyā b. al-Muṣafalb b. Aḥmad al-Nāṣir. The last named ancestor was the son and second successor of Yahyā al-Ḥādhī. After the death of al-Nāṣir Ṣa‘d al-Dīn, a kādī ‘Abbāl Ṣa‘d b. al-Ḥasan al-Dauwārī worked with a few partisans on behalf of his sons who were still minors. But the ‘Abbāl, anxious to consolidate the power which was gradually breaking up, placed in the mosque of Dhmādah al-Dīn in Ṣa‘dā three claimants: ‘Abbāl b. Aḥmad al-Faḍaṭ, al-Nāṣir b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad and Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Muṭarṣaṣ and these three were to decide on the order of the number. The choice fell on Ahmad b. Yahyā, the youngest of them. In spite of his objections, he had to give in to their argument that “one who has gone deeply into learned problems with their subtle points, cannot be incapable of conducting worldly affairs”. They at the same time promised him their advice and support (Tatimmah, fol. 72a). But on the very night on which he was proclaimed, the kādī al-Dauwārī succeeded in getting homage paid to his candidate (end of 793 = 1391). Ahmad b. Yahyā and his adherents at once left the town in a body and withdrew to the hills to the Banū Shīhāb, a clan of the Hamalānids. His abode was betrayed by one of the Shīhāb. Fighting went on for 13 days in which the enemy lost about 50 men and the Imam 10. The latter then went farther into the mountains and his claims were recognised in Amīn also. Among his special supporters were al-Hadī b. al-Muṣafalb, son of a former Imam, and Ibn Aḥmad b. Faḍaṭ. He was also asked by people in Ṣa‘dā to receive his homage. But he was surprised by his enemies and as he would not interrupt his ritual ablutions and prayers to fight, he surrendered under a promise that no harm would befall him. In spite of this, as the Tatimmah tells us, which, it is however much biased in his favour, 80 of his men were massacred, he himself was taken to Ṣa‘dā where he was kept a prisoner for 7 years.
and 3 weeks (794—801). Liberated with the help of his warders, he lived a further 40 years, “tossed up and down the country”, devoting himself entirely to learning until he died in Żafar (end of 1437) of the plague in the Yamans, which had already carried off with many notables including the rival İmân ‘Ali b. Şalâd al-Din. According to the Tütünnim (fol. 75a) İbn al-Murtafa was born in 775 (1373) in Dhamâr, according to other sources (see Rieu, in Brit. Mus. Cat. Suppl., No. 365) in 764 (1363) at Anis. The choice of İbn al-Murtafa as İmân was a mistake, inasmuch as he lacked the necessary military and administrative ability. On the other hand he had another qualification in perfection. As a result of a careful education and a thirst for learning from his youth upwards, he wrote a great deal, dogmatic, legal and paraenetic; he was also a poet and worked at grammar and logic. The kindness of his warders, who supplied him with ink and paper, enabled him to compose the law book Al-Aṣār fi fiqh al-Aimmâ al-ağaḥr (Berlin MS. 4919) on which he wrote a commentary. His most valuable work is still his theological and legal encyclopedia, al-Bahr al-zâlühhâr (Berlin MS. 4894—4907) on which he likewise wrote a commentary. Although not the work of an original scholar, it is a rich and well arranged compendium, which deserves attention, if only for the part of the introduction which compares the various religions, as the distinctions between them are seen from quite a different point of view to that of Ash‘arî or Shâhrastânî.

About 80 years after al-Mahdî Aḥmad b. Yahyâ from 922 (1516), the Turks had begun to occupy Yemen and to hold it with great fortunes (see Kuft al-Din al-Makki, al-Burk al-Yamanî fi l-Fath al-ÔtÔmâni, in S. de Sacy, in N.E., iv. 412—504 and A. Rutgers, Història Iemanae sus Isisano Pascha, Leyden 1838). In his struggle with them al-Muṣârî b’il-lâh al-Kâsim b. Muḥammad, a descendant of al-Ḥâdi in the 17th generation, was able about 1600 A.H. to restore the present imâmâte in Şan‘î (see A.S. Tritton, The Rise of the Ismâ‘îls of Sanaa, Oxford 1925). Of his sons, Muḥammad al-Mu‘āyâyad succeeded him. Even in his reign but still more after his death in 1054 (1647), when his successor _WS b. al-Kâsim, was making his way with difficulty against his many brothers and nephews, one of al-Kâsim’s grandsons began to come to the front, afterwards the İmân ʃ al-Mahdî li-Dîn Allâh Aḥmad b. al-Hâsân b. al-Kâsim. His father was not İmân but distinguished himself in the wars against the Turks and was also a scholar. In 1049 Aḥmad appeared in the hills of Wusâb; in 1051 he besieged Dhamâr without success; in 1053 he was in Mecca with many members of his family on the pilgrimage. Just at the accession of İsmâ‘îl, he set out with another cousin against Şan‘î. At first he came to terms with the İmân but then fought in different places for his own hand, eg. at al-Ṭili and again in the Djebel Wusâb. In 1057, he was chosen for İsmâ‘îl, to which the İzids had been summoned by the disputes for the throne. When in 1057 (1676) on the death of İsmâ‘îl he himself assumed the İmâmâte, a nephew, al-Kâsim b. Muḥammad al-Mu‘āyâyad, proclaimed himself İmân and was recognised particularly in the remoter territory in the south towards al-Tihâma in Zâhid. A Zâhid assembly of leading Şâris and ‘Ulama met, at which Aḥmad was with some difficulty recognised as the legitimate İmân. Although this did not mean that he enjoyed the authority of a sovereign, since his rivals and the other amirs remained as independent as before, yet peace and security reigned in the country. But Aḥmad b. al-Hâsân died soon afterwards in 1092 (1681) in al-Ghîris near Sibân which had been built by the first Turkish conqueror Hasan Pasha. After the short and weak reign of his son al-Mu‘âwakkil Muḥammad (to 1097 = 1686), family feuds broke out again. Among the later İmânâtes of this Kâsimid dynasty another Aḥmad b. al-Hâsân b. al-Kâsim (from 1221 = 1806) again bore the official title of al-Mahdî li-Dîn Allâh.


(AG. STROMFALT)
The most important events of this reign were the attacks on Egypt. The Mahdi's son, Abu 'Uqayl b. Ziyād, was sent in command of the forces; while a fleet operated under Khabasa. Tripoli, Barka, and then Alexandria (302 = 914) were taken, until the victorious army was checked outside Fustat by the eunuch Mūnis, the Egyptian commander. A second expeditionary force (916–917) repeated the feats of the previous one and devastated the Delta and ravaged the Faiyum, only to be checked once more at Old Cairo, while the fleet of 80 vessels was destroyed at Rosetta (307 = 920) by the Khāliṣa's smaller but more efficient fleet under the Greek mariners. Once more the Mahdi had to withdraw. Nevertheless the dominion of the Mahdi extended from the borders of Egypt to the confines of the Idrisid stronghold in Morocco. His fleets spread terror throughout the Mediterranean. Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, and the Balearic Islands felt his influence; while his secret-service agents were to be found throughout Andalusia. A revolt in Sicily in favour of an Aḥlabī prince Alī b. Ziyād b. Al-Mahdi affected his sway in that island, but his administration generally was strong and secure, albeit rigorous and unmerciful. The year 926 found him taking up his residence in the new city he had founded on the Tunisian coast, named after himself Al-Mahdiyya (p. v.) (now "Africa" of Frisson). This became his capital instead of Kairawān (16 mls. distant). The new town was founded in 303 (916) and was situated on a projecting peninsula called Ḥajarat al-Fār. It was strongly fortified with high and massive walls, and colossal heavy gates, enclosing the palace and the royal barracks. A natural harbour was improved to shelter 100 vessels of war. On the mainland lay the faubourg of Zawila intended as a place of residence for traders and the general public. After a reign of 25 years the 'Ubayd Allāh died on the 4th March 934 (14th Rabi' I, 322) at the age of 63 and was succeeded by his son Abu 'Uqayl b. Ziyād under the title of 'Ubayd Allāh.


MAHDIYA, a town on the east coast of Tunisia, is the "town of Africa" of the European historians of the Middle Ages. It is built between Sousse and Gabès on the coast, more than a mile in length and less than 500 yards in breadth, which terminates the cape of Africa and is connected to the mainland by a narrow isthmus "much as the hand is joined to the wrist". The site was without doubt occupied by a Phoenician factory and by a Roman settlement, which it has not been possible to identify. Its name comes from the Shī'ite Mahdi 'Ubayd Allāh, who in 300 (912) founded and fortified it, after having consulted the oracles and foreseeing the dangers which would threaten the Fatimid dynasty. A rampart of rubble of which a few towers are in existence ran along the coast, and the wall protected the port, an ancient Phoenician harbour excavated out of the rock, which the ships entered under a large gate flanked by two strong defensive works. A little farther on, towards the point was the naval arsenal. From the side of the isthmus, the rampart, which is very strong and strengthened by round and square towers, had a wall in front of it and was pierced by a gate which still exists. Flanked by two salients with inclined sides entrance is gained under an arch 45 yards in length (al-kīfâ, al-kaḥlî). The highest point of the peninsula is occupied by an old Turkish ārâb, built on the probable site of the palace of Mahdi. In front towards the west, probably lay the palace of his son al-Kâmil. The town owes to the Fatimids also a great mosque built near the sea, of which considerable remains still exist, notably an ornamental porch. A customs-house was at hand (dar al-maḥâṣabâh); beyond the peninsula the suburb of Zawila (ancient Zella') of which the site is still known and where remains have been found, amongst other things glass-ware.

The Mahdi 'Ubayd Allâh after leaving Raqqâda near al-Kairawaän, came to live at al-Mahdiya in the year 308 (921) Having become the capital of the empire, the town prospered. It was, according to Tâhâ, the richest city in Barbary. The son of 'Ubayd Allâh, al-Kâmil, was besieged there for over five months (January–September 945) by 'Abî Yazid, "the man with the ass", a kharjì agitator, who starting from Tawzer made himself master of the whole of Hišîyâ. The failure of the blockade of al-Mahdiya was the first stage in the downfall of the heretic. More than a century after, al-Mahdiya, which had been the refuge of the Fâtimids when in danger, served also as an asylum to their unconquered vassals, the Zirid Amirs, the victims of the Hilîlî invasion. In the year 449 (1057) the Zirid al-Mu'izz abandoned al-Kairawaan for al-Mahdiya. From that time onwards the corsairs set themselves to recover the lands they had formerly ruled. From there they also turned their activities to the sea. Al-Mahdiya, where the corsairs were now equipped, became and was to remain
down to modern times the most active centre of Tunisian piracy. The expeditions of the Muslim corsairs provoked attacks from the Normans of Sicily, Pisan and Genoan raids on the town along the coast. In 1087, al-Mahdiya fell into the hands of the combined Christian forces. The Normans again took it in 1148. Then they were blockaded in it by land and by sea during the conquest of Ifriqiya by the Almohad 'Abd al-Mu'min. Having become once more a Muslim town, it was retaken and pillaged in 1180. Then it concluded with William II, the King of Sicily, a treaty of peace. The Normans were able to trade with it. During the famous campaigns of the B. Ghannuqy [q.v.], Almoravid Amir, al-Mahdiya was for a short time in the hands of an adventurer 'Abd al-Karim al-Kagragh who took the title of Caliph. Those troubles led to the installation in Ifriqiya of a governor of the Almohad family of the B. Hafs. Al-Mahdiya was henceforth one of the principal towns of the kingdom of the Hafsids. Its government was generally confined to one of the sons of the sovereign of Tunis.

The persistent activity however of the Corsairs provoked in the year 1390 a new Genoan expedition supported by Charles VI, King of France, who sent his galleys and his knights against *cette malheureuse ville d'Affrique* (Fosse-des-sables). Al-Mahdiya resisted but was forced to pay a tribute to the Christians. In 1539, after the conquest of Tunis by Charles V, the town received a Spanish garrison. In the following year the corsair Dragut took it by surprise. Taken prisoner by the fleet of Andrea Doria, then released, Dragut came back and installed himself in al-Mahdiya. On the 8th September 1559, Dorra seized the town from Dragut "prince of Africa", after a memorable siege. Charles V offered the charge of it to the Knights of Malta but they refused it, so he ordered it to be disembowelled. Al-Mahdiya, after falling once more into the hands of the Muslims, arose from its ruins and remained under Turkish rule until the 18th century, the nest of corsairs, the terror of Christian merchant-ships that it had been for nearly 900 years. It is now a quiet little town of about 10,000 inhabitants, who live by fishing and by the produce of their oil-works.


**AL-MADHIYA**, formerly called AL-MA'MURA, a town of Morocco, on the Atlantic coast at the mouth of the Wadi Sabib (Sebou), built on a rocky promontory which dominates the valley of the river. Situated on the southern extremity of the plain of Gharb and 20 miles to the North East of Salé (Salia) it enjoys a geographical position of the first importance. A port is shortly to be created here for ships of heavy tonnage, which cannot sail up the Wadi Sabib as far as the river port of Kenitra (Ar. al-Kunaitira, "the little bridge") situated 6 miles as the crow flies from the mouth of the river.

It is generally agreed that the site of al-Mahdiya corresponds to that of one of the earliest Phoenician settlements founded by Hanno in the fifth century B.C. on the Atlantic coast of Morocco: the Phoenician factory of Thynateria. Nothing is known of the later history of this foundation and we have to wait till the fourth century A.D. (tenth A.D.) to get the first mention in Arab writers of the town at the mouth of the Wadi Sabib under the names al-Ma'mura ("the populated, the flourishing"); Halik ("the mouth") al-Mumura or Halik Sabib. According to the chronicle of Abu'l-Kasim al-Zayani [q.v.] the modern town was founded by the short-lived dynasty of the Banu Ifren [q.v.] which settled on the Atlantic side of Morocco at the end of the tenth century of our era. In the second half of the XIIth, the Almohad Sultan 'Abd al-Mu'min built there one of his dockyards for his navy (dar al-mu'alla). Later, down to the XVIth century, al-Ma'mura's history is obscure — it was a small trading centre to which European ships came for the products of the country.

Al-Ma'mura, when the Christians of the Iberian peninsula made their offensive against Morocco, was one of their first objectives; on June 24, 1515 a large Portuguese fleet anchored at the mouth of the Wadi Sabib and a landing force of 8,000 men occupied the town without a blow being struck. The Portuguese made themselves a strong base in al-Mumura, built fortifications there, remains of which still exist, but they were only able to hold it for a short time. The Muslims drove the Christians out of al-Mumura at the end of the same year, inflicting very heavy losses upon them.

Al-Ma'mura re-enters history when at the end of the XVIIth century it became a formidable nest of European pirates, who under the leadership of an English captain, Mainwaring, practised piracy along the whole Atlantic coast and became a terror to the seafaring centres of Europe. This state of things was put an end to when Spain, which in 1610 had occupied the port of Larache (al-Ar'ish, q.v.), a little farther north, made a landing at al-Mumura in August 1614, after negotiations with the Moroccan ruler, the Sa'dian Mawlay Zaidan. The town was taken and the Spanish fleet withdrew leaving a strong garrison of 1,500 men. The captured town was given the name of San Miguel de Ultrimar.

The Spanish occupation of al-Ma'mura was to last 67 years, during which it was several times fiercely attacked by the Muslims, particularly the "volunteers of the faith" (Mujahidin), who mobilised to drive the Christians from the various points on the coast where they had established themselves under the active leadership of the chief al-Aysh of Salé. The principal attacks on San Miguel de Ultrimar were delivered in 1628, 1630
and 1647. In 1681 (1092 A.H.) the 'Alawid Sultan Mawlāy Ḫisamu'll [q.v.] laid siege to the town and finally took it by storm. He then gave it the name of al-Maḥdīya; the name of al-Ma'mūra only survived that of the great forest of cork oaks which lies between Salé and the lower valley of the Wādi Sabīḥ. — It may be noted that for a few years at an earlier date the name al-Maḥdīya had been borne in Morocco by the little military station founded by the Almohad Caliph 'Abd al-Mu'min on the site of the future Ribāṭ al-Faṭḥ (Rabat), on the south bank at the mouth of the Wādi Salé (the modern Wādi Būregreg) [cf. the article Rabat]. Al-Maḥdīya was occupied by French troops in 1911. Considerable remains survive at al-Maḥdīya, dating from the brief Portuguese occupation, the Spanish occupation or from the date when it was definitely retaken by the Muslims. Around the citadel (kābra) runs a continuous rampart with a ditch. These defences are entered by two gates; — one very massive, with two Arabic inscriptions, dates from the XVIIth century. The other, a simple postern, dating from the Spanish occupation, opens on the steep slope which runs down to the river. In the dark streets of the broken town a little mosque are the runs of the Muslim governor's palace of the XVIIIth century. Between the foot of the citadel and the bank of the Wādi Sabīḥ for a length of 200 yards and a breadth of about 40 may still be seen buildings consisting of a series of square chambers completely isolated from one another and each protected by a double wall. These were probably granaries, which need not be earlier than the end of the XVIIth century, and are not, as has been suggested, of the Phoenician period.


(É. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

MAḤIYA (A.), technical term in metaphysics, quidditā, frequently used as equivalent of gowhar, substance. Abī Ḥanīfa, Dīrār (and al-Nāḏḏār) used it to designate the pure divine essence; cf. 'Abd al-Kādir al-Baghdādī, al-Fārāb bain al-Fārāb, p. 201—202; al-Shahrārī, Kitiš al-Malā' wa 'l-Nihāl Cairos, i. 114; Kitiš al-Malā', ed. and translat. Huart, i. 85. On the question whether the quiddity is identical or not to existence (rendjīd) cf. Dīrārīn, Sharḥ al-Mawāfīq, Cairo, p. 92.

(L. MASSIGNON)

MAḤKAMA. [See MAḤKAMAH.]

MAḤMAL (or more correctly: MAḤMI, A.), the name of the splendidly decorated empty litters, which since the Xth century have been sent by the Mamluk sultans princes on the Ḥājiyūd to Mecca, to display their independence and claim to a place of honour at the ceremony. The camel which bears the maḥmal is not ridden but borne on the shoulders. It goes at the head of the caravan and is regarded as its sanctifying element. What extravagance the rivalry of princes led to is shown by the mention of a maḥmal adorned with much gold, pearls and jewels, which was sent in 721 (1321) from the 'Irāq to Mecca (Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, ed. F. Wustenfeld, ii, 1859, p. 278). The maḥmal which is most esteemed, that which accompanied the pilgrim caravan from Cairo, is described by Lane as a square wooden framework, with a pyramid at top and covered with black brocade richly worked with inscriptions and ornamental embroidery in gold, in some parts upon a ground of green or red silk; it is bordered with a fringe of silk and silver balls are fixed to the corners and to the top of the pyramid. On the front of the pyramidal roof is a view of the Kaʿbah in enamelled gold. In the brief description given by Burckhardt of the Egyptian maḥmal it is added that it is decorated with ostrich feathers. According to him there was only a prayer-book in the empty interior, which on its return was exhibited in Cairo and kissed by the people; according to Lane on the other hand there are two silver receptacles in the maḥmal which contain two Kurāns, one in a scroll, the other in book form. The maḥmal is carried by a fine tall camel, which after the pilgrimage is spared any further work. On their arrival in Mecca the maḥmals are hailed with joy and led through the crowded streets in a solemn procession after which they go with the pilgrims to 'Arafat, where they occupy a position reserved for them. It used to be generally supposed that the covering of the Egyptian maḥmal was used to cover the tomb of Muhammad or the Kaʿbah but this is wrong; the kiswa is of course taken to Mecca with the great pilgrim caravan but it has nothing to do with the maḥmal.

According to Maḥzārī the custom of sending a maḥmal to Mecca was first introduced in 670 A.H. by the Mamluk Sultan Bihārī but others attribute it to the Shari' Abū Naym; it is also said that it was a prince going on the pilgrimage in a splendid litter that gave Bihārī the idea of sending one with the pilgrim caravan. This is however only a story; and it is a much more important question whether the custom did not arise at an earlier date and whether it did not originally have a direct religious significance. It is natural to recall the portable sanctuaries of the Arabs and the maḥmal particularly reminds one of the description which Mūsīl (Die Kultur, 1910, p. 8 sq.) gives of the "Abū Zühr al-Markhāt" of the Rvāḥa tribe: a framework of thin pieces of wood adorned with ostrich feathers which is fastened on to the saddle of a pack-camel and is the visible centre of the tribe. This would at any rate lead us to the practical significance of the later maḥmal, a visible sign of independence and claim to suzerainty of the various Muslim states. It is just this significance which gives the maḥmals a certain historical interest as political changes and rivalries are reflected in them in course of time. There have occasionally been rulers who by sending maḥmals gave expression to their endeavour to obtain recognition as sovereigns and protectors of the sharīfs, only to be soon driven from power again by others. That the Egyptian maḥmal came to obtain a place of honour, that from Syria being the only other at all comparable to it, was a result of the great wealth of the Mamluk Sultāns. It is noteworthy that Ottoman rule made no alteration in this respect and an attempt to send a maḥmal from Constantinople met with no success. In 1587 an interruption was
caused by the conquest of Mecca by the Wahhābīs who forbade this empty pomp so hateful to them; but this ceased when they were driven out and Muhammad 'Alī's rule again gave the Egyptian maḥmāl pride of place.

After the World War the sending of a maḥmāl from Syria stopped. Difficulties arose between the Egyptian government and King Ḥusayn (1915—1924) regarding the powers of the heads of a field-hospital which was to accompany the maḥmāl as well as regarding the ceremony of its reception, which twice resulted in the maḥmāl not being sent.

When Ibn Saʿūd had become king of the Ḥijārā, long negotiations took place over the maḥmāl. The Wahhābī ruler insisted on the maḥmāl which usually accompanied the maḥmāl being omitted and all sort of superstitious customs being dropped; he also protested against the armed escort as a denial of his sovereignty. The attempt made in 1926 to harmonize the demands of the two sides came to nothing: a fight broke out between the Ḥiwald of Ibn Saʿūd and the Egyptian soldiers which was stopped by the personal intervention of Ibn Saʿūd. Since then the Egyptian government has not sent a maḥmāl, but neither does it any longer send a new ḥirāf for the Kaʿba to the Ḥajj. By biogr.: Burkhart. Reisen in Arabien, p. 394. 396. 407 sq.: Burton, A Pilgrimage to Mecca and Mhad, 1586, II. p. 12. 267; Wavell, A Modern Pilgrim in Mecca, 1912, p. 152. 155 sq.: Lane, Mahommed and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1836, II. p. 180—186. 245 sqf. (with a picture of the Egyptian maḥmāl); Snouck Hurgrönje, Medd., i. 29. 83 sq. 152. 157 (with a photograph in the Atlas, Pl. V); Juyon, Handbuch der islamischen Gesch., p. 151 sq. (Fr. Buhl.)

MAHMUD I. Twentieth Ottoman Sultan, reigned 1143—1168 (1730—1754). He was born in the 3rd Muharram 1108 (Aug. 2, 1696), the son of Mustafa II — the S defter 'Othmān gives the date 7th Ramadān 1107 (April 10, 1696) — and had spent his life in seclusion up to his accession. He came to the throne through the mutiny of the Janissaries under Patrona Khalīl, a mutiny which cost the grand vizier Ḥabīb Pasha, the Kapudan Pasha and the Kuyu Beg their lives, and forced Sultan Ἀljāmād III to abdicate in favour of Mahmund; these events took place on the 17th Rabī'a 1, 1143 (Oct. 1. 1730). The mutiny, which really had the sympathy of most of the 'Ālūm and seems to have been in the nature of a social revolt (Jorga), was only suppressed after some time through the efforts of the KİLAR Ağa Beşhir; for its suppression a certain number of appointment-to important offices dictated by the rebels had to be conceded and the many palaces built in the luxurious reign of Ahmad III were allowed to be pillaged. After the Janissaries had been pacified by considerable largesse on the accession of the Sultan, Beşhir Ağa succeeded in plotting the death of Patrona Khalīl, who was assassinated on Nov. 15, 1730. The KİLAR-agha continued to exercise a preponderating influence on affairs of state; the Sultan, who was by nature more interested in literature and in the erection of more or less useful buildings, did nothing to throw off this influence, which on the whole was for the good of the state. One of the consequences of this system was the very frequent changes of grand viziers — there were no fewer then 16 in Mahmūd's reign — but the state possessed a number of able men who worked for the good of the empire in the offices of grand vizier, reis efendi and kuyu beg. The state finances were kept in good order, as much by the confiscation of any great fortunes amassed by high officials as by a financial system which made no distinction between the public treasury and the personal revenues of the Sultan. The situation abroad was also favourable, especially after the peace of Belgrade in 1739, which secured to Turkey a fairly long period of peace in Europe.

At the beginning of the reign, Turkey was at war with Persia. The campaign of 1731 was favourable to the Turks, who reconquered Kirmānshāh and took Hamadān (battle of Kordijān, Sept. 15), Urmīyā and Tabrīz; however, by a peace signed on Jan. 10, 1732 by the ser−asker and grand vizier Topal 'Othmān Pasha, Turkey gave up Tabrīz and Hamadān. This peace neither pleased the powers in Constantinople, who replaced the grand vizier by Hekum Zāde 'Ali Pasha [q.v.] nor 'Ālūm Kuli Khān, who on his return from Herāt had despatched Şah 'Ālamār and was making new preparations for war. On Oct. 6, 1732, the Porte issued a formal declaration of war and in December a Persian army invaded Mesopotamia, took Kūrkū and laid siege to Baghdād; the great battles of this campaign were those of Duldijālīk on the Tigris, where the Persians were defeated (July 19, 1733), and that of Kūrkū, where a week later the Turks suffered a defeat which involved the death of the ser−asker Topal 'Othmān Pasha. In the same year, the Persian war produced a conflict with Russia, provoked by the Khān of the Crimean march through the Caucasus to reinforce the Turkish troops fighting against Persia. Russia declared she could not allow the passage of the Tatars through the country of the Kumuk and the Kaituk, which she regarded as under her authority; the Khān's force was therefore held up and several battles were fought in Daghestān between Turks and Russians. The negotiations opened at Constantinople showed more and more that a war with Russia would be inevitable and they were finally broken off by the siege and capture of Azof by the Russians in March 1736. Meanwhile the war withPersia, which had ceased in 1734 on an armistice being concluded by the Pasha of Baghādād, had been resumed in 1735 when 'Ālūm Kopulā was appointed ser−asker. The campaign was unfortunate for the Turks. They lost a number of towns in the Caucasus; however the development of affairs in Persia where 'Ālamār Kuli, afterwards Şāhid Šāh, proclaimed himself king on Dec. 1, 1735 in his camp on the Caucasus front, was favourable to the peace negotiations which began at this time. These negotiations ended in a peace signed at Constantinople on Oct. 17, 1736; the frontiers of the two countries remained as they had been fixed in the time of Murād IV. In the same year a Russian army invaded and laid waste the Crimea, although negotiations still went on, first at Constantinople and then in the country. Austria, posing as mediator, took an active part in these negotiations, which were finally broken off at the Congress of Nierwind in Aug. 1637, when it became evident that Austria was really Russia's ally, so that Turkey had to
deal with two adversaries. The war began badly for the Turks who lost Niş to the Austrians and Ocakow to the Russians. Niş however was won back in Oct. 1737. During the next two years fortune was rather on the side of the Turkish armies under the grand vizier Yegen Muhammad Pasha. The conclusion of the war was marked by the appearance of the forces of the grand vizier Hâdidji Muḥammad before Belgrade in July 1739. It was before this town that the famous peace of Belgrade (Sept. 18) was negotiated with the assistance and mediation of the French Ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, by which Turkey again obtained possession of the town. Russia was included in the same treaty and had to promise to demolish the fortifications of Azof.

This ending of the war in a way very advantageous to the Porte was followed by a long period of peace with the states of Europe, which, as a result of the Seven Years’ War, had no time to devote to plans for the partition of Turkey. From 1743 to 1746 there was a new Persian war. It began through the demands of Nādir Shāh to have the Persian Shi’a recognised as a fifth Madžhhab, that of the 40. The Porte gave an evasive answer but after they had become convinced that Nādir Shāh intended to make himself lord of Mesopotamia, the Shāhī al-Īslām gave a fatwâ against the recognition of the Dājrâ’iyya. In 1743 Nādir Shāh took Kirkūk and laid siege to al-Mawâril, only to be forced to raise it after a while. In the following year the scene of hostilities shifted to the Caucasus. The Porte then attempted to support a Persian pretender of the Šafawī family, whom it sent off with great pomp to ʿArāz; in 1746 the Turkish ser-asker, the former grand vizier Yegen Muḥammad, fell in the battle of Murâd Tepe in Kurdistan. During all this time, peace negotiations were going on in Constantinople and conducted through the Turkish commander-in-chief. During these negotiations Nādir Shāh had dropped his demand for the recognition of the Dājrâ’iyya and finally agreement was reached on the basis of the frontiers of Murâd IV (Sept. 4, 1746). In July of the same year the all powerful Beshir Agha died at the age of 96; in spite of the efforts of the grand vizier al-Sâyi’d Ḥasan Pasha, his successor Beshir Agha the younger succeeded in procuring the same influence in affairs. This new regime only lasted till 1752 when there was reason to fear a new outbreak of discontent among the Janissaries and the ‘ulama’ also; the Sultan seems therefore to have decided to sacrifice the Kizlar Agha by having him treacherously assassinated along with other favorites (July 16, 1752). Two years later, on Friday, Dec. 1754, Muḥammad himself died suddenly on his way from the mosque; he was buried in the Yeni Dâjmâ.

The Sultan left a pleasing memory behind him; it is even said of him that he took a personal part in the affairs of state (Sîdîjî-i ʿOthmânî, l.c.) although the sources give little evidence of this. He did not continue the splendors of the court of his predecessor, respecting public feeling which had led to the latter’s fall. Muḥammad is especially celebrated for the large number of buildings he had erected; in Constantinople he built no less than four cîsme and he began the building of the Nûr-i ʿOthmânî mosque. This activity was equally displayed in the provinces. This Sultan also acquired considerable merit by founding four libraries in the capital, those of Aya Soφia, the Wâlide Dâjmâʿ-i mosque, the Fâtih mosque and the Gâhâla Şerâyî. The reign of Muḥammad is further marked by the display of a very skilful diplomatic activity by the Porte, conducted by several very able reis efendî, like Râghib Pasha [q. v.]. They had profited by the lessons of European diplomats and also by the advice of the famous French renegade Bonneval, who lived in Constantinople from 1729 till his death in 1747 and introduced several useful reforms into the army. But in spite of appearances, the Ottoman empire was far from being a strong power as the historian Djeuwêd Pasha (Taṣrîk-i Lycuwêd, 1302 ed., i. 63) has very justly remarked; therefore, in the period of anarchy that followed in Persia the death of Nâdir Shâh, the Porte consistently declined to interfere in Persian affairs. From time to time minor revolts contributed to weaken the strength of the empire; besides the always dangerous Janissaries, there were several risings in Anatolia (e.g. Şârî Beg Oğlu in ʿAldîn in 1739). It was also in the reign of Muḥammad I that the Wâhidîs first began to give trouble to the government. In Egypt the Mamlûk beylerbey was re-introduced in the country in practical independence, in spite of the energetic steps taken by Râghib Pasha, when the latter was governor of this province. As to foreign relations, it is interesting to note that it was in this reign that France, which became very influential after the peace of Belgrade, succeeded in 1740 in obtaining the celebrated capitulation which became in time the most important document on the extra-territorial rights of foreigners in Turkey.

Bibliography: The principal Turkish sources are the imperial historiographers Taṣrîk Şâhî ve Şâhir ve-Sûbûh, Constantinople 1195 (years 1143–1156), Taṣrîk-i ʿAzî, Constantinople 1199 (year 1157–1165) and the beginning of the Taṣrîk-i Wâdîf, Constantinople 1219 (beginning in 1166); then there are the reports of certain embassies like the Taṣrîk ve-Taṣrîf of Râghib Pasha on the peace negotiations with Nâdir Shâh in 1736, a manuscript which was used by von Hammer. There are also several works still in manuscript on the history of the reign of Muḥammad I, noted by Babinger, G.O.W., Leipzig 1927, p. 332. The same author (op. cit., p. 289) also quotes a series of monographs in Turkish which deal with the wars of Nâdir Shâh. For these wars, a complementary source is the biography of Nâdir Shâh by Mahdî Khan and Hanway, A Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia, 1735. — General sketches of the reign of Muḥammad I are to be found in von Hammer, G.O.R. 2, Pêsh 1836, iv. 462–468; Zinkelstein, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, v., Göra 1857; p. 620–647; Jorga, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, Göra 1911, iv. 409–462. (J. H. Kramer)}
dethroned sultan had undoubtedly exercised a great influence on Mahmud's ideas, making him appear afterwards as Salim's avenger.

The grand-vizierate of Muṣṭafā Bairâdâr Paṣha, the consequence of the latter's victory, lasted only until November 1808; a revolt put an end to his reformatory tyranny and to his life. The next years were taken up by the war against the Russians, who had occupied the Danubian principalities in December 1806. Endeavouring to continue their conquests on the southern side of the Danube, the Russians met with more resistance from the Turks than had been expected; it was, however, due principally to the increasing danger of the Franco-Russian war, that the Turks obtained the peace of Bucarest, signed on May 25, 1812, and negotiated, on the part of the Turks, by Ghalib Efendi. By this peace, Turkey had only to cede Bessarabia to Russia. In the meantime the new sultan had inaugurated a policy of internal consolidation of the empire, a policy which lasted until the Greek revolt in 1820 began to absorb all the strength of the state. He put an end to the almost independent position of the ḥāna in Rumelia and to that of the numerous derebâys in Anatolia, especially to the families of the Kâr 'Othman Oghlu in Sarukhan and Arîin and of the Çapan Oghlu of the region of Kar-asâyı [cf. Derbây].

The sultan's authority was equally reestablished in southern Mesopotamia after the death of Sulayman Paṣha of Baghdad in 1810. The aid of Muhammad 'Ali Paṣha of Egypt had to be invoked to repulse the Wahhabi power in Arabia; Mekka and Medina were reconquered in 1813 by 'Uṣūn Paṣha [cf. ibn Saʿīd]. In Syria it was only after years of trouble that an arrangement could be attained, which left Miḥd-ūd as supreme baṣr of this principality. The submission of Bosna only took place after 1821. On the contrary 'Ali Paṣha of Yemen succeeded in keeping his strong position during this period; not till 1820 were the Turkish troops able to lay siege to Yemâna. In Constanti-nopole the sultan took severe measures to maintain order, especially against the dangerous element of the Janissaries.

During this time the diplomatic difficulties with Russia, relating to the interpretation and the execution of the peace treaty, continued, especially with regard to the regime in Moldavia and Wallachia. These difficulties were to become a real danger after the Greek insurrection had broken out. This insurrection, being in a way a consequence of the autocratic regime of 'Ali of Yemen, and secretly favoured by Russia, began in 1820 with the appearance of Alexander Ipsilânti in Rumânia and a feeble revolt in Morea, instigated by Demetrius Ipsilânti. The first reactions on the Turkish side were numerous executions at Constantinople, including that of the Greek patriarch Then Turkish troops entered Rumânia, where Ipsilânti was easily beaten. As this military action provoked sharp protests from Russia, who ambassador Stroganow left Constantinople, the Turkish troops were soon withdrawn for the greater part. But in 1822 the insurrection in Morea spread quickly: Tripoli and Corinth fell into the hands of the insurgents. In the same year 'Ali of Yemen was murdered. In May 1822 the Ecumenical Patriarch of Athens was surrendered by the Turks: the latter, however, remained on the whole stronger than the Greeks. In order to avoid all difficulties with Russia, the Porte had evacuated in 1823 the whole of Rumânia, while declaring that, henceforward, she would suffer no more foreign intervention in her internal affairs. But Russia continually came forward with new claims (e.g. the division of Greece into three principalities, after the model of the principalities on the Danube); at the same time the other European powers no longer remained indifferent towards the Greek affairs, partly because public opinion began to be influenced by the philhellenic movement, and partly because they feared that Russia might gain too much profit from the weakness of the Ottoman Empire. In these years Turkey had even to sustain a war with Persia occasioned by Persian incursions into Kurdistan; this war was ended by 1823. During the years 1824 and 1825, while Turks and Greeks were waging a guerilla war by land and sea, and while amongst the Greeks there reigned complete anarchy, nothing decisive happened. The situation was only changed by the death of Alexander I of Russia (December 1, 1825) — which brought to the throne Nicolas I, much more inclined to make short work of the Turks — and by the combined action in Morea of Egyptian and Turkish troops under the command of Ibrahim Paṣha, son of Muḥammad 'Ali. This action was crowned by complete success, for Morea was entirely subdued, and on April 23, 1826 the fortress of Missolonghi capitulated after a siege of more than six months.

The Turkish successes encouraged the sultan to realise his long considered project to form a new army, trained and equipped after the European fashion. These new troops were recruited from the Janissaries. Their inauguration took place on June 4, 1826 and occasioned, ten days afterwards, the revolt of the Janissaries which ended in the complete and bloody extermination of these once famous troops (June 16). The extermination of the Janissaries is an act that will always be connected with the name of Mahmud II; it made a formidable impression in the whole country and in the reform party — who spoke of it as the waṭfa-i khairyī — considered it as the beginning of a new era of prosperity. The first consequences, however, were disastrous; the strength of the empire was weakened to a degree, which made itself felt more and more in the development of the relations with Russia. Hoping to get rid of the everlasting demands of Russia, the Porte had given still more concessions by the convention of Akkerman (September 25, 1826), but soon afterwards followed an agreement between Russia, Great Britain, France and Prussia with regard to the Greek question (July 7, 1827), which precipitated the Turks from the suppression of the insurrection. Though directed, since the beginning of 1827, by the fanatical Pertev Efendi as Re's Efendi, Turkish diplomacy was powerless against this new intervention. One of the consequences of the agreement of the powers was the destruction of the Turkish-Egyptian fleet in the Gulf of Navarino, on October 10, 1827, without previous declaration of war, by the English, French and Russian naval forces. Subsequently the diplomatic relations with these countries were broken off, but, when war actually broke out, it was only with Russia.

The Russian war, inaugurated by a declaration of war by Russia (May 7, 1828), was particularly disastrous for Turkey. The Russians immediately
occupied Rumania and crossed the Danube, while on the Oriental front they took Karas and Akhalčik in the Caucasus. In 1829 the debacle was completed by the occupation of Adrianople by General Diebitch, on August 19. Thus, by the peace treaty of Adrianople of September 14, 1829, the Porte was obliged to make all the concessions required of her. Russia gave back nearly all her conquests, but obtained the payment of a heavy war indemnity. As to Greece, Turkey had to accept the decision of the great powers, which meant absolute independence. In the following years the near frontier and the future relations between Turkey and the new state were regulated by special conventions.

The principal political facts of the nine last years of Mahmud's reign were the conflict with Muhammad 'Ali of Egypt and the Russian intervention, which was its consequence and put Turkey in a state of dependence on Russia. The activity of Muhammad 'Ali [q. v.] began in 1831 with the invasion by Ibrahim Pasha of the territory of the pasha of Akka; this town was besieged and fell in May 1832. Within a short time Damascus, and Aleppo also submitted to Ibrahim. The military measures of the sultan were unable to stop the advance of the Egyptian troops, who marched from Syria into Asia Minor; the Turkish General Rashid Pasha was beaten by them in the battle of Konya (December 21, 1832) and was himself made a prisoner. The Porte then was obliged to accept the aid offered by Russia and the mediation of France, the result of which was an agreement, concluded on April 8, 1833 at Kutahiya, with Ibrahim Pasha; Muhammad 'Ali had to be recognised as pasha of Syria while the province of Adana was given to Ibrahim. In the meantime Russian troops had been landed in the Bosporus. These were only withdrawn after the conclusion of the notorious treaty of Hasköy, signed on July 1, 1853 between Turkey and Russia. The treaty was a defensive alliance and contained a secret clause by which Turkey undertook to prevent any eventual enemies of Russia from entering into the Black Sea. Thus Turkey became still more politically linked to Russia, without the other powers being able to hinder this.

On the other hand Mahmud continued with tenacity the consolidation of his authority in the interior. The principal agent of this policy was the former grand-vizier Rashid Pasha, appointed governor of Siwās after his return from Egyptian captivity. He succeeded in establishing order in Upper and Lower Egypt and in Armenia, especially by subduing the Karageorges. After his death, in 1836, he was replaced as serasker by Hāfiz Pasha. The latter, unlike Rashid, was in favour of the introduction of modern tactics into the Turkish army; in his successful expeditions in the north of Mesopotamia he was accompanied by the Prussian lieutenant von Moltke, one of the army instructors who had been sent by the King of Prussia. These military measures of Mahmud had also in view the strengthening of the frontier on the Syrian side, in order to be prepared for a new conflict with Muhammad 'Ali. This event happened only after 1838, when Khusraw Pasha [q. v.], the zealous reformer and ancient enemy of the Egypt, came again into power as president of the new Turkish cabinet. The next year Hāfiz Pasha, appointed again as serasker in Kurdistan, crossed the Euphrates and occupied 'Aintab, but he was completely beaten by the Egyptians under Ibrahim Pasha, in the battle of Nizib, on June 24, 1839. This battle left Turkey again in a desperate condition, just a week before the death of Mahmud himself.

During the same period the sultan had to suppress dangerous and repeated revolts in Albania and Bosnia; the situation in Serbia had remained quiet after a khaṭṭat sharif of 1830. In 1837, the situation in the interior had become sufficiently stabilised for Mahmud to undertake a journey in his European provinces, which he had on no previous occasion. He then went to Adrianople, and to Constantinople in his palace of Çanlıca, above Scutari.

It is quite clear, from the many descriptions we possess of this sultan, that he was a strong personality, who made his own ideas prevail in the government of his empire. In his immediate entourage only few first rate men were to be found. But the task which Mahmud had set himself, of reforming the empire after the European model was nearly super-human in the extremely unfavourable political circumstances that prevailed during his reign. To which must be added the enormous difficulties presented by the traditional institutions and views existing in all ranks of the Turkish people of those days (cf. e.g. the severe judgement by von Moltke, p. 434 sgg.). Mahmud has often been compared, as a reformer, with Peter the Great, though the conditions were quite different. On the other hand he has been blamed for having commenced his reforms where he should have finished ("par la queue"), for demolishing things existing without being capable of constructive activity; especially in Turkey of to-day Mahmud is judged severely (cf. Halide Edib, Monatsz., London 1926, p. 237 sgg.). It is very probable, however, that without the drastic measures of this sultan, the following period of the Tanzimat [q. v.] would have been an impossibility (cf. Rosen, i. 300 sgg.). The most important reform was that of the army; it brought about the extermination of the Janissaries, but the formation of an army after the European fashion did not succeed till much later; the most zealous reformers, such as Khusraw Pasha, had only very vague ideas about what it really meant. The most useful work was done by the Prussian military instructors. By sending young officers to military schools in Western Europe, Mahmud prepared, however, a new organization. In the government system there gradually developed a cabinet of ministers of state after the Western fashion; at a certain period in 1837, the ancient title of qadi-i aẓam was even temporarily abolished, and the ministers received the new title of vakil. Moreover, by a firman of October 1826, Mahmud had opened the way to the development of a better and more dignified position of the state functionaries; this firman abolished the sultan's right of confiscating the possessions of the functionaries after their death. It was, however, a long time before a new corps of real and loyal functionaries came into existence. The men whose services Mahmud was obliged to use were too often highly corruptible, a circumstance of which the other powers,
especially Russia, took advantage in a large degree.

Mahmūd II lies buried in the turbe that bears his name; it was constructed in Stambul on the Dvān Yolu by his son and successor 'Abd al-Majīd.

**Bibliography:** The Turkish historical works deserve more attention than has been paid as so far. The more accessible ones are: Dżawdat Paşa’s Tārīkh, Constantinople 1303, vol. 1—xii, comprising the period from 1223 to 1241, and its continuation, the Turbe of Ahmad Lutfî, Constantinople 1350—1306, vol. 1—vi, comprising the period from 1241 to 1255. Other printed sources are: Abū Bakr, Wahāf al-dīdī, Constantinople 1332; Tārīkh ‘Abbâs, Constantinople n. d.; Mahfūz ‘Abd, Uṣūl al-faḡīf, Constantinople 1243, a monograph on the extermination of the Janisaries; Mahfūz Thūreryā, Nāṣir al-Waṭāfî, Constantinople (cf. also Bahmig, G. O. W., p. 387). European general treatments of this period: Zinkisen, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, vol. 3, Gotha 1869, p. 561 sqq. (until 1812); Rosen, Geschichte des Türkischen, Leipzig 1866, vol. 8 (after 1826); Jorga, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, vol. 4, Gotha 1319, p. 382—387.

A valuable contemporary source is H. von Mutke, Beziehungen und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, Berlin 1883.

**MAHMŪD I, NĀṢIR AL-DĪN,** was Sultan of Bengal from 1446 to 1460. When the ferocious tyranny of Shahb al-Dīn Ahmad Shāh, grandson of the usurper, Kāḏjā Čanās, or Čanāš, could no longer be borne, he was put to death, and Nāṣir Kān, one of his amirs, seized the throne, but after a reign of one week was slain by his amirs, who would not submit to one of their own number. Their choice fell on Mahmūd, who was a descendant of Hāfūz, the founder of the old royal house, and he was raised to the throne. He reigned with justice and clemency for twenty-six years, and restored and beautified the city of Gaur. On his death in 1460 he was succeeded by his son Barbak Shāh.

**Bibliography:** Ghulām Husain Salim, Nāṣir al-Dīn Ahmad Shāh, both in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kāsim Fīrishtā, Gulshan-e-Haḍīmi, Bombay lith. ed. of 1832.

**MAHMŪD II, NĀṢIR AL-DĪN** was the third of the Hābšārī, or African Sultāns of Bengal. He succeeded his father in 1494, but was a mere puppet in the hands of one minister after another. His first minister, an African entitled Habīb Shāh, was slain by a rival, another African known as Mālik Bahr the Mahmūd, who afterwards slew Mahmūd, he having occupied the throne for no more than six months, and usurped the throne.

**Bibliography:** see MAHMŪD I of Bengal.

**MAHMŪD III, GHUVRĪ AL-DĪN,** was one of the sixteen sons of ‘Alī al-Dīn Husain Shāh of Bengal. He remained loyal to his eldest brother, Nāṣir al-Dīn ‘Alī Shāh, throughout his reign, but after his death slew his son, ‘Alī al-Dīn Firūz Shāh, in 1533, and ascended the throne. During a troubled reign of five years he never ruled the whole of Bengal Shīr Khān Sūr, who ultimately ascended the throne of Delhi, was already powerful in Bāhār, and allied himself to Mahmūd’s rebellious brother-in-law, Mahdūm-
MAHMBUD, NASIR AL-DIN, Sultan of Dihli, was the son of Shams al-Din Itutmish by the daughter of Kuth al-Din Aibak [q.v.]. In 1246, when the nobles at Dihli were growing weary of the sloth, incompetence, and tyranny of Mas'ud, Mahmud, then about 18 years of age, was governor of Bahrali, and hastened secretly to the capital when he learned that the throne was likely to become vacant. On June 10, 1246, Mas'ud was deposed and thrown into prison, where he died shortly afterwards, and Mahmud, his uncle, was enthroned in the Green Palace. He was an amiable and pious prince, with a taste for calligraphy, which he displayed in making copies of the Koran, but as a ruler he was a mere cipher. He was well served by Chiyay al-Din Balban, whose daughter he married, and who ultimately succeeded him on the throne. Balban restored the royal authority in the Pandjab, the Dab, Mewat, Multan, Nagaur, and northern Malwa, but his enemies had long been busy during his absence from court, and on his return attempted to assassinate him. He frustrated this design, but was banished from court. The nobles soon grew weary of the rough Rajah, who had supplanted Dihli, and Balban and other nobles assembled their troops at Bhatinda. Rajah and the king marched against them, but as most of the nobles in the royal camp were in sympathy with Balban, who hesitated to attack the king, serious hostilities were avoided, and the royal army retreated. The nobles at court now prevailed upon the king to dismiss Rajah, who was banished, first to Budan, and afterwards to Bahrali, a reconciliation between the king and Balban was effected, and they returned together to Dihli in January, 1255. Rajah was soon discovered to be in communication with Kutlug Khan, of Bayana, who had secretly married the king's mother, and the enuch was captured and put to death. In 1256 Mahmud and Balban marched against Kutlug Khan, who fled, and when he was pursued, in 1257, into Sirmur, again fled and took refuge with Myri Khan, the rebellious governor of Multan and Ceth. Balban marched against the rebels, but they evaded him and marched on Dihli. Finding, however, that preparations had been made to receive them, and that Balban was menacing their retreat, they fled, and in 1259 joined an army of Mughuls which was invading the Pandjab. It was feared that the Mughuls would attack Dihli, but they retired without crossing the Satlaj. Order was then again restored in the Dihli, and in the following year the Meos of Mewat expiated by a terrible punishment a long series of crimes. Their country was ravaged, and 250 of their principal men were brought to Dihli and put to death with torture. In a second expedition 12,000 of them, men, women, and children were put to the sword. Meanwhile negotiations had been in progress with Hulaghi Khan at Tabriz, and in 1260 a Mughul envoy reached Dihli and promised, in his master's name, that raids into India should cease. At this point a hiatus of nearly six years occurs in the history of the Muslims in India, and the next fact which is recorded is that Mahmud died on Feb. 18, 1266, and was succeeded by Balban.

Bibliography: Minhaj al-Din Siraj. Tabakat Nasi'i, text and translation by Major H. G. Raverty; 'Abd al-Kadir Bad'awi, Munakhab al-Tawarikh, text and translation by G. S. A. Ranking; Nizam al-Din Ahmad, Tabakat-i Akbari, text, in all in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kaim Firuz, Gulshan-i Ibrahiimi, Bombay lith. ed. of 1832. (T. W. Haig) MAHMBUD II, NASIR AL-DIN, was the grandson of Firuz Shah, of the Tughluq dynasty, and was placed on the throne of Dihli on March 8, 1353, on the death of his elder brother Humayun (Skandar Shah) and was never more than a puppet in the hands of intriguing ministers. The eunuch Sarwar, who was amanuensis to Humayun, led a Hindustan rebellion in Awadh, received the title of Sultan al-Shahr, and never returned to Dihli, but established his independence in Dnjawan. Another amir, Sargar Khan, became virtually independent in the Pandjab, and the minister Sa'idat Khan, presenting his supersession by Mukarrab Khan, set up Mahmud's cousin Nu'srat as a rival king within the narrow limits of the kingdom of Dihli. In 1358 Mulla, the brother of Sargar Khan, murdered Mukarrab Khan and assumed control of Mahmud, who deposed him on the title of Iibai Khan, Nu'srat Shah was then driven into the Dab, but the kingdom of Dihli was thrown into confusion when, in October, 1358, news was received that the Amir Timur [q.v.] had crossed the Indus and taken Multan. He reached Panipat on Dec. 2, and meanwhile the capital had been filled with fugitives, fleeing before him. The sources of the kingdom were so restricted that no adequate preparations could be made to resist him, and Mahmud and Mulla were filled with terror; but such troops as could be collected were assembled within the walls, and on Dec. 15, the king and his minister marched forth to meet the invader, who had crossed the Dnjama from his camp at Lon. They were utterly defeated, and fled by night, Mulla to Baran in the Dab, and Mahmud to Gudjarat, and afterwards to Malwa. Timur left Dihli on Jan. 1, 1359, and on his way to plunder, devastation, and bloodshed was finished, and Mahmud's rival, Nu'srat Shah, occupied the ruins of the capital, but was expelled by Mulla, and driven into Mewat, where he shortly afterwards died. Mulla returned to Dihli in 1400, and in 1401 was rejoined by Mahmud. In 1402 Mulla, carrying Mahmud with him, marched to Kannwadj to attack Ibrhim Shah of Dnjawan, but Mahmud, weary of the domination of Mulla, fled and joined Ibrhim, who, however, received him so ill that he again fled, and established himself in Kannwadj. Mulla then made a fruitless attempt to recover Gwalior, and returned to Kannwadj in order to recapture Mahmud, but was baffled by the strength of its defences and returned to Dihli. He attempted to subdue Khijr Khan of Multan, but was defeated and slain by him in November, 1405. After his death Djalat Khan Lodhi became the virtual ruler of Dihli, and at his invitation Mahmud returned to his capital. The rest of his reign was spent in attempts to re-establish his authority in Sambha, Sambhal, and Baran, and to punish Ibrhim of Dnjawan for his reception of him when he had fled from Mulla; but he was obliged to conclude an inglorious peace with Ibrhim, and his successes in other directions was neutralized by the advance of Khijr Khan, who pretended that Timur had appointed him his viceregy in India, and in 1406 stripped Mahmud of all his possessions beyond the walls of Dihli except the Dab, Rohtak, and
Sambhal. In 1409 and 1410 Khizr Khān captured Rohtak, Nainauli, three towns to the south of Dhilli, and Firuzābād, and besieged Mahmūd in his capital, which was only saved by a famine which compelled the invader to retire. In 1413 Mahmūd died, the last of his line, at Kaithal, after a nominal reign of twenty years.

Bibliography: Abd al-Kadîr Badshâh, Muntahâb al-Tawârîkh, text, and translation by Rangkî; Nizâm al-Dîn Ahmad, Tâbâqât-i Akhbari, text, all in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kâsim Firdusi, Gûlshan-i Irânshâh, Bombay lith. ed. of 1870 (T. W. Hays). MAHMUD, Bâhil Shârki, succeeded his father, Irâshâm Shah, on the throne of Džawnpûr in 1436. In 1443 he obtained permission from Mahmûd I of Mâwla to punish Nâvir Khân, governor of Kalâ, which was a sie of Mâwla, for breaches of the law and customs of Islâm committed by him, but Mahmûd of Mâwla repented of his complaisance, and war broke out between Mâwla and Džawnpûr. Hostilities, which were indiscriminate were terminated by a compromise. In 1452 Mahmûd Shârki, on the invitation of some disaffected nobles, attacked Dhilli in the absence of Bahûdûr Loud, but was defeated and compelled to retreat to Džawnpûr. The foolish act of aggression served only to arouse in Bahûlû a sense of the danger to Dhilli of the existence of an independent kingdom in Awadh. And in 1457 he marched to attack Mahmûd, who, however, died before he could meet him in the field.


MAHMUD I, SAFI AL-DIN, Bâhil Shârki, the greatest of the Suljânân of Gujrat, was a younger son of Muhammad I, Karm, and was born in 1444. In 1458 the nobles dethroned his nephew, Dâwûd, a vicious and depraved youth, and placed Mahmûd on the throne. The boy immediately displayed great courage and resource in the suppression of a serious conspiracy and rebellion at the beginning of his reign, and in 1461-1462 he marched to the assistance of the youthful Nizâm Shâh of the Dakhân, whose dominions had been invaded by Mahmûd I of Mâwla. He compelled the invaders to retire and frustrated a second attempt to invade the Dakhân. In 1466-1467 he attacked and defeated the Râdji of Gînîr in Kâthîwâr, which had been independent since the capture of the fortresses by Muhammad b. Tughluq of Dhilli in 1438, and reduced them to the position of a vassal. In 1470 he again invaded Gînîr, and on Dec. 4, captured the Râdji's stronghold and compelled him to accept Islâm, thus putting an end to the Cûdâsma dynasty, which had reigned in Gînîr for about 1,000 years. The Râdji became an amir of Gujrat, and received the title of Khân-Djâhan, and Mahmûd founded, near Gînîr, a new fortress, which he named Mushâtâbâbâd. He then invaded Kaich and suppressed a rebellion in that province, carrying its leaders, who were compelled to accept Islâm, to Musûtâtâbâbâd as hostages. In 1472 he crossed the Rân and marched into Sind, to assist LâshâNâ Nânda (Nizâm al-Dîn) who was beset by rebels. He crushed the rebellion, and after his return marched to Dwarthâ, to punish the Râdji, Bhîm, who had plundered a ship belonging to a Muslim merchant. Dwarthâ and Bhâst Shânkhodhar, the robber chief's stronghold, were taken, and a Muslim governor was appointed to manage the small state. Bhîm himself was captured and executed. Mahmûd's next expedition was against some Malâbârt pirates who had harassed the coast near Khambatây (Camby), and whose depredations were checked by the capture and execution of some of their number. Râdji Patâ of Câmpânâ had long encouraged brigandage in the kingdom of Gujrat, and Mahmûd now retaliated by raiding some districts of his state. On his return to Ahmadabâd he discovered a plot to depose him, formed by some of his nobles, who were weary of his ceaseless activity, but the malcontents, who were well aware of the dangers which threatened the kingdom, were brought to their senses by his threat to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah, leaving his young son as regent. After restoring order in various districts of his kingdom he marched, in December, 1482, to settle accounts with Câmpânâ. The forces fell, after a siege of two years, at the end of 1484 and the Râdji and his Minister, having refused, after five months' imprisonment, to accept Islâm, were put to death. In 1491 Mahmûd was disturbed by acts of piracy and aggression committed against his subjects by Bahûdûr Gilânî, a rebel in the Konkan, and his protests compelled the nobles of the distracted kingdom of the Dakân to unite for the purpose of crushing the rebel. In 1507 Mahmûd's fleet, under Malik Aiyân of Dîâ, participated with that of Malik Ashraf Kanâtî, of Egypt, in the victory over the Portuguese fleet, in which the gallant young Lourenço de Almeida, son of the viceroy, was slain, and later in the same year he invaded Khândesh and placed on the throne of that kingdom his daughter's son, 'Alam Khân, whose father was descended from the ruling family of Khândesh, and who ascended the throne under the title of 'Adîl Khân. In this campaign he was opposed by Nizâm Shâh of Ahmâdâbâd. In 1511 a mission from Shâh Isâm of Safawî of Persia arrived in Gujrat for the purpose of inviting Mahmûd to accept the Shîa faith, but he refused to see the heretics. He had now been ailing for some time, and on Nov. 23, 1511, he died, at the age of sixty-nine (lunar) years, after a reign of rather more than fifty-three years. He was a tall, burly man of commanding appearance, and was, besides being an able administrator, both warlike and chivalrous. His nickname of Begarha has been variously explained, but it undoubtedly had reference to his capture of the two great fortresses (gârêb) of Gînîr and Câmpânâ. His elder brother had died of poison, and strange stories are told of his precautions against a like fate. He is said to have gradually absorbed poisons into his system until he was so impregnated with them that a fly settling on his hand instantly died. Butler refers to this strange prophylactic treatment in the lines:

"The King of Cambay's daily food
Is ap, and basilisk, and toad".

He was also distinguished by his voracious ap-
petite. His daily allowance of food was between twenty and thirty pounds' weight, and before going to sleep he placed two pounds, or more, of boiled rice on either side of his couch, so that he might find something to eat on whichever side he awoke. When he rose in the morning he swallowed a cup of honey, a cup of butter, and from 100 to 150 bananans.


MAHMUD II of Gujurat, was the sixth son of Mu'ajjar II, on whose death his eldest son, Sikandar, was raised to the throne, but was assassinated on July 12, 1526. The minister then placed on the throne Mahmūd, who was an infant, in order that he might rule in his name, but Bahādur, the second son of Mu'ajjar, who had been absent at Dhihli and Djarwāpur, hastened back to secure his birthright, and on July 11, ascended the throne at Aḩmadābād and marched on to Cāmpāner, where his infant brother was. He entered the fortress without opposition, and Mahmūd was dethroned and secretly murdered within the year.

Bibliography: See MAHMUD I of Gujurat.

MAHMUD III, Sād-al-Dīn, of Gujurat, was the son of Latif Kān, third son of Mu'ajjar II. On the death of Bahādur Shāh Muhammed Shāh Farūkī of Kāhndes was offered the crown of Gujurat, but died on his way thither. The choice of the nobles then fell on Mahmūd, the heir male, but his cousin, Mubārak II of Kāhndes, in whose custody he was, and who had himself expected an offer of the crown of Gujurat, refused to surrender him, until an army from Gujurat compelled him to do so. The prince was escorted back to his country, and on Aug. 8, 1537, was enthroned as Mahmūd III, being then only eleven years of age. For the first three or four years of his reign he was a puppet in the hands of powerful ministers, and when he escaped from tutelage proved himself to be weak and inefficient. His attempt, in 1546, to recover Dīrī from the Portu-
guese, was a miserable failure, brutally avenged by him on the few Portuguese prisoners in his hands. In 1549 he retired to Mahmūdābād, where he lived in slothful luxury, ruining his constitution with drugs. On Feb. 15, 1554, he was stabbed, as he lay in a drunken stupor, at the instigation of an attendant named Burhān al-Dīn, who attempted to usurp the throne, but was slain by the nobles. The discovery of an heir was no easy matter, for Mahmūd, dreading an heir as a possible competitor, had taken the barbarous precaution of procuring an abortion whenever a woman of his harem became pregnant. The choice of the nobles ultimately fell on a young prince entitled Rādī al-Mulk, the great-grandson of Shākar Kān, a younger son of Aḩmad I, and he was raised to the throne under the title of Aḩmad II.

Bibliography: See MAHMUD I of Gujurat.

MAHMUD I, KHALID, of Mālwa, was the son of Malik Mu'ayyad, sister's son to Dilās̄ar Kān, the first independent Sulṭān of Mālwa. On May 12, 1436, Mahmūd caused his cousin, Muhammed Ghūrī, a debauched and barbarous prince, to be poisoned, frustrated an attempt to enthrone his young son, Mas'ūd, and offered the crown to his own father, Muqībī, who refused it, whereupon Mahmūd himself ascended the throne. He was beset by difficulties, and after quelling a rebellion raised on behalf of Aḩmad, a Ghūrī prince, repelled an invasion by Aḩmad I of Gujurat, who attempted to restore Mas'ūd to his father's throne. A pretender was set up in Cāndēri, and died while Mahmūd was besieging the fortress, but he was obliged to turn immediately against Dongar Singh of Gvālıār, who had taken advantage of the disturbed state of Mālwa to invade the country. He expelled the Hindus and returned to Māndū, whence he was summoned, in 1440, by a faction among the nobles of Dīhli, who offered him the throne. He marched to Tughluqābād, but his partisans failed him, and he was met by the army of Muhammed Shāh the Sayyid, under Bahālūl Lodi. After some indecisive fighting he agreed to retire, assenting the more readily owing to news of a serious rebellion in Māndū. On his return he found that the rebellion had been suppressed by his father, and in 1442 he invaded Mewār to punish the Rānā for the assistance which he had given to the pretender who had troubled the early years of his reign. He had considerable success in the campaign, but retired without attempting to besiege Cītār. On his return to Māndū he quarrelled with Mahmūd Shāh Shāh Shāfiq [q. v.] of Djarwāpur, regarding Nasīr Kān, the turbulent ruler of Kālpī, but after an indecisive campaign the two kings made peace on the basis of a compromise. In October, 1446, he again invaded Mewār, extorted some tribute from the Rānā, established his own authority in Ranthambhor, compelled Aḩmad Kān of Bīyānā to do homage and pay tribute, and collected tribute from the Rājā of Kota. He left a force to besiege Cītār, but the siege was not formed. In 1450 he invaded Gujurat to establish him to the allegiance of Kanak Dās, Rājā of Cāmpāner, but gained nothing except an instalment of tribute from the Rājā, and in the following year he suffered a severe defeat during a second invasion of Gujurat. In 1451 he subdued the turbulent Hārā Rājdāps on his northern frontier, and later in the year invaded Berār and besieged Māhūr, but retired when the Bahmani king marched to its relief. In 1455 he again invaded Mewār, recaptured Aḑjmer, collected tribute from minor chieftains, and harassed and plundered large tracts in Rājdūtpūtañā. In 1461 he was induced to invade the Dakan, where he defeated the army of the boy-king, Nīżām Shāh, and besieged him in his capital, but was obliged to retire by the news that Mahmūd I of Gujurat was marching to the assistance of Nīżām Shāh, and suffered severely at the hands of the Korkūs of the Melghāt during his retreat. He invaded the Dakan in the following year, but before he could effect anything was again obliged to retire by Mahmūd I of Gujurat. In the same year Kherla, a fortress of Berār held by him, was taken by the officers of the Bahmani king, but he succeeded in recovering it. In 1466 he again invaded Mewār, but though he defeated Rānā
Kumhā in the field he failed to take his capital by surprise, and returned to Māndā. In 1468 he marched to Canderi, and his officers captured and destroyed the fortress of Karahra. On his way back to Māndā he suffered severely from the heat, and on June 1, 1469, he died, at the age of sixty-eight. He was the greatest of the Muslim kings of Mālwa, and under him the kingdom reached its greatest extent. The "column of victory" at Citor is said to commemorate Rānā Kumhā's victories over Māhūmd I of Gudjarāt, and Māhūmd II, not by Kumhā himself, but by Māhūmd I. Māhūmd I's fame had reached distant Egypt, for he received an envoy from the phantom 'Abhāsīd Khālsī, who formally recognized him as Sulṭān of Mālwa. He was a zealous Muslim, and restored the use in all public offices of the inconvenient lunar calendar of Islām, and, while he gloried in his successes against the "infidels", was careful to excuse himself for his attacks — often unjustifiable — on sovereigns of his own faith.


(T. W. Haig)

MAHŪMD II, "ALI" AL-DIN, KHALEDJ, OF MĀLWA, was raised to the throne on May 2, 1511, on the death of his father, Nāṣir al-Dīn Khāledj. The early days of his reign were disturbed by rebellions on behalf of his brothers, and other pretenders, and he was once driven from his capital, but was enabled to return and expel the rebels by the assistance of Mehdī Khāj, with a force of Kāhdjīs. The king soon had reason to repent of having accepted their aid, for Mehdī Khāj assumed the place of minister, and the dominion of the Hindūs, alienated and disgusted all the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. Bihījī Khaṇ, governor of Canderi, openly expressed the cause of a pretender, and Māhūmd, while engaged in correspondence with him, was disturbed by news of a revolt in his capital, and of the invasion of his kingdom by Muṣafar II of Gudjarāt, but the revolt was suppressed, and the invader was recalled to Gudjarāt by domestic disturbances. After protracted negotiations the pretender fled, and Bihījī Khaṇ received Māhūmd at Canderi and endeavoured, but in vain, to free him from the influence of the Hindūs. Māhūmd returned to Māndā early in 1514 and fell entirely under the control of the Kāhdjīs, at whose instance he put to death many of the Muslim nobles of the kingdom. The arrogance of the Hindūs at length became intolerable, and in 1517 Māhūmd fled to Gudjarāt and sought aid of Muṣafar II, who led an army into Mālwa to restore his authority, captured Māndā, and massacred the Kāhdjīs who had held it. The rest of the Kāhdjīs in the state established themselves on its northern border and transferred their allegiance to Rānā Sangrama of Citor. Muṣafar retired to Gudjarāt leaving 10,000 horse to a-i Māhūmd, and Māhūmd besieged Gāgrān, held by Hemkaran for Mehdī Khāj. The Rānā marched to its relief, and Māhūmd, turning aside to meet him, suffered a severe defeat, and was wounded and captured. Sangrama received him courteously, but compelled him to surrender his crown jewels. He might now have annexed Mālwa, but, fearing to arouse the hostility of every Muslim ruler in India, made a virtue of necessity, and replaced Māhūmd on his throne. A few years later Māhūmd harboured and encouraged Cānd Khān, brother of Bahādur Shāh of Gudjarāt, and a pretendee to his throne. Bahādur invaded Mālwa and besieged Māndā. Māhūmd's sloth and negligence infected his army, and on March 17, 1531, Bahādur captured the city, and Māhūmd appeared before him. Mālwa was annexed to Gudjarāt, and Māhūmd and his family were sent towards Cāmpānī, to be imprisoned there. On April 12 the camp was attacked by a force of Bhīls and Kōlis, and Māhūmd's guards, fearing a rescue, put him to death. His seven sons were conveyed to Cāmpānī, and nothing more is known of their fate.

Bibliography: See MAHŪMD I OF MĀLWA.

(T. W. Haig)

MAHŪMD B. ISMĀ'IL. [See IBN KĀDI SMĀNĪN.]

MAHŪMD B. MUḤĀMMAD B. MALIKSHAḤ, a Salṭān ruler in the 'Irāq (511-525 = 1118-1131), ascended the throne as a boy of 13, being the eldest of his father's five sons. To his misfortune, his trusted advisers only troubled about their own interests, and made the young Sulṭān take various steps which were fatal to the prosperity of his reign. Anushahverd in al-Bondārī mentions no fewer than ten such fatal mistakes, the result was that even in the early years of his reign several ambitious Turkish emirs were in open rebellion while his father's Great Hādījī 'Ali Bār, who, during the latter's illness, had had and still retained control of the vast treasures which the latter had hoarded up, dissipated them in a very short time and let the young Sulṭān lead a gay life. Especially dangerous to him were the atabeks of his brothers Mas'ūd and Tūghrīl, who found the opportunity a favourable one to dispute the sultanate on behalf of their infant protégés. The result was that in 513 (1119) Sandjar, the Sulṭān's powerful uncle, was forced to interfere and marched on al-Ra'i after an attempt to appease him had failed. Māhūmd was then forced to allow matters to come to an open fight but his troops were defeated at Sāwā [q.v.] and nothing was left for him but to go to the victor and accede to the demands made by him. Fortunately Sandjar, whose mother was Māhūmd's grandmother, was favourably disposed to his nephew and announced himself content to add to his territory a few districts, e.g. al-Ra'i, but otherwise received Māhūmd in a friendly fashion and even gave him one of his daughters in marriage. Thereupon he retired and left Māhūmd without his help to make the best of the difficulties that faced him in the 'Irāq. There were had enough, for the Atabeg of Mas'ūd, whom Ibn al-Mīrīr calls Ayāba Dīyūḥsh-beg (cf. Erculii, ii. 132, note), in conjunction with the unruly Malik al-'Arab Dūhās [q.v.], was plotting to proclaim his protégé Sulṭān. The plan failed, however: Ayāba's troops were routed at Asadābād (514) and Mas'ūd's, unlucky vizier, the celebrated Arab poet al-'Uṭbārī [q.v.], was captured and soon afterwards put to death on the pretext
that he was an infidel. The two brothers readily
made friends again as Mṣūd was still a mere
child; Aiyāba escaped, was afterwards pardoned
by Mahmūd, but lost to Aṣḵonḵor al-Bursuki
[q.v.]; the governorship of Mūsul which he had
previously held. Dubais was preparing the Sulṭān
still further, and in the spring of 324 H., because Toghhril, who with his Atālıql had mean-
while been given the province of Arrān as Ṣafīq,
could not withstand the Georgians there, who had
taken Tiflis in 515 (cf. Brosset, Histoire de la
Géorgie, i. 365; Matthias de Edessa, ch. 230—
232; Ibn al-Fārīḵi in Ibn al-Ḵalâfī, ed. Ame-
droz, p. 205), and came to the ʿIrāk to seek
help from Mahmūd. The latter himself took the
field against the Georgians without doing much
and Toghhril, who had now returned to his pro-
vince, soon received a visit there from Dubais,
who persuaded him to set out to the ʿIrāk
against the caliph al-Mustarshīd. As they had no
success in this enterprise, they went to Shāndaq,
to attack the coming Caliph and Mahmūd. Shāndaq
thereupon went to al-Iṣaṣi and sent an
invitation to Mahmūd to come to answer the
charges (522 = 1128). Mahmūd was received with
honours and instructed to restore Dubais to his
territory in Ḥilla while Toghhril and Mṣūd was
also with him, went off with Shāndaq. Mahmūd
however did not find the caliph inclined to tolerate
Dubais in his neighbourhood, and the Sulṭān with-
drew his claims for a sum of 100,000 ānārs and
went to ʿHamadān. There had been trouble between
Mahmūd and the Caliph before and in 520 (1126)
for example there had been open fighting in the streets of ʿAbād between the Arabs and the
Sulṭān's Turkish troops. In all these circumstances,
Mahmūd proved unequal to his task; while he left
the business of government to his vinters,
among whom al-Sumairam and al-Dargazint (or
al-Anasaḵlādī as Ibn al-Ṯāhir always has it) were
the most prominent, he spent his time with his
hawks and hounds, which, according to Mīrḵhwānd,
were 400 in number and wore jewelled collars
and coverings embroidered with gold. It became
worse when he devoted himself to sensual plea-
sures and as a result of his sexual excesses fell
ill and died at ʿHamadān at the early age of
27 (Shawwāl 15, 525 = Sept. 10, 1131). Nevertheless
he was by no means an insignificant figure; he
had a good acquaintance with Arabic and was
celebrated in a long panegyric by Ḥaḡa-Baḡa
[q.v.]; Ibn al-Ṯāhir hands his gentleness and em-
phases that he never, as Sulṭāns usually did,
laid violent hands on the property of his sub-
jects.

Bibliography: in the article ʿIRĀK; cf. also Ibn Ḵalīḵūn, Wafayāt, Cairo 1299;
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Mahmūd of Ghazna, one of the most
famous of Muslim conquerrors, was the
elder son of Subuktigin and was born in 969 A.D.
In 994 Nūḥ II of Buhkār appointed Subuktigin
governor of Khurāsān, as a reward for assistance
received from him, and Subuktigin appointed as
his deputy his son Mahmūd, who took Nīshāpūr
and made it his capital. On his death in 997 Subuktigin left his throne to his young son Mṣūd, but Mahmūd marched to Ghazna, defeated his brother, and ascended the
throne in 999. Begrānī, an amir of Manṣūr II
of Buhkār, attempted to deprive Mahmūd of the
government of Khurāsān, but failed, and the Sī-
mānī dynasty was shortly afterwards extinguished,
its dominions being divided between Mahmūd and
Iḥāl Khand of Kāḡḡar. The ʿKhāṭif the ʿKāḏī
den now recognized Mahmūd as king of Ghazna
and Khurāsān, and conferred on him the title of
Aṭīm al-Malāt, and later that of Vāmīn al-Dawla,
as the last, and also as the successor of the
Valmī dynasty. Mahmūd now made a vow
to invade India and chastise the infidels every year
of his life, and during the remaining thirty years
of his life led no fewer than seventeen raids into
India. After an expedition in the year 1000 he
defeated and captured Djiāpīl I of the Pandjāb
in 1004, and took the town of Īnd. Djiāpīl was
released on promising to pay tribute, but would
not survive his disgrace, and burned himself to
death, leaving his kingdom to his son, Anandpāl.
Mahmūd received the title of Ghiārā, and in 1003
subdued Sīstān. Ḵalaf b. ʿArīmah, whom he defeated,
saved his life by addressing his conqueror as
ʿṢafīqīn"; a title which pleased Mahmūd so much
that he bore it ever afterwards, being, it is said,
the first Muslim sovereign to do so. In 1004 he
invaded the Multān state, and besieged its ruler,
Ḍawād, who had adopted the Carthamian heresy,
for seven months in its capital. Dāwād saved his
kingdom by abjuring his heresy and undertaking
to pay tribute, and Mahmūd returned to his
domains in time to meet Iḥāl Khand, who had
invaded them, near Ḵalīkh. He defeated the invader
and put him to flight, but while he was thus
engaged Sukhpal, a son of Anandpāl, who had
accepted Islam and received the title of Nawās,
tacitly rebelled. Mahmūd marched towards Ḵubār, Sukhpal's capital, but before his arrival there his officers had captured Sukhpal,
who was compelled to disgorge 400,000 dirhams,
and was imprisoned for life. Mahmūd then invaded
the district of Ghiārā, conquered it, and compelled
the inhabitants to accept Islam. Meanwhile the
princes of India had formed a confederacy to
defend their country and their religion, and when
Mahmūd crossed the Indus in 1008 he was met
at Īnd by a great army composed of the troops
of Anandpāl and those of the Ṭarāḏās of Udīḏḏān,
Gwaḵyār, Kūḵāndar, Kāmnawād, Dīḥī, and ʿAdḡān. Their combined forces nearly succeeded in defeating
Mahmūd, but after a hotly contested battle he
won the day, and the Hindus fled. The Ṭarāḏās
lost faith in each other, and the confederacy was
dissolved. Mahmūd pressed on to the fortress of
Ḵhavān and the temple of Nagarkot or ʿḴindā, the
gates of which were opened to him after a siege of seven days. The enormous plunder which
the temple yielded whetted Mahmūd's appetite
for further exploits of the same nature. In 1009
he again invaded the Pandjāb and plundered the
country and slaughtered its inhabitants. Anandpāl,
who dared not attack him, purchased peace by
the payment of an indemnity, a promise of tribute,
and an undertaking to allow him unrestricted
passage through the Pandjāb in future. Dāwād of
Multān had by now relapsed into heresy, and in
1010 Mahmūd invaded his kingdom, took his
capital, and after slaughtering and mutilating great
numbers of his heretical subjects sent him to end
his days as a prisoner in Ghiārā. In 1011 Mahmūd
marched through the Pandjāb to the plunder of
the wealthy temple of Thānesar. The Ṭarāḏās fled,
and Mahmūd plundered the temple, the city and
the kingdom, and carried off the idol Čakravartin,
with much booty and large numbers of captives, to Ghazna.

In 1012 Mahmūd's officers subdued Ghardjistān, and he compelled the Khalīfa al-Kādīr to cede to him those districts of Khurāsān which he had not yet occupied, but the Khalīfa returned a stern refusal to Mahmūd's demand for Samarkand, and Mahmūd was obliged to apologize for his presumption.

Anandpāl had now died and had been succeeded by his son, Trilokanāpāl, a weak monarch who committed the management of his affairs to his son, Nidar Bhīm, or "Bhim the Fearless". Bhīm reversed the submissive policy of his grandfather, and in 1013 Mahmūd was obliged to invade the Pandjāb in order to keep the road to Hindūstān open. In the spring of 1014 he defeated the Hindū prince in the Margala Pass, captured the fortress of Nandana, and pursued him into Kashmir, but was unable to come up with him, and was obliged to return. A second invasion of Kashmir was equally unsuccessful; he failed to take Lahore, and in the spring of 1016 he retired, with heavy losses, from his only unsuccessful campaign in India, losing, on his way, many of his men in the flooded Dījhām. In the same year he marched to Khāhir to avenge the death of his sister's husband, Abu 'l-Abbās Ma'nūn, who had been slain by rebels. He crushed the rebellion and appointed one of his own officers, Alūntāsh, to the government of his new conquest. In the autumn of 1016 he set out on his long meditated expedition into Hindustān, whether Trilokanāpāl and Nidar Bhīm had retired. He crossed the Indus on December 3 and received the submission of the Rāja of Barān, 10,000 of whose subjects accepted Islam. He next defeated Rājā Kulkand of Mahāthān, who to avoid disgrace stabbed his daughter and son, and himself. He sacked and destroyed the splendid cities of Mathurā and Fīrūzābād, and, using the greater part of his army there, marched with a picked force to Kannawād, defended by seven forts on the Ganges. Its ruler, Kāhyapāla, fled, leaving his capital undefended, the seven forts were plundered in one day, and the city was sacked. Aon, further down the Ganges, shared its fate, and Māhājān, "the Fort of the Brahman", was plundered after its defenders had been slain to a man. Rājā Can of Bharaya fled, but this city was sacked, and he was overtaken and defeated on January 6, 1019. Mahmūd then set out on his return march to Ghazna with a large number of elephants, 300,000 dālam, much other plunder, and captives so numerous that slaves were to be had for two or three dālam each. On his return he founded at Ghazna his great mosque, the "Pride of Heaven". Rādžā Nanda of Khānīqān and the Rājā of Gwalīyār had marched to Kannawād after Mahmūd's retreat, and had plundered Kāhyapāla for his cowardly desertion of his capital by putting him to death. They were attempting to form a new confederacy of Hindū princes when Mahmūd, in his invasion of Hindustān to frustrate their design, he defeated Trilokanāpāl on the Kāmān Pass and then turned to confront Rājā Nanda, who was marching to meet him with a great army, at the sight of which even Mahmūd quailed. Nanda, however, was smitten with a sudden panic and fled in the night, leaving his camp to be plundered by Mahmūd, who obtained, with much other booty, 580 elephants, in addition to 270 already taken

from Trilokanāpāl. Then, fearing lest his retreat through the Pandjāb should be cut off, he returned to Ghazna. In 1021 he resolved to provide himself with a base for future raids, and having invaded Swāt and Badjawr and compelled the inhabitants to accept Islam he attacked, but again failed to capture, the fortress of Lokhot, and, raising the siege, marched into the Pandjāb. Trilokanāpāl was dead, and Nidar Bhīm fled and took refuge with the Rājā of Adjarā, where he died in 1026. Mahmūd was thus able to annex the Pandjāb, and brought it under his own sway. In 1022 he again invaded Hindustān and attacked the fortresses of Gwalīyār and Kālidārā, but left their rulers in possession of them on their promising to pay tribute. On his return to Ghazna he mustered his army, and in 1023 invaded Transoxiana to establish his authority there. The smaller chiefs hastened to pay him homage, the ruler of Samarkand was brought before him in chains and was sentenced as a prisoner to Kālindārā, as were also the chiefs of the Saldājā tribe, 4,000 families of which Mahmūd, though he was apprehensive of their power, transported into Khurāsān. In 1025 Mahmūd set out on the most famous of his raids into India, the expedition to Sonnāth. The insolent boasts of the Brāhmans had annoyed him, but it was the reputed wealth of the temple that prompted the enterprise. He crossed the Indian desert after elaborate preparations, plundered both Adjarā and Anhilwārā, and reached Sonnāth in the middle of January, 1026. Within two days his troops had stormed the ramparts and entered the city, but the temple was strongly defended, and while he was attacking it he learned that the Hindū princes of Gujārāt, who had fled before his arrival, had rallied to the defence of the idol, and were before the city. Leaving a force to continue the siege of the temple, he marched against them, and, after a battle in which he narrowly escaped defeat, put them to flight. Their defeat sealed the fate of the temple, which was almost immediately captured. Mahmūd plundered it of its vast treasures and broke up its idol, a huge lingam. From Sonnāth he marched to punish Param Deo, Rādžā of Anhilwārā, for the attempt to relieve the temple, but the Rājā fled, leaving his stronghold and its treasures to the conqueror. It is said that Mahmūd was so captivated by the beauty and climate of Gujārāt that he was with difficulty dissuaded by his officers from making Anihilwārā his capital, and leaving Ghazna to his son, Ma'sūd. On his return march through the Sind desert his army suffered severely, and after crossing the desert was harried by the Dījāts, but succeeded in reaching Ghazna with its spoils. In 1027 Mahmūd undertook his last expedition into India, in order to punish these Dījāts. He collected a flotilla of boats at Multān, and, owing partly to their superior construction, defeated the Dījāts in a naval battle on the Indus, and carried off their families, which they had removed for safety to islands in the river.

The remainder of Mahmūd's life was devoted to the western provinces of his empire. He wrested Ira'ī, Ray 'i and Isfahān from the Buwayhids, invested his son Ma'sūd with the government of the newly conquered territory, and employed himself in establishing order and security on the caravan routes throughout his wide dominions, and in extirpating the heretics whom the Shī'ā Buwayhids had tolerated. In 1029 he returned from Ray'ī to


Balkh, and marched in the spring to Ghazna, where, on April 30, 1050, he died, at the age of sixty-three, worn out with the labours of forty years.

Mahmūd was far from being the zealous champion of the faith depicted by Muslim historians. Occasionally he encouraged, and even compelled Hindūs and others to accept Islam, but the propagation of the faith was never the primary object of any of his campaigns. Temples were attacked rather because they contained treasure than because they contained idols, and he did not hesitate to employ bodies of unconverted Hindūs, even against his brethren in the faith. He has been described as miserly but he loved money chieflly as the source of power. He adorned Ghazna with noble buildings and his court was in that age the chief resort of poets and men of learning, and was adorned by al-‘Uthn, al-Brānī, Usuri, Asadi, Asadad, Mināshirī, Firdawsī, and many other poets and men of letters. His sycophant treatment of Firdawsī is to be attributed rather to the malignity of a personal enemy than to the meanness of the king, and the poet’s mode of resenting it placed him beyond the pale of forgiveness. Mahmūd was one of the great figures in Islamic history, and though his warlike career left him no leisure for the acquisition of learning, he knew how to appreciate and reward literary merit in others.


(W. T. Hark)

MAHMUD GAWAN, IMAD AL-DIN, Khwārīzma, was born in A.D. 1045, of a family which had long held high office in the small principality of Ghur, which was attached to the empire of Gāwān, by which he was afterwards known in India, from Khwārīzma, his birthplace. He received a good education and as a young man made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While he was there his family fell into disgrace, so that he could not safely return home. Refusing offers of employment in other parts of Persia he became a merchant, and in 1055 sailed from the Persian Gulf for India, and landed at the port of Dabhol. Thence he proceeded to Bīdar, the capital of the Bahmani kings, and was well received by ‘Alī al-Dīn Aḥmad II, who was then reigning. He received the command of 1,000 horse and was sent to quell the rebellion of Daulat Khan in Telingāna. His conspicuous success secured his position as one of the leading nobles of the kingdom, and after the death of Aḥmad II in 1057 he received from his son and successor, Humayyān, the title of Malik al-Tughrīr (“Chief of the Merchants”), then highly esteemed. During Humayūn’s short reign he was employed in suppressing rebellion and restoring order in Telingāna, and on the king’s death, in 1061, was associated by his widow with herself and Khwādja Dānān in a council of regency. The foreign enemies of the kingdom took advantage of the childhood of the new king; Niẓām Shāh, and Mahmūd Gāwān bore an honourable part in repelling the invasion of the Rūdiana of Ur, who was forced to pay a large indemnity. Mahmūd Khaḍjī I of Māvāra next invaded the Dākan, defeated the army of Niẓām Shāh, and menaced the existence of the state. Mahmūd Gāwān succeeded in enlisting the aid of Mahmūd I, Begarā, of Gudjarāt, and with his help defeated and expelled the invader. Niẓām Shāh died in 1063, and the kingdom was governed for his younger brother, who succeeded as Muhammad III, by the same council of regency, but the arrogance and ambition of Khwādja Dānān the Turc so aroused the suspicions of the queen-mother that she ordered her young son to put him to death. She shortly afterwards retired from public life, leaving Mahmūd Gāwān, now entitled Khwādja Dānān, sole regent. In 1069 he was sent to subdue the Konkan, and to suppress the pirates of that region, and, in a series of campaigns extending over three years, conquered the country and captured Goa, then one of the principal ports of Vidāyānagar. On his return to Bīdar he was received with great honour and his position as first noble of the kingdom was assured. In 1072 he brought the seige of Belgaum to a successful conclusion, but the chief service which he rendered to the Bahmani kingdom was the reform of its administration. It had originally been divided into four great provinces, Jawlākhān, Berār, and Telingāna, to which the name of fārṣa was given, and the power of the fārṣār, or provincial governor, was almost absolute. He collected the revenue; raised, paid and commanded the army; and appointed all officials, his responsibility to the king being limited to maintaining order, keeping the people contented, remitting to the capital the quota of revenue due, and joining the king, when summoned, with the contingent of troops which he was bound to supply. Even in the early days of the kingdom rebellions raised by provincial governors had not been unknown, but the system had worked well on the whole so long as the limits of the kingdom were comparatively narrow, and the kings were energetic; but when the kingdom now stretched from sea to sea, the provinces were unwieldy and the duties and dangers of the old system were apparent to all. Mahmūd Gāwān divided each of the original fārṣas into two, so that their number became eight. Berār was divided into the two fārṣas of Gāwāl and Mihār; Dawlatābād into Dawlatābād and Dhumār; Gulbarga into Gulbarga and Bīḍā; and Telingāna into Warangal and Rājāmāhendri. The powers of the fārṣās were at the same time curtailed. These reforms were resented by all the old fārṣās, and by none more than by Malik Hasan Bahri. Niẓām al-Mulk, fārṣār of the great province of Telingāna, who was posted to the new fārṣa of Khwādja Dānān, and found his power, influence, and his emoluments reduced by more than half. He was the leader of the Dā-kānī party and Mahmūd, though he had done all in his power to end the strife between the Dakāns and the Foreigners, was a foreigner, and was regarded by all as the leader of the Foreign party. In 1081, the royal camp being then in Telingāna, Hasan Bahri took advantage of the absence of Mahmūd’s chief supporter, Yūnus ‘Adil Khan the Turk, who had been sent on an expedition into the eastern provinces of the kingdom of Vidāyānagar, to compass the downfall and death of Mahmūd. The minister’s
confidential secretary was induced, by misrepresen-
tation, to affix his master’s seal to a folded paper. The
paper was blank, and the conspirators wrote, above the
deed, a treasonable letter to the Râdja of Urisa, inviting him to invade the
kingdom. The letter was shown to the king when he was
drunk, and he at once summoned Mahmûd, who, though warned by his friends that mischief was
afoot, insisted on obeying the order. He was asked
by the king what was the punishment of treason
and unhesitatingly replied, “Death by the sword”.
He was then confronted with the letter, and though
he declared it to be a forgery the king paid no heed
to him, but bade the executioner do his
office, and withdrew. Mahmûd knelt down and repeated
the symbol of his faith, and the executioner, Dêshwar by name, struck off his head. An
order for the plundering of his camp was then
issued, and his followers were dispersed. The king
was much disappointed by the examination of his
late minister’s affairs. He had, throughout his official life continued his mercantile transactions,
and lived frugally on his profits. His great official
emoluments were expended on the troops and
establishments which he maintained and on public
works, and the balance was di-bur-ed in alms, in the
king’s name as well as in his own. Mahmûd III understood, too late, the value of the servant whom he had so
summarily put to death, and his remorse was bitter. Mahmûd was a great statesman and public benefactor. Learned himself,
he was a munificent patron of learning, and built at Biah a magnificent college, the ruins of which
are still to be seen. The only private property
which he left at his death was a splendid library.
He is one of the foremost figures in the political
history of India, and his death was the cause of the
fall of the dynasty which he had served so
well, for it destroyed the confidence of the nobles
in the town, and hastened the advent of the day
when the provincial governors proclaimed their
independence.

Bibliography: Muhammad Khâ-im Firâstây, Gülshân-i Hâkimî, Bombay lith. ed of 1832;
‘Abî ‘Arîb Allah Salâtâlî, Fûlân-i Mâgî, MSS., and translation by J. S. King, History of
the Rûmiyyâ‘n Dynasty, London 1900; E. Denison Ross, An Arabic History of Gujarat,
London 1910; Strât al-Mahmûdî, Hâdâis al-Balâd, Dâkan 1314.

(M. W. Huc)

MAHMÛD PASHA, grand vizier in the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Muhammad II, often
called Weli Mahmûd Pasha. He was born in Maşû
Hissar (Krusevatz) in Serbia, of Christian parents;
according to Chalcedonians, his father was Greek and his mother Serb. Taken in his youth to
Adrianople, he was brought up at the court of
Murâd II, and began his public career on the occasion of the accession of Muhammad II in 1451. Soon
afterwards he became Îlgerbeg of Rûmânia; ac-
cording to the historian Rûmiyyâ‘n Zade Mehmed
(Kutûk Nishândî) he had been also Nâşri arîb
[q. v.]. As Îlgerbeg, he took part in the capture
of Constantinople. After this event he was ap-
pointed grand vizier in 1453; the office had been
empty since the execution of Cendereki Khâtîf Pasha. As grand vizier, Mahmûd Pasha frequently
accompanied the Sultan on his campaigns but in
1456–1458 he was appointed to conduct the
operations against the Serbs, while the Sultan
conquered the Morea; in 1459 Muhammad himself
advanced against Serbia which was completely
subdued; during this war Mahmûd Pasha’s brother
was the leader of the Turkish party in Serbia. In
1460 and 1461 the grand vizier took part in the
expeditions against Sâmora and Trebizond as
commander of the fleet while Mahmûd led the
army by land. The capture of Trebizond was
mainly due to Mahmûd Pasha; he was related to
a high dignitary of the court there so that some Greek
authors talk of treachery (Fallmerayer, Geschichte des Kaiserums Trapezunt, p. 279). In 1462, Mahmûd
accompanied the Sultan against the Woiwod of
Wallachia, Wlad Dracul and in the following year as commander of the fleet he was sent to
conquer Lesbos and forced the Duke of Lesbos to
capitulate. In the same year he drove the Venetians
out of the isleusmus of Corinth. In the Bosnian
campaign of 1464, Mahmûd prepared the way for the Sultan’s advance by taking the principal
towns of the country. In the war that followed with Mathias, king of Hungary, Mahmûd failed
in his latter attempt to raise the siege of Zvornik. In
1466 he aided the Sultan in the campaign which was
to put an end to the power of the Karamanoglu and
defeated the Karamanîd Ishâq Beg near Lâranda. The latter himself escaped and this fact
combined with the too humane treatment which the
governor wished to apply to the people of
Konîja and Lâranda and the intrigues of the
second vizier Rûm Mahmûd Pasha, brought the
Sultan to dismiss him on the return march to
Constantinople. Mahmûd Pasha then governed the
sandjak of Gallipoli for some time. In 1472 he
again became grand vizier. The Sultan wished in
that year to send him against Uzun Hasan but
was persuaded by Mahmûd to send Ishâq Pasha in
his place; in the following year he accompanied the
Sultan against the Ak-Koyunlu, who were
finally routed after the Ottomans themselves had
suffered the defeat of Beg Bazar. In the same year
Mahmûd was again dismissed; the reason alleged
was a lack of zeal in the pursuit of the fugitives.
He then retired to the village of Khaîs Koy near
Adrianople. Next year he came to the capital on
the occasion of the marriage of Prince Muştafâ; this
opportunity was taken to calumniate him to the
Sultan on account of the intimacy which had existed
between Muştafâ and Mahmûd Pasha. This was
sufficient to get him imprisoned in the castle of
Yeti Kule and executed a few days later in Rabî’I,
879 (July—Aug. 1474).

Mahmûd Pasha was one of the most popular
grand viziers. His name still survives in the mosque
which he built at Stamoul in 868 (1463–64) on a site originally occupied by a church; in the
mosque is the turbe of the founder. He also erected
a medres, a mekhâme, a mekteb, a well and a
hammâm. There is a legendary story entitled
Menâkîr-ntâmî Mahmûd Pasha, in which his
unjust execution is specially emphasised (printed
in Fr. Dieterici, Christomathic Ottomanae, Berlin
1854): the historian Şarî al-Dîn in his Tâbîî
Tarîx-ü Eâmûî (i. 557) also devotes a chapter to the
Wâ‘arîâ‘ Mahmûd Pasha. Mahmûd Pasha was the
patron of a number of men of letters and scholars,
who dedicated their works to him. He was himself
a poet but it is uncertain whether he wrote under
the nâmâlis of ‘Adâm or ‘Adil. There is a Divân
of ‘Adil (printed Constantinople 1358) which is
generally attributed to Sultan Bâyazîd II but Glib
(Hist. Ott. Poetry, ii. 25 ff.) thinks it should be attributed to Mâhûd Paxha.
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(I. H. Kramers)

MAHÂPAIKER. [See KOSFAM.]

MAHR (x.), Hebrew Mahor, Syriac Mahî, "bridal gift", originally "purchase-money",
synonymous with gaddik which properly means
"friendship", then "present", a gift given voluntarily
and not as a result of a contract, is in Muslim
law the gift which the bridegroom has to give
the bride when the contract of marriage is made
and which becomes the property of the wife.

1. Among the pagan Arabs the mahû was an essential condition for a legal marriage and
only when a mahû had been given did a proper legal relationship arise. A marriage without a mahû
was regarded as shameful and looked upon as
concupiscible. In the romance of Antar the Arab
women, who are being forced to marry without
a mahû, indignantly reject such a marriage as
a disgrace. Victors alone married the daughter
of the conquered without giving them a mahû.

In the pre-Islamic period, the mahû was handed
over to the zâwi, i.e. the father, or brother or
relative in whose guardianship (zawil) the girl
was. Here the original character of the marriage
by purchase is more apparent. Earlier times
the bride received none of the mahû. What was
usually given the woman at the betrothal is the
gaddik: the mahû, being the purchase price
of the bride, is given to the wife.

But in the period shortly before Muhammad,
the mahû, or at least a part of it, seems already
to be given to the woman. According to the
Kurânic regulation that a divorce after cohabita-
tion the woman has the right to the whole mahû.

4. According to Muslim fîqh-books, marriage
is a contract (wed) made between the bridegroom
and the zawil of the bride. An essential element
in it is the mahû or gaddik, which the bridegroom
hands himself to give to the bride. The marriage
is null without a mahû. The jurisprudents
are not quite agreed as to the nature of the mahû.
Some regard it practically as purchase-money (e.g.
Khalil: "the mahû is like the purchase-money")
or as an equivalent (iwâf) for the possession
of the woman and the right over her, so that it is
like the price paid in a contract of sale, while
other jurisprudents see in the mahû a symbol, a mark
of honour or a proper legal security of property
for the woman.

All the things can be given as mahû that are
things (mîlî) in the legal sense and therefore
possible to deal in, that is can be the object of
an agreement. The mahû may also — but opinions
differ on the point — consist in a pledge to do
something or in doing something, e.g. instructing
the woman in the Kurânic regulation or allowing her to make
the pilgrimage. The whole of the mahû can either
be given at or shortly after the marriage or it
may be paid in installments. When the latter is
the case it is recommended to give the woman
a half or two-thirds before cohabitation and the rest
later. The mahû may be consumed:

Two kinds of mahû are distinguished:

dissolved. "And if ye wish to exchange one wife
for another and have given one a talent, take
nothing of it back". Even if the man divorces
the wife before he has cohabited with her he
must leave half the mahû with her (Sûra, ii. 237—238).

Down into the Muslim period the wife was
considered after the death of the husband as part
of his estate; the heir simply continued the marriage
of the deceased. Such levirate marriages are found
in the Old Testament also. Muhammad abolished
this custom, which still remained in his time, by
Sûra, iv. 23: "O ye, who are believers, it is not
permitted to you to inherit women against their will."

3. There was an ample store of traditions
about the mahû and these pave the way for the
theories laid down by the jurists in the fîqh-books.
From all the traditions, it is clear that the mahû
was an essential part of the contract of marriage.

According to a tradition in Bukhûrî the mahû is an essential condition for the legality of the marriage:
"every marriage without mahû is null and void".
Even if this tradition, so brief and to the point,
is not genuine, a number of traditions point to
the fact that the mahû was necessary for the
marriage, even if it only consisted of some trifling
thing. Thus in Ibn Mađa and Bukhûrî traditions
are given, according to which the Prophet permitted
a marriage with only a pair of shoes as mahû
and approved of a poor man, who did not even
possess an iron ring, giving his wife instruction
in the Kurânic mahû.

A few hadîths endeavour to show that the mahû
must be neither too high nor too low. From the
traditions we also learn what mahû was given in
particular cases in the Prophet's time: for example,
the bridal gift of "Abd al-Rahmân b. ˚Awf was
an ounce of gold, that of Abu Hurairâ of 10 ākâya
and a dish, that of Shaḥb. Sa'd an iron ring.

In the hadîths we again frequently find
the Kurânic regulation that in a divorce after cohabita-
tion the woman has the right to the whole mahû.

4. According to Muslim fîqh-books, marriage
is a contract (wed) made between the bridegroom
and the zawil of the bride. An essential element
in it is the mahû or gaddik, which the bridegroom
hands himself to give to the bride. The marriage
is null without a mahû. The jurisprudents
are not quite agreed as to the nature of the mahû.
Some regard it practically as purchase-money (e.g.
Khalil: "the mahû is like the purchase-money")
or as an equivalent (iwâf) for the possession
of the woman and the right over her, so that it is
like the price paid in a contract of sale, while
other jurisprudents see in the mahû a symbol, a mark
of honour or a proper legal security of property
for the woman.

All the things can be given as mahû that are
things (mîlî) in the legal sense and therefore
possible to deal in, that is can be the object of
an agreement. The mahû may also — but opinions
differ on the point — consist in a pledge to do
something or in doing something, e.g. instructing
the woman in the Kurânic regulation or allowing her to make
the pilgrimage. The whole of the mahû can either
be given at or shortly after the marriage or it
may be paid in installments. When the latter is
the case it is recommended to give the woman
a half or two-thirds before cohabitation and the rest
later. The mahû may be consumed:

Two kinds of mahû are distinguished:

a. Mahr muṣammā, "definite mahr", the amount of which is exactly laid down in the wedding contract.

b. Mahr al-mithl in which the amount is not exactly laid down, but the bridgegroom gives a brid al gift befitting the wealth, family and qualities of the bride. This mahr al-mithl is also applied in all cases in which nothing definite about the mahr was agreed upon in the contract.

The mahr becomes the property of the wife and she has full right to dispose of it as she likes. In the case of any dispute afterwards as to whether certain things belong to the mahr or not, the man is put upon oath.

The Sharī'ah lays down no maximum or minimum for the amount of the mahr; but limitations were introduced by the various law-schools: the Hanafīs and Shāfiʿīs insist upon 10 dirhems as a minimum and the Malikīs three dirhems. The difference in the amount fixed depends on the economic conditions in the different countries where the madhhab in question prevail.

If the man pronounces a divorce, the mahr must be paid in every case if cohabitation has taken place but the bridgegroom may give it in four installments before it is consummated; in this case he is bound to give the woman half the mahr.


MAHRA, a land on the southeast coast of Arabia on the Indian Ocean between Ḥadramāt, the coast of which is inhabited by the Kaʾait (Geyt), and Zafar: the Arabs however and modern geographers include Zafar itself. Formerly the town only and now the country, the old frankencese region [see Zafar], in Mahra, so that Mahra may be said to be the country between Ḥadramāt and Oman (cf. al-Dakhli, B. G. A. I. 11, 271; T. al-Husaini, ch. 6, n. 172; al-Makki, ibid., ch. 11, 52; Vajāk, Maṣṣūm, iv. 700; al-Dhīl, ed. Jaubert, Farnham 1836, p. 48; Ibn Khallābin, in Kay, Roman, London 1892, p. 132). This connotation of Mahra seems to have been already known to the Greeks of the fourth century n.c.: Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. iv. 4. 2, numbers among the lands of Arabia which yield spices, along with Sabaʾ, Ḥadramāt and Katabān, a fourth, Manusāna (var. Mānṣā). A satisfactory identification of this land, which would also explain the name, has not been made. Of the various attempts to explain it, given in the article SABAʾ in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencykl. d. r. Kunst. Altchristl., col. 1331 sqq. [cf. the article SABAʾ, iv. p. 64] that which suggests Manusāna is a corruption of Manusāna (Mānṣā) which Strabo, xvi. 678 gives with the three South Arabian kingdoms above mentioned, following Erothosthenes — these two authors represent one original source; Erothosthenes and Strabo are two different sources — is certainly wrong. The identification of Mānṣā with Mahra proposed by A. Sprenger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens, München 1875, p. 92, 263, 266, without however any attempt at proving it and also adopted by Fr. Hommel, Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients, München 1896 (i. v. Müller, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Sect. iii., Pt. i., vol. 1) p. 137, is worthy of attention. It was naturally to be expected that the botanist Theophrastus, whose duty it was to give as full a list as possible of lands in Arabia producing aromatic plants, should mention the real land of frankencese, Zafar or in a wider sense Mahra, including Zaftar. On the other hand, it is not to be denied that the mention in Theophrastus of a Mamali or Mali, which is quite unknown, after three well-known names, is remarkable, as it must of course be an important country, fit to be compared with Sabaʾ, Ḥadramāt and Katabān. Simply for this reason Alzer's various attempts to identify it (Schize der Geschichte und Geogr. Arabiens, ii., Berlin 1890, p. 3, 35 sqq., 40, 132, 153 sqq., 217), not one of which is tenable (cf. Realencykl. s.v. Sabaʾ, col. 1333 and here Sabaʾ, iv. p. 56), may be discarded. The passage in Theophrastus has been wrongly interpreted as mentioning Mamali only as the home of the cinnamon plant (see SABAʾ, iv., p. 56) and the literature there given to which may be now added: Hommel, Ethnologie [= Grundriss], p. 517, note 2). Although Mahra is not suggested without certain inherent probability, the question still arises how has it come to be called Mamali or Mali, which must remain more or less a puzzle. As the first two letters in Mahra and Mali are the same, it may be supposed that there is a corruption in the third letter of Mali. The name seems to conceal the Greek transcription of Mahra, which in the form MAPI (from MAPA), was corrupted to MAALI because it was of course unintelligible to the Greek copyists, or more likely been altered by a learned editor with emendation of the first syllable to MAMALI, especially as this form might seem to him to be superficially supported by the Maṣṣālā kūnām in Ptolemy, iv. 7. 5. A further corroborating factor is that Theophrastus' description of the hilly country, where the lībrahūs grows, with the ḫirʾ ṣuʾlah and ḥāwūt and nūrān, from which rivers pour down to the plain and which was visible to sailors from the coast, agrees very well with the description of the ḥirʾ lībrahūs wārṣā你会 in کی یا دچاریت of the land of Zafar [q.v.: in the Persian 'Peregrina Maris Erythraei', § 29 (cf. the ḫirʾ ṣuʾlah and širāth and nūrān, § 32, very probably the Ḥār mountains), and also recalls Carter's statement that nowhere else in South Arabia is there so much running water as in the frankencese country. This undeniable agreement is not affected by the fact that, according to Theophrastus, the frankencese country mentioned by him was in possession of the Sabaens. The fact that he mentions this land as a fourth with Sabaʾ, Ḥadramāt and Katabān and at the same time says that the Sabaens were lords (mişaṣa) of this frankencese country, suggests that the country which was quite a considerable distance from their original home, had passed to Sabaʾ by direct conquest or automatically with the occupation of the
whole territory of some formerly independent power. This may have been either its ancient rival Katabân, which, although still an independent kingdom, no longer exercised sovereignty over the frankincense country and about two centuries later lost its independence to Saba', or the ancient kingdom of Ḥadramôt, which with the frankincense country was in the time of Juba a part of the Sabaeœan kingdom, already ruled by the Himyars (according to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xii. 52 sq.; see Saba') and to which, certainly in the time of the Peripius, i.e. in the Himyar period of the early centuries A.D., long after the beginning of the dissolution of Sabæan rule, the frankincense country belonged but it is only if it is supposed that the frankincense country had been lost however have also been Saba' become a great power. Hommel assumes (*op. cit.*, p. 140 and notably p. 655) quite a close ethnic connection between the Ḥadramôtis and the Minaeans and he definitely says that the Ḥadramôtis Minaeans were those who took possession of the frankincense land, which geographically also appears most natural. No convincing argument can be brought against the evidence of Theophrastus that in his time or in that of his authority, perhaps Andrae's dates (cf. *Realencycl.*, s. v. Saba', col. 1306), the frankincense country was not independent, but belonged to Saba', so that the latter was already a great power, which possessed the hegemony of South Arabia and numbered its weaker neighbours among its feudatories. The frankincense land only became independent early in the Christian era. That the campaigns of the Sabæans extended considerably to the east may be deduced from the Šir̄at inscription (Glaseur, No. 1000) (cf. Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 658 sq.). On the unjustified alteration in the text (Za2r) in Theophrastus, see Sarx, iv. 6 (to the literature there quoted may now be added: Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 516 sq. and 653 sq. [in addition to 138]). To support the assumption that the Katabûnians occupied the frankincense land, it is not necessary to presume Gebban as a later name of Katabân (in allusion to the Gebhânaids of Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 153: on Glaseur's chronological error in the period of Katabûnian occupation of the frankincense country, see Zafer, No. 4). The expression Yamanat in the longer titles of the south Arabian kings of the last epoch means, according to Hommel in *Handbuch der alterthumskunde*, ed. by D. Nielsen, Copenhagen—Paris—Leipzig 1927, p. 96, note 5, "perhaps the frankincense coast as the "southland" of Ḥadramût"; it might well be interpreted as a general name of the southern coasts, at a later date still included in Yemen, in contrast to the lands of Saba', Ḫārīdân and Ḥadramût preceding it in the title, i.e. 49, "Sprenger's remark: *Das Leben und die Leere des Mahommed*, Berlin 1865, iii. 437: "The Mahrites were called Sachalities by the Greeks", is misleading; the land around the Sachalite Gulf is in the conception of the author of the Peripius and of Ptolemy not only Mahra, but also the land lying east of it and especially the part of al-Shîhr in the wider sense lying west of it, the land of the Ka‘āʾit (cf. the article *Ibaraita* in *Realencycl.*). The *regio turfae* in Pliny, xii. 52 (vi. 161) is probably to be understood as Zafr in the narrower sense but may include Mahra to which alone Glaseur refers it (*Die Abh. in Arabien und Afrika*, Munich 1895, p. 125; see at the beginning). The ʿAzārāḥ used in *Herodotos*, ii. 73, in the story of the phoenix is practically a reference to Mahra (Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 138) although it is not mentioned by name. On the *ʿAzārāḥ* in Stephanus, see below.

The inscriptions which, according to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 150, are inscribed on stone pillars on an island off the South Arabian coast (cf. the article *Shinna* in *Realencycl.*), cannot as Ritter for example (*Erzbuch.*, Vol. viii., Sect. 1, Pt. xii., Berlin 1846, p. 290) thought, be attributed "to the Mahri who were settled in the neighbourhood of Cane" but were probably Minaean (or Nabataean). The position of the emporium of Kanē which according to the *Peripius*, § 27 and Pliny, vi. 134 belonged to the frankincense country and is also mentioned by Ptolemy, vi. 7, 10 cannot be definitely ascertained. Recently several scholars, following Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 175, C. Landberg, *Arabica*, i., Leyden 1897, p. 75 sq., and *Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabe Miridionade*, i. (Ḥadhamōt), Leyden 1901, p. 196 and earlier writers (see the list in *Realencycl.*, s. v. Saba, col. 1330), have again expressed the view that this port is probably to be located at Ḥṣn al-Ghūrâb (Nielsen in *Handbuch, op. cit.*, p. 8) while Sprenger, *Geographie*, p. 82 sq. had placed it at Bâl-Ḥäft. Since Sprenger, nothing new has been produced in favour of the old view and against. In favour of the latter, in the inscription of Bâl-Ḥäft, and the description of the *Peripius*, § 27 according to which two uninhabited islands, the Šfrūw nūrēh ("Bird Island") and Ṣūllāla were 120 stadia distant from Kane. These, according to Sprenger, are the islands of "Haliyân and Ghusâl", also called al-Sīkka" (to be written: Ḥillīnâyyâ and ʿAnnâs also called Sakkâ; see Landberg, *Arabica*, iv. 66). Their mention makes certain the reference to Bâl-Ḥäft as the opposite point on the coast from which they are 110 and 150 stadia distant respectively, but not to Ḥṣn al-Ghūrâb which, according to Carter, is only a mile from Ḥillīnâyyâ. Landberg himself tells us that the island of ʿAnnâs seems never to have been inhabited. The distances from Bâl-Ḥäft from Ptolemy which besides varying in the manuscripts, naturally yield nothing really convincing in favour of Ḥṣn al-Ghūrâb (particularly of "Ka‘a al-ʿAṣīda, the equivalent of Cape Kane, west of Kane", according to Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 216: but this promontory of al-ʿAṣīda is at Bâl-Ḥäft!): these measurements can equally well be made to fit Bâl-Ḥäft. 11. v. Malizan, *Reise nach Sudarabien*, Brunswick 1873, p. 225 sqq. who could not yet have known of Sprenger's view, had already called attention to the Ḥṣn (he transcribes it Cane) occurring in the (third) smaller inscription of Ḥṣn al-Ghūrâb (a reprint in Landberg, *Arabica*, iv., P. 102, F. 398), is mentioned in it with "Cape Euphratium"; J. H. Mordtmann, *Z. D. M. G.*, xxxv. (1885), 233 likewise explained it as Kanē, the harbour of the citadel of al-Ghūrâb. Even if we readily grant that the uncertain word in the text of the inscription, most recently and probably definitively published and translated by B. Mlaker in *W. Z. K. M.*, xxxiv. (1927), p. 72, really reproduces the name Kanē, this does not prove, as Sprenger, *op. cit.*, p. 83 has pointed out, that the ancient seaport lay on the present rocky point of Ḥṣn al-Ghūrâb. It must also be remembered that the names of many Arabian harbours have in course of time been transferred to other places in the vicinity, e.g. Zafr (q. v., No. 4) and Mibāt. Landberg's
objection (Arabic, iv. 76) that the Periplos, if Kazâh had been Bûl-Haf, would not have said (39) that after Kane came another gulf running far inland, the Sâkhalîn, but would have mentioned the harbour of Bir ʿAll to the east of it, is not a cogent one. The Periplos gives a list of the most important gulfs of South Arabia and the comparatively small bay of Bir ʿAll might easily be overlooked behind the broad Sâkhalîn gulf which runs far inland, especially as the use of the term Sâkhalîn is a fairly elastic one (cf. the article IOMRÎT in Realencyc.) and the list of the places on the coast in the Periplos is not as a rule scientifically complete and exact but sometimes even gives wrong names (e.g. Mâyax, to say nothing of the fact that in many places on the South Arabian coast, the habitation conditions have changed since ancient times. Landberg himself (op. cit., p. 65) observes that the promontory of Hûn al-Qalmûn must have had a different appearance in earlier times. M. Hartmann, also, who had previously The Chibcha: Their ethnographical relations (Die Islamische Welt, ii.), Berlin 1909, p. 173, declared for the older views, and later in the very same work, p. 418, 614 that he had now adopted Sprenger’s opinion. The ʿAṣw in the inscription is still not sufficient ground for the conclusion that the identification of Kazâh with Bûl-Haf should be rejected in opposition to Sprenger, who himself appreciated the force of this evidence. The form of the name used by Sprenger, Bûl-Haf (Bûl-Haf), is incorrect however (as also is Glaser-ʿArr e-al-Ḥaṭf; cf. Landberg, Haṭf und Wadi ʿArabia, p. 195), ʿAṣw is equivalent to ʿAṣw but Sprenger rightly recognised that in this name there is preserved a memory of a son of al-Ḥaṭf, the son of Kudîa and ancestor of the Mahra (al-Lakkû, i. 19. Tāyit aṣṣirû, in. 551, see below).

The Arab geographers had no accurate knowledge of Mahra nor of Ḥadramît; modern explorers have found out much more about these regions. Al-Ḥamdûnī, Ṣafī al-Din Æbû al-Ṭârīkh (ed. D. H. Mâlî, Leyden 1884), p. 45 mentions al-ʿĀṣw—which Landberg Haṭf und Wadi ʿArabia, p. 158—wishes to restore to al-Wâṣa from manuscript-extracts— as the capital of Mahra, which, according to Glaser, Abécédaire, p. 87, stretches to the district lying roughly between Dûmûn and Ṣâq al-Tarîb ʿAll, almost in the centre of the modern coast region of Mahra. On p. 53 he says, as do Ibn al-Madhâwûr and others after him, that the Mahra people also inhabit Solōfûn (the conversion to Christianity of the mixed population of Solōfûn, see Yâkût, Muṣjam, in. 102; al-Muḥînī. Muṣjam, in. 36 sqq., etc. particularly in the article ʿAṣwû). On p. 51 he talks of the Mahra tribes and their settling and on p. 86 of the road from Ḥadramît to Mahra and tells us about the tomb of the Prophet Ἠḥîd. This sanctuary on the frontier between Ḥadramît and Mahra is still held in particular veneration and is much visited by the inhabitants of these two lands (a text from Ḥadramît showing this is given in Landberg, Haṭf und Wadi ʿArabia, ii. 432 :). — The Arab geographers include Mahra in the Yemen, e.g. Yâkût, Muṣjam, in. 394; see the reference to the Mîkhîrî Malî Mahra in Yâkût, Muṣjam, iv. 700. who in this his main reference, also repeats the view that Mahra is the name of a tribe and that the correct form is Mahârî. The Mahârî in Mahra is mentioned on iv. 697. It is sometimes more accurately defined as an extreme (furthest) Yemenite. E.g. Yâkût, Muṣjam, i. 280; ii. 510 (= Muḥînî, p. 160); iii. 306; iv. 345, 495; Muḥînî, p. 415. The Arabs speak of a Najdî in the land of the Mahra (Yâkût, Muṣjam, i. 280; iii. 681; iv. 345, 495, 697; Muḥînî, p. 394, 415; cf. al-Mukaddasî, op. cit., p. 98, al-Ṭabarî, ed. de Goeje, i. 1986). This is the Najdî (or Najdû) which Carter also mentions as a district in which the frankincense especially flourishes, the highland country about two days’ journey north of the coast within the latitude which Carter has also defined, although too narrowly (cf. 36X). The Mahra are also said to be inhabitants of the coastland of al-Ṣîhîr (q.v.1), for example by al-Masʿûdî, i. 333 and Yâkût, Muṣjam, iv. 387 and we find the land of Mahra is called al-Ṣîhîr (al-Ṣîhîr, op. cit., p. 25 = Ibn Ḥawâl, op. cit., p. 32 sqq.; al-Idrîsî, i. 48: Ibn Kâhûlán, ed. Kay, op. cit., p. 132; cf. al-Ḥamdûnî, Siṣa, p. 51 and al-Lakkû on al-ṢÎhîr; the statement in Rommel, Abhînedar Arabî Arabî Descriptiô, Göttingen 1802, p. 32 sq., is obscure). Al-Ṣîhîr however in the later and modern use of the name is applied to the coast not only of Mahraland proper but of the land of Ḫafṣîr also which is that of the frankincense country generally, i.e. the “frankincense coast” which is identified by many modern writers with the Mahra country but at the same time includes the part of the Ḥadramît which adjoins on the west (cf. Ibn Kâhûlán, op. cit., i. 332), i.e. in general the name of the shores of the Gulf of the Moon, finally in a still wider sense, the name of the whole coast between ʿĀden and ʿOmnā. Al-Ṣîhîr, op. cit., p. 25, and almost in the same words, Ibn Ḥawâl, op. cit., p. 32, also al-Masʿûdî, i. 333 op.; al-Idrîsî, i. 48, 150; Abu ʿI-Fâdî (see Rommel, op. cit., p. 33); Ibn Kâhûlán (loc. cit.) describe Mahra as a desert in which there are no palms and no agriculture and the inhabitants therefore are not acquainted with bread. Carter, like these Arab writers, also emphasises the contrast between the frankincense region and the dreary desert west and east of it and more recent travellers like Bent agree with him. The only possessors of the inhabitants, according to these authorities, are goats and very fine camels, particularly renowned for their swiftness, mentioned also by al-Ḥamdûnî, op. cit., p. 100, 201; Ibn Ḥawâl, Siṣa, ed. Westenfeld, p. 963 and the poets as well as the Lîfîn al-ʿArab, vii. 36; Kîmûs, i. 455 and Tâyît al-ʿArab (Mahârî); the Lîfîn quote three plural forms of Mahârîn, Mahârîn, Mahârûn; on the first cf. Howe, Grammar, i. 997, 1000). The camel which Mahârîn dîrîd chose for him-elf out of the booty after the battle of Badr had been purchased in Mahra; his governor the Yemen procured Mahra camels for the Caliph Sulâmîn b. Abî al-Malîk (714—717) (al-Ḵâzânî, ʿArab al-Ṭâfîl, ed. Westenfeld, u. 41). Ibn Ḥawâl (ibid.; Ibn Kâhûlán, op. cit.; cf. al-Idrîsî, i. 48) adds that the Mahra live on meat, milk and its products, and fish (cf. al-Mukaddasî, op. cit., p. 100) and that they feed their camels and goats on fish. Yâkût, Muṣjam, iv. 700, records a note that the Mahra camels do not take their name from the land but from the ancestor of the Mahra’s, Mahra b. Ḥailûn (cf. al-Ḥajwârî, also Lîfîn, Kîmûs and Tâyît loc. cit. and Rommel, op. cit., p. 33). According to Landberg, Haṭf und Wadi ʿArabia, p. 87, and others the Mahra riding camels have for long had a bad reputation, as they are really not swift; the best of this kind is said to be those of the Banî
In 1837 he obtained some information about conditions along this coast through his intercourse in Djidda with merchants from Ḥadramūt or Mahra (in *Journ. As.,* 3rd Ser., 1838, vol. v. 507 sqq., vol. vi. 529 sqq.); he gave an account of Gišīn, the capital of Mahra and the Sulṭān whose authority did not extend beyond the walls of the city. His description of the boundaries of the country was incorrect. Much more detailed and accurate were the topographical data collected by Captain S. B. Haines, who was appointed in 1854 to make an astronomical and nautical survey of the South Arabian coast from Bāb al-Mandab eastwards (as far as Ṣāṣ al-Ḥaḍād). In his *Memoir of the South and East Coast of Arabia* (in *J. R. Geog. Soc.,* London 1845, xvi. 104 sqq.), he describes the western boundary of Mahra, the Wāḍī Muslīm, which is rich in water and well tilled by the Mahra and contains many villages lying among palm groves. He then gives his short notes on the town of Ṣēṣṭ east of the Wāḍī and corroborates Frenzel’s account of Gišīn about which he is the first to give fuller details. C. Niebuhr, *Beschreibung von Arabien,* Copenhagen 1772, p. 287, had already mentioned “Keschin” and the independent shāikh there, who was also lord of Soḥoṣra; he also gives a plan of the harbour from a drawing by an Englishman, whom he had met only a few points on it, which were practically confined to the Gulf of Gišīn because their duty was really confined to surveying the coast west of Mahra. Valuable information about the Mahra is given in H. J. Carter’s *Notes on the Mahra Tribe of Southern Arabia with a Vocabulary of their Language,* in *J. R. A. S.,* Bombay Branch, July 1847, vol. ii., p. 339 sqq. Maltzan combined ethnological research with his study of the Mahra language (in the introduction of his edition of Adolph von Wrangel’s *Reise in Ḥadramaut,* Brunswick 1873 [the preface is dated 1870], p. 15 sqq., and 25 sqq., and in his article cited below) but regarding the country itself which he never entered, he knows not more than the English naval officers. The extracts in Ritter, *op. cit.* xii. 625 sqq., and 625 sqq. he says, are sufficiently accurate according to his own information. The coastlands east of Wāḍī Muslīm to Rās al-Ḥaḍād, i.e., Mahra, Zafār and ‘Oman he however calls the great “terra incognita of Oceanic Arabia.” “The names Mahra and Gārā (also ‘Al-nahr “writen Gara”) by which the two countries on the coast are distinguished, he described as “not clearly defined” (*op. cit.* p. 28). We now know that these are the Mahra and Kārā (the hill-people of Zafār) and the language of the latter is Kārāwī (Grawī or Shāhwī, in modern times also called Ḥakīli, or Shēhrāt [cf. Zafār]). Maltzan recognised
that the two peoples are fundamentally different in language, mode of life, and religion from the people of Central Arabia.

Glaser, Sicer, ii, p. 26, wrongly identifies Musawa in Sandeq, xvi, 768 (quoting Eratothenes) with Mahra (Keil, loc. cit., s.v. Satb, 1334 sgg.). On p. 20 he gives the land of Hadramut (after the fall of the ‘Abyssinian-Arab kingdom’) too great an extent (as far as Mirtha). On his note that the ‘Wajzatir’ of Hadramut are the hill-people of all Mahra cf. Keil, loc. cit., s.v. JOPAPATTEL. — As a result of the inquiries made by him on his travels in Arabia, he states (Abou Inaner, p. 87) that there are three distinct divisions of the Mahra tribes: the east-tern is called Shehab or Za’ir and inhabitant, according to another authority from the island of Mayara, to Ras Nas (55° 17’ East Long. from Gr.), according to another other person from the island of Mayara, to Ras Darbat ‘Ali (53° 3’ East Long.); the western that to which the name Mahra is generally applied, stretches from Ras Darbat ‘Ali to Sehut, while the third group inhabits Soqotra (cf. above on Ibn al-Madawi). — L. Hirsch gives not a little new and valuable information about the people of the southwestern coast. His account of Mahra is based on his ten days’ stay (1893) in Gishin (or Gishin, tran-scribed Kishan or Kishin; Hirsch writes sometimes [op. cit., p. 48, 50, 52 sgg.], Gishin and sometimes Kischin, like W. Hein and others [p. 2 sgg.]), he gives “Kaschen” in the Index as the Mahri pronunciation which is also given by Jahn (see below). Of the wretched little capital of the country, he tells us, practically agreeing with Haines before him and Hein and Bent after him, that it consists almost entirely of isolated mud-houses in a ruinous condition and a few ragged tents and reed huts which, being scattered aimlessly over a wide area, leave irregular wide open spaces between them. Even the palace of the Sultan whose rule over Gishin and Sehut and other places on the coast is quite nominal, as he can do nothing without the approval of his Beduins, is a broken down mud building; there is said to be only one building in the town that is kept clean, the house of another Sultan According to Hain, the most imposing of the mud houses, which are not built according to any system, is that occupied by the reigning Sultan’s body-guard. There is nothing like a regular market or regulated trade there. Even the most rudimentary necessities of life are acquired by barter and money is unknown from the government buildings a little mosque may be seen. While Maltan, corroborating Frendel and Haines, pointed out (Brit. E. Africa, p. 25), that the Mahra have long been distinguished a heretics, from the great majority of the orthodox and in creed can hardly be called Muslims at all, Hirsch says that at least in Gishin and Sehut the Mahra are no less attached to Islam than any other Arabs; he saw them regularly performing their "fetis". This contradiction may perhaps be explained by the observation already made by Haines on the same question. According to Hirsch the ruling Sultans or Shams are pure Arabs and not Mahra’s. In any case the attitude to Islam of Belus living north of the coastal territory is quite superficial. The Sultan of Gishin belongs to the dynasty which has also a kind of suzerainty over Soqotra. The Mahra coast, like Soqotra is under British suzerainty. Hirsch (p. 76 sgg. and on his map) gives the names of several places on the coast east of Gishin. Th.
p. 134) calls their language a jargon and al-Mašūdi, i. 333, points out differences between it and Arabic. Fresnel was the first, apart from early vague reports of a peculiar language in Hadramût, to explain that Hadramût, like a number of other districts of Arabia, had a language quite different from Arabic "in the interior of Yemen towards Ḥaḍramût". He had become acquainted with it from natives who called it Eḥkilī. This name however he gave (Note sur la langue Hdimarite f.A, 1838, 3rd Ser., vi. 79 sqq.) not only to Mehri or what he considered as such but to other South Arabian dialects and, as Maltzan has already pointed out, to Ḥimyarite also, although we must confess that this (or Sabaean) has several features in common with Mehri. Ritter, op. cit., xii. 46 ff., 254 and others followed Fresnel’s error, including Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, iii. 437; it is however quite an old mistake; it was made by Ibn Durri (see Wustenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, Register, p. 280) whom Sprenger follows (on al-Idrisi see above). Haines (see above) said that the language of the Mahra was strange to the Arabs. With these earlier and recent statements may be compared Landberg’s observation given by Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 153, that, “according to the statements of Arabs, Beduin tribes of the great desert of el-Ruba’ el-khalī north of Ḥaḍramût and the frankincense coast speak a language which the ordinary Arabs do not understand”; this, according to Hommel, could best be explained if a Mahra dialect was known in Ḥimyarite, from which it was descended through an unknown intermediary. He called attention to the similarity with Ethiopic and its modern forms, Ge’ez and Amhāric, and presupposed a homogeneous group distinct from Kur’ānic Arabic (see also his edition of Wrede’s Reise, p. 30 ff.). In Sprenger’s belief (Geographie, p. 268), the Semites of Ethiopia are of Mahri origin.

Maltzan’s studies in spite of their defects were most valuable preliminary work. Glaser was the first to define more accurately the limits within which Mehri was spoken (Abessinier, p. 87). Fresnel, Maltzan and Glaser had not been in Mahra or Ṣafar, but they ascertained the existence of the two districts: Fresnel in Djdma, Maltzan and Glaser in ‘Aden (Glaser, Abessinier, p. 184). The latter states (Szkize, ii. p. 96) that the Ḥakili live east of Ḥaḍramût and western Mahra (on the word of the cf. Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 233), and their language is called Shehrāt, while the dialect of the territory west of it is “Mehri (certainly not Eḥkilī)”, similarly in p. 178 sq. In his Abessinier, p. 155, also he identifies the Karā people with the Ḥakili [as does Hommel, op. cit., p. 153, who says: *šrā (villages) is the Arabic name for the native tribe of Ḥakili, whose language is called Shehrāt”). Ḥakili is the name given by Glaser (Szkize, ii., p. 95) to the inhabitants of Mahra whose tribal name in the form Ḥejjilī, Fresnel took for the name of the language spoken there and thus introduced it into European philological literature. Landberg’s opinion (Arabica, x., Leyden, 1898, p. 153) that the name Ḥakili is “toute à fait juste à côté de la vraie forme Ḥakilī”, is contradicted by Hirschi’s testimony (op. cit., p. 52: from Suhāt) that the name Ḥakili applied by European scholars to Mehri is unknown there and simply means “barbaric, unintelligible”. Hommel records (op. cit., p. 153) that Glaser had interesting specimens of the Karā dialect and of Mehri and Soğut but these have not been published.

Glaser (cf. Szkize, ii., p. 20, 96, 181 sq., 246, 503; Abessinier, p. 8 sqq. and Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 12, 148, 150 sqq.) further developed these ideas of Maltzan on the South Arabian-Ethiopian group of languages. According to the latter, the Ethiopic alphabet came from the Axum inscriptions and that of the later literature in the Ge’ez language from a variety of the alphabet of the South Arabian inscriptions, once common in the Mahra country and the frankincense land in general was the ancestral home of the Semitic Abyssinians and Amhārs. Against the view that the name of the latter is a plural of Mahra, it is sufficient to quote the form Amhār (Hommel, op. cit., p. 152, No. 182).

There is no reason to doubt contacts between Mehri and Ethiohpic (Hommel, p. 153). That in ancient times members of the people called Ḥabashat in the South Arabian inscriptions (cf. Glaser, Szkize, i., p. 25—27 and Abessinier, p. 28) were settled in Arabia is suggested by the mention of the Aṣṣuṣnu in Stephanus Byzantius s.v. from Uranus’ Arabia (μετα τος Σαμείου Χαθαμάτυ, Α’)[ Ahyfn] and the ‘Aṣṣuṣṣu tóis in Ptolemys, vi. 7, 11 (in Ṣafar, q.v.). From the first passage, Glaser, Abessinier, p. 88 has concluded that the Aṣṣuṣnu lived east of Ḥaḍramût, from Szkize, i., p. 26 he had previously supposed that by the land of the Aṣṣuṣnu was understood the whole coast from Ṣafar and Ṣāfī in the Ṣāfī and islands lying off it: his further identification, which however had been suggested by his predecessors, of the Aṣṣuṣnu with the Abyssinians (cf. Sabatik Dēnbąyler by J. H. Mordtmann and D. H. Muller, Vienna 1853, p. 40, where attention is called to the Albagshin of the inscriptions) is however worthy of attention. C. Conti Rossini in his article Sayli Ḥabashi (K, R. A. L., Vol. xiv., Ser. 54, 1906, p. 39—59) has however shown that the old home of the Ḥabashat of the South Arabian and Axumite inscriptions was in the southwest of Arabia and on the plains along the coast west of Ṣan’ā’, roughly between Ṣaḥaṭ and Zabīd. In the Aṣṣuṣnu of Uranus, Rossini rightly sees only an isolated section of this people or a military settlement. Glaser moreover (Szkize, i., p. 27) had at once identified the people Ṣakṣar mentioned in the Monumentum Adulatum (cf. D. H. Muller, Epigraphische Denkmaler aus Abessinien, Denkämmer, Ak. Wiener, xlii., p. 5, 7 sqg. ) in the Mahra and the people of the islands off the coast, which cannot at all be considered proved. In any case one cannot draw any deductions from the spread of Mehri regarding the extent of an old Ḥabashat kingdom (with Glaser, Szkize, p. 179) nor assume that as late as 100 B.C. the kings of Ḥabashat
were established in the land of Mahra (Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 151).

D. H. Müller and his collaborators were the first to collect and investigate texts in the Mahra language in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. In Vol. iv. of the Sudarabische Expedition, Vienna 1902, Die Mehri- und Sogotri-Sprache (1) he published Biblical texts, stories, poems and proverbs, which he collected for the most part on the Swedish steamer placed at the disposal of the expedition from the mouths of natives, who had been taken on board in ‘Aden and Soqotri. For Mehri in particular, he had a single authority, the same man as Jahn had. In the third volume of the same collection appeared Die Mehri-Sprache in Sudarabien by A. Jahn, texts and glossary, Vienna 1902. On these two works cf. the brief review by Glaser, Zwei Wiener Publikationen über den habschtlisch-puntischen Dialekt in Sudarabien, Beilage der Monatlichen Allgemeinen Zeitung, 1902, Nr. 186 and 187 of 16th and 18th August, and the very thorough and expert criticism by Landberg, Die Mehri-Sprache in Sudarabien… von A. Jahn and … D. H. Müller, kritisch durch Landberg, Seputri, 1902, Vol. iv. ed. by D. H. Müller, Sogotri-Texte, Wien 1902, forms Vol. vi. of the collection.

The already mentioned traveller W. Hein had in 1902 in Gishin with the assistance of various natives collected Mehri and Hadrami texts. He died in 1903 before he was able to put his material into its final form; D. H. Müller edited and published it in vol. ix. of the collection (Mehri- und Hadrami-Texte… Vienna 1909). Some of these texts are also included in vol. vii, Sogotri-Texte (III) by D. H. Müller, Vienna 1910 and supplied with Shihwari and Soqotri parallels.

M. Bittner’s grammatical studies in Mehri are full of matter and excellent in method (see Bibli.). The modern South Arabian dialects differ somewhat in some features in common with Sabaean cannot be explained as daughter-languages and the last surviving relics of the South Arabian language which is found in the Sabaeo and Minaean inscriptions (Jahn, op. cit., p. 1; see also Sogotri). In them, especially Mehri and Soqotri, we can at most recognize with Hommel, op. cit., p. 152 “a daughter language of south Arabian dialects formerly spoken there (in Mahra-land and on Soqotri), a pronouncement to which Mehri had already come very near. On the other hand Glaser went too far when he decreed Mehri and Soqotri as remains of the old “Panitic” Arabian (cf. Wirtschaft und Sozialleben der Mahra, Beilage der Monatlichen Allgemeinen Zeitung, 1899, Nr. 120 and 121 of May 27 and 29) as descendant of the old language of Hadhabat from which Ethiope and Amburhi are also and to come (see Hommel, op. cit., p. 153. note 1 and 4 and in Nielsen’s Handbuch, p. 91).

According to Vollers (Z. t. xvii. 223) the South Arabian dialects go back to the time of the settlement from Yemen; the immigrant Ad. not long before the coming of Islam, had occupied Mahra from which it had inculcated its language by their dialect. So early as al-Maqrizi (535) we find that the Mahra described as a mixed people (Glaser, Sogotri, u. p. 188 and 96) also speaks of the influence of eastern and north-eastern people on the Mahra language, but he wrongly ascribes to Parthian and Indian elements “the notable corruption of the Arabic language in the district of Mahra This”, hypothesis is in any case sufficient to help to explain the similarity of ‘Omání to the neighbouring dialect of Zafar. As regards Mehri, the possibility of older and deeper causes for its fundamental divergence from Arabic must be taken into consideration. That the foundations for the modern South Arabian dialects were laid not much before the coming of Islam is not improbable. The Mahra may, as has already been suggested, be the remains of an original population, which was driven into the inhospitable south from more habitable territory by later immigrations of Arab tribes. Even now, as Glaser, Sogotri, p. 187 tells us, the whole area in which Mahra is spoken is becoming more and more Arabic because no foreign people is now predominant in these regions, but traders who are mainly Arab. The cultural level of the Mahra is very low. They have never played a part of any note in history.


AL-MÂĐÂNĪ (A.), the Table, title of the fifth Sûra of the Qur’ân.

The obliquity of the ecliptic is one of the fundamental magnitudes of the solar system. It was therefore continually being calculated anew and almost always so as to obtain the altitudes of culmination $a_1$ and $a_2$ of the sun at the summer and winter solstices. The sun is at these times at the same distance from the equator, north in one case and south in the other. The obliquity of the ecliptic is the $\frac{a_1-a_2}{2} = \epsilon$. It should be mentioned that Muḥammad b. Ṣahāḥ (c. 875) claims to ascertain the magnitude from three different points (O. Schirmer, op. cit., p. 52).

The first method was that used by Hipparchus, Ptolemy and Eratosthenes, using the most varied instruments, the two rings, the quadrant and the armillary spheres. In the Muḥammadan period these observations were continued with larger and larger instruments and account taken of the fact that the sun does not always enter the solstices in question by day but may do so at night, that the heavens may be obscured at the time etc. From observations made before and after in time the question has to be obtained by interpolations. This is how Ṣahāḥ worked, (on the instruments used, cf. e.g. E. Wiedemann and Th. W. Juynboll, Astronomische Schriften ein von ihm erschlossenes Beobachtungsinstrument, Acta orientalci, v., 1926, p. 81–167). The values ascertained have been calculated by O. Schirmer (O. Schirmer, Studien zur Astronomic der Araber, S. B. P. M. S. Erl., lvii., 1926, p. 30–96). From the measurements, it was found that the obliquity of the ecliptic decreases in course of time, i.e. that the plain of the ecliptic approaches the plain of the equator. A conspectus of the views of Muslim scholars on this question has been given by O. Schirmer (op. cit.).

Further expressions used in this connection are utsūf al-mā'dīl, the inclined horizontal; it means any horizontal, except that of the equator, i.e. the horizontal inclined towards the horizontal of the equator. Khāṭf mā'dī 'an khāṭf al-irritwī', i.e. the line which is inclined towards the equator; this is a line (a circle) which lies parallel to the equator on the globe of the earth either north or south. Falak mā'dī 'an falak ma' addil al-naḥār has a corresponding meaning on the globe of the heavens; ṭirīṣa' a ṣaddūt tā mail il-ṣamthi, third altitude in the first vertical i.e. the vertical which goes through the eastern and western points of the horizontal.

(E. Wiedemann)

MAIMANA. situated at 36° N. and 64° 45' E., was formerly known as Al-Yahūdī, or Yahūdīya (Yakūt also calls it Yūhūdīn al-Kabīr), but the name was changed to Maimana, "the auspicious town", for the sake of good omen. It is at present the capital of the little province of Almār in Afghan Turkestan on the trade route between Herat and Balkh. Afghan Turkestan includes the western Kūhātes of Sir-i-pul, Shībargān, Andkhū and Maimana, sometimes classed together as the Čahār Wilāyāt. Dost Muḥammad took this territory from Būkhrā in the year 1855; the sovereignty remained in dispute between Kābul and Būkhrā, till it was settled in favour of Kābul by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1873. The low-spurs and offshoots of the Band-i Turkistān range subside gently into the Oxus plains and this favoured part of Afghanistan is
rich in agricultural possibilities. Until Maimana was visited by Professor Vambery in 1863, but one European, Captain Süring, had set foot within it. According to Vambery, the place consisted of some fifteen hundred mud huts and a dilapidated brick bazaar. Its inhabitants are Uzbekhs with a sprinkling of Tajiks, Heratis, Jews, Hindus and Afghans. Trade is now considerable and Maimana is renowned for its carpets and other stuffs made partly of wool and partly of camel's hair. It traffics with Persia and Baghdad in raisins, aniseed and pistacho nuts. Horses are good, plentiful and cheap.


**[R. I. Whitehead] Maimaní, the name of a district in southern Irāq.**

The origin and significance of this name, which fell into disuse in the late middle ages, is unknown. There is no certain trace of it in the cuneiform inscriptions; for the Babylonian Māšān, which Hommel (Ehmerer und Geogr. des alt. Orientes, Munich 1926, p. 261, 263) identifies with it is little worthy of serious consideration as the Old Testament *Māshān* (נָבָן, Gen. x. 30) which Biblical exegists frequently quote. Māšān first appears in the form *Maršān* in Sarbel in the first century A.D. Ptolemy gives *Marashān kēlēs* as the name for the innermost part of the land of the Persian Gulf. The word is certainly not Greek; the meaning "middle land", the land between two rivers, may be dismissed as a fanciful etymology. The territory of Mesene is in the cuneiform inscriptions the region of the southern Kaldu states, especially the most southerly Bit-Yakin; at the same time we find in them the term the sea-land (*māt-lamān*) as almost identical with Bit-Yakin; the part of Mesene between the Tigris and Kūzūstān was in the Babylonian period the home of the nomadic Aramaic tribes of Gambaū; cf. Streck, *Assurmapilul*, Leipzig 1916, iss. 775, 783, 796-97.

In classical literature Mesene is usually absolutely synonymous with Charakaene. Mesene or Charakeane appears in the second century B.C. (after ca. 129) as a small independent kingdom founded by a certain Hygasinoes, our knowledge of whom is practically limited to his coinage. After an existence of three and a half centuries Ardashir I put an end to this kingdom shortly after his accession, between 224 and 227 A.D.: for Arabic sources for this event, see Nolderke, *Gesch. d. Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden*, Leyden 1879, p. 13 (Tabari, i 818). In the strict sense of the word, Charakeene is only the delta of the Euphrates and Tigris before the junction of the two streams, the land on the north was Mesene: we have no information about the eastern and western frontiers of Charakeene. Perhaps, as Wensbach suggests (see Bibl.), Mesene was only later conquered by the rulers of Charakeene and its name transferred to this southern district. The Tailmād knows Mesene as *Mashān* (and *Māşān*). Syrian literature also knows *Mashān*. Among the Persians we have *Mēshān* and the Armenians *Mēšān*; of therein Schneider, *et al.*, p. 11. The Arabs took the word over as *Masān*; but we occasionally also find *Masān* (e.g. Tabari, iii. 1950 s). The old name Mesene is perhaps concealed in that of the little town of Mashān, which, according to the Arab sources, was near Basra and was celebrated as the birthplace of the Masānā

As in the case of Mesene-Charakene, we have no exact information about the mediaeval Arab Maīsān, which would enable us to define exactly the area and boundaries of the district. According to Yākūt, iv. 714 and ʿAlāʾīnī, p. 310, Maïsān is "an extensive district with numerous villages and palm groves between Baṣra and Wasṣīt, the capital of which is also called Maïsān". This district formed the sixth in the term Maïsān was also called "Sādāh-Baṣra" which was taken over by the Arabs (q. v.) and was called Shāḥān-Baṣra or "the Tigris district"; the name Furāt-Baṣra is also found. It was divided into four divisions (ṭasīd, q. v.) namely, Bahman Ardaṣhir, Maïsān, Dastmaīsān and Abāz-Kubād; according to Kūdāmā (B. G. A., vi. 236, 19), these four divisions of the Tigris district later passed into the administrative district of Baṣra. All four ṭasīd are to be located on the east side of the Tigris. Bahman Ardaṣhir, the capital of the district of the same name, lay on the left or north bank of the Tigris, opposite Ubūl on the west or south side of the Tigris river (the latter roughly on the site of the modern Ṭashḫah, the port of modern Baṣra). The second division, Maïsān in the narrow sense, must have been in that which stood the capital of the whole district of the same name. Al-Madīḥār however usually figures as such in the Arabic sources; it may be supposed that this was the successor of an older town called Maïsān. The locality of Al-Madīḥār cannot be exactly fixed (see below); it lies on the east bank of the Tigris, about thirty miles (as the crow flies) north of Kurna. Dastmaīsān also is to be sought east of the Tigris, in the region of al-Madīḥār, probably south or south-east of it. As to the fourth division, Abāz-Kubād, a name, which Marqāṭ, op. cit., p. 61 and Herzfeld, Id., ii. 150 would emend to Iradāh-Kawādī (Kubādī), relying on Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī (Ṭurābīz, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 57), this also must be placed east of the Tigris not too far from al-Madīḥār. A reference in Kūdāmā (p. 235, 15 sq.) agrees very well with this, according to which the four divisions of the land of Maïsān lay east of the Tigris.

Even under the Sassanians there was a separate Neotestamental ecclesiastical province of Maïsān, which was again divided into four subdivisions, the bishoprics of Pārāt de Maïsān, Karḵā de Maïsān, Bēḥ Raimā and Nehār Gāl (Gūr); cf. especially Sashau, op. cit., p. 48 sq. Marqāṭ, op. cit., assumed it as certain that these four dioceses must correspond to the four political divisions of the district of Maïsān. This view in itself probable and first found by Sashau, p. 49 as worthy of consideration is untenable, as Schaeber, op. cit., p. 29 sq. has shown. Pārāt de Maïsān is certainly identical with Bahmān but the second bishopric Karḵā de Maïsān does not correspond to the tāṣūd of Maïsān or Madīḥār but is to be located much farther south in the district of the modern Muḥammama. Bēḥ Raimā very probably lay not on the east but on the west bank of the Tigris at some distance N. E. of Baṣra, so that it does not even come into consideration as the equivalent of one of the four Arab divisions. Nehār Gāl (Gūr) may be equated to Nahīr Dīlūr of the Arab geographers (see Sashau, op. cit., p. 51; Schaeber, op. cit., p. 37). This is to be sought towards Khūzistān somewhere in the neighbourhood of Ḥuwaiza (see below). Whether the fourth tāṣūd Abāz-Kubād corresponds to it cannot be settled.

If then the capitals of all four divisions of the Tigris district are to be located on the east bank of the river, the lands on the west bank, also included in the sawād must have belonged to the same district as did the whole delta down to the Persian Gulf; for there is no district to which only the doubtful western and southern divisions might be allotted. In the Sasanian period, according to the Turfan fragments (cf. A. Schaser, op. cit., p. 370), the term Maïsān was also used for the whole of southern ʿIrāq (or Mādīgām) and this remained the case under the Arabs. But according to the Muslim sources, it does not seem to have been limited to the south proper but to have extended a considerable distance northwards. The quotations above given from Yākūt and ʿAlāʾīnī show that Maïsān was considered to stretch northwards to Wāṣīt (q. v. and vol. i., p. 676, ii., art. Kaskar); indeed it is most probable that the extreme N. E. frontier of the area known as Maïsān lay in the vicinity of the modern Kūt al-Amāra (q. v.; the Madīḥāyūd of the Arab geographers, cf. 669 sqq. of Masʿūd, Babylonian, ii. 310). The territory of Kaskar also stretched up to here and seems in the main to have included lands east of the Tigris (cf. Kaskar).

To avoid misunderstandings it should here be expressly mentioned that for the Arab period, of the present course of the Tigris only the Shāṭ al-ʿArab and the stretches as far as al-Maṭār come into question; in those days the Tigris bed corresponded with that of the Nahr al-Gharrāḥ (Shāṭ al-Hair) which was the western boundary of the district of Kaskar. For further details of the hydrography of Maïsān, see below. Maïsān is occasionally used as synonymous with Kaskar; cf. Schaeber, op. cit., p. 14, 17 sq. Maïsān probably stretched to the east as far as the alluvial land of the sawād, up to the frontier of Khūzistān in places beyond the present frontier of ʿIrāq. At least Ḥuwaiza (the modern Ḥawiza [q. v.]) which is now on Persian soil, is expressly mentioned as a town belonging to Maïsān.

The swamp regions, al-Batīf, for the most part came within the area of Maïsān. On this cf. al-Baṭiḥa and the articles on al-Baṭiḥa al-Hilāya and al-Djāzīrī by ʿAli Shārktī in the periodical Luḥat al-ʿArab, iv. (Baghdād 1927), p. 375-384, 474-477, 526-530 and vi. 277-279; also Ḥasım al-Sādī, Liqāʿīyat al-ʿIrāq, Baghdād 1927, p. 40, where the more important of the swamps (ḥūrūs) are given. In modern times the practically synonymous name Al-Kūhār (plur. of Ḫūr) is used for al-Batīf (see ʿAli Shārktī, op. cit., p. 376). The two specifically ʿIrāqī words Ḫūr and Ḫūr, which are very often used indiscriminately in European works, especially on maps (usually the one form Ḫūr) (cf. al-Baṭiḥa where Ḫūr is wrongly given for Ḫūr), have to be carefully distinguished. For haŭr (older alternative hasel), popularly Ḫūr = "permanent swamp, temporary lake, land liable to inundation" (cf. B. G. A., ed. de Goeje, iv. 370; G. le Strange, J.R.A.S., 1895, p. 298) and al-ḥawwār, popularly Ḫūr = "arm of a river, creek, lagoon-like gulf"; cf. especially the remarks of Brecc, in his Austerlitz-Marien, the account of the Baghdād periodical Luḥat al-ʿArab, in M. Lidzbarski, Das Johannesebuch der Mandaeer (Gießen 1915, p. 145).

One of the divisions of the Tigris district was called, as already mentioned, Dāst-i Maīsān. The
name is also vocalised Dastu- and Dasta-Maisan in our Arabic texts. Ibn Khalikān always writes the Persian form Dastūr Maisān; cf. ماریزد al-lṭlis‘, ed. Juybūlī, v. 468. Dastūr, dastūr can here only be the Persian dastūr = "plain". Schaefer's assumption, op. cit., p. 34, that Dastūr represents an abbreviation of the Pahlavi Daskert (Arabic maškar, q.v.) seems to me hardly tenable. With this division in particular was distinguished as the "plain of Maisān" from Maisān proper (especially from the second division of the district), is however not apparent. Could it here have been a more level plain, less filled with swamps? In any case, it is not correct to equate Dastūr Maisān without more ado to Maisān (as does G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 43). Yākūt (ib. 574) thus defines Dastūr Maisān:

"It is an important district between Wāsīt, Bāṣra and al-Ahwāz [q.v. (= Khūzāt, q.v.)] lying near to the last-named. The capital is Basamata; Dastūr Maisān is not identical with Maisān but is connected with it; it is also said that it is a district with the capital al-Ubulla and Bāṣra belonging to it." Nothing further is known about Basamata; here mentioned as the capital of Dastūr Maisān: the form in which the name is handed down varies (see the variant in the Mašūq, ed. Juybūlī, v. 468); it is apparently identical with Bāṣamāy, which al-Ma‘ṣūdādās (F. G. A., ii, 114, 4) details among the places of the district of Wāsīt (cf. Tahtān, iii, 1958, 17; Z. D. M. G., xxix. 669; xxxix. 26).

From the rather general remarks in Yākūt the boundaries of the district of Dastūr Maisān cannot unfortunately be ascertained. We are brought a step forward by a note in Ibn Rostān (F. G. A., vii 94, 2) which expressly states that a place named Aḥādīs, frequently mentioned in Arabic sources, is in Dastūr Maisān. When Yākūt in another connection (iv. 275, 2) mentions Aḥādīs as the "district of Dastūr Maisān" (i.e. distinguishing the two), as a division of the Kūzait, this probably is an inaccuracy. From the passage of Ibn Rostān quoted it is further evident that Aḥādīs must have been also al-Maḥān in the direction of Wāsīt. In keeping with this is an itinerary given by Kadhāmī (F. G. A., vii 126, 1-4) according to which a road from Wāsīt via Bāb Alīn (5 far. sakhs S. or S. E. of Wāsīt; cf. Yākūt, i. 461) to Bāṣra passed successively through Aḥādīs (= Aḥādīs) and al-Maḥān, Masakin. The distance of Bāb Alīn from Aḥādīs is put at 5 stages (zikā‘a’s), and from Aḥādīs to al-Maḥān at 8; cf. also Streck. Baby.-lon., i. 13-14. As a zikā‘a on the average may be put at 4-5 miles (see Streck, op. cit., p. xv) the distance from Bāb Alīn to Aḥādīs may be estimated at 30-40 miles; from Bāb Alīn to Wāsīt was about 15 miles. To this location of Aḥādīs agrees very well a note in Ibn Hawā‘īs (F. G. A., ii. 159, 1) who says that the date-palm grove of the district of Bāṣra stretched without interruption for over 20 parasangs = 150 miles, hardly remanufacturable from Aḥādīs (then away to the south on the seashore; q.v.) as far as Aḥādīs; the latter must mark the northern limit of the then district of Bāṣra. From the passages mentioned we have to look for Aḥādīs a fair distance to the north of al-Maḥān, probably rather near the bank of the eastern arm of the Tigris which was dry in the middle ages. The position given to Aḥādīs by G. Le Strange in his map to Ibn Serapion (J. K. A. A., 1895) and in The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (map ii.) — south of al-Maḥān on the left bank of the Tigris (in map ii.) or on the right bank opposite al-Maḥān — seems untenable. For further reference to Aḥādīs (with the variants ‘Abdās, ‘Abdās or ‘Abdās; according to Ḫanrawī al-Ǧāhidīn in Yākūt, iii. 609, 19 a Pehlavi name in B. G. A., Glossary, p. 94). The approximate identification of the position of ‘Abdās, which we have obtained, gives us a clue to that of Dastūr Maisān. This must have been aboveMaisān proper (with al-Maḥān), and have comprised roughly the most northern part of the whole district of Maisān in the wider sense. It should be noted that the order in which the four divisions of the Tigris district are officially given (Bahman Ardašīr, Maisān, Dastūr Maisān, Abāz-Kūhād; see above) is apparently that from south to north or rather north-east to the east. Dastūr Maisān extended as far as Khūzāt. It should not be forgotten that the eastern frontier of the caliphate during the caliphate must have undergone changes as a result of the constant alterations in the organisation of the provincial administration (cf. Schwartz, op. cit., p. 290, 291); this explains the apparent contradictions in our sources, in which one and the same place is sometimes put in the Ǧāhidīs, sometimes in Ahwāz [q.v.] (Khūzāt, q.v.; ‘Abāzīstan; see ARĀKIRI).

When we know definitely that Dastūr Maisān was separated by the division of Maisān from that of Bahman Ardašīr to which Ubbulla belonged, it appears rather remarkable that in Ibn Khordādbeh as well as in Yākūt (cf. Streck, op. cit., vi. 16, 19) Dastūr Maisān is equivalent to Ubbulla. If this is not simply a mistake, it might at most be explained, as Schaefer does (op. cit., p. 35) by saying that under the Ǧāhidīs the headquarters for the collection of taxes for Dastūr Maisān was moved to Ubbulla. The whole system of division into sawād, originally simply made for convenience in taxation, had lost any practical importance, at least under the later rulers of this dynasty. We are further definitely told that the Tigris district later passed under Bāṣra, where no doubt some of the officials of the old administrative district were moved to towns near Bāṣra like Ubbulla.

A part of Dastūr Maisān was known as Dūkhā. It must have lain to the west of the modern course of the Tigris roughly from al-Maḥān to ‘Abdās Ibn Rostān (op. cit., p. 95) tells us that in Dūkhā between the two towns just mentioned, a part of the Tigris water used at one time to collect into swamps, before the river altered its bed in the direction of Wāṣit. From the accounts of the campaigns of the Ǧāhidīs in the Umayyad period when the Dūkhā was a favourite place for these rebels to assemble (see vol. ii., p. 903b), it is evident that this district must have occupied the position here sketched out for it; cf. Wellhausen, in N. G. W. Götz, N. S., vol. vi., no. 2 (1901), p. 22. Whether al-Dūkhā stretched as far as the Nahr al-Ǧamarāf (Shāft al-Hayān) and even beyond it, we do not know. There is a Tell Dūkhā at some distance from the west bank of the Nahr al-Ǧamarāf, to be exact in 45° 52' E. Long., Greenew and 31° 45' N. Lat. It is possible that the mediaeval name of the division Dūkhā has survived in that of this mound, which conceals the ruins of the very ancient, not unimportant town of Ummā (ideographically written Ǧīh-Ūḥī).
For Umma, which is mentioned in inscriptions as early as 3200 B.C., and disappeared from history even before the time of Hammurabi, see Hommel, op. cit., p. 354–355, 1019, 1102 (Index) and Unger in the Reisschrift. der Vorgeschichte, xv. (1928), p. 3–4. Names like Đūkhā, Đawkhā, Đawkhan are found elsewhere in the mediaeval geographical nomenclature of ʻIrāk and Kūtšātān; see Yākūt, i. 669, 15–16; ii. 143; 144, 1; iii. 13; cf. on Đūkhā (Đawkhan) also Scheeder, op. cit., p. 23.

In southern ʻIrāk, to which the district of Mašān of the Arab middle ages roughly corresponds, in course of time far reaching changes have taken place in the appearance of the country. The history of the hydrography of this area is thus a very complicated problem and the solution of topographical questions especially difficult. The first thing to note in this connection is the fact that the Persian Gulf, the Khaljī al-Baṣra or al- ʿFāris, as the modern inhabitants of al- ʻIrāk call it (cf. Hāshim al- ʻAṣdā, op. cit., p. 20, 41; ʻAbd al-Razzāk al-ʿAṣdā, op. cit., p. 115; Lughat al-ʿArab, iii. 58, and the article BAṢRA AL-FĀRIS), stretched much farther north in ancient times and that what is now, that what is now called the Bahreinian period it was a lagoon almost as wide as a sea called Nārum Murratu (see Streck, Astur- banipal, Leipzig 1916, i. 726) and stretched northwards nearly as far as 31° N. Lat. The lagoon must have stretched from Kurna in a westerly direction indicated by the later course of the Euphrates or the modern swamps (hūrūs) of Abū Kīlām and al-Ḥamār, as far as the region of the mound of ruins of Abū Shahriyān (c. 12 miles S.W. of al-Maṣāyiyr-Ur). Abū Shahriyān, the ancient Eridu, certainly lay on the shore of this lagoon as we know from inscriptions found there; cf. Langdon, Ausgrabungen in Babylonien seit 1918 = A O. xxvi. (1928), p. 3–4; Weisbach's objections to the equation Abū Shahriyān = Eridu (in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., vi. 1205) are now disposed of. From Kurna the lagoon probably sent an arm to the east as far as the Kārūn. The land south of Kurna beyond Baṣra on both sides of the broad arm of the sea now marked by the bed of the Shatt al- ʿArab was probably only partly under water in ancient times (cf. Herzfeld, in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat und Tigrisgebiet, vol. i. Berlin 1911, p. 251), although it was probably exceedingly swampy. In any case in the Sargoniid period, the Euphrates, Tigris, Kārūn, and Kārūn all entered the sea or rather the lagoon running up from it by separate mouths. Cf. also al-BAṬĪHA and ii., p. 777.

If then the question of the extent of the delta since the beginning of the historical period can be approximately answered, it hardly seems possible to allot accurately the increase in land to each century, as we do not know if the sea always retired at a constant rate. In the middle ages 'Abbadān (q. v. and below) in 48° 22' E. Long. Greenwich, and 30° 12' N. Lat., c. 45 miles in a direct line from Baṣra, was still regarded as the most southerly town of the ʻIrāk. According to Ibn Baṭṭuta's Travels (ed. Paris, ii. 18) in the first half of the xivth century, it was also an hour's journey from the coast. This distance has now increased to over 20 miles. In the last 50 years there has been an average increase of land of at least 2½ miles a century. For further information on the steady formation of land by alluvial deposits at the north end of the Persian Gulf cf. SHATT AL- ʿARAB; S. Genthe, Der Pers. Meroosien, Marburg 1896, p. 54 sq.; The Persian Gulf (= Handbooks of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, No. 76, London 1920), p. 13; Hāshim al- ʿAṣdā, op. cit., p. 51–52. Since the last century the most southerly settlement immediately on the sea has been the telegraph and lighthouse station of Pāo; on this cf. below.

On the hydrographical conditions in Southern ʻIrāk, especially the course of the Euphrates and Tigris and the canal systems connected with them, as well as the swamps there (al-BAṬĪHA, q. v. or al-BAṬĀTH), we have a full and lucid description of the beginning of the tenth century in the part of the Geography of Ibn Serapion that has survived to us; see the pertinent passages in Le Strange's edition, in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 9–10 (sect. i.–ii.), 28–30 (sect. xiii.–xvi.), and translation and notes on p. 33 sq., 46 sq., 296–311.

The Tigris, probably, was in ancient times at its site in the modern Kūt al-ʿAmāra (q. v.), the Mādharā of the mediaeval Arabic sources (see above), into an eastern and western arm. For four centuries after 750 the Tigris has used the eastern bed running via ʿAmāra to Kurna, while the western arm, a more canal-like channel only navigable at high water, has been connected with the Euphrates. This western arm is in modern European literature known as Shatt al-Haiy. This seems to be a name coined by European travellers, apparently first found in the last decades of the xvith century (in Beauchamp; see Ritter, Erdkunde, xi. 973). Shatt al-Haiy = "river of the Haiy" was and still is the name given locally to the northern stretch of the river reaching as far as Haiy; but its whole course is usually called the ʻIrāk Nahr al-Gharrāf (cf. the quotations noted below from the works of Hāshim al- ʿAṣdā and ʻAbd al-Razzāk al- ʿAṣdā); Yākūt (ii. 533, 5 sq.; iii. 781, 3) already knows Nahr al-Gharrāf as the name of one of the five arms of the Tigris and of a district belonging to it. The Nahr al-Gharrāf was at one time called al-Muṣārakah; cf. Lughat al-ʿArab, i. 51. At the little town of al-Haiy the Nahr al-Gharrāf divides into five channels of which only the western Abū Djinairān has any water, while the eastern Shatt al-ʿAmā (or Amā; on the name cf. above ii. 777) is now quite dry; cf. Lughat al-ʿArab, i. 51, with note and correction on p. 225 sq. Four miles above Shattāra the main western arm also divides into the large Nahr al-Shattā Ṿ in the west, which enters the Tigris at Nāvyīrā (Nāvyīyeh, see KUT AL-ʿAMĀRA), the capital of the liwā of Muntashīk — for some years joined by a branch line to the station of al-Muṣārakah-Ur (Ur-junction) on the Baghdād-Baṣra railway —, and the smaller eastern Nahr Badīʿa (Baḍā) said to have been originally dug out by the Muntashīk which enters the Hūr al-Ḥamār somewhat east of Sīk al-Shiyākh (q. v.).

On the Nahr al-Gharrāf (Shatt al-Haiy) and the territory through which it flows, of which now as in the Turkish period, the northern part (including al-Haiy) belongs to the liwā of Kūt (al-ʿAmāra) and the southern to the liwā of al-Muntashīk, cf. vol. i., p. 676; ii. 513 sq. and KUT AL-ʿAMĀRA; and Streck, Babylonien, ii. 311 sq.; Lughat al-ʿArab, i. 51 sq., 152, 217, 219,
a little below the modern Kurna; cf. i. 676, 969 sq., ii. 119. Yākūt's account differs seriously from Ibn Serapion's description of the Lower Tigris. How far Yākūt, who lived 300 years after Ibn Serapion, reflects an alteration in the river system, it is impossible to say. According to Yākūt (iv. 553, 3 sq.; cf. thereon Streck, Babylonien, i. 39-40 and above i., p. 676), the Tigris after passing Wāsiṣ divided into five arms, which reunited at a place called al-Maṭara. This Maṭara (var. Maṭara and Maṭār in B. G. A., ii. 53, 15; iii. 161, 3) lay a day's journey from Baṣra i.e. about halfway between this town and Kurna.

These five arms of the Tigris were, he says, the Nahr Sāṣi, Nahr Gharraß, Nahr Dījār and Nahr Maṣān. Sāṣi is mentioned in another passage in Yākūt (iii. 11, 20) as a place above Wāsiṣ. Gharraß has already been mentioned as the usual modern name for the western arm of the Tigris (Shaṭ al-Hayy). The Nahr Dījār (apparently the Araicic form of the Arabic Diṭla) flowed, according to Yākūt, iv. 830, 22, or v. 838, 2, near the Nahr Abi l-Asad and east of the Nahr Dījār. The latter was (see Yākūt, v. 838, 2) between Wāsiṣ and Nahr Dākla. The Nahr Maṣān, finally, seems to be identical with the Diṭla al-Awrāa from al-Maṭara to the mouth of the Nahr Abi l-Asad (cf. also Yākūt, i. 603, 4).

The bed of the upper Diṭla al-Awrāa' which seems to have been dammed at al-Maṭara was apparently also fed by the waters of the Nahr Abi l-Asad. The Arab geographer Kūdāma (B. G. A., vi. 233, 3-4) says, "After leaving the Baṭha, the Tigris divides into two arms, the one of which goes to Baṣra and the other to al-Maṭara". On the banks of the Nahr Maṣān, "between al-Maṭara and Baṣra", lay the village of al-Bāzzār (Yākūt, i. 603, 4).

As to the Euphrates, we are told that in the middle ages it poured its waters into the Baṭha in two channels below Kūf & Hilla, like the main body of the Tigris in the west; cf. especially Ibn Serapion, ed. G. Le Strange, in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 109, 10 sq. and (p. 47, 260); G. Le Strange, Thi. Lands etc., p. 74 and above i., p. 513, 48, art. AL-FURĀT.

The Nahr Abi l-Asad, which runs out of the Baṭha and is often described by the Arab geographers as the eastern section of the (western) Tigris (cf. above and Yākūt, iv. 830, 22) might with a certain amount of justice also be claimed as the last stretch of the Euphrates. It is in this sense that Yākūt (iv. 561, 22) says that al-Maṭara, mentioned above, is "on the bank of the Tigris and the Euphrates at the junction of the two". On the alterations in the lower course of the Euphrates in the later middle ages down to the xvth century we have very little information (cf. AL-FURĀT), but we may assume that since about the xvth century, at latest since the beginning of the xvth, the whole volume of the Euphrates no longer disappeared in the swamps but a portion ran in a definite channel which roughly coincided with the course of the modern bed, and we may assume that since about the xvth century, at latest since the beginning of the xvth, the whole volume of the Euphrates no longer disappeared in the swamps but a portion ran in a definite channel which roughly coincided with the course of the modern bed, and we may assume that since about the xvi cent.
town; see also below, iv. 364). Since the great scheme for regulating the Euphrates was carried out by Willoccks in the last decade of this century (cf. ii., p. 515a and Shatt Al-`Arab) only a small and insignificant arm of the Euphrates now flows out at Kirkuk while its main arm cuts through the swamps of al-Hammar in a new channel and enters what is now called the Shatt al-`Arab above Karmat `Ali (c. 10 miles N. of Basra). On this modern Euphrates channel called after Karmat `Ali (popularly Karmat and Garmat `Ali) cf. Hāším al-Sa’dī, op. cit. p. 20, 69q. 36. In 1595, 56. 1 Abū al-Rāzáq al-Ḥasanī, op. cit., p. 69; 2, luḥat al-`Arab, ii. 365, 8 sq.; iv. 527; 3, Mecopotamia (Handbook of the Foreign Office, No. 63), London 1920, p. 6, 52 sq., 55 and cf. ii., p. 515.

The Eastern Tigris from al-Madīḥar to its mouth on the Persian Gulf bore in the middle ages the name of Dīdijat al-`Arwārā the one-eyed Tigris (on this cf. above, ii. 777); cf. especially Ibn Rosta (B. G. A., viii.), p. 94 sq. and Ibn Serapion (J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 28, 299–303); Streck, Babylonien, i. 41–42; G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 43; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 21–23 and cf. i., p. 676, 699 sq.; ii., p. 513 sq. Yākūt (iv. 850, 20) however limits the definition of Dīdijat al-`Arwārā from Oman to Maṭāra to the sea, i.e. the combined Euphrates and Tigris. At the same time we find other special names for this last section among the Arab authors of the middle ages like Dīdijat al-Asa`ra (the Tigris of B.), Fād al-Asa`ra (cf. e.g. Yākūt, iii. 931, 10), Batingha` Ward (Yākūt, i. 462, 11). A specifically Persian name is Bahmanīr = the river of the district of Bahman Ardashir (cf. ii., p. 777; see Yākūt, i. 770, 20).

Even in the Babylonian period the lower Tigris seems to have had a special name, Surāpū; see Meissner, op. cit., p. 5. For nearly two centuries the combined Euphrates and Tigris has been known as Shatt al-`Arab = the river of the Arabs, because its banks, although sinuous and with interior interruptions they have been in parts incorporated in the Persian kingdom, are almost exclusively inhabited by Arab tribesmen. (The name Shatt al-`Arab is found in the middle of the 11th century in Naṣr-i Khusraw [Sefernānī, ed. Schefer, p. 89] but this is the only early occurrence). In its lower half the Shatt al-`Arab has since that date formed the often contested frontier between Persia and Turkey (since the World War) the Kingdom of Irāk; about an hour's journey above (or west of) Muḥammara, the eastern bank becomes Persian. Cf. also the article Shatt al-`Arab and The Persian Gulf (Foreign Office Handbook, No. 76), London 1820, p. 15, 54.

The stretch of the Dīdijat al-`Arwārā corresponding to the modern Shatt al-`Arab in the middle ages sent out numerous canals on either side; the very complicated canal-system of the country round Basra was especially celebrated. The most important canals on the west bank were the Nahr Ma`ṣik (still to-day the name of a small village, an hour above al-`Aṣḥārā and the Nahr Ubulla (apparently the modern Nahr al-`Aṣḥārā) which united at the town of Basra and connected it with the Tigris. The medieval Nahr Abū al-Khalīsb, c. 15 miles south of Basra to the west side, may also be mentioned: this still exists to-day and has given its name to a district and its capital (belonging to the sandjak of Basra): see Cuinet, op. cit. p. 23; Abū al-Rāzáq al-Ḥasanī, op. cit., p. 118. Of the canals on the west bank the most important was the Nahr Bayān (cf. Schwars, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 311, 390–391). The Nahr Bayān formed an artificial channel connecting the Tigris and the Kārūn; we have also medieval references to a similar communication between these two rivers. Another canal still in existence on the west side is the Nahr Kayān (Rayān; modern Ryan) north of the Nahr Bayān. The most northern canal on the east side which left the Tigris about the neighbourhood of the modern Kirkuk, was called Nahr al-Mubarak, not Nahr al-Madīḥar (cf. thereon de Goeje, in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 749; cf. also to J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 30, 207, 308 and Streck, Babylonien, i. 41). Generally speaking, there are not now so many canals in the Shatt al-`Arab as there were in the middle ages. The best account of conditions in the caliphate is that of Ibn Serapion: see the text in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 29–30 (thereon p. 303–311); cf. also Streck, Babylonien, i. 42 and G. Le Strange, The Lands etc., p. 46–48. Cf. particularly the article al-`Asa`ra wa-Ankhurā, which gives a list of old and new names of canals, in Luḥat al-`Arab, iii. (1915), p. 57–68, 128–132 and p. 673–674 (additions) and p. 700–704 (indices); al-Nakhšhī, al-Tabšt al-Nakhshīyā fi Taʿrikh al-Qaṣr al-`Arabiyya, 2nd ed. Cairo 1342 (1923), ii. 15–53.

After the hydrography of the district of Māsān, we may now deal briefly with the more important places in it. The mediaeval Arab geographers give as its capital the already frequently mentioned al-Madīḥar on the eastern bank of the Tigris, 4 days' journey from Basra. The Shā`a inhabitants according to Yākūt (vi. 468) had a splendid mosque here with the tomb of `Abd Allāh b. `Ali who fell at Karbalā' in the year 680; on this see the references in Wustenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen der arab. Stamme, Register (1855), p. 8 and Yākūt, vi. 506; cf. also Ḫuwxī. This sanctuary still survives and it has not been noticed before (hence, for example, the inaccurate locations by G. Le Strange in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 300 and in The Lands etc., p. 42) to define quite exactly the site of al-Madīḥar. The name al-Madīḥar is no longer known on the spot; as of the old town the highly revered `Alid sanctuary is all that remains, the place is now called simply `Abd Allāh b. `Ali. Keppel, who passed here on his way up the river in 1824, speaks erroneously of "the residence of Sheikh Abdulla bin Ali, an Arab chief"; cf. his Personal Narrative of a Journey from India to England (London 1837), i. 91. According to his map (see Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, London 1856, Atlas, Pl. x.), Uzair and `Abbās Allāh are only 10 miles apart in a direct line, a figure which has however to be doubled when allowing for the many windings of the river if one goes by boat. The traveller Schläfli, who in 1862 went down the Tigris on a steamer, took two hours to go from `Abbās Allāh b. `Ali to Uzair; cf. his Reisen im Orient (Winterthur 1864), p. 137. Kich took six hours to ascend (Ritter, xi. 945). On my own journey in March 1927 I visited `Abbās Allāh b. `Ali the steamer covered Uzair with the river in favourable condition in not quite three hours. `Abbās Allāh b. `Ali lies on a slight eminence ten minutes from the left bank of the Tigris, which describes a curve here. The mosque of the tomb with its dome
visible from a long distance off stands within the south side of an oblong court, to which entrance is given by a door in the slightly built north wall. The Mağâna-poet al-Ḥarîrî, born in Mâsân (near Bâsra) is said by Yâkîn (iv. 468) to have died in al-Madâhr. As Ibn Rostâ (B. G. A., vil.), p. 95. tells us, the tides came up as far as al-Madâhr; this agrees with Schlafli’s observation (cf. cit.). The tide indeed is sometimes perceptible as far up as the town of Kaḥfân Sâbih, farther north; cf. Hashim al-Śâdî, op. cit., p. 39. 2; cf. also The Persian Gulf Pilot, London 1898, p. 295.

Opposite al-Madâhr, on the west bank was the little town of al-Hâtî (Yâkîn, iv. 947, ch. 49). When one observes in one passage (iv. 714) that the capital of Mâsân was also called Mâsân, he can only be referring to al-Madâhr, the centre of the district of Mâsân in the narrower sense, not perhaps, Futât Mâsân, for which we also find an abbreviated form Mâsân. The name al-Madâhr probably first came into existence in the Muslim period, perhaps for a new foundation on the site of the old town of Mâsân.

As to Kaḥfân Sâbih already mentioned on the left bank of the Tigris, which is called Abd Allah b. Ṭâīr, it belonged to the ārâb of Amâra, see Hashim al-Śâdî, op. cit., p. 151; Abd al-Razzâk al-Ḥanî, op. cit., p. 173—174 and Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, iv. 377—378, 380—385. This town of modern origin a couple of hours’ journey below Abd Allah b. Ṭâīr has now about 3,000 inhabitants (including many Mandaes). The site of al-Madâhr cannot be marked by Kaḥfân Sâbih for al-Madâhr was certainly of moderate extent and the Abd mosque is to be sought within it and not in its vicinity.

As to ‘Uzâir already mentioned (now usually pronounced Aṣṣār), south of Abd Allah b. Ṭâīr on the west bank of the Tigris, it is especially mentioned that it belonged to the district of Mâsân; see Yâkîn, iv. 319, 740; Kazwinî, Aṣṣâr at-Ṭârîkh, ed. Wuûtenfeld, ii. 310. The proper name of this place with the alleged tomb of Ezra (Uzâir) in the middle ages was, according to Arabic and Jewish sources, Nahr Sâma (popularity Summarah); cf. e.g. Yâkîn, iv. 820, 90. Cf. on Uzâir especially D. S. Sasson, op. cit. (see Bibl.). J. R. Ghannam, op. cit. (see Bibl.), p. 189 sqq. and the article ‘Uzâir.

The town of Aḥ láb (‘Ahlâb etc.) to the north of al-Madâhr has already been discussed. On the town of Huwâza (now Ḥawwârî) also belonging to Mâsân see above i. 670 and art. Ḥawwârî; to the Ḥawwârî may now also be added Layard in J. R. G. S. xi. (1846) p. 36. 36, l. de Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, État du Chalpeh, ii. Paris 1895, p. 275 and Schwarz, Ibn Imtâr at-Ṭârîkh, p. 392 sqq.; Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, vi. 377 sqq. An extensive swamp (ľâr), (cf. i.e. 676), takes its name from this town, the water from which flows into the Tigris a little south of Kûrân; cf. Hashim al-Śâdî, op. cit., p. 21.

The modern towns of importance on the Nahr al-Ghâzârî (Ṣaṭîb al-Hayî) are of recent origin and are still developing. They are from north to south: Hayî (Kît al-Hayî), a town with 9,000—10,000 inhabitants (cf. above i. 676; Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, i. 152, 224; Kaḥfân Sikkar with 1,500 and Shârû with 7,000 inhabitants; on these three places cf. Cunnet, op. cit., ii. 290, 310 sqq. 312—315, where Kaḥfân Šâhî is wrongly given for Kaḥfân Sikkar); Sâchûn, Am Enufatrât a And Tigris, Leipzig 1900, p. 69 sqq.; ’Abd al-Razzâk al-Ḥanî, op. cit., p. 111—113, 130 sqq.; Hashim al-Šâdî, op. cit., p. 147, 162—163.

At the spot which up till some two centuries ago was regarded as the junction of the Euphrates and the Tigris stands the little town of Kûrân (Kûrân, Gurna) with 2,000 inhabitants. It is not known to have existed in the middle ages; on it cf. above and Mignan, Travels in Chaldaea, London 1829, p. 284 sqq.; Ritter, xi. 1018—1023; Cunnet, op. cit., ii. 211 sqq.; ’Abd al-Razzâk al-Ḥanî, op. cit., p. 119; Hashim al-Śâdî, op. cit., p. 156; Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, ii. 37. Halfway between Kûrân and Bâsra must have stood al-Mâsânârâ where, according to Yâkîn, the two streams of the Tigris, or the Euphrates and the Tigris met in the middle ages; cf. above. About 3 hours’ journey above Bâsra on the right bank of the river is the little village of Kûrmârî, where as already mentioned, the main stream of the Euphrates flows into the Tigris or the Ṣaṭîb al-Ṭârîkh.

In the Muslim period, Bâsra was the largest and most important town in the old district of Mâsân and in practice its capital, although under the Ábbâṣids, al-Madâhr may have for a considerable period been regarded as the official capital. On Bâsra, mediaeval Bâsra, modern Bâsra and al-Áshâhîr, cf. the article Bâsra.

Al-Áshâhîr stands approximately on the site of Ubbûlla which as a suburb and port on the Tigris for the mediaeval Bâsra was of some importance. In our sources we are expressly told that Ubbûlla lay north of the canal which bore its name, partly on an island, which was formed by the Tigris and the two canals of Nahr al-Mâqîl and Nahr al-Ubbûlla which joined another at Bâsra. The modern Nahr al-Mâkîrî which leaves the Ṣaṭîb al-Ṭârîkh about one hour south of al-Áshâhîr, cannot be the Nahr al-Ubbûlla (in spite of Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, iii. 63). The modern al-Áshâhîr, the principal commercial centre of southern Irâk, is only a little inferior to Bâsra as regards numbers of population. The two together have now a population of 50—60,000. On Ubbûlla, the ancient Aṣṣâr al-kirîsî (i.e. Paulus-Wissowa, Reallex. der klass. Altertumswiss, Suppl.-Bd., i. 111), cf. G. Le Strange, J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 306 and The Lands etc., p. 47; Drouin, a.a.O. (Lit.), p. 91; Sachau, Arâb. Pr. Ac. W., 1919, N° 1, p. 20, 31 sqq.; Isl., xi. 151; Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, v. 477; vi. 200 sqq. and the art. UBBULLA.

Opposite al-Áshâhîr, on the east bank of the Ṣaṭîb al-Ṭârîkh stands the little town of al-Tânîmâ (cf. Lâzhâb at-Ṭârîkh, i. 129, p. 230, qii; ’Abd al-Razzâk al-Ḥanî, op. cit., p. 118; Hashim al-Šâdî, op. cit., p. 156, no). On its site or at least in the neighbourhood, there was already in ancient and mediaeval times an important harbour, known to Pliny as Forat (cf. also Drouin, op. cit., p. 8). In the Talmud (see Berliner, op. cit., p. 44) and in Syrian sources it is called Perât de Maṣîhân, in the mediaeval Arab authors Forât, Mâsân or Forât al-Bâsra. In Syrian and Arabic texts we also find Perât or Futât, without the addition of Mâsân; with Futât = Euphrates the name has no connection. When the first Sāsânîan king Ardâshîr I refounded the city it received from him the new name of Bâman-Ardâshîr, shortened to Bahmanshîr; see Hâmra al-Jâfshâhî, Tarîkh, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 37 sqq. 46 and Isl., xi. 149. Cf. the above mentioned
specifically Persian name of the Dījjāt al-`Awrīt and Banīshir (= Bahmanshir) as a name of an arm of the Kūrān (cf. ii., p. 777). That Farūt Mašāin was opposite Ubbul in the left bank is quite clear from the Arabic references: cf. Wellhausen, Abh. G. W. Götting. N. F., v., No. 2 (1901), p. 34 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31. The identification of Farūt Mašāin with the modern Başra or even with old Başra (Berliner, op. cit.), which has been championed by different scholars (Noldeke in S. B. Ak. Wien, 1893, Abb. ix., p. 18; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Sachau, Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1919, No. 1, p. 49; only suggested as a possibility by Herzfeld in Sylloge Inscriptionum Assyriarum, 1891, i., 251) is therefore untenable. Perāt de Mašāin was the see of the Nestorian metropolitan which was later moved to Başra (first certain reference in 893); cf. Sachau, op. cit., p. 49 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31 sq. The old name of the diocese Perāt de Mašāin was still frequently used in place of Başra even after the transfer of the episcopal see. If we have on one occasion, c. 900 A.D., a mention of a bishop of Mašāin simply, we should refer it to Perāt de Mašāin rather than to Karkh de Mašāin (so Sachau, op. cit., p. 50) because the abbreviation Mašāin for Perāt de Mašāin is found elsewhere in the Syriac literature (cf. Schaefer, op. cit., p. 32-33). As to the coins of the Omayyad period of the mint of Mašāin, this is probably to be explained also as al-Farūt Mašāin and not as Karkh Mašāin (so Mordtmann, Z. D. M. G., xxxiii. 126) or Mašāin (al-Madhār) as Schaefer, op. cit., p. 34 thinks. Abu 'Abd-fida, Taqsim al-Buldān (ed. Reinaud, p. 295), also is obviously thinking of Farūt Mašāin not Mašāin (al-Madhār) when he says “Mašāin is a little town in the lower part of the land of Başra”.

* On the east bank of the Shāṭ al-`Arab about where the Eulautos or Dukdevil (the modern Kūrān [q. v.]) joins it, Alexander the Great built a new town on the site of an older settlement, which he called Alexandria after himself. After its restoration by one of the Seleucids, it was known as Antiocheia. When Spasines (Hyaspasines) created a kingdom of his own in Mesene-Charakene, Alexandria-Antiocheia became his capital and was known as Xapaz Erawain; under this name (Arabic Karākhā Aspasina or simply Karākhā) it is mentioned in the Palmyrene inscriptions. Another foundation of the town is ascribed to Ardashir I, hence its official designation in the Sassanian period as Astārābahār Ardashir (also abbreviated to Astābahār); cf. Noldeke, Gesch. d. Araber und Perser zur Zeit der Sassaniden (Leiden 1879), p. 14; Marquart, op. cit., p. 41; Herzfeld, Ist., xi. c. 10; Hamza al-Isfahānī, op. cit., p. 47, gives the (corrupt?) form of the name Inshā Ardashir. The older name Karākhā more exactly defined by the addition “of Mašāin” remained in existence. The Syriac texts always write Karākhā de Mašāin. There was a Nestorian bishopric here, which seems soon to have disappeared under Islam; see Sachau, op. cit., p. 49-50 and Schaefer, op. cit., p. 53. The Arabs took over the Syriac name as Karākhā [q. v.]; cf. e.g. Vajz, iv. 207, 1. The Persian traveller Naṣir-i Khūraw, who visited the ‘Irāq about 445 (1051) (cf. his Sefername, ed. Schefer, p. 89) mentions, besides Bāṣra, in the district of Mašāin a place called ‘Akr Mašāin, probably an inaccurate reproduction of Karkh Mašāin. The site of Karākhā Mašāin is usually sought on that of the Persian port of Muhammarā, which has only arisen since about 1812, or at least in its immediate neighbourhood; cf. Andreas in Paulus-Wissowa, Realsynk., i., 1394 sq.; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7; Herzfeld in Sylloge, Archaeologische Reise im Ennner- und Tigrisgebiet, i. 251. Sachau, op. cit., p. 50; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 33. This identification has, therefore, been absolutely certain: Karkh Mašāin is perhaps to be located farther to the north; cf. e.g. the objections of Mordtmann in S. B. Ak., 1875, vol. ii. Suppl. Heft, iii., p. 14. Cf. also on Alexandria-Charax Spasina-Karkh Mašāin the important article “Alexandria” by Andreas in Paulus-Wissowa, Realsynk., i., 1390 sq. and the article Charax Spasinu by Weisbach, ibid., iii. 2122; Drouin, op. cit., p. 7—8, 15; Schaefer, op. cit., p. 31 sq. On coins struck in Karkh Mašāin of the Arsakid and Sassanian periods cf. Mordtmann, Z. D. M. G., xxxiii. 126 sq. and G. F. Hill, Catalogue of Greek Coins of Arabia and Persia in the British Museum (London 1922); cf. also Muhammera and also vol. ii. p. 777.

* In the middle ages the most southerly town in the ‘Irāq was ‘Abbādān, which then lay on the coast — under the later ‘Abbādās it was already some distance from it — and was an important harbour. Cf. above and the article ‘ABBĀDĀN.

* At the beginning of the twentieth century it was still an insignificant little village. It is only since the last twenty years that it has undergone an unexpected development because of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company making it the terminus of their pipes from Shuster and Mādīnā-Nafūn (cf. ii., p. 779b). The oil is now pumped into tank steamers at ‘Abbādān; important factories, warehouses etc. have been built there. Bīrūm, five minutes west of ‘Abbādān proper, has developed into a flourishing town which bears the name Bīrūm ‘Abbādān or ‘Abbādān al-Hadhūla = New ‘Abbādān. On the meaning of the word bīrūm (a particular kind of date) cf. Lughat al-‘Arab, i. 125, 1 sq., 443, 5; iii. 502, 2, from below. In Bīrūm are the ruins of a palace or castle said to date from the time of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; cf. Lughat al-‘Arab, i. 126, 5 sq. ‘Abbādān is now next to Bāṣra-‘Abbādān and Muhammera the largest and most important town in the whole of the Shāṭ al-‘Arab. On the other places on the island of ‘Abbādān cf. Lughat al-‘Arab, i. 128, 3 sq. The island, which before the war belonged to the Shaikh of Muhammera who was under Persian suzerainty, was leased about 1911 by England for 99 years. On mediaeval ‘Abbādān cf. Lughat al-‘Arab, i. 121—129; on modern ‘Abbādān and the works of the Persian Oil Company, ibid., i. 176-184; W. Schweer, Die türkisch-persisch. Erdbaukoronnen, Hamburg 1919, p. 52, 112—115.

At ‘Abbādān close to the sea-coast there stood in the middle ages the lighthouses known as al-`Abdhabīb [q. v.].

As has already been pointed out, ‘Abbādān is now over 20 miles from the sea. The most southerly place in the ‘Irāq for about a century has been the important lighthouse and telegraph station at Fānā [q. v.], built on the shore of the Persian Gulf; on it and the district, cf. Cuinet, op. cit., iii. 268—270; ‘Abb al-Raṣāzā al-Hasani, op. cit., p. 118; Hāṣim al-Sādī, op. cit., p. 21, 155-3 from below; cf. above and art. SHĀṬ AL-‘ARAB. The Turks fortified this important strategic point (see Persian Gulf [Handbooks etc.], p. 54; Meso
The remarkable set of the Mandaeans (the Sābī'a of the Kurān, q.v.), now called Sabbē, had from their early times their headquarters in southern Irāk, in Maisān, especially in the swamp country. On their geographical distribution in the sixth century cf. Chwolson, Die Sehnsucht der Siwaianer (St. Petersburg 1850, i. 124—125) and Euting, in Das Ausland (1876), p. 224—225. According to enquiries which I made in 1872 of Mandaeans, the number of Mandaeans in the larger towns of the Irāk may be approximately estimated as follows: in Amūrā and Hawīza 1,000 each; in Kūhāt Shībī and Mümmeh 500 each, in Bāṣa 500 and in Kūn 100. The language of the Mandaeans, who represent a remnant of the original native Aramaic population of Babylon, is probably identical in the main with the Aramaic idiom which was once predominant in southern Irāk, the dialect of the old kingdom of Mesene-Charakene, the Mekkān dialect as it is called in the Targum; cf. Noldeke, Mandische Grammatik (Halle 1875), xxvi and Pognon, Inschr. mandäische des gesce der Khouhout (Paris 1898—1899), p. 13—14, 224.

On the Indian people of the Dūst (Arab. Zūt) and the Zindī from East Africa, who were settled on the soil of Maisān at the end of the first (seventh) or in the third (ninith) century, see above i.e., p. 676 and the articles zūt and zītyī.

As to the industries of the people of Maisān in the middle ages we need only mention the mats made here, which are praised as the best of their kind; cf. S. Franck, Die aram. Fremdspr. in Arabisch. (Leyden 1886), p. 92. The reed-beds of the marshes supplied excellent material for them in enormous quantities. Even at the present day the manufacture of reed-mats continues to give employment to many hands; for the people of the flat lands in southern Irāk like to use long, thin-shaped butts called zerifa's, the walls of which are made of reed-matting.

The history of Maisān since the introduction of Islam practically coincides with that of the Irāk, especially that of the northern part (the province of Bāṣa and the Bāṭah); the reader may therefore be referred to the articles Irāk, Nasra and Abū Qīra. Here we will only point out that the administrative district of the Tigris belonging to Maisān was conquered with Dāst-i Maisān in the year 14 (635) on this conquest of Baladūrī, op. cit., p. 340—346 and Caetani, Ann. dell' Islam, iii. 252, 301—304 (§ 6 and 81—86); vi. 108 (Index s.v. Maisān).

Al-Madīr, the capital of Maisān, was the scene of important military happenings at the time of the Arab invasion and frequently later also. In the year 12 (633) al-Khālid and al-Muhammad fought a great battle with the Persians at this town, the first in their invasion of the Irāk. This battle is sometimes called after an adjacent canal, called al-Thīn (Yāḵūt, i. 937, 5). The defeated Persians are said to have lost 30,000 men in this encounter; cf. Baladūrī, op. cit., p. 242 and Tāḥārī, op. cit., v. 2026—2029; al-Masūdī, op. cit., 209; Muller, Der Islam, i. 228; Caetani, op. cit., ii. 595—602 (§ 196—200). In the fighting with the Khāndis for whom the district of Dūst-i Maisān frequently served as a hiding-place, there was a desperate battle in 47 (664) in and around the town of al-Madīr. These rebels were forced to retreat by the Khāfūn under the leadership of Mākbīl b. Kais; cf. Wellhausen, Abb.
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MAISARA, a Berber chief of the Maghrib, who rebelled against Arab rule in 122 (739/40). He belonged to the tribe of the Maṭḥār, and the historians give him the surname of al-Ḥakīr "the low-born" because he was of humble origin and before his rebellion had been a water-seller in the market of al-Kairawān.

After the recall of Mūṣā b. Nuṣair at the end of the first century A. H., rebellion began to smoulder in North Africa. Umār b. Abī Allāh al-Marrādī, governor of Tangier, and a grandson of 'Uṣba b. Nāṣir, Ḥabīb b. Abī 'Urnadi, governor of Sūs, were inflicting grievances on the Berbers by treating them, as regards taxation, as a conquered people not converted to Islam, and by taking the fairest of their women to send as slaves to Damascen. The general Ḥabīb having been sent from Sūs with his troops to the conquest of Sicily, his departure was the signal for insurrection. A movement on a large scale broke out; at its head the Berbers put Maisār al-Maṭḥārī. With the related tribes of the Mīkānas and Baraghāwā [q. v.] Maisār advanced on Tangier and seized it. The Arabs tried in vain to withstand him; the governor of Spain, 'Uṣba b. al-Haddājī, even crossed the Strait to help Tangier but his efforts were in vain. It was not long before Maisār was disarmed and killed by his own followers but his successor Khalīd b. Ḥamd al-Zanātī was more fortunate: at the beginning of 123 (740) he inflicted on the Arabs on the banks of the Wādī Shalīf (Chelif) the disastrous defeat known as the "battle of the nobles" (ghawāzī la-tāghrīf). It required a great expeditionary force to be organised in the east in order to overcome finally this general rebellion, which was not done without considerable losses.


MAISIR, casting lots by arrows, a method by which a head of cattle was divided. This was the custom of the Arabs before Islam. The word seems almost to mean lucky chance, easy success, from yasīra, to be easy, yasara, to succeed; cf. maisara, comfort, riches. A group of ten Arabs used to buy a young camel, which was cut into ten portions and the yāhir presiding distributed the portions among his companions by means of arrows on which he had written their names and which he drew at random out of a bag. In another system 28 portions were made of the animal; there was one part for the first arrow, 2 for the second and 3 for the third and so on up to 7; the three last got nothing. These arrows were deposited with the guardians of the temple in Mecca.

The game was considered a pagan practice and the Kur'an (ii. 216 and v. 92) forbade it along with wine and idols as a major sin.

The word maisir has acquired a wider sense among the commentators and in certain traditions.
Zamakhshari gives it the same sense as *kimār* [q.v.]. According to a tradition of the Prophet, *maisir* is applied also to *dūce*: “these accused dūce are the *maisir* of Persia (*maisir* al-*fāṣid*)”; according to a tradition attributed to ‘Ali it is also to be extended to backgammon and chess (presumably in so far as dice were used in these games) and according to Ibn Sirin to every practice in which there is an element of chance.

Cf. the Dictionaries, the *Kāmil, Dajbari, Zamakhshari, Kochākhāb*, ed. Nasrān Līs, i. 380; al-‘Aṣākb, ed. Houtsm, i. 500 sqq.; Huber, *Über die: Māsur genannte Spieß; Freytag, Einleitung*, p. 170 sqq. (B. CARRA DE VAUX)

**MAISUN**, daughter of the Caliph Yazid I. We do not know if after her marriage with Mu’āwiyah she retained the Christian religion which had been that of her family and of her tribe. A few verses are attributed to her in which she sings for the desert and shows very slight attachment for her husband. But the attribution to Masun of this fragment of poetry, which is in any case old, has been rightly disputed. She took a great interest in the education of her son Yazid and accompanied him to the desert of Khul where the prince passed a part of his youth; this temporary separation from her husband gave rise to the legend of her repudiation by Mu’āwiyah. She must have died before Yazid became Caliph.

**Bibliography:** This is given in Lammens, *Iktisat, ou l’histoire du califat omeyyade Méziria I* (M 10, 6, ii.), p. 286–287, 305, 312–314 (II. LAMMENS).

**MAISUR** (Masore) (St. mabili-Cañor “buffalo town”), the premier Hindu State in India, is a principality in Southern India under the British protection, having an area of 29,492 square miles, between 17° 36’ and 15° 2’ N. and 74° 38’ and 76° 36’ E. Its Hindu rulers preserved their independence until the middle of the sixteenth century when Haidar Ali [q.v.] took possession of the territory in his and his successor, Tippa Sultan’s [q.v.], possession until the capture of Secangapatam by the British in 1714 (1790). Maisur was then restored by Lord Wellesley to the old Hindu dynasty. The majority of the Muslims are Sunnis, very few being Shi‘is. Of Muhammadan buildings the most noteworthy are the Ganjāb or Mas-djem of Haidar Ali and Tipu at Gandhām, and the Davā Dāwat, a summer palace at Secangapatam. The population at the census of 1911 was 5,866,193, of whom 314,014 are Muslims, mostly Sunnis. The capital of the principality bears the same name, Maisur. The languages spoken are Canaree, Hindustani, Tamil, and Telugu.

**Bibliography:** *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Myse and Coog., Calcutta 1908, * Census of India, 1911*, vol. xx., Bangle or 1912 (M. HAYMY PT HOSAIN).

**MAITAI** (v.), feminine of *mais*, dead used of *sacred things*; as a substantive it means an animal that has died in any way other than by slaughter. In later terminology the word means firstly an animal that has not been slain in the usually prescribed fashion, the flesh of which therefore cannot be eaten, and secondly all parts of animals whose flesh cannot be eaten, whether because not properly slaughtered or as a result of a general prohibition against eating them.

In addition to Sura xxxvi. 33 where *maita* appears as an adjective, the word occurs in the following passages in the Kurān in the first of these meanings, xvi. 116: “He has forbidden you *maita* blood, pork and that over which another than Allāh has been invoked; if however anyone is forced (to eat these) without wishing to transgress or sin, Allāh is merciful and indulgent” (of the third Meccan period, since vi. 119 may refer to this context and the appearance of the same exception for cases of coercion in vi. 146 [cf. below] is then only easily explained in view of the whole trend of the passage, if there were an earlier passage, namely xi. 116, which is given full justification; cf. Noldeke-Schawly, Geschichte des Qurān, i. 146 sqq.; Grimm, *Mohammed*, u. 26 transfers the whole Sura to the later Meccan period; vi. 140, 146: “They have said: ‘What is in the womb of this cattle belongs to the males, and is forbidden to our females’; but if it is *maita* (still born), all have a share in it... Say: I find in what is revealed to me nothing forbidden, which must not be eaten, except it be *maita* or congealed blood or pork — for this is filth — or a slaughter that another than Allāh is invoked, but if anyone is forced (to eat it) without wishing to commit a transgression or sin, thy heart is merciful and indulgent” (of the third Meccan period; cf. Noldeke-Schawly, i. 161; Grimm, u. 26): u. 168: “He has forbidden you *maita* blood, pork and that at which another than Allāh is invoked but if anyone is forced (to eat it) without wishing to commit a sin or transgression, it is not reckoned as a sin against him; Allāh is merciful and indulgent” (of the year 2 of the Hijraj, before the battle of Badr; cf. Noldeke-Schawly, i. 178; Grimm, ii. 27): v. 4, 5: “Forbidden to you is *maita* blood, pork, that at which another than Allāh is invoked, and that which has been strangled, killed by a blow or a fall, or by the horns (of another beast), that which has been eaten by wild beasts — with the exception of what is made pure — and that which hath been vaunted to idols... But if anyone (in his) hunger is forced to eat of them without wishing to commit a sin, Allāh is merciful and indulgent” (in all probability revealed after the valedictory pilgrimage of the year 10; cf. Noldeke-Schawly, i. 227 sqq.; Grimm, ii. 28 dates the Sura to the year 7).

It is quite evident from Sūra, vi. 140 that the *maita* was of some significance for the Meccans in the many laws about food with which Arab paganism was acquainted (cf. Wellhausen, *Reise arabischen Heidentums*, 2nd ed. p. 168 sqq.). Although it is no longer possible to define exactly the part it played (even the statements recorded by Tabarī from the earliest interpreters of this passage, which moreover only refers to a detail, reveal the complete disappearance of any reliable tradition), it may be assumed without misgiving that the Kurānic prohibition contained a corresponding pre-Islamic prohibition, although it perhaps modified it. Both go back to the religious reluctance to consume the blood of animals, and indeed in all the Kurānic passages quoted, blood is mentioned alongside *maita*. It is unnecessary to assume that Muhammad was influenced by Judaism on this point and the suggestion may be rejected especially as the prohibition in its stereotyped form occurs again in Sūra ii. 168 just at the time of vigorous reaction against Judaism and Sura vi. 147 (Madinense, a
late insertion) which contrasts the prohibition of *maita* etc. with the Jewish laws relating to food. What Muhammad understood by *maita*, he tells us himself in the latest passage dealing with it, v. 4: in the second half of the verse the principal kinds of *maita* are given (with the exception of the animal that dies of disease), which had already been mentioned in general terms; the commentators were thus able to interpret the single cases given as examples wrongly as different from the *maita* proper. The purification (in the Kur‘ān only mentioned in this passage) must mean ritual slaughter, by which, even if done at the last moment, the animal does not become *maita* but can be eaten.

These prescriptions of the Kur‘ān are further developed in the Traditions. According to the latter it is forbidden to trade in *maita* or more accurately its edible parts; some traditions (mainly on the authority of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal) even forbid any use being made of all that comes from *maita* in any moment of slaughter (in conformity with the usual code of *maita*). An exception from the prohibition of *maita* is made in the cases of fish and locusts; these are in general considered as the two kinds of *maita* that are permitted, i.e., no ritual slaughter is demanded in their case (because they have no "blood", cf. above). While some traditions, extending this permission by the earliest *ḥiṣāt*, say that all creatures of the sea, not only fishes, can be eaten without ritual slaughter, including even sea-fowl (in this case it is said that "the sea has performed the ritual slaughter"), others limit the permission to those animals and fishes which the sea casts up on the land or the tide leaves behind it in contrast to those which swim about on the water. But there is also quoted a saying of Abu Bakr expressly declaring what swims on the surface to be permitted. In this connection we have the story of a monster cast up by the sea (sometimes described as a fish) which fed a Muslim army under the leadership of Abu Ḫubaida when they were in dire straits; but in this tradition and in the interpretation that has been given it (that they only ate of it out of hunger i.e., took advantage of the Kur‘ānic permission for cases of need) is clearly reflected the uncertainty that prevailed about such questions as were on the border line. Sometimes we read that portions that cut out of living animals are also considered *maita*. The way is at least paved for the declaration that all forbidden animal-dishes are *maita*. The regulations found in the Kur‘ān appear again here, e.g., the permission to eat *maita* in case of need and slay properly dying animals at the moment to prevent them becoming *maita*.

Some traditions handed down through Ḥammād from Ibrahim al-Nakha‘ī bring us to a somewhat late period (in the Kitāb al-Aṯār); one says that of the creatures of the sea only fishes can be eaten; another, which is found in two versions, limits the permission to what is thrown up by the sea or left behind by the tide; ritual slaughter is not demanded in this case. The question whether the embryo of a slaughtered dam requires a special purification i.e., ritual slaughter, is raised in one tradition and decided in the affirmative.

The most important regulations of Muslim law about *maita*, which express the last stage of development are as follows: It is unanimously agreed that *maita* in the legal sense is impure and "forbidden" (ḥarām) i.e., cannot be eaten and also that fish are exceptions to this; the Mālikis and Ḥanbalis also except the majority of creatures of the sea, and according to the more correct Shi‘ī view, this applies to all marine creatures (the Ḥanbalis here hold the opinion of Ibrahim al-Nakha‘ī, except that the two ideas of "brought up" and "swimming on the surface" are later overlaid and destroyed by the to some extent synonymous "slain by another cause", "died of itself"). The edible parts of *maita* are also *maita*, as are the bones, hair etc. among the Shi‘īs, but not the Ḥanafis, and among the Mālikis only the bones; the hide when tanned, is considered pure and may be used. Emergency slaughter (*dhakāt* or *tašī‘iya*; ritual slaughter in general is *dhakī* or *naqr*) is according to the Ḥanafis and the better known view of the Shi‘īs (also according to al-Zuhri) permitted, even if the animal will certainly die, provided it still shows signs of life at the moment of slaughter. According to the view predominant among the Mālikis, such slaughter is not valid and the animal becomes *maita* (in contrast to Mālik’s own view). The question of the embryo (cf. above) is answered in the affirmative by the Ḥanafis, following Ibrahim al-Nakha‘ī and Abu Ḫanifa (al-Shaibāni himself held the Mālik view, to be mentioned immediately) but in the negative by the Mālikis and Shi‘īs (in this case it is said that "the ritual slaughter of the dam is also the ritual slaughter of the embryo") except that the Mālikis made it a condition that the embryo should be fully developed (Mālik himself also demanded its slaughter, "to do the blood from it" in the case where the embryo had been dropped). That anyone who is forced to eat *maita* may do so, is the unanimous opinion; only on the questions whether one is bound to eat *maita* to save his life, whether he should satisfy his hunger completely, or only eat the minimum to keep life alive etc., there is a difference of opinion. The Shi‘īs and Ḥanbalis further demand that one should not have been brought to these straits through illegal action (a different interpretation of the Kur‘ānic regulations).

A clear definition of *maita* and its distinction from other kinds of forbidden animal foods was never reached. Sometimes it is separated on the authority of the Kur‘ānic passage itself from its own 4 subdivisions given in Sura v. Sometimes its validity is extended over extensive allied fields. As is evident from the Fāk books, this terminological uncertainty has not infrequently caused still further confusion in the discussion of differences of opinion.


**MAIYAFĀRĪKIN, a town in the north-east of Diyarbakr [q. v.].** The other Muhammadan forms of the name are Mafarikin, Mafarikin, Ferkin (whence the name of origin al-Ferik) etc. The town is called in Greek Mattyropolis, in Syriac Mīphērēkē, in Armenian Xpherk (later Muharkan, Muphargin). According to Y sluggish, iv. 702, the old name of the town was Madur-salā (read *fūla* > "matur-khalakh in Armenian, "town of the martyrs"). On the identification of Tigranocerta with Maiyafarikin see below.
Geography. The town lies to the south of the little range of the Ḥzarq which rises like the first tier of the amphitheatre of the mountains, the higher parts of which consist of the summits (Maššū, Antioch) rising to the south of Mašš and separating the course of the eastern Euphrates (Maššu, Antioch) from those of the Tigris and its left bank tributaries.

Mayāfārīkīn lies 25 miles north of the Tigris and 12 west of the Batmān-šu. It is watered by a little river (now called the Fārshīn-su) which flows into the Batmān-šu 12 miles to the southeast, an important left bank tributary of the Tigris which drains the wild and mountainous country south of Mašš (the cantons of Kulh and Sā sân). The old names of the Batmān-šu are Nispoura (Roman period), Nympheia (Byzantine period), Symeia Kallath, Armēnak Sāhdān, a ward of Armēnak origin transliterated Shštthūnā in Armenian and explained as "tender of blood"; Armen. Geogr. of the seventh century, Marquart, *Landauf.,* p. 164, Armēnak Kallath and perhaps Mamshēsh (Faus). Of Byzantium) Some of these identifications, as we shall see, are still uncertain.

Marquart in *Landauf.,* the meeting-place of a number of wells from the north shedding the different streams which go to form the Batmān-šu: 1. Cāhāyūrī on the Minūn-usa, 1. Karqamūn-Lurdż-Bāshī, Marquart; 2. Mašš-Kulīp-Fārshī-Mayafārīkīn; 3. Mašš-Khūnt-Ingīrt (=. Sā sân) - Mayafārīkīn. Routes 3 and 4 passing Sādān are still little known. The distance between Diyarbakr and Mayafārīkīn is about 15 miles. The old road Diyarbakr-Biltis, which was used to run through Mayafārīkīn, now runs inside. It crosses the Batmān-šu south of Armēnak (Diyār-barku-Sūmān - Zok - Wasiš-kam - Biltis).

Mayafārīkīn has thus lost the advantage of being a stage on the road between Armenia and upper Mesopotamia. Since 1260 it has no longer been a political centre around which gravitated the interests of the country around. It retains only a small importance as a market for the produce of the mountainous and pastoral country drained by the Batmān-šu.

Ancient History. The mountains to the north of Mayafārīkīn have long sheltered the remnants of ancient aboriginal peoples. About 600 B.C. Georgius (Cyprus) (ed. Geiger, p. 48) mentions the Khorhakas and Sameos sahar there who gave their names to the districts of Khor and Same. Marquart (1916) supposes there are elements of the aboriginal language in names like Mašš, Khor, and Mamshēsh, which are, he says, "mixed with the Median ("sad-khun-kasch") prefixed. According to tradition (Vākān, iv. 703, the founder of Marāqspol, Marāqspā, Layšū was the son of a woman of the mountains, and Marquart sees in Layšū a mutilated form of the name of the Arzūn (Hawara, *Armāni, 1915,* f. 99: 1916, p. 126). The Marāqspā Aba Naṣr was married to the daughter of Sīnāshīr, lord of the Minūnī, cf. Amedroz, in *F.K.A.S.,* 1905, F.K.A.S. *Inflammaro* three points he can recognize at Mayafārīkīn traces of an ancient Aram科学技术 settlement, "von Haus aus asiatische Anlage" (Armēnak, f. 100, 309).

Tigranocerta = Mayafārīkīn (?). As early as 1838 Moltke had suggested that Mayafārīkīn from the point of view of the interests of Tigranes, one is forced to admit that against an enemy coming from the west (Lucullus!) Tigranocerta = Mayafārīkīn was devoid of natural defences, while in the event of an enemy coming from the east it ran the risk of being easily cut off from Armenia on the main road from Biltis (the ancient *Klorēs* Bakələrn, cf. Tomashchik, taken by Lucullus after the victory won on the banks of the Nicopolis (Oct. 6, 69 B.C.) and again in the reign of Nero by the legate Corbul (e. 63 A.D.); it is regularly mentioned down to the middle of the fourth century A.D. Other scholars had sought Tigranocerta at Sīrīt (d'Anville), Arzān (H. Kiepert, 1834), near Kreft-Esche (Kiepert 1875), near Tell Arma west of Nispūn (E. Sachau, cf. Duvanny) etc. Late Armenian tradition gives the name Tigranocerta to Diyarbakr. Moltke's idea was taken up vigorously by Lehmann-Haupt and W. Beuck, after their expedition to Armenia in 1898-99.

On the north wall of Mayafārīkīn is a mutilated Greek inscription. It was deciphered and published by Lehmann-Haupt, who attributes it to the Armenian King Pap (369-374), which is quite in keeping with the known facts of the reign of this monarch. In spite of his criticism of the details of Lehmann-Haupt's hypothesis, Marquart (1915) has rather corroborated him by bringing forward new considerations.

In view of the many contradictions found in the classical sources regarding Tigranocerta the question comes to be, if Mayafārīkīn is not Tigranocerta, what other unknown town existed here in the time of Pap, unless the stones on which the inscription is engraved and which are now hopelessly disarranged ("in helioser-verwirrung") were brought from another place when Tigranes was building?

The main objection to the identification of Tigranocerta with Mayafārīkīn is that, according to Eutropius, vi. 9, 1, and Faustus, v. 24, Tigranocerta was in Arzanene (Ardnīkh); on the other hand the river Mamshēsh seems to have formed in the fourth century the western frontier of this latter province. From this fact (Huebschm, *Die altrum. Oryx. Inschriften, in: Indoger. Forsch.,* 1904, pp. 473-475), it seems that Tigranocerta ought to be placed east of the Batmān-šu if this river is identical with the Mamshēsh. This last name was connected by Marquart with the name al-Musūliyat, which Muṣāfadda, p. 144, gives to one of the tributaries of the Tigris (on the left bank) and apparently corresponding to the Batmān-šu. (A district of Musiliya (?) still exists farther east on the upper course of the Biltis, in the area of the ancient possessions of the Bāṭrīsh Mūshūš; cf. Kāsrawi, in *Yākūt,* ii. 551-552).

To reconcile the statements of Faustus, iv. 24 and 27, with the position of Mayafārīkīn (12 miles W. of the Batmān-šu), Marquart proposes to identify the Mamshēsh = Nicopolis with the Fārshīn-su while the Musūllūyāt would be applied to the whole system of the Batmān-šu (Nymphia, Sāhdān etc.). The insignificance of the Fārshīn-su, which rises in the hills about 3 miles north of Mayafārīkīn (Ibn al-Asrār calls its source Ra's al-Ain; the *Lūkān-vanūs,* p. 437: "Ain al-Hawd) and does not suit the description of the hermitage of Mābrē, which, according to Faustus, must have been on the right bank, makes Marquart's hypothesis less attractive. If finally we consider the position of Mayafārīkīn from the point of view of the interests of Tigranes, one is forced to admit that against an enemy coming from the west (Lucullus!) Tigranocerta = Mayafārīkīn was devoid of natural defences, while in the event of an enemy coming from the east it ran the risk of being easily cut off from Armenia on the main road from Biltis (the ancient *Klorēs* Bakələrn, cf. Tomashchik,
Maiyāfārikīn = Martyropolis. The identity of these two towns is quite certain. The Christian sources (Syriac, Armenian and Greek) referring to the foundation of Martyropolis are numerous. A Syriac "history" (tasāʾīdā) kept in the Jacobite church of Maiyāfārikīn was translated for the historian of the town, Ibn al-ʿArāṣa, and is given in a synopsis in Yākūt, iv. 703–707 and Kāzīnī, ii. 379–380 (transl. with notes in Marquart, Handes Anthorvya, 1916, p. 125–135).

The town is said to have been founded on the site of a "large village" (kurya ʿaṣima) by the bishop Marūṭa (Mār Marūṭa) who had obtained a concession from Persia to do so. This ecclesiastical flourishing between c. 353 and 420 (on the sources for his biography cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 91–92, 125). The town of Martyropolis to which Marūṭa brought the remains of the Christian martyrs of Persia is mentioned for the first time in 410. The etymology of the Syriac name Mēpērēt is uncertain (cf. above). In Armenian the town is mentioned for the first time in the Geography of the viiith century as Npērēt (once Npērēt).

By the peace of 297 with Diocletian, the province of Sophanene, within which Martyropolis lay, had become part of the Roman empire. Vincentius Jovian (363) Sophanene remained to the Emperor. Under Theodosius II (401–450), the new town, situated quite near the frontier, acquired considerable importance and became the capital of Sophanene (= Great Tsophkh). The town was still insufficiently fortified and in 502 the Sasanian Kavād b. Fērōz seized it and carried the inhabitants off to Khūzistan where he founded for them the town of Abāz-Kobād (Yākūt, iv. 707) (Wēh-Āmīdī-Kavād = Ṣarrājān; cf. Marquart, Erānīāhār, p. 41, 307). Anastasius began the fortification of Martyropolis but Justinian, after his accession (527), was the first to reorganise completely the eastern frontier between Dīrād and Trebizond. Martyropolis, the headquarters of a commander under the strategos of Theodosiopolis (Erzerūm), became one of the most important military centres. Procopius, De aedificiis, iii., gives a complete description of the walls of the town, the height and thickness of which were doubled and a full account of the system of defences (outer walls, advanced forts etc.); cf. Adnotz, op. cit., p. 10–12, 140–142. In 589 the town fell into the hands of the Sasaniān but in 591 came back to the Byzantines in return for the support given by the Emperor Maurice to Abū-Ḥāshīm II. Heraclius held it till the year 18 = 619 (Yākūt, iv. 73; cf. [year]). The date is not given in Muralt, Chronog. byz., i. 2.

The vicissitudes of Martyropolis probably explain the fact that in the Armenian Geography of the seventh century (ed. Patkanow, transl., p. 45; Marquart, Erānīāhār, p. 18 and 161) the Persian province of ʿĀbdānīk (Arzanene) is separated from Tsophkh (Sophanene) by the line of the Khāfīr (= Bāʾmān-su) while in the description of parts of Armenia Npērēt (= Npērēt) figures as one of the 10 cantons of Arzanene.

Christian legend as preserved by Ibn ʿArāṣa and Yākūt gives very full details of the building of the town in the time of Mār Marūṭa: the arches (fēkān) of the walls in which the remains of the martyrs were placed, the eight gates of the town, the names of which are carefully recorded in the convent of SS. Peter and Paul, the buildings erected by the three ministers of the Byzantine emperor, each of whom built a tower and a church. There is still to be seen in Maiyāfārikīn the ruins of a magnificent basilica and of the Church of the Virgin (al-ʿAdhrāʾ). Miss Gertrude L. Bell, who has studied these monuments, dates the basilica "not much later than the beginning of the fifth century", and suggests that the Church of the Virgin was one of the two built by Khusraw II in recognition of the assistance lent by Maurice; cf Abū ʿl-ʿArāṣa, Mukhtārat, ed. Pocock, p. 98.

Under Islām. In 19 (450) in the reign of the caliph ʿUmar, Maiyāfārikīn was taken by ʿĪyād b. Gāmn without a blow being struck (Balādhūrī, p. 175–6) and henceforth shared the lot of Diyarbakr.

The intermediate character of the position occupied by Maiyāfārikīn puzzled Arab geographers. Ibn Rusta, p. 106, puts the town in Īṣazīrī while the others (Ibn Hawqal, p. 246) regard it as belonging to Armenia. According to these authors, Maiyāfārikīn was a little fortified town having an unhealthy climate on account of the stagnant water but not without its amenities (Īsāghī, p. 76; Ibn l-Ḥawqāl, p. 131, 134, 135; Maḥāṣil, p. 54). The region (gūdā muqālā) of Maiyāfārikīn and Arzan in the time of Ibn Hawqal was however entirely depopulated.

The Hamānīds and the Būyids. Maiyāfārikīn formed part of the territory of the Hamānīds. They built a castle (kṣar) near the gate Bāb al-ʿArāṣa wa l-Ḥammān (Yākūt); its ruins are apparently mentioned by Ewliyā (1655), iv. 71–4 under the name Saṣīf al-Dawla Saṣīfī. The Bāb al-Malādān gate also dates from Saṣīf al-Dawla (333–356). This prince was buried at Maiyāfārikīn; cf. ʿĪyān-nunā, p. 437. In 352, Nāgā, a client of the Hamānīd, rebelled in Maiyāfārikīn. In 362 (July 4, 973) ʿAlībābā b. ʿAlībābā al-Dawī defeated the Byzantines in the vicinities of the town.

In 367 (978) the Būyids ʿĀdūd al-Dawī divided the Ḥamānīd who had supported his cousin Bakhtiyār and in 368 Abū l-Wafā, a general of ʿĀdūd al-Dawī, took Maiyāfārikīn (Ibn Miskwārī, ed. Amedroz, ii. 199, 266, 312, 324).

The Marwānī dynasty. After the death of ʿĀdūd al-Dawī (374), Maiyāfārikīn and the rest of Diyarbakr fell into the power of the Kurd Bādh [cf. KURDS and MARWĀNĪS] who had the Dalāroa garrison of Maiyāfārikīn massacred and was able to defend what he held against the Būyids ʿAbd al-Ṣāmān al-Dawī and the sons of ʿAlībābā al-Dawī, who had meanwhile returned to Māvaṣī. After the death of Bādh, his nephew, Abū ʿAli Ḥasan b. Marwān, established himself in Maiyāfārikīn and for a century this town remained the capital of the Marwānī dynasty (380–479 and again in 486). In 384 the governor Māmā, appointed by Abū ʿAlī, succeeded in checking the turbulence of the inhabitants who had been incited by Ḥamānīd intrigues. There is an inscription of Mumahhid
al-Dawla dated 391 (1000) on the wall of the town. In 392 an "Adid pretender again stirred up trouble in Mayyaşarıkçin. In 401 after the assassination of Muḥammad al-Dawla, his murderer Shahrwān, son of Māmā, with the help of his Georgian guards seized Mayyaşarıkçin but Saʿīd Abū Naṣr came from Arzān and began his long and brilliant reign (401–453).

A fine castle decorated with gilding was built in 403 on the little hill on which stood the convent and church of the Virgin. This Christian sanctuary (the connection of which with the al-Adhīr church is not quite clear, cf. above) was transferred to the Melkite church. Later were built a hospital, a mosque with a clock (baqā‘ān < Pers. pījān) and baths. Water was led to all the town from the spring of Ra‘s al-A‘īn. A palace was built on the banks of the Sāṭidāmā (Baṭmān-šū) and the water was raised to it from the river by a noria. A bridge spanned the river Haww (Hazzār?)

A tawfīq bequeathed by Shahrwān Abū Naṣr al-Manzār endowed the mosque(s) of Mayyaşarıkçin with a library. A fort was built to protect the town against the Sanā‘ān (people of al-Sanā‘ān). Information from Ibn al-Aṣrāq is supplemented by the statements of Nāṣīrī Khusraw, who visited the town under Abū Naṣr on the 6th Jumādā I 438. The Persian traveller speaks of its walls, built of huge blocks of white stone ( Ibn Miskawa'[i, n. 354: "strong walls of black stone"; Lehmann-Haupt: "gelbluchsweiser Kalkstein"), the western gate all of iron, the Friday mosque, the water-channel passing before each house (one uncovered with drinking water and the other covered serving as a sewer). Outside the town were the caravanserais, the hot baths, and a second Friday mosque. To the north of the town was the suburb of Muhāhā, also with a Friday mosque and baths. At a distance of 4 farshākh from the town (on the bank of the Sāṭidāmā) was a new little town called Nāṣīrāt built by the emir then reigning.

After the death of Abū Naṣr, who was buried in the town, the Salmāsīs began to interfere in the affairs of Mayyaşarıkçin. In 458 Sallār Ḫārāsānī sent by Tugh'ull arrived before the town with 5,000 horsemen. In 463 it was visited by the celebrated Ḫārīm al-Mulk. In 478 by orders of Malik Shāh the former viceroy of the Marwāns, Ibn Dūḥān, besieged the capital of his masters, which surrendered in Jumādā I 478. The treasures of the Marwāns valued at 1,000,000 dirhams were carried off by Ibn Dūḥān. In 482, ʿAmīd al-Dawla, son of Ibn Dūḥān, was appointed governor of Mayyaşarıkçin. After the death of Malik Shāh (485), the Marwānī Naṣīr al-Dawla succeeded in re-entering Mayyaşarıkçin but the Saldūq Tashūq of Syria took the town in Rabī‘ I 486; cf. Ibn Aṣrāq in Amaduz, f. R. A. S., 1903. In 532 (Ibn al-Adhir, n. 45) the last representatives of the Marwānī family disappeared from the neighbourhood of Mayyaşarıkçin.

The Orťukd̲s and the Aiyūbīs. In 575 (1181) the Salmāsī Sultan Muḥammad added to the possessions of Il-Ghānī, founder of the line of Orťukdz̲s of Mardin, theief of Mayyaşarıkçin, to which Il-Ghānī appointed his son Sulaimān (516–518); cf. Abū Iṭrādī, ed. Pocock, p. 240 and Katib Fardī, Mardin Muḥāled-ı Orťukdz̲l-ı (Arabic) Târīkh (written in 944–1537), ed. ʿAlī Emīrī Efendi (Constantinople, 1331, p. 20). Six successive Orťukdz̲s ruled Mayyaşarıkçin till 580 (1184). In 587 (1191) the last Orťukd̲ Yuluq Arslān again seized the town and held it for a time.

In 587 the Aiyūbīs had become masters of Mayyaşarıkçin and held it till 658 (1260). Saʿīd al-Dīn built a mosque there for which the columns of the Byzantine basilica were used (Gertrude L. Bell, op. cit., Pl. xi). Mayyaşarıkçin had a mint under the Aṭābeqs: the coins which they struck (dated 591, 599, 600, 612, 618) bear curious human figures which are portraits or symbolical personages (Gečišb Behrem, Catalogue des monnaies byzanto-turques etc., Constantinople 1854, p. 440–457; S. Lane-Poole, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iv., p. 255; see vol. iii., p. 24 for a Marwānī coin of this mint). On the walls of the town are inscriptions of the following Aiyūbīs: ʿAwād Nāṣır al-Dīn Ayyūb (of 600 A.D.), Malik Aṣḥāf Māsā (607–617), Malik Muḥaffar Gūzā (623), Malik Kāmil Muḥammad (654). A complete list of rulers at Mayyaşarıkçin from 515 to 658 prepared by van Biezen is given in the appendix to Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien, p. 134.

The Mongols. In 639 (1241) the Aiyūbī Shihāb al-Dīn Gūzā had received the summons from the Mongol Khāqān to submit and raze the walls of the town but gave an evasive answer. In 650 (1252) the Mongols pillaged the country round Mayyaşarıkçin. During Hülagū's expedition to Syria in 658 (1260) the army of the prince Yâshmut besieged Mayyaşarıkçin which was defended with great bravery by Malik al-Kâmil. The blockade produced a terrible famine in the town which was forced to surrender. Only 70 of the defenders survived. Kâmil was put to death in cruel fashion and his head carried on the point of a lance through the streets of Damascus (Rashīd al-Dīn ed. Quatremère, p. 330–331, 350–375; d'Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, iii. 354). Before his death, in 662 (1264), Hūlagū gave the district of Diyarbakr to his general Tūdān (cf. sulūd). Three years later, Aḥāṣa allotted Mayyaşarıkçin to his father's widow, Kūtāy Shāhin. Mayyaşarıkçin later lost its independence and henceforth shared the lot of Diyarbakr [g. v.]

In 796 during Timūr's stay at Mardin, a number of Maliks including those of Arzin (ṭīr) and Baṭmān came to pay him homage but the Saʿfar-nāmeh (i. e. 665) does not mention the lord of Mayyaşarıkçin. After the conquest of Diyarbakr, Timūr on his way to Mūsī took the road via Mayyaşarıkçin (ibid., i. 685) and Sefīwar (the name of a summit in al-Sanā‘ān east of al-Antāk). This march is the only example of a considerable force following the direct road Mayyaşarıkçin–Mūsī.

The Şafawīds and the Ottomans. Our information about the rule of the Turkoman dynasties (Karā-Koyunlu and Ak-Koyunlu) in the region of Diyarbakr is still very deficient. In pursuit of his campaign against the last Ak-Koyunlu Murād, Shāh Ḫān I Şafawi in 915 occupied all the region of Diyarbakr, the government of which was entrusted to Kūhā Muḥammad Ṭatādjī (Şarfâr-nāmeh, i. 405; Ḫām-ārā, p. 23–25). The defeat at Šādihrān produced risings against the Persians throughout Kurdistan. The Kurd chief Siyād Ahmad Beg Rūzākī seized Mayyaşarıkçin and ʿAtāk (Hatūk, cf. the Kātīrāt ʿArṭăxšīs of Georgius Cyprus). Mayyaşarıkçin passed definitively under Ottoman rule after the battle (921) of Koč-Ḥışār (south of Mardin) in which the Persian general Kara-Ḫān was defeated (von Hammer, G.O.R. 3, i. 731–741).
MAKĀMA


MAKALLA. [See MUCALLA.]

MAKĀM (A.), place, place where šalāt is performed. As to Makām Ibnâikîm, see KĀBA I.

MAKĀMA (A.), a variety of Arabic prose of a highly elaborate and artificial nature. Makāma in the old language was the name for the assembly of the tribe, synonymous with nādî (e.g. Lebel, Divân, No. 46, 10; Salâma b. Djânu- d, Divân, i. 4 = Mufaddalîyât, ed. Thorbecke, No. 20, 50, ed. Iyâl, No. 123, 4; Hamânî, p. 95, v. 1 etc.; so also Hamadhânî, Maž. 16, 5 [Stamb. = 44 u. Bair]), hence the word was next applied to gatherings at which the Omayyad and early ‘Abbasid caliphs received pious men in order to hear edifying discourses from them, as Hîshâm for example did with Khalîl b. Salâman (Khitb al-Ash’în, ii. 15, 35, 33, 47 sqq.); Ibn Ḫuttaiba gives an account of it in the chapter Mufaddâlîyât (Sing, appears as Makām in the separate headings) al-Zâhin b. ‘Ibâlîsfa wa ‘L-Muljî in the K. al-Zâhid, 6 of the K. ‘Cûyûn al-Akhbâr (cod.

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLĀM, III.
Kops. 1344, fol. 212v—213r), upon which Ibn ʿAbd Ḳallābi in ʿIṣā al-Faʿrīd (Cairo 1305), i. 286 sqq. and ʿAlī Frīḥūd, ʿṢārīṣ al-Muḥāḍa (Bāleq 1289), p. 32 sqq. have again drawn. The word then came to have the more general meaning of lecture, e.g. in Mašʿūdī, Muḥūd al-Dhakhāb (ed. Paris), v. 421, and perhaps also Djiḥīṣ, K. ʿAlī Frīḥūd, p. 218, 19, where it appears along with poetry, proverbs and tales of battles as an essential element in Arab education. In the third century A.H., however, the word began to sink from this higher sphere; it became the name for a beggar’s appeal, which had to be framed in carefully chosen language, the more the literary training of the adīb, once a privilege of court circles, became disseminated among the people; an example of these appeals is preserved by Djiḥīṣ in Bišāṣī, K. al-Muḥāḍa, p. 218 (ed. Schwally), p. 623 sqq. The appeals of beggars seem to have paved the way for the literary genre proper (cf. A. Moz, Mīn l-Ḳasīm, p. xxi/xxvii). This owes its existence to Hamadhanī [q. v.]. He created a typical representative of this literary Bohemianism to which he himself belonged, which entered upon the inheritance of the ḫāṣṣī poets of the early days of Islam, like al-Ḥaṯāma. The frequently very witty execution of the constantly changing part of his hero Abu l-Fath al-Iskandari and from the point of view of form the adoption for his tales of rhymed prose, which was already beginning to dominate the finer style of letter-writing, are the two special characteristics of Hamadhanī’s work. To the hero himself he gives a foil in the person of a narrator, Ḥaṣān b. Ḥaḍām, who serves sometimes in the role of a trickster, as in maṣākīna 12. In the 7th also — one of the poorest of the way — in which a certain ʿUṣma b. Badr al-Faḍlān records a meeting with Farāzādān not very creditable to Dhu l-Rummā, the principal hero takes no part. Six of these stories are only intended to glorify his patron, Ḳālaf b. Ahmad ruler of Sidjīstān, to whom as Margoliouth supposes (cf. HAMADHANĪ) the whole collection was dedicated. Sometimes he only uses the maṣākīna form to give expression to his own views on literary questions, as, for example, in the first on ancient and modern poets, in the fourteenth on the steeds of prose, al-Djīḥīṣ and Ibn al-Muṣaffā in the 25th maṣākīna, another in which al-Iskandari does not appear, he puts his polemic against the Muṭaridīs in the mouth of a maḏūm. He does not always make al-Iskandari appear as a rogue but in the 42nd maṣākīna he displays a knowledge of the world which is quite indifferent. No. 26 (Syrian, lacking in the Barīt edition) and 31 (the Ḩuṣaḥī, incomplete in the Barīt edition) contain specimens of erotic jargon and cant-language; of purely lexicographical interest is maṣākīna 30, selected and elucidated by Alwardi in Īṣāʾ al-ʿUṣma, v. 250 sqq., which deals with a competition instituted by Saḥ al-Ḍawalī for the best description of a horse. The 1st (No. 52 in the Barīt edition) is of quite another character and has only the rhymed prose in common with the maṣākīna proper; it is on this account classed with nine other anecdotes as muṣaffā in the Stamba edition and put in an appendix.

Hos for al-Ḥarīrī’s statement quoted above, s.v. ḲAMĀMA, that al-Hamadhanī got the idea from Ibn Durān. Al-Ḥarīrī is true cannot be ascertained as this work has not survived. In any case he is entitled to the credit of having created a new literary form, which might have proved very fertile in Arabic literature which is not exactly rich in forms. It is perhaps impossible to appreciate his talent fully if we may believe the tradition that the 51 specimens that have survived to us and which were apparently all that were known to al-Ḥarīrī represent only about an eighth of his whole output. His contemporaries and immediate successors were however not able to follow him on the path he had indicated. One only of his contemporaries, the court poet of Saḥ al-Dawalī ʿAbū Naṣr ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿUmar al-Salṭ († 405 = 919), has left us a maṣākīna (Alwardi, Verz. der ar. Handschr. Berlin, in No. 8536). Not till a century later do Ibn Naṣīrī and al-Ḥarīrī again take up the form created by him. The former (Abu l-Kāsim ʿAbd Allāh or ʿAbd al-Bābī Ṭūḥī Muhammad b. Ḥusayn, b. 15th Dhu l-ʿKhāḍ 410 [March 14, 1020] in Baghdād, d. 4 Muḥarram 485 [Feb. 15, 1092]), of whose other poetic and philological work nothing has come down to us, does not keep strictly to the model created by al-Hamadhanī in the nine maṣākīnas preserved in a Stamba MM. (Fāṭīḥ 4097; M.O., vii. 112) in as much as he does not have one hero all through and also introduces various persons as narrators, but the main point is the polished form, in which he tells his otherwise not remarkable stories (cf. Ch. HUART, Les stances d’Ibn Naṣīrī, J. A., ser. 10, vol. xii., 1908, p. 435—454, and the edition by O. RESCHER, in Beiträge zur Magiûn-Literatur, Heft 4, Stambal 1914, S. 123—153). It is not till Ḥarīrī [q. v.] that the form appears in its most complete form, the latter at the same time considerably limited its subject matter in as much as he makes the anecdotes recorded by al-Ḥarīrī b. Ḥammān centre around a hero. Abū Zayd of Sārūdje, and relates the adventures of this Bohemian, whose wit is never at a loss and who is able to meet all difficulties, in a style sparkling with wit and full of all the tricks of language. That he owed the stimulus to his work to an encounter with an actual vagabond may be legend; al-Subkī, Ṭabākāt al-Shafi’īya, iv. 296, 10; and Ibn Taghībdīri, iii. 23, 1 sqq. say he was a Bāṣānī al-Muṭahār (Ibn Taghībdīri says al-Muṣaffā) b. Sallār (cf. C. DUMAS, Le héroïs des maṣākīnas de Ḥarīrī, Abu Zayd de Sărudji, Algiers 1917). The story at least may be quite true that the Maṣākīna al-Ḥarīmīya saḥīh to be inspired by this meeting was the first from his pen. In any case Ḥarīrī’s tricks of rhetoric (cf. the antithesis in Crusot, Études sur les stances de Ḥ., Paris 1913) so overshadowed his subject matter in the eyes of later generations that henceforth the form became the essential characteristic of the literary genre, and it could be used to clothe the very varied subject matter. Al-Ḥaẓāzī (d. 505 = 1111) and ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Samʿānī (d. 526 = 1137) in their Maṣākīna al-ʿUṣma bāina yadai al-Khalīfa wa ʿl-ʿUṣma (Alwardi, Verz. der Hess. Berlin, in No. 8537, 1) and Maṣākīna al-ʿUṣma bāina yadai al-ʿUṣma (Ḫalīfa Ḫalīfa, No. 12702) attempt to go back to the older form. But the Spaniard Abu l-Tāhir Muhammad b. ʿUsuf al-Ṣakhrīnī (d. 535 = 1143) in Cordova seems to have come nearer to Ḥarīrī in his al-Maṣākīna al-Sarāḥaṣṣa (in Stamba, Lille, 1928, 1333). He also set himself the classical number of 50. Al-Zamakhshāri (d. 538 = 1143) on the other hand disclaims any...
such affinity; his maḥkāmas are simply moral ad-
monitions and like their counterparts, the Naṣariyya
al-Kāmil and the Afsāf al-Dhakhāb, are intended to
be appreciated mainly as tours-de-force of rhetoric
(cf. the editions, printed Cairo 1313, 1325, and
the translation by Rescher, in Beiträge zur Maṣūma-
literatur, Heft 6, Greifswald 1913). Whether the
Maḥkāmat al-Ṣūfīya of Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardi
(d. 587 = 1191), which deals with mystic terminology
(s. Cat. of MSS. Brit. Mus., No. 1349, 25), belong to
this class at all is doubtful. On the other hand the
Maḥkāmat al-Djawwāyī fi l-Maṣūmah al-wa’diya
(Leyden, No. 426, Cambridge, No. 1098, Escurial,
Dèrenbourg, No. 542), which the author Ibn al-
Djawi (d. 597 = 1200) himself provided with a
lexico-graphical commentary, are certainly modelled
on those of Ḥarīrī. The al-Maḥkāmat al-Muṣiliyya
of the Christian physician Abū ʿl-Abbās Vahiyū
b. Saʿīd b. Mārī (d. 589 = 1193; see Ibn al-Ḵīṭī, p.
361, 4) definitely profess to be a single imitation
of the latter. They have a hero and a narrator
but the subject manner is varied, usually of a learned
and technical nature (cf. Flügel, Vers. der Hs.
Wien, No. 384). To the end of the sixth A.H. seems to belong Abū ʿl-ʿĀliʿ Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr b.
Aḥmad al-Rāzī al-Ḥanafi who dedicated 30 maḥkāmas to the chief ʿdāl Muhīy al-Dīn Abū
Ḥāmid Mūḥammad b. Mūḥammad b. Aḥsīm al-
Shahrizārī (not the same as mentioned in Ibn
Khaliḳān, Balāq 1329, i. 597). The only indica-
tion of his date is the mention of the Kāh-
īn of Shīrwān (717); this title was first borne by
His aim is to imitate Hamadhanī, Ḥarīrī but his
language is much like theirs, he introduces his hero and a narrator and is fond of elaborate
descriptions, frequently dropping into the
obscure; a number of the maḥkāmas go together
in pairs, the one being supplementary to the other
(cf. the edition in O. Rescher, Beiträge zur Maṣū-
literatur, Heft 4, p. 1–115). Of the viith
century A.H. we only need mention an imitation of
Ḥarīrī’s maḥkāmas, 50 in number, dedicated to
the family of Dīwawīn (cf. his Taḥrīr-i Dāwāwīn, ed.
Mīrzā Mūḥammad, G. M. S., xvii, i, ii, note 2)
by Shams al-Dīn Maḥmūd (Mūḥammad) b. Naṣr
Allāh b. al-Saʿīd in 672 (1273) (s. Hādījī Khaliḳa
No. 17090) entitled al-Maḥkāmat al-Zamīmīya (s.
Brit. Mus., No. 609, 120, Stambul, Nāʿīn-ol-Mīnāyī,
No. 4273). The Syrian Egyptian poet Mūḥammad b.
ʿAfīf al-Dīn al-Tilimsanī al-Shāhī al-Zarī († 688
= 1289) applied the form in the field of love-poetry,
sometimes with lascivious subjects (Maḥkāmat
al-ʿUṣhāb, Paris, No. 3947; Faṣāḥat al-Maṣūfī fī
Maḥāhat al-Maṣūfī fī al-Maṣūfī wa l-Shārāsīya, Aḥwāl,
Vers. des Moscheen, Berlin, No. 8539, 4, 5). These
imitations become more numerous in the viiith
al-Maʿṣūm al-Rāzī composed al-
Maḥkāmat al-tishārī ʿaddara (tr. Tunis 1303, Les
dons sculpts du Comté A. B. M. al-Mohdakh, re-
print, Paris, 1855). The form is used for religious
subjects, e.g. by Abū ʿl-Fath Mūḥammad b. Sāli-
ḥ al-Nās († 1344 = 1334) in praise of the Prophet
and his companions in al-Maḥkāmat al-ʿalīya fi
l-Kārūmāt al-ʿalīya (s. Rosen, Notices sommaires
des miss. or. du Musée Asiatique, St. Petersboug
1881, No. 146, 19), for mysticism by Shams al-Dīn
Mūḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Dīnā Ṣalāḥ al-
Maḥkāmat al-tafassāfīa ʿadd la-Tardījamāt;
ṣūfīya, in number 50 (Cambridge 1912), and
again for the paraenesis in 749 (1349) by Zāin
al-Dīn ʿOmar b. al-Wardi in the maḥkāma on the
plague of which he died in the same year entitled
Abu ʿl-Abas Wāhid (Aḥwāl, Berlin, No. 8550, π, probably identical with the maḥkāma which Čiček put in his work on the plague). The maḥkāma
was adopted for the panegyric by the Meccan ʿAlī
b. Nāṣr al-Hijāzī in his al-Maḥkāma al-Ǧawwāriya
wa l-Tāṣīfīya al-Maṣūmīya in honour of the Mamlūk
Ṣūfān Kānṣūf al-Ghwāri (906–912 = 1500–
1516; s. Pertsch, Vers. der Hs. Gotha, No. 2773).
The great encyclopaedist of the ninth century,
Ṣūfā, naturally did not omit this form of
composition, which he used with complete contempt
for its traditional use to treat of subjects from
the most varied branches of knowledge, religious
as well as profane, e.g. the question of the fate
of Mūḥammad’s parents in the other world, the
merits of different perfumes, flowers and fruits;
for did he hesitate to use it for obscene subjects
(cf. the article suʾūfīa where the printed editions
are given). His contemporary, the South Arabi
Zaidī Ibrāhīm b. Mūḥammad al-Hadawi b. al-Wazir
(d. 914 = 1508), used the maḥkāma for theological
instruction in al-Maḥkāma al-ṣuṣuriya wa l-Fāțika
al-ḥabariya (Leyden, No. 438; Brill-Houtsmans,
No. 67), as did Ṣūfā’s rival Abī Mūḥammad b. Mūḥammad
al-Kaṭtālānī (d. 923 = 1517) in the Maḥkāmāt
al-ʿArifīn (Stambul, Koprunli, No. 784). Even in
the centuries when literature was at a low level, the
xith and xiiith, the maḥkāma was still used for the
most varied purposes. In 1078 (1667) Djamāl
Abu ʿl-Fath b. al-Kaḥān composed a maḥkāma on
the war then being waged by the lords of Baṣrā Ḥusain Pasha and Ṣulām Pascha
Afrāsīyāb on a Turkish army under Ibrāhīm
Pasha, which he elucidates in the commentary
Zūd al-Maṣūr (Brit. Mus., No. 1405–6, Baghdād
1924, used by R. Mignot in his History of
modem Bessarab, p. 269–286; s. St. H. Longrigg,
Four Centuries of modern Iraq, Oxford 1925,
p. 328). His compatriot ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥusain
b. Mārī al-Baghdādī al-Suwarī (d. 1174 = 1760)
and his son Abu ʿl-Khaṭir ʿAbd al-Kaḥān (d.
1200 = 1786) used the form to string together
a series of old and new proverbs in a witty context
(Maḥkāmat al-Amīḥāf al-ʿawra, Cairo 1244
with the son’s al-Maḥkāma Ḟanāfī al-Amīḥāf azzīt
al-Azīzāl, Berlin, No. 4832–83). An imitation of
Ḥarīrī in 50 adventures, the scene of which is
laid in India, of an Abu ʿl-Zafer al-Ḥindī al-
Ṣāiyā, which al-Nāṣr b. Fattāḥ narrates was
finished in 1125 (1715) by Abū Bakr b. Muḥsin
Bābībī al-Awālī (lit. at the Maṭbaa al-ʿUmm Press
1264 entituled al-Maḥkāmat al-Hindīya, s. M. Hidayat
Ḥusain, Catalogue raisonné de l’hôtel Library,
i. 459).
Ḥarīrī himself had already allowed his art to
degenerate to mere juggling with words, when he
used in the Kārūmāt l-Ṣūfīya wa l-Shārāsīya,
not included among the maḥkāmas in the maḥkāmas
with ʿin and in the other only those with
ṣīn (just as a contemporary of Simonides had
written a Greek hymn without a sigma in it; cf.
V. Wilamowitz, Kultur d. Gegenwart, i, iii, 49);
also al-Ḥanafī’s maḥkāmas contain such jugglings
with words; ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Idkāwī
(d. 1184 = 1770) wrote al-Maḥkāma al-Iskandariya
wa l-Tāṣīfīya in which the words are arranged in
pairs only distinguishable by their diacritical points
Finally the metropolitans of Nisibî 'Abdîshko (<i>Emīdêshshêt</i>) who died in 1318, composed in 1290–91 on Harîrî’s model 50 Syriac poems, religious and edifying in their subject matter in two parts, called after Enoch and Elias, the artificial language of which himself elucidated in a commentary in 1316 (the first half: <i>Pardaisa dha Edên seu Paradisus Eden Carmina auctore Mer Eboleso Schemi</i>, ed. Gabriel Cardacli, Bâritû 1889).

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(C. Brockelmann)

**Mâkan b. Kâki, Abû Mansûr,** like his father was a captain in the army of the <i>Alid</i> rulers of Tabaristan. Sâyîd Abû l-Kâsim Dîjarî b. Sâyîd Nâšr, son-in-law of Mâkan, who came to the throne after the death of Sâyîd Abû Muhammad Ḩasan b. Kâsim, known as the <i>Dâ’i</i> (“the summoner unto the truth”), appointed Mâkan to the governorship of Lurîdjon. Sâyîd Abû l-Kâsim died in 312 (924) and was succeeded by Sâyîd Abû ‘Ali Muhammad Abû l-Husnî Aḥmâd. Mâkan depôsed him, sent him as a prisoner to Abû l-Ḥusnî b. Kâki, his nephew, for safe custody, and placed his own grandson Sâyîd Ismâ’îl Abû l-Kâsim on the throne. Shortly after this, Sâyîd Abû ‘Ali Muhammad effected his escape and was joined by Asfâr b. Shurawâdî (<i>q.v.</i>) who had rebelled against Mâkan and made himself master of Lurîdjon. Mâkan took the field against them but was beaten and forced to take refuge in the hills in the neighbourhood of Sârî.

Sâyîd Abû ‘Ali Muhammad died in 315 (927), and was succeeded by his brother, Sâyîd Abû Dîjarî Ḥusnî. Mâkan now issued from his mountain retreat, overthrew Asfâr, who was the commander of the army of Sâyîd Abû Dîjarî, forced him to fly to Khurâsân, and declared the Dâ’i ruler of Tabaristan. In 316 (928) Mâhâmîd b. Sâlîk, the Šāhâbîl governor of Raîy, invited the Dâ’i and Mâkan to Raîy, delivered the province to them and retired to Khurâsân. During his absence of the Dâ’i and Mâkan, Asfâr returned from Khurâsân, conquered Lurîdjon, defeated and killed the Dâ’i, and became the ruler of Tabaristan. He then marched to Raîy, defeated Mâkan and put him to flight. But soon after this Asfâr came to terms with Mâkan and delivered Amûlî to him. Mâkan now gradually extended his sway to Lurîdjon and even conquered Nishâpûr in 318 (930). About this time Mâdâwîd revolted against Asfâr, and forced him to take refuge in Tabas in Kuhîsân, but Mâkan fell upon him from Nishâpûr and sent him flying back to Raîy.

In 319 (931) Mâkan evacuated Khurâsân at the request of Amir Nâyîr b. Aḥmâd and returned to Tabaristan, but he was soon turned out of it by Mâdâwîd who had become master of Raîy after the death of A-fâr. Mâkan tried to recapture Tabaristan with the help of Abû l-Fadîl l-Dîjan and later of Aḥmâd b. Mâhâmîd b. Mâhî, the commander of the army of Khurâsân, but Mâdâwîd proved too strong for him, and he was forced to fly for refuge to Khurâsân. Amir Nâyîr b. Aḥmâd now bestowed on him the government of the province of Kûrmân. He proceeded thither, defeated the former governor and took possession of the province. But when he heard the news of the murder of Mâdâwîd in 323, he returned from Kûrmân, procured the grant of the province of Lurîdjon from Amir Nâyîr b. Aḥmâd,
and asked Washmir, the brother and successor of Mardawij, to surrender the province to him which he did. Henceforth very friendly relations were established between them on the strength of which Makan threw off the yoke of Bukhara. When Amr Nasr b. Ahmad learnt this, he despatched Ammad, the commander of the army of Khurasan, against Makan who was defeated after a desperate struggle of 7 months and forced to flee to Washmir at Ray. Ammad followed him thither, and defeated the combined forces of Makan and Washmir at Ishakbadab (near Ray) on 21st Rabi 1, 329 (December 25, 940 A.D.). Makan was shot in the head by an arrow and fell dead. His head was cut off and sent to Bukhara.


Makan [see Makan]

Makedishu, a town in East-Africa on the shore of the Indian Ocean, capital of Italian Somaliland. Population: 21,000. Setting aside the question of some ruins perhaps South-Arabic, Makedishu arose in the 11th century A.D. as an Arabian colony. The immigrations of the Arabs reached Makedishu in different times successively, and from different regions of the Arabian peninsula; the most remarkable one came from al-Ahsa on the Persian Gulf, probably during the struggles of the Caliphate with the Karmatians.

Perhaps at the same time also Persian groups emigrated to Makedishu; and even to-day some inscriptions which have been found in the town demonstrate that Persians from Shiraz and Naisabur were dwelling there during the Middle Ages. These foreign merchants were, however, obliged to unite themselves politically against the nomadic (Somali) tribes that surrounded Makedishu on every side, and eventually against other invaders from the sea.

Therefore a federation was concluded in the same 11th century A.D. and composed of thirty-nine clans, divided in two quarters (Hamar-Wan and Shangani). The city was divided among the tribal federations, and the clans were treated as a separate tribe. The federation became extinct in the 13th century, when Makedishu was conquered by the Somalis.

In the 11th century A.D., the dynasty of the Muraffer succeeded to the dynasty of Fakhr al-Din. However, in the region of the Wabi Shabilla, viz. the true commercial hinterland of Makedishu, the Adjudann (Somali), who had constituted there another Sultanate friendly and allied with Makedishu, were defeated by the nomadic Hauyya (Somali) who conquered that territory. Thus Makedishu was cut away by the Bedouins from the interior of the land and began to decline from its prosperity. The colonial enterprises of the Portuguese and the British in the Indian Ocean hastened even more this decadence. Vasco da Gama, when he was coming back from India in 1499 A.D., as-sailed unsuccessfully Makedishu with his squadron; and even Da Cunha in 1507 A.D. did not succeed in occupying the town. In 1552 A.D. Makedishu was visited by Dom Estevam da Gama, son of Vasco, who came there to buy a ship. In December 5, 1700 A.D. a British squadron of men-of-war stopped threateningly before Makedishu but they did not land any force and after some days went away probably to India. During the wars between the Portuguese and the Imam of Oman, Makedishu and other towns on the Somali coast were occupied by the soldiers of Imam Sidi. Sultan (died 1116 = 1704); but after a little while the Imam ordered his troops to come back to Oman.

In the meantime the Sultanate of Makedishu was practically divided into two quarters (Hamar-Wan and Shangani) and was wasted by civil wars. The Somalis had so penetrated little by little, into the ancient Arabian town that the clan of Makedishu changed their Arabian names with new Somali appellatives: the "Akhali clan became the "Sheikh;" the "Lijaddati" were called "Shahshiyat;" the "Affis took the name of "Gudmanak;" and even the Murabi (Kalijam) changed their name for the Somali "Sheikh.

But in the 11th century A.D., the Bedouins (Somalis) Danandola, excited by exaggerated traditions of the wealth of Makedishu, assailed and conquered the town. The chief of the Danandola, who had the title of "Imam, established himself in the Shangani quarter; and the privilege of the "Imam, about the election of the "Kadi was again recognised by the new masters of the town. In the first half of the 12th century A.D. the Sultan Barghash b. Sa'id of Zanzibar occupied Makedishu and ruled the town by means of a "Wali. In 1180 the Sultan of Zanzibar leased the town to Italy, who afterwards in 1906 bought all the settlements of Zanzibar on the Somali coast.

MAKDISHU — MAKHZEN


(ENRICO CERULLI)

MAKDUM AL-MULK, whose real name is Mawlá Abú Alláh, was the son of Shaikh Shams al-Din of Sulţānāpur. His forefathers immigrated from Multán and settled at Sulţānāpur near Lahore. He was the pupil of Mawlá Ana Abu al-Kādir Sarhindī and became one of the most distinguished scholars and saints of India. He was a bigoted Sunnī and looked upon Abu l-Fadl (d. 1011 = 1602) from the beginning as a dangerous man. Contemporary monarchs had a great regard and respect for him. Emperor Humayūn (1537-98 = 1530-56) conferred on him the title of Shaikh al-лизām. When the empire of India came into the possession of Shāh Shāh (1546-52 = 1539-45) he also honoured him with the title of Saheb al-ilāh. He was also a man of great importance during the time of Emperor Akbar (1563-1605 = 1556-1609). Bairam Khan Khānān (d. 1596 = 1605) extorted his position very much by giving him the subdivision of Thānakadāla, which yielded an income of one lac of rupees, while Akbar gave him the title of Makhduum al-Mulk by which designation he has become known to posterity. When Akbar introduced his religious innovations and converted people to his "Divine Fath", Makhduum al-Mulk opposed the Emperor, who became very angry with him and ordered him to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca. He therefore stilled in 957 (1579).

He died or was poisoned in 990 (1582) in Almudalādāl after his return from Mecca.

He is the author of the following books:

1. *Ismat al-imāyā*, a work on the chrestiety of prophets (cf. Bādāʿini, ii. 70).

Biography: Abu al-Kādir Bahātūnī, Muntazzah al-Tarāzī, iii. 70; Shāhīm al-Mir Kān Arangābādī, Mārar al-mabādil, iii. 252; Khazzmat al-āsītān, p. 443-464; Alaʾ al-Akbar, transl. by Blochman, p. 172 and 544. (M. H. YABAT BOSAIN)

MAKDUM-I DJAHANIYAN. [See Djalīl BUKHARI]

MAKLAD (BAN), a family of famous Cordovan jurists who, from father to son, during ten generations, distinguished themselves in the study of Fikh. The eponymous ancestor of the family was Makhlad b. Yazid, who was_kāf_i of the province of Reiyadh (the_kāf_in the south-east of Spain, the capital of which was Malaga) in the reign of the Emir Abu al-Rahmān II, in the first half of the third century A.H. His son, Abu 'Abdu al-Rahmān Bahā b. Makhlad, was a great jurist and traditionist. He was born in Ramdān 201 (April 517) and after being in Spain the pupil of Malik b. Anas and of Yahya b. Yahya al-Latifi, he made a long journey to the East where he perfected himself in the sciences of Law and Tradition. On his return to Cordova his indisputable mastery earned him the hatred and envy of the chief Spanish jurists, especially of Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allāh Ibn Martanīl (cf. Ibn al-Farāhi, N. 245; al-Dābbih, N. 572) who tried to get him sentenced to death by accusing him of impiety and heresy. Bahā b. Makhlad only owed his safety to the intervention of the secretary to the court of Hāshim b. 'Abd al-'Aziz and was able to end his life under the protection of the Umayyad government, respected by the people of Cordova, where he died in 276 (889).

Baḥā b. Makhlad who, it is believed, was one of the first to introduce the Zādiya movement into al-Andalus [see the article ZĀDIYAH], wrote two celebrated books: a Tafsīr al-Qur'ān and a Musnad of Muhammadan traditions, the loss of which is greatly to be regretted if we may believe the laudatory judgment passed on them by Ibn Hazm in his *Kitāb* repeated by al-Makarrī (Analekta, ii. 115).


The direct descendants of Baḥā b. Makhlad devoted their scientific activity mainly to commenting on the masterpieces of their celebrated ancestor. A list of these scholars, with bibliographical references, is supplied in a small monograph devoted to the family of the Banū Makhlad by Rafael de Ureña y Menjauco, Familias de jurisconsultos: Los Beneméritos de Córdoba, Homenaje a D. Francisco Codina, Zaragoza 1904, p. 251—258. (E. LEY—PROVENÇAL)

MAKHZEN (A.), from khazana, "to shut up, to preserve, to hoard." The word is believed to have been first used in North Africa as an official term in the second century A.H. applied to an iron chest in which Ihābī b. al-Aḥlāb, emir of Ifrikiya, kept the sums of money raised by taxation and intended for the Abāsīd caliph of Baghdad. At first this term, which in Morocco is now in synonymy with the government, was applied more particularly to the financial department, the Treasury.

It may be said that the term makhzem meaning the Moroccan government and everything more or less connected with it at first meant simply the place where the sums raised by taxation were kept, intended to be paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, the bit al-māl. Later, when the sums thus raised were kept for use in the countries in which they were collected and were no longer paid into the treasury of the Muslim community, and they became as it were, the private treasuries of the communities in which they were collected, the word makhesen was used to mean the separate local treasuries and a certain amount of confusion arose between the makhzem and the bit el-māl.

We do find in Spain the expression 'abd al-makhesen but it still means slave, of the treasury
rather than slave of the government, and it seems that it was only later in Morocco that in proportion as the state became separated from the whole Muslim community after being successively under the Omayyads of Damascus, the 'Abdids of Bagdad, the Omayyads of Spain and the Fatimids of Egypt that the word makhen came to be used for the government itself.

To sum up, the word makhen, after being used for the place where the sums intended for the bit al-nul of the Muslim community were kept was used for the local treasury of the Muslim community of Morocco, when it became separate under the great Berber dynasties: later with the Sharifite dynasties the word was applied not only to the treasury but to the whole organisation more or less administrative which lives on the treasury, that it is to say the whole government of Morocco. In tracing through history the changes of meaning of the word makhen, one comes to the conclusion that not only is the institution to which it is applied not religious in character but on the contrary it represents the combined usurpations of powers, originally religious, by laymen, at the expense of which it has grown up through several centuries. The result of these successive usurpations is that the makhen which originally was only a chest in the treasury came to mean first the treasury itself, and the government and to represent to the Moroccan the sole principle of authority.

We know that the fundamental principle of Muslim society is that of the community: the head of this community is simply an administrator who has to exercise his functions, said the caliph 'Omar, like an honest teacher solely concerned with the interests of his pupils. Of this ideal the only part remaining in practice is that the members of the community are effectively in tutelage. In rapidly surveying the history of the Makhen, we can see how this arbitrary government became gradually established while using the prescriptions of Islam, and how it succeeded in forming in face of the native Berber element which surrounded it a kind of Arab façade, behind which the Berbers in spite of the slowness of their gradual Islamisation, have sustained their institutions, superstitions and their independence. In this connexion it cannot be too strongly emphasised that, in spite of their perhaps disputable orthodoxy, the Berbers are Muslims and consider that they belong to the Muslim community. No doubt they do not practise it very frequently but they have the pride of Islam and its intolerance; they have taken Muslim ostracism into the service of their native savagery and it would be a dangerous error to think that they could be open to anti-Muslim sentiments and particularly to imagine that their religious lukewarmness ought to make them favourable to us. The organisation was made at the first conquest by 'Oqba b. Nafi' 63 (682 a.d.). All the representatives of Arab culture had to do was to levy heavy tributes in money and slaves to satisfy their own greed and to enable them to send valuable gifts to the caliph of Damascus.

It was the same in 90 (708) with Musa b. Nu'air but the conquest of Spain brought over to Islam a large number of Berber tribes by promising them a share in plundering the wealth of the Visigoths. On the other hand the exactions of the Arabs and the desire to escape the demands of the caliphs facilitated the spread of Kharijite doctrines, the many schools of which made any unity of power impossible and on the contrary increased decentralisation.

The Idrisid dynasty, which its Sharifite origin gives a claim to be the first Muslim dynasty of Morocco and which completed the conversion of the country to Islam only exercised its power over a small part of Morocco. Alongside of it the Barghawata [?c.] heretics and numerous Kharijite emirs continued to exist. The Zenata Mknaasia, Maghraowa and Banu Ifren at a later period were no more able to effect a centralisation of power. It was not till the fifth century A.H. (11th A.D.) under the Shanadi dynasty of the Almoravids that in the reign of Ya'kub b. Tashfin we can see the beginnings of a makhen which only becomes clearly recognisable under the Almohad dynasty. It was under the latter that religious unity was first attained in Morocco. The heresy of the Barghawata and all other schisms were destroyed and a single Muslim community, that of the Almohads, replaced the numerous more or less heterodox sects which had been sharing the country and its revenues. It may be said that the organisation of the makhen which we found in Morocco is fundamentally based on this unification and the measures which resulted from it. The Almohads regarded theirs as the only true Muslim community. All who did not belong to it were infidels whom it was lawful to fight, to kill, to reduce their women and children to slavery and to seize their goods and lands for the benefit of the Almohads, the only orthodox community. The Almohads were thus able to apply to all the territory of their empire the ideal Muslim principle for dealing with land, i.e. that all the lands conquered by them from non-Almohads and even from Almohads whose faith was regarded as suspect were classed as lands taken from infidels and became habus of the Muslim i.e. Almohad community. These habus districts are those whose occupants have to pay the tax called kharaj. In order to levy this the Sultan 'Abd al-Mumin had all his African empire surveyed from Gades to the Wadi Nunn.

A few years later Ya'kub al-Manṣur brought to Morocco the Djasaam and Banu Hilaal Arabs and settled them on lands belonging to the Muslim community, which had been uninhabited since the destruction of the Barghawata, the wars of the Almohads with the last Almoravids and large despatches of troops to Spain. These Arab tribes who formed the gish (pronounced gish in Morocco) of the Almohads did not pay the kharaj for the lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. They were Makhen tribes who rendered military service in place of kharaj. We shall find later the remains of this organisation with the gish tribes and the tribes of nîtha. The efforts of the Marinids to reconstitute a gish with their own tribes did not succeed and they had to return to the makhzen of Arab tribes brought to Morocco by Ya'kub al-Manṣur and even added to it contingents of the Ma'kil Arabs of Sás.

Under the Banu Wat.?as this movement became more marked and Spanish influences became more and more felt in the more complicated organisation of the central Makhen and by the creation of new offices at the court and in the palace.
The conquests by the Christians by causing the development of the zayyus and the fall of the Banū Wattār brought about the rise of the Sa'dians [1:6] of Wādi Dār. The latter with their primitive manners as Saharan tribes and under the religious influence of the shāikhs of the brotherhoods began to try to bring back the exercise of power to the patriarchal simplicity with which it was wielded in the early days of 1-il. The necessities of the government, the intrigues of the tribes and the wars of members of the ruling family against one another soon made necessary the constitution of a proper makhzen with its military tribes, mini-ters, its crown officials of high and low degree, its governors to whom were soon added the innumerable groups of palace officials, which will be mentioned below.

The frequent intercourse between the Sa'dians and the Turks, who had come to settle in Algeria at the beginning of the eighteenth century brought to the court of Morocco a certain amount of eastern ceremonial, a certain amount of luxury and even a certain degree of pomp in the life of the sovereign and in that of his entourage and of all the individuals employed in the Makhzen.

It is from this time that really dates the existence of this entity, which is really foreign to the country itself, which lived by exploiting rather than governing it and is known as the Makhzen.

The increasing official relations of Morocco with European powers, the exchange of ambassadors, the commercial agreements, the ransoming of Christian slaves, largely contributed to give this Makhzen more and more the appearance of a regular government. The jealousies of the powers, their desire to maintain the status quo in Morocco and the need to have a regular government to deal with them further strengthened the Makhzen both at home and abroad and enabled the Sulṭān Mawlāy al-Hassan to conduct for nearly twenty years this policy of equilibrium between the powers on one side, and the tribes on the other, who kept till his death the empire of Morocco in existence, built up of very diverse elements, of which the Makhzen formed the facade.

The very humble, almost humiliating, attitude imposed on the European ambassadors at official receptions preceded the prestige of the Sulṭān and the Makhzen in the eyes of the tribes. The envoy of the Christian powers, surrounded by the presents which he brought, appeared on foot in the court of the palace and seemed to have come to pay tribute to the emin of the Muslims, who was on horseback. All the theatrical side was developed to strike the imagination of the Makhzen with much care and succeeded in creating an illusion of the real efficiency of this organization in the eyes of both tribes and powers.

Under the Berber dynasty, the Amhods, the Marmāt, and the Banū Wattār, the military tribes, the Sīrī, were almost all Arab; under the Sa'dians they were entirely Arab; to the Hāshim and Banū Hātim, Arabs were added the Mālī Arabs of Sīrī. On the other hand, the Sa'dians had removed from the registries of the Qarādā a certain number of the Arab tribes who then paid in money the Ḫwajā for the Ḫwajā lands of the Muslim community which they occupied. These tribes, in contrast to the Qarādā, were called tribes of the mātir, that is to say, according to the etymology proposed for the word, they were under the tutelage of the makhzen (from nānib "tutor" or "substitute" for a father) or perhaps that they paid the tribes of the Qarādā a sum for replacing them (from nābā, to substitute).

From this time on, Morocco assumed the appearance which it had when France established her protectorate there. The frontier, settled with the Turks in the east, had hardly been altered by the occupation of Algeria by France and the territory of Morocco was, as it still is to-day, divided into two parts: 1. bilād al-makhzen or conquered territory; 2. bilād al-sīrāb or land of schism; the latter was almost exclusively occupied by the Berbers.

The bilād al-makhzen, which represents official Morocco, was formed of territories belonging to the ḥanīf of the Muslim community and liable to the ḥarāṣ. This land was occupied by Arab tribes, some Qarādā, others nātib. Morocco consisted of an Arab government (makhzen) which administered the regions liable to ḥarāṣ, and occupied by Arab tribes, the status of which varied according as they were Qarādā or nātib.

The Berber tribes of the bilād al-sīrāb not only refused to allow the authority of the makhzen to penetrate among them, but even had a tendency to go back to the plains from which they had gradually been pushed into the mountains. One of the main endeavours of the present dynasty, the 'Alawī Shūrta of Tafṣīlāt, which succeeded the Sa'dians in the seventeenth century has been to oppose this movement of expansion of the Berber tribes. This is why Mawlāy Ismā'īl, the most illustrious Sulṭān of this dynasty, built 70 qāya's on the frontier of the bilād al-makhzen to keep down the Berbers. Hence we have this policy of equilibrium and intrigues which has just been mentioned and which up till quite recent years was the work of the Makhzen.

As we have already said, it was not a question of organizing the country nor even of governing it, but simply of holding their own by keeping rebellion within bounds with the help of the tribes of the Qarādā by extracting from the ports and from the tribes of the nātib all that could be extorted by every means. From time to time expeditions led by the Sulṭān himself against the unsolicited tribes asserted his power and increased his prestige.

The Makhzen, gradually formed in course of centuries by the possibilities and exigencies of domestic policy as well as by the demands of foreign policy, seems to have attained its most complete development in the reign of Mawlāy al-Hassan, the last great independent Sulṭān of Morocco (1873–1894). The government of Mawlāy al-Hassan consisted in the first place of the Sulṭān himself, at once hereditary and also, if not exactly elected, at least nominated by the 'alavī and notables of each town and tribes from among the sons, brothers, nephews and even the consuls of the last ruler. This proclamation is called kāba. It is in general he who takes control of the Treasury and of the troops when the moment comes to assume the right of succession. It sometimes happens that the late sovereign has nominated his successors, but this does not constitute an obligation on the electors to obey it. There is then no rule of succession to the throne.

Formerly there was only one vizier, the grand vizier: the grand vizierate, a kind of Home
Ministry, was divided into three sections, each managed by a secretary (kāīb):
1. From the Strait of Gibraltar to the Wādī Regreg;
2. From Wādī Regreg to the Sahara;
3. Tāīfilāt.

In the reign of Sidi Muḥammad (1859—1873), the more frequent and intimate relations with Europe and more particularly the working of the protectorate made it necessary to found a special office for foreign relations, and a waṣīr al-bahār, literally Minister of the Sea, was appointed. This does not mean minister for the Navy, but for all that came by sea, i.e., Europeans. This minister had a representative in Tangier, the nābī al-sulṭān, who was the intermediary between European representatives and the Central Makhzen. His task was to deal with European complaints and claims from perpetual settlements and to play off against one another the protégés of the European powers, who were certainly increasing in numbers and frequently formed an obstacle to the traditional arbitrary rule of the Makhzen. The régime of the consular protectorate, settled and regulated in 1880 by the Convention of Madrid, had also resulted in discouraging the Makhzen from extending its authority over new territory.

The exercise of this authority was in fact automatically followed by the exercise of the right of protection and from the point of view of resistance to European penetration, the Makhzen had everything to gain by keeping in an apparent political independence the greater part of the territory which thus escaped the influence which threatened in time to turn Morocco into a regular international protectorate.

By a conciliatory native policy and cautious dealing with the local chiefs, the šakhs of the šīwīs and the Sharīfi families, the Makhzen was able to exert even in the remotest districts a real influence and never ceased to carry on perpetual intrigues in order to divide the tribes against one another.

It maintained its religious prestige by the hope of preparation for the holy war which was one day to drive out the infidels and sought to penetrate by spreading the Arabic language and the teaching of the Keblā and gradually substituting the principles of Mahometan law of the šīrā' for Berber customs. In a word, it continued the conquest of the country by trying to complete its islāmisation and making Islām permeate its customs.

In the reign of Mawlay al-Ḥasan, the Makhzen consisted of the grand vizier, the waṣīr al-bahār, minister of foreign affairs, the 'āliṣf — afterwards called minister of war —, the waṣīr al-ṣanā'ī, — afterwards minister of finance —, the kāīb al-tāīmī, kāīb of complaints, who became minister of justice by combining his duties with that of the kāīb al-ṣanā'ī, kāīb of Kasāf. These ministers had the offices (banīṣa, pl. banīṣā), in the mikhṣar at the Palace.

The offices were under the galleries which were built round a large courtyard. At the top of the mikhṣar was the office of the grand vizier, beside which was that of the kāīb al-ṣanā'ī, a kind of captain of the guard, who also made presentations to the sulṭān. The kāīb al-makhṣar was in command of the police of the mikhṣar and he had under his command the troops of the ġād, makhṣarīya, masākhirīya (hānīf — sg. hānīf) etc., as well as all the bodies of servants outside the palace: the maṭāla al-ruwā, grand-master of the stables, the frā'īya, who had charge of the sulṭān’s encampments.

In addition to these banīṣ of the mikhṣar, mention must be made of an individual, who as was shown in recent times could play a more considerable part in the government than his actual office would lead one to expect. This is the kāīb ('īqīn), literally the “curtain”, i.e. an official placed between the Sulṭān and his subjects like a curtain. His kāībī was situated between the mikhṣar and the palace proper and he had charge of the interior arrangements of the Sulṭān’s household. Under his orders were the various groups of domestic servants (hānīf, al-dakhīṣīn, makhṣarī al-sulṭān, al-makhṣarī who looked after the washing arrangements, makhṣarī al-frā'ī, who attended to the beds, etc., etc.; he also commanded the envoys and even was responsible for the discipline of the women of the Sulṭān, through the 'ārifīs ormistresses of the palace. The kāībī is often called grand chamberlain, although he does not exactly correspond to this office.

Around these officers gravitated a world of secretaries of different ranks, of officers of the ġād, then the kāīb al-ṣanā'ī, who was in theory in command of 500 horsemen, the kāīb al-makhṣarī who commanded 100 down to a simple mukhālī. All this horde of officials, badly paid when paid at all, lived on the country as it could, trafficking shamelessly in the influence which it had or was thought to have and in the prestige it gained from belonging to the court, whether closely or remotely. The influence of these court officials spread throughout the regions controlled by the organisation of Makhzen officials, which contributed to the centralisation of authority and its profits.

In this organisation it may be noticed that the authority of the Makhzen properly so-called, i.e. a lay power, continually increased at the expense of the religious power by a series of changes. No doubt the basis continued to be religious, but the application of power became less and less so and the civil jurisdiction of the kāšīs and of the Makhzen more and more took the place of the administration of the šīrā' by the kāšīs, which finally became restricted to questions of personal law and landed property.

The authority of the sulṭān was represented in the towns and in the tribes by the kāšīs, appointed by the grand vizier and by the makhṣarīs, who office owed its origin to the religious law of the šīrā'. The makhṣarī supervised and controlled the gilds, fixed the prices of articles of food and inspected weights and measures and coins.

The tax of the ūmrī, which represented the old khāna, was levied on the non-ġād tribes by the kāšīs of these tribes. It was one of the principal causes of abuses: the amount of the tax was never fixed on the spot which came from the tax was in reality divided among the kāšīs, the secretaries of the Makhzen and the vizier without the sulṭān or the public treasury getting any benefit from them.

The grand vizier also appointed the nāṣir officers, who from the reign of Mawlay ʿAbd al-Raḥmān had been attached to the local nāṣirs of the ġād of the mosques and sanctuaries. The kāšīs were appointed by the kāšī or ġād; at the present day they are appointed by the minister of justice.
They propose the 'raudl but do not actually appoint them. The financial staff, 'umanā', who control the customs, the possessions of the Makhzen (al-anṭāk), the ministīfādat (market-dues and tolls etc. called niṣba), the controller of the biṭ al-nāl (popularly abu-l-'mawāriḥ) i.e. the official who intervened to collect the share of the Muslim community from estates of deceased persons and who also acted as curator of intestate estates (ṣuṣūl al-gāyx) and these officers were appointed by the amīn al-umānā who was later known as the minister of finance.

This organisation was completely centralised i.e. its only object was to bring all the resources of the country into the coffers of the State and of its agents, but there was no provision for utilising these resources in the public interest. No budget was drawn up, no public works, no railways, no navy, no commerce, no port, nothing at all was provided for. Military expenses were confined to the maintenance of a regiment commanded by an English officer, of a French mission of military instruction, of a factory of arms at Fāṣ directed by an Italian officer and of the building at Ṭālah of a fort by a German engineer. These were really rather diplomatic concessions to the powers interested than a regular military organisation. In the spirit of the Makhzen the defence of the territory was to be the task of the Berber tribes, carefully maintained out of all contact with Europeans behind the elaborate display maintained by the court.

In the event of war, the Makhzen, faithful to its system of equal favour, purchased arms and munitions from the different powers and kept them in the maṣāna of Fāṣ to be able when necessity arose to distribute them to the tribes when proclaiming a holy war.

The expenses of the education service were limited to the very modest allowances granted to the šulāna of al-Karawun at Fāṣ. These allowances were levied from the ḫuṣara and augmented by gifts made by the Sultān on the occasion of feasts (ṣāda).

Nothing was done for public health and one could not give the name of hospitals to the few niṣrā-iṣān to be found in certain towns where a few miserable creatures lived in filth, receiving from the ḫuṣara and the charity of the public barely enough to prevent them dying of hunger and of course without receiving any medical assistance.

On the repeated representation of the Powers the Makhzen had ultimately delegated its powers to the members of the diplomatic corps in Tangier, which had been able to form a public health committee in order to be able to refuse admission to infected vessels if necessary. In spite of its defects, the Makhzen constituted a real force; it formed a solid bloc in the centre of surrounding anarchy which it was interested in maintaining, to be able to exploit it more easily on the one hand and on the other to prevent the preservation in the country of any united order which might become a danger to it.

In short we may say that the Makhzen in Morocco was an instrument of arbitrary government, which worked quite well in the social disorder of the country and thanks to this disorder, we may add, it worked for its own profit and was in a way like a foreign element in a conquered country. It was and still is a regular caste with its own traditions, way of living, of dressing, of furnishing, of feeding, with its own language, al-lughat al-makhzaniya, which is a correct Arabic intermediate between the literary and the spoken Arabic, composed of official formulae, regular cliches, courteous, concise and binding to nothing.

This Makhzen which was sufficient in the old order of things which it had itself contributed to create and maintain, was, forced, if it was not to disappear at once, to undergo fundamental modifications from the moment this state of things had rendered necessary the establishment of a protectorate.

Various changes have always been made in the old regime, which has been a matter of regret to many as reducing sources of profit. The vizierate of foreign affairs and that of war have been handed over to the Resident-General, that of finance to the Director-General of finance who administers the revenue of the empire alike to those of a regularly organised state.

The director-generalships of agriculture and education, which are regular ministries are held by French officials as are the management of the postal service, telegraph and telephone and the trade of health.

Two new vizierates had been created, that of the regal domains (al-anṭāk) and that of the ḥubās. The vizierate al-anṭāk has just been suppressed and the domains are administered by a branch of the finance department. The vizierate of the ḥubās is under that of the Sharifian affairs. This organisation represents the principle of protectorate in the Moroccan government itself and in order to realise "the organisation of a reformed Sharifian Makhzen" in keeping with the treaty.

Bibliography: 1. On the evolution of the meaning of the word makhzen of the words khāṣīn (treasurer); khaṣāna (place where treasury is kept); khouza and khouza (the treasure itself) in the standard lexicons, especially Tāh al-'Arab: Muḥīṭ al-Makhzī, Baḥrī 1867, ni khouza and khazānāt; E. Lévi-Provençal, Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, Paris 1926, Arabic text, p. 71 and glossary and esp. Dazzy, Supplement aux dictionnaires arabes, Leyden 1881, Add to the bibliography there given the following article in the Recueil Africain: 1856—1857, p. 393: F. Pharron, Notes sur les tribus de la Subdivision de Melha; 187; p. 196 and sqq.: N. Robin, Note sur l'organisation militaire et administrative des Turcs dans la Grande Kabylie; 1895, p. 5. sqq. and p. 109 sqq.: E. Mangin, Notes sur l'Histoire de Laghouat, for the Algerian use of the word makhzen.


Bulletin du Comité de l'Afrique Française: 1902, p. 420; Le Voyage du Sultan; suppl. p. 293—304; René Manduit, Le Maroc Marocain; 1904, p. 4; General Derrécaux, La crise marocaine; p. 50; L'évolution du Marhzen; 1905, R. C., p. 517—528; Commandant Ferry, La réorganisation marocaine; 1906, p. 335; Le Sultan et la Cour; 1907, p. 102; Le Gouvernement Marocain; p. 367; Le Sultan du Sud; p. 368; Le dépôtlement de la Cour de Fès; 1909, R. C., p. 185 sqq.; Ed. Douitté, Les causes de la chute d'un Sultan, La Royauté marocaine.

(M. BUKET)

MAKHZUM BÊNE) along with the Omaniyads, the aristocratic clan of Mecca. This asser- tion is contrary to the theory popularised by the Sîraj in virtue of which the ancestor of the aristocratic families was Kûshay [q.v.]. About the middle of the viith century A. H. we find that among the clans of Kûrâshî [q.v.] that held in most consideration was the Banû Ma'kûzûm, which traced its descent through Yakaî b. Murra to the legendary Fîrîr (Kûrâshî) without going through Kûshayî. At this period the Makûzûm controlled everything at Mecca except the sanctuary. They alone were able to counterbalance the growing influence of the Omaniyads. It is at this time that their name becomes occasionally synonymous with Kûrâshî (Ibn Durâdî, Kitâb al-Isbâtî, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 94 sqq.).

The Makûzûm seem to have owed their primacy to Mughîrâ b. 'Abd Allâh, a contemporary of 'Abd al-Mu'tazzî and grandson of the eponymous ances- tor of the clan. The adjective Mughîrî thus comes to be used for Makûzûm. His son, Highân b. al-Mughîrî, is even said to have had the title "lord (râbî) of Mecca" (Ibn Durâdî, Isbâtî, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 93 sqq.). The Kûrâshî are said to have dated one of their eras from the death of this individual, if the reference is not to Walî b. al-Mughîrî. Tradition hesitates between these two Makûzûms. The influence of the Makûzûm was preponderant in the nôla', or council of notables which decided affairs at Mecca. It is frequently a Makûzûm who speaks in name of the nôla', as for example in the discussion with Muḥammad, at the beginning of the preaching of Islâm. They are believed to have opened up to Meccan commerce the principal routes to foreign markets. For their intelligence, their activity — they were said to be "ardent as
bear no grudge against the Makhzūmīs. They even chose members of the clan for the office of governor of Madina, hitherto reserved for an Omayyad. After, as before, the Ḥāḍira, the Makhzūmīs continued to be reckoned among the richest capitalists in Mecca. They had about 5,000 mīrākāl of gold laid out in the caravan which was the cause of the battle of Badr. It was to them that Muḥammad applied on the eve of Ḥanain for a loan of 40,000 dirhams. Their systematic opposition to authority put them completely out of the running for any of the great administrative offices in which the members of the Kurāish clans enriched themselves. Their aristocratic pride did not prevent them however from seeking profit in commerce and even in industry. We know from the story of ʿOmar b. ʿAbd Ḥafīḍh [q. v., the most famous of the Kurāish poets. ʿOmar kept 70 of his slaves employed in the weaving-mills established in Mecca (Aḥqāfī, i, 37, 3). Another Makhzūmī, a contemporary of Ṣa‘dī, was known as “the monk (shahīb) of Kurāish” on account of his merit and his asceticism in prayer (Ibn Sa‘d, Tabakht, ed. Sachau, v, 153, 20). Much better known than this ascetic and continually quoted on questions of ʿIṣṣik and Ḥadhrāt is the Makhzūmī Sa‘d b. ʿAbd Ḥafīd. ʿAbd Ḥafīd [q. v., one of the most famous ʿAbdālā of the first century A.H.

With the coming of the ʿAbbāsid, influence passed over to the Iranians. Gradually the Makhzūmī, like other Kurāish clans, fell into obscurity. At the present day there are still families bearing the name Makhzūmī. It remains to be seen to what extent they are justified in claiming descent from the Makhzūmīs, if it is not in the female line as in the case of Ṣa‘d, Makhzūmī al-Ḥarmi (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii, 98). Kāšānī (Ṣabk al-Rūḥ, Cairo, i, 213) justly remarks that the tribe of the Banū Khālid which led a nomadic life around Hims has only the name in common with the great Makhzūmīs. The male line from Khālid b. al-Walid is said to have become extinct very early (cf. Ibn al-Athir, Usd al-Qaws, v, 249, [infra]), a statement disputed by the Ṣa‘dī of al-Dīn mentioned above.

here, we only give the dates of his birth and death, 602 (1205) and 675 (1273). The latter date is given by Ḥaḍḍū Ḫaṭīfa, ii. 104, No. 2103. His grandfather, according to J. H. Hottinger, Persianism, p. 75 sqq., died in 606 and his father in 636.

Al-Makin’s world-chronicle consists of two parts, the first of which deals with the pre-Islamic world from the Creation onwards and the second with Muslim history down to 658 (1260). The work is so planned that the whole history of the world is given in the form of successively numbered biographies of its most important men. Near the beginning the discussion of several cosmological questions and the several climes is inserted. Down to 586 B.C. it is based on Biblical history; the enumeration of the biographies begins with Adam as No. 1. For the period after the destruction of Solomon’s temple there come on the usual scheme the dynasties of Eastern Asia, which in turn are succeeded by Alexander, the Romans and the Byzantines. In this and in the second part, as the author himself tells us, he is following the model of al-Ṭabarī’s chronicle.

The work which is entitled al-Maḏjmūʿ al-mubāyak exists in numerous manuscripts. The first part is regularly quoted with a Latin translation by Hottinger, Synchronia Orientalis (1658) in the chapter De usum linguarum orientalium in theologiam historiam on various facts of history. The chapter on Alexander the Great has been edited in Ethiopic and translated into English by E. A. W. Budge, The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great (1896). The second part was edited and translated by Th. Erpenius under the title Historia Saracenica... a Georgii Fudami, 1625; English and French translations appeared soon after. Many emendations were given by Kohler in Eichhorn’s Repertorium, vii–ix., xi., xiv., xvii. A critical edition of the whole work is an urgent desideratum. How important it is for Oriental church history has been shown by A. v. Gutschmidt, Verzeichnis der Patriarchen von Alexandrien = Kl. Schr., ii., 1896, p. 395–525.

This is sufficient to show how necessary would be a comprehensive investigation of al-Makin’s place in historical treasuries which could only be undertaken on the basis of a certain text. Besides it is evident that al-Makin used old sources independently which are not known to his immediate predecessors like Eutychius [q.v.] and his contemporary, much quoted by him, Ibn al-Rāḥib (Brockelmann, G. L. A., i. 349 where of course it should be 669 = 1270) with whom he agrees in the numbering of the biographies which are also used by al-Ṭabarī. In the chapter on Alexander the Great, the Ethiopic translation of which edited by Budge agrees very closely with the Arabic original, are found long word for word extracts from the very old Hebraic work in Arabic entitled al-Sayyidūkī (cf. Stein- schneider, Zur pseud. Lit., 1862, p. 375; Die arab. ērs., a. d. Griech., Centrall., f. Bibliotheks- turen, chap. xii., 1893, p. 88), which had been previously copied in the Ghiyāṯ al-Ḥikmāt of Ps.-Madjīṭt (Brockelmann, G. L. A., i. 243, cf. Ritter, Pictoris, ein arab. Handbuch hellenist. Magic, Vorträge d. Bibli. Warburg, 194 sqq.; ed. by Ritter and transl. by Ritter and Plessner in preparation for Studien d. Bibli. Warburg). In Budge’s work is also given the Ethiopic translation of Ibn al-Rāḥib’s account of Alexander which in contrast to the Arabic text in Cheikho’s edition (C. S. C. O. Arab., iii/6, 1903) is here not simply a brief list of events but is a very full account. Only general statements are given from the above mentioned Hermetic work and do not compel the belief that it was used independently so that in spite of all agreements between him and his Rāḥib, al-Makin must really have worked independently of him. That the reverse might be the case and Ibn al-Rāḥib be dependent on al-Makin is impossible because al-Makin expressly quotes Ibn al-Rāḥib (cf. Budge, ii. 380, note 7). Since Cheikho only published the Ibn al-Rāḥib text of Abūma Dāwūd, which is perhaps an abbreviation of the basic text while the Ethiopic translation perhaps reproduces the original form, the question of the relations between the two ecclesiastical writers cannot yet be definitely settled; but even the Alexander chapter shows that it is of the utmost importance to settle the problem.


M. MAḴḴAṈI, Abū l-Ḍaḏīl Ḥaḏīṯ b. Muḥammad b. Ḥaḏīṯ al-Dīn, a Maḏhabī man of letters and biographer, born at Tilmīn (Tlemcen, q. v.) c. 1000 (1591–92) d. at Cairo in Djamād Il 1041 (Jan. 1632). He belonged to a family of scholars, natives of Maḵḵā (about 12 miles S. E. of Misla, in the present province of Constantine in Algeria). One of his paternal ancestors, Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Ḵaḵḵār, had been chief ḳādī of Fās and one of the teachers of the famous Ġīṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Rāḥib of Granada. He himself received his early youth; his principal teacher was his paternal uncle Abī ‘Uṯmān Sa’d (d. at Tlemcen in 1030 [1620–21]; on him cf. Ben Cheneb, Ind. des. 103). He then left his native town and went to Marrakush and Fās where he became Ṣāḥib and Muftī of the great mosque of al-Ğarawīyīn from 1022 (1613) to 1027 (1617). He then set out for the East in order to make the pilgrimage to the Holy Places; after doing so he came to Cairo in 1028 (1618) where he stayed for some months and married. In the next year he made a journey to Jerusalem then returned to Cairo. In 1037 (1627) he again made the pilgrimage which he was to repeat several times later. At Mecca as well as at Medina on these occasions
he taught ḥadīth in a way that attracted much attention. He again made stays at Jerusalem and Damascus where he was received at the Madrasa ʿIṣṭaṣarīyya by the learned Ahmad b. Shāhīn. In this city also his lectures on Muslim Traditions were largely attended. He then returned to Cairo and while he was preparing to return to Damascus to settle there permanently, he fell ill and died.

In spite of his long stay in the East, it was in Morocco that al-Makrānī collected the essential materials for his work as the historian and biographer of Muslim Spain, especially at Marrākush in the library of the Saʿdīna Sultān (now in part in the Escorial); this is how al-Makrānī consulted among other works the unique copy of the Muṣnad of Ibn Marṣūd: cf. Ḥibṭīrī, v. 8 sq.). Indeed his masterpiece, written in the East at the suggestion of Ibn Shāhīn from materials collected by him in the Maghrib, is a long monograph on Muslim Spain and on the famous encyclopedia of Granada, Liṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Naṣīf al-Tīb ma’ṣūm al-Andalus al-Kalīf wa-dāhir al-Wasirīn Liṣān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭīb, an immense compilation of historical and literary information, poems, letters and quotations very often taken from works now lost. It is this that gives the Naṣīf al-Tīb an inestimable value and puts it in the first rank for our sources of Muslim Spain from the conquest to the last days of the "reconquista". Even for the later period it is the only Arabic source that we still possess.

The Naṣīf al-Tīb consists of two quite distinct parts, a monograph on the history and literature of Muslim Spain and the monograph on Ibn al-Khaṭīb. The first part is divided as follows:

1. physical geography of al-Andalus. 2. Conquest of al-Andalus by the Arabs, period of the governors. 3. History of the Omayyad Caliphs and of the petty dynasts (Muḥibb al-tāfarīf). 4. Description of Cordova, its history and its monuments. 5. Spanish Arabs who have made the journey to the East. 6. Orontes who have made the journey to Spain. 7. Sketches of literary history, the intellectual and moral qualities of the Spanish Arabs. 8. The "reconquista" of Spain and the expulsion of the Muslims. The second part contains 1. Origin and biography of the ancestors of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, 2. biography of Ibn al-Khaṭīb, 3. biographies of his teachers. 4. letters in rhymed prose of the chancellors of Granada and of Fās, sent or received by Ibn al-Khaṭīb (muḥāṣṣarāt), 5. a selection of his works in prose and verse, 6. analytical list of his works.

The Naṣīf al-Tīb was printed in full at Itīlāk in 1279 and at Cairo in 1302 and 1304 (4 vols.). The first part was published at Leyden from 1855 to 1861 under the title of 'Inlātāt sur l’histoire et la littérature des Arabes d’Espagne'; by R. Dozy, G. Dugat, L. Krebitz and W. Wright. In 1850, D. Pascual de Gayangos had published in English, at London, under the title The History of the Muhammadan Dynasties in Spain, a version adapted from the part of the first half which deals with the history of Muslim Spain. A critical translation of this monumental work in its entirety remains to be done.

Al-Makrānī also wrote other important works, among which special mention must be made of a lengthy monograph on the famous kāḥif ʿIṣād [q.v.] Aḥkāf al-ʿRūfī fī Aḥkāf al-ʿRūfī ʿIṣādī publ. at Tunis in 1322 in 2 vols. A list with reference to known MSS. will be found in Brockelmann and Ben Cheneb.


AL-MAKKI, ABU ṬALĪB MUHAMMAD B. ʿALI AL-ḤARĪTHI, d. in Baghdād in 386 (996), an Arab muḥādīth and mystic, head of the theological madhab of the Sālimiya [q.v.] of Baghda. His principal work is the Kitāb al-Kulūb (Cairo 1310, 2 vols.) whole pages of which have been copied by al-Ghazālī into his Ihyāʾ Ulum al-Dīn.


MAKRĀN, the coastal region of Balūcīstān, extending from about 59° to 65° 35′ E. and inland from the coast to the Sīyāhān Range, a little beyond 27° north. This tract was known to the Greeks as Gedrosia, and was inhabited by the Ichtiyophagi, or fish-eaters, the Persian translation (Maḥī-Khūnūn) of whose name supplies a fanciful derivation for its present name, which is traced, with more probability, to a Dravidian source.

In Persian legend Kaḵkhuṣraw of Iran captured the country from Afraṣiyab of Tūrūn, and both Cyrus and Semiramis marched through it. In 325 B.C. it was traversed by Alexander in his retreat from India, and fell, later, under the dominion of the Sāsānians, but was occasionally absorbed into the Hindu kingdom of Sind. It was annexed by the Arabs in the course of the rapid expansion of the empire of Islām in the early days of the caliphate, and it was through Makrān that Muhammad b. Kašīn invaded Sind in 711 A.D., and established the first Muslim settlement to the east of the Indus. Marco Polo mentions it in 1290 as the most westerly part of India, under an independent chief, probably a Muslim, who found it unnecessary to make any pretense of submission either to Persia or to India. Indigenous tribes ruled the country until they were ousted by the Ġūkīs from India, but the Persian monarchs reckoned Makrān as part of Balūcīstān, which was included in the great province of Kirmān. In the middle of the eighteenth century the Ahmād Khān of Kalat established their sovereignty over the country, and in 1879 Colonel Goldsmid demarcated the frontier between Persian Makrān and eastern Makrān, which remains subject to
the Khān of Kalāt, though British intervention has frequently been necessary to compose the disputes between him and the dominant tribes of the province, Gikhis, Nīshītrawānis, Branzdians and Mīnāris. Cultivators of the soil are Balāchis, and tribes of inferior social status and the fishermen form a class apart.

The climate of the country varies with the altitude. Near the coast it is uniformly hot, but not unpleasant; in Kīč or Kēf, from which eastern Makrān is known as Kēf Makrān, the winter is dry and cool, the summer intensely hot; and higher still Pindigir is bitterly cold in winter and moderately hot in summer (1844).

AL-MAKRIZĪ

(1. W. HAIG)

ABU 'AL-‘ABBĀS AHMAD B. 'ALI B. 'ABD AL-KĀDIR AL-HUSAINI TAṣĪ AL-DIN, Arabic historian, b. 786 (1330) at Cairo, grandson of the Ḥasanī Ibn al-Sā'īgh who educated him according to his school; but on attaining his majority he went over to the Sā'īghīs, attacked the Ḥasanīs and even showed Zāhirī tendencies. He began his career as deputy qādī in Cairo and rose to the highest positions in the government. He planned an encyclopaedic work, but they remained unfinished on account of the enormous scale on which they were planned. He intended to write the lives of all the rulers and famous men who had lived in Egypt in 80 volumes entitled al-Muḥaṣṣa but was only able to complete 16 of them of which 3 are preserved in autograph in Leyden (Cat. cod. ar., No. 1032, perhaps also 1103) and one in Paris (No. 2144). His revised number of historical questions in separate essays, some of which are preserved in two collected volumes, Paris, No. 4657 and Leyden, No. 2408 (the latter in part written by the author himself, and in part revised by him, see Dozy, Notice sur quelques ms. arabes, Leyden 1847, p. 8—16, a portion in van Vloten, Z. D. M. G., iii. 224. His collection of biographies of contemporaries entitled Durar al-Uṣūl al-faridā fi Tarājim al-Aṣnān al-mufidā intended to be arranged in alphabetical order also remained a torso (a portion of the autograph of vol. i., Alī and a part of 'Ain, Gotha, No. 1771). He also dealt with a number of historical questions in separate essays, some of which are preserved in two collected volumes, Paris, No. 4657 and Leyden, No. 2408 (the latter in part written by the author himself, and in part revised by him, see Dozy, Notices, p. 17). The most important of these deals with the history of the Umayyads and 'Abbasids (al-Niẓām wa-l-Tahāṣṣa fīr-mā hiyā hāni bani Umayya wa-bani Ḥāshim, ed. G. Vos, Leyden 1883, and 'Abū al-walā wālā wa-l-Muḥāsin, Vienna No. 1887; al-Durar al-mufidā fī Tarājim al-ʿĀṣirāt al-istiṣlāḥīya, Cambridge, Preston, p. 2), the Arab tribes who migrated into Egypt (al-Bayān wa-l-Farāḥ tawāmat bi-ʿArif Ṭaṣāwī min al-ʿArab, ed. Wustenfeld, Gottingen 1847), the geography of Hadramawt based on enquiries of pilgrims from there whom he met in Mecca (al-Tafsīr al-qurbīa min al-ʿĀṣirāt Wādir Hadramawt al-ʿAṣirīa, ed. P. Noskowy), Bonn 1866), the Muslim princes in Abyssinia (al-Ilmān bi-Abābār min bi-ʿArif al-Habshāna al-Mulik al-Islāmī, Cairo 1895; ed. Th. Rink, Leyden 1790, and I. Ghendi, Sut testo del Ilmān d'-M. in Contenuto della nascita di Mich. Amary, Palermo 1910, ii. 387—394), on the Ziyānids in Tunūn (Tarājim Mulik al-Qārī, Leyden, op. cit., according to Dozy's hypothesis, originally a portion of the Durar al-Uṣūl), Islamic coins and
Measures (Nabhāt al-Uṣūl fi ʿUmūr al-Nuḥāṣ, Cairo 1298, ed. O. G. Tychsen, Rostock 1977; Tarte des monnaies musulmanes, transl. by S. de Saucy in Mag. enc. by Millin, iv, 1797, p. 472; iii, p. 38; reprinted, Paris 1977, an edition revised by the author Shāhīr al-Uṣūl fi al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-ṣāhirāt; printed under the title al-ʿUṣūl al-Farāisiyya, Stamboul 1298 in a collected volume; Ksitan al-Mukātīl wa l-Musaytib al-Dhawīya, ed. O. G. Tychsen, Rostock 1800). He also wrote a geography under the title Dārāt al-Aṣhar min al-Rawḍ al-mushīr (Berlin, N°. 6049, Cairo, v. 40) what work he drew upon for this is still uncertain; in Paris, N°. 5919, al-Idrīsī's Nuzhat al-Mustagāf fi l-khārij al-ʿAṣāf is said to be the basis; Lévi-Provençal, Livres Historiques des Chosars, p. 361 identifies it with the al-Rawḍ al-mushīr fi Khābār al-Mukātīl mentioned by Hājīdī Khaliṣa, iii, N°. 6598 of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī al-Muṣāin al-Hīnjari, which is said still to exist in the Kārnavīn mosque of Fez. In some of these shorter essays he touches on theology, a subject he does not elsewhere deal with, dogmatics in the essay composed in 813 (1410) entitled al-Bayān al-mumīd li l-Fāṣik bimar l-Tālūkāt wa l-Talqōd the autograph of which is in Leyden. Amin, N°. 158 (cf. also Cairo, vi 565), Taṣrīḥ al-Tawḥīd (in Parīs) and tradition in lectures on the family and domestic arrangements of the Prophet, which he delivered in Mecca (Imrāʾ al-ʿAmīd fi maʿām al-ʿAllāh wa l-ʿAllāh), in 6 vols., Gotha 1830. Stamhul, Kurunth, N°. 1004. To supplement this work, towards the end of his life, he planned a work which beginning, with the Creation, was to be also a general geography to give the genealogies of the Arab tribes and the history of the Persians down to the Sāmāns under the title al-Khawār min l-Baḥrāt, at which he was still working in 844 (1441) (parts in the autograph Stamboul Aya Sophia, N°. 3562 and Fatḥ, N°. 4383–4341, others in the copy Aya Sophia, N°. 3393–3360, Strasburg, v. Nulke, Z. P. M. G., x 306, cf. Thaler in Islam, N°. 357–364). Even later than this work which he quoted in it was the essay Dārāt al-Aṣhar fi Māʾṣir il-Hūsaini al-Tamūrā (in the Leyden collected volume and also in Leyden, N°. 1080, Brit. Mus., p. 660).

Mārkūr. [see SHARĪʿA]

Māks, toll, customs duty, is a loanword in Arabic and goes back to the Aramaic mākis, cf. Hebrew mākēs and Arām mākēs: from it is formed a verb mākhān, mākhā, the collector of customs. According to the Arabic tradition preserved in Ibn Sula, even in the Duḥāliyya there were market-dues called māks, so that the word must have entered Arabic very early, and is found in Arabic papyri towards the end of the first century A.D.

Becker has dealt with the history of the māks, especially in Egypt, and we follow him here. The old law books use mākis in the sense of ʿāṣir, the tenth levied by the merchants, more properly the equivalent of an excise duty than of a custom. They still show some opposition to the māks, then give it due legal force, but the word continued to have unpleasant associations, cf. the ḫudūl: tāna gāḥārī ʿl-makāši fi ʾl-nār; “the tax-collector will go to hell”: Goldziher has suggested that the Jewish view of the publican may have had some influence here.

The institution of the customs duty was adopted by Islam about the beginning of the Omaiyad period or shortly before it. While theological theory demanded a single customs area in Islam, the old frontiers remained in existence by land and water, and Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia were separate customs areas. The amount of the duty in the canon law was settled not so much by the value of the goods as by the person, i.e. the religion of the individual paying it; but in practice, attention was paid to the article and there were preferential duties and no attention was paid to the position of the owner in regard to Islam. The laws of taxation were very complicated and graduated; the duties rose in course of time from the tenth (nār) to the fifth (khuwān).

The Egyptian māks was levied on the frontier at al-Arish and in the ports (surwāhḥā) Aṭīlahā, al-kuṣair, al-Tūr and al-Suways but there was also an octroi to be paid in al-Fusṭāṭ at a place called Māks. This name is said to have replaced an old ʿUm Dūnāin and then became identified with the Maks—custom-house of Cairo. All grain had to pass through here before it could be sold and two dirhams per ʿarba and a few minor charges had to be paid on it. Further details of the administration of the māks in the earliest period are not known but there are references towards the end of the first century A.H. to a gāḥār makās ʿmīr in papyri and in literature also.

The conception of the māks was extended in the Fāṭimid period when all kinds of small dues and taxes became known as mubākār, especially—emphasising the already mentioned unpleasant associations of the word—the unpopular ones which the people regarded as unjust. Such occasional taxes had been levied from time to time in the early centuries of Islam. The first to make them systematic was the dreaded financial secretary and noted opponent of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalin, ʿAbd Allāh al-Muṭṭabi. The latter introduced not only an increase in the ground-tax and the three great monopolies of oysters, fisheries and soda (in connection with which it is interesting to note that a revulsion was made to old Roman taxes), but also a large number of smaller taxes which were called ṭalīqīn and mārnāq and included among the kāfēl, the taxes to be paid according to lunar years. Such attics (known as mubākār from the Fāṭimid period and later as maṣāqīn, ḥumṣīn, ṭuṣuṣ va maṣāqīn) were destined to develop in time into the main form of oppressing the people and to become one of the principal causes of the economic decline of Egypt, until under the Manūkhi a limit was reached where hardly anything was left untaxed and mubākār were even granted to ʿafs and “misfortune became general” (wa-anAwz al-Mubākār). These small taxes however (but not the monopolies) were repeatedly abolished by reforming rulers, indeed ḫudūl al-mubākār (other terms are xānd, maṣarquṭ, ṭuṣuṣ, waṣf, raʿʿ al-mubākār) even formed part of the style and title of such rulers. Thus it is recorded of ʿAbd Allāh b. Fāṭūn that he abolished some duties, and later of Salādīn, ʿAbbāsī, ʿAlāʾun and his sons Khalīl and ʿAlī Muḥammad, of ʿAṣhrāf ʿAlāʾun, ʿAbdūkīnt and Djak-
mak. Makrizi gives a long list of mukās abolished by Saladin and Kalkashandi gives copies of the texts of musāmahāt, which are decrees of the Mamlūk Sultāns abolishing taxes or granting exemption from dues which were sent to the governors and read from the mukās and sometimes contain very full details, while shorter decrees were probably carved on stone and are given among the fragments published by van Berchem. It would of course be wrong to deduce from such abolitions of taxes that the government was a particularly good one, while on the other hand the continually recurring extortation of the same taxes shows that the abuses had been restored in the interval. Makrizi, i. 111 concludes with the well-known jibe at the Copts: *even now there are mukās, which are in the control of the vizier, but bring nothing to the state but only to the Copts, who do exactly as they like with them to their great advantage.*

Among the great variety of dues which were of course not all levied at the same place and at the same time were the following: *kitāb* taxes on houses, baths, ovens, walls and gardens; harbour-dues in Gizeh, in Cairo at *the corn-quay* (ṣāḥab al-khalla) and at the arsenal (jībā'a), also levied separately on each passenger; market-dues for goods and caravans (baqā'il wa-baqā'il) especially for horses, camels, mules, cattle, sheep, poultry and slaves; meat, fish, salt, sugar, pepper, oil, vinegar, turnips, wool, silk, linen and cotton; wood, earthenware, coal, halfa grass, straw and henna; wine and oil-presses, tanned goods; *brokerage* (samās) charges on the sale of sheep, dates and linen. Taxes on markets, drinking-houses and brothels which were euphemistically called *ṣu'in al-sūlya.* Warders deprive prisoners of everything they have; indeed this right is sold to the highest bidder; officers consume the fees of their soldiers; peasants pay their lords forced labour and give them presents (baqā'il, hadāya) and many officials (ṣāḥā, mutāṣib, muḥāṣirūn and wāli) also accept them; when a campaign is begun the merchants pay a special war-tax and a third of inheritances falls to the state; when news of victories is received and when the Nile rises, levies are made; the ḍimmānis, in addition to paying the poll-tax, have to contribute to the maintenance of the army; pilgrims to the Holy Sepulchre pay a tax in Jerusalem; separate special taxes are levied to maintain the embankments, the Nilometer etc.

Outside of Egypt we occasionally hear of the makās as toll or market-dues, e.g. in Djidda, in North Africa (cf. Dozy, Suppl., i. 606). Ibn al-Hadjdī, iii. 67 mentions a musāmahat magazine, but does not use the word mukās in this sense.

**Makṣūrā.** [See Musjadi.]

**Maktab** (A.), literally a “school in which writing is taught” in practice means a Kurānic school, the Muslims believing that the first thing that should be taught an infant is the Kurān. The word maktab, plur. maktabb belongs to the classical language. It is hardly ever found in the spoken dialects in this form. These prefer the word kutāb, especially in Cairo and Tunis. Kutāb is found in the middle ages used by Ibn al-Hadjdī al-Abbālari, a Moroccan author (see Bibliography), but it is not now used any longer in Algeria or Morocco.

The Kurānic school has also other names: *mīrād* in Algiers, Tlemcen, and in certain districts of the Algerian Tell, at Fez, Rabat and Sale; *djarnā* at Tangier, Larache, Constantine, in Oranā and some districts of Morocco and the Algerian Tell; *gūla* among the nomads of Algeria; *mīmmara* among the Moroccans of the Djellaba; *ṭimīmīr* among the Kabyls of the Djerda; *mahīfār* at Safi: Spain had *mukās,* now found in Senegal.

The position of the Kurānic school varies in different countries. Among the African nomads it is a tent placed in the centre of the dōrā which is also used as a mosque. In most towns it is a room on the ground floor, very often dark, damp and badly ventilated. In Cairo, the Kurānic school is placed on the first story of some public building, usually a fountain. In Fez, a number of mīrād are also on a higher level than the street. The schools of Fez and those of Cairo show architectural features which deserve special study. The façades, doors, windows, usually large, are adorned with carved woodwork.

Inside, the Kurānic school is as a rule bare of all ornament, mats of asfa grass or of rushes are stretched on the floor; the walls are also hung with mats of the same kind from the ground up to a height of 4 to 6 feet. A wooden or stone bench serves as a chair for the teacher. In one corner is a vessel of water (mīr) in which the slates of the pupils are washed.

The Kurānic schools are distributed through the different quarters of the town. There are none in the immediate vicinity of the mosques, the Prophet having recommended that children and lunatics should be kept away from mosques (cf. Madkhāl). On the other hand, it is not unusual to find Kurānic schools in sanctuaries built to the memory of some saint or in the zawiyas, the places of assembly of the religious brotherhoods. According to the Madkhāl, it is recommended to place schools in the most frequented streets and not to place them in isolated places or by-streets. Although the author of this book gives pedagogical reasons for this recommendation, it is quite clear at the present day that it is due to the desire to let as many passers-by as possible hear the divine word. In the village, the Kurānic school is held in one of the rooms of the building which is used as a mosque. The sites of Kurānic schools are *ḥabīis* or *wāzīf* properties. Rich individuals sometimes install Kurānic schools at their own expense in boxes fronting the street for the use of their children and of those of their servants and neighbours and friends.

The head of the Kurānic school is called *ṣāḥik* or *ṣāhī (classical *ṣāḥib)* in the towns of Morocco, *gālūt* in the country districts of North Africa, sometimes *ṣāḥā, mutādeb* at Tunis and in the Tunisian
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Säyl: at Tlemcen, we find the word derrar which again crops up in the Algerian towns.

The master in the Kur'anī school has as his only intellectual equipment as a rule a perfect knowledge of the text of the Kurān. He cannot understand or expound it; he hardly knows any grammar or any of the branches of religious knowledge. The most learned masters are those who have devoted themselves to learning a certain number of the seven ways of reciting the Kurānī text according to the principles laid down by the seven Brakh al-Kindīa.

In some towns there are Kurānī schools for girls but this is exceptional. The mistress is known as feihā or fīrīa (Morocco).

The pupils are called tānādī in the towns, gandī in the country districts and mīghādī in the towns of Morocco. Their ages run from six to eighteen. Where there are schools for girls, little boys are sent there also up to the age of six.

In Kurānī schools nothing is studied but the Kurān and without any explanation. The task of the pupils is to learn the sacred text by heart. Ibn Khaldūn in his Muqaddimah says that in his time the schools of Spain and Tunisia taught children reading and writing and the Arabic language before putting them to study the Kurān, which they then learned without much difficulty while in the rest of the Maghrib they were only taught to recite the Kurān and from the beginning of that study. It is this latter that is still the usual fashion in North Africa of our day.

The Kurān is not studied to know and understand it. It is learned by heart for the reward promised in the next world to those who know it and to benefit the virtuous or kurādī of the divine word. The latter point of view is very much in keeping with the mentality of Muhammadan peoples with a strong belief in magic.

When the boy begins his studies he is taught to smear a wooden slate with a fine white clay called ruṣāf steeped in water. When the slate is made dry, either by being exposed to the sun or held to a fire, the master traces on it the letters of the alphabet with the point of a ḫafīūsa (reed sharpened for writing) without any ink. He cuts into the clay by basting the letters on the slate and the pupil is then asked to go over them with the ḫafīūsa dipped in ink (which is made from burned wool). At the same time the child learns by heart the names of the letters and their declensions without the master however thinking it worth while to point out to him on the slate that a certain character corresponds to a certain name of a letter. It is therefore not surprising that with such a method a pupil has to devote two or three years to learning to read and to write.

When the child can write to dictation, the master dictates verses from the Kurān. The child writes them one by one. As soon as he has finished writing one he says, sam jā al jumla on reaching the last word he has to write. The master then dictates the next verse and so on till the slate is completely covered with writing. Then the pupil goes to the bottom of the class and begins to learn by heart what has been dictated to him aloud. When he knows the text by heart, he recites it to the master. If the latter is satisfied he orders the child to clean his slate. For this purpose the boy washes it in the wūlī, the vessel of water at the corner of the school; then he covers his slate with clay again and begins all over again.

If we reflect that the master has 30 or 40 pupils in front of him each of whom is at a different place in the Kurān and that his method of instruction is individual, we can see that to learn the whole of the Kurān, even the most intelligent pupil requires several years if he is not discouraged before reaching the last sūra.

The study of the Kurān begins with the first chapter, the jāthā. After this sūra the last and then the second last, then the ante- penultimate is learned and so on back to the second sūra, that of the Cow. The Kurān is thus learned in reversed order. This method is explained by the fact that the sūras have been classed, except for the jāthā, in order of length, the shortest being at the end. Since at the time of prayer, the believer repeats a sūra usually one of the last, there is some point in the study of the Kurān beginning with the sūras at the end of the book. When the pupil has learned the sacred text in the reverse order, he repeats it in the proper order.

For sixty years the Kurān is divided into sixty parts called kībch each kībch is divided in its turn into four ḥālīs or quarters, each quarter into two thānūn or eighths, and each eighth into two ḥālī al ḥālī. No recreation is provided for. The only relaxation is the recitation by the pupils in a body of panegyrics of the Prophet. In the Maghrib there is no school from Wednesday to noon of the Prophet's birthday. Tradition has it that the Caliph 'Umar (who founded the first Kurānī schools) prescribed the Thursday rest. It is said in explanation that the triumphal return of the Muslim troops after the conquest of Palestine took place on a Thursday; the pupils having had a holiday to take part in the festivities, the Caliph 'Umar decided that henceforth Thursdays should be a holiday in the schools.

In the Hijārā the holiday is Tuesday (cf. W. M帅气, Tizint Arabes de Tanger, p. 184, note 2).

The schools are also closed on the occasion of the religious feasts and the fast of Ramadān for one week or two, each country having its own special habit in this respect (cf. especially Michaux-Belain in Archäologie Maroc, 1897, p. 177).

When a child knows by heart a fixed portion of the Kurān, the first sūra, the first quarter of the book, the half, the whole, his parents give a feast in which all the pupils share, the master and frequently all the other masters of the quarter, needy men who take advantage of every occasion when good cheer is going. These feasts are called ṭabia or ṭabia or tābiya, sometimes ṭaibiya, according to the country; some of these titles are used on the occasion of the partial recitation of the Kurān and others of a complete recitation. For the feast the master decorates the boy's slate
with different colours. It is to be noted that the mixture used for this purpose always includes eggs. Some verses are written on the slate. A procession is formed to go to the house of the child, who is the hero of the occasion; a part of the Kur'ân is recited and a cup of milk is eaten. A collection made after the feast and also at the houses of the relatives and friends of the family procures the teacher a supplement to his salary which he much appreciates.

Discipline is maintained in the Kur'ânic school by corporal punishment. The master keeps in his hand a long stick with which he strikes more or less cruelly inattentive children on the head. To punish serious faults he inflicts a certain number of blows on the soles of the delinquent's feet. The boy is laid on his back, with his legs in the air and laid together; one of the older pupils holds his feet up to the master who beats them rhythmically with a rod of the wild quince tree. If the pupil is too strong for his comrades to be easily able to keep him in the desired position, his feet are fastened to a wooden bench (falekha) which two of his comrades hold up. These corporal punishments have been frequently condemned (cf. especially Mattakal) but they continue to be applied with the unanimous consent of the parents. Indeed the parents very often commission the master to punish children for faults committed out of school.

The master's duty is to give the children a good education; that is to say an education that is entirely religious. He generally does his duty very badly, at least from the European point of view.

The results obtained in the traditional Kur'ânic teaching are generally bad. After long and monotonous years spent in school, the child only knows a few sections of the Kur'ân and like his master is unable to write a letter correctly or read a book. Wherever general education has made some progress we find the Kur'ânic schools losing their importance in spite of the piety of the people. The child is often taken there to learn a few verses after which he is taken away and put at the primary school. Very often the child goes to the Kur'ânic school outside of the hours of the primary school and only for a year or two. On the other hand in cases where the people are at all backward but ardent in their faith, the Kur'ânic schools are numerous and largely attended.

The children at the Kur'ânic schools play a certain part in social ceremonies on account of the doubly magic character which their youth and knowledge of the divine word gives them. On Thursdays they go in a body under the conduct of the master to recite the Kur'ân over the graves of persons recently buried; when a woman's accouchement is difficult and threatens to be dangerous, the children from the neighbouring school go round the town chanting litanies behind a piece of cloth held by four of them; in the centre of the cloth is an egg; the passers-by throw coppers into the cloth and utter good wishes for the sick woman. The school-children, slate in hand are also sent to seek mercy from a conqueror for a conquered town or tribe; to appeal for rain in time of drought, the Kur'ânic schools are also called upon to take part in processions.

The organisation of Kur'ânic teaching is rudimentary. In the towns, it is the kâji who in theory supervises the schools; in reality he only interferes in cases where complaints are made against the teacher. In the tribes it is the kâli who takes the place of the kâji in this connection.

The teacher is very often a stranger to the country, more often from the country than the town, which is to some extent explained by the magic character common to the state of being a foreigner and to Kur'ânic study.

In the towns he receives a very small sum monthly from the parents of his pupils; on the Wednesday, the children pay him a few coins on leaving school; on the occasion of school-feasts and holidays he receives a few more gifts. He also makes annulets which he sells. In the country the fâlek is paid in kind. The relatives of his pupils feed him in turn, giving him, eggs, butter, cereals and lamb; sometimes the village or donor shares the labour of working a plot of ground and gathering its yield for him. Payment in kind of the services of the teacher is the subject of a regular contract between the representative of the village or of the donor and the fâlek. The latter is then called fâlek naskhâris. The teacher is also the imâm of the village; he washes the dead and prepares them for burial; he is also occasionally tailor and public letter-writer. In brief although he enjoys the respect of those around him he lives very poorly.

The choice of a teacher is often decided by the reputation which he enjoys. The consent of the parents in the towns, of the djama'a in the country gives him the right to exercise his functions. Tunisia however has endeavoured since the French occupation to regulate more carefully Kur'ânic instruction and to demand a certain standard of knowledge and morality in the teacher. Kur'ânic instruction by its very nature seems to have remained unchanged from the early days of Islam.
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MAKTAB — MĀKŪ

 face of the transverse chain (Alāgān) which separates Aḵẖ-čai from Tīghnīt. The waters of the Aḵẖ-čai and its tributary irrigate the canton of Sogmān-āwāl, flow into the fertile plain of Čalpāta and flow into the Kōtūr-čai which waters the plain of Khoī. Below this confluence the Aḵẖ-čai receives on its right bank the waters of the district of Aland which rise near the Turco-Persian frontier to the south of the sources of the Aḵẖ-čai and the north of those of the Kōtūr-čai.

The town. The site of the town of Mākū is very striking. It lies in the short gorge through which the Zangīmār here runs. The cliffs rise perpendicularly on the right bank. The cliffs on the left bank rise to a height of 600 feet above the river. The little town lies in an amphitheatre on the slope. Above the town at the foot of the rocks, are the ruins of ancient fortifications and a spring. Then the mountain wall rises almost perpendicularly and at a height of 180 to 200 feet leans forward. There is therefore an incredible mass of rock suspended over the town. (According to Monteith’s estimate the dimensions of the cavern thus formed are: height 600 feet, depth of the cavern 500 feet, breath 1200, thickness at the top of the arch 600 feet.) For a brief period daily that the sun penetrates into this gigantic cave, just above is a cave which used to be entered by a perilous scaffolding. At a later date when the cave was used as a prison, the prisoners were hoisted up by a rope. (The only European who has been inside it is A. Iwanowski.)

The population. The population of Mākū consists of Turks and Kurds. The former, who are in the majority, occupy villages along the rivers of the khanāt. They are the remains of the Turkoman tribes of Bayat, Pornak etc. The canton at the foot of the Soḵḵār is called Kārāḵoyunlu. The people (about 900 houses grouped into 26 villages) belong to the Aḥl-i Ḥaḵḵ faith (R.M.M., xl, p. 66) which is indirect but interesting evidence of the character of the heroes of which the Turkoman dynasty of the Kārā-ḵoyunlu was accused (Munēdejīm-bāshī, iii, p. 155). The old eminence between the Turkoman tribes survives in the general name applied by the Kārā-ḵoyunlu to their Shefa “Twelver” neighbours: they call them Aḵḵ-ḵoyunlu (Gordlevsky, p. 9).

The Kurds of the khanāte are semi-nomads. The Ḯalātī (cf. on their supposed ancestors, Ḫamūḵ, p. 539 under the years 1017—1018) occupy the slopes of Ararat and in summer betake themselves to the pasturages along the Turco-Persian frontier. Many sections of them lead a troglodyte life in the caves of the Dambat region.

The Milan live between the Araxes and the massif of Soḵḵār where they pass the summer. At Kārā-ḵain (in Kurdish Ḫalānī) there are Hādānānūn.

Before the war there were only 1,200 Armenians left in Mākū. It is remarkable that the confidential servants in the houses of the khan are of this nationality. The celebrated and imposing monastery of St. Thaddeus—(Thadevos-Arakel = Kāra-Kilisa among the Muslims) rebuilt in 1247 (St. Martin, Ménaires de l’Arménie, ii, 463) is in the central canton of Babādjk. It is regarded with a certain respect even by Muslims who kiss the Gospels on entering it. A long inscription recording the firmān of protection given it by Shāh Ἀbābās adorns the doorway. At one time the villages at Mākū and
at Khoi belonged to the monastery and paid their rents to it. Another Armenian monastery (Surp-Stephanos; Dnini-Al-Beigembar among the Muslims) lies below the mouth of the Kotaur-caii on the borders of Măkū. The little village of Djambirā is inhabited by Yazidis.

Ancient history. The oldest monuments of Măkū go back to the period of the Khalid (Vannic) kingdom. The chamber carved in the rock near Sangar (on the Măkū-Bārzigān-Bāyzāy road) is one of a number of similar constructions in Bāynazād and in the country west of Umna (Minorsky, *Kela-šāin*, Zep., xxiv., p. 171). A Khalidic inscription known as that of "Măkū" seems to come from Bastām on the Akh-cāi (district of Cai-pāra). It is of king Rusia II, son of Argishtī (c. 680—645 B.C.; cf. Sayce, *A new Vannic Inscription*, J. R. A. S., 1912, p. 107—113; N. Y. Marr, *Napīs Rūzī II is Măkū*, Zep., xxv., 1921, p. 1—54). The inscription is important as showing that the power of the kings of Wān extended to the region of Khoi.

Măkū later formed part of Armenia. It corresponds to the canton of Artaz of the province of Vaspurakan (Armenian seventh century Geography). According to Moses of Chorene, the district was at first known as Shwarchan but was given the name of Artaz in memory of the old home of the Alān whom Artashēs transplanted hither (cf. Ardoz in Ossetia). The name Shwarchan may be explained from the rule of the Artashēs kings among whom the name Shavarth (Shošrūz = Shavarth = Mod. Pers. Shavāwash) was frequent (cf. Marguart, *Erān*, p. 4, 177). The suggestion of this scholar that Artaz is equated with the older Akarpaz etc., Strabo, xi, 14, 3, is untenable because Azara is above Artaxata which again is above the land of Artaz = Măkū. The Amatuni kings who later established themselves north of the Araxes must also have ruled in Artaz for the diocese of Măkū is called Amatunac-č-tan (Adontz).

The names Măkū and Hājījun (= Hasun) north of Măkū are mentioned in the *History of Thomas Arturuni* written in the tenth century, in the passage (ii. 3) describing the frontier of the lands ceded by the Sasanian Khusraw to the emperor Maurice in 591 (Brosset, *Coll. d'Hist. Arm.*, St. Petersburg 1874, i., p. 78). On the many Armenian monuments in the land of Măkū cf. the work of Minorsky on the antiquities of the khánate; cf. also Hübischmann, *Die allarm. Ortstennen*, 1904, p. 344 and Adontz, *Armenia v epokhu Juštiniama*, St. Petersburg 1908, index.

According to a legend recorded by Moses of Chorene (i. 30; ii. 49), Tigranes, having defeated the Medes (in Arm. Mār) Aḏāḏak settled his descendants all around Māsī (Araart). Neither the Arab historians (Tabari, Ibn al-Adhīr) nor geographers know this corner of Armenia although the names looks very old. It would be tempting to explain Măkū as Mār — Kāh = Mountain of the Medes (Pers. māk and Arm. mār go back to the old Iranian Mār); the former Mākū (Mākūya) which is found in Ḥamdollahi Muṣāwfi however presupposes a different final element.

History under Islam. Ḥamdollahi Muṣāwfi (*Nūchak al-Kūlāb*, ed. Le Strange, p. 89) is the first writer (740 = 1340) to mention Măkū among the cantons of the *mann* of Nakhtuwa: It is a castle in the cleft of a rock and at the foot lies a village which stands in the shade till midday. In this place lives the Christian chief priest (*kārbah*) whom they call Mar-Īṭāsiyā (this reading is preferable to Mārdzanīthā of Le Strange; cf. Aram. Mar-Kābān “the Lord Bishop”).

The Spanish Ambassador Clavijo who visited Măkū on June 1, 1401 still found it inhabited by Armenian Catholics ruled by their prince Noradin, who enjoyed practical independence. Timūr did not succeed in taking Măkū but by a treaty Noradin agreed to supply him with 20 horsemen when required. The eldest son of Noradin was taken to the court of ʿOmar Mirzā and converted to Islam when he was given the name of Sorgatimīx (Syurqhatmand); as to another son, Noradin intended to send him to Europe to be consecrated a bishop. Clavijo mentions a monastery of Dominicans at Măkū, "en el dicho lugar" (Frayles de Sancto Domingo, *Vida y haznada*, ed. Srezniewski, St. Petersburg 1851, p. 158—162 and 376; transl. Le Strange, London 1928, p. 144—145). Clavijo gives an accurate description of the town (a castle in the valley; on the slope, the town surrounded by walls; higher, a second wall, which was reached by steps cut in the rock).

On the death of Timūr, Kāra-Yūsuf the Kāra-Ḵoyūnlu reappeared on the scene and Măkū was one of the first places he conquered in 809 (1406) (Sharaf-nāma, i. 376). Henceforth the country must have become rapidly Turkised. According to the *Sharaf-nāma* (i. 295, 308), in 982 (1574) the Ottoman government ordered the Kur候选 Beg of the Maḥmūdī tribe (cf. above ii., p. 1145) to take Măkū (one of the cantons of Nakhtuwa) from the Persians and to restore the fortress. ʿĪwan was given Măkū as qeṣqā. After his death in 1002, Sulṭān Muḥammad II gave the fortress to Muṣṭafā Beg, son of ʿĪwan.

When in the summer of 1014 (1605) Shāh ʿAbbās was in the vicinity of Khoi the Maḥmūdī Kurs of the district of Măkū and Pasak (a village on the Alān-cāi to the west of Khoi) did not come to pay homage to the Shāh. ʿAbbās I transferred the clan of Mānūr-beg to the Irāk (Persian) and took the field in person against Muṣṭafā, beg of Măkū. The historian Iskandar-munḥī mentioned two forts at Măkū, one at the foot of the mountain (fār-i kāh) and the other on its side (muṣīn-kāh). The former was soon taken by the Shāh’s troops but the capture of the other was "not so easy". Orders were given to plunder the Maḥmūdī tribe which was done. The women and children were carried off and the Maḥmūd men executed. The booty was so great that cows were sold at 2 dirhams = 200 (Persian) dinārs a head. The royal camp remained for 10 days at Măkū but the upper fortress "in spite of the constreignedness of the place and the lack of water" held out and the Shāh left for Nakhtuwa without having obtained its surrender (*Alam-arā, p. 479*).

The Turks and Persians attached great importance to the position of Măkū. Mūṣafir IV in the chronicle of 1045 himself realised the importance of Kotor and Măkū and in the instructions given in 1048 to Kāra Muṣṭafā Pasha ordered him to demand that the Persians should destroy the two fortresses. Indeed by the treaty of 1049 (1639) the Persians decided to raze Kotur Măkū, (read Măkū) and Maḥgūbern (Tūrābī Ṭūmānī, i. 686). However Mūṣafir IV died and in the reign of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm the Persians reoccupied Kotur and Măkū (Ewlyā Čelebi, iv., p. 279).
The next stage is recorded in the Persian inscription engraved on the rock above the fortress (Minorsky, Brevevoti, p. 25). It tells us that Shah Ablâs II ordered the destruction of the fortress because it sheltered the unsubdued (naqsh-tishân). The fortress is compared to a Kalâ-yeKalân; the excavator of the Shah's order was a certain Akbar and the date is 1052 = 1641-1642 (Chronogram "Je-nr"). The history of Abbas II (Kâbog al-Khâyâm, ibbl. Nat. Paris, Suppl. Pers., No. 227) throws no light on the incident but as (fol. 74b) an Ottoman embassy to the court of the young Shah in 1052 is mentioned, it is probable that it was not without influence on the destruction of the fortress, on the preservation of which Persia had formerly laid stress.

Contrary to the tenor of the inscription, Ewyâh Šâdeh II, 337—339 claims that it was the Ottomans who, after the peace of 1049, destroyed Mâkû and at the same time recalled the Mâkûdî Beg who was their representative there. In 1053 (1647) the Kûrû Beg of Shûsh-îk (a stronghold on the borders of Persia) rebelled against the Turks. The Persians, while protecting against his raids, seized the occasion to introduce to Mâkû 2,000 riflemen from Mârâmârân. The Ottomans sent an army of 3,000 men against Shûsh-îk. Murâjî Beg of Shûsh-îk was defeated and sought refuge in Mâkû. Ewyâh accompanied the Pâsa and the detachment that went to Mâkû to demand the extradition of the rebel. Satisfaction was given them and the war of Ewyâh Mehemîd Pâsha treated the Persian captives in a very friendly fashion. He told them however that if the Persians did not withdraw their troops from Mâkû and destroy the fortress he would attack Erivan and Nakhchivan. The result is not known but Persia's possession of Mâkû recognised in 1056 does not seem to have again been seriously disputed by Turkey.

The family which ruled Mâkû from 1747 to 1923 belonged to the Bayat tribe. The clan settled around the Sâr-Kâr (on the Bayat cf. Kânpul-a-Khân-î Mehrâb) in the eastern part of the plain of Mâkû, in the service of Nâzir Shâh. After the latter's assassination, he seized one of his wives, and a part of his treasures and returned to Mâkû. Very little is known about him or his son Husân Khan (Monteith's 'hot') who died in 1833. It is possible under the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the Kâdir, the real authority in the region N.W. of Adharbâdjan belonging to the family of Dumbûl Khan [cf. Kûrû], whose headquarter was at Khân (cf. Târîkh, the special history of the Dumbûl is not accessible in Europe). The disappearance of the Dumbûl must have opened the way to the Bayat. All Khan (1775—1805), son of Husân Khan, is often mentioned by Frascarelli (Fraser, Aliâbî, Flandin, Girikow, Likhâtin), an influential chief jealous of the prospective. We know that the his was entrusted to the guardianship of All Khan from June to December 1847 and that the latter treated him very kindly. The Bab in his esoteric language calls Mâkû Mâkû: (cf. Çâhrîk, cf. vâmis) where his imprisonment was more rigorous (cf. Brown, J Traveler's Naturalist, 1891, ii, p. 16, 271—277; Jâni-Kashân, Nâvâj-e-trav, G. M. S., vi, 1910, p. 151—152). During the war of 1853—1856 All Khan derived great material advantage from the neutrality of his territory which lay between Russia and Turkey. His son Timur Pasha Khan (1820—1895?) profited by a similar situation during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—1878. In 1881, his appearance at the head of the Mâkû horsemen in the district of Sâmâyâs accelerated the collapse of the invasion of Kurds under Shâh iBâsidâlah [q. v.]. Timur Pasha Khan was hailed as the saviour of Adharâbâdjan and the people even called him Mâkû Pamâghâb.

His son and successor Mustâdâli Kûli Khan Ibyâl al-Sâlâmâ (1863—1923) at first continued the policy of isolation and agrarianism of the khânate but his activity aroused suspicion on all sides. At the beginning of the war of 1914 Russian distrust forced him a forced stay in Tiflis. In time Mâkû became part of the theatre of war. The Russian troops built a light railway from Shâh-takû (on the Araxes) to Bâyazid and the station of Mâkû became a busy centre. In 1917 the Sârdâr returned home and held his position until the coming of Râd-i Shâh Pahlây, when accused of intrigues, he was arrested on 25th Mrh 1912 (Oct. 17, 1923) and transported to the prison of Tabriz where he died suddenly. A Persian officer was appointed governor of Mâkû (Navâlkhâb, Shâhkhâb-i Pahlây, Târîkh 1342, p. 112).


Mâkû (A), means in the old language possession, property, referring among the Beduins particularly to camels, but also to estates and money, in any case to concrete things. The word is formed from mél and h and means properly anything that belongs to one's own. As a noun it is of course treated as a. adj. stem from which a
verb is then formed. In the meaning “money” the word is used in the expression māl gāmid “dumb property” in contrast to māl nāyīk “speaking property”, applied to slaves and cattle. There is a full definition of the conception in the introduction to the Ishāra lūli Mağārin al-Tūğrān of Abu l-Faḍl Dja’far b. ‘Ali al-Dimashqī (Cairo 1318, p. 2 sq.) studied and for the most part translated by H. Ritter, Ist., vii. (1916), 1—91. There and in the Mayţarīf al-‘Ulūm (see Bibli.), p. 59, the different classes of property are enumerated. As māl includes property in its different aspects the word can also mean “taxes”.

The attitude of the Muslim religion to money and its acquisition was of course a subject of discussion from the beginning of the literature. The authoritative religious and ethical point of view is that of al-Ghazzālī (so to be written, cf. Moh. ben Cheneb, R.A.A., vii., 1927, p. 224 sqq.) in the second decade of the îlyâr, especially book 13 (Ritter, op. cit., gives an analysis) and 14 (transl. by H. Bauer, Erlaubtes und verbotes Güt = Islamische Ethik, iii., 1922; cf. R. Hartmann in Ist., iv.).

The acquisition, guarding and disposal of property is one of the four main sections of economics (Tadbir al-Munifl), the second part of practical philosophy, which is divided into ethics, economics and politics, just as it entered Islam with the rest of Hellenistic sciences. As the Politics of Aristotle, the first book of which deals with ethics was not translated into Arabic, the Muslims had to be content with the only translated work on economics, composed by the Neo-Pythagorean Ps.-Bryson which has had a decisive influence on the whole economic literature of Islam. The text, the Greek original of which is lost, was first edited by J. Chékeho in Mokhrī, xiv. (1921) and has been recently published with the Hebrew and Latin versions, and a German translation by M. Plessner (cf. Bibli.). The interesting chapter on māl in it was further expanded by Muslim authors of the school of Ps.-Bryson, particularly from religious literature. A standard work is the Akhbār al-Nāfi of al-Ṭūsī [q. v.] of which the economic section has been analysed and translated by Plessner. The view of the origin of money which Aristotle holds in the Nic. Ethics reached Islam direct, be-ides coming through Ps.-Bryson: it is first found in the Tadbir al-Akhbār of Miskawaih (this is his correct name and not Ibn Miskawaih [q. v.] e.g., Cairo 1322, p. 38 [cf. also Naẓīr’s and Elḥāb].

The word māl very early became a technical term in arithmetic. It is first found in exercises in dividing inheritance; applied to the property of the testator which is to be divided. We later find the word used regularly for the unknown quantity in an equation; in this meaning it was afterwards replaced by šayt [q. v.]. Used for the unknown in quadratic equations it became the word for the square of a number. The fourth power is called māl al-māl, the fifth māl al-šayt, the square of the cube. The history of this change of meaning has been elucidated by J. Ruska, Zur völkeren arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst (S. B. Ak. Hild., Phil-hist. Kl., 1917, N° 2, esp. chap. vi., cf. also index, s. v. Māl).

ristan dated from about 550 (1155). The capital was [the city of] [Ishak] at times the power of these princes stretched eastwards as far as the vicinity of [Isfahan] and southwards to Basra and to the Persian Gulf. They owned the suzerainty of the caliphs or of the Mongol Khans who replaced the 'Abbasids; in practice they were fairly independent. Among the Atabegs of this dynasty mention may be made of Ahmad Nusret Al-Din (696–730 or 733 = 1226–1239 or 1332). According to Ibn Battuta, he built 160 madrasas in his kingdom, of which 44 were in Ibadh. He also improved caravan traffic by having roads through the rocks. Under his successor Afsaryad II, Ibn Battuta spent some time in Ibadh and gives an interesting description of life at the court in this town. The Timurids in 1277 (1424) put an end to the rule of the Faijali dynasty. On this dynasty cf. above ii., p. 48 sqq. and the genealogical tables in Justi, Iranisches Nomenclatur, Marburg 1895, p. 460 and E. von Zimmern, Manuel de Gérald et de Cheronal, pour l'Histoire de l'Islam, Hanover 1927, p. 234. On the later history of Ibadh nothing is known. The town probably became deserted after the fall of the Faijali. Its ruins are now represented by a large mound of earth, about 35 feet high, of irregular shape with smaller mounds of rubble around it. Cf. Layard in J. R. G. S., xxvi. 1856, p. 74 and Layard, Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia, London 1857, i. 493. and Jéquier, op. cit. (s. Bibl.), p. 134.

It may be mentioned that the Buryid Sultans struck coins in Ibadh; cf. Lindberg, Les Monnaies Centuries du Bani Yusef = Recherches de la Société des Antiquités du Nord, Paris 1830–1844, ii. 269 and above iii., p. 44 sqq. On coins of the Atabegs minted in Ibadh, cf. above iii., p. 48 sqq. The perfectly flat plain of Māl-Amīr out of which rise the mound of ruins of the Sasanian and Muslim town of Ibadh is about 4 miles broad and about 7 long according to Jéquier (see Bibl.) who has given a plan of it (cf. cit., p. 133). It runs from N. W. to S. E. c. 3100 feet above sea level and is surrounded on all sides by steep, barren but not high hills. The most important of these border ranges is in the S.E. and is linked up to the Māl-Amīr farther south by Rawlinson in J. R. G. S., ix. So–S1: de Bode, cf. cit., viii. 100: Layard, cf. cit., viii. 74 and de Bode, Toitère, u. 39) within which stood the town of the same name, which played an important part in the middle ages (Mungasti, Manckheri, Māndābšt; cf. also above iii., p. 46, 47 sqq.). The ridge which stretches in the plain of Māl-Amīr in the e. or N.E. is called Kūh-tchehmät According to Jéquier, there is a large artificial lake in the north (north-eastern) part of the plain, which finally disappears in the swamp. According to de Bode (J. R. G. S., xiii. 104) there were in his time two small lakes there, the so-called Yābdūni, which dried up in summer like the marshes and the small streams which run through the plain. The water of the latter came in the main from the lake of Perīghel Bandān, south of the plain of Māl-Amīr, behind which Hūtum-Schindler (see F. K. L.) ascended the steep wall of the Tarawāsh range. The lake called Fām al-Bawār described by Vīznī may be identical with this trench of water; cf. Le Strange, cf. cit., p. 245: Schwarz, cf. cit., p. 337.

Among the numerous ravines which are to be found among the hills that border the Māl-Amīr plain on the N. E. the most interesting from the archaeological point of view is that of Kūh-i Fārā (see the plan in Jéquier, op. cit., p. 135). Kūh, according to O. Mann means in Luri "little ravine"; cf. above iii., p. 41: Dieulafoy and Schindler have erroneously reproduced this to them unintelligible word by Kāl'a or Kūt = fortress: see Weissbach, op. cit., p. 743, note, whose suggestion about the meaning of Kūh is now ruled out. For Fārā, H. Schindler gives the form Ferra and Ferendí (Franks, Europeans), the latter apparently based on a Luri interpretation of the male costume in the relics there. Earlier travellers (Layard, de Bode) write Kūh-i Fārāwīn, apparently because their Luri authorities identified the name Fārā with Fārāwīn (Pharaoh) whom they knew from the Kūrān. The majority of the sculptures of pre-Iranian (Elamite) origin in the region of Māl-Amīr are to be found in Kūh-i Fārā. Quite close to the entrance to the ravine is a large stele with a large human figure in high relief, a row of smaller figures with a well preserved 24 line cuneiform inscription and 10 smaller inscriptions (the latter giving the names of the individuals represented). According to the large inscription it is a monument erected by a certain Hannī, son of Tāzhīhi. Opposite, on the other side of the ravine at intervals on blocks of stone and on the wall are five tablets with other reliefs of rude execution. Special mention must be made of a great procession with 67 figures. The total number of figures in Kūh-i Fārā is according to Layard 134.

Opposite the ravine of Kūh-i Fārā, in the hills which bound the S.W. side of the plain of Māl-Amīr is the cave with many corridors of Shīkhfetei-salmān, "the cave of Salmān." According to the Bakhṭyāris who hold this place in great honour, the name is derived from that of Salmān al-Fārisī (q.v.), the first Persian to adopt Islam, who is buried there, contrary to the modern Sunnī and Shiʿrī tradition which locates the tomb of this companion of the Prophet in al-Madāʾin (Salmān Pāk; cf. iii., p. 79). In Shīkhfetei-salmān have survived four primitive bas-reliefs of the Elamite period of which two are outside and two inside the cave. Among them is a figure, over life size with c. 36 lines of cuneiform inscription which also dates from the Hannī above mentioned. On a little esplanade to the south of the cave are the ruins of a little Muslim sanctuary, probably erected on the site of an older sanctuary. In the corner of the cave is a spring in which rises one of the little streams that water Māl-Amīr.

Apart from the monuments of Kūh-i Fārā and Shīkhfetei-salmān there are a series of other monuments and remains of the ancient and mediaeval periods in the plains of Shīkhfetei-salmān. For example, in the southwest part of the plain near a ruined mausoleum (saint's tomb) which the Lūrs call Shīk-Sawār (the king on horseback) on a slope of the hill is a small stele, obviously also of the Elamite period, with 6 figures and an inscription which has been destroyed. According to Layard, there are many popular traditions about this place. A little north of Shīk-Sawār at a place called Kūh Wān are the ruins of a palace. In the opposite direction in the N.E. section of the plain rises a round palace on the summit of a rock, called Kāl'a Gashūm (= Scorpion Hill) by the natives. A ravine near by is called Hōng; in it
may be seen a much weathered Sásánián rock-sculpture of great dimensions, probably of the earlier period (cf. Shāpūr I). That the plain of Māl-Amīr enjoyed comparative prosperity in the Sásánián period is evident from the remains of canals of this date.

In the S.W. of the plain a narrow road runs to the village of Hāllādān (de Bode: Hālegun). Near it are old ruins of the period of the Atābēg dynasty. There is an Atābēg citadel, an Atābēg bridge and well. The numerous traces of buildings probably date from a mediaeval town. Of recent date is the ruin (mentioned by de Bode) of a palace of Hasan Khān, a chief of the Bahā Girlī tribe of Cappadocia, who lived here about 1521. Here is another little river named Hāllādān or Shāh Rābi, which is probably connected with the lake at Derūdje-i Bandān already mentioned (cf. Layard, *J. R. G. S.*, vii, 74 and *Early Adventures*, i, 403; de Bode, *J. R. G. S.*, viii, 100 and *Travels* etc., i, 404).

In the N.E. of Māl-Amīr runs an old road paved with huge blocks of stone, which is now called Rāh-i Sūltān (the Sūltān’s path) or Dūdāt-i Atābēg (= Atābēg road) to the Sāri-Rāk (Kādji) some 3,500 feet high, the highest point, and thence to Isfāhān after several days’ journey. It has already been mentioned above that the Atābēgs did a great deal for the local people and their lands. But the original planning of the road probably goes back to a great antiquity: cf. the road de Bode, *J. R. G. S.*, xiii, 102—104, and *Travels* etc., ii, 6—8, 35—46. Perhaps, he suggests, the “ladder-road” (kālāyān ḡašāf) over which Enumen passed, as mentioned by Diodorus xix, 21, may be identical with the Atābēg road. Remains of old roads paved or hewn out of the rock are also found in other places in the neighbourhood of Māl-Amīr; cf. iii, 510. The natives ascribe them at once to the Atābēgs, as they do the ruined caravanserais found everywhere. Near the Sāri-Rāk pass about 12 miles east of Māl-Amīr is a place called Kālā-i Medrese, where chiefs of the Bahā Girlīs met every year. There are the ruins of two Sásānián buildings; cf. Uvulâ, in *Revue d’assyriologie*, xxv, 1928, p. 86—88, who gives a detailed description of them. Schwarz, (op. cit., p. 342) thinks that this Kālā-i Medrese—in spite of the discrepancy in the distances given—corresponds with the place Ḥalāfshān mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭūṭ (ii, 41). A ruined site of the same name, also with two Sásānián buildings is according to Uvulâ 24 miles S. E. of Mazdijal-sulaimān (cf. *Sasan*): 4—5 hours N.E. of Māl-Amīr are the ruins of Sūsan (q.v.). The Sasanian geographers of the middle ages reckoned the celebrated bridge (kālā) of Idrāhīm crossing the Djudjail (Kāfān) among the wonders of the world. It was also called Kānūra Khurrazād from the alleged (otherwise unknown) name of the mother of Ardashīr I, who is said to have built this bridge and another in the town of Shuwar (see Schwarz, *op. cit.,* p. 342).

Otherwise we only know the masculine form of the Iranian name Khurrazād (cf. Schwarz, *op. cit.* p. 338 note 4 and Justi, *Iranisches Nomenclatur*, Marburg 1895, p. 180). In the ivth (xth) century this bridge of Idrāhīm was restored by the vizier of the Bāyād Rūkh-al-dāshāh. This work after two years of work. De Bode identifies it with the kālā-i Medrese, probably however we should, with Rawlinson, *op. cit.,* p. 53 and Schwarz, *op. cit.,* p. 339, identify it with the "Old Bridge" crossing a small tributary of the Kūran N. E. of Kašāv-e Medrese. For further information on the bridge of Idrāhīm cf. Vāqīī, 416, iv, 189 and Schwarz, *op. cit.,* p. 338—339. The rulers who had the sculptures and rock inscriptions of Kūl-i Fārāb and Shīkete-i Salmān made, belong to the period of the later Elâmite kingdom, to the period between Nebuchadnezer I (1146—1123) and the rise of Assyria in the first half of the ivth century i.e. about 1000 B.C. It cannot be decided whether king Ḥannii, son of Tāhūghī, from whom the monuments and inscriptions date, and the Shūtar Naḵkhtune, son of Indada mentioned by him, ruled the whole of Elâm or whether they are to be regarded as members of a local dynasty ruling perhaps the district of Māl-Amīr. The inscriptions are in the Elâmite language but contracts written in the Babylonian language have also been found in Māl-Amīr; cf. the Bibliography.

Here it may be mentioned that following de Bode the town of the Uxians which Alexander the Great passed on his way from Susa to Persepolis after passing the "Susan Gates" has often been sought in the region of Māl-Amīr; cf. de Bode, *Travels* etc., ii, 47 sq.; Spiegel, *Ehrwürdige Alterthumsbunde*, i, Leipzig 1870, p. 409 and Kaerst in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencykl. d. klass. Altertums*, ii, 142. Since the late middle ages (beginning of the vii/viiith century) the Bahā Girlī Lārs have settled in the district of Māl-Amīr (cf. above iii, p. 428, 45b). They spend the winter there on account of the fine green pastures. On the Bahā Girlīs see BAKHTIYĀRĪS and iii, p. 42b, 45b, 46a, 50a.

MALAM — MALACCA

MALACCA (from the Sanskrit amlaka through the Malay mālaka, Phyllanthus pectinatus Hook. fil., Euphorbiaceae) is the name of a town situated on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula in 2° 1' 30" N., 102° 1' 5" E. (Gr.), of a river which receives the sea at that spot, and of a territory of about 720 English square miles adjacent to and administered from the town. Formerly the name was often extended to the Malay Peninsula as a whole, but this usage is obsolete in English though still sometimes found in Continental works.

The earliest date in the history of Malacca occurs in Book 215 of the History of the Ming dynasty of China (1368-1643), which relates the sending of a Chinese mission to it in the year 1403, in consequence of which the local chief was shortly afterwards recognized as king by the Chinese Emperor. Previous to this time Siam had apparently claimed some kind of suzerainty over the country. Two alleged earlier references are very doubtful, one in chapter ix. of the lavoisian history Pararatan, and the other in the Siamese Kof Mouthierabkin (Mang/liba). The latter work certainly mentions Malaca as a vassal of Siam, but in its introduction it speaks of a Siamese king (Paramattraolokanatha) whose reign began about 1335. The oldest strictly contemporary notice of the place occurs in the Yo, vai sight of Ma Huan, which records a Chinese mission to it in 1409 and states that at that time the king and people of Malaca carefully observed the tenets of Islam. As Malacca had tradition history connects the rise of Malacca with the fall of Singapore (probably circa 1377), it seems likely that the establishment of Islam as the official religion in Malacca may have occurred between these dates.

Owing to its position on the trade route from India and Western Asia to the Malay Archipelago, China, and Japan, Malacca became in the xth century the most important of the Malay states; it was visited by traders from various countries, many of them being Muslims from Northern and Southern India, the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, and it became the centre of a Muslim propaganda of which the earliest successes in this part of the world had already been registered by Marco Polo in North-Eastern Sumatra before the close of the
xiith century. After the middle of the xvth century Malacca territory was increased by the conquest of Pahang (on the East coast of the Peninsula); and for the whole kingdom included all the coasts of the centre and South of the Peninsula to about 4° N. together with a suzerainty over the parts of Sumatra and Java. It was made the scene of several unsuccessful attacks on Malacca during this period.

The growth of this incipient empire, which however already showed signs of decay in the form of internal divisions and bad administration, was cut short by the Portuguese conquest in 1511, whereby the town and its immediately adjoining territory, together with the command of the sea, fell into European hands. Though often challenged by the attacks of their Muslim neighbours (especially the new state of Acheh [Achin] in Northern Sumatra), the Portuguese maintained their hold on Malacca till 1641, when after a prolonged siege it was taken by the Dutch. In 1795 it was occupied by the British, in the name of the Sultan of Perak, and held until 1818, when it was returned to the Netherlands under the provisions of the treaty of Vienna. In 1824 it finally became British and in 1826 it was incorporated in one government with Penang and Singapore and made subject to the East India Company.

During the Dutch period the importance of Malacca as a trading centre declined; it was never allowed to compete seriously with Batavaria, and in the end it was quite overshadowed by Penang (founded in 1786) and Singapore (founded in 1819). In recent times it has shared in the general economic development that has been limited to only one-fifth of the population, as the fifth town in British Malaya, with a population (in 1921) of 36,071 (of whom about one-fifth were Muslims) in an area of 3.5 English square miles. In the whole settlement or territory of Malacca, including the town itself, the population was 135,322, of whom 83,635 were Malay; proper (including a considerable number of Minangkabau descent), 2,777 other Muslims (such as Javanese, Banjar, etc.) of similar Indonesian stock, 1,146 Muslim Indians, 257 Muslim Chinese, and 56 Arabs, making an approximate total Muslim population of 37,871, almost all of whom were Sunni of the school of Shafi‘i. Of the rest of the native population about 74,500 were Chinese and one-fifth Hindus.


(O. C. Blagden)

MALAGA. Arabic Malāgā (ethnic: Malājī), a large town in Spain on the Mediterranean coast and capital of the same name, has at the present day 135,600 inhabitants. It is built at the centre of a bay commanded by the hill of Gibralta (the Ejidal Fasoh of Idris). The town is traversed from north to south by the ravina (i.e. the bed. usually dry [Arabic ramill]) of the Guadalmedina (Aqidi ‘Umādina) which, while very often dried up, sometimes overflows in the rainy season. To the west of the town lies the Vega or Hoyá of Malaga where the vegetation is exotic and extremely luxurious.

Malaga, the ancient Malata, was founded by the Phoenicians and retained for long under Roman rule traces of a deep Syrian influence; its port under the Empire was one of the most important in the Iberian peninsula. At a later date it was the see of a bishop. It was taken from the Byzantines in 571 by the Visigothic king Leowigild. In 711 it was taken by a Muslim force sent from Ejea by Tarik. It soon became an important Muslim town and in time supplanted Archilhóma (Archidona, q.v.) as capital of the province of Reiya (Latin: regio) where in the time of the governor Abu ’l-Khayr al-Mu‘tim b. 'Abd al-Kaliq the Arab of Jordan (al-Qudma) was settled in 125 (742). Malaga welcomed the Masmara of the Umayyad dynasty of Omayya and the governor Abu Bakr al-Dājilb, after his landing at Almunecar and his triumphant progress through the district of Elvira. But, in the second half of the third (nineth) century, the province of Reiya including Malaga became closely involved in the troubles stirred up by the nationalist ‘Umar b. Hafṣūn. In the reign of the Emir Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmaan b. ‘Abd Allah, according to the historian Ibn Hafṣūn, the province supplied for a summer expedition (al-sifir) against Gueica an imposing number of horsemen: 2,000. Later, when the rebel was causing anxiety to the Emir ‘Abd Allah an expedition on a large scale was made against the province of Reiya. An army under the command of prince ‘Abd b. ‘Abd Allah took the field in 904 and inflicted a severe defeat on the troops of Ibn Hafṣūn. Three years later, the same general had to besiege Malaga which was held by the rebel Musawir b. ‘Abd al-Rahmaan. Another expedition was again led against Malaga in the reign of ‘Abd Allah in 909.

The great caliph ‘Abd al-Rahmaan III, on ascended the throne, had no peace until he succeeded in putting down the rebellion of Ibn Hafṣūn. In the early years of his reign several expeditions were again sent against the rebel in the province of Reiya of which the governor was the post but not yet the capital. Once order was completely restored by the sovereign, Malaga entered on a long period of prosperity which continued till the end of the Umayyad caliphate.

From being capital of a province, Malaga became the capital of an independent kingdom in the period of the muhāhid al-ma‘ṣir. The Ummāhidids after having had to renounce their claims to the caliphate of all Muslim Spain were able to hold out in a little principality in the S. E. of Spain with Malaga as capital. At the same time another branch of the same family founded a little kingdom around the town of Algeciras. The Ummāhidid dynasty of Malaga survived till 1497 (on it cf. the article Ummāhidids). The king of Gdara, the Zirid Badi b. Habbās, had hitherto been nominally their vassal. He decided to cast off their suzerainty and seize their principality. He did this with ease and exiled the last Ummāhidid to Africa: his son al-Mu‘izz was appointed ruler of Malaga. On the death of Badi in 1073 his kingdom was divided between his two grandsons ‘Abd Allah and Tamur and Malaga
fell to the latter. The town very soon passed to the Almoravids and then to the Almohads. When in 629 (1232) Muhammad I Ibn al-Ahmur founded the Nasrid kingdom of Granada, Malaga and its province formed part of his lands and remained in the power of the dynasty till the period of the Catholic Kings. Ferdinand and Isabella took Malaga from the Muslims on Aug. 18, 1487 after a close blockade.

The Arab geographers of Muslim Spain almost all give enthusiastic descriptions of Malaga. Idriṣ (ixth century) mentions two of its suburbs, praises the sweetness of its waters and the flavour of its fruits. Ibn Baṭṭaṭa in the second half of the xith century says much the same and adds that a fine gilt porcelain was made at Malaga which was exported to the whole Muslim world. Finally Ibn al-Khaṭīb frequently speaks of Malaga in his description of the kingdom of Granada; one of his minor works is devoted to a comparison of Malaga with Salé, the Muṣṭāhirra Mālaqī (the Arabic text has been published from two MSS. of the Escorial by M. Muller. W. v. der Spah, Wasch-Sale, in Beiträge zu Geschichte der zentralen Arabien, p. 1—13).

Very few monuments of the Muslim period survive in Malaga, which have not been very much altered. The old chief mosque has become the cathedral. According to the author of al-Rauṣ fī-maṣrūr, this dzāmi had five naves and five doors, two on the side facing the sea, one on the east front (Bāb al-Vahēd) and one on the north side (Bāb al-Khālīka). Another mosque of Malaga built in the Kūfīya is said to have been founded by the traditionists Mūniya b. Shihāb al-Fāsā (d. 158 = 775). The old Muslim citadel is still called Alcazaba.

There are very few relics of Islam in it, a vaulted gateway (Arco de Christo) and a tower (Torre de la Vela). This citadel was joined to another fortress by a double rampart built on the hill of Gibralfaro: it was restored at the end of the xith century by the Nasrid rulers of Granada.

Malaga in the Muslim period remained an important sea-port and an active centre of shipbuilding, less important however than its neighbour Almeria. The city al-Quṣna, the name of which has survived in the form Alcazaba, occupied the actual site of a market and one of the gates with the motto of the Nasrides (ṣā Kālīm Allāh). There is no victor but Allah) is still standing.

MALĀḤIM (A., sing. maḥāma) came, after a long and obscure development, to mean "destinies," either simply al-maḥāmah, or kutub al-maḥāmah or in the singular. The word was already quite adequately explained by De Sacy in his Christianisation 2, ii. 295—302, on the basis of several passages in Ibn Khaldun’s Muqaddima. These Ibn Khaldun defines al-maḥāmah as “numerous books on dynastic changes and events (bihḍān al-dawlah), written in verse and prose and rājūs, many of which are spread abroad amongst the people, some dealing with the changes in the Muslim people (al-nilīn) as a whole, and others with particular dynasties, but all ascribed to well known individuals,” although, in Ibn Khaldun’s opinion, it would be difficult to prove the correctness of any of these ascriptions (Quatremerè’s text, ii. 192 foot; De Sacy’s transl., ii. 226). The most famous case of these is the book called al-Dīnār (q.v. and the references there). Such predictions as to public affairs have close connection with, and were probably developed from, the Jewish apocalyptic. As there are many stories, both in sober historians and in popular tales, describing these books as securely preserved and consulted by dynastic leaders for their own guidance, they have also contacts with the Roman Sibylline books. The popular doctrine of the Mahdi [q.v. and of the Last Day (al-Kiyāma [q.v.]) became inextricably confused with this branch of Muslim literature.

The derivation of maḥāma and the development of its meanings are very obscure. The word does not occur in the Kurān which has the root only in leḥm and laḥm with the concrete meaning, "flesh." Yet the root lehm-like, the migrate Hebrew root, had apparently two very separate meanings, "beef" and "fighting." Further, the fact that the Hebrew word, lehm, means "breathe," while its exact equivalent in Arabic means "flesh" would suggest a separation very far back rather than a borrowing (cf. the comparative treatment and references in Browne-Briggs, Hebrew Lexicon, p. 535 sqq.). In old Arabic the meaning of decisive fighting, leading to defeat, pursuit and slaughter, seems to be certain (cf. the treatment in the Liḥāma, xxii. 9—11, and add to the quotations there Hamīd, ed. Freytag, p. 124, 724: Dīnār of Ṭaflāt b. ʿAwf, ed. Krenkow, p. 141, l. 29, with translation and note on p. 15). The Liḥāma endeavours to connect the meanings (flesh: warp and wool in weaving; close, entangled fighting) under the general idea "being intricate, mixed" (ṣābītik, ʿiḥīṣātik) or with the picture of the flesh of the slain on the battlefield. But, in view of the Hebrew usage, it is better to be satisfied with the meaning of maḥāma as "stricken field"; the Liḥāma (p. 10) reiterates the idea of war and fighting with much slaughter and especially in the Sifra (Fīṣṭāma), its only allusion to the prophetic and e-chatological usage. An epithet of Muhammad is "the prophet of the maḥāma" and of that the Liḥāma gives two explanations: (i) "the prophet who was sent with the sword" (as in another tradition, bikhīṣān bīḥlāf); (ii) "the prophet of union and good order" (ṭlīṣ, qalab).

There is very little general prophecy in the Kūra as to future historical events in this world; but in Tradition there is a great deal. Even the two Siḥa’s have sections on such future plan —
apparently the oldest word for them and frequent in the Kūrān — especially those leading up to the Last Day. In Bukhārī (Būlāk 1315, ix. 46–61; Book 92 in Wensinck, Handbook) the Prophet is quite explicit in foretelling such woes and trials to come and in warning how they must be met. In Musliin (Constantinople 1329–1333; vii. 165–210; Book 52 in Wensinck, Handbook) there is a similar series of hortatory predictions, but, also, an explicit statement (p. 172 vv.) that the Prophet foretold everything which would happen to his People until the Last Day. By Ibn Khaldūn (Muhaddidīna, ed. Quatremère, ii. 182 sqq.; transl. De Slane, ii. 212 sqq.) this tradition is cited and others, by later and less weighty authorities, which make the Prophet give a dynastic history for future Islam, with the names, fathers’ names and tribes of all leaders of revolts until the end.

The use of the term malaḥīm in connection with these prophecies appears first among the ‘Alids in their doctrine of the Dā’ir. The Dā’irīst gives two occurrences: ‘Abī b. Yākūn (d. A.H. 182; A.D. 294, 292) had a Kita‘b al-Malaḥīm. An other text is from ‘Abī l-Muhāsin ibn Mihān (p. 223, l. 20) had a Kita‘b al-Malaḥīm. But the use must have spread very rapidly. In the Maṣūḥ of al-Baghdāwi (Cairo 1318, ii. 128 sqq.) those traditions are classified and one section is Bāb al-Malaḥīm (p. 130–33). All these traditions bear on the wars of the Last Days but the word malaḥīm itself occurs only in the early part of the hikāt section (p. 132 middle) in such phrases as “the Malaḥīm,” “the great Malaḥīm,” connected with the capture of Constantinople and the appearance of al-Dā’irī. In the Hikāt al-Maṣūḥ of Dīhib (327, p. 396 sqq.) the text is practically the same, only adding the names of the collections from which the traditions are taken, ‘Abī Dāwūd al-Dinawarī. ‘Abī Dāwūd has a separate section on malaḥīm (N. 36 in Wensinck). In such a book of edification as the Tuhfahat al-Dinawarī of al-Kurtubi (d. 671 = 1272), in the Muḥtaṣar of al-Sha‘rānī (Cairo 1324) the sections on the Maṣūḥ have swallowed up the whole doctrine and the aid of whom there is an angel called Mādāma (I), ṣiḥḥ al-malaḥīm.

Ibn Khaldūn has recorded the final form which these prophecies took. Traditions put in the mouth of the Prophet were supplemented and largely disregarded by calculations of astronomers and by the speculations of pantheistic Sufis using the science of Siniyāt? [q.v.] in the interests of the ‘Alids. We have thus to distinguish sharply between (i) the malaḥīm-predictions registered in the canonical books of traditions and in the literature of edification based upon these and (ii) the malaḥīm-books based upon secret tradition and on astrology which went back to the ‘Alids and are represented best by the Dā’ir. For, besides the Dā’ir ascribed to Dā’ir al-Sādiq, there was also an astronomical Dā’ir, ascribed to Ibn Ishāk al-Kindi, dealing with the dynastic destinies of the ‘Abbāsid. An asserted fragment of this, called the Little Dā’ir, was in circulation in the Maghrib in Ibn Khaldūn’s time, but had apparently been composed in the interests of the Muwahhids. Further Ibn Khaldūn had known as in circulation in the Maghrib several poems of this class in the interests of different western dynasties. In the Orient he had heard of several such malaḥīm ascribed to Ibn Sinā and he had actually had knowledge of one such ascribed to Ibn al-‘Arabī. In Cairo he had found another, also ascribed to Ibn al-‘Arabī, giving a horoscope for that town. In the Orient, too, he had seen a matlama poem by a certain Shīr, Muḥammad al-Bāḍirī, of the Kārāndī Fraternity of darwishes, who left behind him a heretical sect, al-Bāḍirīkūya, and who died 724 (1324). Ibn Khaldūn gives a mass of details on this matlama and on its author, who calls himself al-Dā’ir. It dealt with the dynasties of the Mamluks and Ibn Khaldūn knew it in two recensions from which he quotes. For still more details on this genre of literature, based on Ibn Khaldūn’s personal knowledge, see Quatremère, text, ii. 193–201 (the Būlāk texts are not complete) and De Slane’s translation, ii. 226–237.

In stories, there are frequent references to the science of malaḥīm as one of the esoteric sciences along with astrology and ḍar al-ramāl. Thus, in Habicht’s text of The Root Nights (ed. Breslau, iii. 218) in the Story of Kamar al-Zamān and Badūr, a form closely akin to the version of Galland and different from that in the second Calcutta and the Būlāk editions. Marwāz, the foster-brother of Badūr, is described as learned in the sciences of astronomy and the sphere and reckoning and algebra and ramāl and malaḥīm.
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MAL’AK. [See MA‘AIRAKA.] MAL’AKA, angels, is the Arabic broken plural of an early Semitic (Cananëīt? ) word malāk, meaning “messenger.” The evidence would suggest that it is a loan-word, coming into Arabic from Hebrw; there is no trace of a verb in Hebrw (nor in Phœnic. with which the noun occurs in later inscriptions), and in Arabic the root, even, is in the greatest uncertainty, being referred to a dubious č-l-k (Lane, p. 81, b, c; Lisan, xii. 272 sqq.; Tafti. Taafsir, i. 150) and to a still more dubious č-k (Lisan, xii. 370). The singular in Arabic is normally malāk without hawā, and so always in the Kūrān; although the Lisan in two places (xii. 274, s; 371, 3) quotes the same verse as a proof that malāk does occur, as an exceptional form (chalif). Both singular and plural in Arabic are used only in the sense “angel.” In the Kūrān it occurs twice in the dual (malākān, ii. 96; v. 19); of the two angels Hārūn and Mūḥāf (q.v. and under sūkān), and of Adam and Eve being tempted in the Garden to believe that they may become angels. The plural occurs very often in the Kūrān (in Flugel’s Concordance under č-k, p. 171) but the singular only 12 times (Flugel under m-l-k, p. 183). These are of the people demanding revelation by an angel rather than a human being (bāṣkar, vi. 8, 9, 50; xi. 15, 33; xvii. 97; xxv. 8); women think Joseph an angel for his beauty rather than a human being (bāṣkar, xii. 31); and an angel’s intercession (chufa, lii. 20) does not avail; twice as collective for angels, besides the ārād (lxix. 17), and in rows and rows (lxviii. 23).

In xxxii. 11 “the angel of death” (malāk al-mawt) occurs but not by name; see article ‘IRĀK, and references in tradition in Wensinck, Handbook, p. 228. Dijbril, the angel of revelation, is named three times (ii. 91, 92; lxvi. 4); cf. traditions on him in Musliin, i. 109–111 of ed. Constantinople 1333, and other references in Wensinck, p. 59. In Kūrān xxv. 193–195; Dijbril, unnamed, is called
the Faithful Spirit" (al-rūh al-a'mīn); he brings down the revelation to the ʿālā of Muḥammad in a clear Arabic tongue. There are other descriptions of him, still unnamed, in Kurʾān liii. 5–18 and lxxxi. 19–25, as appearing plainly to Muḥammad in revelation. He, as "our Spirit" (rūḥuḥ), was sent to Maryam (six. 17). He is called "the Holy Spirit" (rūḥ al-qudūs) in xvi. 104 and Allāh aided 'Isā with the same (ii. 81, 254; v. 109). Mikāl (variant Mikāl) is named (i. 92) as an angel of the same rank as Dārūrā; see a long and apparently true story of how his name came about in Bairdāwī (Feišcher's ed., i. 74, 129); in traditions he, with Dārūrā, appears as a friend of Muḥammad and in the hadith: "two of the angels of the heavens" (Wilkins, p. 153); Muḥammad called the two his wāris of the angels. To Isāfī (q. v.), the angel with the trumpet of resurrection, there is no reference either in the Kurʾān or in canonical traditions but very much in eschatological legend. In Kurʾān xliii. 47, the tortured in hell call to the keeper of hell, "O Mālik!" and in lxxviii. 18, the guards of hell are called al-Zalāma, an otherwise unused word, meaning apparently, "violent thrusters" (Litān, xvii. 53); the number of these, Kurʾān lxxiv. 30, is nineteen and they are asserted specifically to be angels—apparently to guard against the idea that they are devils; the term is called "rough, violent" (zāhīrī, zāhīlī). Another class of angels are those "brought near" (to Allāh), ad-dārūrāt (iv. 170); these praise Allāh day and night without ceasing (xxi. 20); Bairdāwī calls them also al-dārūrizā' (on Kurʾān ii. 28; Feišcher's ed., i. 47, 21) and al-karrāfūlā (al-kāfūlā) on Kurʾān iv. 170 (Feišcher's ed., i. 245, 22) as those that are around the sūrah. The same term, muqarruš, is used of lās (Kurʾān, iii. 40) as he is in the company of the angels nearest Allāh; cf. note xvi. 18, above, for his semiangelic character. At the beginning of the sura of the Angels (Kurʾān xxxv.), there is a significant description: "making the angels messengers (mānaʾir), with wings, two and three and four; He increases in the creation what He wills"; this has had much effect on later descriptions and pictures. They are guardians (zāfūrīn) over mankind, cognizant of what man does and writing it down (kaʾī in; Kurʾān lxxvii. 10–12). In xvi. 94 the writing down is ascended to Allāh himself. In lxv. 4; lxvii. 38; xlviii. 4, there occurs the very puzzling phrase "the angels and al-qālūn". Bairdāwī on the first two passages shows how perplexing the distinction is found (Feišcher's ed. n. 356, 13; p. 383, 4); "the rūḥ is an angel set over the spirits (al-tahāwī); or he is the whole genius of spirits; or lighted; or a creation (zāfūrī) mightier than the angels"; cf. too, Kāzmi's Līlījī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 50. For spirit and the conception spirit in Līlījī see article ruḥ. In the Kurʾān there is no reference to the two angels, Munkar and Nākrār who visit the dead man in his grave, on the night after his burial, and catechize him as to his Faith. Thereafter, if he is an unbeliever, his grave becomes a preliminary hell and if he is a believer, it becomes a preliminary purgatory from which he may pass at the Last Day into paradise; it may even, if he is a ¡min, be a preliminary paradise. This is called technically the Questioning of the grave (al-muḥâjībī aš-šāḥībī). This doctrine, similar to the Louter Judgement of Christian theology, is one of the sāʾūrāt (to be believed on oral testimony) and is based on the implicit meaning of Kurʾānic passages (xiv. 32; xi. 49; lvii. 25) and upon explicit traditions (Ṭafṣālīn's commentary on Nasaft's Ḥāfīd, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 109; Māwīfī of al-Iṣār with commentary of al-Dārūrī, ed. Bülāk 1266, p. 590 sqq.). There is a still fuller account and discussion by the Hanbalite theologian Ibn Kāyīn al-Dārūrī (Drockern, G. A. L., ii. 106, No. 23) in his Kitāb al-Līlījī, ed. Haidarābād 1324, p. 62–144, vii. 6–xii. The angels are, also, called the heavenly host, or multitude (al-munāmīd al-wāṣiṭīs) in xlviii. 66 and guarding the walls of heaven against the "listening" of the dīmūn and shāfīrūn's. See further on this under sīhr, iv. 410. The Kurʾān lays stress on the absolute submission and obedience of the angels to Allāh. "To Him belong those who are in the heavens and in the earth and those who are with Him (in-tābāb) are not too proud for His service (ţibābī) and they do not become tired. They praise, night and day, without intermission" (xxix. 19, 20). "They do not anticipate Him in speech and they labour in His command" (xxvii. 27). At the creation of Adam they are distinguished in this respect from him and his future race: "while we praise Thee and sanctify Thee" (xvi. 66). The Fire there are set certain terrible and powerful angels, "they do not rebel against Allāh as to what He commands them and they do what they are commanded" (lxvi. 6). But does this absolute obedience extend to imbecibility (līmān; q. v.)? The Kurʾān is emphatic as to their obedience, but is in contradiction to their created nature and to their relationship in that respect to the dīmūn and to the shāfīrūn. Thus, in several passages in the Kurʾān, the story is told of the creation of man out of clay and that the angels were hidden by Allāh to prostrate themselves to him. This they all did "except Iblīs" (līmān Iblīs; Kurʾān ii. 32; vii. 10; xv. 48; xviii. 74). Iblīs, therefore, must have been an angel; as Bairdāwī says, "If not, the command to them did not apply to him and being excepted from them was illegitimate" (Feišcher's ed., i. 51, 2). This would mean that the angels were not imbecible. But, again, in Kurʾān xviii. 43 the statement is expanded, "except Iblīs; he was of the dīmūn; so he departed from the command of his Lord" (fasuqah an amrī rabbihī). Further, in Kurʾān vi. 11; xxviii. 77, Iblīs, pleads in justification that man was created of clay (līmān) but he of fire (nāsīr); and the dīmūn are acceptably created of fire (al-munāmīd al-šāfīrūn) in Kurʾān xv. 27, "of a mūlāṣīf of fire" in Kurʾān iv. 14. The meaning of mūlāṣīf is unknown: the Līlījī (iii. 189, 13–14) gives a number of contradictory explanations, but it is probably an unidentifiable loc.-verb. Iblīs and the dīmūn, then, were created of fire; but there is no statement in the Kurʾān as to the material out of which the angels were formed. A tradition traced back to 'Abī Jābīr is the foundation of the accepted position that the angels were formed of light: "The Prophet said, 'The angels were formed of light (khitabat min nīr) and the dīmūn were formed of a mūlāṣīf of fire and I Allām of that which was described to you' " (Muslim, vi. 236 ed. Constantinople 1333: Bairdāwī, i. 52, 1). Another difficulty in the doctrine of the imbecility of the angels is the Kurʾānic statement as to Ḥārūt and Mūrūt referred.
to above. These two angels are supposed to have yielded to sexual temptation, to be confined in a pit near Babil and there to teach magic to men. But, it is answered, the Kur'an says nothing of their fall; (ii.) teaching magic is not practising magic; (iii.) they always first warn those who come to them, “We are only a temptation (jima); so do not disbelieve” (Kur'an ii. 96); cf., further, Tafza'ani on the 'Isfahān of Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1521, p. 333.

In Baidawi on Kur'an ii. 32, there is a long discussion of the angelic nature (ed. Fleischer, i. 51, to p. 52, s) which, however, runs out in the despairing statement that knowledge on the point is with Allah alone (al-tīn 'inda-lāhī). Perhaps Iblis was of the djīn as to his actions (l-tārīkh), but of the angels as to species (nasūd). Also, Ibn 'Abbas has a tradition that there was a variety (qarib) of the angels who propagated their kind (this has always been regarded as an essential characteristic of the djīn and of the shajān's as opposed to the angels) and who were called al-sānīn; and Iblis was of these. Or, that the term djīn brought amongst the angels and identified with them. Or, that they were among those commanded to prostitute themselves to Adam. Or, that some of the angels were not impeccable, although that was their characteristic in general, just as some men, e.g. the prophets, are guarded against sin but not against. Further, perhaps a variety of the angels are not essentially different from the shajān's but differ only in accidents and qualities as men are virtuous or evil, while the djīn unite both, and Iblis was of this variety. The tradition from 'Ali is no answer to this explanation, for light and fire in it are not to be taken too precisely; they are used as in a proverb, and light is of the nature of fire and fire of light, they pass into another; fire can be purified into light and light obscured to fire.

So al-Baidawi.

With this should be compared the scholastic discussion in the Mawdūkh of al-Iṣa, with the commentary of al-Durjānī (ed. Bālāk 1526, p. 576). In it the objector to the 'isma of the angels has two grounds: (i.) their urging upon Allah that he should not create Adam showed defects (shander, pride, malice, finding fault with Allah) in their moral character; (ii.) that Iblis was rebellious, as above. These grounds are then answered scholasically. Then various 'urfic texts, as above, on the submission and obedience of the angels are quoted. But it is pointed out that these texts cannot prove that all of them, at all times, are kept free from all sins. The point, therefore, cannot be absolutely decided. Individual exceptions under varying circumstances may have occurred, just as, while the shajān's as a class were created for evil (shajān l-lā-şahr), there is a definite tradition (Zafur) by al-Māturidi on al-Farj al-bahar ascribed to Abū Hanīfah, ed. Ḥantarīād 1521, p. 25) of one Muslim shajān, a great-grandson of Iblis, who appeared to Muhammad and was taught by him certain sūras of the Kur'an.

The story of Ḥārūt and Mārūt suggests that the angels possess sex, although they may not propagate their kind. But “they are not to be described with either masculinity or femininity” (l-lāzim) of Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1521, p. 133). Tafza'ani and the other commentators in this edition explain that there is no authority (nasūd) on this point and no proof by reason (l-fikr); it should, therefore, be left unconsidered and that, apparently, was the course followed by al-Iṣa and al-Durjānī. They may have sex and use it. In that respect man who has in him the possibility of sin and must himself rule his appetites of lust (l-jāhān) and of anger (l-qādah) has a higher potentiality of excellency than the angels (Bādawī on Kur'an ii. 28, ed. Fleischer, i. 48, n sā'yī). This leads to the second question as to the angels which scholastic theology has considered, the relative excellency of angels and men, and, especially, of angels and prophets. This is stated shortly by Nasafi (p. 147 of ed. cited above): (i.) “The Messengers (risāl) of mankind (al-bahār) are more excellent than the Messengers of the angels and (ii.) the Messengers of the angels are more excellent than the generality of mankind and (iii.) the generality of mankind are more excellent than the generality of the angels.” Tafza'ani develops that there is general and indeed necessary agreement on the excellency of the messengers of the angels over mankind in general, yet that the other two statements (i. and iii.) will bear argument. He urges (i.) the prostituting of the angels to Adam; (ii.) that Adam was taught all the names of things (Kur'an ii. 25); (iii.) that Allah “chose” (l-jāf) Adam and Nāhī and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ‘Imrān over all created things (lāla l-'ālimin; Kur'an iii. 30); (iv.) that mankind achieves excellences and perfections of knowledge and action in spite of the hindrances of lust and anger. But the Mu'tazilites and the philosophers (al-fātasīfī) and some Aṣhrā'ites held the superior excellence of the angels. They urged (i.) that they were spirits, stripped of materiality (mawjūd madgās al-qādah), complete actually, free of even the beginnings of evils and defects, like last and anger, and from the obscurities of form and matter (zulmāni al-bāyūl wa-l-'īra), capable of doing wonderful things, knowing events (ka-nālīn), past and to come, without error. The answer is that this description is based on philosophical and not Muslim principles. (ii.) That the prophets learn from the angels, as in Kur'an xxvi. 193; liii. 5. The answer is that the prophets learn from Allah and that the angels are only intermediaries. (iii.) That there are multiplied cases both in Kur'an and in tradition where mention of the angels precedes that of the prophets. The answer is that precedence is because of their precedence in existence or because their existence is more conceded (l-qīm) and, therefore, faith in them must be emphasized. (iv.) In Kur'an iv. 170, “al-mawṣūl does not disdain to be an 'abd to Allah nor do the angels” must mean, because of linguistic usage, that the angels are more excellent than ‘Isa. The answer is that the point is not simple excellency but to combat the Christian position that ‘Isa is not an 'abd but a son to Allah. In the 'Arbā'īy (p. 572—578) there is a similar but much fuller discussion which involves philosophical consideration of the endowment — mental, physical, spiritual — of all living creatures from immaterial spirits to the lower animals (al-bahār).

In the 'Arbā'īy al-Mas'ūdīy of al-Kuzmin (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 55—63) there is an objective description of the angels in all their classes, in which the statements of 'Umar and Sūma are adjusted to the Aristotelian-Neoplatonic universe
with its spheres (al-asfāk), in accordance with al-
Kazwini’s general aim to give a picture of the
created universe in its details and wonders. Yet,
apparently, while the angels possess the quality
“life” (hayy), and are the inhabitants of the heavens
and of the heavenly spheres (sukkān al-samāwārī)
they are not to be reckoned among the animals
(al-jawwān). Al-Damiri includes mankind and the
djinn, even the diabolical (mutaghażna) djinn, such
as the Šāhīn, in his Hayy al-Jawwān but not the
angels. Equally acute and philosophic is his
discussion in the Muwāṣṣif, and more spiritual
than that by Kazwini, is al-Ghazzâlî’s treatment of
the mystery of the angelic nature in some of his
specialistic smaller treatises. For him it is part
of the general question of the nature of spirit
in which his smaller Maṣūfān is devoted. See, too,
the larger Maṣūfān (ed. Cairo 1933) in Rukn, ii.,
p. 23 sqq., and the translation by W. H. T. Gairdner
of his Mshkat al-Awisūr (London, Royal Asiatic
Society, 1924), passim.

The above is a statement of Muslim ideas as
to the angels. But Muslim literature also takes
account of non-Muslim ideas on them, as those of
the philosophers: Christians, dualists, idolaters.
These will be found given shortly by Baḍrī on
Kūrān ii. 28 (ed. Feliście, i. 47, 18 vij.), and in
more detail in Dict. of tecken, termus, p. 1357 sqq.
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(L. D. MACDONALD)

MALATYA, an old city, not far from the
upper Euphrates. It lies at the junction of
important roads (in antiquity: the Persian royal
road and the Euphrates route; in modern times
Samsun–Sivas–Malatya–Diyarbakr and Kars-Kağızman–
Malatya–Kartçum) in a plain, the fertility and
richness of which in all kinds of vegetables and
fruits was celebrated by the Arab geographers,
as in modern times by von Moltke and others,
as in the northern foot of the Taurus not very far south of
Tokhma–ā (Arab. Nahr al-Kurbākib) which is there crossed by the old bridge of Kkğöz. The
town was supplied with drinking-water by the
springs of Yûnûn Dâvidiya and by the Euphrates.
Weaving used to be a flourishing industry there;
according to Ibn al-Shijna there were once 12,000
looms for spinning wool in Malatya but they no
longer existed in his time.

The town appears as Moûdû in Assyrian
cuneiform inscriptions and two “Hittite” stelae
have been found there (to be more accurate: at
Arslan Tepe, a little south of Malatya; Messerschmidt,
Corpus Insr. Hittit. in M. T. A. G. 1900, part
iv, p. 13; 1906, part iv, p. 7). It is probably also
identified with the district called Mûzî-
(last letter uncertain) in the inscription of king
Zēr-ḫr of Hamat. (c. 800 B.C.) which Pogno found
in Afis near Aleppo. Pline (Nat. Hist., vi. 8)
calls the town Moûta a Simurakanda condito; the
name of the legendary foundress has perhaps
survived in that of the fortress of Shamrin which
Michael Syrus (Chronicle, transl., Chabot iii., 272)
mentions in the 6th century in the land of Sawid,
in the region of Malatya. To its position on the
Oriental lines Malatya owed its great prosperity
in the Roman period. From the time of Titus it
was the headquarters of the Legio XII Fulminata;
it was much extended by Trajan and under Justinian
raised to the capital of the province of Armenia III.
Anastasius and Justinian restored and beautified
it. After his severe defeat at Malatya in the autumn
of 575 Khosrow I burned the town (John of Ephesus, vi. 9; E. Stein, Studien zur Gesch. d.
Kuräns. Reichswelt, 1911, p. 66–8; 83
note 9; 200 Habib b. Maslama al-Fihri was sent
by Tâyy b. Ghanîm from Armenia VI
(Shmâghî) against Malatya and took the town;
but it was later retaken from the Muslims. When
Mu‘awiyah became wâli of Syria and al-Djazira, he
again sent Habib b. Maslama against the town.
He stormed it in 36, left a troop of cavalry in
it to guard the frontier and placed a governor in
it. Mu‘awiyah himself visited Malatya on his campaign
against Asia Minor and left a large garrison in
the town which henceforth became one of the
headquarters for the summer campaigns into Bâlân
al-Rûm. When the people abandoned the town in the
time of the caliphs ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-
Khâlid they were attacked by the Byzantines; on
their withdrawal, it and the whole of Armenia IV was settled by the Armenians and
and Nabataeans, that is, Arabian speaking peasants,
driven out of his kingdom by the emperor Philippicus.
(Noldke, Z. D. M. G, xxv. 125; al-Balâghirî, ed.
de Goeje, p. 185; Michael Syrus, transl. Chabot II,
482; according to Theophanes the Armenians were
settled in Malatya by Philippicus in 712 A. D.
They increased very much and were valuable
allyes of the Arabs in the wars against the Byzan-
tines (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.). The caliph
Omar settled the fugitive inhabitants of Turânda
(now Derende) in Malatya and made al-Djâwna
b. al-Harîth of the tribe of the Bani ‘Amîr
Sa‘îda governor. In 123 (740–741) a Greek army of
20,000 men under Askivâsh, the general of the
Thema Armeniakon, advanced against Malatya
and plundered the country round it. The inhabitants
closed the gates and sent a messenger to Hişâm
in al-Rûsîfâ but the latter soon heard that the
Greeks had withdrawn and sent the messenger back
with a body of cavalry. Later, when he himself took
the field against the Byzantines, he camped before
Malatya until the rebuilding of the town which
the enemy had destroyed was completed (Balâghirî,
loc. cit.; Michael Syrus, ii. 506; Theophanes,
ed. de Boor, year 743; Pâl Dîvûs, ed. Chabot, year
1051). The Emperor Constantine VI Copronymos
in 133 (750) advanced on Kamkân and Malatya,
whose inhabitants looked in vain for help to
Mesopotamia, as a civil war was raging there. As
the emperor knew this he demanded that the
inhabitants should abandon the town. After at first
refusing they finally agreed, being exhausted by
the siege, left the town with all their goods
and chattels and went to al-Djazira whereupon
Constantine levied Malatya to the ground; nothing
but a half ruined granary remained standing. Hişân
Kalawthîya was also destroyed and its inhabitants,
like those of the other villages in Armenia IV,
carried off into captivity (Balâghirî, loc. cit.; Michael
Syrus, ii. 518; Bæthgen, Abb. f. d. K. d. Morgenl.,
viii. 3, p. 54, 137; Well, Gesch. d. Chaliften, ii.
15). Six years afterwards (139 A. H.) al-Mansûr
wrote to Šâlih b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allah who had in the
campaign in Asia Minor in Radjab 249 (863) by the valiant Petraonas (al-Bahrūmān), Michael III's general, with his whole army on the Mardj al-Usfā (Weil, op. cit., ii, 381; Tscherning, Saâgu u. d. Quellengebiet des Tigris, S. B. Ak. Wien, cxxiv., vol. iv, 1893, p. 23; on the site of the "Bishop's Meadow": Le Strange, Eastern Caliph., p. 138). The Emperor Basil I in 871 went against Tephrike and Taranton (Derende); he plundered Zibaţra and Sumaisašt and then encamped pēs ū ḫarābī ḫatāyū (Nahr al-Zamīn, now: Cirmiklî-Şū, bāṬa ṭa ṫa ṫa ṭī (Theophan. continuat., ed. Bonn, p. 268; Kaastro Karâmis in Barhebræus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abbeḷa-Lamy, i. 400; now: Cirmiklî, cf. Tomašek, Beitr. z. alten Gesch. u. Geogr., Forsch. f. H. Kirp. Berlin 1898, p. 141). But he was not able to take Malaty a which was fortified (Harenrocher, Phœbus, ii. 442; Weil, op. cit., ii. 471). His army suffered heavy losses during the siege and the emperor himself was nearly captured. Whether he undertook a second campaign against Malaty a is doubtful (Weil, op. cit., ii. 475).

The Arab general Mūnis in 304 (916–917) devastated Cappadocia from Malaty a (Weil, op. cit., ii. 635); similar invasions took place in 310 and the following years. It was not till 314 (926–927) that the Byzantines were able to exact their revenge. Under the brave Domestikos Joannes Kurkuas (Ibn al-Âṣhār, ed. Tornberg, vii. al-daunateh kāmirī; Michael al-Dāne, viii. 158: Kyriakos), they entered the district and advanced up to the suburbs of Malaty a, laying waste the country and going as far as Shimshāt (Arsamosata) (in 315 according to Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, Tuṭīṭa, ed. Gottwald, p. 205; transl. p. 158, wrongly "in fines Samosateni invasore"). Kurkuas forced the amir of the town to send his son, Abū Ḥaṣf (Abū Ḥaṭîf), and the general Abu l-Âṣbāḥ (Abu Āṣbū) to him and to acknowledge the suzerainty of the emperor (Symeon Magister, Bonn, p. 741 sq.; Georg. Monach., ed. Maralt, p. 834, while the Bonn edition p. 908 and Theophanes continu., ed. Bonn, p. 416 and Georg. Kedren., ii. 100 sq. wrongly write: "Abu l-Âṣbāḥ the son of an Armenian by birth, is meant to have granted the lands of Malaty a and Sumaisašt to the Armenian prince Mīhē (Arab. Malīk, Greek Μαλάκ) who was however again driven out of Malaty a and Sumaisašt in 320 by Saîd al-Dawla, uncle of the ʿHanāḏīndī Nāṣīr al-Dawla of Mawṣīl (Weil, op. cit., ii. 639; Zaǧīšī Imp. Akad. Nauk., xiv. 102 sq. following Džamāl al-Din b. Zahir). But in 934, after the death of the two friends of the Byzantines, Abu Ḥaṣf and Abu l-Âṣbāḥ, Kurkuas and Mīhē again appeared before the town, which at that time was protected by a double wall and a ditch full of water inhabited and found themselves forced by starvation to negotiate about the surrender of the town. During the negotiations the Greeks succeeded by a stratagem in forcing an entrance through the north gate of the town and taking it on May 19, 934. The inhabitants, in keeping with the promise that had been given them, were allowed to leave the town. The walls were razed so that the town was henceforth open to all attacks (Michael Syrus, iii. 122 sq.; Ibn al-Âṣhār, viii. 221; Rambaud, L'Empire Grèc au XIème siècle, Paris 1870, p. 423; ; Rosen, op. cit., p. 89 sq., 106, 108). In the next decade Saîd al-Dawla repeatedly raided the territory of Malaty a.
His mamlik Nadž in his campaign to Hanžit in 350 (961–962) encountered 'Abd Allah of Malatya and put him and his friends to flight (Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 197; Rosen, op. cit., p. 88). Two years later he again ravaged the land of Malatya for 18 days with fire and sword (Freytag, p. 204, 206).

When the emperor Nicephorus conquered Syria, he wished to repopulate Malatya, which was defended and deserted. But the Greeks refused to live there for fear of Arab raizans. His advisers therefore recommended him to invite Syrian Jacobites to the country. He did this and promised the Patriarch Mār Yūhanān Sargiṭa, that if he repopulated Malatya, Hanžit and the passes (māsūrās), he would no longer persecute the Jacobites (Michael Syrus, iii. 130 sq.; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abboele-Lamy, i. 411 sqq.; Markwart, Handb. Ammūya, xxx., 1016. p. 121 note). People now flocked to Malatya from all parts (c. 969 A.D.). Monasteries were built. About 1000 there were said to be in Malatya and district 53 churches and 60,000 Christians capable of bearing arms, including many Melkites (Michael of Tinnis in Renanod, Hitt. Patr. Alexandr., Paris 1713, p. 403: Barhebraeus, op. cit., i. 424, note 1). The emperor did not, however, keep his promise; persecution again became of everyday occurrence and drove the Jacobites more and more into the arms of the Arabs (Michael Syrus, iii. 131, 136, 147).

According to Ibn al-Aṣkārī (al-Ḳānīl, iii. 65), Malatya at this time was placed in the šīrāz 'Amīrāwīn (Arminius) which he says stretched to the Bosphorus (Khalīḍ al-Kustantiniyya).

The Emperor John Tīmūrids (Sīmḥāshัก) in 1218 (918) on his campaign to Nišābūr crossed the Euphrates at Malatya (Yabū al-Anjīkī in Kosen, ref. cit., p. 183 note; Schlimmerger, Lioofie Byzantins, i., Paris 1896, p. 255). The rebel Bardas Scleros in 366 (970–977) seised the town of Malatya, imprisoned the strategos who was governing it for the Emperor and had himself proclaimed strategos. When Scleros was fighting against the imperial general Michael Barze (al-Jurdu) there was with him a Shaikī ḥ had been converted to Christianity, the patriarch 'Ubad Allḥ al-Mutanāyarī of Malatya, who is perhaps identical with the 'Abd Allah mentioned in 350. Scleros made him magistros and sent him with one of his slaves, the eunuch Kantaṭīsh (.DALK: Alnst?) whom he raised to the rank of bāntīkās ("Count"), to Anjīkīya against the Ḫalīd Kulaib, the imperial governor of this town. Kulaib surrendered to them Anjīkīya, the Thugīyūn and the whole of the "Orient"; he and the most prominent citizens of Anjōch were then sent as prisoners to al-Kalbām (Cappadocia) (Kosen, ref. cit., p. 2 sq. and note: p. 81–90 sq.; Schlimmerger, Lioofie Byzantins, i., 359, 362, 376 sq.). Scleros however at once sent the Anjōch notables back to their homes and made Kulaib istiqlāsī of Malatya (Kosen, ref. cit.; Schlimmerger, i. 356) while on the other hand 'Ubad Allḥ soon went over to the emperor Basil (977–978). When after a seven years' interregnum on the Tigris island of Madīda near Baghdad, Bardas Scleros succeeded in gaining his freedom, he escaped Malatya with the help of Beduins, where he at once (in Shawwal 376 = March 987) seized the istiqlās Kulaib who had gone over to the emperor, and himself again proclaimed

fasīlus (Yabū, transl. Rosen, p. 22; Schlimmerger, i. 678). Bardas Phocas, who took Bardas Scleros prisoner by treachery and then claimed the imperial title for himself, passed through Malatya on Sept. 14, 987 on his way westwards straight through Asia Minor (Schlimmerger, i. 695). In 399 (1008) the Hmandān Abu 'l-Haidj ṭ fled to Malatya before the Miṣrān Mānṣūr b. Lūlū, where the emperor appointed him magistros (Rosen, ref. cit., p. 51; Schlimmerger, ii. 442).

The most important event during the Byzantine occupation of Malatya was the invasion of the Turks. Their first inroad into the area of the town was in 1058; the inhabitants fled before them mainly into the adjoining mountains where they perished of hunger and cold. The Turkish force 3,000 strong under the amīr Abū Dinār remained 10 days pillaging Malatya and laid the country waste for a day's journey round. On their retreat the Turks were surprised by the people of the Armenian district of Sansun (Arab, al-Sansūn; now: Sāṣān) and all slain, with the assistance of the prisoners and fugitives from Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 158 sq.), according to whose erroneous chronology these incidents took place in the 9th or in the last year of Constantine IX [i.e. 1050–1051 or 1054–1055]; Matthias of Edessa, transl. Duhaur, p. 107–109; Aristakēs Lastivei, in Tomaschek, Sasan u. das Ouestengebiet des Tigris, S. B. Ab. Wien, cccxiii., vol. iv., 1895, p. 29 sq.). One of the prisoners who survived, the Syrian monk Joseph, wrote three mnāmō on these events; the patriarch Yōhanān X bar Shēshāḥ also composed 4 mnāmō on the devastation of Malatya (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 291 sq.). By the time of the Emperor Isaac I (1057–1059) we again find the Turks raiding the territory of Malatya and carrying off prisoners from it. His successor Constantine X Ducas (1059–1067) restored the two walls and the ditch at Malatya (probably in 1060–1061). When the imperial decree regarding this was published, a number of citizens of Malatya, who were in Constantinople returned home and arranged for a large number of workmen and builders to be brought from Asia Minor and Anjūkaya; in a very short time owing to the continual threat to the town, the fortifications were rebuilt on the old foundations (Michael Syrus, iii. 165 sq.). The Byzantine ūstānūrū Kinoites was afterwards killed with his wife and children and the town "henceforth knew no peace" (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.).

These constant invasions of the Turks, which specially affected the region of Malatya (Skyltizes in the ed. of Kedrenos, Bonn, ii. 660 sq.) met with very little opposition. Then the legions quartered around Malatya, whose pay and provisions had been withheld, refused to cross the Euphrates to meet the enemy along with the local volunteers. The Turks did not besiege the town but went on to attack Kūshāriya, which they stormed (Skyltizes, loc. cit.). When Romanus IV Diogenes attacked the Turks in 1068 he sent a general from Gökṣun, perhaps as Giūer suggests (Byz. Gesch. iii. 720), the Bulgar Alūbān, to Malatya to guard the frontier against the raids of the Turk Afšin (Afsāne). The general however did not leave Malatya so that Afšin was able to advance against the emperor undisturbed (Skyltizes in Kedrenos, ed. Bonn, ii. 671; Welh, op. cit., iii. 112, note 2). In the same year the emperor appointed the
succeeded in conquering Abulustain, the district on the Djiānān and the whole country round Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 193). The Atabeg of the Sultan of Malatya (probably Bālāk), in 1111 again deprived him of his lands on the Djiānān. Kīffīddj Arslān's widow left Malatya to marry the doughty amir Bālāk (Michael Syrus, iii. 200). A Turkish cavalry leader offered to sell Tughrīl Arslān the mother of Ziyād when the young sultan of Malatya wanted to take possession of it; however, it was taken from him by the son of the sultan of Khurāsān without a blow being struck. On the 11th March 1118 the amir Manguđān of Kamak pillaged the country round Malatya; the Khāṭīl of Malatya thereupon turned to Joselin of Edessa for help (Michael Syrus, iii. 204). In the following year the Sultan of Malatya conquered Abulustain and the lands on the Djiānān; the region of Kaṭīfā passed as a gift to Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 205). Tughrīl Arslān owed his success to the governor Bālāk, who advanced as far as Kamak, defeated the Greeks with the help of al-Ṣaḥābī b. Qāsim, and the Djiānān, again had been given in marriage to Baldwin of Edessa, summoned the Franks to his assistance (Michael Syrus, iii. 187, 192; Will of Tyre, xii. 4). When Gūmūṣhtaqān besieged the town and laid waste the country around, Bōmūnd came from Anfājīkā with his relative Riccardo del Principato and a troop of cavalry, but he was ambushed at Marāsh and sent a prisoner to Nīkār (or Swās) in June 1100. From there he appealed for help to Baldwin of Edessa who relieved Malatya and pursued Gūmūṣhtaqān for 3 days without overtaking him. He then returned to Edessa via Malatya which Gabriel surrendered to him and left 50 housemen for its protection. Gūmūṣhtaqān appeared before Malatya again in 1100, where Gabriel had in the meantime made himself so detested by the inhabitants that they handed him over to Gūmūṣhtaqān, who thereupon entered Malatya on Sept. 18, 1101 (Michael Syrus, iii. 188; Recueil. Hist. Or. Crois., i. 5, 203; iii. 522, 526; Mathias of Edessa, trans. Dulaurier, p. 230). The dynasty of the Djiānānids [q. v.] thus came to rule there (on them cf. also van Berchem-Kh. Ethem, C. I., iii., p. 2, note 3; p. 3, note 1; Zambar, Manuel d. Geniot. et de Chronol., Hanover 1927, p. 146 sq.). At the suggestion of the Emperor Alexios, Gūmūṣhtaqān in the summer of 1103 released Bōmūnd, who had been brought to Malatya, on payment of 100,000 dinars (Michael Syrus, iii. 189; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kreuzer. Jermuel., p. 45). According to Michael Syrus (iii. 192), Taḵnūkīn i.e. Gūmūṣhtaqān b. Djiānān died within two years of the taking of Malatya (i.e. 1103—1104); he was succeeded by his son Aḡūsān (Yaghībīsān). Kīffīddj Arslān again began the siege of Malatya on June 28 and directed siege-artillery against the round N.E. tower of the town, which had to surrender after several onslaughts had been made on it. Kīffīddj Arslān I began his rule in Hezoum as co-Prince of it in 1094. The very next year in the battle on the Khābūr, he was succeeded in Malatya by his youngest son Tughrīl Arslān, in whose reign much evil fell upon the town as a result of the murder of the governor Fīzīmīš (Michael Syrus, iii. 194). During the fighting among the other sons of Kīffīddj Arslān, of whom Maṣʿūd sought refuge in Malatya about 1107 (Rec. Hist. Or. Crois., iii. 534) Bōmūnd
plotted against his life (Michael Syrus, iii. 305 sq.).

Maiden again (July 23, 1152) tried without success to
take the town. Dhu ʿl-Karnain was succeeded in
October 1162 by his minor son Naṣīr al-Dīn
Muhammad (Muḥammad) who made himself so detested
by his excesses that he had to leave Malātya (1170).
His place was taken by his brother Abu ʿl-Ḡāsim
(Fakhr ʿal-Dīn Ṣāʾīn; Michael Syrus, iii. 336 sq.).
In May 1172 when, 15, he married the daughter
of the lord of Ḥisn Ziyād. During the wedding
festivities he fell from his horse while jouusting and
died of his injuries (Michael Syrus, iii. 343). He
was succeeded by his younger brother Ferdīn
(Ferdūn) who had to marry the princess intended
for the brother. On the news of these happenings,
Kīldīj Arslān II attacked Malātya, where however
preparations were rapidly made for the defence
under the direction of the enmich Saʿd al-Dīn.
Kīldīj Arslān had to withdraw but carried off with
him 30,000 prisoners from the country round
(Michael Syrus, iii. 346). On Feb. 15, 1175, Ferdīn
was murdered by his brother Muhammad, who after
many adventures had returned in disguise to Malātya
by a secret agreement with the princess of Ziyād
whom he had left behind him at Michael Syrus, iii.
362–364). When Kīldīj Arslān II thereupon again
besieged Malātya, the discontent with Muhammad
was so great that he no longer felt safe in the
town but withdrew to Ḥisn Ziyād. Kīldīj Arslān
after a four months’ siege entered Malātya on Oct.
25, 1175 (Michael Syrus, iii. 373). He repaired the
two walls of the town (Michael Syrus, iii. 388).
The Turkomans, who since 1158 had been ravaging
wide tracts of Asia Minor also invaded and plundered
the district of Malātya (Michael Syrus, iii.
402). In 1189 (Michael Syrus; 1191 according to
Arabic sources) Kīldīj Arslān gave the town of Malātya
to his son Muʿīz al-Dīn Kaṣar Shāh
56; iii. 269). Kīldīj Arslān later found himself
forced to hand Malātya over to his other son Kaṭh
al-Dīn Malik Shāh; but Muʿīz al-Dīn went to
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (580 = 1191–1192) and regained his
position with his help (Rec. Hist. Ort. Crest., i.
57, 68 sq.; iii. 269; v. 44).

To strengthen the alliance he married the daughter
of Malik al-ʿAdil and accompanied Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s
117). In June 1200 Rukn al-Dīn Sulṭān of Dūkāt (Ṭūğāt)
deprecated his brother Muʿīz al-Dīn of Malātya;
the latter fled to his father-in-law Malik al-ʿAdil
(Barhebraeus, Chron. Sivrit, ed. Beijan, p. 406;
al-Zahir, who had only Sumaiʿa-al of his inher-
tance, submitted in 1207 to Rukn al-Dīn and of Malātya and
Konya (Barhebraeus, Chron. Sivrit., p. 408). In the next year Rukn al-Dīn took An-
gora; a few days later he died (Barhebraeus, p. 418 sq.).
He was succeeded by his young son Kīldīj
Arslān III, who was however soon thrown into
prison by Ḡūṣūlf al-Dīn Kāṭh-Khusraw I (Bar-
hebraeus, p. 419). After the latter (d. 1205) came
his son ʿĪz al-Dīn Kāṭh-Kāwā, who, while on
a campaign against Malik al-ʿAṣraf in Malātya
developed consumption from which he died on
his return (Barhebraeus, p. 437; Rec. Hist. Ort. Crest.,
i. 150 sq.). In the reign of his successor ʿAlī al-
Dīn Kāṭh-Kābūd, the Tupars in 1231 penetrated to
Ḥisn Ziyād and to the Ephrathes near Malātya (Barhebraeus,
p. 463). ʿAlī al-Dīn took Kāṭh from Malik al-ʿAṣraf in 1232. When in the next year
the latter along with his brother Malik al-Kāmīl
of Egypt occupied Ḥisn Mansūr, ʿAlī al-Dīn
collected an army of over 100,000 men, took Ḥisn
Ziyād (Barhebraeus, p. 467) and besieged al-Ruḥān
in the following year; the inhabitants of Ḥarrān
fearing an attack on Malātya sent him the keys
of their town (Barhebraeus, p. 468; Kāmil al-Dīn,
Kāṭh-Khusraw II (1237–1245) at the beginning
of his reign drove the Kāṭhī-Bīšārīs out of his
kingdom on their retreat they defeated the com-
mander (Sūlāhī) of Malātya Saʿīf al-Dawla and
crossed the Ephrathes at Masār (var. Muṣṭaṭ)
(Barhebraeus, p. 471). In 1241, the amir of Malātya
again suffered an annihilating defeat from fanatical
Turkoman hordes under the prophet Pāṭāb (Bābā)
(Barhebraeus, p. 474). When the news of
the victory of the Tupars at Kūzā-Dāgh (1243; Bar-
hebraeus, p. 475) reached Malātya, the Sūlāhī Rashīd
al-Dīn and the other court officials broke into
the royal treasury, shared the treasure among
themselves, and fled to Ḥalab. Many prominent citizens
followed them; but they were surprised by the
Tupars on the hill of Bīshāl on a day’s journey
from Malātya and some slain, some taken
prisoners. The inhabitants of the town, Muslims and Christians,
asked the Metropolitan Mār Dīniosios ʿAnġūr to
direct the defence of the town. After two months
during which Malātya was watchfully defended,
the Tupars withdrew. In 1244 the Tupar chief
Hūssār (var. Nasāwūr) Nuyin besieged Malātya and
ravaged the country round until Rashād al-Dīn
caused him to retreat by rich presents (Barhebraeus,
p. 477–479). After the division of the Sālāḥ
empire by Hūshār, there ruled at first ʿĪz al-Dīn
at Malātya; then, after his dethronement, his brother
Rukn al-Dīn (Barhebraeus, p. 482). At the end of
649 (1251–1252) and in July 650 (1252–1253),
the Tupars again besieged the town under Iṣāwūr
and wasted its surroundings (Barhebraeus, p. 491).
When in 1257 ʿĪz al-Dīn sent al-Tughr Ḥaṭā
into the district of Malātya to seek recruits and
the latter allotted the town to the Kurd chief
Ṣahrāf al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Bīhā; the inhabitants
would not have him because they had sworn fealty to Rukn
al-Dīn and feared his Tupar patron Bāḏīj. It was
not till ʿĪz al-Dīn had sent a second envoy, Bīhā-
ār, that the Tupars consented to admit him into the town;
the latter soon fled again before Bāḏīj and only
returned when he had gone, but again found the
gates closed against him and was only admitted
after famine had broken out in Malātya as a result of his
siege (Barhebraeus, p. 498–500). In 1260 Hūshār built bridges over the Ephrathes
for his vast host at Malātya, Kālʿar al-Rūm al-Bīra
and Kāršīya (Barhebraeus, p. 505). The Egyptian
ruler of al-Bīra Ḥīdar (Kāhīr) in 1282 laid
waste the country round Malātya (Barhebraeus,
p. 546).
The Mongol Khūz Āḫū (1265–1282) again
divided the kingdom of Rūm between two Sālāḏūk
consuls of whom Masʿūd received Artūḏān, Siwās
and Malātya.

In the 11th and 12th century lived the two
great Syriac historians, both born in Malātya, to
whose chronicles we mainly owe our knowledge
of the history of the town: the patriarch Michael I
(1126–99); son of the priest Eliya, who belonged
to the family of Kīndast in Malātya and
the Mār ʿīyān Gregor Abū ʿl-ʿAbārī called Barhebraeus
(1265–86; q.v.), whose father, the baptised
Jewish physician Ahrón had restrained his fellow citizens in Malatya from stupidly flying before the Tatars (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 298—300, 312—20). Michael's principal authority, Ignatio (d. 1104), was also metropolitan of Malatya (Baumstark, op. cit., p. 291).

The increasing weakness of the Seldjûks about 1300 favoured the formation of local Turkomon and Armenian petty states, especially in the east of Asia Minor. According to Abu l-Fida', Christians and Muslims in Malatya in those days lived on the best of terms with one another; the town was the side of the Tatars and informed them of every thing that went on in the country. During his war against the Tatars, Sultan Malik al-Nâsîr in 715 (1315) decided to send a large army under the nâṣib of Damascus, Saif al-Din Tunguz who was joined by his vassal Abu l-Fida' of Hamat, against Malatya. The army went by Halab, Ain'atâb, Hissân Masûr and Zibatra to Malatya and encamped before the town on April 28. The inhabitants sent their lâkim Djamâl al-Din al-Khîdr, whose father and grandfather had filled the same office in their time, through the south gate, Bâb al-Khâtî, to Tunguz, who was willing to afford them protection and security, if they surrendered the town. But he was unwilling to let the soldiers could not be restrained from plundering and ravaging in the town. Among the prisoners was the Tarâb Ibn Kerbâghâ and the nårîl of Hissân Arkanâ, Shâhîd Minârû. The greater part of the town was finally burned down (Abu l-Fida', Annales Musulm., ed. Reiske, v. 286—92; ed. Stambul 1286, iv. 77 sq.; transl. also in Rec. hist. or., creis., i. 180; Wel, Gesch. d. Chalif., iii. 310 sq.). The Sultan made the territory of Malatya a separate frontier province, which included seven districts (Khâlîl al-Khîdr, Zâbdat, ed. Ravaisse, p. 52). There were seven citadels around the town: Mûshar or Mînshret, Kûni, Kârahâshîr, Kaddarî, Kâlîf al-Aqâdia, Kâlîf al-Nawhamûs (?) and Kâlîf al-Akrîd (Khâlîl, op. cit.; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Le Syrie à l'Époque des Mamelouks, p. 97, i. 105).

Malatya for the next few decades belonged to the Mamlûk Sûlûns. As their remotest province, it was with Halab in 791 (1289) the scene of a great rebellion led by the governors Minsharî and Yelbogîhâ against Barkîq [q. v.]. About this time the Turkish family of the Dhû l-Kadrogîhâ [q. v.] began to rise to power in the region of Malatya and Albitân where they ruled till 1515 under Egyptian suzerainty. About 794 (1391/2) Hayyân I conquered the town and in 1400/1 Timur. By the battle of Kök Hüşür (1516) it fell into the hands of Selim I, who destroyed the Dhû l-Kadrogîhâ. This was the cause of his wars against Egypt, which was rapidly decided on the field of Mardj Dabiq. At a later date the eyalet to which the Sandjak of Malatya belonged was still called Dhû l-Kadrogîhâ; Malatya now forms a sandjak of the vilâyet of Ma'mûret al-Azîz (Khârîfît).

The town in 1383 was the headquarters of the Sereşker Hasan Pasha, with whom Molîke was attached. It is said to have suffered much at the hands of the troops quartered there for months before the battle of Nizib. After the earthquake of 1393 Malatya was rebuilt on the site of the suburb of Ashûra, one of the older sites now called Eski-Shehr, but the old town continued to be inhabited. It has now about 30,000 inhabitants, including many Armenians, Kurds and Kârîbîsh.


**MALAY PENINSULA** is a name sometimes rather loosely applied to the whole tract of land south of the Isthmus of Kra (Lat. 10° N.); but so far as the Northern part of this tract is concerned the name is a misnomer, the bulk of the population there being Siamese and Chinese, not Malay. Excluding from the total Malay population of Siam [q. v.] as a whole some 50,000 Malays scattered in Ayuthya, Bangkok, Chattabun and the rest of the Eastern shore of the Gulf of Siam, the remaining 350,000 are in Southern Siam and mainly in the parts South of Kra. But it is not till about 1 lat. 7° N. that one meets with districts where the majority of the inhabitants are Malays, viz. on the West coast of Peninsula and on the East coast the province of Patani (formerly an important Malay state, finally conquered by Siam in 1832). Of the approximate total population of 370,000 in these three districts the greater part consists of Malays. The Southern boundary of Siam, running irregularly between 6° 45' and 5° 45' N., separates them from the rest of the Peninsula, which is attached to the British Empire and with which we are here concerned. The area of this latter portion is about 52,500 English square miles.

The geological structure of the Peninsula includes calcareous rocks and limestone, schists, slates, quartzite, volcanic rocks, granite, alluvial deposits, and the ferruginous substance known as laterite. The most important minerals are tin and tungsten. The former has been exported for more
than a thousand years and is still a very important product.

Until about fifty years ago the rivers, though mostly small and only navigable for small craft, were the chief and almost the sole means of access to the interior, which was then an almost trackless forest of luxuriant vegetation, traversed by a number of mountain ranges, some running roughly north and south, others transversely or irregularly. A few of the highest points exceed 7,000 feet (roughly 2,100 metres). At sea-level the average temperature is about 82°F. (about 27°C) with a daily and annual variation of not more than about 10°F. (about 4.5°C) in each direction; the annual rainfall varies locally from about 60 inches (about 150 cm.) to four times that amount. The N.E. and S.W. monsoons prevail, but are subject to periods of slight or variable wind. The climatic conditions are therefore very favourable to the main staples of native agriculture, viz.: rice, coconuts and miscellaneous local fruits; to these, foreigners have added the cultivation of other products, such as tapioca and coffee (now almost abandoned) and especially Para rubber, in the cultivation of which the Peninsula has led the way. The economic development of the Peninsula may be said to date from the institution of the Residency system in three of the Western states in 1874, which led progressively to the making of a network of excellent roads and a State railway system now comprising a trunk line from Singapore to the western part of the boundary with Suma, where it links with the Siamese system, and a number of branches, one of which turning northward through the centre of the Peninsula is destined to join the same railway at a point near the eastern end of the frontier.

From the administrative point of view, the British portion of the Peninsula falls into: 1. the British colony styled the Straits Settlements (which is an abbreviation of "British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca"), comprising the three "settlements" or divisions of Singapore, Penang and Malacca: 2. the Federated Malay States, viz. Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, on the West coast and Pahang on the East coast, which are united in an administrative union under a Chief Secretary to Government at Kuala Lumpur (in Selangor) and 3. the Unfederated Malay States, viz. in the extreme North and on the West coast, Perlis and Kedah, and on the East coast, Kelantan and Trengganu, and in the extreme South Johore, Administratively the Island of Labuan off the coast of North Borneo, and the Celebes-Keeling Islands and Christmas Island to the South-West of Java form part of the "settlements" of Singapore; and the State of Brunei (Brunei) in Borneo is an unfederated Malay State ranking with those of the Peninsula.

The Colony has the usual administrative machinery, consisting of a Governor (who is also the High Commissioner for the Malay States), together with executive and legislative councils, and a Court of Final Appeal. Each of the Malay States has a Malay ruler, who usually bears the title of Sultan, and also a British official, styled in the Federated Malay States the British Resident and in the unfederated ones British Advisor or General Advisor, and a State Council. For the Federated States there is in addition a Federal Council and a Judicial Commission. In these states the chief administrative departments are federalized under federal heads, and in one or two cases (such as Education) are linked up with the corresponding department in the Colony. Both the Colony and the States are divided into administrative districts, and the officials in charge of such districts in the Colony and Federated States are mainly Europeans. The same applies to the heads of the principal departments of Government. Many of their assistants are also European. In the unfederated States the administrative machinery is not so Incorporated: the proportion of Europeans is smaller. Government schools have been established in the principal villages and give elementary instruction exclusively through the medium of Malay. In towns there are also higher schools, supported but not founded or managed, by Government, which give instruction through the medium of English. The college at Kuala Kangsar, which is bilingual, is mainly for the sons of Malay rajas and chiefs though others are admitted. Female education has developed more slowly but is gaining ground.

The ancient history of the Peninsula is obscure. Palaeolithic and neolithic implements have been found in various places. The population of the Peninsula amounted in 1921 to about one per cent. of the total population, comprise in the extreme North a few thousand woolly-haired Negritos, generally termed Siames, in the centre a much larger number of wavy-haired light brown people known as Sakai, and in the South mostly straight-haired people of the Indonesian type, often referred to as Jakun. The first two groups and a portion of the third speak languages containing a strong Mon-Khmer element, the remaining Jakun speak Malay dialects with some alien admixture. From about the 17th century A.D. Sanskrit inscriptions on stone found in Kedah and Province Wellesley (opposite Penang) attest the presence of Buddhists using a South Indian script. An inscription of 775 originally set up at Ligur (Nakhon Sri Dhammaraj) about Lat. 8° N. indicates that before that date certain points on the isthmus were held by the Saliendra kings of Sri Vijaya (Palembang in Southern Sumatra), who controlled the trade route through the Straits and across the isthmus probably till near the end of the 12th century. It would appear from a notice in the History of the Liang dynasty of China (502-556 A.D.), Book 54, that this isthmus had formerly been controlled by the state of Fuman, which centred round the mouths and lower course of the Mekong river. An inscription found at Chaiya (Jaya, near Lat. 10° N.) and probably dated 1783 gives the king who presumably set it up a princely title which points to the Malay region of Southern Sumatra, adjoining Sri Vijaya to the North-West. Another inscription of Chaiya dated 1230 was set up by the local king Candrabahnu who according to the Mahavamsa and other sources raided Ceylon on two occasions (probably about 1235 and 1250) with his "Javakar" (i.e. Malay) forces.

It is plain, therefore, that between the eighth and the ninth centuries the settlement of the Peninsula by Malays from Sumatra had been going on. A few years later, but before 1280, the Siamese from Sukhothai (Sukhodhata) put an end to Malay rule in Ligur, thus beginning the extension of Siamese influence to the southward. In the Javanese poem Nagarakretagama (1365) a
number of places on both coasts, from Kedah and Sai (in the old Patani state) in the North to Singapore [q.v.] in the South are claimed as vassals of the Javanese empire of Majapahit. In the same century, but at a date which cannot be precisely fixed owing to the fragmentary condition of the record, the earliest Malay inscription in the Arabic character as yet discovered makes it plain that Islam had recently become the state religion of Trêngganu. In the xvi\textsuperscript{th} century Islam was being spread in the Peninsula under the influence of the most important state, Malacca [q.v.]; and after its fall in 1511 at the hands of the Portuguese its dynasty continued to rule in the extreme South (Johor) and neighbouring islands, while another branch held Perak, and Perak eventually came into the hands of a family claiming to descend from the senior line of the same stock. In or before the xvi\textsuperscript{th} century an immigration of Minangkabau settlers from Sumatra founded a number of small states inland of Malacca, which all eventually admitted the suzerainty of Johor, save the southernmost, Nanning, which was in theory at any rate a subordinate ally of the Peninsula. In the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century the Chinese raided Kedah, Perak, Johor, etc., and for a number of years exercised some sort of suzerainty over Perak. Meanwhile the Northern states came intermittently under Siamese influence, which varied with the strength of that power but retained the character of an external suzerainty till Kedah in 1821 and Patani in 1832 (this last finally) were conquered by Siam.

The Dutch tenure of Malacca (1641–1795), while it controlled to some extent the external trade of the Malay states, did not interfere with their internal affairs. In the eighteenth century Bugis adventurers settled in the Klau-Lingga Archipelago and made their influence felt on the mainland, ultimately establishing the new state of Selangor under a still ruling Bugis dynasty. British influence dates from the founding of Penang (1786), which was followed by a temporary occupation of Malacca (1795–1818), its final cession in 1824, the founding of Singapore (1819), and the incorporation of all three settlements in one government (1826), which in 1867 was transferred from the control of India to that of the Colonial Office. The policy of non-interference with the Malay states was maintained until long continued disturbances in Perak, Selangor, and Sungai Ujong (part of Negri Sembilan), due to Malay dynastic quarrels and civil war between unruly gangs of Chinese tin-miners, coupled with an increase of piracy in the Straits, led in 1874 to the inauguration of the Resident System. This ultimately developed into the present system whereby since 1895 Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang form a federation administered under the direction of British officials. Perlis, Kedah, Trengganu and Patani were ceded by Siam in 1909 in return for certain concessions, one of which was the abolition of the extra-territorial privileges of British subjects.

The population in 1921 of the part of the Peninsula and adjacent islands under British administration was about 1,325,000, nearly half being immigrants, mainly Chinese, and to a less extent Indians, among whom males predominated very considerably. The great bulk of the native-born population consisted of Malays, and the total number of Malays, properly so-called (including, however, something like 100,000 persons of Minangkabau descent in Negri Sembilan and Malacca) numbered 1,418,198. The other Muslim Indonesians amounted to 171,315 (including 112,775 Javanese. 37,848 Banjarese, 9,772 Boyanese, 8,388 Bugis, 727 Achinese, 850 Korinchi, and 946 Mendeling). The 47,465 non-Indonesian Muslims comprised 41,337 Indians, 4,315 Arabs, 1,800 Chinese, and a few Persians and Turks; the total Muslim population was 1,636,978, the great majority being Sunnis of the school of Sh\textsuperscript{a}fi. Of the non-Muslim population roughly three-quarters were Chinese and about one-quarter Indians but there were also 32,448 so-called aborigines of the Peninsula (a few of whom may, however, have been converts to Islam), 18,178 Siamese, 14,583 Europeans (mostly British, but including Continental Europeans and Americans of European descent), 12,629 Eurasians, 6,989 Japanese, and 2,215 Sinhalese, besides several smaller communities.


MALAYS. People. In this article only the Islamic features of the Malay nation will be dealt with, so neither ethnographical nor anthropological questions will be discussed. It may be sufficient to say that the Malays originally — we do not venture to say: as autochthons — were established in the middle part of Sumatra, especially in Palembang, and spread over the eastern and northern part of that huge island, and settled in the Straits, mainly in Malacca [see MALAY PENINSULA], and founded colonies in Bornoe, along the great rivers, and elsewhere eastward. They belong to the widely dispersed Polynesian (or Indonesian) race, whose languages extend from Madagascar to the Philippines and from the peninsula of the utmost S.E. point of Asia to the remoter islands of Micronesia and Melanesia in the Pacific. The Malay chronicles, for the greater part mythical, and a few epigraphical data, make it clear that there was a highly cultivated Hinduised Malay kingdom in Palumbang, the seafaring people of which went over to several adjacent and more distant countries; it was along the way of commerce that they carried the Malay language to sundry ports and lands. It is not exactly known in what century Islam swept away Hinduism, but it is a fact that the new religion on its arrival in the Straits found Malay people settled in the Peninsula and the Malay language introduced there as the generally adopted speech of commerce and political intercourse.
Language. It is due to Islam that Malay, being already a language enriched with many Sanskrit words, became an idiom of very mixed lexicographical character. The Islamic current brought words of Tamil origin, innumerable Arabic words, some of them in Delicised or Persian-like garb, many Persian words, some of them with Indian characteristics, and a small quantity of Hindustani vocables. In that heterogeneous form Malay became the vehicular language of the new religion. Undoubtedly it had found its way already to the most visited ports in the Archipelago in a simplified form fit for intercourse with all kinds of natives and foreign merchants, later also with European, namely Portuguese and Dutch captains and ambassadors. It was Islam that gave Malay a literary character, and when it had established itself as a medium into which innumerable Arabic books were translated, its form became crystallised and its orthography was fixed systematically. That uniformity made it the appropriate language for literary and liturgical purposes and also a kawi for dogmatists and mysticism, as well as romantic and historical literature. It has to be borne in mind that there is a great difference between the patois or langacce heard in most of the sea-ports, and the cultivated literary language, which became highly developed in Malacca, once the seat of a Muhammadan court and a royal library. When Arabic and Indian learned men came to Acheh, they discussed theological questions in Malay and even wrote books in that language. The literary form is sustained uniformly to the present day, literary products being written in archaistic formulae, and the colloquial style being used in different parts of the Archipelago, the purest in Johore and Malaya in general and the East-coast-districts of Sumatra; the latter being pure in Java and more eastern islands. In the Moluccas, especially in Ambon (Amboyn), the preaching of Christianity availed itself of Malay; in those islands this language has therefore assumed an individual character. As to its linguistic character, it may suffice to notice that Malay, like all Polynesian languages, belongs to the agglutinative type, declension not existing, conjugation being limited within narrow bounds, and amplification of the mainly disyllabic stems with a quantity of prexes, infixes and suffixes giving opportunity of forming words for almost all grammatical and logical relations. There are some traces of the influence of Arabic grammar on Malay syntax, but on the whole the Muhammadan current has not essentially altered the character of the language; it has only enriched it with an enormous number of words, and given to its written literature an individual Islamic character.

Literature. Of pre-Islamic literature nothing is known A far as may be concluded from a few old mss. in Hindu script, it seems that Malay was written in Kawi-like characters, but literature, in its earliest known form, written in Arabic lettering only. The oldest manuscripts are preserved in the Cambridge and Oxford libraries, they date from the last years of the xvth and the first decades of the xvith century. The only literary-historical evidence of the exisence of written literature in the xvith century is the mention, in a xvith century chronicle, of the use made of a royal library in Malacca at the time when the Portuguese endeavoured to capture that town (1511). Malay literature, as it presents itself now, is only for a very small part original. Hardy any of the chronicles, tales and poems are derived from Arabic sources directly, most of the religious and semi-historical romances having been translated from Persian, but all these literary products are imbued with the Muslim atmosphere, being full of Arabic words and phrases, and ladeen with Islamic theory. There are, it is true, some indigenous farcical tales, and some fables, especially the sometime highly appreciated mouse-deer-tales, moreover some original romances with Hinduistic influences, and several adapted old Javanese tales, that do not betray real Islamic influence, but the very fact that all these books are written in Arabic characters makes them overfull with Arabic words, and in that way shows that they belong to Islamic mentality. In this short account there will be no mention of literary products going back to the great Sanskrit epic poems, nor of the tales that do not show traces of Muslim influence; only in so far as Malay literature has Islamic features, will it be treated here. The originally genuine Indonesian deer-fable has undergone an Islamic correction. The historical writings, more or less mythical and semi-romantic, are almost absolutely Islamised. To that class of works the chronicle Syarik Murb, and other tales, as the chronicles of Kutawaringin, Kutsa, Acheh and Pasai are to be reckoned, no partly historical, but for the greater part fictitious, romance is the Hibayat Hang Tuah. A host of romances, dealing with foreign princes and princesses and their endless adventures, has been spread over a great part of the Malay-reading East-Indian World; the titles of all those popular, but for European readers less attractive, books, may be found in the catalogues of Malay manuscripts at Leyden, Batavia and London. Some books of fiction have been translated from Persian, Arabic or Hindustani. A group of them is to be traced to the Hiwarada-collection, another one to the Tuti-nama-series, a third one to the Bakhithar cyclce. By way of exception foreign authors have written in Malay; e.g. the Radjput Nur al-Din al-Raniri [q.v.], who wrote a great encyclopaedic chronicle at the instigation of an Achehnese queen. A very great number of texts deals with the old prophets, the Prophet Muhammad, his family and friends. Those works, like e.g. the romances of Amir Hamza and Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya, have Persian originals. The purely religious books cannot be regarded as Malay literature.

Poetical literature has a different character. The real Malay kind of poetry, though not devoid of Persian influences, is the pantun, i.e. popular quatrains, whose first two lines deal with a natural fact, or a well known event, and are intended to prelude, phonetically, the 3rd and 4th lines, that contain the real meaning of the usually erotic poem. The other "genre" is the shair, its form is the stanza of four rhyming lines. Some of these very extensive overloaded poems are from the Javanese, some others are versified versions of prose romances; moreover historical events, love-scenes, religious matters, mystical speculations etc. are dealt with in innumerable shairs, the titles of which may be seen in the following catalogues: Leyden Univ. Library, by H. H. Juyboll; Supplement thereto by Ph. S. van Ronkel; Batavia, the Hague and Brussels by the same; London (R.A.S.) and ibidem E. I. H. (India Office Library) by H. N. van der Tuuk.
MALAYSIA — MALÄZGERD

MALÄZGERD, district (Kağız) and town in Armenia, to the North of the lake of Wan. Of the name, there occur, in old-Armenian, the forms Manavazkert, Manavazkert and Manazkert. The middle-Armenian and Byzantine forms, Mandzgerd and Manavgüpert resp. as well as the Arabic form Manakard, belong to the same root as the original form, Manavazakert representing a popular etymological formation, from the name of the noble family of the Manavazen's, which, in old times, resided in the district. For it is phonetically impossible, that an old-Armenian form Manavazakert should regularly becomes Manazkert. This is the theory of Hubbschmann, who admits however the possibility, that an earlier Manavazakert may have been arbitrarily shortened in pronunciation, so as to become Manazkert, the word being otherwise too long. Welt Belcek has conjectured, that in the first part of the word, there may be hidden the name of the Urartæic (pre-Aramaic) word *Manaz* or *Manavaz*-kert. This conjecture is based on the fact, that an inscription of Menuas it appears, that this king founded a city, which was called Menaza('ina (== Menas-town); thus it would, according to Belcek, be very probable, that Malazgerd, in whose environs there have been found many inscriptions of Menuas, was this very town, named after him. If such be the case, then the old-Armenian form Manazkert must have originated from a later, popular etymology. From the fact, that names of towns formed with -kert (== -kar(t)a) seem to have originated not before the Parthian epoch, as Houbenschmann observes, it would follow, that the memory of the old king Menaza, or *Manaz* was still alive in late Parthian times. This difficulty, however, is not insoluble, for it seems, that the name of another Urartæic king of Wan may also survive in classical Armenian quasi-historical tradition as Aram.

The oldest and best Arabic spelling of the name of the town is Manadžor, with n; the forms with f are later, and on them is based the modern name (Malazgerd). The spelling with n we find e.g. in al-Iṣṭakhrī; Yāṣūṭ; the author edited by Houtsma in Rec. des textes reli. à l'hist. des Selçoukides, ii.; al-Nasawi (ed. Houdas); in a varia lectio of the text of the Rāḥūṭ al-Siddî (c.M.S., New Series, i. 119); and in the text quoted by al-Maqrīzī, pp. 576. The spelling with f, common in later texts, occurs, among others, in al-Mukaddasi; Ibn al-Athir; the Rāḥūṭ al-Siddî (the reading adopted by the editor); Dhuwain, and the Nuzhat al-Kiflîb. The terminations -gird and -kird also alternate in the spelling; this variation is already noted by Yāṣūṭ (Mīḍyam, iv. 648). As regards the form Manazav, cited by Marquardt (Einschr. p. 162) from Thomas Arruri, cf. Houbenschmann, Die alt-armenischen Ortnamen (in Idg. Forschungen, xvi.), p. 450.

For the year 1298 the number of inhabitants of the district Malazgerd is given as 21,000, viz. 12,000 Kurds, and the rest Armenians. The district belonged to the vilayet Bûlûs, sandjak Mûsh. In this hilly country, the highest elevation is the Sipan-Dagh (3,000 m.); perhaps the same mount as the Sengi Safid, which is, according to Yāṣūṭ (Mīḍyam, iii. 168), a mountain in these regions. The soil of the district is fertile; its main products are wheat, barley, mellet, lentils and peas, which are also exported, as are also sheep and horses, e.g. to Diyarbekr. The region of Malazgerd produces also salt and mineral stone, which becomes hard when brought to the day light. Its wild animals are the wolf, the fox and the stone-marten, which is hunted for its fur. Textiles are manufactured in and exported from the district.

The town of Malazgerd is situated on a tributary of the Murd Şu, called the Tuzl Şu; Hâddûji Khâlif (Zîkîn-numa, p. 426) reckons 2 marhafta between Malazgerd and Erzerum. The town lies, moreover, on the way from Siwâs to Arslâch, and also at the crossing of the two different ways, which connect Mûsh and Bayazed. The city it surrounded by a high wall and towers; at the East of the town there is the citadel, built from black volcanic stone. In the 16th (xviith) century, Malazgerd had a triple wall, and it was well furnished with drinking water from within (Cedrenus, ed. Bonn, ii. 590). More than one fruitless siege of this place is recorded in its history.

Belcek supposes, that the well-known battle between the Assyrian king Tigrathpîlesar I against the allied Nuri-kings took place in the plain of Malazgerd (Z.D.M.G., li. 510). If, at that remote time, the town of Malazgerd existed already, is not certain. That it existed in the time of the Urartæic kingdom Menuas, who, as Belcek thinks, gave his name to the town, is made probable by an inscription of that prince, from which it would appear, that he rebuilt an older citadel and an older palace on that place. The environs of the modern city of Malazgerd are remarkably rich in cuneiform inscriptions, which were discovered by Lehmann and Belcek during their stay there. They found an Assyrian inscription of Tigrathpîlesar I and several Urartæic inscriptions, among others, of Menuas (= 800 b. c.) and Arдейtis ii (114—ca. 690 b. c.). It appears from these documents, that Menuas devoted great attention to the irrigation of the land, by constructing several canals.

In the early Middle-ages, the town of Malazgerd (Manazkert), lying on the confines of the cantons Harkh and Apahunik, was sometimes assigned to the former, sometimes to the latter. That in old-Armenian times here resided the family of the Menuasen's, has already been remarked. For these matters, and also for the quotations from Byzantine and Armenian authorities regarding them, cf. Houbenschmann, Die alt-armenischen Ortnamen, p. 325, 330, 449 sq.

Malazgerd belonged, since the beginning of their dynasty, to the realm of the Bagratides of Armenia, who allowed it to be ruled, as well as Khilâj, Ardiq and *Perkri* (= Bergêri), by a family of their vassals. This family, whose members bear Arabic names, became in course of time independent of the Armenian kings, but, on the other hand, was obliged to pay tribute to the emperor of Byzantium (Constantinus Porphyrogennetus, De admin. imp., ed. Bonn, p. 192 sq.).

Yāṣūṭ says, that the inhabitants of Malazgerd are Armenian and Byzantines (*Kûnis*); a native of this town was *Abû Nâṣr al-Manâzî (this, therefore, is the nîsha of the name), who was wazir to one of the Marwanid princes of Diyarbekr. This Abî
Nasir died 437 (1045–1046) and, according to our authority, was a good poet; Yâqût cites two fragments from his poems (Ma'dâ'ir, iv. 648 sq.). Regarding another al-Manûzî, cf. J. R. A. S., 1902, p. 788, note 1.

Among political events connected with the town of Malazgird, it may be noted that, on the occasion of the campaign, which the great Hamdanid Saffar al-Dawla undertook into Armenia (328 = 940), there is mentioned one Abû al-Hamad, prince (al-khâlîq) of Malazgird and Shirawsh (Sewerik) (J. R. A. S., 1902, p. 779); the name Abû al-Hamad occurs among the princes of Malazgird; it is also recorded by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, and this contemporary of Saffar al-Dawla doubtless belonged to that family. But he cannot be the Abû al-Hamad of the Greek text, who, from a chronological point of view, must have lived two generations earlier (cf. the genealogical table of the dynasts of Malazgird in Bardians und Aristokratien in Cent. Perlh. Ist. de Administra. Imp., in the Bonn edition of Constantinus, iii. 372). In 553 (964) a certain Nadâj, a ghaflum of Saffar al-Dawla, revolted against his master, after taking possession of that part of Armenia, which was left to him by one Abu'l-Ward. The latter was slain, and, among the places conquered by Nadâj, Malazgird also is cited (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Torbergh, viii. 408): in the year 559 (969–970) Malazgird was taken by the Byzantines (ibid., viii. 445); they must have lost it again before 582 (992–993), for in that year they besieged not only Akhlat and Ardijah, but also Malazgird, but this time they could not take it, but returned home after concluding a treaty for ten years with Abû 'Ali al-Hasan b. Marwân (ibid., ix. 67). In 450 (1058–1059) it must have belonged to the Byzantines, for the gazelle, which Ibrahim Topkûr Beg's brother, undertook into the Byzantine empire, affected also the territory of Malazgird (ibid., i. 372). And it is explicitly stated by Ibn al-Athir (iv. 411), under the year 446 (1054–1055), that Malazgird was in possession of the Byzantines, for there he relates, that this strong city resisted a siege by Topkûr Beg himself (cf. also Cedemenus, ed. Bonn, ii. 590 etc.). The most important historical event, with which the name of the town is connected, is the battle of Malazgird (463 = 1071) between Alp Arslân and the Byzantine emperor Romanus Diogenes, in consequence of which the eastern part of Asht Amûn, viz. Armenia and Cappadocia, was lost for ever to the Greek empire (Ibn al-Athir, iv. 44; Köch, dt. Texte i. 1. Selbst des Normannens, Herrschaft, ii. 39 sq. etc.; Köch al-Nadîm, G. M. S. New Series, ii., p. 119; Zanaras, ed. Dem-ı Rûfû, iv. 213 etc.; cf. also H. Geiger in K. Krumbacher's Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, p. 1010. After this event, therefore, Malazgird passed into the possession of the Bulgars. In 553 (1157) it was given by king Malik-shah, along with Erzerum and part of the territory of Akhlat, to his brother Sulâjî, as a kâtîf (Kev. d't. text., ed. Houtman, ii. 183).

In course of time, the city was besieged in vain (557 = 1161) by Taki al-Imâm Marâr b. Arîb. In 601 (1204–1205) it was occupied by the Crusaders, who came from the direction of Akhlat-Kisla (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 41, 154). During the disturbances, of which Armenia was the scene in the beginning of the sixteenth century, mention is several times made of Malazgird. In 603 (1206–1207), a former mansûh of the Shâh Arman took possession of Malazgird, and, after that, also of Akhlat. He had, in addition, control of Ardijah and other places. This man, whose name was Ballân (the vocalisation of the first syllable is uncertain), was assisted by the prince of Erzerum, Mughâb al-Dîn Topkûr Shâh b. Khâlid Arslân, against al-Malik al-Awdâd, son of al-Malik al-Ádîl of Egypt. Later on, Ballân was murdered by his ally of Erzerum, who tried to enter Akhlat and Malazgird, but in vain, so that he was obliged to return to his own states (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 168 sq.); in 618 (1220) he came to the court of Malazgird and was granted the title of Khârîzâmshah 'Alâî al-Dîn Muhammad occupied Malazgird, as he intended to attack Hûsâm al-Dîn 'Ali, the newwâb of al-Malik al-Áshraf, in Akhlat. But, since his attempt on this town did not succeed, and as the winter also set in (he had entered Malazgird on Dhu 'l-Ka'da 13, November 5, 623), and the Turkomans invaded his own realm, he was obliged to retire (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 301). In 626 (1229) however he succeeded in taking Akhlat, after which he besieged Malazgird, first in person, afterwards leaving one of his generals in charge of the siege, but on this occasion without success (al-Nasawi, ed. O. Houdas, text, p. 205, 208; translation, p. 342, 344, 347).


(V. F. Büchner)

MALDA (properly, Maldah or Malda), a district in Eastern Bengal, and in the Radjâshâh Division of the Presidency of Bengal. Area 1,899 sq. m. Pop. in 1901, 1,004,159, of whom 465,521 were Hindus, and 505,596 Muslims. In old times it was famous for its two capitals of Gaur [q.v.] or Lakhnauti, and Pandua, where there are many ruins of the mosques and other buildings of the Muhammadan kings of Bengal.

Bibliography: Minhâdji-i Sarâdj, Tâhâbâdî Nâṣîr, Raverty's translation (Bibl. Ind., 1881); Chulah Husain Salim, Kâvdâlâ'lâfîn (Bibl. Ind., text and translation); Mohini C. Mozamdar, Brahmans of Gaur (in Bengal, Calcutta 1886); Holger's Diary, ed. Yale (Hakluyt Society 1817); Reigns of Gaur, London 1878; W. Franklin, Notes on old Gaur 1830 (J. A. S. B., for 1894); Archæological Reports, xx.; Blochmann, Gouf of Bengal (J. A. S. B.); Ibbi Baksh, Kâvâd Dâhûm-nâma (J. A. S. B., for 1895); Imperial Gazetteer of India, and Statistical Account of Bengal, vol. viii., s. v.; Census Report for 1911, vol. v., parts i. and ii.

(H. Beveridge)

MALDIVE ISLANDS, a group of coral islets in the Indian Ocean, lying between 7° 6' N. and 0° 42' S. lat., and 72° and 74° E. long., and consisting of seventeen atolls with a great number of islands, of which about 300 are inhabited, the population being estimated at 70,000. The Mournish traveller, Ibn Battûta, lived for more
than a year (1543–1544) in the islands, but the first Europeans to visit them were the Portuguese, who established a factory in them in 1518. The Maldives were much harassed by Māppilla (Mophia) pirates from the Malabar Coast and in 1645 the king, who is entitled Sūliūn of the Thousand Isles, placed himself under the protection of the Dutch in Ceylon, with which island the Maldives have, since that time, been politically connected. The natives are Muslims and fall into three ethnographic divisions, (1) the northern, with a strong admixture of Dravidian blood from India, (2) the central, under the immediate rule of the Sultan who resides in Male, which has acquired from Arab traders and settlers a strain of Semitic blood, and (3) the natives of the southern clusters, who have had little communication with the central group, and preserve more of the primitive type, resembling the Sinhalese villagers of Ceylon. All are peaceful, intelligent and industrious, growing their own crops and weaving their own cloth and mats. The chief exports are copra, coir, and dried fish products. The language is a dialect of the Sinhalese, somewhat Muhammadanized, but many read Arabic more or less fluently.


(T. W. HAIG)

MALAHANA. [See MAŁAHI.]

MALI, a town, which no longer exists, the old capital of the Mandingo empire, in the western Sudan, also called Mali, Malî, Melli, Melle, Mani or Mané. All these names are dialectic or local variants of the same word which is the name of the country of origin of a people whom the French call Malinké, following the Pab and Tuculors, and the English “Mandingo”, following the form used by one section of this people on the Lower Gambia.

The name found in the Arab authors for this town was not the one used by the inhabitants themselves and the latter is not given us by the geographer Idrisi, nor the historian Ibn Khaldun, nor the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, nor Leo Africanus. It was only in 1913 that the translation of an Arabic manuscript not long before discovered in the Sudan, the Tārīkh al-Fattāḥ, enabled us to learn that in reality there were two successive capitals of the Mandingo empire or of Mali: the older was called Djarraba or Djirrha and there was later another called Niani.

Recent researches in the valley of the Niger have enabled the sites of these two towns to be discovered. The first was situated at the junction of the Niger and the Sankaran, and at the place called Mani or Mali Tombo, i.e. ruins of Mali. There are still traces of a very ancient and important town, which the natives regard, according to their traditions, as the ancient residence of their former sovereigns and the place where the latter are buried.

As to the second town, a抄ist’s error in the text of Ibn Khaldun concealed the true name till the publication of the Tārīkh al-Fattāḥ in 1913. It was recently recognised that the capital in question should be located on the left bank of the Sankaran, and at the level of Sigiri, not far from the place where there is still a town of the same name, Niani.

Djerba was no doubt the cradle of the Mandingo dynasty of the Keita of the xvi—xvii century. We have no information about it. We are more accurately informed about Niani. It is supposed to have been founded in 1238 after Sundjata Keita, ruler of the Mandingo, had defeated in 1235 at Kirina the emperor of Su-ṣu, Sumangurur Kante, his rival and enemy. Gongô Mūsā, often wrongly called Kankan Mūsā, was ruling there a century later, when on his return from a pilgrimage to Mecca, he attracted to his court an Arab poet named al-Sâlihî who belonged to a Granada family. By orders of Gongô Mūsā, this foreigner built in Gao a mosque with battlemented terrace and pyramidal minaret. According to tradition, this was the first building of the type, now so widely spread in the western Sudan, the origin of which is North African.

In 1532–53 in the reign of Sulaimān Keita, brother of Gongô Mūsā, the Arab traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited the town. It was then a completely Muslim metropolis, in which lived Egyptian and Moroccan legal authorities, students of Islam, readers of the Qur’ān in the mosques, and merchants. No description of the different quarters of the town has come down to us but we have a fairly detailed account of the sovereign’s palace. The ruler gave his audiences in a room looking out on a courtyard, with six windows of wood, three of which were covered with plates of silver and above these three covered with plates of gold. The windows were hidden by curtains, which were lifted to show that the hour of audience had come.

The empire of Mali retained its power down to the beginning of the xviii century when its decline began. According to Leo Africanus, who visited the Sudan in the first quarter of the xvii century, the capital Mali or better Niani was inhabited by about 6,000 families who included many arti-sans and traders. Islam was flourishing, the town had still a number of mosques and prosperous schools but it had lost its former glory.

In 1545, Duṭid, brother of the archer of Gao, marched to Niani; the ruler of the Mandingo having succeeded in escaping, Duṭid occupied the town which he plundered for a week before withdrawing, ordering his soldiers to defile the palace of the king with ordure.

In the xvii century the growth of the Bambara kingdoms of Segu and Kaarta contributed to overthrow what was left of the old Mandingo power, the last chiefs of which, leaving Niani, took refuge in Kangaba.

There is no doubt that Niani was visited on several occasions by the Portuguese. We know nothing of the expeditions which set out from there to take their factories in Lower Gambia to the interior; on the other hand, we have notes about the Mandingo capital on the journey made in 1485 of an embassy from Elmina (now the Gold Coast Colony). João de Barros describes it in his Book III of his Asia: “By the route of the fortress of Minas (Elmina) he (John II) also sent an embassy to Māhmūd b. Manzûgul, grandson of Mūsā, king of Songo. This city is one of the most populous of this great country which we usually called
land of the Mandingoos*. Another author, Barth, claims to identify the Songo of the Portuguese historian with the land of the Songhay in the Niger. This is clearly wrong. But is Songo a name applicable to the Mandingo capital? M. Delafosse does not think so; he calls attention to the fact that the country of the Mandingo is still known among the coast peoples of the Gulf of Guinea and in all the Fanti and Ashanti country under the name of Songo, so that among those with whom the Portuguese of Elmina mixed, the word was simply a synonym of Mandingo or Malli.


**Mali ‘Ambar Ḥabashi**, an Abyssinian slave who rose to great power and influence in the Decan. When Ahmadnagar was conquered by prince Dānīyūl in 1585 (n. C.), Mali ‘Ambar and Rādīās Minān, a Decan chief, divided the remaining territories between them. About this period owing to the rebellion of Sulṭān Salīm, the death of Akbar, and the revolt of Sulṭān Ḥusain, ‘Ambar found time to regulate his country and raised large armies, and even dared to seize several of the imperial districts. He introduced a new revenue system into the Decan, perhaps in imitation of Tōdar Mall. When the authority of the emperor Dālāṅgīr was established, he sent several expeditions to the Decan, but ‘Ambar could not be subdued. At last he restored the places taken from the Mughals (May 23) 1620 in *Akhkā* by Rādīās Minān, whom he became attached to and remained loyal to until his death, which occurred in 1625 (1626), in the 50th year of his age. He was buried in Daulatabad [q. v.].

On the news of their landing, al-ʿAdil [q.v.], who was then in Syria, sent troops to Egypt and al-Kāmil endeavoured to defend the land as best he could. The Christians gained the upper hand at first and by the end of Shabān 616 (beg. Nov. 1219), Damietta had fallen into their hands. It took nearly two years for al-Kāmil, who had had homage paid to himself as sultan of Egypt and Syria after the death of his father, to retake the town with the help of the other Ayyūbid, particularly his brother al-Malik al-Muʿazzam; the Christians by this time were tired of fighting and in Rajab 618 (the end of August 1221) they offered to abandon the town if given a free passage. Al-Kāmil, who feared not without reason that they would soon receive reinforcements from Europe, gladly accepted their terms whereupon the Franks left Egypt. But then troubles broke out within the Ayyūbid ranks. When al-Muʿazzam died (end of Dhu l-ʿKhāda 624 = Nov. 1227) al-Kāmil and his brother al-Malik al-Ashraf attacked his son and successor al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dāwūd and finally took Damascus from him (Shában 626 = June/July 1229); al-Kāmil next occupied southern Syria and Palestine and al-Ashraf was recognised as ruler of Damascus until the successor of the Ayyūbids, the Ayyūbīd, was established in Damascus, when their nephew Dāwūd received al-Karkh, al-Shawbak and some other remote fortresses as compensation.

Al-Kāmil had previously entered into negotiations with the Emperor Frederick II and concluded a treaty with him by which he ceded Jerusalem to him with a corridor to Jaffa and the Emperor in return promised to help him against all his enemies. After some time the Ayyūbīds came into conflict with the Saldāq, Kā-Ḥusayn [q.v.] had previously quarrelled with al-Ashraf and sought to bring against him a confederacy of petty Mesopotamian dynasties and under his brother and successor Kā-Ḥusayn [q.v.] it came to open fighting. The successes won by al-Kāmil in this war, however, aroused the jealousy of his relatives and they formed a coalition against him (cf. AYYĀBĪD). Al-Kāmil then set out for Egypt and advanced victoriously as far as Damascus. He succeeded in taking this city also but died very soon afterwards (in Rajab 635 = March 1238). As a ruler he was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished of the Ayyūbīds. He was a brave soldier and a skilful diplomat and rendered lasting services to the development of his country. He devoted special attention to irrigation and in his reign the defenses of the citadel of Cairo were completed. He also took a lively interest in the cause of learning.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khalīfān, Wafayat al-Āṣyān (ed. Wustenfeld), NΘ. 705 (transl. de Slane, iii. 240); Ibn al-ʿAṣir, al-Kāmil (ed. Tornberg), xii., see Index; Abu l-Fāda, Annakad (ed. Reiske), iv., passim; Ibn Khalīfān, al-Sharīr, v. 545 sqq.; Ibn Ṭabārī, Mīrāj (Bulāk 1311), i. 77 sqq.; Recueil des Historiens de Croisade, Hist. orient., i., v., passim; Weil, Gesch. der Christenheit, iii. 533 sqq., 441 sqq.; Stanley Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt, p. 221 sqq.; Rohricht, Gesch. des Königreichs Jerusalem, see Index.

K. V. Zettersten

**AL-MALIK AL-KĀMIL I.** [See SHABĀN.]

**MALIK SARWAR,** KHWAIDJAH DHIHĀN was a sūnna given by Sāfūr Radjab to his grandson Muhammad, son of Fīris Thughlak, in whose service he rose to be chief sūnna and controller of the elephant stables. He was faithful to his master in all his troubles, and in 1389 received the title of Khwāidjī Dhihān and was made wāzir. Muhammad's son, Mahmūd Shāh, sent him in March, 1394, to govern the eastern provinces, with his headquarters at Djiwānpūr, and conferred on him the title of Malik al-Shārūk, or lord of the east. He took thither with him Kāranfūl, a slave and water-bearer of Fīris Thughlak, whom he had adopted, and his brothers. His administration was most successful and his adopted son Kāranfūl served him loyally. On the disruption of the kingdom of the Thughlak dynasty after Timūr's invasion, Malik Sarwar assumed the title of Sultan al-Shārūk and established his independence in Djiwānpūr. Kāranfūl received the title of Malik al-Shārūk, and his brother Ibrahim was made commander of the fort and city.

Malik Sarwar died in 1400 and was succeeded by Kāranfūl, who ascended the throne of Djiwānpūr under the title of Mahārāk Shāh.

**Bibliography:** Firanch, Gulshan-i Ḏorūhī, Bombay 1832; Tarikh-i Mahārāk Shāhī in Elliot and Dowson's History of India, vol. iv.; Taḥāfūz-i Abkārī, by Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad; Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, New Series, i. 1, N. W. P. and Oudh (Sharqi Architecture of Jumānpūr, by A. Fuhrer), 1589.

(T. W. Hage)

**MALIK b. ANAS,** a Muslim jurist, the imām of the madhhab of the Malikis, which is named after him, and frequently called briefly the imām of Medina.

**I. The Sources for Malik's Biography**

The oldest authority of any length for Malik, Ibn Sa'd's account (d. 250) based on al-Wāqīfī (d. 207) in the sixth class of the Medina "successors," is lost as there is a hiatus in the manuscript of the work, but it is possible to reconstruct the bulk of it from the quotations preserved, mainly in Ṭabarī (iii. 2519 sqq.), in the Kibr āl-Ḥiyān (Frugm. hist. arīb., l. 297 sqq.), in Ibn Khalūkūn and al-Suyūtī (p. 7, 6 sqq., 12 sqq., 41 sqq.), from this it is evident that the brief biographical notes in Ibn Ṭaḥāfa (d. 276) and the somewhat more full ones in the Fihrist (compiled in 777) are based on Ibn Sa'd. The article on Malik in Tabari's (d. 310) Dīwān al-Muḥāsibiyāt is essentially dependent on the same source, while a few other short references there and in his history are based on other authorities. Al-Samām (c. 550) with the minimum of bare facts gives only the legendary version of an otherwise quite well established incident, while in Ibn Khalīfan (d. 672) and particularly in al-Nawawī (d. 676) the legendary features are more pronounced although isolated facts of importance are also preserved by them. Al-Suyūtī (d. 911) gives a detailed compilation from Ibn Sa'd and other works, most of which are now no longer accessible but are for the most part of later date and unreliable, like the Mawrid ʿAbū l-Munafīq of al-Faṣāri, the Hīta of Abū Nuʿaim, the Kibr al-Muṣafar wa ʻl-Muṣalaf of al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī and al-Ṭabāṭabāʾī, the Kibr Turīb al-Mudārib of al-Ḥusayn, the Fihrist of Malik of Abu ʿIsān Fihri. The bulk of the latter part is for example that of al-Zawawi, is of no independent value.

**II. Malik's Life**

Malik's full name was Abū ʿAbd Allāh Malik b. Anas b. Malik b. Abī ʿAmr b. ʿAmr b. al-
The date of his birth is not known; the dates given, varying between 90 and 97, are hypotheses which are not usually accepted as being approximately correct. As early as Ibn Sa'd we find the statement that he spent three years in his mother's womb (over two according to Ibn Kathir, p. 290), a legend, the origin of which is a wrong interpretation of an alleged statement by Malik in the possible duration of pregnancy is still evident in the text of Ibn Sa'd. According to a tradition preserved by al-Tirmidhi, Muhammad himself is said to have foretold his coming as well as that of Abu Hanifa and al-Shafi'i. His grandfather and his uncle on the father's side are mentioned by al-Sam'ani as traditionalis, so that there is nothing remarkable in his also being a student. According to the Kitab al-Ahkam, he is said to have first wanted to become a singer, and only exchanged his career for the study of Fiqh on his mother's advice on account of his ugliness (cf. Goldzirher, Mub. Studien, ii. 79, note 2); but such anecdotes are little more than evidence that some one did not particularly admire him. Very little reliable is known about his studies, but the story that he studied Fiqh with the celebrated Rabia b. Farrikh (d. 132 or 133 or 143) who cultivated ra'y in Medina, whence he is called Rabi'a al-Kayy can hardly be an invention, although it is only found in somewhat late sources (cf. Goldzirher, op. cit., p. 80). Later legends increase the number of his teachers to considerable figures: 900, including 300 tawba are mentioned. He is said to have learned fiqh from Nafi' b. Abi Nu'aim. He transmitted traditions from al-Zuhri, Nafi', the Mawalis of Ibn 'Umar, Abu 'l-Zaid, 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Amr, al-Shafi'i, 'Urwah, Yahya b. Sa'd, 'Abd Allah b. Dinar, Muhammad b. al-Munkadhir, Abu 'l-Zubair and others, but the isnaads of course are not sufficient evidence that he studied with the authorities in question; a list of 95 shaykhs is given by al-Suyuti, p. 48 sqq.

A fixed chronological point in his life, most of which he spent in Medina, is his being involved in the rising of the Allah sect in the year 145 in the reign of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah in 145 (on the other hand the story of Malik's alleged dealings with Ibn Hurmuz in the same year gives the impression of being quite apocryphal). As early as 144 the caliph al-Manṣur sent to the Hasanids of Mecca through him a demand that the two brothers Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah be left alone; the story of being suspected of being pretenders should be handed over to him; this shows that he must have already attained a position of general esteem and one at least not openly hostile to the government: he was even rewarded out of the proceeds of the confiscated property of the captured 'Abd Allah, father of the two brothers above named. This mission met with no success. When Muhammad in 145 by a coup made himself master of Medina, Malik declared in a fatwa that the homage paid to al-Manṣur was binding, because it was given under compulsion, whereupon many who would otherwise had held joined Muhammad. Malik took no active part in the rising but stayed at home. On the failure of the rebellion (147) he was punished by flogging by Qa'far b. Sulaiman, the governor of Medina, when he suffered a dislocation of the shoulder, but this is said to have still further increased his prestige and there is no reason to doubt that the stories of Abu Hanifa's ill-treatment in prison are based on this episode in the life of Malik. He must have later made his peace with the government: in 160 the caliph al-Mahdi consulted him on structural alterations in the Meccan sanctuary, and in the year of his death 179 the caliph al-Rashid visited him on the occasion of his pilgrimage. While this fact may be considered certain, the details in the Kitab al-Muqaddim are already somewhat legendary and in Suyuti, following Abu Nu'aim, quite fantastic. The story of al-Manṣur found as early as Ibn Sa'd, in a parallel version in al-Tabari of al-Mahdi, is quite fictitious and is given again with fantastic detail in al-Suyuti (from Abu Nu'aim) of al-Rashid, that the caliph wanted to make the Mawalta canonical and only abandoned his intention on the representations of Malik.

As early as Ibn Sa'd (certainly going back to al-Wâkiti) we have a fairly full description of Malik's personal appearance, his habits and manner of life, which however cannot claim to be authentic, nor can other sayings attributed to him which became more and more numerous as time went on. The few certain facts about him have been buried under a mass of legends: the most important facts have already been noted and the others will be found in al-Suyuti and al-Zawawi.

On the transmitters of his Mawalata and the earliest members of his madhhab see Sect. iii. and v.; here we will only mention the most important scholars who handled traditions from him. These were 'Abd Allah b. al-Mubarak, al-Awza'i, Ibn Dhiyâ'uddin, Hamadân b. Zaid, al-Lâbiq b. Sa'd, Ibn Salama, al-Shafi'i, Shu'ba, al-Thawri, Ibn 'Umayya, Ibn 'Umar, 'Abd Allah b. Zuhri and Yahya b. Sa'id (al-Suyuti, p. 18 sqq.) gives a long list of transmitters but most of them are not corroborated. We may just mention the apocryphal story of Malik's meeting with the young al-Shafi'i (Faqâm. hist. ar., i. 359; Wustenfeld, Gott. Abh., 1890, p. 34 and 1891, p. 1 sqq.), which is simply an expression of the view that was held of the relation between the two Imams.

III. Malik's Writings

Further sources for his teachings

1. Malik's great work is the Kitâb al-Mawala't, which, if we except the Corpus iuris of Zaid b. 'Ali, is the earliest surviving Muslim law-book. Its object is to give a survey of law and justice, ritual and practice of religion according to the ijmâ' of Islam in Medina, according to the sunna usual in Medina and to create a theoretical standard for matters which were not settled from the point of view of ijmâ' and sunna. In a period of recognition and appreciation of the canon law under the early 'Abbâsid, there was a practical interest in pointing out a "smoothed path" (this
is practically what al-muwaqta' means) through the far-reaching differences of opinion even on the most elementary questions. Mālik wished to help this interest on the basis of the practice in the Ḥijāz and to codify and systematise the customary law of Medina. Tradition, which he interprets from the point of view of practice, is with him not an end but a means; the older jurists are therefore hardly ever quoted except as authorities for Mālik himself. As he was only concerned with the documentation of the sunna and not with criticism of its form, he is exceedingly careless as far as order is concerned in his treatment of traditions. The Muwatta' thus represents the transition from the simple Ḥijāzi period to the pure science of Ḥadīth of the later period.

Mālik was not alone among his contemporaries in the composition of the Muwatta'; al-Mājdžahīn (d. 164) is said to have dealt with the consensus of the scholars of Medina without quoting the pertinent traditions, and works quite in the style of the Muwatta' are recorded by several Medina scholars of the same time (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 219 sq.) but nothing of them has survived to us. The success of the Muwatta' is due to the fact that it always takes an average view on disputed points.

In transmitting the Muwatta', Mālik did not make a definitive text, either oral or by muniṣṣaḥ, to be disseminated; on the contrary, the different riwāyāt's (recensions) of his work in places differ very much (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 222). The reason for this, besides the fact that in those days very little stress was laid on accurate literal repetition of such texts and great liberty was taken by the transmitters (Goldziher, op. cit., p. 221), lies probably in the fact that Mālik did not always give exactly the same form to the same lectures in different "classes". But the name Muwatta', which certainly goes back to Mālik himself, and is found in all recensions is a guarantee that Mālik wanted to create a "work" in the later sense of the term, although of course the stories which make Mālik talk of his writings reflect the conditions of a later period. In later times the Muwatta' was regarded by many as canonical (cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 213, 265 sq.; al-Suyūṭī, p. 47 and numerous legends deal with its origin in al-Suyūṭī, p. 42 sqq.).

Fifteen recensions in all of the Muwatta' are known, only two of which still survive in their entirety, while some five were studied in the sixteenth centuries A.H. in Spain (Goldziher, op. cit., p. 222, note 2 and 4) and twelve were still available to al-Rudānī (d. 1094) (Hefening, Freudenreich, p. 144, note 1):

a. the vulgate of the work transmitted by Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Maṣūmī (d. 234), often printed, e.g. Delhi 1216, 1296 (without iṣnāds, with Hindustāni translation and commentary), 1307, 1308, Cairo 1279-1280 (with the commentary of Māḥmūd b. 'Abd al-Bākī al-Ẓurkānī, d. 1122), Lahore 1889, Thā' al-Dschāfī, p. 1280; numerous commentaries, editions and synopses, cf. Brockelmann, G.A.N., 1: 176. This is called the Muwatta' of Māḥmūd b. 'Abd al-Ḥāfi al-Lakhnawī (Introduction to the edition of the recension b). Lucknow 1297, p. 21 sqq.; al-Suyūṭī, p. 3 and passim (work of al-Fāṭikī). p. 57 (on Ibn 'Abd al-Barr) and p. 58 (chief passage); Goldziher, op. cit., p. 230, note 2; Schacht, Abb. Manuel, 16: 194, 201; 'Abd al-Muwaqta' bi-Riḍāf al-Muwaqta', Delhi 1320 and Muhammad b. Ṭāhir al-Patnī, Madīnā biḥār al-ʿAnwār, Lucknow 1283:

b. the recension of Muhammad b. Ḥasan al-Shirāzī (d. 189) which is also an edition and critical development of Mālik's work, as al-Shirāzī at the end of most chapters gives his own views and that of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṭabarānī on the questions discussed, sometimes with very full reasonings; often printed e.g. Lahore 1211-1213 (with Hindustāni translation and notes), Ludhiana 1291, 1292, 1293; Lucknow 1297 (with introduction and commentary by Māḥmūd b. Ḥasān al-Ṭabarānī), Kasān 1910 (ibd.); several commentaries; cf. Brockelmann, op. cit.; Schacht, op. cit., N. 2, 2a, 2b; and the works quoted under a.

On the relation of these riwāyāt to one another cf. Goldziher, op. cit., p. 223 sqq.

c. The quotations from the recension of 'Abd Allāh b. Wāhba (d. 197) which are preserved in the two fragments of al-Ṭabarānī's Kitāb ʾiqlīm al-ʾaṣbāb (ed. Kern, Cairo 1902) and Schacht, op. cit., N. 22) are fairly comprehensive; this riwāya follows that of Yahyā b. Yahyā quite closely.

The other recensions of the Muwatta' are given by al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., p. 18 sqq.; further lists of transmitters of the Muwatta' are given in al-Suyūṭī, pp. 48, 51 and in al-Nawawī.

2. Whether Mālik composed other works besides the Muwatta' is doubtful (the statements in the Pihrist, p. 199, 199, 199, transmitted by Ibn Wahb or by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Ḥakam al-Miṣrī, a Kitāb al-Manāsik (al-Suyūṭī, p. 40), a Kitāb al-Muḥājfalāt, transmitted by Ibn Wahb (ibid.), a Kitāb al-ʾAdhā, transmitted by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Ḥaḍīl (ibid.), p. 41) and a Kitāb ʾi-ʾAtāfūqā, transmitted by Ḥāfīd b. Nazzār and Māḥmūd b. Muṣarrāt (ibid.). The genuineness of all these is, however, uncertain and even if they go back to Mālik's immediate pupils (sometimes they are actually attributed to the latter; cf. al-Lakhnawī, op. cit., p. 19) Mālik's own share in them would be still uncertain. A book (Gotha 1143) said to have been transmitted by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Ḥakam al-Miṣrī and heard by him along with Ibn Wahb and Ibn al-Ḵāsim is certainly apocryphal and besides does not pretend to give any utterances of Mālik himself.

Of other titles are mentioned a Tafsīr, a Kitāb ʾi-ʾAnwār in al-ʾAbīd al-ʾĀṣrib, a Kitāb al-Vuqūm and a Kitāb al-Sūr (al-Suyūṭī, p. 40 sqq.) which are in the usual style of the apocryphal literature. The suspicion of falsity is also strong in the case of the Kitāb containing advice to the caliph al-Raḍīd, mentioned as early as the Pihrist alongside of the Muwatta' (printed Bābih 1311; cf. Brockelmann, op. cit.) which look like a Mālik counterpart of the Kitāb al-Aḥbarād of Abū ʿYūsuf; even al-Suyūṭī doubted its genuineness, although for reasons which are not convincing to us.

3. There are two other main sources for Mālik's teaching (setting aside the later accounts of the doctrine of the Mālikī madhhab):

The more important is the al-Mudawwana al-Kabīra of Saḥnūn (d. 240) which contains replies by Ibn ʾĀṣim (d. 191) according to the school of Mālik or according to his own rā'y to questions of Saḥnūn as well as traditions and opinions of
Ibn Wahb (d. 197) (cf. Brockelmann, op. cit., p. 177; Heffenigen, op. cit., p. 144; Krenkow, in the article Sahn"en).

Al-Tabari who in his Kitab Ikhtilaf al-Fikha has preserved fragments of the Musavatta recension of Ibn Wahb (cf. above), also quotes frequently traditions and opinions of Malik in his commentary on the Qur'an on the "legal" verses.

IV. Malik's position in the history of Fikh

Malik represents, in time, a stage in the development of Fikh in which the reasoning is not yet thorough and fundamental but only occasional and for a special purpose, in which the legal thought of Islam has not yet become jurisprudence and, in place, Medina where the decisive foundations of Muslim law were laid down. One of the main objects in the juristic thought that appears in the Musavatta is the permeation of the whole legal life by religious and moral ideas. This characteristic of the formation of legal ideas in early Islam is very clear, not only in the method of putting questions but in the structure of the legal material itself. The legal material, having in itself no connection with religion, that has to be permeated by religious and moral points of view, is the customary law of Medina, by no means primitive but adapted to the demands of a highly developed trading community, which for us is the principal representative of old Arabian customary law: it appears in Malik sometimes as sunna "use and wont", sometimes it is concealed under the Medina idjma which he ascertains with great care; broadly speaking this only means that objections on religious grounds have not been raised by anyone against a principle etc. of customary law. The older jurisprudence had another main object: the formation of a system which sets out from principles of a more general character, which aim at the formation of legal conceptions in contrast to the prevailing casuistry and is to some extent rounded off in a codification, if still a loose one, of the whole legal material. While the islamization of the law had been already concluded in its essential principles before Malik, many generations had still to work at its systematisation; therefore Malik's own legal achievement can only have consisted in the development of the formation of the system how his great share in it was cannot be ascertained with certainty from the lack of material for comparison.

The surprising success achieved by the Musavatta of Malik out of a number of similar works, would in any case be completely explained by the fact that it recorded the usual consensus of opinion in Medina without any considerable work of the author's own and came to be regarded as authoritative as the expression of compromise (just as the works on Tradition came to be regarded as canonical). The Musavatta would in this case have to be regarded less as evidence of Malik's individual activity than as evidence of the stage reached in the general development of law in his time. It may be said that this average character was just what Malik aimed at (cf. Sect. iii. 1).

The high estimation in which Malik is held in the older sources is justified by his strict criticism of Hadith and not by his activity in the interest of Fikh (al-Tabari, iii. 2484. 2492; al-Sam'ani; al-Nawawi; Goldziher, op. cit., p. 147, 168; do., Zahiriten, p. 230); even this only means that with his hadiths he kept within the later consensus. That al-Shafi'i devoted special attention to him out of all the Medina scholars (cf. his Kitab Ikhtilaf Malik wa l-Shafi'i) is explained by the fact that he was a disciple of his.

As to the style of legal reasoning found in the Musavatta, Hadith is not by any means the highest or only court of appeal for Malik; on the one hand he gives the amal, the actual undoubted practice in Medina, the preference over traditions, when these differ (cf. al-Tabari, iii. 2505 sq.) and on the other hand in cases where neither Medina tradition nor Medina idjma existed, he laid down the law independently; in other words he exercises ra'y, and to such an extent that he is occasionally reproached with tar'uruk, agreement with the Ir"a"sid (cf. Goldziher, Mu#ah. Studien, ii. 217; do., Zahiriten, p. 4 sq., 20, note 1). According to a later anti-ra'y legend, he is said to have repented of it on his deathbed (Ibn Khallik\n). It is scarcely to be supposed that he had diverged seriously from his Medina contemporaries in the results of his ra'y.

V. Malik's Pupils

The Malik Madhab

In the strict sense Malik no more formed a school than did Abu Hanifa; evidence of this is found in the oldest names Abu al-Hijaz and Abu al-Ira^ab resp. compared for example with As'hab al-Shafi'i. These names at once indicate the probable origin of the Malik madhab; after a regular Shafi'i school had been formed, which in view of al-Shafi'i's personal achievement, is quite intelligible in the development of Fikh (cf. Bergstrasser, op. cit., p. 76, 80 sq.), it became necessary for the two other great schools of Fikh, whose difference was probably originally the result of geographical conditions in the main, also to combine to form a regular school, when a typical representative of the average views like Malik or Abu Hanifa was regarded as head. In the case of Malik the high personal esteem, which he must have enjoyed even in his life-time (cf. Sect. II) no doubt contributed to this also. But it is to his pupils that his elevation to the head of a school is mainly due. Traces of this process are still to be found in the varying classification of old jurists as of the Hijaz school or as independent mujadidhs (cf. also Fihrist, p. 199, sq.).

Among Malik's pupils and companions who soon became known as Malikis may be mentioned: Abu Lailah b. Sa'd (d. 161 or 165 or 175), 'Abd al-Rahman b. Al-Kasim (d. 191), 'Abd Allah b. Wahb (d. 197), Mahb. b. Is"a (d. 198), As'hab b. 'Abd al-'Aziz (d. 204), 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abd al-'Aziz (d. 212), 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Hakam (d. 214), 'Abd Allah al-Ka"nab (d. 221), Isma'il b. 'Uwais (d. 226) and his brother Abu Bakr, Sa"fin (d. 240).

Sa"fin was too late to hear Malik himself; with him the formation of the Malik madhab is already concluded.

Of the later Malik Fikh literature two short compendia attained special fame as text-books: the Ruhul of 'Abd Allah b. Abu Zaid al-Kairaw\ni (d. 366) whom the author of the Fihrist mentions as an important contemporary (p. 201, sq.) and the Mu\t\ac\ha\'tar of Khallil b. Ishak (d. 767); numerous commentaries and editions of both exist and they have also been discussed in Euro-
pean languages (cf. *Bibl*). Their importance has sometimes been exaggerated in Europe; development did not stop with them (cf. Prost, *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Rechtswiss.*, xlii. 422 sqq.; Prost debates an important later jurist in *Islamica*, ii. 470 sqq.). His immediate pupils are not to be regarded as opponents of his; many more than Malik, and the Malikī madhhab is not at all more conservative or traditionalist than the Ḥanafī for example (B. Ducati in *Islamica*, iii. 214 sqq., even endeavours to show that it is the most juridical of the Muslim schools of law).

The Malikī madhhab spread mainly in the west of the Muslim world; after it had succeeded in driving out the madhhab of al-Awāzī and the Zahrī school, it prevailed not only in the Maghrib (Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, including Muslim Spain) but in all the rest of Africa, so far as it has adopted Islam. The Malikī school has many followers in Egypt: in Upper Egypt it occupies about the same position as the Shāfi‘ī in Lower Egypt. This geographical distribution seems to go back to corresponding conditions existing before the formation of the madhhabs. Particularly ardent on the dissemination of Malikī teaching were ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb al-Sulamī (d. 230 or 239) and Ismā‘īl b. Ishāq (d. 282; *Fihrīst*, p. 200, 2) but there must also have been earlier scholars for whose time the existence of a regular school is doubtful.


The older Malikīs are given in *Fihrīst*, p. 199 sqq. Of the Malikī *Taḥāfūt*-works there have been printed e.g. al-Dībāqī of Ibn Farḥūn (d. 799) along with the *Taḥāfūt al-Dībāqī* of Ahmad Bāba (d. 1032), Fez 1898 and Nāṣr al-Dībāqī al-Naṭflīz al-Dībāqī of the same Ahmad Bāba, Fez 1317 (cf. Fagnan, in *Peschricht* Coquand, p. 105). On individual Malikī jurists cf. the articles on them. The spread of the Malikīs: Ahmad Paşa Taimūr, *Nayara tariqā bi Ḥadīth al-Malikī al-arba‘a*, Cairo 1344; *Juybunn, Handbuch des islamischen Gesetzes*, p. 28; do., *Handlungs* 2. 3. 212; Ibn Farḥūn, *op. cit.*, p. 17; Bergstrasser, *Z. d. M. G.*, 1914, 410 sq.


(J. Schacht)

MALIK B. ‘AWF, a contemporary of Muḥammad, called al-Naṣrī, to distinguish him from several men of the same circle in his time, and also because he traced his descent through Naṣr b. Mu‘awiyah to the eponymous ancestor of the powerful Ka‘īt tribe of the Banū Ḥazāwīn. We know very little about his history previous to the day of Ḥaṣān [q. v.] to which he owes his dubious fame. We may assume that he early found opportunities to display his personal bravery. He was still enrolled, “but dastardly” (*Agāhān*, xix, 81) — that is, barely out of his first years of adolescence — when he commanded a detachment of the Ḥaẓāwīs in the Fidjar [q. v.] war.

This distinction he perhaps also owed to the consideration which his clan, the Banū Naṣr b. Mu‘awiyah, enjoyed among the Banū Ḥaẓāwī. Allies of the tribe of Thaqīf (*Agāhān*, xii. 46), the Banū Naṣr found themselves in the same position with regard to the latter and the town of Tā‘if as the Al-Ḥāshībīs with respect to the Kurādīs and Mecca. They supplied mercenaries to Tā‘if and were given the task of defending the town and protecting against the depredations of marauders the fine gardens that covered the Thaqīfī territory. Their relations were, as a rule, peaceful and friendly, but occasionally it happened that the anarchical instincts of the Beduins, gaining the upper hand, drove them to encroach on the domain of their allies, the citizens of Tā‘if. This situation enables us to understand how in the struggle that was about to develop against Islam, the Tā‘ifs were ready to march under the banner of a Beduin generalissimo.

In the year 8, Muhammad at the head of a strong force was preparing to attack Mecca. This news disturbed the people who lived on the hills of the Sarāt. They asked themselves, if, once master of Mecca, the Prophet would not be tempted to invade their country. It was then that Malik b. ‘Awf succeeded in combining for their joint defence the majority of the Ka‘īt tribes, settled in the frontiers of Naṣrā and of the Hijāz. The Thaqīfs joined their forces to those of their Ḥaẓāwī allies. The only result was the defeat at Hunain. The commander-in-chief Malik had had the unfortunate idea of bringing the women, children and flocks along with the actual combatants. The whole of this enormous booty fell into the hands of the Muslims.

The defeated side did not distinguish themselves by bravery on the battlefield; the tradition of the Banū Ḥaẓāwī attempts the impossible when it endeavours to hide this failure and save Malik’s reputation. After the debacle, he is said to have bravely sacrificed himself to cover the retreat of his comrades-in-arms. This same tradition attributes
to him a series of poetical improvisations on this occasion, in which, after the fashion of the old Beduin paladins he explains and excuses his flight.

The defeated leader tried to make a stand at 14 miles south of Ṭārif where he had a ʿāshra. What was a ʿāshra? In Medina at the time of the Ḥijrah the name was given to an enclosure commanded by an ʿāshra or tower. Malik had probably only brick walls like the little strongholds in Yemen described by the geographer Maḳdīsī (Alḥṣan al-Taḥfīzīs, ed. de Goeje, p. 84). A century ago, the traveller Maurice Tamiṣier (Voyage en Arabie, Paris 1840, ii. 5) passing through Liya saw there "une forteresse flanquée de tours" intended, as in the days of Malik, to guard the road. In any case, whatever the strength of the little building, Muḥammad easily destroyed it. When Malik learned of the approach of the Muslims, he thought it prudent to seek refuge behind the ramparts of Ṭārif.

In the interval all the booty taken by the Muslim at Ḥudayda had been collected in the camp at Ḫudayda including Malik's family and flocks. To the Ḥudayda deputies sent to negotiate the ransom of the prisōners, Muḥammad said: "If Malik comes to embrace Islam, I shall return him his family and property with the addition of a gift of a hundred camels". Whatever the decision adopted by Malik, this declaration could not fail to compromise him with the Thaqafis. He rightly recognised that his position in Ṭārif had become untenable. He succeeded in escaping from the town and presented his submission to Muḥammad who fulfilled his promise to the letter. Malik then pronounced the Muḥammadan confession of faith and, to use the traditional formula, "his Islam was of good quality".

The new proselyte of the Prophet had extensive connections and was remarkably well acquainted with the Thaqaf region. The Prophet was glad to use him against Ṭārif which he had been unable to take by force. He sent Malik at the head of the Khaṭṭ tribes who had adopted Islam. Malik therefore organised a guerrilla war against his old allies in Thaqif. No caravan could leave Ṭārif without being intercepted by Malik's men. Exhausted by this ceaseless struggle, the Thaqafis decided to sue for terms. Malik then became the representative of the Prophet among the Banū Ḥudaydah and the caliph, Abū Bakr, later confirmed him in the office. He took part in the wars of conquest, and was at the taking of Damascæus and the victory of Kādıya in the Inqār.


MALIK b. NUWAIRA, chief of the Banū ʿAbd al-Ḥafṣ, a considerable clan of the Banū Ḥamāla, who in turn bore a branch of the confederation of the Banū Tamīm [q. v.]. His liberality, magnanimity and especially his courage had earned him a great reputation before the Ḥijrah. His contemporaries said that in the last respect he was without a peer. There was a proverbial saying: ʿāshra tuwaḥ kāḏūr, "a hero no doubt, but not comparable to Malik". His fame, however, was principally from the impression made by his tragic death and from the collection of elegies, which his brother Mutammīm [q. v.] devoted to him.

Along with several otherTamīmīs notables he embraced Islam in the lifetime of Muḥammad. In return the latter appointed him to collect the canonical taxes, yāfārāt, from among of his fellow-tribe-men. By giving him an appointment like this the Prophet hoped to bring him definitely to his side. The death of the Prophet and the incident of the rīḥā [q. v.] served to show the foolishness of this hope. Like most of the nomads, Malik had joined Islam as a political organisation, having clearly made up his mind that he would not be absorbed by it to the extent of sacrificing the independence of his tribe and his own prerogatives.

When the Muslims, or more accurately the Kuraish of Medina gave their parishes for it, Malik refused to recognize the legitimacy of this election which had been carried through without his participation in it. He argued for the strictly personal character of the bāṣīt, as the Beduins interpreted it. He explained himself in verse, for he was also a poet: — "If the thing turns out badly, we shall bring a remedy, crying: — long live the faith of Muḥammad!" He did not stop at this but passing from words to deeds, he divided among the Tamīmīs the taxes which had been collected. An even graver step, he next plundered a caravan which was taking to Medina the contributions of those nomads who had remained loyal.

Then — an eminently Beduīn trait — he celebrated in verse this strange exploit, which was equivalent to a declaration of war. He finally compromized himself completely by joining his cause with that of the prophetess Sadīqah [q. v.].

In Medina, Abū Bakr had at first to shut his eyes to these things. But as soon as he felt himself master of the situation, he decided to act vigorously. Khaṭṭ b. al-Walīd was sent against the secessionists. His orders were to spare only those who declared themselves Muslims. The individualism of the Beduins singularly facilitated the task. He attacked separately the tribes, who were divided or hesitating, and succeeded without difficulty in debasing the rebels in small sections.

Thus he came to the Banū Tamīm. The chiefs were suspicious of one another and declined to combine for joint action. Surprised by Khaṭṭ and finding himself almost alone, Malik had to refrain from the fighting forces so markedly superior to his. He surrendered on an assurance that his life would be spared and finally declared a Muslim. The prisoners including Malik were new enemies, executed with refinements of cruelty. It was said there had been some misunderstanding of Khaṭṭ's orders for which dialectic differences were to blame: so say those authors who feel the need of exculpating Khaṭṭ. It was by no means the first act of the kind of the impetuous Makhdūm. Did he want to get rid of a rival or deal the last blow to a rebellion by sacrificing, even against the laws of nations and his own orders, a person so highly esteemed as the chief of the Banū ʿAbd al-Hafṣ? As he had been anxious to marry Laila, the vivacious wife of Malik, he was credited with the first aim. 'Omar demanded that the
Malik B. Nuwaira — Malikshah

Although he should be dismissed and brought to judgment, but Abú Bakr refused. “Never”, he replied, “shall I put back in the scabbard a sword which Allâh has brought out of it”. The elogies on Malik by Mutammim remained celebrated in literary tradition. “No dead man”, said the Arabs, “was ever lamented as Malik was by Mutammim”.


**Malik al-Ta’ī, Abū Walīd Malik b. Abī ’l-Samî’ī, was one of the great singers and composers of the Umayyad and early Abbasid period.** He was born during the reign of Mu’āwiyah I (40–60 = 660–680) in the land of the Ta’ī, his father belonging to the Banû Thâlî, a branch of the Ta’, whilst his mother came from the Banû Makhzûm. In this way Malik could claim to be one of the aristocracy of Isâm, and as a child he was adopted by Abūdâlah b. Daff, the famous art patron of Madîna, and was given a good education. In the year 64 (684), he became enamoured with the singing of the celebrated Mâbad [q.v.] whom he heard at the house of Hama b. Abûdâlah b. Abû Zabârâb, and the event changed his whole career. Taking lessons from Mâbad and Diamî [q.v.], in singing, he soon astonished everyone by his abilities, and he became very popular with the aristocracy. He thus came to be recognized as a professional musician, for indeed his protector, Abûdâlah b. Daff, had made his house a veritable conservatory of music (al-Mas̄ūdî, Murâdî, v. 385, text). On the death of Abûdâlah b. Daff, Malik attached himself to Sulaimân b. Abî al-Hâṣîm. In spite of this however (cf. J. S. Nov.—Dec., 1873, p. 499), Malik was favoured by the Umayyads Yazîd b. Abî Malik and Mâbad b. Yazîd. On the accession of the Abbasids (132 = 750) Sulaimân was appointed governor of the Lower Tigris, and Malik accompanied him to his seat at Baṣra. After a short stay in this city, Malik returned to Madîna, where he died over eighty years of age about the year 137 (754).

Malik was certainly a fine singer. In one place in the Aḥâmi at least (i. 98; cf. ii. 127), he is mentioned as one of the “four great singers”, by no less an authority than Ishaq al-Mawṣîlî, although the latter in another place ranks him after Ibn Surârî, Ibn Mulhîzî, Mâbad, and Abî al-Qâbir (Aḥâmi, ii. 151). He was apparently not an original composer but a good adapter it would seem (Aḥâmi, i. 173; xiii. 64). Certainly, he was at a disadvantage in not being a performer on the lute (‘ud), and Mâbad had to correct his compositions for him.


(H. G. Farmer)
bring Ḥalab under his rule also, but retired when he heard of the approach of Malikshah. The town was granted to Aḵsŏnḵor, father of Zangi, another general, but Ḥurān received al-Rūḥū and Yaghīṣyān. Arzāfīya which had just been retaken from Sulaimān while Sulaimān's son Kūlīḡ Ailān [967-994] who was still a youth was taken back by the Sultan to the Ḥarās. There was no further campaign in Asia Minor, Malikshah left the war against the Byzantines to be conducted by the above mentioned amirs, to whom should be added Buṣūḵ, although the author of the Zawād al-Tawādīq makes him besiege Constantinople in person. The fiction narrated in the Talāsh-ū Gūstā in and Mukhārī is well known, according to which Malikshah was taken prisoner by the Byzantines without their recognizing him, and only regained his liberty by the stratagem of the vizier, Niẓām al-Mulk. The story in al-Ruḍārī is more credible that the Byzantines had to pay the Sultan an annual tribute of 300,000 dinārs plus a lump sum of 30,000 dinārs. On his return from Ḥalab, Malikshah visited Baghdaḏ for the first time and he was received in ceremonial audience by the Caliph al-Muqtadī bi-Amr Allāh. The latter had previously in 474 brought a daughter of the Sultan in marriage but she had been then still a child, the opportunity was now taken to conclude the matrimonial alliance. The wedding took place next year with great splendour and amid the jubilation of the people of Baghdaḏ. The chroniclers give a full account of it and give no hint that this marriage was meant to be a source of trouble to the Caliph as well as to the Sultan. Before we deal with that, it must be mentioned that in 482 (1093) Malikshah undertook a second campaign against Bukhara, Samarqand and Kashghar as a result of the tyrannical conduct of the young prince Ahmad, a nephew of Shams al-Mulk who was now dead. He gained great successes, took Ahmad back to the Ḥarās and then forced the ruler of Kashghar to recognize adalāq suzerainty. Later however, he allowed Ahmad to return to his kingdom and resume his rule, probably at the instigation of his wife Tarkan Khatun (so to be read) Tarkan Khatun who was Ahmad's aunt. On the other hand, cf. Barthold Tarkan in the Mongol invaders, p. 316 sqq. Towards the end of the reign of Malikshah the Seljuq empire thus reached its greatest extent, especially when in 485 (1097) some Turkish amirs were sent even so far as Yaman, who subdivided the land for the Sultan, temporarily only, it is true. As regards the internal administration of the country, the Sultan left this in the hands of his vizier, Niẓām al-Mulk, who was given unlimited power by him at the very beginning of his reign, which he wielded till his death, as a result of his great age his prestige began to decline towards the end of the reign of Malikshah and to be threatened by intrigues in the palace. His services will be appreciated in the article NIẒĀM AL-MULK; here it is sufficient to characterize his policy briefly, which was to restore the dominion of orthodox Islam under its supreme head, the Caliph, with the help of the sword of the Seljuq. He had, therefore, to do all he could to maintain harmony between the Sultan and the Caliph, but the course of events led to a breach between the two. Malikshah had several sons by his wife Zulfiqar Khatun, and the eldest, Ahmad, had been designated successor to the throne but died in 481 (1093). The obvious thing was for Prince Barkyān to take his place as was desired by Niẓām al-Mulk and the Turkish amirs but Malikshah had in the meanwhile married another wife, the Princess Tarkan Khatun, who made every effort to secure the throne for her son Mahmūd born in 480. Malikshah, however, was more anxious about his daughter who had married the Caliph, for she was unhappy in Baghdaḏ and complained of being neglected by her husband, so that finally the Sultan demanded that she should be sent home with the little son whom she had borne to the Caliph. She, therefore, returned to her father but died soon afterwards in 482; her son Ẓalīfšāh however, became his grandfather's pet and he gave him the name of "Little Commander of the Faithful" in the hope that he would one day bear this title in reality. At the same time he decided to make Baghdaḏ his winter capital and had extensive building operations carried out in the N.E. of the town when he was there in the winter of 1091/92, including a great mosque, the Djamā' al-Sulṭān; he also ordered Niẓām al-Mulk and his amirs to build residences for themselves there. During this period the great amirs from the west, Aḵsŏnḵor, Ṭutuš etc., had come to Baghdaḏ, great hunts and other pleasure parties were held, but the Caliph was completely ignored. When in the autumn of 1092 he was on his way from Ḫaḡān to Baghdaḏ for the third time, the aged vizier Niẓām al-Mulk was stabbed by a ʿAdalī at Sahan. It was now for the first time apparent how much the existence of the Seljuq empire depended on this one man, for without the Sultan and his wife were no longer guided by his advice, they committed the gravest errors, which were very soon to plunge themselves and their empire into destruction. Sarcely had the Sultan arrived in Baghdaḏ than, with the intention of making his grandson Caliph, — which was contrary to Muḥammadan law as he was a minor — he announced to Muqtadī that he must at once abdicate and leave the town. With difficulty the Caliph obtained a few days respite which he was spending in prayer and fasting, when suddenly the news came that the Sultan was dead. The exact date is not certain but it was about the middle of Shawwal 485 (middle of November 1092). He was said to have caught a severe fever while out hunting, which they attempted to ease without success by bleeding, and he died soon afterwards. But it can hardly be doubted that he was poisoned, as some writers expressly state (cf. Houtsma, in Journal of Indian History, sept. 1924, p. 147 sqq.). The usual funeral ceremonies were not held; the body was sent to Ḫaḡān and buried there. The Caliph had no difficulty in coming to terms with Tarkan Khatun; he offered to recognize her young son Mahmūd as Sultan. If she would hand over to him his own son, the Sultan's grand-son. This was done. The little "Commander of the Faithful" died the very next year, when the course of events took a disastrous turn for the Caliph and Tarkan Khatun with the rçe of Barkyān. The tragic deaths of the Sultan and his vizier were celebrated in verse by Muṭīzī; cf. Schefer, Sissetnamakh, suppl., p. 62 sqq. Malikshah's was a highly honourable character, he was loyal to his relatives and to his servants, brave, just and gentle. His rule is, therefore, much praised by Christian as well as Muslim
The raids against Sicily and Malta began in the viiith century A.D., and it is not rash to believe that Malta fell before 800 A.D. under Muslim influence. This is also de Goeje's opinion (Z. D. M. G., lvi. 905, note 2).

In Malta the Muslim occupation was certainly more permanent and strongly established than in Sicily; the narrow island was completely subjugated by the conquerors; and this helped us to understand how the Arab-Berber Muslims of Africa succeeded in forcing upon Malta the Arabic language, from which the modern Maltese dialect is derived.

The question of the origin of the Maltese dialect has occasioned many discussions between those who sustained its Phoenician origin (Vasalli, Bros, Bellermann, Cumbo, E. Cassana, Preca) and those who derived it from Arabic (Genesius, de Nacca, L. Bonelli, Stumme, Noldke). The conclusion must be accepted that Maltese is an Arabic dialect, which in some ways shows resemblances to the Eastern Arabic dialects, in many others recalls the Arabic dialects of the Maghrib. Peculiarities of Maltese phonetics are the inala of ṣ, which tends to become ṣ and ⟨ṣ⟩ at the beginning of words, as ṣināa for ʿināa, the pronunciation of ⟨ʃ⟩ as hamza, the existence of ⟨p⟩ and ⟨t⟩ sounds in neo-latin and arabic words; in morphology the use of ⟨t⟩ as prefix of the 1st person singular forms the main affinity with the Maghrib dialects. The accent tends to fall towards the beginning of words. In Malta itself are to be found dialectal varieties between town and country; in the country and in Gozo the dialect is nearer the original Arabic, sounds like ⟨k⟩ and ⟨g⟩ not heard in Valletta, are noticeable in the Gozo vernacular.

A study of the Maltese lexicon, to show how affinities with Arabic dialects, Eastern and Western, may be explained, and how word-fossils have been preserved in Maltese, is still to be undertaken. The prevalence of the Latin-Italian race and the flourishing of Italian civilization and culture in the island have influenced its dialect, both as to syntax and as to phonetics. The percentage of Latin, or rather Italian, words in spoken Maltese varies according to the area of individual Maltese.

The Maltese, up to a few centuries ago, had not chosen any particular alphabet for their dialect, as they did not use it as a written language. In the xvith century Agus de Soldamis, a Maltese, turned his attention to the dialect and began to study it; since his time several attempts have been made to systematize the writing of Maltese; it was also proposed to use the Arabic alphabet, and a diacritical transliteration, precise and scientific, was tried. In practice the use of the common Latin alphabet, with the modification of some few letters, was continued. The last attempt of this kind, which has not met with public favour nor with the approval of the vernacular press, was that of the Għajda tal-kittxa tal-malti “Association of the writers of Maltese”, which has published a small grammar, particularly concerned with the spelling, called Taghirif fagu Tekktia maltina. Malta 1924; the preface mentions the precedent systems of writing Maltese. The same Għajda, in 1925, began to publish a quarterly review called Il-Malti; it is mostly concerned with grammatical questions, and has promoted a movement in favour of pure Maltese (malti infi).
Since about 1850 the question of the Maltese dialect has also acquired a political character: the English rulers favoured the development of the dialect at the expense of the Italian language (which remains the language of culture, of the Church and of the Bar). Bibliographical information of Maltese literature to about 1900 is to be found in the works of L. Bonelli and H. Stumme.

Besides the Arabic dialect and place-names, the Muslims have left in Malta a few coins and a considerable number of inscriptions on tombstones; one of them, the celebrated inscription called of Mamun, dated 1173 A.D., was published more than a century ago, and repeatedly studied by orientalists (Itahnski, Luce, Amati, Nallino etc.); another one, found in Gozo, is to be seen in the Malta Museum: about twenty more have been found in the excavations made in 1922-1925 at Rubato (near the city Notabile); they are preserved in the Museum of the Villa Romana, near the place of excavation.

The Muslims lost Malta in 1569, when the Normans conquered it; they were however allowed to live on the island under the Norman government until 1549. From 1530 to 1798 Malta was the seat of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which the Turks had expelled from Rhodes in 1522. The Order organized there an important war navy. The island was in constant relations with the East and with Barbary; thousands of Muslim slaves were taken to Malta; the Maltese ships had repeated encounters with those of the Porte and of the Levant and Barbary pirates. The Turks attempted to occupy Malta in 1565, with then well-known expedition which ended in disaster, and again in 1644: more than once they threatened to invade it under Sultan Muhammad IV.

Considering the Order's relations with the Muslim East and the fact that an important portion of the regents of Rhodes was saved, the importance of the Order's archives for the history of the Mediterranean Levant and of North Africa in the eighteenth century is easily understood.

A few Arabic MSS. and nautical charts, of no great value, are preserved in the Public Library of Malta and in its Museum.


(Enire Rott)

MALTHAI, or properly MAL'THAYA, the Arabic name of two villages in the kādā of Duhāk in the old wilayet of Mawṣil. They are about 40 miles N.N.W. of Mawṣil at the point where the river of Duhāk (left bank tributary of the Tigris) enters the plain, whence the Aramaic name Maal'ihat > Mal'thāi, "entrance".

The pass of Mal'thāyi giving access to the country to the south of Lake Van must have played an important part in ancient times. Its importance is indicated by the famous bas-reliefs carved on the rock half an hour's walk to the south of Ma'al'thāyi. They reproduce the same scene four times: a king standing in an attitude of adoration before a procession of seven gods, six of whom are standing, each on a mythological animal, and the seventh is seated on a throne placed on the back of a lion. There are no inscriptions accompanying them. Since, however, they are evidently connected with the similar bas-reliefs at Bāwiyān (30 miles N.E. of Mawṣil on the Khazīr, a right bank tributary of the great Zab) and these belong to the kings Salamassār II (860—825 b.c.) and Sennacherib (689—681), it is supposed that the bas-reliefs of Mal'al'thāyi were also executed in the time of Salamassār II. The figures of the gods are especially interesting as forming a link between Assyrian and Hitite art.

Among the Nestorian Christians Mal'al'thāyi gave its name to a diocese (also called Bīh-Nūhāchēh). A Nestorian bishop of Mal'al'thāyi is mentioned as early as the fourth century (Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 52, 210); there are other references to the years 497, 544, 554, 576, 585, 605, 962, 1063, 1074, 1092, 1263 (Chabot, Spieccy Orientale, Paris 1902, Index, and Hoffmann, o.c.). In the seventh century the Metropolitans of the Jacobites, Māthūh, still numbered among his subordinates a bishop of Mal'al'thāyi (Labourt, Le Christianisme dans l'Empire gréco, 1904, p. 240). At the present day Mal'al'thāyi is still inhabited by Nestorians (in part in union with the Catholic Church).

Bibliography: Layard, Nineveh and its remains, 1849, i. 231; Badger, The Nestorians, London 1852, i. 174; V. Place, Nineveh et Assyrie, 1867, pl. 45; Hoffmann, Auszuge aus tyrkischen Akten von Martyrs, 1889, p. 208 and Index; Ferrot and Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'Antiquité, 1884—1890, ii. 642; Luschza, Ausgrabungen von Soujirîh, i. (1893), p. 23; G. I. Bell, Amurath, London 1911, p. 284; Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, i., 1926, p. 360—375; Thureau-Dangin, Les sculptures rupestres de Mal'thāi, Revue d'Asyriologie, xxii, 1924, p. 185—197; new photographs taken at Maltai have led the author to identify the gods and the beasts which carry them in the following order: Assur (a dragon and a horned lion),
Malthai — Mławá

Målůla, a town in central Syria north-east of Damascus. It is mentioned as early as Georgios Kypros (ed. Geizer, p. 188, No. 993) as Māluwa (MSS. māluwa, māluwa) in Phoinike Libaniana. Yāqūt also calls Māluwa an ʿizzīm (ʿizzīm) near Dimashq with many villages. The modern Māluwa, a village of Christians, is picturesquely situated at the west end of a deep ravine of the Artilbanon, which splits into a western and southern entrance to the valley; and on the northern lies the monastery of Mār Tāklā built half into the rocks. The two ravines form the way to the other monastery of Mār Serkis, which stands on a rocky plateau above the village. Numerous caves, mostly ancient dwelling-places, have been found on the west and southern corner of the rock on the eastern slope of which the modern village is built in the form of an amphitheatre. Some Greek inscriptions have been found in the caves (Waddington, Inscriptions, No. 2553-2563, Moritz, p. 145-147, No. 3-8, including one dated 107 and 167 A.D.). Māluwa and the adjoining villages of Bakhīya and Djjubb ʿAdm are noted for the fact that the Western Arabic dialect still spoken there represents the last remnants of the Syrian spoken throughout Palestine and Syria in the time of Christ.


Mławá proper is an inland district of India bordered on the south by the Vindhya and the Lyndhurst, 25° 30' and 24° 30' N. and 74° 30'. To this tract, known in the age of the Maḥābārāta as Nishahrā, and later as Avantī, from the name of its capital, now Udjpān, was afterwards added Akara, or Eastern Mławá, with its capital, Bhilsā, and the country lying between the Vindhya and the Sēlpūra. The province formed part of the dominions of the Mauryas, the Western Satraps, the Gupas of Magadh, the White Huns, and the Kingdom of Kanawāj, and then passed to the Mówās, from whom it has its name. These, when Hinduized formed the Parmara tribe of Pāṇḍūra, which bore sway in Mławā from 800 to 1200, and was overpowered in 1053 by a confederacy of the Cakayas of Anhilvāla and the Kalačūris of Tripurī. In 1235 Shams al-Dīn Hūktīmish of Dhihl captured Ujjain, demolished the temple of Mahākālī, and sacked Bhilsā. Mławā became a province of Dhihl, and, with interludes of Hindu revolt, remained so until, in 1392, on the dissolution of the kingdom of Dhihl after Timur’s invasion, the Afghan governor, Dilawar Khān Ghūrī, made it an independent kingdom. He was murdered in 1405 by his son Aḥā Ḫán, who ascended the throne under the title of Hūḫ-sang Shāh. He transferred the capital from Dhar to Sūr Shāhī, and founded the town of Mówā. His death in 1435 was succeeded by his son Ḥaḍī Ḫān, who, after a reign of a few months, was succeeded by his infant son Mavīḍ Ḫān. The child was removed by his cousin and guardian, Māḥmūd Khālījī, who in 1436 ascended the throne as Māḥmūd I, and whose reign of thirty-three years was the most glorious in the annals of Mławā. He waged war successfully against the kings of Gudjarāt, the Dakhān, and Džawpur, the small state of Kalpī, and Khān Kumbhā of Citor; he retired, but without disgrace, before the superior power of Dhihl; and he extended the frontiers of his kingdom on the north, the east, and the south. On his death in 1469 his third son, Aḥā al-Kādir Chhībān al-Din, who succeeded him, surfaced with public business during his father’s strenuous reign, retired into his harem and left the administration of the kingdom to his son, Nāṣār al-Dīn, who in 1500 poisoned his father and ascended the throne. Nāṣār al-Dīn met his death in 1510 by falling, in a fit of drunkenness, into a tank or cistern, where his attendants, thankless to be rid of the monster, let him lie. He was succeeded by his son Māḥmūd II, who was as unfortunate in war as his father was fortunate in love. With the help of Mūzafrī II of Gudjarāt he rid him of his powerful Kādāpūt minister, Medīnī Khān, but in doing so embroiled himself with Sāngaram Khān of Citor, who defeated him in the field and took him prisoner, but generously released him. He then, with inconceivable folly and ingratitude, bitterly offended Bāḥdur Shāh of Gudjarāt, who invaded Mławā and, after giving Māḥmūd every opportunity of atoning for his error, carried Māḥmūd by assault on March 21, 1531. Māḥmūd and his sons were sent in custody towards Citor, but the officer in charge of them, apprehending a rescue, put them to death.

Mławā now became a province of Gudjarāt, and in 1535 the emperor Humāyūn, invading that kingdom, defeated Bāḥdur Shāh at Mandavā, and captured Māḥmūd, but was recalled to Hindūstān in the following year by the menacing attitude of Shir Khān in Bengal. Malik Khān, the officer of Māḥmūd II, established himself in Mławā and assumed the title of Kādir Shāh. Shujāʿī Khān and Hāḍī Khān, two officers of Shir Shāh, drove him from Mławā and assumed the government of the province. Shujāʿī Khān died.
in 1554, and was succeeded by his son Malik Bayzid, known as Bāz Bahādur, who, during the decline of the power of the Sūrūmperors, became independent. A severe defeat at the hands of the queen of the Gond kingdom of Garha Mandlaengendered in him a distaste for warlike enterprise and he devoted himself to music and to the eminences of the beautiful Rāmpatt. In 1561 Akbar’s army under Adham Khan surprised the vanguard at Sarangpur, defeated his troops, put him to flight, and captured his mistress, who took poison rather than become the conqueror’s paramour. Bāz Bahādur fled into ḫândesheg and Pir Muḥammad Khan, second-in-command of Akbar’s army, who followed him thither, was defeated by Muḥarrak Khan. ḫândesheg and drowned in the Narbās. Bāz Bahādur returned and again reigned in Mandla, but in 1562 another army under ʿAbd Allāh Khan the Uzbek invaded Mālwa and compelled him to flee to Cītor. He remained a fugitive until 1570, when he submitted to Akbar and entered his service.

Mālwa was now a province of the empire, and remained so until, in 1743, the Mārāṯās extended their rule over it, and the Peshwā was made deputy-governor.

It was afterwards divided between the great Mārāṯā generals whose descendants, Sindhyā of Gwalior, and the Ponwars of Dhār and Dewas still hold most of it.

From 1780 until 1818, when British supremacy was firmly established, the province was one of the principal arenas in which Muslim, Mārāṯā, and European contended for empire. Since then its history has been eventful, but sporadic risings took place at six military stations during the mutiny of 1857.

MĀMĀR B. A.L-MUṬHĀNĀ. [See ABDU "QADĪ.""

MAMLŪK (M., plural mamlūkūn and mamlūṭāt), participle passive I of mamlük "to possess," denotes the slave in the master’s possession. The term owes its origin probably to the current phrase of the Kur’ān: wa l-malākat umūnukmūn "what your right hands possess," a general designation of slaves without specialisation of gender. Mamlûk occurs only in the Kur’ān (sūrat xxi. 77), in the expression ʿabd mamlûk "a slave in the possession of his master," mamlûk alone not yet being a technical term for slave, to all appearance. In ḥadīth, ʿabd mamlûk occurs likewise (Dārīm, Siyāṣ, b. 34): but throughout the literature of ḥadīth mamlûk alone is already a technical term synonymous with ʿabīd. — The distinction between a slave born and a slave born from free parents, must be made by the addition of a genitive to ʿabīd, in the former case bīn ʿabīd kinsmen, in the latter mamlūk (mamlūk mamlūkīn).

It may be remarked that neither in ḥadīth nor, to all probability, in Arabic literature, has the term mamlûk ever received the religious meaning of devotee, as is the case with ʿabīd.

The Kur’ān enjoins the master to be humane towards "what his right hands possess" (sūrat iv. 40). Ḥadīth is copious on this point. It assures us that Muḥammad on his death-bed did not cease repeating "(I recommend to you) ʿabīd and what your hands possess" (Aḥmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, iii. 117; cf. i. 78). "Whosoever does not treat his mamlûk as he ought to do, shall not enter Paradise" (Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 12). "When the mamlûk performs ʿabīd, he is thy brother" (Ibn Māḏī, Ṭabāh, b. 10). "The mamlûk may claim his food and raiment" (Muslim, Aınān, trad. 41). "The Apostle of Allāh used.... to protect the mamlûk who appealed to his help" (Ibn Māḏī, Zakhd., b. 16). "The mamlûk who acquires himself of his obligations towards Allāh and towards his master, will receive double wages" (Bukhārī, Qoḥ. b. 31) and "one is bound to pardon his mamlûk even unto seventy times a day" (Aḥmad b. Hanbal, ii. 111).

For the legal position of slaves see ʿABD.

For the Egyptian dynasties called the Mamlûks, see the following article. — It may be finally remarked that in certain circles mamlûk had the special meaning of white slave. See Fagnan, Addition aux lexiques arabes, s. v.

MAMLŪKS, a dynasty of rulers of Egypt and Syria.

A. Period from 1250 to 1517. The history of this dynasty is dealt with under the separate rulers; the general questions of art, religion and economics of their time are also dealt with in these articles and notably in Becker’s article AEGYPT [q. v.] and Hartmann’s article DAMASCUS [q. v.].. Only a brief survey of the whole period is given here.

They were, as their name shows [cf. MAMLŪK], former slaves from the bodyguards of the sultāns and amirs who had distinguished themselves by ability and been given their freedom by their masters. A somewhat arbitrary distinction is made between two dynasties, the Bahri [q. v.], from 648—792 = 1250—1390 and the Burdji from 784—922 = 1382—1517. The name Bahri Mamlūks was given to the guards of Sūltān Nādir al-Dīn Ayyūb (637—47 = 1340—49), whose barracks were upon the island of Rūdā [q. v.] in the Nile (Bahri). Except for the first three the Bahri Sultāns were chosen by the Mamlūks from among the descendants of the Sultān. Thus after Bahri [q. v.] there ruled two of his sons, after Kulaʿīn [q. v.] two sons, a series of grandsons and a great grandson. It was different with the Burdji Mamlūks, a bodyguard founded by Kulaʿīn, who were quartered in the towers of the citadel of Cairo. The first Burdji, Barkūq, [q. v.], was able to secure the succession of his son and even a second son succeeded for a brief period to the throne, but after this the Mamlūk guards never tolerated hereditary succession again; no Sultān’s son, who was proclaimed heir-apparent, ever succeeded in keeping the throne (the only exception is al-Nāṣir Muhammad II who occupied the throne for nearly three years.) The Mamlūks did not always choose the ablest, but more often the oldest; a kind of system of seniority developed. The first Mamlūk on the throne was Ikīl al-Dīn Aibak (648—55 = 1250—57), the husband of Shajjar al-Durr [q. v.], a slave whom Ayyūb had married.

In the period of its greatest extension under the Mamlūks, the frontiers of Egypt were in the west the Lybian desert as far as Barka, in the
south Nubia as far as Massawa, in the north the Mediterranean Sea. The frontiers of Syria in the east stretched to the Euphrates to Der al-Żar through Raḥṣa, in the south to the Arabian deserts and in the north to the Taurus. The two countries met in Sinai and were separated by the Red Sea. The Mamlūks usually exercised suzerainty over the holy places in Mecca and Medina; Sultan Kāmil Ghūri [q.v.] even maintained garrisons in South Arabia for a time.

The first task of the Mamlūk sultans was to consolidate the kingdom. Their most dangerous enemy, the Tatārs under Hulāgū, was defeated in Syria in 658 (1260) at A‘in Djaḥlūt [q.v.]; the Crusaders were destroyed by Sultan Naṣr Baibars, Kāmil and Khālid, the remnants of the Alids and Assassins [q.v.] rendered harmless by Baibars. Their power was finally consolidated and justified to the Ayyūbid petty kingdoms left to them, by Baibars welcoming in Cairo the Caliph who had been driven from Baghādād by the Mongols, restoring the caliphate here in 659 (1261) and then having himself appointed by the Caliph participator in power (Kātim al-Dawla) and having the power ceremonially transferred to him. They had the position till the end of Mamlūk rule. The Caliph paid homage to the Sultan on his accession and ceded all his rights to him. He thus lost all authority and became the shadow of a ruler without power, without money and without influence; only now and then an Indian Sultan sought a diploma of investiture from the Caliph.

The rule of the Sultan was absolute. He was assisted by a council in which the chief commanders of the Mamlūks sat to the left and right of the ruler according to their rank (this sitting in order of rank dated from the early Mamlūk period): the representative of the Sultan (maḥbūb kāhir, later only appointed in case of absence of the ruler), the commander-in-chief (amīr kāhir), later combined with the office of Atabeg, the commander of the guards (rūs nawḥat al-nawṣal, see Al-Amīr al-Tabāris), the War Minister (amīr-iḥtīāt, ibid.), the president of the council who was the chief civil official (amīr muqāṭir); later the minister of the Ilāma (amīr al-kāhir [q.v.]) and the ministers of the palace and domains (māʾāʾir) gained more influence and became numbered among the highest officials, as did the chief military judge (ḥālīb al-khawāṣṣ [q.v.], properly high chamberlain) and at times the chief marshal (amīr aṣḥāb q.v.). The officers and their relative rank (cf. e.g. under Amīr al-Kāhir for the composition and order of precedence in later times) changed. These members of the council were military officers, the so called lords of the sword (ṣūḥāb al-suḥāf); they belonged to the class of amirs of 1,000 (muḥādīm al-suḥāf). From this class were chosen the governors of the Syrian provinces (Damascus, Aleppo, Tripolis, Hāmā, Ṣafad) and frequently also the governors of the citadels of Damascus and Aleppo who were appointed by the Sultan himself. The next class was formed by the Ṣalṭānīs, orphans of 40 Mamlūks, who had the right to be accompanied by a band. They were followed by the amirs of 10 and those of 5 Mamlūks. All the amirs of 1,000 were appointed by the Sultan himself; the other amirs in the provinces sometimes by the Sultan and sometimes by the governor. The administrative system at the Sultan’s court was reproduced on a small scale in the provinces. Every governor was a little Sultan who had to some extent the same routine as the Sultan in Cairo. The Syrian governors were in general independent of one another (very few like the Amīr Tengīz [see Damascus, §. ii. p. 908] had other governors subordinated to them). In the beginning the Mamlūks, perhaps influenced by the Mongols, had the tendency to make all offices secular and fill them with Mamlūks who, as lords of the sword (ṣūḥāb al-suḥāf), belonged to the military caste. They kept this up in the highest offices throughout the dynasty, but they had to create the important offices of private secretary (kāṭib al-ṣīr) and head of the chancellery (ṣūḥāb Dīwān al-imād) and fill them with civilians and even admit Christians, Jews, and especially convert to Islam to them, because the Turkish ruling caste was not suited for them. The above mentioned chief officers on the military and administrative side remained however reserved for the constantly increasing oligarchy, into which neither Arabs, nor the sons of Mamlūks were admitted. It had never happened (I only know of 3 cases of Arabs) that Arabs or sons of Mamlūks became amirs of 1,000, or rose to the highest pots in the legal and scholastic world and in the other branches of the civil service.

The Mamlūks were purchased on the government by a high officer, the purchaser of Mamlūks (ṣāqīr al-mamlūkī), educated in the first place in the Mamlūk School in Cairo, then distributed in the different branches of the corps of pages to act as amours-bearers, cup-bearers, carvers, polo-grooms, club-bearers etc., for further training and then placed in the service of the amirs or of the Sultan as vacancies occurred. The Sultan’s bodyguards were called khāṣṣī and the amirs had also similar bodyguards. The army consisted of a) the bodyguard of the Sultan, b) the gūnd al-khāṣṣa, enlisted troops, who were paid in money and with the yield of the crown estates, c) the guards of the great amirs and former Sultans. In later times there was a body of reserves, awṣāf al-ṣawī, who were only called up for service in times of war but also received pay in times of peace. Military expeditions were usually decided upon by the council of state; the amirs were given money to equip and maintain their troops, to be able to lead them into the enemy’s country.

In addition to the military officers there were civil officials, ẓuhūl al-kalām (lords of the pen): a) the religious officials (al-ṣīr); b) who filled posts in the legal and scholastic worlds and a series of other offices; b) the regular administrative officials (al-dīwānīya) for the rest of the civil service.

The Sultan’s revenue was made up of the ground, poll and poor-tax, from the yield of the fields (on the Egyptian system of appanages). p. 149 out of which he gave the necessary funds for the army and officials, the customs, the state factories and extraordinary taxes on goods and markets, which, not being laid down in the Kūfīn, were considered illegal and resisted. He also sometimes made money by forced purchases and sales. The government bought up goods at a fixed price and forced purchasers to take them at a definite price. Finally there were monopolies out of which the Sultan made profits. Another favourite means of raising money was for the Sultan to visit some great man from whom he extorted large sums while a guest (especially Kūfīn [q.v.]). Things
seem to have been similar in Syria but we know very little about the division of the feuds there. The importance of the Mamluks in history lay in the fact that, protected by the deserts and their armed armies they stemmed the flood of Asiatic conquerors; they conquered Cinglie Khan’s Mongols and later the hordes of Timur Lenk, who had conquered Syria for a short time, and other conquerors. After the defeat of the Timurid and the retreat of Timur, the Sultans were forced to concentrate on the struggle with the gradually increasing power of the Ottomans. The struggle was long avoided by the formation of buffer states on both sides; among these the most notable were the dynasties of Dhu ‘l-Ghadir and of the White and Black Sheep (so-called from their standards). The success of Kālidār’s policy postponed the end but the rulers who followed him were weak. The rule of the Mamluks lost its vigour. They were weakened in long wars; their finances became quite hopeless as a result of their immediate expenditure, not commensurate with their means and a defective system of taxation which in the later period enabled the owners of large estates to escape the taxes. They therefore could not permanently resist the Ottomans, especially as the lack of discipline among the Mamluk leaders and the weakness of their field artillery made the army useless. The well-equipped fortresses were not defended against the Ottomans; they fell through treachery. The hum-eligible Sulṭān Kanṣāl Ghūri was defeated and slain in 1222 (1516) at Mardj Dābik (in the province of Aleppo). The line to Egypt was thus opened to Sulṭān Solm: after six months’ resistance the last Sulṭān Ṭūmanabād had to surrender. He was hanged from the Bāb Zuwa in Cairo. A number of the great amirs and the Caliph were taken to Constantinople. The caliphate ceased as a new Caliph was appointed; the Sulṭān of Constantinople became the first ruler in Islam. The protection of the holy places also passed automatically to him. The period of the Mamluks was marked by great activity in building (ii. 23–). Of secular buildings, few palaces have survived; on the other hand, fortresses (Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus and Birejik) which were entirely rebuilt in the Mamluk period, as well as a large number of fine tombs, hospitals, baths, mountains and aqueducts, still exist. Of religious buildings, splendid mosques with schools attached to them were built. While even under the Mamluks, there had been only one “great mosque” in each town or independent suburb, where the Friday service was held, it became the custom under the Mamluks that many Sulṭāns and governors and occasionally even one of the guilds built “great mosques” for the Friday service in the large towns. Mention may be made of the mosques of Baibars, Khalīl. Muḥammad al-Nāṣir, Sulṭān Ha-ṣan, Barākā, Muḥ`ayyad, Kālidār in Cairo, as well as the mosque in the provincial capitals Aleppo, Damascus and Tripoli. While agriculture, industry and art showed great prosperity, trade suffered very much under the later Mamluk Sulṭāns through the extortionate taxes of the government. The trade through Egypt, based on treaties with Frankish and Oriental rulers, yielded huge sums. The customs and the treatment of merchants by the Sulṭāns finally became so intolerable that the European powers did everything possible to secure the sea-route to India in order to avoid the transit through Egypt with its enormous expense and the roguery to which it was exposed.

The object of the last wars of Sulṭān Kānṣāl Ghūri was to gain a footing in South Arabia and nearer India to secure the Egyptian share in Indian trade.

Bibliography: Only the most important of the rich literature on the Mamluks is cited below (s. especially in van Berchem’s index to Mamluks pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabici-aranum, i., Egypte, Paris 1903, the full list):


MAMLUKS

7. Medina: Samatlı, Wafı Qa'wafa, Cairo 1285 (1869); Geschichte der Stadt Medinät, transl. Wustenfeld, Göttingen 1861.

(M. Sobernheim)

B. Period from 1517 to 1798. It is a significant fact, that even this period of nearly three centuries, during which Egypt belonged to the Ottoman Empire, may still be designated as a third Mamluk period. The change brought about by the conquest of Sultan Selim I in 1517 was, after all, not a radical one, from the point of view of government. Egypt and its inhabitants remained under the rule of a powerful minority of foreign race. The antagonism that existed in the beginning between Ottoman Turks and Mamluks and which had led at first to much bloodshed (execution of 800 mamluks by Selim I in Cairo) did not last very long after the troubles of the occupation were over. The Turkish soldiers and officials who entered Egypt during Ottoman rule soon became mixed up to a large extent with the numerically more powerful class of the Mamluks, whose aid was, moreover, indispensable, for the government of the country. Besides, the number of Mamluks (al-Sharif) continued to receive additions by purchase of slaves from the Caucasus. An author of the xviiith century (Vansbdl, p. 13) says that Egypt, in his day, was inhabited by Copts, Moors (by whom he means the islamised population), Arabs, Turks, Greeks, Jews and Franks. The "Turks" were the governing class and the "Mamluks" the Ottoman element; the real Ottomanisation of the country belongs to the sixteenth century. In accordance with what is said, the history of those centuries never shows, among the parties and factions into which the Mamluks were divided, a pro- or anti-Ottoman party; those quarrels were only of local and personal character. Even the first governor of Egypt, Khairbek, was a Mamluk, although, after him, the Pašas were sent, without exception, from Constantinople.

During the first 100 years, it is true, the authority of the Pašas sent from Constantinople to govern the country was undisputed. The Pašas could rely on seven contingents of troops (sahib) six of which were instituted by Selim I, while a seventh contingent was added under Sulaiman I, composed of Mamluks. Their nominal strength was 20,000 men in all. They were not commanded by the Paša, but by their own commander, who belonged to the sahib of the janissaries and resided in the citadel of Cairo. Afterwards these troops behaved more and more independently and were even able to depose Pašas whom they did not like, until, in the xviiiith century, this military force became the instrument of some all-influential Mamluk beys. Important matters of administration were treated by a great Diwan or State Council, which only met in extraordinary cases and in which the high functionaries were represented, as well as the military chiefs and the high religious dignitaries. Local and special government functions were exercised by twelve Sağıq beys; these represented at the same time the feudal aristocracy; from the beginning however, the ties that linked them to particular provinces seem to have been rather loose, for among them are mentioned the Kheya of the
Pasha, the Daftardar, the Amir al-Hadjj and the Amir al-Khaza, the three first of whom were also members of the great Dziwān. The other Beys were commanders at Suze, Damietta and Alexandria, and governors of the five big provinces in the Nile delta. Besides these twelve Beys there were twelve other Beys with similar functions. The real provincial administration was exercised by a class of functionaries called Kāhīfīs. Their chief task was the collection of the revenues. They may be considered as a kind of governor; some of the great Beys themselves were also Kāhīfīs in their districts or had different Kāhīfīs under them. Vansleb mentions 36 Kāhīfīs. As to the revenues, they were collected in various ways, the local customs in different parts of Lower Egypt and Upper Egypt varying considerably. The most common form was the furnishing of revenues (litāqūn); the mudāraqas had different kinds of right of possession on the lands, which were hereditary. They collected the revenue, in taxes or in kind, from the fellāhīs, generally through the village notables called Shāhīs al-Balad. In the tax-collecting there were further employed, a host of subordinate technical and financial functionaries, many of whom were Copts. Some Kāhīfīs were at the same time mudāraqas. This system of administration showed the close relation between administration and landowning, which has always been characteristic of Egyptian conditions [cf. iv. 142]. It was the continuation of the system which had prevailed under the Mamlik Sulṭāns (regulation by Kāıt Bay) and was regulated again in the Kānīn-nâmê-i Mihr of Sulaimān I (cf. J. von Hammer, Die osmanischen Reiches Statutarverordnung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, i. 101-142); here a special stress is laid on the rights and obligations of the Kāhīfīs.

In Cairo a large chancery, the chief of which was the Küzanīnâdī, had to collect these taxes and to keep the registers; the revenue collected were reserved partly for the pay of the troops and works of public utility such as irrigation, building of bridges and dikes, etc. partly for the yearly tribute to the Sultan, which was in the beginning 5,000,000 ducats and afterwards lowered to 600,000 and later to 400,000 ducats. In the xvith century the paying of tribute practically fell into disuse.

Besides the land-tax, there existed a great number of other taxes, under different denominations; they were collected more or less arbitrarily, and, in course of time, the anarchy in the government assumed greater proportions, they pressed ever heavier on the population. The rural population had as much to suffer from the exactions of their Mamlik administrators and proprietors as from the raids of Arab tribes, which the government was unable to control.

The history of Egypt during this period is a not very interesting succession of domestic intrigues, struggles and revolts. Until the beginning of the xviith century the Pashas could more or less maintain their authority, but they were replaced too often to have a lasting influence. No less than 117 Pashas governed Egypt until the arrival of the French (a complete list of them is given in Thureyia, Seljübi I. Čolmānî, iv. 355 sqq.). Many of them tried to make their short stay as profitable for themselves as possible, and several of them had to pay their creditors with their lives after their return to Constantinople. In the xviith century the real power in the country was exercised by the great Beys in Cairo, who had the troops in their hands and tolerated only those Pashas who did not interfere with their affairs. By this time the two most powerful positions in the country were those of the commander of Cairo, called the Shāhīs al-Balad and of the Amir al-Hadjj. Some of the Shāhīs al-Balad are reputed as good rulers, especially Ismā’il Bey, who held that office from 1707 to 1724. But the changes of power were always of a violent kind and prevented the forming of a dynasty; Ismā’il’s shāhīs al-Baladship itself had been preceded by a curious struggle between the two rival parties of the Dhu ‘l-Fikāriyya and the Khāsimiya, which had lasted for three months outside Cairo. In 1747 the Porte tried for the first time to reestablish its authority by ordering the governor Rāghib Pasha to exterminate the Mamlik Beys; this attempt failed, however, completely and the disorders continued until the appearance of the young Mamlik ‘Ali Bey [q.v.] who made himself for a short time independent Shāhīs al-Balad and ruler of Egypt, for the years 1770-1771. By this time the Porte began to take more serious measures to retain its hold on Egypt, but the regime of the Mamlik Beys did not end until a foreign power, France, temporarily occupied Egypt [cf. Kh. 120].

Under such a regime the conditions of living of the population could not be flourishing. It was not so much the position of Egypt as an Ottoman province that caused the suffering of the population, as the lack of a strong central power. European travellers like Vansleb and Lucas point to the fact that Egypt was, in the xviith century a rich country and that by the practical stopping of the payment of tribute, all the money remained in the country itself. But the riches remained only in the possession of the ruling minority, while the rural population was oppressed very hardly. The bad organisation caused, moreover, from time to time terrible famines, while, about the middle of the xviiith century began a yearly for the yellow plague and epidemics of plague. Since the last period of the Mamlik Sultans the country had lost, moreover, a rich source of revenue by the change of the trade-route to India. The transit trade was now restricted to inner African products and coffee and aromatics from Arabia, while the exportation of Egyptian products such as corn, cotton and sugar was limited. The timber that the country needed had to be imported from Turkey. Moreover, the trade with Christian countries often experienced serious hindrances from the arbitrary measures of the local authorities. At the same time the local industries declined rapidly; one of the causes may have been the transportation of a large number of skilled craftsmen to Constantinople by Salim 1; the once flourishing guild organisation was paralysed by this measure (cf. Thorning, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des islamischen Völkerverwesens, Berlin 1913, p. 81 and al-Donate, i. 20).

The decline of Egypt’s economic strength, on the other hand, made Egypt a relatively quiet possession for the Porte. Only in the very beginning of Ottoman rule, in 1524, a Turkish governor, Ahmad Pasha, tried to take the title of sultan of Egypt, but afterwards no attempts to recover independence were made until the time of ‘Ali Bey. Then, however, the political needs of the European colonial powers
made Egypt appear again as an important stage on the way to India and opened new possibilities of a more independent development, which were to be realised in the sixteenth century. In the meantime the possession of Egypt had been useful to Turkey in many respects; the Porte could always count on an Egyptian contingent of troops in its wars and the country itself was a base of action for the military operations in Syria, the Hijaz and Yemen. The reconquest of Yemen under Selim II was carefully prepared in Cairo. As soon as the tendency to independence appeared, however, as under Ali Bey, the Turkish hold on Syria and Arabia was immediately endangered seriously.

The predominant position of Egypt in Islam was not seriously affected by the Ottoman occupation. Al-Azhar [q.v.] remained one of the most important centres of Islamic learning; the Turkish Pasha and other dignitaries showed their acknowledgement of this fact by gifts and by the execution of restorations to the building, as they did occasionally for other religious institutions in the country. Though Islamic science continued to flourish, Egypt did not produce many prominent figures in this period. In the domain of the most important figure was al-Ramli (q.v.; d. 1506), the commentator of al-Nawawi, further the mystic al-Sha'wani (q.v.; d. 1565), and, as representative of Arabic philology, 'Abd al-Karim al-Baghdadi (q.v.; d. 1682). In popular mysticism the veneration of Ahmad al-Badawi [q.v.] by the Almadiya held a large place.

The period of Ottoman domination in Egypt is not wholly without interest from the point of view of architecture and art. Several governors, beginning with Khâ'iribek have constructed mosques; these mosques show a kind of transition from the Mamlûk to the Ottoman architectural style. There are also in Cairo several mosques founded by the Mamlûk Beys, like the mosque of Abu Dhabab, the traitor of 'Ali Bey, constructed in 1773. Some beautiful palaces have likewise been built by the Mamlûks, but only few of them are still extant (cf. on this subject: Mme R. L.Devonsch, L'Egypte musulmane et les fondateurs de ses monuments, Paris 1926, p. 115 sqq.).

Bibliography: The sources for the history of Egypt under Ottoman rule have not been much studied. Of the many Arabic works have to be mentioned (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 289 sqq.): Ibn Iyâs, Baddîl al-Zâhir fi Waḥīf i al-Dhâhir, iii., Bilâq 1312, p. 101 sqq. (until 1522); al-Mînhâdî, al-Baddûr al-ṣâfira fi man waḥlâ 'l-Ṣâhâra, MS. Vienna, No. 9152 (until 1549); al-Burgdjî, al-Rûyâ al-ṣâhâra fi Abû Shâmir, MS. Algiers, No. 1605; Ibn Zunbul, Fath Mîr, many MSS. (1517—1519); al-Îshâkî (cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 160 sqq.), Dawhat al-Îshâr fi man waḥlâ 'l-Dîwâr al-Mîrîya also called Lâlîfat 'Abd al-Uzâr fi man tâṣarrafi bi-Mîrî min Arab al-Dîwâl, several times printed in Cairo 1276, 1296, 1300, 1304 (until 1623); do., al-Rauwâl as-sâlim fi Abîhûr màna fi al-'Aţâwîl, MSS. Paris, No. 1562 and Brit. Mus., No. 1251 (until 1623); al-Ghumrî, 'Abbâhâr al-Fîlâm bi-'l-Târîkh Cmaîrâl 'l-Mîrî fi 'l-Islâm, only in MSS. (poem, until 1650); Muhammâd b. Muhammad b. 'Abd a-Sâtîrî, al-Ṭâfâs al-Bâhîya fi Tâmâlik Abî 'l-'Ummân al-Dîyâr al-Mîrîya, several MSS. (until 1634); do., al-Rauwâl al-Zâhiya fi Waḥlâ Mîrî al-Kâhira al-Mîrîsa, several MSS. (until 1651); do., al-Rauwâl al-Sâkîra fi Abîhûr Mîrî wa-'l-Kâhira, several MSS. (until 1645); al-Îbîfî, Târîkh al-Sâkîra fi Waḥlâ Abîl-Sâdîkî al-Sa'dîgî, several MSS. (treats of some events in the years 1658 and 1661); 'Abd al-Kâdir, al-Zâhir, MS. Berlin (G. A. L., ii. 299; the years 1603—1643); Ibrahim al-Khâhîîrî, Mabûa al-'Ajlî khâ tâbî al-Mîrî min al-Mu'mînîbî, MS. at Cairo (G. A. L., ii. 299; written about 1721); al-Damirâbâli, al-Dûrra al-Mâridâna fi Waḥlâ 'l-Khâhîrî, several MSS. (G. A. L., ii. 300; the years 1688—1755); Muṣâfî b. Ibrahimî, al-Zâhirî Mîrî, MS. Copenhagen, No. II59 (the years 1686—1739); al-Djâbâri, Târîkh Abîhûr al-Îslâm wa-'l-Târîkh wa-'l-Akkârî Cairo 1236, vol. i. and ii. (from 1694 up to the French occupation).

Among the Turkish sources all the great historical works of the Ottoman Empire since the time of Selim I should be mentioned, to begin with the different Sâlih namees; on the conquest of Egypt: Haidar Çelebi, Tegboek des egyptischen Feldherrn Sultan Selim, transl. by Khalil Edhem, Weimar 1916 (Deutsche Orient-bücherei, vol. xx). The following deal especially with Egypt: 'Abd al-Ålamîd, Namûdîr al-Åkhârî, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 58 sqq.; Turkish translation and continuation of an older work, up till 1540); Sûlîb b. Djâlahî, Târîkhî Mîrî-i Qâdirî, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 100 sqq.; written in 1546); Yusuf b. Ni'met-Allah, Târîkhî Mîrî, MS. Turin (G. O. W., p. 121; Turkish translation of an older Arabic work and continuation up till 1592); 'Ali, Hâdît al-Kâhîrî min Abî-Ådâl al-Zâhirî, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 133; written in 1599); Muhammâd b. 'Abd Allah, Târîkhî Mîrî, several MSS. (G. O. W., p. 243 sqq.; up till 1679).


Vansleb, Nouvelle Relation d'un voyage fait en Egypte, Paris 1677; Evliyâ Çelebi, Sûrat-hâname, 6th part, not printed; Paul Lucas, Voyage dans la Turquie, l'Arabie, Soudan, Palestine, Haute et Basse Egypte, etc., Amsterdam 1720, 2 vols.; B. de Maillet, Description de l'Egypte, Paris 1735. Cf. also the articles EGYPT and KIBIT.

( J. H. KRAMERS)

AL-MA'MûN, 'Abû 'l-Abâs 'Abd Allah [B. Hurûs], 'Abbâsîd caliph, born in Rabî' I 170 (Sept. 786), son of Hûrûn al-Râkhîî and a Persian slave named Mardûqî. After a desperate struggle, which ended in the assassination of the Caliph al-Amin (q.v.) in Muharram 158 (Sept. 813), the latter's brother al-Ma'mûn ascended the throne; it was six years, however, before he could make his entry into Bagdad. On account of his sympathy for things Persian, which was stimulated by the vizier al-Fa'fî b. Sahl [q.v.], the Caliph was not
at all popular with the Arabs. An 'Alid Muham-
mad b. Ibrahim. usually called Ibn 'Abd Rabbah, there- 
fore set up as a pretender to the throne in Kufa 
in Djamā' II 199 (Jan.-Feb. 815) and was sup- 
ported by a former adherent of al-Ma'mūn, Abu 
1-Sarāyā. The rebels had some success at first 
but Ibn 'Abd Rabbah died suddenly and when the 
general Hārthama b. 'A'yan [q. v.] advanced against 
him, Abu 1-Sarāyā had to take to flight. Soon 
afterwards he was taken prisoner and put to 
death (Rabi' 200 = Oct. 815). In the meanwhile 
the movement had spread, but the 'Alids made 
themselves so hated that Hārthama's troops were 
able to enforce order with difficulty. The victorious 
Hārthama, however, was shamefully 
rewarded for his services. After he had occupied 
Merw, the suspicious Caliph had him thrown 
into prison where he soon died (Dhu 'l-Ka'da 
200 = June 816). This increased the general 
discontent. While al-Ma'mūn remained for the time 
in Merw, the people of Bagdad rebelled and 
placed al-Manṣūr, a son of the Caliph al-Mahdī, 
at the head of the movement. When in Ramādān 
201 (March 817) al-Ma'mūn designated an 1-Alid, 
'Ath al-Kidā [q. v.], as heir apparent and assumed 
the crown of the 'Alids instead of the black of 
the 'Abbāsids, the people of the capital elected 
Ibrahim, another son of al-Mahdī, Caliph (Dhu 
'l-Hijja 201 = July 817). Then there were 
trouble in Egypt and in Ashšab al-Dīn, the people 
were stirred up by the Khurram Bābak [q. v.] 
who terrorised the northern provinces for nearly 
20 years. In these circumstances al-Ma'mūn had 
finally to leave Merw and go to the 'Iraq (202 = 
817). But when the Arabs murdered the vizier 
al-Hādī who was, particularly hostile to them, 
'Ath al-Kidā died suddenly, and in addition, the 
governor of Wāṣīq, al-Hāsān b. Shāh, the vizier's 
brother went mad, or at least was treated as such, 
the people of Bagdad had really no longer rea- 
sion to support Ibrahim and in Safar 204 (Aug. 
819) al-Ma'mūn entered the capital and the 1-Alid 
colours were exchanged for the 1-Ahmad. Al-Hāsān 
b. Shāh was then restored to his government, 
and a few years later the Caliph married his 
daughter Būtain [q. v.]. As soon as the Caliph had 
left Khurasān, a rebellion broke out there among the 1-Jatān. At the end of 205 (June of 
820) or beginning of 206, Tāhir b. al-Husāin 
[q. v.] was appointed governor of Khurasān. He 
proved in every way fitted for his difficult post 
but carried his independence so far that in 207 
(822) he renounced his fealty to the Caliph. 
Although he died the following day, the Caliph 
did not dare to deprive his sons of Tāhir's go-
vernorship, and in this way the dynasty of the 
Jatān was founded in Khurasān. In 210 (825- 
826) 'Abd Allah b. Tāhir [q. v.] after defeating 
Nāyr b. Shāhārīb went by the Caliph's order to 
Jerusalem. Here the Yamanis, who were loyal to 
al-Ma'mūn, had begun to fight with the Kātib b. 
Anīn who sided with al-Amin, and the struggle lasted till 
the latter's death. A more peaceful period ensued, 
but soon new troubles broke out, and with the 
arrival of the Spanish Muslims banished by the 
Caliph al-Hakam I [q. v.] the situation became 
still more complicated. The latter seized the town 
of al-Kandārya, but when 'Abd Allah b. Tāhir 
arrived in Egypt the native rebels had to submit, 
and the Spanish intruders retired to Crete. When 
'Abd Allah was appointed governor of Khurasān,
AL-MA'MUN, nomarch of Seville and Cordova, died in 932.

At the death of Abū-Abd Allāh in 925, al-Ma'mūn was left to rule alone. He was a just and wise ruler, and his reign was marked by peace and prosperity. He was able to maintain friendly relations with the caliph of Baghdad, and his subjects were content with his rule. However, his death in 932 marked the end of the Umayyad dynasty in Spain.

At the time of his death, Al-Ma'mūn was negotiating with the Caliph of Baghdad to restore the Umayyad dynasty to power in Spain. He was also involved in a conflict with the Berbers in the south of the kingdom.

Al-Ma'mūn was succeeded by his son, Abū-Abd Allāh, who continued his father's policies of peace and prosperity. However, the kingdom was soon threatened by the invasion of the Almoravids from Morocco. The Almoravids were able to conquer the kingdom and establish their rule.

The reign of Al-Ma'mūn was characterized by peace and prosperity, and he is remembered as a just and wise ruler.
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defeated the army of al-Mu'tasim in 627 (1230).

Enraged at the defection of the Almohad Malhūtun, so devoted to his predecessors, al-Ma'mūn took a decision at Marrākush, which was quite unprecedented in the annals of the dynasty. He stigmatised the memory of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart, denied him "impeccability" ('inma) and had a large number of Almohad shāhids executed whom he suspected of having betrayed him. The rest of the reign of al-Ma'mūn was spent in trying to put down several rebellions in the Maghrib; but he did not succeed in bringing his rival to terms for the latter was able to take and plunder Marrākush. On hearing this, al-Ma'mūn, then with the siege of Ceuta, hurried off to the capital at once (but fell ill and died on the way in the valley of the Wādī 'l-Abid at the end of Dhu'l-Hijjah 629 (Oct. 1232).


E. Leve-Provençal

MA'MŪNIS, name of a dynasty.

In the 12th (3rd) century Qādirīyā, to the north of modern Khiva, was a dependency of Bukhāra and was ruled by a line of princes called the Ma'mūnis. Nothing is mentioned about them by the Oriental historians till 382 (992) when Ma'mūn b. Muhammad b. A'īsul Rulof of Qādirīyā, is said to have assisted Amir Nuḥ b. Mansûr the Samānid in his exile during the temporary occupation of Bukhāra by Bughrā Khān, ruler of Kāshqār. In 385 (995) Ma'mūn attacked Abū 'Abd Allāh, ruler of Khwarizm, in order to punish him for his treachery to Abū 'Ali Sindiūrī, took him prisoner and annexed Khwārizm. Ma'mūn was assassinated in 387 (997). His son Abu l-Hasan 'Ali succeeded to the throne, and married a sister of Sultan Muhammad of Ghazna. Abu l-Hasan died about 399 (1000–1001) and was succeeded by his brother Abu l-Abbas Ma'mūn. Abu l-Abbas married his brother's widow, the sister of Sultan Muhammad. Shortly after this he gave offence to his army by doing homage to Sultan Mustūm. The commanders of the army organised a rebellion against him, put him to death on Shawaal 15, 407 (March 10, 1017) and raised one of his sons to the throne. On hearing this, Sultan Mahmūd marched to Khwarizm to avenge the death of his brother-in-law, defeated the rebels at Ḥazā'īn on Safr 5, 408 (July 3, 1017), and executed the leaders of the insurrection. All the seions of the royal house were taken prisoners and sent to Khvāsān. The kingdom of Khwārizm was annexed and placed under the command of Altūnāt with the title of Khwārizm-shāh. But after the return of Sultan Mahmūd to Ghazna, Abū Ishāq, father-in-law of Abu l-Abbas Ma'mūn, tried to establish himself in Khwārizm but was defeated by Altūnāt.

This dynasty was famous for the Tarīkh-i Gudīc and Tarīkh-i Dīghān Arā' of Kādī Ahmad Ghaffārī, with the Farīghūnīs who were the rulers of Dīghānānī.


MA'MŪRET AL-'AZĪZ, the name given to the new town of Mezz, built beside Kharpūt [q.v.] in honour of Sultan 'Abd al-'Azīz. In time the name became applied to the new wilāyet formed in 1879 around Kharpūt-Mezz; this consisted of three sandjaks: al-'Azīz, Khazāt and Ma'latiya. As a result of the administrative reforms of 1919 (1921) each of these sandjaks became an independent wilayet but later modifications were made. According to the official annual of 1925–1926, the wilayet of Ma'mūret al-'Azīz has an area of 11,299 sq. km. or 12,282,900 dunums, of which 3,124,596 are arable. It contains 6 kaḍās: the central kaḍā, Pulī, Kharpūt, Kebīn, 'Arabkūr, Kemālīye (this new name replaces the historical one of Egin).

The annual of 1926–1927 records an even more radical reorganisation. The area of the wilayet of al-'Azīz is given as 17,268 sq. km. with 1,562,296 dunums of arable land. The wilayet which lost the western kaḍās ('Arabkūr and Egin) has been extended on N. and E. It has 11 kaḍās subdivided into 32 nāḥiyāt with names little known and difficult to transliterate:

1. the kaḍā al-'Azīz, with the nāḥiyā: Khan-kendi, Mullā-kendi, Irm, Khudāsiya (?), Erenler (Ayunus), Bālū-bey, Kharpūt, Čengūdzh, Sarīn (Dishidi).

2. Kebīn, with only one nāḥiyā: Tahir.

3. Bāskūl: Mūshūr-Huyak, Izōli (Komur-khān), Karabekān (Meriwan), Seywan.

4. Pulī: Gök-dere (and Bulanık) Okhi (and Lower Bulanık), Kara-cor.

5. Khazāt (Dersim): Ballkan (Elghāzi), Kermit, Amutka, Sinu, Der-Aghzenik.


8. Čabakçur: Perkheŋuk (Kamran).

The kaḍās without nāḥiyā are:


10. Gendj-Merkez (Dāhrīn).

II. Madēn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of the kaḍā.</th>
<th>Number of villages.</th>
<th>Number of inhabitants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>52,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>17,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Leve-Provençal
The wilayet (without Cemish-gezek) has therefore 171,631 inhabitants. The events of the war and the suppression of the Kurd rising in 1925 must have had far-reaching effects on the ethnical aspect of this territory. Before the war the population was mixed: Kurd, Armenian and "Zazi" (a people speaking an Iranian dialect, q.v.).


Ma'n b. AWS, an early Muhammadian poet of the tribe of the Banu Muzaina. His period can be established with some accuracy. From the Kitâb al-Aghâni we know that he composed a panegyric on Omar I. and a lampoon on 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair for his lack of hospitality; the latter is preserved in the Aghâni as is the beginning of the former. The panegyric survives also in the Divânî, where it is dedicated to 'Omar's son 'Asim. The Aghâni further records that Ma'n lived to the beginning of the fitna between 'Abd Allah and Marwân b. al-İskak, i.e. to 64 (684). The poet must therefore have been born about the beginning of the Muslim era. The Aghâni further gives details of his private life and the Divânî also gives similar information. He had an estate in Arabia and made journeys to Syria and the 'Irâq. One of his wives came from Syria. He also took part in the wars of his tribes. In his old age he became blind.

Up till recently all that we knew of Ma'n's poems were the fragments preserved in the Aghâni and elsewhere. P. Schwarz however discovered in the Escorial an incomplete manuscript of the Divânî with a commentary, the work of al-Kâlî [q.v.] which he published in 1903 with a short introduction and translation of the notices in the Aghâni. H. Reckendorf supplemented this. In 1927 Kamûl Mustafâ published an edition in Cairo. It lacks some poems given by Schwarz; on the other hand it has two fragments not given by him. The introduction is part a literal translation of Schwarz, who is mentioned by name. It is not clear from where the edition is based. It seems however to be based simply on Schwarz's edition with new manuscripts and, compared with it, only shows corrections of the text and omissions and additions from other sources.


(M. Plessner)

Ma'n b. Muhammâd b. Ahmâd b. Şûrûhû at-Tânûbî au-l’Awáq ou Abd Ya’bû, founder of a dynasty in the little principality of Almeria, in Eastern Spain in the middle of the 14th century A.D. The principality had been founded in 1025 by the two Amrîd "Slavs" Khârain and Zuhair. On the latter's death in 1037, their overlords "Abd al-'Azîz b. Abû 'Amir, king of Valencia, declared it his property and in 1041 placed his brother-in-law Ma'n b. Şûrûhû as governor there. The latter belonged to a noble family of Arab origin; his father had been one of the generals of the celebrated Hâdîjib al-Mansûr [q.v.] and was governor of the town of Huesca. Ma'n remained loyal to the king of Valencia for nearly four years, then cast off his allegiance and declared himself independent. He reigned at Almeria for a few years longer and died in Ramada'ın 443 (Jan. 1052).


Ma'n b. Zâ’îda, Abu l-Walîd al-Salîmî, a Muslim general and governor. In the Omayyad period Ma'n was in the service of the governor of the 'Irâq, Yazid b. 'Omar b. Hubâra, and took part in the fighting against the 'Abîd rebel 'Abd Allah b. Mu'âwiyah and the general of the 'Abâsîd bâdâhà Kâhumah b. Shabbîb as well as against his son al-Hasan. He thus gained the enmity of al-Mansûr and after the murder of Ibn Hubâra had to escape to the insignificance of the 'Abâsîds. But when the Râwândîs [q.v.] went to al-Hâshimîyya (probably in 141 = 758–759) and tried to storm the palace of the caliph, because he had had their ringleaders arrested, Ma'n came out of his retirement, drove back the rebels with his men and rescued al-Mansûr, who at once pardoned him and gave him the governorship of the Yaman. Here he favoured his fellow tribesmen, the Banû Rabî'a, while the Yamanis were treated with the greatest severity. He was transferred to Sidjûţ, according to the usual date, in 151 (768–769) and his son Zâ'îda followed him as governor of the Yaman. Soon afterwards, probably the next year, Ma'n was murdered in Burz by some Khârîjîs, who had gained an entrance to his house by pretending they were workmen doing repairs. 151 and 158 are given for the year of his death, in addition to 152.


(K. V. Zeitsestren)

Ma'n (Banû), Emirs of the Lebanon. Their political history begins with the Turkish conquest of Syria. We do not know if they were of Arab origin like the Banû Bohîr or Kurds like the Djinbîlî or Maghribî like the 'Abîd al-Yamîn, the Tallûk etc., who came to the Lebanon in the time of the Fatimids. While, in the 13th century, the biographer Mahbûbî (Khulafâ' al-Âthar âl'Amîn al-kârîn al-khâlî tâ‘arîkh, in 266) was collecting the records of the family of the Banû Ma'n, he found they were not agreed about the genealogy of their ancestors. But it is certain that they had long been in possession of the emirate of Shûf (Southern Lebanon). He is certain that they did not belong to the princely family of the Lebanon Taunîk. It is none the less surprising that in the monograph, which he devotes to the latter family (Târîkî Bellârît, ed. Cheikho) Sâ‘îh b. Yahyâ deliberately passes over the Banû Ma'n. The Banû Ma'n seem to have early adopted the teaching of the Druses. This step secured them the sympathies of the Druses of the Lebanon and
of the Wadi l-Taim at the foot of Hermon. In the latter district they were allied with the Shiḥbā emirs. Enfeebled by the struggles with the 'Alam al-Din—their relations and also their secular rivals—the Banū Tanūkh, themselves divided into Kaṣāf and Yamānī, underwent the fate of such exhausted organisms and ended by breaking up. The Maʿnīs were only waiting the opportunity to seize their political heritage. This was given by the Ottoman conquest of Syria.

On the eve of the battle of Dābīk (1516) between the Turks and the Mamluks of Egypt they divided in time to which side victory would incline and wiser than the Tanūkh declared for the Turks. Their chief at that time was the emir Fakhr al-Dīn I. He was one of the first of the Syrian chiefs to hasten to Damascus to congratulate Selim I on his victory. Favourably impressed by his protestations of devotion, the Sultan sent him back to the Lebanon with enhanced prestige and authority at the expense of the Tanūkh. In this accession of power, the Maʿnī emir was much assisted by Ghazālī, a traitor to the Mamluk cause, to whose fortune he had decided to link that of his family. We do not know how he escaped the catastrophe that overwhelmed him (Jan. 1521) his protector Ghazālī, who in the end played traitor to the Turks also.

In 1544 the emir Kurkās succeeded his father Fakhr al-Dīn and in 1585 there took place at Dārūn ʿĀkkār the plundering of the caravan which was taking to Constantinople the taxes collected in Egypt and Syria. The Ottomans accused the Maʿn of complicity and of having sheltered the criminals. Their troops invaded the Lebanon. The emir Kurkās shut himself up in the inaccessible rock of Shaṭīr Tiṣrin near Dārūn (Southern Lebanon) and died there of chagrin or poison (1585).

The most remarkable of the Maʿnīs was undoubtedly the son and successor of Kurkās, called Fakhr al-Dīn (1585–1635), like his grandfather. The partisans of the cause of independence in the Lebanon regarded him as a precursor and have never ceased to invoke the example of his efforts for his country. For an account of his career see the article on him (ii., p. 45). The conquests beyond the Lebanon and his relations with European powers brought down upon him the vengeance of the Porte. He had to go into exile in Italy and leave to ʿAli, the eldest and most gifted of his sons along with his own brother Yūnus, the administration of the Lebanon (1613). On a promise to dismantle the chief fortresses of the Lebanon the Porte recognised ʿAli and even, after five years of exile, allowed his father Fakhr al-Dīn to return to the Lebanon. His son ʿAli displayed no enthusiasm at his return (1618) The new conquests of his father soon began to disturb the Porte, who resolved to make an end of the troublesome Maʿnī vassal. Surprised by superior forces in the Wadi l-Taim his son ʿAli fell fighting bravely and Fakhr al-Dīn was taken to Constantinople and put to death (1635).

The Central and Southern Lebanon, “the Mountain of the Druses” as it was officially called, was then handed to the family of the ʿAlam al-Dīn, whose ambitions had never ceased from the beginning of the rise of the Banū Tanūkh, to thwart the efforts of all the rulers of the Lebanon. One of their first acts was to exterminate the last scions of the Tanūkh. This crime facilitated the rise to power of the Shiḥbā. Their excesses and the regret for the Maʿnīs soon made the ʿAlam al-Dīn unpopular. After their expulsion from the Lebanon the Maʿnī emir Muḥīm followed; his son Aḥmad succeeded in regaining a precarious authority under the jealous supervision of the Turkish Pashas. The more distinguished of the two emirs was Muḥīm, son of the emir Yūnus and nephew of the great Fakhr al-Dīn. He ruled for about 20 years. Both continued the liberal traditions of their illustrious ancestor. Like him they protected the colonies of Christian agriculturists whom he had invited from northern Lebanon and for whom he had built churches and monasteries.

Aḥmad, grand-nephew of Fakhr al-Dīn II, died in 1697 without leaving male heirs and the family of the Maʿnīs thus became extinct. Turkey could no longer have any illusions about the rebellious nature of the Lebanonese and their impatience under a foreign yoke. To assume the direct government of the Lebanon was not attractive to the Porte and would have forced it to undertake its conquest. The grave political crisis through which Turkey was then passing prevented a new expedition being undertaken, the risks of which were very well known. On the other hand the rule of the ʿAlam al-Dīn with official support had not given satisfactory results. On promise of the payment of an annual tribute, the notables of the Lebanon were authorised to form a general assembly at Sumkāntiya (province of Shuf) to elect a governor to inherit the legacy of the Banū Maʿn. Their choice fell upon the Shiḥbā emirs, allies and relatives of the old emirs.

### Bibliography:

See that of the article FAKHR AL-DIN and the notices of xvith century individuals scattered through Muḥīm's bibliographical work quoted above; among them i. 381–387: iii. 266 sqq. 209–303, iv. 396, 409, 426–427: Ḥidār Shībīn, Taʾrīkh, Cairo 1909, p. 709–717, 722–725, 731–741; Tanūkh Shīrāzī, Taʾrīkh al-ʿĀkām fi Ḥabl Lmjna, Bairūt 1859, p. 247–345: Ristelhueber, Les traditions françaises au Liban, Paris 1918, p. 18–21: H. Lammens, La Syrie, précis historique, Bairūt 1921, ii. 57, 66–94. (H. Lammens) MAʿN (A.) means in the old language sense, significance and is so used as a grammatical term. In philosophical language the use of the word varies from the most general to the most particular so that it is impossible to give a general translation for it. It occurs in quite untechnical connections as “thought”, “what is meant” or simply “thing” etc. but also has the special meaning of “conception” or as the Dictionary of Technical Terms, ed. by Spranger, has it “an image of the intelligence (ṭārā al-dhiḥna) in so far as a word corresponds to it, i.e. in so far as
it is meant by a word”. Horten has investigated the special meaning of the word in metaphysics (Was bedeutet als philosophischer Terminus; in Z. D. M. G., liv. 391 sqq.). According to him, manā is an “incorporeal reality” not merely a subjective conception. In this use it is regularly contrasted to sīfa.

The plural ma'nā is the name of a branch of study, namely, rhetorical style.

_Bibliography:_ in the article; cf. also the dictionaries and Tākhkoprūzdā, Misfāḥ al-Salātu li Min al-Ma'nāi. (M. Plessner)

_MANĀF_ is the name of an early-Arabian idol which was venerated by Kūrānā and Hadhālā, as may be concluded from the fact that among these clans the name ‘Abd Manāf “servant of Manāf” occurred. It is said that one of Muḥammad’s ancestors — the pedigree being Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Muttaṭāb b. Ḥādījim b. ‘Abd Manāf — received this name, because his mother consecrated him to Manāf, who was then the chief deity of Makkā.

Whether this last statement be true or not, it does not restore to life a deity whose individuality remains to us as dim as that of all its companions. Ibn al-Kalībī knows nothing of its whereabouts, except that menstruating women were bound to keep themselves at a distance from it.

The name does not occur either in the Kūrān or in classical hadīth. It derives from a root _n-z-f_, which in several Semitic languages conveys the meaning of “being elevated”.

_Bibliography:_ al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1091 sq.; Wellhausen, Reise arabischen Heidentums, 2nd ed., p. 56 sq. (A. J. Wensinck)

_MANĀKĪB_ (A.), plural of manāka, means the merits and doings of a miraculous nature of celebrated holy persons of Islam, heads of schools, saints and founders of μανία. Other terms like karamāt, faḍā’il are used with the same meaning but less frequently. We have the titles or manuscripts of several works on eastern manākīb. Ḥāfīz Khalīfa gives a long list of them. Among the most notable may be mentioned the manākīb of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, of al-Shāfi’i and of Abū Hanīfa.

The literature of the manākīb assumed a special development in Morocco from the end of the middle ages. The majority of the shīfiʿkhs who played a part in the great renaissance of Islam in this country at that time had one or more monographs devoted to their manākīb after their deaths.

For a more detailed study of the place occupied by the genre of manākīb in the Arabic literature of Morocco cf. my Historiens des Chorfa; Essai sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVème au XVème siècle, Paris 1922, p. 44—54 and 220 sqq. (E. Lévy-Provençal)

_MANĀRA, tower, minaret._

_Material, structure and adornment._ The use of brick or stone for manāras depended on the material generally used for building in the country in question. The manāras in Spain were therefore of stone so far as one can judge from those still existing in the African Maghrib mainly of brick, in Cairo of stone, in Arabia, Syria, Anatolia, Armenia and Mesopotamia of both, in the Ṭrāṭ, Persia and Fārgīstān of brick and in India of both. In Persia there are isolated exceptions, like the manāra in Kerāt, a structure of stone and lime with an outer covering of tiles; indeed stone and lime were very often used for the foundations and bases without affecting the character of the edifices themselves in brick. Of considerable importance from the artistic point of view is the outer covering of a layer of tiles in Persia and the Ṭrāṭ, from the variations and patterns of which the manāras receive their decorative exteriors; by alternating horizontal and vertical layers (hażirīhā, bonding), by alternating reliefs and depressions, ornamental areas are formed from which strips of ornament or script arise formed of tiles specially prepared for the purpose. The Turkestān and Timurī manāras are decorated with coloured glaze. In the post-Timurī period also the glaze continually appears, especially in the pair of minarets which now commonly flank the entrance to a mosque (Tabīz, Māghban, etc.). It is in the Guldesta, the balconies round the top, that the art of working decoratively in brick reaches its height. Here the necessary basis for the balcony was formed by brackets arranged in layers or rows of cells (stalactite-like cornices, maḥmānas).

_Object and Significance._ The term manāra or minār is applied to all Muslim towers. They were used not only for religious purposes as places from which to call to prayer and to mark mosques but also, as before the Muslim conquest, for profane purposes as watch- and signal-towers. The tower on the top of a hill at Kerāt in Khurasān (cf. below) is from its isolated commanding position intended as a signal-tower or column of victory and it shows that these towers were built in the Muslim period exactly like the manāras of mosques. In form and style these erection, serving different purposes, form one category, into which they also fall objectively from having the same name. There are a number of early references to such manāras, which were intended to be indicators for caravans and watch-towers (cf. Dict. Persien, Islam. Ik in Khurasān, p. 59). Such towers were however found all over the Asian plains and through China to the Pacific Ocean. Of course very few of them were works of art. There are a number of exceptions in the contemporary names for such towers, like that of Mahnuḏ of Gharzā which is called a _minare_ in an inscription (see below). One of the minarets of the mašūla in Ḫust is called simply _sumnart_ in the inscription (cf. Niedermayer-Diez, Afghanistan, p. 59). The _stanakhs_ or _litā_ erected by king Asoka in India between 250—232 B.C. may be claimed as precursors of the minarets of eastern Islam; although actually pillars of much smaller size than a minār, many of them already show the same division into a polygonal and a cylindrical section. Their object was also half religious and half monumental in character. They in turn came from the Indo-Aryan columns of wood which were put up from the earliest times as symbols of the deity. The Indo-Buddhist stambha of brick at Kābul of uncertain date is a connecting link between these and the earliest Muslim memorial towers in Gharzā (see below).

_Shape._ From this similarity just mentioned, it is evident that the manāras follow the traditional shape of the towers of the country in question. In the Mediterranean lands, as H. Thiersch has shown, it was the lighthouses and in Syria the watch-towers, dwelling- and church-towers that
were the predecessors in form of the manāras. The manwiyas of Sāmarrā and the manāra of Iba Ṭūlūn in Cairo again go back to old Oriental models. In Persia and Sijistān also, Nestorian church towers may have given the early manāras their square and polygonal shape (cf. Diez, Persien, 6. Ehe. in Kāhāsān, p. 75); but in the rivalry of shapes in the eastern empire the slender cylindrical manāra, which is often also called nil, won. It was the victory of the monumental building without windows over the western dwelling-tower with windows. Their earliest precursors were, as already mentioned, the Indian lāts. The observatory towers built by Sultāns Maḥmūd and Maṣʿūd III in Ghazna were built as memorials of victories like the Indian Ḍagastamāns. Their shape was suggested by India but remodelled by the spirit of Muslim Persia and given a character of their own (cf. Diez, op. cit., p. 76 and 151 sqq.).

The most monumental evidence of Indian inspiration is the Kūb Minār [q.v.] in Dehli (beg. of viith—xiith century; cf. M. v. Berchem, in Diez, Churasanische Baukunst, p. 109 sqq.). The fact that the Persians called them nil points to their ancestry, the primitive poles and pillars used as indicators. To such poles, which can still be found at the present day at saints' tombs, revered by the common people in the country districts of Persia, may perhaps be traced the square and octagonal decorative shafts of the city and mosque iwans, found in pairs in Persian towns with Turkish inhabitants and in Asia Minor. Although they are frequently in the shape of minarets and have a gallery, their object is as a rule merely decorative. Both groups of mansions, the square and the round, the hollow towers with a staircased winding up inside opening out on the gallery. In the old Persian minarets of brick, these galleries or guldest have been completely destroyed as they were made of wood. We must imagine them to have stood on arcades of cells with carved wooden railings, rafters and roofs such as may be seen everywhere in the surviving mināras at popular places of pilgrimage like Karbalā', Kūm and Maḥbād. A comparison with the galleries in the towers of the wooden churches of Eastern Europe (e.g. in Transylvania) points to the descent of the minaret galleries from wooden buildings of an everyday character.

Form and Significance of the Manāras.

In spite of the similarity of purpose there is a marked difference, indeed contrast, between the minarets of eastern and western Islam. The square and polygonal minarets of the Maghrib, Egypt and Syria are still essentially buildings for habitation; the cylindrical manāras of the eastern lands are on the other hand distinctly monumental buildings, pillars symbolic of the deity. The angular minarets of the west are divided into stories by moldings and have windows for communication with the outer world; they are usually heavy on a broad base, while in contrast the cylindrical minarets of the east incorporate the symbol of the absolute which has this form, the unique, the abstract; the irresistible ascension to the deity without transitions or stopping places. The minarets of the west remain individual towers, of which hardly two are alike; in the east of the viith (xiith) century the cylindrical form was already established as the absolute and only one, never to be altered nor made capable of ascension, as the only possible form of manāra. The minarets of the west thus remain ex-watch-, church- or lighthouse-towers without bells or lights, decorative survivals of a culture foreign to their nature; those of the east on the other hand were etherealized and became spiritual manāras. The Cairo minarets were an interesting sport in their shape; the Persian and Turkish on the other hand a confession of faith in monumental form. They soar up to the heavens with unimpeded vigour. The silhouette of their tiled decoration rises upwards on close inspection till finally the eye of the beholder is held by the marked effects of light and shade on the guldest. The form of the guldest however is chosen with an idea of magical effect. The spire rests on a gallery of cells, the secret of the construction of which the spectator cannot easily grasp and the decorative gallery of wooden rafters and railings glitters with bright colours above it. A coat of glaze and the gilt top reflect far and wide a magic reflection like the glazed domes.

Shape and Development of the Manāra in Different Countries—Syria is the original home of the square manāra, which there took over the old native form for watch-towers, dwelling-towers or grave-towers and the church-tower which succeeded them. Islam at first used the existing pre-Islamic towers as minarets, on to which mosques were frequently built, when old churches which already had towers were not taken over and adapted (cf. Bünnow in Thiersch, Pharas, p. 101). The oldest minarets of this kind are in Ḥarrān, the land of stone building ṣawt ḫayyām, which contained many old decaying stone-towers (Bosra, manāra of the mosque of Omar b. al-Ḳaṭṭāb, inscription of the time of the Caliph Omar, Dār al-Muslin etc.). In Damascus the two southern minarets of the Omayyad mosque begun by Walīd in 675 [765?] belonged to the old church of St. John, while the northern minaret was a completely new building of Walīd’s. This is therefore the oldest independent Muslim manāra. The manāras of the Omayyad mosque became models not only for Syria but through the Omayyad migration to Spain (Cordova) for the Maghrib also. Wherever we later find in Syria the Egyptian tower-form, there is always a definite Egyptian influence present and as a rule they are Mamlik foundations. It is still hardly possible to compile a chronological list of Syrian manāras (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 99—110 and the illustrations).

Palestine. In this country on the borders of Egypt, the influence of the latter country made itself felt. The octagonal manāra on a square base predominates. The manāra of the chief mosque in Ghazza shows an octagon diminishing in width by successive stages, while the minaret of the mosque of al-Ḥāshim there has the same diameter throughout and is only divided into four stories with windows by large moldings. The smaller mosques have short squat octagonal towers. The manāra of ʿAlī Bakka in Hebron is half rectangular and half octagonal with a high mihrāb-like niche in the lower story. The octagonal tower is found as far as Jerusalem, where it meets with the northein Syrian square towers. The latter is again found at Ḥārām al-Sharif and in the mosque of Sīdī Omar beside the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and along the coast in Jaffa, Ḥaifa, Sidon, Tyre and Baitūt, and in the interior in Tiberias, Ṣafad, Nablus, etc. On the other hand
Khusrawgird near Sabzawar in Khorasan: Manara of 505 (1111)

Gharna: Manara of Mas'ud of 495 (1101-1102)
Cairo: Mināras of the Mamlūk period
Sangbast near Mashhad in Khorasan: Manara of a Ribat, 11th (xiith) cent.

Cairo: sketches of the two Manaras with outer covering of the Mosque of Hakim
the manāra in Ramla of the viith (xiiith) century is unique with its buttresses and pointed arches and dwarf pillars and columns. Thiersch takes it to be a copy of the most celebrated Christian tower of the country, the bell-tower of the Holy Sepulchre built in 1160—1180 in Jerusalem, of which only the base is still standing; (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 119 sqq. and the pictures there).

Egypt. The oldest manāra in Egypt is the tower of the Djāmī’ b. Ṭullun. Like the Mahlīya of Sāmarrā, this minaret stands outside the masque and resembles them in form also, although it differs in its material which is limestone. The first storey is a square tower with a window with horsehoe arches, the second is cylindrical and an outer staircase leads up around them. The two upper octagonal stories are later in date, having been erected by the Mamlūk Sulṭān Lāḏīn. Nothing final can be said about this manāra, apparently erected by a foreign architect and combining a number of foreign influences. The manāras next to it in time are the five towers of hewn stone of the mosque of Hākim with their covering of tiles of a later date; they must be contemporary with the mosque, which was built in 393—404 (1002—1013), and were covered by Ballāris II and given new spires (703 = 1303—1304). They are of different shapes. The northern tower is cylindrical on a square base, the southern has a square lower half and four octagonal upper stories, each narrower than the one below it, the first of which has four semi-cylindrical cornices in the corners. The decoration in relief on the stone has analogies in the gateway of the same date (pictures in Diez, K. d. isl. Vulk. 1, p. 58; 2, p. 54). Of these two towers the southern one may be considered the ancestor of the minarets of Cairo. Its square-octagonal form, usually crowned by a cylindrical storey, survives. The further development is limited to the proportions, which aim at greater elegance and slenderness, and the breaking up of the surface with niches and muqarnāt cornices. Towards the end of the second Mamlūk period, say under Khalīfa ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, it reached its culmination. The manāra of the mosque at his tomb was never to be surpassed in grace and wealth of ornament. A list of the most important minarets of Cairo between 1000—1356 a. n. is given by Thiersch with many illustrations.

Arabia. As in Palestine, in Arabia there was no native type of manāra and indeed Arabia never developed any sacral architecture with a character of its own. The minaret of the mosque of Walīd in Medina may have been Syrian in form. The manāras at present standing in Medina belong to the sixth restoration of the mosque by Kā’īr Bāy in 888 (1483). They are slender minarets of the Mamlūk type with octagonal and cylindrical stories. The seven manāras in Mecca, the sanctuary of which was ten times restored, only show modern forms of tower, frequently influenced by the slender Turkish form (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 123). Two slender round minarets of the ixth (xvith) century still flank the ruined mosque on the island of Bahrain (cf. Diez, Jahrb. d. as. Kunst, 1925, ii. 2).

Maghrib. The oldest gawmā’s, as the manāras of the Maghrib are called, in Africa is in Kairūnā, the massive three storied tower of the mosque of Sidi Ẓokhā of 105 (724). The two upper receding stories with blind niches are probably of later date than the unadorned upper storey with loopholes on three sides and three windows only on the side that looks on the court. The cistern in the basement and the measurements of this tower which are exactly half those of the Pharas, suggested to Thiersch that it was an imitation of the Pharas. Another gawmā’s, also of the iiith (viiith) century was the minaret of the Djamī’ al-Zāhīna in Tunis before its restoration in the xviith century. Old pictures of it show a plain square lower storey with a narrower octagonal upper storey and the platform on top enclosed by a breez-high parapet with a pillared gallery. Of this probably only the lower part is old, while the second storey and the parapet date from the restoration of 1653 (pictures in K. d. O., ix.; Kuhn, Maurische Kunst, vi.). Egyptian influence, in so far as such existed, extended to Tunis. West of Tunis begins the Spanish sphere of influence, the model for which was the gawmā’s in Cordoba built by ‘Abd al-Rahlān III in 339—340 (951) and destroyed in 1593. A description of it is given by Idrīs (c. 548 = 1154). According to him, the minaret of Cordova was a high quadrangular tower, square in plan, the sides of which were richly adored with inscriptions in relief. The upper termination terminated in two rows of blind arcades probably like those still to be seen in the mosque of Cordova and on other minarets of the Maghrib. On the platform was a second, probably also square, storey with four doors and upon the dome which crowned it shone three balls of gold and two of silver and lily leaves (cf. Thiersch, op. cit., p. 127). This minaret however had a predecessor in a more modest tower built by ‘Abd al-Rahlān I, the model of which according to Marqāṣ (Rev. Afr., 1906) was Walīd’s minarets in Damascus. The second, imposing and splendid, minaret at Cordova seems to have served as a model for the gawmās of Seville and Morocco. At the same time we must consider the claims of the minaret of the Ka’āfa Bani Ḥammād built in 593 (1191), the only tower that survives of the Fatimid period, which was half destroyed by the Almohads in 1572 (cf. Saladin, Bull. arch., 1904, p. 243 sqq.). It is a high square tower of hewn stone, smooth on three sides and embellished on the courtyard side only with shallow blind niches and balcony doors in three layers above one another (pictures in Thiersch, op. cit., p. 150; Kuhn, op. cit., xviii.; Saladin, Manuel, p. 217; Marqāṣ, Manuel and op. cit.). This tower already shows the scheme of decoration of the Giralda and allied towers, namely the vertical combination of two windows or doors of the middle axis above one another by flanking double high shallow niches. The most contemporary Giralda in Seville of about 1290 a. d., the so-called Tower of Hassan in Rabāt and the Kutubiyah in Marrākush are allied to it, the two latter of the viith (xvith) century (pictures in Thiersch, Kuhn, Marqāṣ), all square with narrower square top stories, of which only that of the Kutubiyah still survives. These towers already show the system of decorating the surface now becoming typical in the later Maghribi manāras, the network of geometrical patterns in high relief and the beautiful windows with horsehoe and toothed arches and muqarnāt niches. In the other towers of Morocco, in Fez, Tetouan, Tangier, etc., are more modern minarets. The characteristic type of Algeria is best seen in the numerous minarets in Tlemcen, mainly of the xiiiith—xivth
century. They continue the form, characterized above, only the geometrical decoration in relief gains the upper hand and the windows disappear; their appearance is not quite so solid. On the other hand, the huge minaret of the great mosque of Manārā is highly thought of in Morocco for its size as well as its decoration, because it was built by a Moroccan Marinid (701–702 = 1302). The square tower therefore dominates the whole of the west. It is only later in the xvi century that we find the octagonal tower appearing in Tunisia, which Saladin attributes to Hanafi influence.

The 'Irāk and Syria give a picture of great development similar to that of Persia and the lands east of Persia. The oldest mināras still standing, the two mawlays in Sūmārūn of the viith (xvi) century, have remained the only examples of spiral towers but they are significant monuments of the early Muslim Arab variation of Babylonian architecture (the spiral as motif). These genuinely Arab buildings were followed by a reaction towards the Mediterranean style with square and octagonal towers and with the coming of the Turkish peoples and Seljūk rule the cylindrical minaret, usually on a polygonal base. The following list is given by Herzfeld (Arch. Reis., ii. 229): Raḥṣa, mosque extra muros, rectangular tower of the ivith (xith) or viith (xith) century; Raḥṣa, intra muros, a round tower. Nur al-Dīn 561 (1166); Abū Hurayra, round; Kūy, octagonal, 589 (1193) to 615 (1218); Ibīl, round on octagonal base 586–630 (1190–1232); Sūnḏār, round on polygonal base 598 (1201); Baghādād, Sūḥ al-Ghāzāl, round on a base (560–1232): Mūṣal, minaret of the great mosque, round on a cubical base: Mūṣal, minaret of the Kāfa, round on a cubical base: Mūṣal, Manārā al-Makāna: Tālūk, round shaft on a polygonal base. In addition there is the unique octagonal minaret built of small broken stones with a covering of plaster, on the island of Anā in the Euphrates of the viith (xvi) century (Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 319, and PI. 137) and the bulk of the later minarets from the viith (xvi) century onwards, which repeat this type.

Persia. The oldest mināras of Iran and the countries adjoining on east and north, Afghanistan, Sūlījestān and Turkестān seem to have been usually octagonal, as the ruin of the minaret, possibly of the viith (xvi) century in Zāandād, Nād Aḥī, Sūlīj̣estān (now 25–30 feet, originally twice as high; cf. G. P. Tate, Scitūn, Calcutta 191o, p. 202 and Plate) shows. The models for these earliest mināras may have been the watch-towers found all over the Asiatic steppes, hence the blind window and the great diameter. Octagonal mināras still exist in Amīrin, Sūlīj̣estān (viith–xvith century): octagonal with cylindrical upper stoupy are the two observatory towers of Ghāna of about 410 (1019–1020) and 495 (1101–1102) (the original height was estimated at about 140 feet); the inscriptions on the two towers only say that their erection was ordered by Mālḡūr and Mašʿūd respectively, both with full titles; cf. Diez, Chur. Bdk., p. 162 sqq. Counterparts to these towers in two parts, which are the mināras in Sīrwān, east of Herāt (c. 100 feet high) and Herāt in eastern Khurāsān (c. 80 feet high), with octagonal bases and cylindrical shaft, both of the ivith (xith)–xvith (xvn) centuries. Cylindrical minarets of the ivith–xvith (xvn–xvith) centuries still survive in Persia and the land east of it in Sangbast, Fīrūzābād, Kāšān.
nāra in the Muslim world, are built of red sandstone, the two upper, which have been restored, of white marble with layers of sandstone. The pavilion which once crowned the top fell down in 1863 during an earthquake and was put up again on the ground. The exterior is of angular and round flutings and ornamented with inscriptions from the Kūrān. There is no reason to doubt that the numerous mosques of the Pathan dynasties also had minarets but most of them seem to be destroyed and so far as I am aware no one has yet studied the subject. Isolated surviving manāras like the detached slender round minaret of the Lat-ki-Masjid in Ḥiṣār show however that they were usual (cf. Arch. Surv. India, Annual Report, 1913—1914, Pt. I 1913—1914, Pl. 1). But their occurrence in India was confined to particular areas. The mos-ques of Djiwānpur, Sirkej, Manda, Kulīrbagh and other places usually of the xivth—xvith century have no minarets. On the other hand they are characteristic of the xivth—xvith century mosques in Aḥmadābād, built in pairs flanking the doors or at the corners of the surrounding wall, as in the Mongol mosques of Persia. In shape, the towers of Aḥmadābād are quite Indian with well marked outlines, many mouldings outside and three to six galleries. In the Moghul empire again the smooth round or faceted minaret of Persian origin again became predominant but was hindusted by the pavilion placed on the top and by other alterations.

Bibliography: The fundamental monograph on the manāra is Herman Thielsch, Phares en Antīke, Islam und Occident (G. B. Teubner, Leipzig and Berlin 1909); where references are given to the detailed literature. Further general works: E. Diez, Die Kunst der islamischen Völker (Supplement to Hölch. d. Kunstwissens- schaft, Wildpark-Postdam, 1 1915; 2 1927); Saladin, Manuel d'art musulman, Paris 1907; new ed. by G. Marçais, 1926; cf. also M. v. Berchem’s article ARCHITECTURE in this encyclopedia. — For the separate countries:


MANĀT, an old Arabian goddess. Her character can only be deduced from her name, which may safely be connected as a plural (for manātān) with the Aramaic monātā, plur. monātān, portion, lot, Hebrew manāth, plur. manāthān and also with the god of fate mani, Is. lv. 11 (cf. lxx.). In Arabic we have corresponding to it, maniyā, plur. maniyān, “a portion, fate, especially of death”. She was therefore a goddess of fate, especially of death. Her main sanctuary was a black stone among the Hudhailis in Kūdulādī, not far from Mecca on the road to Medina near a hill called Meššallāl. She was however worshipped by many Arab tribes, primarily by the Aws and Khazād in Yathrib. In Mecca she was very popular along with the goddess al-Lāt and al-ʿUzza [q. v.]; the three (according to the Kūrān) were regarded as Allah’s daughters, and in a weak moment Muhammad declared their worship permitted (cf. Sūra liii. 19 sqq.). The obscure expression “Manāt, the third, the other” is probably due simply to the rhyme. According to Ibn al-Kalbī, she was the oldest deity, whose worship gave rise to that of the others, because names compounded with Manāt occur earlier than other theophoric names. Another view is found in the poem of the two daughters of Ibn Ḥishām, p. 145, where “the two daughters of ʿUzza” are Manāt and al-Lāt. As an independent deity we find her in the Nabatean inscriptions of al-Hıdır, where ʿUzza (the Aramaic plural form; cf. above) is often found along with Dūshārā and others. Manāt is connected in a peculiar way by some writers with the great ʿūdṣī [q. v.], for we are told that several tribes including the Aws and Khazād assumed the ʿūdṣān at the sanctuary of Manāt and on the conclusion of the rīts cut their hair there and dropped the ʿūdṣān [q. v.]. Wellhausen sees in this an erroneous confusion of an independent pilgrimage to Manāt with the great ʿūdṣī, as later writers acknowledge none but the latter; it is however possible that some such confusion may really have taken place in pagan times.

That Manāt was also a domestic deity is evident from the story in Ibn Ḥishām, p. 350 (cf. Wākīdī, ed. Wellhausen, p. 350). The destruction of the
great sanctuary in Kudaid after the capture of Mecca is attributed by some to Abū Sufyān, by others to ʿĀli, according to Wādīdī, op. cit., Ibn Saʿd, tituli. 15, 25, to the Awst Saʿd b. Zaid.

Bibliography: Vākūt, Muʿjam, iv. 652–654; Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Altertums, p. 25–29; Ibn Hisāh, p. 55; Ṭabarī, Annates, ed. de Goeje, i. 1649; Arzākī, ed. Wüstenfeld, C. S. M., i. 75, 82, 154; commentaries on Sūra liin. 19; Noldke, in Z. D. M. G., xli. 790; Bu-khārī, ed. Kreilh, in. 161; Jaussen und Sagnières, Mission archéologique, i. 491 (Index); C askel, Das Schicksal in der altarabischer Poesie (Morgan, Texte und Forschungen, ed. by H. Fischer. 15). (Fr. Buhl)

MANAZERD. [See Malāgerd.]

AL-MANĀZĪL (A.), pl. of al-manāzil, more fully manāt al-kamar, the stations of the moon. Just as for the sun the zodiacal circle is divided into 12 stations each of 30°, so which it traverses in the course of a year, so the course of the moon is connected with 28 groups of stars, each of which corresponds to one day of its course, so that on an average each is an arc of 13° apart. The settings of the sun at these stations, Arabic now, pl. awār, are of decisive importance for the beginning and forecasting of the phenomena of the weather and the fertility or otherwise of a year which depends on them, i.e. for the peasant’s calendar. As regards the testimony of the Arab poets, the reader may be referred to the verses given by al-Kāwīnī. M. Steinschneider in particular has published very thorough investigations of the importance of the stations of the moon among the Hindus and Arabs from Arabic, Hebrew and late Latin sources. The Arabic names of the stations and the constellations belonging to them are as follows:

1. al-Sharrūt, “the two signs”, also al-ʿArāf, the horns of the Ram (γ Άριες).
2. al-ḥaṣrīn, “the little paunch”; the paunch of the Ram (δ Άριες).
3. al-Lāqūr liwā, “the pleiades” [q.v.]
4. al-Ḥabūrīn, “the Aldebaran” (α Tauri) with the Hyades.
5. al-Ḫakī, three small stars on the head of Orion.
6. al-Hiwa, the stars al-Zīr r and al-Maṣāṣ (ζ Geminorum).
7. al-Līgpūrī, “the Lion’s Paw”; Castor and Pollux (α, β Geminorum).
8. al-Nūhūrī, “the nostril” of the Lion or fence with asses (in Cancer).
9. al-Ṭūrī, i.e. Ṭūr al-ʾAṣd, “the eye” of the Lion (ξ Cancri = Leonis).
10. al-Dīyākha, i.e. Ḥabīl al-ʾAṣd, “the forehead” of the Lion (γ Άλεξ).
11. al-Zubrā, i.e. Ṣubrāt al-ʾAṣd, “the mane” of the Lion (δ Leonis).
12. al-Sarjū, “the weathercock” (β Leonis).
13. al-Sawwār, “the barker” or Dogs (α, β Virgins).
15. al-Gafr, “the cover” (φ, υ Virginis).
16. al-Zubr, i.e. Ṣubrāt al-ʿAṣrāb, “the pincers” of the Scorpion (α Scorp. Librae).
17. al-Riḥl, “the crown”, i.e. the head of the Scorpion, the three stars (α, β Librae).
18. al-Kālī, “the heart” of the Scorpion, the Antares (ξ Scorp.).
19. al-Shawla, “the tail” or sting of the Scorpion (α Scorp.).
20. al-Nāṣib, “the ostriches”, 8 stars in Sagittarius (γ, δ, ε, ζ, ξ, η, θ, ι Sagitt.).
21. al-Balda, “the town”, an area in Sag. without stars.
22. Saʿd al-Dāhili, “the luck of the slayer” or sacrificer (α, β Caprici).
23. Saʿd al-Bul̄ūs, “the luck of the devourer” (α, β Aquar.)
24. Saʿd al-Sāqīd, “the greatest luck” (β Aquar.).
25. Saʿd al-Aḥli, “the luck of the tents” (ζ, τ Aquar.).
26. al-Faṛq al-aṣwāl, “the fore socket” on the pail (α Pegasi).
27. al-Faṛq al-maḥthan, “the hinder socket” on the pail (γ Peg. + Androm.).
28. Bāṭn al-Hāt, “the fish-belly”, a number of stars in the form of a fish (Androm. the brightest).


MANBIDJ (Bambylue, Hierapolis), an ancient city in northern Syria, two days’ journey or 10 farsakh N.E. of Halab, about 3 farsaks from the Ephruses. It lay in a fertile plain, and had a double wall built by the Greeks. According to Ibn Khurad-ad-dībīhī, there was a very fine church there, built of wood (B. G. A., vi. 161 sq.). Ps. Dionysios (ed. Chabot, p. 47, 68) mentions a church of the Virgin and another of St. Thomas in Manbīdīj; there were no buildings in the neighbourhood of the town (Najīrī Khursaw, ed. Schefer, p. 31); Abu ’l-Fida’ mentions the many canals, fruit- and particularly mulberry-trees there, the latter for the silkworm culture. As K. Ritter (Erdkunde, x. 1057 sqq.) shows, the name Ṣubūrī for the silkworm can hardly be connected with “Bambye”, the old name of Manbīdīj; on the other hand, the Levantine trade-name bombaceo, bombagio, common in the middle ages for raw cotton, seems to be derived from Manbīdīj; it is perhaps also concealed in the name of the ancient Phrygian Hierapolis, Pambuk-Kale (as early as Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, i. 148; Mabbug in Phrygia). The Arabs called the houses made in Manbīdīj, manbīdīnīya (Lammens, Fämita, Rome 1912, p. 71).

Kamāl al-Dīn b. al-ʿAdīm gives the following account of its origin: Khursaw [1] built it, when he conquered Syria (in reality the town in 540 A.D. ransomed itself from a threatened siege by paying tribute), built a fire-temple there and made a certain Yazdānī of the family of Ardashīr b. Bābak its governor. According to other authorities, Manbīh was the name of the fire-temple from which the town took its name (Ibn al-Shihāna, al-Daur al-muntakhab fl ʿārīkh Halab, ed. Sarkis, Biarūt 1909, p. 227). Ṣubūb (Agapios) b. Kustānjīn of Manbīdīj says in his history of the world written
in the tenth century, at the end of the history of the patriarchs (ed. Vasilev, Patrol. Orient., v. [1910], p. 664): "in the year 31 after the birth of Levi, the son of Jacob, queen Samrin built a great sanctuary for the worship of the idol Κύτταρα in a town on the banks of the Euphrates (?), installed 70 priests and called the town Hieropolis (Ḫarmābū; جمیع), i.e. the City of the Priests; this was the town Manbijī al-‘Āthā). For Κύτταρα Ḫarmābū should be read; on the coins of Hieropolis this deity seems also to be depicted (Wroth, Catalogue of the Greek coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria (Brit. Mus.), 1899, p. liii.), and the Armenian Epiphanius (ed. Finck, p. 12) says: "Erapolis consists of 3 towns: it is called Mappech; in it is the idol Kayana"; with Freuensch (Gotting. Gel. Anc., clxviii. [1903], II, p. 837, note 3) we should here also read Kayawan.

In reality Manbijī seems to have been known to the Assyrians (as Nappigi or Nampli in Salmanassar, Karhāh-Monolith, rev. 35; Johns, Assy. Bibl., xvii. 11, 82; cf. also Bambaki on the cuneiform tablet Brit. Mus. K 180, in Johns, Assy. Birds and Documents, No. 773; Chyerey's Encycl. Bibl., s. v. 'Carchemish'). If the name is of Semitic origin, it perhaps goes back to a Syriac word Ṣarmagē, "spring" (Noldeke, Nect. G.G.W., 1876, p. 5–8). The Greeks knew as the name of the town besides Hieropolis (on coins always Hieropolis) also the native form of Msābōn (rarely Bambōn; Papyr. Oxyrh. xi. [1915], p. 197, col. v., i. 100); in the common proper name Msapjaōs, etc., Nábataean Mambōgitā, the name of the town is concealed (for references see Pauly-Wissowa, Realen., suppl. vol., iv., p. 733). The town which at first was included in Kyrhirissēk and afterwards was made, probably by Constantius, the capital of the Syrian Euphratesia, played an important part in ancient times as the centre of the worship of Atargatis. Barḏaṣaṭīn was brought up here by a heretic priest Antiḏūbar and his son Kudūz. After the triumph of Christianity, the pagan cult was supplanted by the worship of holy relics, which also brought numbers of the faithful to Bambakte (Procopius of Gaza, Panegyr., ch. 18, in Migne, Patr. Grac., lxxxvii., iii, col. 2817). From the third century onwards the town is frequently mentioned as a place for the concentration of troops for campaigns against the east or for the defence of Syria. In the Byzantine period it was a great centre of the Monophysites, according to whose tradition Justinian married Theodora in Hieropolis; she is said to have belonged to the neighbourhood of the town (Michael Syrus, ii. 189). After the end of the Byzantine period, it was for a considerable period a stronghold of the Monorōites (Michael Syrus, ii. 412, 511).

In the year 16 Abū ‘Uthāda went to Halab al-Sāḏūr and sent ‘Uyāq b. Ghānim on to Manbijī. The inhabitants capitulated under the same conditions as the people of Antioch; when Abū ‘Uthāda reached the town, the agreement was ratified (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 150; al-Yaḥyāi, ed. Houtsm, ii. 161; Ibn al-Šahīna, ed. Bairūt, p. 228; Gaetani, Annali dell’ Islām, ii., p. 792, § 251, p. 794, § 284, p. 797, § 290, p. 816, § 325). Manbijī seems to have enjoyed a certain degree of independence down to the time of Yazid I; the inhabitants of the town, for example, asked ‘Umar for permission to trade within the caliphate (Lammens, M. F. O. B., vi. 437, note 1). The vicinity of the town was settled by Yamani tribes (Michael Syrus, iii. 47), notably the Bani Taghlib (Lammens, op. cit., p. 445, note 1). Yazid, when he created the diwan of Khassarīn threw Manbijī into this military province (al-Baladhuri, p. 132; Lammens, p. 437 sgg.). Hārūn al-Rashīd separated it again, made it the capital of the frontier district of the "Awaṣim (q.v.) in 786 and appointed Abū al-Malik b. Ṣaḥīh b. ‘Alī as wali there in 173, to whom the town owed many buildings (al-Baladhuri, loc. cit.). In 131 (748) it was severely damaged by an earthquake, in which the church of the Jacobites collapsed during mass and buried many of the worshippers in its ruins (Pseudo-Dionysios, transl. Chabot, p. 42; Michael Syrus, ii. 510; Beethoven, Abb. d. J. Kundt d. Morgenl., viii/vii., 1884, p. 120). The brother of the caliph al-Muʿāṣim, al-‘Abbās, who had taken part in the mutiny led by the general Cdaif b. ‘Anbaa, was tortured to death by Ḥādar b. ‘Awdas the Ṣafān of Usrūšana, at Manbijī in 223 (838) (Tahari, iii. 1265; Ibn al-Asrīr, ed. Tornberg, vi. 349; Michael Syrus, iii. 101; Weil, Gesch. des Christl., ii. 320). The conquest of the town by Tullin in 264 (877–878) brought Manbijī also under Egyptian suzerainty (Ibn al-Šahīna, p. 228).

In the account of the évos êkhipiêw of Esdessa, said to have been compiled by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennētos, a miracle is mentioned that took place in the time of Christ at the kótroi Ἐραπόλος, ἦ τῷ κένοι Σαράκινοι ξώοι Μαμελίτη λεγεται, τῷ ἐν τοίς Σαράκινοι Λαμπρά (De imag. Esd., in Migne, Patr. Gr., cxiii., col. 432; better in von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, in Texte u. Unters. z. altchristl. Lit., xvii., 51ff.). Abgar's envoy, who was spending the night in a brickworks near Manbijī on his way back from Jerusalem hid there among the bricks the sacred handkerchief with the portrait of Christ Terrified by the bright light that issuing from fire, the heathen inhabitants of the neighbourhood carried next morning to the brickworks and found there a brick with a miraculous copy of the portrait, which they carefully preserved in their city.

The Ḡamīnī Saʿīd al-Dawla, soon after the capture of Manbijī in 947, made his cousin, the poet Abī Fīrīṣ, governor of Manbijī (Dīwān, Abī Fīrīṣ, p. 75). When the Domestikos Nīχēphōros Phocas invaded Syria in 962, Abī Fīrīṣ, who happened to be hunting outside the town, was taken prisoner by the strategos Būrus (Theodoros’ Petros’), a nephew of the emperor, and taken first to Khārēkhān and then to Constantinople (Dīwān, 98 sq.; Weil, ii. 17) where he wrote poems full of longing for Manbijī and his mother there (Dīwān, p. 300, 323, 323 sq.). In 966 when emperor, Nīχēphōros encamped before Manbijī and made the people of the town produce the sacred brick (m-Ḳirmand, i.e. m-Ḳirmand) but did them no other injury (Yahyā al-ʾAntīk, Kol. Parisin. Bibl. Nat., anc. fond ar. No. 151 A, fol. 96v; the translation by Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 212, has been corrected by Rosen, Z. Zeit. Imp. Akad. N. i., 1883, pp. 97–98, note d.). The Byzantine writers who apparently did not know that Ḡamīnī was the Arabic name of Hierapolis and sought to locate it in Palestine or near Hims, wrongly make Nīχēphōros take Manbijī in 968 and carry off the brick and some hair from the head of John the Baptist (which was only done
by his successor (Leo Diaconos, Bonn, iv. 10, p. 71; John Skylitzes, ii. 364; Zonaras, xvi. 25, p. 503; Glykas, Bonn, p. 569 etc.) but this statement cannot be reconciled either with the route given for his campaign of 968 (cf. v. Dobschütz, op. cit., p. 172, note 1; Schümberger, Nicola Phocas, p. 704—706, note 5), nor with the bounds of his conquests given by Kamal-al-Din (in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 232). It was his successor John Tzinisis, who first took the fortress (ἀπολόγια) of Manbijid in 974, and found there Christ's sanctuary and some still bloody hairs of John the Baptist, which he brought as relics to Byzantium (Leo Diaconos, x. 4, p. 165).

In the year 1025 the Mirdâdis Şâlih took the town (J. J. Muller, Historia Jerusalemarum ex Halchensibus Compendiis annalibus excerpta, Bonn 1819; Rosen, op. cit., p. 68). By the treaties between Mahmund and 'Atiya [cf. 'Ali al, ii., p. 345] Manbijid passed in 456—457 to 'Atiya (Muller, op. cit., p. 56 sq.). In 472 (1079—1080) Tâdj al-Dawla Tuttuh occupied the town (Muller, p. 88). The emperor Romanus IV Diogenes took it on his Syrian campaign in 1068 and strengthened the defences of the citadel (John Skylitzes, Bonn, ii. 673, 675, 685; Michael Attaliates, Bonn, p. 168 sq., i. 106, 110: Zonaras, xviii. ii. 26, Bonn, iii. 691; Michael Syrus, ii. 168; Matthæos of U'hây, transl. Daularker, p. 162; Weil, iii. 112; Kamal-al-Din, transl. Muller, op. cit., p. 63 sq., where it is wrongly stated that Manbijid remained Greek for 70 years). It was not till 479 (1086) that Malik-shâh deprived the Greeks of Manbijid and al-Ruba', and gave the rule over Halab. Hamâ, Manbijid and al-Lâdihiyâ to Al-Sonkor (Ibn al-Athir, x. 98: Weil, iii. 131).

In 504 (1110—1111) the Franks conquered Manbijid, occupied and plundered the town and advanced as far as Bâlis which they burned (Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kyr. Jerusalem, p. 88; Weil, iii. 193, according to Michael Syrus, ii. 215, probably wrongly, in the year 502). But they lost Manbijid again in the same year (504) (Abu 'l-Fadâ', Annals Musulm., ed. K. E. iii. 370). Baldwin II in 513 (1119) invaded the lands east of Halab as far as Manbijid and al-Nûkra, and Joscassin, in the following year, on the pretext that one of his followers had been imprisoned in Manbijid and that no compensation had been given for him to it, plundered the lands of al-Nûkra and al-Ahâz (Recueil hist. or. crois., iii. 623, 625). When Nûr al-Dawla Balag enticed the amir of Manbijid, Hassân al-Balâbakkî, with his power and then imprisoned him in Fâli, Hassân's brother 'Isa seized the citadel of Manbijid, which Balag then attacked with siege artillery (1124). 'Isa then appealed for help to Joscassin and had him proclaimed lord of the town, but Joscassin suffered a severe defeat before the walls of the town. On the next day, however, Balag was mortally wounded by an arrow shot by an unknown hand (according to Kamal al-Din, by 'Isa himself: according to Matthæos of Edessa, by a certain archer). In 518 (1124) Hassân was liberated and returned to Manbijid (Ibn al-Athir, x. 436: Michael Syrus, iii. 211; Matthæos of Edessa, transl. Daularker, p. 311 sq.; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 161 sq.). The Crusaders never again took the town after the brief occupation in 504. Although we know of Frankish archbishops of the town (cf. William of Tyre, xiii. i. xv. 14, xvii. 17) one of whom Francesco took part in the Council of Antioch of Nov. 30, 1139 (Rohricht, op. cit., p. 223), we also know that they did not reside in Manbijid itself but in Dülük (Dolichè) (Michael Syrus, ii. 191). In the old French text of William of Tyre, the archbishopric is called Gerolpe (ed. Paris, i. 489: ii. 68, 167), a name which has often been identified with the modern Djeurâlis (Dirâlis) (Rey, Les colonies franques de Syrie, Paris 1883, p. 315; cf. also Bischof, in Aussenl. 1873, p. 136). This equation must however be rejected on general grounds (Hogarth, Annales of Archbishops, and Anthr., Liverpool, ii. [1909], p. 166, note 2) as well as historically (Djeurâlis = Syr. Agropoli, Euphoros).

The Atâbeg Imad-al-Din Zangi in 521 (1127—1128) seized the towns of Manbijid and Hîn Bîsa'n and entered Halab on the 17th Dümâda II, 522 (Recueil hist. or. crois., i. 17, 330; ii. 69). The emperor John II Comnenos on his campaign against Zangi (1142) only captured Bîsa'n (Tirat), while he passed by Manbijid (τὸ βῆματζ) because, as Niketas (Bonn, p. 37) disparagingly remarks, it was considered easy to take and lay in the hollow of a valley (ὡς ἐκταχθηκὼς κράτος καὶ τοῦ περίφορος κείμενος ὑπάρχοντος), a statement, which in view of the lack of success at the sieges of Halab and Shâiraz hardly seems credible. Anna Comnenus mentions (Bonn, i. 331) a certain Βεμπεμπέτζις (i.e. al-Manbijid), τὸν παρακότα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλγεμένης καχουμ', as in the Byzantine service; but the Byzantines never occupied the town itself or its territory.

An amir Hassân of Manbijid, probably a descendant of the same name of the Hassân already mentioned, distinguished himself frequently in the fighting against the Crusaders, especially by the capture of Tell Bâshir on July 8, 1151 (Kamal al-Din, transl. Blochet, R. O. L., iii. 536 sq.; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kyr. Jerusalem, p. 197, 268, note 3, 281). He was succeeded by his son Ghâzi (Kamal al-Din, op. cit., p. 543). He rebelled against Nûr al-Din from whom he had received Manbijid as a fief. Nûr al-Din sent troops to Manbijid, deposed Ghâzi and made his brother Kutb al-Din Imâl (in Kamal al-Din: Niyâl) his successor (R. O. L., iii. 543: Recueil hist. or. crois., iii. 121). After ruling for eleven years, this well beloved amir, who had built a Hamâni school in Manbijid (R. O. L., iv. 544), was deposed in 572 (1176—1177) by Saladin (Recueil ii. i. 46 sq.; iii. 241; iv. 132; Michael Syrus, iii. 266). According to a note in Kamal al-Din (R. O. L., iv. 147), in the same year (572) Ghars al-Din Khâlid set out with his followers to Manbijid against al-Duwaik to whom Malik al-Nâsir had granted the town as a fief; but this al-Duwaik is otherwise quite unknown. Taqî al-Din 'Umar of Hamâ, a nephew of Malik al-Nâsir who was in Manbijid in 577, wished to bar 'izz al-Din's way to Halab; when he failed in this, he retired to Hamâ, but was not allowed to enter it by the inhabitants (R. O. L., iv. 156). Imâd al-Din attacked Manbijid in 578 (1182—1183) and laid waste the country round it (R. O. L., iv. 162). Saladin made his brother Malik al-'Adil governor of Manbijid and he went there in Rama'dân 579 (1183—1184) (Rec. or. hist. crois., iv. 249). He seems to have spent most of his time in camp, for in 582 (1186—1187) the sultan gave Manbijid to Taqî al-Din along with other towns (Abu 'l-Fadâ', Annals Musulm., iv. 72). Among the leaders, whom Saladin sent in 1190 against the Germans who after Frederick's death were trying to reach 'Akkâ, was Nâ-ir al-Din b. Taqî al-Din of Manbijid (Recueil
MANBIDJ

Saladin’s third son Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī in 589 (1193) was allotted Hāmid b. Sallum, Tell Bēshir, Manbij, A’azā and other forresses (Recueil, i, 76; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kyr. Terr., p. 658). In 591 (1195) the latter set out from Kinnasrin to Ḫarā Ḥṣār in order to besiege Manbijd which then belonged to al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hāmā but on receiving disquieting news hastened to Damascus (R. O. L., iv. 209). Saif al-Dīn Tughrīl al-Zāhirī defeated a division of the army from Hāmā, which attacked Manbijd in 599 (1199), took many prisoners and brought them to Malik al-Zāhirī, who however released them again (R. O. L., iv. 218). The lord of Hāmā in 596 (1200), at the request of Malik al-Mādīl, gave 12 al-Dīn Ibrahim al-Muqadām the towns of Manbijd, Famiyā and Kafarjā in compensation for Bārin (Weil, iii, 434, note 4). When the latter died in Famiyā, Manbijd was to go to his brother Shams al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Malik whom however Malik al-Zāhirī in 597 deprived of his rule over Manbijd and Ḫal‘at Nādir and carried off a prisoner with him; he offered the two towns to al-Malik al-Mansūr of Hāmā, who once previously in 588 (1192–1193) had refused Manbijd (Rec. hist. or. crois., iii, 298), if he would assist him against Malik al-Mādīl, which however he declined to do (Rohricht, op. cit., p. 685). Al-Zāhirī thereupon destroyed the citadel of Manbijd lest it should fall into the enemy’s hands and gave the town, now deprived of its defences, in 597 (1201) to al-Haḍrājī as a fez (R. O. L., iv. 222) and in the following year to ‘Imād al-Dīn b. Saif al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Ahmad al-Maḥṣūb (Abu ‘l-Fida‘, op. cit., iv. 195). But very soon afterwards, al-Zāhirī had again to send the amir of Ḥalab, Mubāriz al-Dīn Aqīdā, to the siege of Manbijd; the latter however withdrew on the approach of Malik al-Fā‘iz, son of Malik al-Mādīl. Malik al-Fā‘iz entered Manbijd, rebuilt the citadel and fortified it. He then returned to his father al-Mādīl in Nābulus, while the Ḥalab troops avoided an encounter (R. O. L., iv. 223). Soon afterwards the Ḥalab army again marched on Manbijd but was recalled by Malik al-Zāhirī, who was besieging Hāmā. A little later, al-Zāhirī himself set out against al-Maṭla‘ī to avenge himself on the inhabitants who had taken the side of al-Fā‘iz; but he was appeased by his amirs, pardoned the town which submitted to him and gave it as a fez in 598 (1202) to Ibn al-Maḥṣūb (R. O. L., iv. 224). The Sāḥib Kākāṣī in 615 (1218–1219) went to Manbijd, which opened its gates to him, placed one of his officers, Sārim al-Dīn al-Manbijdī, as governor there and repaired the walls of the town; but when al-Malik al-Aṣhrāf approached, he left the town again and suffered heavy losses in his retreat (Recueil, hist. or. crois., ii. 145; Kassīr al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 57; Abu ‘l-Fida‘, Amm. Mūsī, iv. 266). When the Shī‘ah of Ḥalab, al-Malik al-Nāṣir, concluded an alliance with the Shī‘ah of Rūm for their mutual defence against the raids of the Turkmans, he sent the Ḫāji of Manbijd, Awḥad al-Dīn, as a confidential envoy to him (R. O. L., v. 94). Al-Malik al-Mughṭīr of Harrān fled in 635 (1237–1238) before the Khwarzimians to Manbijd to seek protection with them (R. O. L., v. 103). When the Khwarzimians three years later invaded Syria, a Ḥalab army met them but suffered an annihilating defeat on the Nahr al-Dhabah (R. O. L., vi. 3). Thereupon the Khwarzimians advanced on Manbijd, the inhabitants of which retired behind its walls and barricaded the place where the walls were no longer standing. The town was stormed on the 21st Rabi‘ 11 of 638, numerous inhabitants put to death, the houses destroyed and rich booty taken; the enemy even entered the mosque where many women had taken refuge and violated them (R. O. L., vi. 6). After the Khwarzimians had been driven back, al-Malik al-Mansūr re-entered Manbijd (R. O. L., vi. 17). In the treaty between Sulṭān Kātūn and Leo of Armenia of the 1st Rabi‘ 11 of 638 (June 6, 1238), Manbijd is mentioned among the Egyptian towns (Makrīzī, ed. Quatremère, Hist. des Sultans Mamouns, i, 168; transl., p. 205).

According to Ibn al-Shihāna (Bairīt 1909, p. 228), Manbijd which previously, excluding its suburbs, had paid annually 510,000 dirhams to the Sulṭān’s Divān, was destroyed by the Tatars (who invaded Syria several times between the end of 699 [1203] and 702 [1302]); perhaps there is here a confusion with the Khwarzimians. According to Abu ‘l-Fida‘, the fortifications and the town were for the most part in ruins in his time: Kahlāt al-Zāhirī does not mention it at all.

After the Russo-Turkish War (1879) Ciezaans were settled in Manbijd, since that date the few remained of antiquity noticed by earlier travellers have almost completely disappeared.

The ruins of Bīnbīl, as the name of the place is now pronounced by the natives with a marked echo of the ancient Bambīke (Eutin in M. Hartmann, Zeitkrit. d. Griech. K. Einz., Berlin, xxix, 525; Littman, Amer. Archæol. Expedit. to Syria, i, 171, note 3), have been visited by Maundrell (1699), Pococke (1737), Drummond (1747), Sachau (1879), Cumont (1907) and Hogarth (1908). The old town walls, surrounded by a broad ditch which were several times restored in the middle ages, still survive almost in their entirety (Ainsworth, A personal narrative of the Ephraim Expedition, i, 1888, p. 238).

The town of "Kāmhul", the site of which is important to fix the limit of the habitations of the Mand, is sometimes located in Hind (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 176), sometimes between Hind and Hind (Idrisi). The form of the name is uncertain (Fāḥmil, Māhmāl, Amāl). Elliott, i. 363, identified it with Anahālāra; cf. al-Birrānī, p. 100. This last town (Anahīlāra, Nahrāra, founded in 746 A.D.) is identical with the modern Fāтан (on the Sarawsat in northern Barōda; cf. Imp. Gazzet. of India, 1906, vol. xx.; Cunningham, ep. cit., p. 290, places "Māhmāl" at this). In any case Kāmhul must mark the limit of the pasturages of the Mand to the S.E. of al-Mansūra (-fatāh eilādāb, on the Indus; cf. Elliott, i. 370).

Among the Muslim sources a special place is occupied by the Misqīm al-Tawārīḥ, written in Persian in 520 (1126). This work gives extracts from a book which was composed first in an Indian language, then translated into Arabic by Abu Ṣalīḥ b. Shuʿāb b. Dīmān in 417 (1028) and finally translated from Arabic into Persian by Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Muhammad al-Ḥalabī, librarian in Dūrījān. This source which is a very inaccurate resumé of the Māḥābārāta, begins with a chapter on the Mādī and the Zuṭtī, two peoples in the land of Sind, descendants of Ham (Ḥām), son of Noah. The Mādī had conquered the Zuṭtī, who withdrew to the banks of the river Pahn (or Bahr) and from there attacked the Mādī by water. Finally tired of fighting, the two peoples agreed to approach king Daḥūshān b. Dāhrān (Duryodhana, son of Dhīrāraghārā) to ask him to appoint a king over them. Daḥūshān sent them his sister Dusul (Duṣçalā), married to Bjdīrd (Jayadratha) who became a powerful king. At the request of Dusul, Daḥūshān sent 30,000 Brahmanos to people Sind. One part of the country was given to the Zuṭtī, who were given as a ruler (Dīfārt (Yuddhishthira, eldest son of Dhīrāraghāt). The Mādī (Mādyān) also were given a special area; cf. Reinsch, Fragments arabes et persans relatifs à l'Inde, 1845, p. 2–3, 25–29.

Here we have an attempt to connect the history of the Mādī and Zuṭtī with Indian tradition by quoting a passage in the Māḥābārāta which says that Duṣçalā was given in marriage to Jayadratha, "king of the lands watered by the Indus" (transl. Fauche, Paris 1863; i. 290, čloka 2742). Indian tradition however contains nothing definite of value about the Mādī. In the Bṛhat-Samhitā, transl. Kern, J. R. A. S., 1871, p. 81–86 which is one of the sources for the enumeration of the peoples of India in al-Birrānī (ed. Sachau, p. 150–157, transl. 199–303), we find a Māṇḍāvya people (located in the centre, north or northwest of India). The derivation of the Arabic Mādī from some such name may be suspected (cf. the name of the
modern town on the coast of Kāthiāwar; Mândvi). On the other hand in Central India alongside of the Māndaya the Medha are mentioned (al-Bīrūnī: Mādhā, the final a being only indicated by means of a fatha). The question of the Maid/Mand has been discussed by Elliot and A. Cunningham; the former (Hist. of India [1867]), i, 519–531) says that the Meds still exist on the borders of Sind and Fodhpūr, as well as to the west in the little harbours of Mārkān (the clans of Gazbur, Hornāri, Dājhar-za‘, Ĉełmar-za‘). The name *Mand has even undergone a phonetic change to Mer (which we find in the mountains of Arāvalli and in Kaṭhīwār). Elliot also thinks it possible that the Meds or one of their branches bore the name Mand of which traces can be found in place-names (Mand-ar, Mand-hro, etc.). Cunningham in his Report 1863–1864 connected the Zuṭ and the "Maid or Mand" with the Iattī and Mandrūni whom Pliny (Nat. Hist., vi, ch. xviii.) mentions near the Oxus and calls the "Med or Mer" the first Indo-Scythic invaders of the Pāndjāb. In The Ancient Geography of India, 1871, p. 290–294, Cunningham finds a variant of the name Mand in the name of the town Māvarīya of the Periplus mar. Erythrae. (cf. Prolemey, vii/i, § 63: Māvarīya to the east of Indo-Scythia,) which would be "the town of the Scythians, Min = Manjābara (Mandjābara in the Arabs = Thatha, etc.

The question of the Maid evidently deserves a new special study. Was there only one, or two peoples *Maid and *Mand? The statements of the Muslim authors seem to refer to a single people. The toponymy of the land south of the Indus reveals the presence of an old element *Mand; cf. Prolemey, vii/i, § 7: Mandāgara. When its origins have been studied, it will be interesting to compare its possible connection with the oldest name of the Aryans, Mandā, found in the cuneiform inscriptions of the third millennium B.C. according to E. Forrer, Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hitites-Reiches, Z.D.M.G., lixvi, 1922, p. 247, according to E. Meyer, Die Volksstämme Kleinasiens, Sitzb. A. W. Berlīn, 1926, p. 244–261 (cf. do. Geich. d. Altertums, vol. ii, sect. i, p. 35, note 3); the name "Manda" meant the Scythians who in the seventh century B.C. had invaded nearer Asia and was sometimes transferred to the Medes alongside of whom the Scythians were settled. A diachronically opposite process would be to compare *Mand with the name of the Mundā language (of the Mon-Khmer family); cf. in this connection: Przyłęski, Un ancien peuple du Panjab, Les Dhamarā, J.A., 1920, N° 1, p. 53, where a theory is advanced according to which, before the arrival of the Indo-Aryans, the valley of the Indus was peopled by "Austro-Asiatic" from the zone of the continent to the sea. The influence of the Austro-Asiatic substratum, i.e. languages of the Mundā type, would also explain the preservation in Sanskrit of the aspirated sonants.

(V. Minorsky)

MAND (Mând, Mund), the longest river in Fārs (Nuchat al-Kulāb: 50 farsakhs; E. C. Ross: over 300 miles in length). The name. As a rule in Persia, sections of a river are called after the districts through which they flow. Mand is the name of the last stretch near its mouth. The name seems to appear for the first time in the Fārs-nāma (before 510/1116) but only in the composite Māndīstan (cf. below).

The old name of the river is usually transcribed in Arabic characters Sakkân (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 220; Ibn Hāḵalī, p. 191; Idrīsī, tr. Jaubert, i, 401) but the orthography varies: Thākān, Fār-nāma, G.M.S., p. 152; Nuchat al-Kulāb, p. 134; Zakān or Zakkān, Nuchat al-Kulāb, p. 217; Sitārān, Diṭḥān-nāma, p. 247; cf. also Sakkān in Ḡāsān Fāsī. The identification of the Sakkān with the Ernakōri mentioned in the Peripiu of Nearchus (Arrian, Indica, xxxvii. 8) is generally recognised. The identity of Sitakōn with the Sittagōn (Sitigōn) mentioned by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 26 is also usually admitted (Weissbach 1927), but Herrfeld (1907) relying on the existence of another river, the Shājdīn (= Sittagōn ?), has suggested doubts about the identification of the Sittagōn with the Sitikōn. Now, according to Iṣṭakhrī, p. 119, the Shājdīn flows into the Persian Gulf at Daḵāl al-Dastāḵān (north of Būbhr). This Shājdīn must be identified with the river Shāpūr. The Fār-nāma, ed. Le Strange, p. 163, mentions Rūdbāl-i Siddādan (= the banks of the S.) as a station on the road from Shīrāz to Tawwād. From this fact and especially from the name, Siddādan seems to be applied to the left bank tributary of the Shāpūr. Pliny, who follows Onesicritus, adds that the Sitigōnus one reaches Pasargades in 7 days (quo Pasargarum septima die navigatur). Whatever be the identity of the Sittagōn, the exaggeration in this statement is evident (especially in the direction of the sea to Pasargades) and the waters of Pasargades (Māshādi Murchābi) do not flow into the Persian Gulf. But there is nothing to prove the absolute impossibility of using the Sakkān as a subsidiary means of transport in the season of floods (the winter). According to Arrian, Nearchus found at the mouth of the Sittagōn large quantities of corn which Alexander had brought there for the army. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 99 places the Sakkān among the rivers of Fārs which are navigable at need (al-awāh al-kibūr allatī tāmīdī al-iş̄fūna īdān īdriyāt fi-hā). Another question is the phonetical identity of the names Sitakōn (Sitigōn ?) and Sakkān. According to C. F. Andreas, Ernakōri is a nominative restored from a supposed genitive *Ernakōri (Sitakōn ?); Sitigōn-us is a mistake for Sittagōn-us; lastly the peculiarity of the Arabic script could explain the change of Sittakōn to Sakkān. Here we may add that Ḡāsān Fāsī gives one of the stretches of the river the strangely written form Shālkān (š Kān). Iṣṭakhrī however derives the name of the river from that of the village of Sakk (Nuchat al-Kulāb: Zakān) in the district of Kāzin considerably below the Shājkān stretch of the river. To sum up the identification of the Sittagōn does not seem sufficiently established. The course of the river. The Sakkān (Mând) describes a great curve. At first it runs in the direction N.W.–S.E., to the northern base of the Kuh-i Marā-yi Shāftik, which separates it from the valley of the river Shāpūr. It follows this direction (c. 100 miles) to the end of Aṣmān-gird mountains around which it makes a bend and turns south (70 miles). It then meets the parallel ranges which run along the Persian Gulf and continues its winding course to the sea in a westerly direction (140 miles).

The Sakkān (Mând) and its tributaries drain and irrigate a considerable area. Iṣṭakhrī says that
its waters contribute the largest share to the fertility of Fārs (akhar-ī sinārāt). The sources of the river (Kān-i Zard, Chīlqāshmā and Surkh-rag) rise in the mountains of Kūh-i Nār and Kūh-i Marajā-ī-Shikakta in the N.W. and W. of Shīrāz. These streams unite before Khān-ī Zīnya in the district of Māsarm on the great Shīrāz-Kāzān-Bāshā road. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 120, places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Shāhīfār (S.) in the district of Ruwādīja (S.). In the same author, p. 130, Khān al-Asad on the Sakkān corresponds to the modern Khān-ī Zīnya. The Fardānāma (and the Nizhāt al-Kūlūb) places the sources of the Sakkān near the village of Čaṭīya (S.). Under the Turkish name of Karajgān, i.e. "the river of the elm", the combined stream flows through the districts of Māsarm (Kalvā-Mara-yī Shīkat), Sīyāh (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 120: Sīyāh and Kawār. In this last district, Rivadanevīra, in S.1, going from Shīrāz to Fīrūzābād crossed the river by a "substantial bridge". It is in the district of Kawār that Ḥasan Fāsā gives the river the name of Sāhkān. In Kawār (Ḥasan Fāsā) there used to be the barrages of Band-e Bahān, where, by a subterranean channel (kawār) part of the water was led into reservoirs (ṣāhī) and then to the fields. In the bulūk of Khār (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 105: Khār), which must be distinguished from the district of the same name in the kingdom of Kūhār, the river runs south. Aucher-Lido, who crossed the river on the road from Fīrūzābād to Dājūrin (Lajārum) calls it "Tengu Tačka" (= Tengi Taškākāi) and speaks of its "beautiful valley" Rivadanevīra continues his journey from Fīrūzābād to Dājūrin crossed the river by a ford between the villages of Tādvān and "Asun-Descheri" (Asmangird?). He also admires the pleasant and flourishing aspect of Khārī. Below the latter, the river enters the bulūk of Shinakān where, near the village of Sārkāl, it receives on its left bank, the brackish (ṣāhī) river of Dājūrum, and then flows through the ravine of Kārzān, and waters the bulūk of Kīrwa-Kārzān. Abbott coming from the river by a ford between Arābī-alāād and Lēfājīgān (cf. the name of the domain of Kūrd in Fārs al-Līwādānī, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 113), where it was 100 yards wide and the water rose up to the horse's belly. Further down below the ford, Stack, going from Kīr to Kārīyān crossed the river, here 60 yards broad, by the bridge of Arābā, built in a zig-zag and in two stories ("the queerest structure in the way of a bridge"). Near the village of Nimūnī, the river enters the bulūk of Aftār. After having wound round the fort of Kāl-yī Shāhrīyār the river receives (near the place called Čam-i Kālābā) the name of Baz and then irrigates the bulūk of Khunūd (cf. Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii. 241: Khunūd-bāl = Khunūd + bāl). In the district of Dīrāgh of the bulūk of Galla-dāi the river has two tributaries: near the village of Gabrī, the Dīr al-Mīrān, and two small others, lower, that of Dīrham. The Dīr al-Mīrān comes from the left (east) side of the bulūk of Asīr. The Dīrham much more important comes from the right side after watering the historic district of Fīrūzābād (the ancient Gūr, capital of Ardāshīr-Khurra; cf. the details in Le Strange, p. 250). Iṣṭakhrī, p. 121 makes this tributary come from Tārāk (of Siyāh) and water first Khunūd-gān and then Gūr (in place of the name of the river Tīra). Iṣṭakhrī, p. 99, 121, one should probably read Barāzā; cf. the Fardānāma, p. 151, Nizhāt al-Kūlūb, p. 117—118: Ḥakim Burdāz was the sage who dried up the Lake of Gūr.

After Dīr-gāh, the river enters the district of Sanā-wa-Shumba of the bulūk of Dāshīt, and near the village of Bāghān receives on the right bank the river Čāntīz which comes from the district of Taštdīj Dāshīt. Finally near the village of Dūmānī the river enters the coast district of Māndīstān and receives the name of Māndī. It flows into the sea near the village of Zīyārat, halfway between the old harbours of Nadījram (to the north) and Stīr (to the south).

Māndīstān. The district forms part of the bulūk of Dāshīt (which is to be distinguished from Dāshīt) to the north of Dāshīt up to Bāshīj). Dāshīt (36 × 18 farsakhs) is composed of 4 districts: 1. Bardāstān, the part of the coast which is the port of Dāshīt. 2. Māndīstān on the coast to the north of Bardāstān and the two banks of the river of Māndī. 3. Sanā and Shumba on the river above Māndīstān. 4. Taštdīj Dāshīt, a very narrow valley (11 × ½ farsakhs), watered by the Čāntīz and separating Sanā and Shumba from the bulūk Arūba (on the lower course of the river of Fīrūzābād).

The whole of the bulūk belongs to the torrent zone (garmasir) of Fārs. Māndīstān (12 × 5 farsakhs) includes lands so flat that the current of the river is imperceptible and the water cannot be used for irrigation. Agriculture (wheat, barley, palm-trees) is dependent on the winter floods. The district has 40 villages. The capital of the district and of the bulūk is Kākī. There used to be two rival families in Māndīstān: the Shābkīyān and the Hādjiyānān. Under the disturbances under Afghān rule (1722—1729) the Hādjiyānān Lāzmān expropriated the Shābkīyān and founded a little dynasty of hereditary governors who were able to annex the district of Bardāstān through matrimonial alliances. One of his descendants, Muḥammad Khān (d. at Bāshīj in 1529 = 1581), was noted as a poet under the pen-name of Dāshīt. Ḥasan Fāsāi explains the name Māndīstān by a popular etymology: "the place where the water flows slowly (sāmāndāz)". Names in -stān are common in Fārs (Lārzān, Bardāstān) but even if such a formation was possible in a river-name, the element Mānd would still be a puzzle. It is curious that Ḥasan Fāsāi sometimes writes it Mānd (read Mānd) and sometimes Mund (read Mood). It might be suggested as a pure hypothesis that there is a connection with the people M N D (cf. Mānds), of which there might have been a colony in Māndīstān.

Mandingo, a people of the Western Sudan whose country of origin was on the Upper Niger stretching from Bamako to Siguri inclusive. This region includes the gold-bearing district of Boure, Bute, or Bito as well as the provinces of Lower Falime and of Bambuk which also produce gold. At the present time the Mandingo have spread into the mountainous country in which the two branches of the Senegal arise; they occupy Sangaran, Gangaran, Bambuk, and the valley of the Gambia to the South while to the North they extend as far as the Western Sahara. In the 17th century, they colonised a part of the modern Mauritania and, according to the Arab authors of this period, who mention them under the name of Gangaran (sing. Gangari) or Wangara — a word which seems to be a corruption of the name of their country of origin: Gangaran, Gangaram, organgar — they were to be met with in Holli. In our time the first of these names has been kept by the Moors and the Sarakole, the second by the Songhay, the Ful of Massina and the Hausa.

The country of these natives is called according to the different dialects: Manding, Mandi, Mani, Mandeng, Maneng, Mande, Mane. The inhabitants are called by the names of Mandinka, Maninka, Maninga, Mandenka, Manenka or Manenga in the dialects of the Centre and of the East and Mandingo or Mandinga, in those of the North, South and West. This last, which the British have possessed of Gambia and Sierra Leone has been adopted by the English while the French keep the term Manding or Mandingue.

The name of the country corrupted by the Ful has become in the language of these natives Mali, Malli, Malli, Melli, and that of the inhabitants has become Mallinke or Malinke. This last word has now come to stand for the South-Western portion of this people or for their dialect.

Ethnography. The Mandingo group constitutes a well-marked ethnological group, but it does not form an organised people under one rule. Three chief divisions can be distinguished, and these can again be subdivided into many sections. They are the Malinke, the Bambara, or Bamana, and the Diula or Giula.

A Sudanese historian of the 18th century, Mahmed Koti, who wrote the Tariikh al-Fattah in Arabic, distinguished in his time between the Malinke and the Wangara, regarding the former as warriors and the latter as merchants and traders. The Mandinka are the least advanced of the Mandingo from the social point of view, many of them remaining faithful to the matriarchal system and are still cultivators of the soil, hunters and gold-diggers.

An attempt has been made to derive their name from that of the hippopotamus: mali or meri; and thus “malinka” would signify the “people of the hippopotamus.” This explanation is erroneous, the suffix *ka*, signifying the nationality, can only be joined to the name of a country or of a tribe and never to that of an animal. It is possible however, that the name of the country which was the cradle of their race, could come from na, mother, and deng or dimg, child; this word then would signify “child of the mother”, in allusion to the descent by the female line which is customary amongst them.

The Bambara inhabit the valleys of the Niger and of the Bani as far as Lake Deblo, they are numerous in the Sahel. They are more advanced agriculturists than the Malinke and they recognize descent by the male line. An attempt has been made to derive their name from that of the crocodile: hamba or hama. Some authors on the other hand, have held that their name signifies “refusal to obey a master” (ban. refusal, ma: master, na: towards). This explanation, although it could be accepted linguistically, must, according to M. Delafosse, be rejected. He prefers that of “renunciation of the mother” (ban: refusal or renunciation; be or ma: mother; na or ia: to).

The Diula or Giula inhabiting some fairly important centres are chiefly merchants and traders. They are met with in small colonies, settled amongst the indigenous peoples to the East of Bani as far as the Upper Volta and the Gold Coast. Having been converted at an early date to Mahommadism they have remained fervent Muslims and there are amongst them quite a large number of learned men.

Their name is said to signify “from the foundation, from the stock” (dun). According to their own account, it was given to them because their ancestors belonged to families of noble birth.

At the basis of Mandingo society is an extended family (gba or gwa) comprising all the living descendants of an ancestor, sufficiently near in place and in time for all the ties of relationship to have been formed. In general, the extended family covers four generations: the patriarch, his brothers and cousins, their children, the children and grand-children of the latter, and an equal number of generations of slaves. Persons of the same generation placed on the same level are called by the same name: father, brother, son, without distinguishing the fathers from the uncles, the brothers from the cousins, the sons from the nephews, all are collectively sharers in the family property, which they have helped to acquire and to augment by their labours. This family property consists of crops, of animals, arms, surplus utensils and clothing, as well as treasure in gold, silver or cowries gathered together by the founder of the family. It is administered by the patriarch who cannot dispose of it without the consent of the majority of the other members. Each of those, man or woman, possesses in addition a private store of which he has the free use.

The chief exercises a political, domestic and religious authority. In this capacity he is charged with making sacrifices and offerings to his ancestors and to the patron deities of the family. A number of families observing the same religious prohibitions and bearing the same name (diamu) form a clan; the members, who form a clan are of the same origin, but so far removed by birth
that it is impossible to trace their back to a common origin.

The chief Mandingo clans are those of Keyta, Kante, Taraore, the Dembele, the Konate, the Kulubali, the Kuruma, the Diara, the Samake, the Mareko, the Kamara, the Bakayoko etc. None of them is either organised or under a single ruler.

There exists between persons of different clans a particular tie called senakuja, without doubt the remains of an ancient phrathy which obliges them to assist one another and to exchange presents on certain occasions; the same persons can also quarrel among themselves or fight with one another without involving any serious consequences.

The organisation which is lacking in the clan and in the tribe shows itself on the contrary in each inhabited centre in the form of the hierarchial brotherhoods, which combine all the young people and the men of the same age who have together submitted to circumcision and to the tests of successive initiation. The first is that of utome, grouping together the boys from the ages of 7 to 14 years, then there come the so-called secret societies, such as those of the kono or of the naka which consist of politico-religious groups within the village.

The village or dugu is the administrative unit, the union of a number of villages and the lands which surround it forming a district or kafe; a number of districts constitute a province or a kingdom, djanaka, at the head of which there was in former times the Mansa or Mass. The latter was surrounded by different ministers and assisted by a treasurer.

Although Musammanism has long penetrated amongst the noble families of the Mandingo, the greater portion of the population has remained faithful to the worship of natural forces and of protecting deities, dugu la siri, gana and boi. The great religious festivals are the agrarian feasts and the most important correspond to the periods of seed-time and harvest.

The Language. The Mandingo properly speaking are in number about 2,500,000 of whom 770,000 are in Senegal: 1,000,000 in French Soudan; 200,000 in the Upper Volta; 2,500 in Nigeria; 290,000 on the Ivory Coast; 550,000 in French Guinea; more than 680,000 live in Gambia, Sierra Leone, Portuguese Guinea and the Republic of Liberia. In addition to these natives, whose mother tongue is Mandingo, more than 2,000,000 other people speak this idiom; for this reason it is often spoken of as a language that is still spreading.

The Mandingo belongs to the African Negro language and more especially to the group which M. Delafosse calls Negro-Senegalese; D. Westermann; Mandingo, and A. Drexel: Nko-Nke: it is closely allied to Susu. Foreign idioms seem to have had little influence, although it has borrowed certain abstract and religious terms from the Arabic; from Phonician or Punic it has borrowed expressions relative to horse-Enterprise and cotton; from Berber about a dozen words, and finally during the space of the last fifty years it has further borrowed from several European languages.

The roots are monosyllabic or disyllabic and many of them can be traced to an ancient African Negro origin. For example: fara, the action of killing or being dead, seems to come from a root far or fa; cf. in Susu fak; Hausa: fano; Mosoi: far; Fang: war; Pul: war (de); Masagu: fada; Congo: fana; Swahili: fa and wa; Ancient Egyptian: fak. The nominal class does not exist in this language.

Mandingo uses derivative suffixes which are used to form distinct substantives used as substantives only; for example: ka, aku, or nga, the suffix for nationality: Mandenka; la or ra, the instrumental suffix: tege, to cut; toge, the instrument for cutting, axe. It employs also adjectival suffixes; for example: ma or ma indicating the possession of the thing mentioned: gyi, water; gyn-la, "full of water"; fe indicating on the contrary the lack of the thing: gyn n-fë, "without water". Certain suffixes, joined to a simple or derived root, indicate the possession of a quality or of a state; for example: safa, "short, little"; surn-au, "shortness" and also "to shorten or to approach". Suffixes also exist, indicating determination or relationship.

The Mandingo conjugation employs prefixes denoting the perfect, the aorist, the injunctive. Certain auxiliary prefixes serve to indicate time. It has a considerable number of verbal forms, affirmative as well as negative.

This language does not possess any trace of a system of syntax of agreement; the relations between one element of a sentence and another are entirely determined by the respective position of the two elements and their grammatical function is often determined only by the place which they occupy in the sentence.

In the syntax of this language, the complement of a noun, pronoun or verb always precedes the noun, pronoun or verb in question; the adjective qualifying or determining a noun always follows this noun; the noun of number always the noun of the thing numbered; an adverb modifying a word follows it. The order of the words in the sentence is subject, prefix or auxiliary of conjugation, direct complement of the verb, verb root or derivative, indirect complement of the verb, adverb modifying the statement.

Mandingo is divided into a fairly large number of dialects revealing differences more or less marked. We distinguish the Bambara or Bamana dialects, the Diula dialects and lastly the Malinke dialects, which were themselves divided into the Malinke of the East, the North (sometimes Khashonke), of the West and of the South.

History. The wide diffusion of this language is due to certain historical circumstances, and to the rise of the Mandingo hegemony which extended over almost all the Western Sudan from the year 1250 to 1500.

According to local tradition, the Mandingo sovereigns bore the title of Mansa or Mass; they belonged to the Keyta and married into that of the Konde orKone. In the beginning, they owed their influence to their knowledge of sorcery and magical practices and little by little they emerged from obscurity. Ibn Khaldun has transmitted to us the name of the first of them, Baramandua, who about the year 1050, was converted to Islam, in order to obtain, according to al-Bakri, the end of a drought, which was cruelly trying the country of Maadé; thereafter he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. Native tradition has kept the name of two of the descendants of this prince, Hamana and Dyigui-Bilali. The son of the latter, Mbabu, called Allakoy, reigned from the year 1200 to 1218. Four times he made a pilgrimage to Mecca,
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...and he extended the power of his dynasty. On the other hand, his son Nare Famaga (1218–1230) suffered a great reverse and was defeated by his neighbour, the king of Sosso, Sumanguru Kante, who annexed Mandingo in 1224 and put to death eleven out of the twelve sons of the conquered monarch. The last son, Son Diata or Mari Diata (1230–1255), who was weak and delicate suddenly recovered his health and strength after touching his father's sceptre. Little by little he got together a powerful army, with the help of which he conquered a part of Futa Djalon, the country situated between the Niger and Bani, in the region of Kita and that of Beledugu. In 1235 he attacked his enemy Sumanguru Kante and defeated him at Kirina, not far from the Niger. After having subdued shortly afterwards the whole of the Sosso, he advanced in 1240 as far as the celebrated city of Gana which he plundered. During the following years, Sun Diata took possession of Gangaran and of the gold-bearing district of Bambuk, without neglecting the good administration of his lands in which he encouraged agriculture and extended the cultivation of the cotton plant. Towards the year 1240 he abandoned the ancient capital of the Mandingoes, Djeriba, and transferred it to Niani, wrongly called Mali or Melli by the Arab historians. He died in 1255 in the vicinity of this town. One of his sons succeeded Sun Diata, whose name only is handed down to us, namely Mansa Ule or the Red King (1255–1270). After him the princes Walji, Khalifa and Abu Bakari between the years 1270 and 1285 about whom we possess no information. After the death of the latter, the power passed into the hands of a slave of the Keyta called Sakara or Sabakura, who kept it from the year 1285 to 1300. Then the Keyta regained the throne and under Gian, Mamada, and Abu Bakari they held it from 1300 to 1307. At the end of this undistinguished period, Kankan Massa, also called Gongo Misa (1307–1332), the son of the last of these sovereigns, seems to have raised to its zenith the power of his dynasty. We owe to Ibn Khalid an some details about his person and the events of his reign. He was an ascetic prince and full of piety, and he made a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1325 and on his return he brought back with him to the Sудan, al-Mamer, a descendant of the founder of the dynasty from the Almohads, as well as the Arab poet al-Sibli. When he was still in the Sahara, Kankan Massa learnt that his troops had seized Gao, Tumbuktu, Walata and the kingdom of Songhoy. He decided to visit the first two of these towns, and on the advice of the strangers who accompanied him, he built in each of them a mosque and a palace, thus introducing Arabic architecture into the country. When he died in 1322, his authority extended from the valley of the Bani to that of the Dahome, and from the Sahara as far as the thick forest, and he had entered into relations with the Sultan of Fez. His son and successor Maghani (1332–1356) was not able to keep intact the kingdom bequeathed to him by his father. During the reign of this prince the Mossi pillaged Tumbuktu, and Songhoy cast off the Mandingo yoke. On his death, Sulaimaun (1356–1359), the brother of Kankan Massa, ascended the throne. According to Ibn Khalid an, the first care of the new sovereign was to assert his authority in his possessions in the North. He was not successful in regaining Songhoy, but he established peace and security in his kingdom, which he reorganised. The traveller Ibn Battuta, who passed through Mandingo in the year 1351–1352 furnishes us with valuable information on the country, the administration, justice and the court.

Kamla, the son of Sulaimaun, succeeded his father but was deposed at the end of a few months by Mari Diata, the son of Maghan who kept his power until 1374. He died of sleeping sickness and is remembered as a cruel, debauched and extravagant prince.

His successors Misa I (1374–1387), Maghan II, Sandigui Maghan III, Mn-sa III and Mn-sa Ule II reigned until the beginning of the 14th century. From this time onwards exact information ceases, as our authority, the historian Ibn Khalid an, died in the year 1406.

The decline of the Mandingo empire was hastened during the 14th century by the attacks of the Tuareg, the Songhoy, the Mossi and the king of Tellem. In the year 1481 Mansa Mamadu feeling himself to be in danger, approached the Turks who were established on the coast of Africa and sought their protection. This move and others similar which followed it influenced the kings John II and John III in sending to the court of the king of the Mandingo two ambassadors, the one in 1483, the other in 1534, but without lending any military aid.

In the year 1545 the Askia Dug'd of Gao came and plundered the Mandingo capital. The Moroccans who had come from Tumbuktu some months before, joined in the year 1591 the enemies who surrounded the kingdom. The period from 1600–1690 marks the last stage of Mandingo power. But two new principalities were formed on its ruins at Segu and in Kaarta.

According to the legend, the Bambara under the guidance of two brothers, Baramango and Nangolo, were flying before their enemies. They were on the point of perishing under the blows of their enemies, since a river barred their route when they were saved by a miraculous fish which carried them to the opposite bank. After this miracle they took the name of Kulu "bali", that is to say the men "without boats".

In the middle of the 18th century the descendants of Baramango had spread into the valley of the Niger and of the Bani but they paid tribute to the inhabitants of Djenné and to the Moroccans of Tumbuktu; their capital was Segu. Biton Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liberated them from this Kulubali (1660–1710) liber...
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MÂNDÛ, a fortress now in ruins, was formerly the capital of Málwâ [q.v.], and stands in 22° 21’ N. and 75° 26’ E. It has probably been a stronghold from time immemorial, but little is known of its history until the fortifications were erected in their present form by Dîlîvar Kân Râghi (1392—1405), the first independent Muslim king of Málwâ, and his successors. His son, Hâshang Shâh, made it his capital, and it remained the capital of the kingdom and province of Málwâ throughout the period of Muslim rule, and has stood many sieges. Its streets ran with the blood of 19,000 Râjîpûts, slain by Mâhmûd II of Málwâ when he recovered his capital from his rebellious troops.

Of the ten gates of the fortress (two on the south, two on the west, one on the east, and five on the north), the Tarâpur Gate was built by Dîlîvar Kân, the Dîhângîpara Gate by the emperor Dîhângîr, and the Alamgîr Gate by an officer of the emperor Awrangîz in A.D. 1668. The Bhâgwânîa Gate was built in 1514, in the reign of Mâhmûd Kâlîjî II, and the Songârî Gate is an old gate rebuilt early in the nineteenth century by Mânaî Bâi, the great Râni of Dâhî. The Lâwâni, Râmpol, Dîhîl, and Bhangî Gates are old, but bear no inscriptions. The last has
temporarily a token coinage in copper to be withdrawn from currency when the finances of the state improved. 500 māngirs were struck to the ounce of copper and put into currency as half aspers. When the situation did not improve, the value was raised to one asper; the remedy proved worse than the disease for very soon the country was flooded with copper coins and gold and silver driven out of circulation.

Māngir is also the name given to imitations of sequins in brass or other cheap metal worn as ornaments.


MANGISLAH, a mountainous peninsula on the eastern shores of the Caspian Sea, first mentioned under the Persian name Siyāh-Kūh ("Black Mountain"); cf. B. G.A., i, 218; the same name was given to the hills west of the sea of Aral (cf. cita., vii. 92; see AMUD-DARIJA). According to Istakhri (op. cit., i. 219), the peninsula used to be uninhabited; it was only shortly before his time (or that of his predecessor al-Bakfi) that Turks, who had quarrelled with the Ghur [q.v.], i.e. with their own kin, had come there and found springs and pastures for their flocks. Ships which were wrecked on the cliffs of the peninsula used to be plundered by these Turks. Mūṣafīr (or Maḍris) mentions the mountain of Bīnjīshāla making the frontier between the land of the Khazars and Djarjān [q.v.] (cf. B. G. A., i, 355).

In the form Mankīshāla (vocalised Manqas jelgh) by Yākūh the name first appears in documents of the 8th (9th) century (W. Barthold, Turkestän, i. 34, 44 and 79) and in Yākūh (iv. 670). According to Yākūh, this name was borne by a strong fortress near the sea between Khwārizm [q.v.], Sānsr [q.v.] and the land of the Rus. The peninsula was evidently no longer, as it had once been, a place held in terror not only for its natural conditions but also for its inhabitants; via Mangishlak there ran, as later almost into modern times, an important trade route from the Volga territory to Khwārizm; goods were unloaded in the bay near Cape Tab-Karagan and taken to Khwārizm by caravans. Before its conquest between 1127-1128 and 1135 by the Khwā السيد Aǧā [q.v.], Mangishlak was a separate and practically independent principality on the frontiers of the Muslim world (it was of course regarded as within the empire of the Seldjūqis; q.v.). As the verse quoted shows, the conquest resulted in the destruction of the town. No permanent settlement is again mentioned on the peninsula until its occupation by the Russians, in spite of its importance for commerce.

For the last few centuries (perhaps even earlier) the peninsula has been inhabited by Turkomans. Towards the beginning of the 18th century these were the Salur [q.v.]; on the coast lived the "inner Salur" (āqš Salur), on the road from Khwārizm to the coast (about 500 miles; it took 20 days to traverse) lived the "outer (tābši) Salur" (Zaf., xvi. 208). Abu l-Chārī (ed. Dehnessons, p. 267) gives the Ersari for the Salur; towards the end of this century, this tribe was almost completely driven out by the Mangit [q.v.], i.e. by the Mograis; later we find the Kalmucks [q.v.]

MANGIR, the general name for copper coin under the early Ottomans, corresponding to altims (gold) and akçe (silver). As a particular denomination it was a copper coin struck in the reign of Sultan II during a period of financial stress. In 1596 (1687) it was resolved to issue
conquering here. On their rule in Mangīshlak, cf. Abu l-Ghāzi, p. 316; the name of the peninsula is written by Abu l-Ghāzi (see Index), Mangīshlak and Mangīshlāk. In addition to the regular traffic by sea with Astrakhan [q. v.], frequently mentioned in Russian sources, there was also a connection with Shīrāz mentioned by Abu l-Ghāzi (p. 257 and 273) and other sources. Three Turkoman tribes, the Āwd, the Iqīr and the Šomānqārd, were deported by the Kalmucks under Ayuqta (1670—1724), according to others as early as the reign of Punctu-Mošeq (1667—70) from Mangīshlak to the northern part of the Caspian, but a section of the Āwd continued to dwell in Mangīshlak. When, under Russian rule, the land of the Turkomans was organised as the "Trans-Caspian territory" (Zakaspiyskaia oblast), the "district of Mangīshlak" was included in it; the capital was the little settlement founded in 1839 as "Novo-Petrovskoye-ukreplenie" and known from 1839 as "Fort Aleksandrovsk" (now: Fort Urokogo). In the sixth century the Turkomans were gradually driven out of Mangīshlak by the Ḫazān [cf. Khorazm]; therefore after the Revolution the district of Mangīshlak was separated from the land of the Turkomans and now belongs to the republic of Kazakhstān.

After the western shore of the Caspian Sea had passed under Russian rule, it was recognised that the Gulf of Bakhchīsārā [q. v.] formed a better gateway to Central Asia than Mangīshlak. In 1819 the ambassador Muraviev proposed to the Ḫān of Khiva, Muhammad Qāhīm, that the caravan route from the Caspian Sea to Khiva should no longer start from Mangīshlak but from the port of Krasnograd on the Gulf of Bakhchīsārā. The Ḫān replied: "It is true, the road via Mangīshlak is much longer than the road via Krasnograd but the people in Mangīshlak are my subjects, whereas the Khomut as far as Astrakhan belong for the most part to the Ḫājī [q. v.]" (N. Muraviev, Puti geografiye v Turkményu i Khivi, Moscow 1822, p. 134). It was only after Russian rule was firmly established in Central Asia that this question could be settled in favour of the Gulf of Bakhchīsārā. Since Krasnograd became the starting point for the Central Asiatic railway, Mangīshlak has lost any importance that it had in favour of the Gulf of Bakhchīsārā. According to the census of 1897, the population of Krasnograd was 6,322 and of Fort Aleksandrovsk only 895.


MANGU-TIMUR, so on his coins, Mongol Mungō-Timur-Timur, as in the article BERKE, [q. v.], written Mungō (e.g. Rakhidi al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 109), in the Russian annots Mengutimer and Mengutimer, Khan of the Golden Horde (1266—1280), grandson of the Khan Bāši [q. v.], son of Tūkān Khan. According to Egyptian sources, the death of his predecessor Berke took place in 665 (Oct. 1266—Oct. 1267); in 666 (Oct.—Nov. 1267) an embassy left Cairo, which was to bring the new Khan an expression of sympathy and congratulations from Sultan Baybars I [q. v.]. In 667 (Sept. 1268—Aug. 1269) an embassy from the Khan arrived in Egypt. The exchange of embassies was maintained throughout the whole of the Khan's reign. When in 670 (1271—1272) an embassy on the way to Egypt was captured by a Frankish ship from Marseille, the ambassadors and all their goods had to be released on the Sultan's demand. When in 680 (April 1281—1282) an Egyptian embassy left for the Golden Horde nothing was yet known of the death of the Khan. Only later did they learn that he was no more, having died in Kābū I 679 in the district of Nīshān (apparently nowhere else mentioned);
his death is said to have been caused by the unkind removal of a boil on the neck. In Rashid
al-Din (ed. Blochet, p. 142) the date of Mangū-
Timur’s death is given as 681 (Apr. 1282–March
1283); there are coins of his brother and succes-
sor Tādž-Mangū struck in this year.

The Egyptian government tried to induce the
Khān to resume the war on the Persian Mongols
began by his predecessor Berke; but soon after his
accession Mangū-Timur concluded peace with
Abāka and never again attacked Persia. Rashid
al-Din by an oversight attributes to Mangū-Timur
the campaign against Arghūn of the year 689 =
1290 (in Blochet’s edition in p. 40, we have
say for tīs); d’Ossor (Histo. des Mongols, iv. 42)
and Barthold (article A[Z]GHUN) have been misled
by this.

On Mangū-Timur’s participation in events in
Central Asia down to the Kūrūlūtā of 667 (1269)
(sending an army of 50,000 men under Berkedīr,
a brother of Bātū and Berke) see the article
A[Z]KHAN. Accounts of this are found in the
still untranslated parts of the Dīnārī al-Tatrāshī
of Rashīd al-Din (reign of Abāka, cf. d’Ossor,
op. cit., iii. 428). The alliance between Mangū-
Timur and Kāidū, whom he was then supporting,
is also mentioned later; when in 1277 two sons
of the emperor Kūbakī Kāidū were taken prisoners
in the war with Kāidū, the latter had the princes
sent to the court of Mangū-Timur, from which they
were later sent back to their father (Rashīd
al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 8; d’Ossor, op. cit., ii.
452 sq.).

Russian rulers appealed to Mangū-Timur for
support as they had done to his predecessors and
successors. Lev of Galićz received assistance from
him against the Lithuanians but the Tatar auxili-
aries proved a great burden not only to his enemies
but also to their proteges. In 1277, a Russian arm-
ies was fighting in the Caucasus against the Alans
under the Khān’s orders. From Mangū-Timur dates
the earliest extant edict of a Khan of the Golden
Horde on the privileges of the Greek orthodox
church; it is dated in the year of the Hare (probable
1267). The bishop of Sāhī, Ḍezgūn, was sent by
Mangū-Timur as an ambassador to Constantinople.

In contrast to the last two decades of the xivth
century the Golden Horde under Mangū-Timur
was a great power, free from internal troubles.
Coins were struck only in the old commercial
city of Bulghār [q. v.] but, unlike those of
his predecessors, in his own name not in that of
the Great Khan. On his coins, the seal of the
Golden Horde appears for the first time.

Bibliography: (so far as not already given): Howorth, History of the Mongols, ii. 125
sq.; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte des Goldenen
Hor. Pczel 1840, p. 248 sq. — The Egyptian references in W. Tiesenhansen, Skovar materialer, etnasjonalhistorisk forskning 1 stolthetens historia, part i. St Petersburg 1884. (W. Barthold)

MANI. [See Zendik.]

Mani is the name given in Ottoman Turkish to
popular songs in quatrains. The name is a corrup-
tion of the Arabic word mānū, meaning “thought, idea”, and is by no means found through-
out the whole area where Ottoman Turkish is
spoken. In many districts isolated quatrains, like
songs of several verses, are simply called mānu.
Songs in quatrains are known among almost all
Turkish peoples: they must therefore be considered
to have been known to the original Turkish stock.

The rhythm of the mani is, as in Turkish popular
poetry generally, sometimes purely syllabic (a de-
finite number of syllables without a fixed caesura),
and sometimes depends on the accented syllables
(with a fixed caesura and therefore with the order
of weak and strong syllables to some degree fixed).
The lines show as a rule 7 syllables (4–3, 3–4,
rarely 2–3–2). Quatrains with all four lines alike
are rare, the third line usually differs from the
others (3–4, 3–4, 4–3, 3–4, or 4–3, 4–3, 3–4, 4–3
and so on). The original arrangement of the
rhyme in Turkish quatrains is a b c a (two lines,
rhyming) which clearly shows the quatrains was
originally a distich. In the Ottoman mani we have
a development of this form, with three rhyming
lines (a b a). The rhyme however which
connects the second and fourth lines is often ful-
ler and more distinct than that which connects
the first and second lines. Alliteration, which is
highly developed among many Turks, especially
in the north, is only found sporadically in the
mani; it is found both as line alliteration (simi-
larly in the initial letters of the words of a line,
e.g. kara köynən bacır hursun, betimə bernine bal, etc.) and as verse alliteration (similarly in the
initial letters of the lines in a verse, e.g. ənənər greeting, senti insan sönri, seni bu kök sön-
rənədi, seni gənəl xoroqə). As regards matter, the majority of the mani fall
into two distinct parts, an introduction dealing
with nature, and a concluding part of a personal
character. Originally the two parts must have been
very closely connected. It would however be a
mistake to find such a connection in all the mani,
because the singers very often only improvise new
conclusions to ready made introductions taken
from older poems, without troubling in the least
about the train of thought. The great majority
of mani are tinged with eroticism, but we also
find satirical ones, also soldiers’ and robbers’
songs in the form of quatrains. The quatrains
composed on the Anatolian brigand Cakdyi have
been much admired by European scholars. Isolated,
originally independent mani are now often strung
together to form ballads of some length. It would
therefore be wrong to regard mani as two
fundamentally different classes of songs.

The number of mani current among the people
is enormous. They are sung at all kinds of fest-
ivals and ceremonies, and by people over their
work in the house in the long winter nights. On
Hedēles, St. George’s Day (April 23), they are
used as oracles by young girls.

Very popular also among the Ottoman Turks
are the so-called aznali mani: panning mani.
These are quatrains, the rhymes of which are
identical syllables but have each a different
meaning.

Bibliography: I. Kunos in the introduction of
Ottoman Turkish popular songs, especially in
the second volume of the Osmanlî Türk elkitâbı
grzfimlml, Budapest 1889 and in the eighth
vol. of the Proben der Volksliedertur der
türkischen Sprache, ed. by Radloff, St. Petersburg
1893; G. Jacob, Türkische Volksliedertur,
Berlin 1901, p. 23 sq.; T. Kowalski, Zs studjóm
nach formen foli lâtkei turcieszci, Krakow 1922,
63 sq., 72 sq. — Collections of mani’s are
also found in the following works: Kunos,
 Turksiche Volkslieder, W. Z. K. M., iv. (1890),
CHRISTOMATHIA TURCICA. Budapest 1899; E. Littmann, Tschakidisch, ein Rautenhauptmann der Gegenwart, Berlin 1915; T. Towalski, Pisanski Iskroudek anatolikos o reichsbuhni Csaklyus, Rozmi Obywatelscy, i. 337—355; W. Heffingen, Türkische Volkslider, in Id., xiiii. 236—267; W. Gurdlewiski, Obrazce ormianockiego narodzenia (Manastirski sv,istoriji), Moscow 1916; M. Kasaan, Eine Sammlung von Mönchen aus Anatolien, Journal de la Sociéte Finno-Ougrienne, xiiii. (1926) (a collection of 390 mani mainly from N.E.-Anatolia); S.čd. Sułtan Nüzhet and Mehemd Ferid, Konis, Wilayetler Kholistat, xiiii. Hartha, Konya 1926, p. 155—177 (a collection of 375 mani from the Wilayet of Konya); Anatol. Tur. Katli̇n̄ Khol̄efehi̇yi̇, ı Mαuı̇ler (collection of texts with a very full introduction by Kopulę-Zade Mehməd Fuad) is to be shortly published by the Turkological Institute in Constantinople); cf. also the Zbl. to the article TURK. (T. KOWALSKI).

AL-MANISA, one of Allah's names. [See ALLAH.]

MANİSA, MAĞHİSNA (Mareńska), in Arabic Mağhūsiyya, capital of the district of Sārū-kitān in western Anatolia.

Maghūsna, in Al-Mağhūsiyya, a city in Mağhūsiyya, the capital of the district of Sārū-kitān in western Anatolia.

Maghūsna is a two hours' journey distant on the south from the river Gediz or Gedüs (the ancient Hermus); on its course, cf. Tschakid. Aust. Minor., ii. (1886), p. 272) on the northern slope of Mount Mağhūsdağl or Vamnlar (the ancient Sipilos) which separates it from Smyrna (the distance between the two towns is by rail 20 miles; by railway 40 miles). In ancient times the town ("Maghūsna ad Sipilos") was mainly noted for the victory won in its vicinity by the two Scætops over Antiochus the Great of Syria (190 B.C.). The town was then incorporated in the Roman empire. It flourished until the fifth century as its coins show. Magnesia is also often mentioned in Byzantine history; after the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204 John Ducas retired to Magnesia where he held out till 1255.

The Türkman chief Sārū-kitān [q. v.] who had formed a principality for himself on the ruins of the Seldjük Kingdom of Konya, took Magnesia in 1313 and the town was the capital of his dynasty for 78 years. It was in the reign of Sārū-kitān that Ibn Baṭṭūra (ii. 312) visited the town and he stayed in a zāvīa of the brotherhood of the ābūna. The town was large and beautiful, rich in gardens and with a plentiful supply of water. On the buildings erected by the Sārū-kitān dynasty see the article on them.

After the battle of Angora (505 A.H.) Timur ordered his grandson Sułtan Muhammed to lay waste (yellet) the district between Brousse and Magnesia and to take up his winter quarters in the latter town. The author of the Fatih-nâma, ii. 466—467, 480, calls it "Maghūsna-i yellet in the Sārū-īlāb" [cf. Tschakid. ii. 322; Sārū-kitān] and comments on the excellence and abundance of its water-supply and the pleasantness of its climate. According to Turkish sources (cf. Tschakid. ii. 322; Oktoměh, ed. Babinger, p. 34—35; Aşkhič-pasha, p. 20; Munedž-i-djum-bāghi, etc., 113). Timur restored the feşes of Anatolia to their old holders (ژکچی-ژکچی) but by S13 (1410) Sułtan Muhammed I had retaken the region of Sārū-kitān [q. v.].

Maghūsna became the residence (Djihan-nâma, p. 635 dâr al-αlnun) of the Ottoman princes but for a time (1405—1425) its district was within the sphere of influence of the rebel Djinnef (son of the Ottoman governor of al-Aydın; von Hammer, op. cit., p. 271—327). Murād II having abdicated the throne in 1444 chose Maghūsna as his place of retirement. The Hungarian offensive drew him out of it but after the victory of Warna (Nov. 10, 1444) he returned to Magnesia (v. Hammer, GÖR., i. 351, 357) where the remains of his palace and gardens can still be seen. Murad III (1574—1595) and his wife also contributed to beautifying the town; cf. Djihan-nâma, p. 635. Chandler, Travels in Asia Minor, Oxford, 1775, p. 207—209 and 266—268 speaks of the palace and the magnificent hall of Murad III (I) and of his foundation (tekciye = college of archiwes, lunatec asylum, etc.). In 1633 in the reign of Murad IV, the governor of Karasi [q. v.] Ilyas Paşa rebelled and laid siege to Magnesia which was taken and plundered for three days. Ilyas was taken prisoner and the Sultan in ordering him to be beheaded reproached him with having devastated "the residence of his ancestors" (I.e., iii. 113—114).

In the xviii century Magnesia became the capital of the powerful family of the Karâ Othmaņ-OGHLU whose authority extended from the Maeander to the Propeant. It was not till 1814 that these hereditary chiefs, whose administration is praised by Keppel, Narrative of a Journey across the Balkans, London 1821, ii. 294—301, were replaced by a regular Turkish governor.

With the introduction of the system of wilayets, Magnesia became the capital of the sanjak of Sārū-kitān in the wilayet of Aydı̇n (Smyrna). Sâmīd, Kâmûs al-Aṭāim, Constantinople 1898, vi. 438 estimated the population of the town at 36,252 of whom 21,000 were Muslims, 10,400 Greeks, 2000 Armenians etc. Magnesia which is divided up by streams into 3 quarters had 25 djāms, 38 mosques, 25 medreses, 18 tekciyes etc. The kaļida of Magnesia had 4 naiye: Amlâk, Yost-daghli Palamut and Belbek. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, iii., 1894, p. 523—534 gives the following as the naiye of the sanjak: Magnesia, Soma, Kırk-Ağacı, Aş-zişär, Kasaba, Gurdüs, Demirdşi, Şâlil, Kule, Ala-shehr, Bğam. After the reform of 1921 Sārū-kitān became a wilayet with 11 kaļida (the old naiye). The population of the new wilayet is 302,275 souls and of the kaļida of Magnesia, 75,021 souls; cf. the Turk. Djamhuri-yetiņni Sâkunesi, 1926—1927, p. 926—933. In view of the movements of the population the ethnic composition of the sanjak must have undergone profound modifications.

(V. MINORSKY)

MANSHR (A.) means literally "spread out" (as in the Kūrān xvii. 14 and lii. 31; opposite maʕil "folded"), or not sealed (opposite maˈkhtim) hence means a certificate, an edict, a diploma of appointment, and particularly a patent granting an appanage.

In Egypt in the early Arab period manshur seems to have been a name for the passes which the government compelled the felâh in to have in order to check the flight of colonists from the land, which threatened to become overflowing (Qālîta, cf. above, ii, p. 14 and 994). In many cases it is a phrase (Fahher durch die Ausstellung (Payyurs Ersther Rainer), N:o. 631 (cf. also N:o. 601—620) such a certificate of the year 180 (796) is called a manshur and in Makrīzī, Kâbaṭ, ii. 493, we are told
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of the period of the financial controller Uṣāma b. Zad al-Tanūkī (104 = 722–723) that Christians who were found without identification papers (manṣūr) had to pay 10 dinārs fine (cf. Becker, Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens, p. 104). In the texts of such proclamations themselves (cf. Becker, Papyri Schott-Rehder, l. 40, i) however, we have, so far as I can see, not the word manṣūr but only kalāt. This seems also to have a quite general meaning of public notice, for example in Kalkashandi, šakā al-maḍār, xii. 142, that it was written on an ‘Abbasid grant of a fief dating from the year 573 (983–984) that no one could demand for the holder that he should show a hadījya or a tawākī or a manṣūr.

The Egyptian Fāṭimids usually called all state documents, appointments, etc. by the general term ḥālī, but they had also special terms for particular diplomatic appointments, including manṣūr.

Thus, among the examples of Fāṭimid documents given by Kalkashandi, x. 452–466 there are several which in their texts are described as manṣūr. Among these are for example, appointments to the supervising officials (tāfir) to tax revenues (ṣir al-ṣirah; ṣir al-ṣirah) of the royal taxes (manṣūrat al-ṣirah), to a professorship (tadhir) etc. A grant of an appointment could also be called manṣūr at this time, so Kalkashandi, xii. 131 sq. from the lost Fāṭimid Ma‘wīdā b-Bayyān of ‘Ali b. Ḥāsaf and the regulation that the manṣūr must not have an address (ṭawāsīn) and that in place of this the head of the Diwān must write the date with his own hand seems to be first found in Ibn al-Saṣir, Kābūt Diwān al- Ṣirāfī, p. 113 sq. = Kalkashandi, vi. 198.

This is the Aliyūbīs also, manṣūr had quite a general meaning. Thus in Kalkashandi, xi. 49 sq. a “noble marshal” (mahbūb al-adhrāf) is appointed by a manṣūr and in 51 sq. governors (ṣulṭān) of different provinces. In the text of it the name manṣūr is given to the edict on the equation of taxation and lunar years (tawāwil al-ṣinān) which is quoted from the Mattahiddādinn of the Kādī al-Paḍīl for the year 567 (1171–1172) in Kalkashandi, i. 281, ed. Wiet, i. 292 (cf. also Kalkashandi, xiii. 71 sqq.), and according to a further quotation, for the year 584 (Kalkashandi, i. 269 = Wiet, i. 248) the so-called “lord of the new year” (amir al-nawwara) issued his manṣūr.

The term manṣūr became limited and specialised in the Mamakī period, for which we have very few full sources. The increasingly complicated system of the administration brought about a minute distinction between and special names for the various diplomas of appointment, edicts, etc. and the term manṣūr was henceforth used exclusively of the grants of appanages. These manṣūr were always written in Cairo in the chancellory (ṣirāw al-ṣināh) in the name of the sultan, only in exceptional cases they might be in the name of the nādī Kādī (see Kalkashandi, iv. 16; xiii. 157). According to the very full description in Kalkashandi, xii. 151 sq. and Maṣrí, i. 211, the procedure in granting a fief was as follows: if a fief became vacant (muḥāl) in a provincial town, e.g. in Damascus, the governor there (ra‘ī) proposed a new holder and had a document (nūkṣa, also called muḥāla or mu‘ālā) drawn up about his proposal by the inspector of the army (nāṣīr al-qādī; cf. Kalkashandi, iv. 190; xii. 97) in the military Diwan (diwān al-ṣirāf) of his town. This document was then sent by courier (baṣīr) or pigeon post (tā‘ī al-adwar al-hamām) to Cairo to the government (al-adwar al-ṣirāf). Here it was received by the postmaster (dāwādīr), later by the private secretary (ṣir al-adwar = šabū al-dawwār), who placed it before the sultan in audience (ṣirāf fī dawādīr) for approval, to receive the sultan’s signature (ṣirr al-adwar) and the note yutabāq (“let it be written out”; see Kalkashandi, iv. 51). The document then went to the Military Diwan in Cairo (diwān al-adwar), occasionally also called diwān al-ṣirāf, where it was filed, after what was called the mu‘āla had been made out. The latter was sent to the diwan al-ṣirāf and the private secretary, the head of this Diwan, wrote his requisition (ṣirr al-adwar) for the tā‘ī; writing concerned and now finally the patent of the appanage (manṣūr) proper could be made out in the diwan al-ṣirāf in Cairo, while the mu‘āla of the army Diwan remained filed in the diwan al-ṣirāf as šabīb (proof; cf. Kalkashandi, iv. 201).

Full particulars are given of the formulae used in these manṣūr and of their order in later Shībāb al-Dīn b. Fakhr al-Makbulī, in ‘Abd al-Mu‘ī tāfar al-ṣirāf, p. 88 sq.; Kalkashandi, xii. 153 sqq. and Quartemere, Histoire des Sultan de Mamlouks de l’Egypte, t. 200 sq. note 82. There are many variants of format (ta‘ī, q.v.) and script according to the military rank of the recipient. Thus manṣūr for the Muḥāfādīn ‘al-ṣirāf were written on hāf al-ṣirāf, for the Umara al-Tālbakīs on hāf al-adwar, for the Umara al-‘Abbāsīs on hāf al-ṣirāf and for the Manṣūrat al-sulṭānīya and Muḥāfādīn ‘al-ṣirāf on hāf al-ṣirāf. Many rules were laid down for the wording to be used; the text is to be shorter and less florid than in the other appointments and there are none of the usual rules about service (wāsīn); an original “virgin” (mārkat al-adwar) is recommended as the finest form of a manṣūr. Special formulae are further required for grants of appanages which were concerned with renewal (ṣirr al-adwar), addition (ṣirr al-adwar) or substitution (ta‘ī al-adwar). A regular signature of the sultan, such as is usual on appointments as confirmation (ma‘ūn), is not found on the manṣūr; instead of this the sultan writes formulae like: God is my hope (Allāhu ma‘ṣūri); God is my Protector (Allāhu wāsī). God is sufficient for me (Allāhu la‘īk); To God belongs the rule (al-Mamlūk li ‘rīs); or: God alone has grace (al-Minān li ‘lākhi wāsīn)!

Occasionally the manṣūr for the highest ranks (Muḥāfādīn ‘al-‘Umarī and Muḥāfādīn ‘al-Tālbakīs) had a tawāqī [q.v.] at the top. The tawāqīs were prepared by a special official beforehand and gummed on to the finished diplomas. In Kalkashandi, viiii. 165 sqq. the tawāqīs of Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Ka‘īn (693–741 with interruptions) and Ashraf Shāhān b. Husain (764–797) are reproduced and described; they differ considerably from the better known form of the tawāqī of the Ottoman Sultans. After Ashraf Shāhān tawāqīs were no longer used on the manṣūr; these were only used for purposes of display on letters to infidel rulers.

The completed manṣūr was then again taken back by a courier from Cairo to the town concerned, e.g. Damascus and handed over to the tenant of the appanage. The inspector of the army there (nāṣīr al-qādī) however first entered it in his register for he had to keep a roll of the holders of fiefs in his province. Kalkashandi, xiii. 167–199 gives as examples of manṣūr no fewer
than 26 texts, beginning with one drawn up by Muḥyi l-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Zāhir in the reign of Kālidā, for the latter’s son Nāṣir Muḥammad, which for its remarkable beauty he calls a regular ṣīlah al-mansūh. The other texts are for the sons of emirs (ṣawādʿ al-emīrī) and for emirs, of the Arabs, Turkomans and Kurds.

The term mansūh was also used for patents of appointment in the Ottoman empire, but it does not seem to have been used so definitely or exclusively in this sense; there are however mansūh for viziers, generals, and governors (ṣawādʿ muḥrīt, muḥrījat mansūh, ʿasād al-mansūh), and in the treaties of peace made after the Balkan War in 1913, it is still provided that the chief ministers to be appointed in Bulgaria and Greece are to receive their mansūh from the Şahīkh al-Islām in Stambol and they have also to put forward for approval the mansūh of the ordinary ministers subordinate to them (cf. e.g. K. L. Stampp, Auswärtliche diplomatische Abhandlungen zur orientalischen Frage, Gotha 1916, p. 295, 308).

The name mansūh was also applied to the pastoral letters and epistles of the Christian patriarchs and bishops. In conclusion it may be mentioned that mansūh in mathematical language means “prism” (varieties e.g. M. muʾāf oblique prism, M. kāʾīm straight prism, M. muwaʿṣiṣ ʿāqṣī parallel prism, M. manṣūm, regular prism, M. muṭalluṣi triangle prism, M. muʾāf truncated prism), and that in the language of the Persian poets the nightsong is called “the mensūh-writers of the garden” (mansūr-nawvāsī-i kāsh). In the letter against the Omayyad, which he distinguished himself and took part in the siege of Fārā, which had been fortified by Ibn Hubaira [q. v.], the last important supporter of Mansūr. The treacherous murder of Ibn Hubaira, to whom the two ʿAbbāsids had expressly promised a pardon, is however not out of keeping with ʿAbū ḫaṭṭār’s character. His brother gave him the government of Armenia, Aḥdarbaḏān and Mesopotamia, which he administered till his accession. On the way back from the pilgrimage, he learned that Abu l-ʿAbbās had died in Dhu l-Ḥijjah 130 (June 754) and that he himself had been proclaimed caliph. His uncle ʿAbd al-ʿAbbās b. Ali [q. v.] wished to dispute the succession but was defeated by ʿAbū Muslim [q. v.]. Soon afterwards the Caliph had the latter put out of the way, which led to a rising in Khurāsān. The leader of this was a Persian named Sunbāḥ; he advanced far into Media but was defeated between Hamadān and Raiy by the caliph’s troops led by Dāhwar b. Marrār and soon afterwards slain. When Dāhwar also cast off his allegiance to the caliph, the latter sent an army under Muḥammad b. al-ʿAshāb against him (138 = 755—756). Dāhwar was defeated and fled to Ṭabarqān, where he was put to death. About the same time the Khāridjīs rebelled in Mesopotamia under Muḥammad b. Ḥarmāl al-ʿAṭhabānī who inflicted severe reverses on al-Mansūr’s armies, until the rebellion was finally suppressed by Kālidā b. Ṭabarqān in 138 and 139. Dāhwar b. Marrār, the Turks and Kurds.

AL-MANSŪR, ʿAbī ḫaṭṭār ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad, the second ʿAbbāsīd caliph. His mother was a Berber slave girl called Suḥāma, his brother the caliph Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Ṣaffār [q. v.]. In the letter against the Omayyad, he distinguished himself and took part in the siege of Fārā, which had been fortified by Ibn Hubaira [q. v.], the last important supporter of Mansūr. The treacherous murder of Ibn Hubaira, to whom the two ʿAbbāsids had expressly promised a pardon, is however not out of keeping with ʿAbū ḫaṭṭār’s character. His brother gave him the government of Armenia, Aḥdarbaḏān and Mesopotamia, which he administered till his accession. On the way back from the pilgrimage, he learned that Abu l-ʿAbbās had died in Dhu l-Ḥijjah 130 (June 754) and that he himself had been proclaimed caliph. His uncle ʿAbd al-ʿAbbās b. Ali [q. v.] wished to dispute the succession but was defeated by ʿAbū Muslim [q. v.]. Soon afterwards the Caliph had the latter put out of the way, which led to a rising in Khurāsān. The leader of this was a Persian named Sunbāḥ; he advanced far into Media but was defeated between Hamadān and Raiy by the caliph’s troops led by Dāhwar b. Marrār and soon afterwards slain. When Dāhwar also cast off his allegiance to the caliph, the latter sent an army under Muḥammad b. al-ʿAshāb against him (138 = 755—756). Dāhwar was defeated and fled to Ṭabarqān, where he was put to death. About the same time the Khāridjīs rebelled in Mesopotamia under Muḥammad b. Ḥarmāl al-ʿAṭhabānī who inflicted severe reverses on al-Mansūr’s armies, until the rebellion was finally suppressed by Kālidā b. Ṭabarqān in 138 and 139. Dāhwar b. Marrār, the Turks and Kurds.
recognise him. His career however was brief and his power unending: for when in 393 (1003) he died, his governor in Şan'a' had already gone over to Yūsuf al-Dā'ī. He was however the first since al-Nāṣir ʿAḥmad, and the fourth in all to be entered — although not by everyone — in the lists as Imām of Yemen (but cf. on the above claimants: Manādījūnbūzālī, in Suhay, Ein Viereinander muthemamscker Denkschrift, in Lib. Arb. u. W. d. phil.-hist. K., 1923, i. 22).

Only for an equally short time from 401-404 (1010-1013) his son al-Hāsim al-Mahdī was able to regain his father’s office. His early death in battle is noteworthy because it produced a quite un-Shi‘ī belief in his return and for a period founded a special sect, the “Haššinīya” in the name of this concealed imām. Some years later another son of al-Kāsim, Ya‘fā, began a struggle full of vicissitudes with the other ʿAlīd claimants to the imamate, which was complicated by a party grouping of the tribes of the country: about 453 (1061) Şan'a’ fell to the Ismā‘īlī Sulahjūs and then to Hamdān chiefs. Only in 545 (1150) Ṭahmāb b. Sulaīman al-Muṭawakkil, whose genealogy also goes back to al-Nāṣir ʿAḥmad b. al-Ḥādi b. al-Ḥādi but neither through al-Kāsim al-Mukhtar nor Yūsuf al-Dā’ī, succeeded in restoring the imamate for a long and brilliant period. For the history of the following centuries, which were full of incidents and individual imāms of importance cf. the article al-Makhtūr al-Muḥarrar bi-dh al-thamālī, in Suhay, Ein Viereinander muthemamscker Denkschrift, in Lib. Arb. u. W. d. phil.-hist. K., 1923, i. 22).

For the history of the following centuries, which were full of incidents and individual Imāms of importance, cf. the article “al-Makhtūr al-Muḥarrar bi-dh al-thamālī,” in Suhay, Ein Viereinander muthemamscker Denkschrift, in Lib. Arb. u. W. d. phil.-hist. K., 1923, i. 22.

order to leave his successor a full treasury. He took an active interest in literature and was a brilliant speaker; on the other hand he did not tolerate music and song at his court and in general led a very simple life. His nephew ʿIsā b. Mūsa [q.v.] had been destined by al-Saffāh to succeed al-Mānsūr but was induced by the latter to withdraw his claims on condition that he should succeed after al-Mahdī [q.v.]. Al-Mānsūr died in Lhū Ṭihādja 158 (Oct. 775) in Dir Māma, when on the pilgrimage to Mecca and was buried near the holy city [cf. the article al-Makhtūr].

was observed for about ten years with a few interruptions especially on the arrival of new governors in 1022 and 1025. After renewed fighting a formal peace in 1028 left the imām in possession of the four separate areas: around Shahāra, around Khājahb in the east, around Ša'da in the north, and lastly in the S.W. of Shāhā around Hāma [q.v.], the inhabitants were however for the most part not Zaidis but Shāfi'ī. Al-Kāsim died in Raš'ī I 1029 (Feb. 1620). In the middle of 1035 (beg. of 1629) Ḥaidar Pasha had to evacuate Shāhā because his son and successor al-Mu'ayyad Muḥammad was con entitled to succeed him.


(K. Strothmann)

AL-MANṣūR, the sixth ruler of the Ḥamādīd dynasty, succeeded his father al-Nāṣir in the year 481 (1088). The latter had witnessed the rise to the height of its power of the dynasty of somewhat artificial development of Kāla Bān Ḥamādī [q.v.], a result of the destruction of Kaitāwān by the Arabs. Two years after the accession of al-Manṣūr, the Arabs, who had advanced towards the west and who had spread over all the region adjoining the Kāla, began to make existence there difficult. The prince moved his capital from Kāla to Bougie which he considered less accessible to the nomads; it should be mentioned that his father al-Nāṣir had already made preparations for the exodus by transforming a little fishing port into a regular town, which he called al-Nāṣirīya and which was to become Bougie. While on the other hand, the Kāla was not completely abandoned by al-Manṣūr and he even embellished it with a number of palaces. The Ḥamādīd kingdom had therefore at this time two capitals joined by a royal road.

After taking up his quarters at Bougie, al-Manṣūr had in the first place to quell the revolt of one of his uncles, Belhar, the governor of Constantine. He sent against the rebel another Ḥamādīd Emir, Abū Yākni. The latter after his victory was given the governorship of Constantine but shortly after he in his turn as well as his brother, who had been given the governorship of Bone, rebelled. These risings over which al-Manṣūr, thanks to his energy, was triumphant, brought to the side of the rebel of the Ḥamādīd family the Zirids of al-Mahdiyya, who wished to get back some power in Barbary, the Almoravids of the Magribī, who wished to extend towards the East and the Arabs who were always ready to join in the feuds of their powerful neighbours.

Al-Manṣūr was, on the other hand, led to oppose the advance of the Almoravids who were curiously allied with the traditional opposition of the Zenātī [q.v.]. With the probable object of disarming the opposition al-Nāṣir and al-Manṣūr had married two sisters of Mākhkhiṭ, the chief of the Banu Wāmānī, at that time the most powerful of the Zenātī group. This alliance did not hinder the time-honoured feud from breaking out again. It became more acute when al-Manṣūr murdered his wife, the sister of his enemy. The latter then asked for support from the Almoravids.

From Tlemcen, where they had been installed for more than twenty years, the Almoravids had after many attempts, endeavoured to expand towards the East at the expense of their brethren of the same race, the Šahāda b. Ḥammād. Al-Manṣūr had twice reduced them to impotence. It was at this time that the murder of the sister of Mākhkhiṭ by al-Manṣūr drove the Wāmānī chief into an alliance with the Almoravids of Tlemcen. The alliance formed in this way was a great blow to the Ḥamādīd kingdom. Algiers was besieged for two days; Ashīr was taken.

The fall of the latter fortress, the oldest stronghold of the family, was bitterly resented by al-Manṣūr. He got together an army of 20,000 men, composed of the Šahāda, the Arabs and even the Zenātī; he marched against Tlemcen, met the governor Tāshīfī b. Tāshīfī, marched against Tlemcen, met the governor Tāshīfī b. Tāshīfī, and put him to flight. Tlemcen was not spared even at the supplication of Tāshīfī's wife, who invoked the ties of relationship uniting them with the Šahāda (496 = 1103).

After the defeat of the Almoravids, al-Manṣūr severely punished the Zenātī and the rebel tribes of the Bougie district, whom he forced to flee into the mountains of Kabylia.

Thus al-Manṣūr seems on the eve of his death (498 = 1104) to have thoroughly re-established the power of the Ḥamādīds. According to a tradition, which is not above suspicion, recorded by Ibn Khuldīn, the two capitals owed very important buildings to him: Bougie, the Palace of the Star and the Palace of Salvation; the Kāla, the government palace and the Kasr al-Manṣūr, the beautiful donjon of which is still in part extant.

Bibliography: Ibn Khuldīn, Kitāb al-Bukhārī, i. 227—228, transl. de Slane, ii. 51—55; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, x. 110; transl. E. Fagan (Annales du Maghreb et de l'Espagne), p. 488; E. Mercier, Hist. de l'Africque septentrionale, ii. 53—56; L. de Bolyé, La Kala des Beni Hammād, p. 38 sqq., 99 sqq. (doubtful traditions relating to the mosque of Bougie which was enlarged by al-Manṣūr); G. Marçais, Manuel d'art musulman, i. 105, 121—123, 129—130.

(Georges Marçais)

He was still a child when on the accession of his eldest brother 'Abd Allah (1557) he accompanied into exile his other brothers 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-Mu‘min, who went for safety from Sulayman to Tlemcen. The fugitives were potential claimants to the throne of the Shāhīns, by virtue of an agreement concluded in the life-time of their father by which the one to inherit the power was not the Sultan’s heir but the eldest of the family. 'Abd al-Mu‘min was assassinated at the instigation of his nephew Mu‘ammad b. ‘Abd Allah called al-Mutawakkil and ‘Abd al-Malik retired to Algiers to join 'Abd al-Malik, who was already there. He was henceforth always a loyal lieutenant of his brother whose ability he fully realised. The death of ‘Abd Allah in 1574 gave the exiles the opportunity to assert their rights. Pretenders and rebels could always rely on the support of the natural enemies of every reigning shah: Spain and Turkey. Philip II had remained deaf to the repeated appeals of ‘Abd al-Malik, who appealed to the Grand Turk and in 1574 went to Constantinople where his marriage with the daughter of the sultan of the Ḥājjid Morato assured him of patronage. In Algiers, Aḥmad conducted successful negotiations with certain Moroccan notables, mainly in Fās. It was perhaps he who gave the signal when an expedition appeared to have some chances of success. He was at his brother’s side when the latter entered Morocco in 1576 with a Turkish army led by Rāmādān Pāsha and helped him to raise troops in the region of Tlemcen. We do not know exactly what part he played in the battles of al-Rukn and al-Sharrāt which gave Morocco to ‘Abd al-Malik but we know that he was given the task of pursuing the dethroned sultan on his flight to Marrakāš.

One of ‘Abd al-Malik’s first acts was to recognise his brother as his heir. It seems, however, that he did not show the latter as much esteem as affection and he had left in Constantinople, with his wife, his son Isma‘īl. But he was bound by his policy. In these circumstances Aḥmad naturally had the vice-royalty of Fās.

He did not stay there long, for he was recalled to save Marrakāš from a return of al-Mutawakkil. Taking command of one of the three armies charged with pursuing the vanquished sultan in al-Sās and the Atlas, he does not seem to have had the opportunity for a decisive military success; he returned to his governorship while Mu‘ammad was driven to seek refuge behind the walls of Cecta.

In June 1578, ‘Abd al-Malik summoned him with all his forces to Kaşr al-Kabir (Alcazarquivir, q.v.) to stop the advance of the King of Portugal’s army. The latter had foolishly sought to realise the dream of conquering Morocco cherished by John III. When Mu‘ammad b. ‘Abd Allah after vainly appealing for help to Philip II, turned to Sebastián, he at once received a favourable reply. A large army with about 20,000 effective fighters left Portugal in June, landed at Tangier, then went to Arzila, which ‘Abd al-Karim b. Tuda had just relieved, and proceeded by land towards Larache. The Moroccan forces coming from Marrakāš and Fās met them at al-Kaşr. Aḥmad found his brother seriously ill, poisoned by the kādīs of his staff, it is said. The battle was fought a few miles from al-Kaşr on Aug. 4. Sebastián’s men, absurdly led, having exhausted all their provisions, fought with their backs to the river of the Wād ‘I-Maḥkāz. The shah arranged his army in a crescent. In about 5 hours the Christians were annihilated by the Moorish cavalry. ‘Abd al-Malik died in his litter during the battle, Sebastian was killed or committed suicide and al-Mutawakkil was drowned. That evening, Aḥmad henceforth known as Aḥmad al-Mansūr was proclaimed emperor.

Elegant, cultivated, very learned in religious matters, more a man of the council-chamber than of the camp, he was succeeding a popular and fearless ruler, of exceptional energy, who having acquired a taste for innovations in Turkey had begun to introduce them, perhaps too eagerly, into Morocco. Designated as his successor by ‘Abd al-Malik, and benefiting by the great reputation left by his father, Aḥmad al-Mansūr was rapidly able to overcome the difficulties which awaited him, as they did every sovereign of Morocco on his accession: mutinies of the troops, demands from allied tribes and the Zāwīyas, and agitations among the Berbers. While in Spain it was feared that the Christian garrison would be attacked and swept away, al-Mansūr had to hurry to Fās to make himself recognised as ruler there, to put down unrest and behead a few notables. He edited the people by displaying the skin of Muhammad al-Maṣūlāk sheered with straw in the regions of al-Sās and the Atlas, where the influence of the former sultan had survived for a brief space his tenure of the throne.

Aḥmad al-Mansūr very soon sought means of enriching himself. The booty taken in the field of al-Kaşr, the work done by the prisoners reduced to slavery, the ransom extorted from the gentlemen gave the shah and his people enormous sums. The sultan kept the nobles for himself; So were soon brought to him and he set about bargaining about them. In a little time, less than a year, the ransoms had been arranged.

The haste displayed by foreign courts to congratulate the Moor on his triumph was remarkable. Ambassadors thronged to Marrakāš, those of Spain and Portugal bringing magnificent gifts. Aḥmad al-Mansūr had the sense to understand that these presents were the less the more he was likely to get from European action. For its neighbours, Morocco was a weak and troublesome state. The rapidity of its neighbours was its best protection. Many reasons urged the Turks to obtain a footing there: the capability of the beglerbegs of Algiers ambitious of extending their powers to the west, the naval basis of Mazagan of al-Ma‘ūrā and of Larache; the formal promises that had been given by ‘Abd al-Malik, when he was begging assistance, and there was always the troublesome question of spiritual supremacy, as the Turk-sultan did not admit that the Moorish shah had an authority in religious matters as great as his. To extirpate himself, al-Mansūr played the usual game, following the example of his brother, who had made advances to the kings of Spain, Portugal and France, to the Queen of England and to the Grand Duke of Tuscany; he turned without ceremony from the Grand Turk and threw himself into the arms of Philip II, overwhelming the Catholic King with demonstrations of friendship, of which the most significant was the return without ransom of the body of Sebastian; he was even promised Larache.

The quarrel with Turkey was soon to come to an end. ‘Ali, Beglerbeg of Algiers, exerted all his influence to get war declared. Aḥmad al-Mansūr
as a last resort had to send in 1581 an embassy laden with presents to Constantinople where the enemies of Eüdyl 'Ali were conducting an effective campaign against the Berglerbeg. The relations between the two Muslims resumed the appearance of a conflict which they usually had. In 1587, the death of Eüdyl 'Ali, the end of the regime of the Berglerbegs and the weakening of Turkish power in Algiers freed Morocco from a threat which had long weighed heavily upon it. There were still periods of tension: when al-Manṣūr ceased to send what he considered gracious gifts and what the Grand Turk received as tribute; when the conquest of the Süddan seemed to be about to threaten Ottoman interests, spiritual and material; and lastly in the periods of friendship with Spain. But there was never again a real crisis; even in spite of the efforts of Hassān who had married 'Abd al-Malik's widow, the Turk did nothing really serious to sustain the claim of Isma'īl.

When al-Manṣūr had peace on the Turkish side he showed Philip what negotiation meant; yielding nothing, breaking off nothing; playing enemies off one against another. It was no longer a question of handing over Larache but of an exchange and the pourparlers dragged along for four years with a decreasing seriousness of purpose. The Duke of Medin-Sidónia, supported by Philip II, to deal with Moroccan affairs was played with by the Moor who was able to reap considerable advantage from his hesitation on several occasions. The Sharif seems to have summed up very skilfully the character of the Catholic king and the needs of his policy. Spain, faced with a crisis at home and abroad, could not think of risking anything important in Africa. It was he interest that Morocco should remain weak, that is to say Moroccan, and especially that it should not fall under the influence of the Turks or of the English. Corsairs sheltered in the Atlantic ports, on the route to India. The garrisons, weak and badly provisioned, were periodically blockaded sometimes threatened, by the natural movements of tribes around them rather than by deliberate hostilities on the part of the Sharif. The policy of the two Phelips, one of distrust and fear, tried to limit the evil and to obtain by subtle means a neutrality as little malevolent as possible, by awaiting the favourable moment of the anarchy, which history showed to recur in Morocco with an inexorable regularity. The Spanish court did not attempt to make capital out of the presence in Spain of two pretenders, al-Nāṣir and al-Shakh, the brother and the son of al-Mutawakkil which disturbed al-Manṣūr; in 1589, Arzila was evacuated without a quid pro quo. The fear of seeing Moors and Moroccans draw closer to one another kept Spain from unfolding a liberal economic policy, the only one capable of affecting the Sharif in a sensitive part.

The latter by nature very cautious and far-seeing was not inclined to take risks. He had also to reckon with a public opinion, already irritated by the influence wielded by Jews and renegades: anti-foreign feeling definitely increased in the course of the reign; the fact that he had compromised himself with the Christianics weakened the prestige of the Sultan, while the wealth and power of the Marabouts and brotherhoods increased to a dangerous degree. The splendour-loving ruler of acovetous people, al-Manṣūr did not think of concealing the sympathy he had for traders. With the Grand Duke, who freely received Moors in Tuscany and did all he could to develop commerce between the two countries, with Elizabeth, with the English, French and Dutch traders, relations were close. Sugar was exported from the South and Morocco also supplied corn in good years, gold from the Süddan, salt petre, copper and hides. It imported principally cloth and for al-Manṣūr himself, the materials for his buildings. From the Sharifian court there went undefinable envoys, at once ambassadors, spies, procurers of jewels and of women. But contraband especially interested the Sharif, contraband of war and the sale, advantageous for every one, of the cargoes and slaves brought in by the corsairs. The English were the most punctilious contrabandists and the trade with Morocco developed so well that in 1585 the Barbary Company was founded with a monopoly and a regular constitution. But Ahmad al-Manṣūr was not too fond of regular traders. The many Christians settled in Morocco must be considered to have been adventurers. Quasi-prisoners of the Sharif and his people, they were able to realise precarious fortunes, always liable to exortion. In 1585 bankruptcies were numerous in Morocco and the royal company could not survive. The caprices of the sovereign drove off many other foreign traders.

These economic relations gradually developed into political ones. It was to exercise pressure on Spain that Ahmad al-Manṣūr pretended to submit to the wishes of a combination of Dutch and English. After the destruction of the Armada in 1588, he entered without hesitation into the English camp; he received at his court Don Christoph, son of the Portuguese pretend Don Antonio, and agreed to a loan to Elizabeth. Then he drew back again. The taking of Cadiz in 1596 again influenced his feelings; he spoke of an alliance and made definite offers. Nothing resulted from these demonstrations, except a painful impression left after deceptions. So long as he was alive, relations were friendly, for the two rulers had kindly feelings for one another, but James I, on his accession, at once showed a much less benevolent attitude towards the Sharifian court.

It was in the direction of the Süddan that Ahmad al-Manṣūr gave reign to his desire for glory and conquest. His troops had had some experience in the Sahara. In 1581, the oases of Tuat and Tigūrāra, which had long been free from the Sharifian yoke had been conquered brilliantly. In 1584 an unsuccessful expedition had ended in the disappearance in the desert of a large army which had not even reached Teghaza. In 1590, having sought a quarrel with the arzīta Išāq over the ownership of the salt mines of Teghaza, al-Manṣūr persuaded his Council to go to war; a little army under the Pasha Djawdar crossed the desert and destroyed the Süddane empire. The occupation of the conquered country was nothing but systematic plunder and massacre. The Sharif collected great wealth there; he received the congratulations of the Powers and gained a prestige which still survives; his lieutenants also enriched themselves. With remarkable regularity, almost every year, reinforcements set out for Gago and very often reached it; caravans brought gold, wealth and slaves back to Marrāḵush. The most famous of the prisoners was the legist Ahmad Bābā [q.v.], for whom Marrāḵush was a gilded prison where he taught quite freely. The
Südän was drained dry. In 1600 al-Mansûr saw the necessity of reorganising trade there but does not seem to have succeeded.

Morocco was, on the whole, prosperous during his reign. The first Sa’dians had done much for the development of commerce and agriculture, sugar factories were built up and down the country which were the Sul’tân’s private property but were farmed out by him to Jews and Christians. Trade was active at the ports. The profits from the sale of captives or their labour contributed to make the notables wealthy and through this to the peace of the country. Besides the industrial monopolies, the normal revenue came from the customs dues and the taxes established by Muḥammad al-Mahdî, which al-Mansûr heavily increased. The collection of these taxes provoked murmurs of discontent and served as an excuse for military demonstrations which maintained good order in the country. Al-Mansûr had also a considerable army (he never formed a fleet) composed of excellent troops, Moors from Spain and particularly renegades, a nursery for kâids and officers of ability and energy. He was rich enough to pay them well. All this contributed to make rebellions few and they were always quickly and harshly suppressed by the Sharîf’s lieutenants: the rising of the people of Sakkawa, stirred up by Mawli‘ı Dâwâd, son of Abîl al-Ma’mûn in 1581 and the rebellion of the Berbers of Amizîn in 1597. The throne itself was never seriously threatened except in 1595—1596 when Abîl-Nâzîr came from Spain and landed at Melilla. Starting without resources, for Philip II would do nothing for him, al-Nâzîr nevertheless proved a redoubtable enemy for he gathered round him all those who were dissatisfied with the rule of al-Mansûr and raised troops from the Barânis (Branes), always ready to rebel and who had until lately been vassals of the Turks. He took Tâza and tried to raise the Rif and the country around Fâs. Defeated at al-Ruka on Aug. 3, 1595, he held out till May 1596. Decisively defeated at Taghât, he was put to death.

Al-Mansûr had rarely need to leave Marrâkush and he did not like to do so. His mother had acquired a great reputation for her pious foundations. He himself, six months after his accession, began the building of the palace of al-Badî which was finished in 1602. Marble for it came from Italy and artists from Spain, and Marrâkush became one great workshop. A splendid palace arose, sumptuous pavilions surrounded by beautiful gardens in which stood numerous fountains. Foreigners were fêted there and the Sharîf displayed his generosity. Especially on the occasion of religious festivals he displayed great pomp and ceremony. His wealth earned him great fame abroad and it was no doubt to it that he owed most of his glory. At his court the principal posts were held by renegades: Jews who had charge of his finances, Christians who conducted his private trading for him, and the agents of foreign courts. Al-Mansûr was one of the richest and most courted rulers of his time. Spain kept a regular ambassador or a representative permanently at Marrâkush; France had a consul there; there was a constant passage of envoys between the Sharîf and the Sublime Porte.

The palace of al-Badî was destroyed by Mawli‘ı Isma’il. The mausoleum in it still remains, a very fine specimen of the art of a decadent period.

Towards the end of his life al-Mansûr was thinking of creating a new Marrâkush on the model of Fâs. Abûm al-Mansûr at first ruled as an autocrat. His orders were clear, his decisions rapid and sometimes, as might be expected, drastic to cruelty. His intimates, the kâids Rusîn, a Jew, whom we only know from European sources and ‘Azîzî, seem to have been his secretaries, like al-Fîghtî, his biographer and poet-laureate whose works have not survived. The Pasha Kirdîn, very powerful at the beginning of the reign, acquired such influence that the Sharîf had him beheaded in 1581. In time the notables acquired a great deal of independence and the Sul’tân hardly dared check their abuse of their power; two factors caused him much anxiety, the anti-foreign and audacious Abîl al-Karîm b. Tûdâ and his own son Abû Fâris. By a concubine, al-Khaizirîn, al-Mansûr had two sons, al-Shaikh and Abû Fâris, and by his wife Lalla ‘Aisha al-Shablabînî, Zaidân. His favourite son Abîl al-Hassan was killed in 1594. In 1579 he had designated as his heir al-Shaikh, called al-Ma’mûn who held the vice-royalty of Fâs. The remainder of Morocco was divided into governor-hips under other princes. These were several times rearranged; Abû Fâris, having considered everything, remained at Marrâkush near his father to be ready in case of his death. In Fâs, al-Ma’mûn, supported by his favourite Mugefî, conducted himself like an independent ruler. He had displayed his gifts of energy, leadership and bravery on the occasion of al-Nâzîr’s escape in 1595; living in great pomp, beloved by his troops, he was undoubtedly a cause of anxiety. His father allowed him-self to be led by Abû Fâris. The conflict broke out in 1598. Forced to sacrifice his favourite, thrown into prison and then half pardoned, al-Ma’mûn had to renounce all hope of winning in the struggle against Zaidân who was supported by Abû Fâris. After 1600 he sought support from Spain and Algiers. Under Abûm al-Mansûr, the dynasty attained its zenith. But it is hardly correct to say that the decline of the Sa’dians only dates from the death of the great Sul’tân. After the conquest of the Südân, the anarchy reigning in Algiers, the weakness of Spain in Europe, the death of al-Nâzîr, the conversion to Christianity of another pretender, al-Shaikh, Morocco was rich, seemed powerful and the Sharîfîan throne stable, Abûm al-Mansûr, by not being able to arrange for his own successor, nor even to keep his son in obedience, gave his country the chance to destroy itself. This process began under his own eyes. He had gone to Fâs to try to reconcile his children and put through the appointment of Abû Fâris as heir apparent when the plague carried him off in 1603. Civil war broke out over his dead body. He had passed the last few years of his life wandering about living in a tent, shifting his camp every ten days, driven from Marrâkush by the plague, which had begun to rage in Morocco in 1598.
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(C. Funk-Brentano)

AL-MANṢŪR Ibn Abī 'Amīr, a famous hāḍījī of al-Andalus in the tenth century A.H., the Almanṣūr of the Christian chroniclers of medieval Spain; his full name was Abī 'Amīr Muhammad ibn Abī 'Amīr Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammad. Ibn Abī 'Amīr belonged to an Arab family which had settled in the Iberian peninsula at an early date: one of his ancestors, 'Abd al-Malik al-Maṣṣūri, had landed there with Ṭāriq [q. v.] and settled at Torrox in the province of Algeciras where he had founded a family. Al-Manṣūr’s father, Abū Ḥafs 'Abd Allāh, was a jurist noted for his knowledge and piety who died on his way back from the pilgrimage to Tripoli in Barbary at the end of the reign of the Caliph ʿAbd al-Rahmān III al-Nāṣir (cf. Ibn al-ʿAblās, Taqīmilat al-Nīl, B. A. E., v.—vi., N. 1251, p. 437—438; al-Majār, Anṭāqāt, i., 894).

While still quite a young man, Muhammad Ibn Abī 'Amīr conceived great political ambitions: they were to dominate his whole career. After studying in Cordova and holding a minor office with the kādi of the capital, Muhammad b. al-Salm, he entered the service of the Omayyad court in 356 (967) as superintendent of the estates of a princess of Basque origin, Sulīf, the wife of the Caliph al-Hakam II and her son ʿAbd al-Rahmān, who had just been born. Ibn Abī 'Amīr was not long, thanks to his tact and courtesy and ability, in making himself persona grata with this princess and the Caliph without the intervention of the latter that the young superintendent found himself within two years the holder of the new offices of superintendent of the mint, treasurer and administrator of instrate estates. A few years later in 358 (969), he was appointed kādi of the district of Seville and Niebla. In 361 (972) the Caliph al-Hakam II gave him command of a section of his police corps (chārja).

All these offices, combined in the person of Ibn Abī 'Amīr assured him a considerable income and soon enabled him to lead a very luxurious life in Cordova. He built himself a palace in the aristocratic quarter of Kuṣāira and his generosity, courtly disposition and his splendour soon placed him in the forefront of the dignitaries of the Omayyad court. In a few years he had filled the first part of his programme: to become popular and indispensable, to make numerous friends, ready to support him on the day on which he would begin his attempt on the throne of the caliph.

Ibn Abī 'Amīr very soon realised that it was not sufficient to be popular in Cordova but that he had also to create reliable friends among the generals of the Caliph’s armies. The circumstances of the time were peculiarly in his favour. Al-Hakam II, following the example of his predecessor ʿAbd al-Rahmān III, had his North African policy and his armies were busy suppressing a Maghribi revolt which had broken out as a result of an expedition of regnal sent against the petty Islamic dynasty of Tangier, Ḥasan b. Gunān. The Omayyad troops, under the orders of the general Ghālib, were sent to dethrone all the petty Idrisid rulers of Morocco who were more or less vassals of the Fatimids. This expedition was crowned with success and Ḥasan b. Gunān was obliged to take refuge in a fortress of the Rif, Ḥaḍjrat al-Naṣr, in which Ghālib besieged him. But the Spanish army in Africa was a heavy burden on the treasury of the Caliph. Ghālib had distributed money recklessly among the chiefs of the Berber tribes of the North of Morocco in order to buy them over. Al-Hakam II decided to send over a controller-general of finance and he chose Ibn Abī 'Amīr who set off with the title of chief kādi (kādi ʿl-kawāf) and exact instructions. He carried out his very delicate task with unusual tact. He returned to Cordova at the same time as the army. When al-Hakam II died, leaving the throne to his young son Hishām in 366 (976), the new Caliph at the same time as he appointed kādi the favourite vizier of his father, Abū ʾl-Ḥasan Dāʾir b. Ṭāmān al-Muṣṭafī, appointed Ibn Abī 'Amīr as the latter’s vizier. The ambitious minister now worked unceasingly to get rid of his chief, al-Muṣṭafī. In the first place he was able to reduce to nothing the considerable power which the Slavs (Ṣaḥāḥa, q. v.) had in the Caliph’s entourage. In Cordova they formed a body of mercenaries who guarded the royal palace, and at this time their leaders were two of their number, Fāʾiq al-Niẓām, grand master of the wardrobe, and Djaḍwiḥar, goldsmith and chief falconer. On the death of al-Hakam they had attempted to oppose the proclamation of Hishām who was still a child and to put on the throne of Cordova his uncle al-Muqhirī. The latter was slain at the instigation of al-Muṣṭafī and it seems likely that Ibn Abī 'Amīr played an active part in the plot which ended in this murder. In any case very soon after the accession of Hishām II as a result of the rigorous measures taken against them, the Slavs lost all influence at the Omayyad court to the great satisfaction of the people of Cordova who had long suffered from their abuses. Ibn Abī 'Amīr also gained in popularity, still further increased when he displayed for the first time the possession of military talents which had not been suspected.

A little later he succeeded in getting the command of an expedition against the Christians of the North who had taken up arms against ʿIsām as soon as al-Hakam II had fallen ill. Setting out from Cordova in Radjab 366 (Feb. 977) he laid siege to the fortress of los Baños in Galicia and returned to the capital with considerable spoil. He then cultivated the friendship of the aged and
distinguished general Ghālib, governor of Madinat Sulm (Medinaceli, q.v.), and obtained his help to liquidate the fall of the ḥālid al-Muṣṭafī. Ghālib on the intervention of Ibn ʿAmīr received the much coveted title of ḥūn ʿl-ʿasāṣirātān and the command of the forces on the frontier in the expeditions against the Christians. This friendship was strengthened in a new campaign in which Ibn Abī ʿAmīr commanded the troops of the central region of Ghālib. This expedition was again crowned with success and earned Ibn Abī ʿAmīr a new and honourable office, that of commander of Cordova in place of the son of al-Muṣṭafī who was dismissed. Al-Muṣṭafī, conscious of the danger which threatened him, then tried to play off Ghālib against Ibn Abī ʿAmīr but the latter was labour lost. The young minister even became son-in-law of Ghālib who gave him the hand of his daughter Asmāʾ. A few months later, al-Muṣṭafī and the members of his family, who had held offices at the court, were dismissed and their property confiscated. On the same day Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was appointed ḥādījīb. With his father-in-law, Ghālib, he was at the head of the administration of the empire.

It was not only the plots he had woven with success in his personal ability that had enabled Ibn Abī ʿAmīr to advance so rapidly in his career. It seems very probable that the princess Suḥb, widow of al-Hakam II and mother of the reigning Caliph, was the mistress of the former superintendent of her son's estates. This liaison was not unknown to the Cordovans and produced bitter criticisms of the princess and her lover. Public opinion, which had at first been favourable to the ḥādījīb, began to be hostile to him. A plot to overthrow Hishām II and put in his place another grandson of Abū al-Rahmān III was prepared but nipped in the bud. The Cordovan prince then spread the rumour that Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was devoted to philosophy and that his orthodoxy therefore was quite nominal. He proved them wrong. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr did not hesitate to burn the splendid library formed by the cultured al-Hakam II and all the books dealing with branches of knowledge prohibited by the ʿUlamāʾ. He conciliated them by this act of vandalism the gravity of which can hardly have escaped him. But with his unparalleled ambition nothing which might prevent him attaining his object was allowed to deter him.

But the young Caliph Hishām II was now growing up. He had to be prevented from taking an active part in the conduct of affairs. Business was then conducted in the Caliph's palace in Cordova, in order to set aside the ruler finally. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr in 358 (968) decided to build near the capital a regular town for administrative purposes. This was al-Madinat al-Zahrāʾ [q.v.] which in a few years became an important city at the very gates of Cordova. As to Hishām, he then began the life of a recluse, either at Cordova or at Madinat al-Zahrāʾ, which was to last throughout his reign. At the same time as he settled the problem of the possible intervention of the ruling princes in the affairs of state in a manner energetic as it was unscrupulous, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was reorganising the army and inaugurating a new policy in the country. The Omayyad army, in the form in which it was then constituted, was recruited in the country itself and the permanent bodies of mercenaries were not large. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr required new ones: this is why from now on till the end of his life, he appealed for Berber volunteers from the north of Morocco and Ifriqiyya. At the same time he realised that the occupation of certain parts of the Magrib by the Omayyads was only a source of expense to the Caliph's treasury and that any plan of territorial expansion in that direction would be disastrous to the ruler of Cordova. He therefore abandoned all these possessions, retaining in Africa only one of the keys of the Strait of Gibraltar, the citadel of Ceuta. The administration of the rest of the country he handed over to petty local dynasties under the nominal suzerainty of Cordova. Along with the Berber troops in his pay, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr formed other corps by recruiting Christian mercenaries from the north of Spain, from Leon, Castile and Navarre. He was able by his generosity and attentions to secure the complete devotion of his new soldiers.

Having thus a strong and veteran army at his disposal, Ibn Abī ʿAmīr renewed with ardour the old feud against the Christians on the frontiers of the empire. He first of all got rid of his father-in-law Ghālib, whom he had displeased by the manner in which he had upset the old military organisation of the country; then he undertook in 371 (981) an expedition on a grand scale against the kingdom of Leon. He took and plundered Zamora, where he took 4,000 prisoners. The King of Leon, Ramiro III, then made an alliance with Garcia Fernandez, Count of Castile, and the King of Navarre. But all three were defeated by the Muslim general at Rueda to the south-west of Simancas and this town itself was taken by him. Ibn Abī ʿAmīr continued his advance on the town of Leon and inflicted another defeat on Ramiro III. The return of the ḥādījīb to Cordova was a regular triumph and it was on this occasion that he took the honorific ḥālīf of al-Maʾṣūr bi-liʿlāh, “the victorious in God”.

All powerful at Cordova and a successful general, al-Maʾṣūr Ibn Abī ʿAmīr was to devote the rest of his life to an unceasing war on the Christian frontiers to the increasing considerably of the territory ruled by the Muslims in the Peninsula. After his defeat, the nobles of Leon had deposed Ramiro III and proclaimed in his place Bermuda II. The latter finally found himself forced to seek al-Maʾṣūr's help and to recognise him as suzerain. Al-Maʾṣūr then decided to make an expedition into Catalonia in 374 (985) he defeated Count Borrell and stormed Barcelona, which he sacked. According to Ibn al-Aụbāʾ, it was the ʿAmīrīd's twenty-third campaign.

Ibn Gannān, the petty Idrīsīd dynasty in the north of Morocco having again rebelled against Cordova, al-Maʾṣūr sent his cousin Ibn ʿAskālādja to subdue him. Ibn Gannān surrendered on being promised his life. But al-Maʾṣūr had him executed along with Ibn ʿAskālādja whom he accused of having plotted against him. This breach of faith and brutal execution having produced a reaction of feeling in the capital, al-Maʾṣūr to rehabilitate himself undertook a pious work: in 377 (987) he extended the cathedral mosque of Cordova which had become too small. Eight new naves were built on the east and the western wall of the hall of prayer and of the ʿabn was moved out 150 feet. The Arab historians say that al-Maʾṣūr made gangs of Christian prisoners do this work, for the greater glory of Islām.
In the same year the war against the kingdom of Leon was resumed. The Muslim troops, that al-Manṣūr had sent there, had oppressed the country and Bermuda II had finally driven them out. Al-Manṣūr punished his boldness with the greatest rigour. In two campaigns several months apart, he took Coimbra, which he had made waste, Leon which he had left completely in ruins, and Zamora. The Counts of Leon had then to lay down their arms and submit to al-Manṣūr and Bermuda II was only left possession very much reduced in extent.

The campaigns that followed were again directed against the N.-W. of the Peninsula. The best known is that of St. Jago de Compostella in 387 (997). This famous sanctuary of western Christianity [cf. the article Şancti Viet)i] was taken by the Muslim troops on the 2nd Šaḥbân (10th August) and only the tomb of the apostle was spared, by orders of al-Manṣūr.

The last expedition against the Christians dates from the year 1002. Its objective was Castile. Al-Manṣūr took Castrid and destroyed the convent of San Millán de la Cogolla. But on his return from the expedition, he fell ill and died at Medinaedd on the 27th Ramadân 392 (Aug. 10, 1002). He was buried in this town.

The last years of the life of al-Manṣūr in spite of his successful career and victorious expeditions had been marked by events which might have been fatal to him if he had not once again displayed an iron will and extreme violence in the suppression of plots hatched against him. The few attempts made on behalf of Hisbâm II to regain for him the power, which had been seized by his first minister were in vain. In 381 (991) al-Manṣūr gave up his title of Hisbêb in favour of his son ʿAbd al-Malik. Five years later he assumed with an audacity worthy of him the princely title of malik karim “noble King” and reserved for himself the title sajjīd “lord”. The only thing that he did not dare to do or could not do was to announce the overthrow of the Omanids caliphate and the constitution of an ‘Abdîrîd caliphate in its stead. He arranged however for the power to pass to his heirs after him, and it was his son ʿAbd al-Malik al-Maṣâfîr, who succeeded him on his death to control for a few more years the destinies of the Muslim empire in Spain.

Various judgments have been passed on al-Manṣūr. His lack of scruples has been emphasised and the often criminal means which he used to attain his ends. His career is nevertheless an extraordinary one. This dictator was undoubtedly one of the greatest men of affairs that Islam has ever produced and under his “reign” Muslim Spain remained the great nation, which in the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Râhîm III had shown itself one of the most remarkable centres of culture and civilization in the mediaeval west.


MANSÛR B. NUḤ, THE NAME OF TWO SAMÀNID RULERS

1. MANSûR b. Nuh I (Abu Shîhî), ruler of Khorasân and Transoxania (350—365 = 961—976), succeeded his brother "Abd al-Malik b. Nuh I [q. v.]. Ibn Hâwîl al-Mansûr is able to describe the internal condition of the Samànid kingdom under Mansûr as an eye-witness; cf. especially B. G. A., ii. 341: fi waqiyâna hâddîn; p. 344 sq.: on the character of Mansûr the “justest king among our contemporaries” in spite of his physical weakness and the slightest of his friends. On the vizier Bâshî, see Bâshî where also information is given about the Persian version of Tabari’s history composed in 352 (963) by or by orders of this vizier. On the rebellion of the commander of the Samânid bodyguard, Alp-Tegh, and the independent kingdom founded by him in Ghazna and on the establishment of Samânid rule there in the reign of Mansûr and the son and successor of Alp-Tegh, Išâkh (or Abu Išâkh Ibrahim) see AL-PUGINY AND GHANNA; in Barcelos, Turkestan, G. M. S. New Series v., p. 251, note 4. Abu Išâkh Ibrahim should be read for Išâkh b. Ibrahim (this passage is misunderstood in the Russian original). In other directions also in this reign the Samânid kingdom prospered in its foreign affairs: the fighting with the Bûyids [q. v.] and Ziyârids was as a rule victorious.

2. MANSûR b. Nuh II (Abu l-Hârijî), ruler of Transoxania (387—389 = 997—999). His father Nûh b. Mansûr, to whom out all the Samânid empire only a portion of Transoxania was left, died on Friday 14th Rabî' II (July 23, 997) but it was not till Dhu'l-Qa'da (November) that homage was paid to Mansûr as his successor. Bâshî (ed. Morley, p. 803) talks highly of his courage and eloquence; on the other hand he is said to have been feared by every one for his extraordinary severity. During his brief and impotent reign he was hardly able to instil terror into any one. The last Samânids were quite helpless against the kings and generals who were quartering over the inheritance of the dying dynasty. One of these generals, Fâ'îk, succeeded even in taking Bukhara; the Samânids probably feared even for Išâkh b. Ibrahim (q. v.) but was called back by Fâ’îk. The last months of his reign were devoted to fruitless efforts to settle peacefully the question of the governorship of Khorasân, which
was claimed by various parties; but before the problem had been settled by force of arms, Manṣūr was deposed on Wednesday, 12th Safar 389 (Feb. 1, 999) by his generals Fāṭīk and Begaṭzūn, blinded a week later and sent to Baḥrān. Bibliography: cf. Sāmānīs, and add: W. Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol Invasion, Sec. Edition, London 1928 (G. M. S., New Series v), p. 251 sqq. — (W. Barthold)

AL-MANṢŪR ISMĀ‘IL, Abu ‘Abd Allāh b. Abū ‘Abd Allāh, third Fatimid caliph, was 32 when he succeeded his father Abū ‘Abd Allāh Al-Kāsim Al-Kāsim in Shawwāl 334 (May 946) under particularly difficult conditions: Abū Yazīd, the Khārijī agitator supported by many Berber tribes and by the people of Ka‘rāwan had failed before al-Mahdiyya, but was still besieging Sūs. Al-Manṣūr concurred in his father’s death and did not alter the formula of the khutba, of the coin-legends or of the standards lest Alī Yazīd should profit by the weakening of authority which was a regular feature of change of ruler. Sūs was relieved by the efforts of the reinforcements sent by Al-Manṣūr by sea. Abū Yazīd had to beat a hurried retreat. Al-Manṣūr, however, having returned to Ka‘rāwan and pardoned the inhabitants who had supported the agitator, had to prepare to meet a new attack. Abū Yazīd was not long in reappearing; repulsed he came again to the attack. Al-Manṣūr tried to make terms with him and gave him back his women captured in Ka‘rāwan but Abū Yazīd, in spite of his promise, attacked him again and was completely defeated in a pitched battle (Aug. 946). He was then pursued to the west. After a delay caused by the illness of Al-Manṣūr, Abū Yazīd mortally wounded was taken prisoner at Djebel Ayānā, north of Mīla, in Muharram 336 (Aug. 947).

This success established Al-Manṣūr securely. A section of the tribes of the Central Maghrib who had embraced the cause of Abū Yazīd made their submission, like the Maghārāwa under Muḥammad b. al-Khāṣbūn. Taking advantage of the difficulties of the Fatimids, the Omayyads of Spain had entrenched themselves more securely in western Bar- bary. A former Fatimid officer, Ḥamdī b. Yeseṭ, was ruling the Maghrib in the name of the caliphs of Cordova and laid siege to Tāhert. Al-Manṣūr relieved the town and appointed the Iṣra’āḥī Yazīd b. Muhammad to rule it. He invested with considerable authority the chief of the Ṣāhāqādī Ziri b. Manīd, who had proved a loyal auxiliary during his days of trial.

Returning to Ka‘rāwan, Al-Manṣūr had again to take the field against the sons of Abū Yazīd who was trying to stir up a rebellion again. Besides taking these vigorous steps in Barbary to put an end to the Khārijī movement, Al-Manṣūr developed the naval power of Ifriqiyya. His freedman Faḥā, supported by the governor of Sicily, won a striking victory over the Greeks in the south of Italy and came home laden with booty (340 = 951).

Lastly Al-Manṣūr holds a high place among the Fatimids of Ifriqiyya for his buildings. The capital was no longer Al-Mahdiyya nor was it Kairouān whose recent treatment made it suspect. From 647 Safar, also called al-Manṣūrīyya from its founder, was the capital. The town built at the gates of Ka‘rāwan was beautified by the palaces which he built and grew rich on the bazaars which he removed from the old city.

The Encyclopedia of Islam, III.

Al-Manṣūr was 39 and had ruled 7 years, when he died suddenly on a journey from a chill caught by taking a bath in cold weather (Shawwāl 29, 341 = March 953).


MANṢŪRA, founded by Manṣūr b. ljaymūh al-Kalābī, was from 258 (871) the capital of Sind under the Arabs. Iṣṭaqhrī described it as more fertile and populous than Multān. Before the arrival of the Arabs, Bhrmansād (probably identical with the modern Iṣṭaṁbūlam) was the capital of Sind, and its name was changed to Manṣūra after the Arab conquest. For notices of Manṣūra by early travellers to India, see Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, i, Part 1, p. 506, 507, 511, 525. Bibliography: al-Baladurī, Futūḥ al- Busān, p. 439, 444, 445; Abu ‘Abd Allāh, Tah‘rīm al-Busān, p. 62, 346, 350; and E. H. Atkīn, Gazetteer of the Province of Sind (Karachi 1907), p. 91, 96 and 508. (M. Hidāyat Hosain)

AL-MANṢŪRA, a large town in Lower Egypt, on the right bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile, capital of the province of Dāmilā. No other canal or branch of the Nile went from here to Asīmān in a north-easterly direction. It was originally a camping place for the army, founded in 616 (1219) by al-Malik al-Kāmil, when he tried to recapture Dimyāt, then occupied by the Crusaders. In 1249 the Crusaders were defeated in the neighbourhood of al-Manṣūra by al-Sultan al-Ma‘ṣṣāzīm Tārānah, on which occasion Lewis IX of France was taken prisoner. The town is now an important emporium for the cotton trade; in 1917 there were 49,238 inhabitants (Baedecker). It possesses no remarkable buildings; a railway bridge crosses the Nile at this place.

There are still various other places in Egypt, called al-Manṣūra.

Bibliography: Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir a la geographie de l’Egypte, Cairo 1909, p. 198 sqq. (where the geographical and historical sources are cited); al-Bāhšī, al-Ma‘ṣṣīm al-Dhārida, xv, 68 sqq.; and Baedecker, Egypten, Leipzig 1925, 197, 173, 249 sqq. (J. L. Kramers)

AL-MANṢŪRA, the name of a town now in ruins built by the Sultan of Fās about 5 miles to the west of Tlemcēn. The very precise account given by Ibn Khallīkān enables us to reconstruct with exactitude the history of this typical town-camp. In the year 669 (1299) the Marinid Abī Ya‘qūb Yūsuf, who had come to lay siege to the capital of the Banū ‘Abd al-Wad,
which he had closely surrounded with entrenchments, set up his camp on the plain which stretches to the west. As it was a long drawn out blockade he built a few dwellings for himself and the leaders of his army and laid the foundation of a mosque. In the year 702 (1302) the “Victorious Camp”, al-Mahalla al-Manṣūra, was given the form of a regular town by the construction of a rampart. Besides the mosque, the dwellings of the chiefs, the store-houses for munitions and the shelters for the army, there were baths and caravanserais. As Tlemcen was inaccessible to caravans, al-Manṣūra or New Tlemcen, as it was called, naturally attracted to itself the business of the invested town. After a siege of eight years and three months the Marinids withdrew from Tlemcen, and al-Manṣūra was methodically evacuated under the direction of İbrahim b. ʿAbd al-Djalal, the vizier of the Sultan Abū Thābit. The people of Tlemcen were compelled, by the terms of the treaty made with the Marinids to respect the rival town for some time. Some time after, when the entente between the two empires had been broken, they demolished its buildings and rendered uninhabitable the entrenchments left at their gate by their hereditary enemy.

Forty years later, in the year 735 (1335), the Moroccan army under Sultan Abu-Abd al-Malik was once more at the gates of Tlemcen. On this occasion the ʿAbd al-Wādī capital was forced to surrender (27th Ramaḍān 737 = 1st May 1337) Al-Manṣūra was rebuilt. It became the official capital of the Marinids during their occupation of the central Maghrib. It was in fact, during this time that the great mosque was built and that the “Palace of Victory” was erected (745).

After the retreat of the Marinids, al-Manṣūra, once more abandoned, fell little by little into ruins. At the present day the rampart of terre pisé flanked by square towers is still comparatively intact; but the interior land is under cultivation and contains a French village. There still exists there, however, the ruins of a palace no longer distinct, a section of a paved street, and probably the surrounding wall in terre pisé of the Mosque with half of the great minaret in stone, which arose above the principal entrance. Although the inlaid ceramic work has almost entirely disappeared, the facade of the square tower, which is 120 feet high, is one of the most perfect pieces of the Maghrib art of the sixteenth century that survives. The columns and the capitals in marble of the mosque are preserved in the Museums of Tlemcen and Alger.


**MANTİK (A.) Logic.** The logic of the Arab philosophers is that of Aristotle, here and there modified by the Stoic and Neo-Platonist tendencies of the Greek commentators. The Arab philosophers did not develop this logic but they gave reasons of it, reproduced it and wrote commentaries on it, often with success; they understood it very well and it is in logic that they came nearest to the authentic Aristotelianism. As to the manner, it was easier for them to grasp the exact sense of the logical writings of Aristotle than of his other works since the translation of the Logic had been made and remade with great care (cf. e.g. the two versions of the beginning of the Interpretation in J. Pollak, Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung, 1572 b. 1582 b. Heimann, Leipzig 1913). While the translation of the Metaphysics was defective and incomplete. The remark of the Ḥadīth al-Ṣafā’—who evidently did not care much for the subject of logic—at the beginning of their little treatise on logic “the ancient sages have dealt with these subjects and their works are in the hands of the reader, but they are very diffuse, for the translators did not understand the exact meaning” is then not justified.

To the six works of Aristotle, the Categories, Hermeneutics, the Prior Analytics and Posterior Analytics, the Topics, and the Sophistics, the Arabs—like the latest Greek commentators—added the Rhetoric and the Politics (as to the latter Aristotle himself had regarded it [Rhet., i. 2, 1356 a 23] as a lateral branch of the Dialectics and Politics). They explained the order of these works in the manner of the later Greek commentators (cf. Ehlai in Aristotelische Category. Comment., ed. Bus., p. 116 sqq., 293). The most important of these treatises was the fourth, the Posterior Analytics, to which the three preceding are only the preparation and introduction; in the Posterior Analutes Aristotle was thought to have treated of the absolutely True, in the Poetics of the absolutely False and in the intermediate treatises, according as they approach the Poetics, the element of improbability begins to preponderate. Then, still in the manner of the Greeks, they placed in front of these works the Logic of Porphyry which, as its name, Eiseigeticon tēs Ἀριστοτέλους καταργημα, Ἐκτὸς τοῦ Ἀλήθους καταργήσας, shows, is an introduction to the logic of Aristotle.

Among the Greeks there were two further kinds of introduction to philosophy or—since the study of philosophy began with logic—to the logic of Aristotle. In the one which preceded the categories, Prolegomena tōn katastropheōn, ten questions were put (among them: Whence came the names of the different “philosophical schools”? What is the division of the works of Aristotle?) to which a brief reply was given. Among the Arabs, we still find an introduction of this kind in a little work by al-Fārābī, Risāla fi-ṣūr yahayhi an yahdīdabibī Tāziyyan al-Farābīyya (ed. Schmoeller in Huxley, philos. arab.). The other kind of introduction, the prototype Prolegomena τῆς φιλοσοφίας of which is given by the pupil of Proclus, Ammonius Hermiae, was introductory to the Isagōg. In the first part definitions were dealt with, in the second divisions of philosophy. The Arabic treatises on the division of the sciences go back to this kind of introduction which they further developed. We still possess from the pens of the two of the greatest Arab philosophers, al-Fārābī and Avicenna, such treatises on the divisions of the sciences. Avicenna’s entitled Maḥbūba fil-Tafṣīl al-Hīma wa-l-Lūm was printed at Constantinople
among the Tammūṭiyya. For the manuscripts, the publication — in a little review, al-Barghūtī in 1921 at Sadra (Syria) — and the emendation of the text of al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ḥikmat al-Tabībīyya, cf. the excellent study by M. Bouyges S. J. in the Milanese de l'Université St. Joseph, vol. ix, fasc. 2, Bârût 1922. These two treatises were translated into Latin and that of al-Fārābī in particular, with the Latin title of De Sciencia since it was incorporated almost completely into the De divisione philosophiae of Gundissalinus, had a great influence on the European thinkers of the middle ages.

There were three opinions among the Greek logicians as to the relationship of logic to the system of philosophy: 1. To the Peripatetics, logic was simply a methodology, an introduction to philosophy; 2. except for its integral realist the structure of reality is in conformity with the structure of the mind; the rules of logic integral itself with realities themselves and logic would then be a true part of philosophy: this was the opinion of the Stoics and especially of Plotinus, Enna, i, 5, 3; 3. the combination of these two views in several Neo-Platonists: logic was at the same time an introduction to and a part of philosophy. Among the Arabs these three points of view were also represented (cf. Khwārizmī, Kitāb Majāmīh al-Ṭabībīyya, ed. van Vloten, p. 152) but the Peripatetic view was in the majority. The third view is found, for example, in Avicenna (cf. Logica, f. 2r, Venice 1508).

Logic, according to the Arab logicians, leads to a knowledge of the unknown from the known (cf. Aristotle, Post. Anal., at the beginning) but its supreme object, according to them and the later Greek commentators, is that, by making us distinguish good from evil, it can guide us to the greatest perfection of soul and the greatest happiness.

Although, on certain points in logic, there were differences among the Arab Aristotelians, they agree on the main lines and even Averroës, who frequently attacks his predecessors with vigour, in other passages of his works often expresses his support of their views that have been disputed; further, the solutions of problems in the Aristotelians and perhaps in other philosophers also sometimes consist of formulæ, the meaning of which on examination is not always quite clear. I may here note some general points which are connected with the great problems of Metaphysics.

As for Aristotle, knowledge for the Arab logicians is a representation, an image of reality: there are in the soul resemblances of things (κατασκευασμένα ἀντιλογικά), concepts, which in judgment are put together. According to this conception — a contradictory conception since it at the same time affirms and denies the knowledge of reality — thought would never be in contact with reality. Naturally implicit or explicit, this contact is often affirmed by Aristotle. A curious example of the conception of knowledge as an image, but in which at the same time the contact with reality is openly affirmed, is found in the theory of the duality of existence, a theory which the Arabs took over from the Greek commentators. The ten categories have a double existence, according as they are found in the outer world or as images in the soul and the word existence has therefore two meanings: 1. reality or objective existence and 2. subjective existence of the soul. The intelligence may direct itself in an intuizione prima (πρώτη έντυση) towards the exterior world of which the highest kinds are the ten categories, but it can turn inwards upon itself in an intuizione secunda (δεύτερη έντυση), upon its concepts, of which the highest kinds are the five "voices" of Porphyry. Everything has an existence, if not in the exterior world, at least in the soul. This theory gives rise to difficulties: in the first place the term "existence" becomes ambiguous; secondly, since the negation of each thing exists in the soul, "what is not in the soul" must exist in the soul. It is in the Kalām [q.v.] notably among the Ash'arīs and probably under the influence of Stoic discussions on the existence or non-existence of the "not things" (δότικα) that the existence of concepts like the impossible and the negative has been discussed. The Arab Aristotelians were very often content to admit a concept "thing" (šarāh, al-rāʾ of the Stoics) more general than being, without paying too much attention to the fact that by this they were contradicting the thesis that everything is. For the rest, in the Aristotelian philosophy the concept of existence or of being gives rise to grave difficulties; it was much discussed in Islam, not only among the philosophers but also among the metaphysical questions connected with it among the theologians and the mystics. Aristotle had already affirmed (e.g. 1040, b 18) that existence or being is neither kind nor substance and the Arab philosophers al-Fārābī, Avicenna, Ghazzālī and Averroes supported this view with the stereotyped reasoning that existence cannot express the essence of things, since being man implies being animal, being a living body, being a body etc., but it does not at all imply that man is being. On the other hand being (šarāh) and substance (al-sharīʿ) are synonyms in Aristotelian philosophy. How are these two views to be reconciled? Avicenna says that the theologians had already done better, that only in God substance (being) and existence coincide: for the other substances, existence must be added to them as an accident. For Averroes on the other hand, as before him for the Ash'arīs, being is always substance and never accident and he says that in judgments, in which being is predicated and thus apparently an accident, as when one says "substance is", "is" is an intuizione secunda.

As to the theory of ideas, the Arab logicians deny, with Aristotle and using his own arguments, the separate existence of the universals, but admit with Plato their supra-sensible existence. This is the theory very prevalent in the last period of philosophy (in the Middle-Platonism, Neo-Platonism and Neo-Platonism) according to which ideas or universal forms exist from eternity in God. The intelligibility of things comes from this, that their cause is an intelligence; as the idea of the statue in the soul of the sculptor is the cause of the existence and intelligibility of the statue, so the intelligence of the creator of the world is the cause of the intelligibility of natural things. Avicenna expressed this theory by the formula that the Universe is ante multiditudinem in multiplicitate (in things) and post multiditudinem (in our soul). It is the second element in this formula "in multiplicitate" that offers a difficulty (a difficulty already found in Aristotle); how to conceive of the existence of universals in things which are themselves individuals? Often a conceptualist or nomi-
Aristotelianism is seen in the Arab Aristotelians; it is explicitly stated that the universal is only found in the mind and following Aphraedias the forms in matter, the ἐννόησις, are regarded as individuals. But since in the system of Aristotle, forms are universals by definition, contradiction cannot be avoided, and the theories of the universals among the Arab philosophers are often very complicated and very obscure. Another nominalist or subjectivist tendency is found in their conception of the relation, which they call — with the Stoics — "what the mind puts into things". But it is the theologians who under the influence of materialist, nominalist and sensualist Stoicism have developed a nominalist system which only admits atomic and individual facts without a connection, in which all relation is regarded as subjective or even non-existent.

The ambiguous manner in which he deals with the concepts “possible”, “impossible” and “necessary” gives rise in Aristotle as well as in the Arab logicians, who follow their master faithfully, to grave difficulties. Aristotle (Prior Analyt., 32a, 18—23) — like the Arab logicians (cf. Avicenna, Kitāb al-ma’tūs, ed. Forget, p. 34) — distinguishes two aspects of the concept of the possible; the possible is the negation at once of the impossible and of the necessary, but he does not always observe these two aspects and thus the necessary and the actual are considered as possible since what happens is not impossible. On the other hand, the actual is considered as the necessary, since what happens, happens necessarily; and although the definition of the possible is “what may or may not happen”, for Aristotle “possible” is also “what will happen” since what never happens is not possible. These contradictions are occasioned by the fact that the problem which is at the basis of all this, that is to say, the objectivity or subjectivity of the possible and of the necessary, is differently treated by Aristotle. Aristotle hesitates between determinism and indeterminism. Of two future events, he says in the Hermeias (7) that one will be true and that which is not determined in advance. He says that necessity does not govern the celestial world and that the sublunar world is the reign of contingency, but he also says that God alone is absolutely necessary, that all the rest is hypothetically necessary, that is to say, contains an element of contingency. On the other hand, everything is caused, and goes back necessarily to a first cause. All these contradictions are found among the Arab Aristotelians. The Mutakallimun, who, like the Stoics, wish to exclude the possible from reality (but they sometimes regard, like certain Stoics, the “possible” and “necessary” as both subjective, thus affirming that everything is possible) have with justice declared that if there is a necessary cause, the effect of it must also be necessary and that there is therefore no contingency in the world.

Averroes in his polemic against al-Ghazālī seems to admit the justice of this argument but elsewhere he repeats all the theories of his master.

Although al-Ghazālī confesses that theology, while opposed to the metaphysics of the philosophers cannot however deny the evidence of their logical technique, certain arguments of Greek scepticism against logic are sometimes repeated by the Mutakallimun. Definition is, they say, not possible, because by the particular one cannot reach the universal, and the syllogism is a petitio principii since the conclusion is already contained in the major premises. These arguments are justified against Aristotelianism, regarded as an empirical theory which sets out from the particular fact. There is however a rationalist tendency in Aristotle and the Arab logicians; they admit that the intelligence can at once know first principles and that without induction from particular facts it can grasp relations between universals. But when the Mutakallimun say that knowledge and the Universal cannot give the truth, according to the definition of truth, agreement must exist between true knowledge and reality, and knowledge is universal and reality individual, they reveal by this argument one of the greatest contradictions in Aristotelianism.

Averroes tried in vain to refute it.


MANŪF, name of two towns, in the region between the two main Nile arms called al-Dirzah, generally distinguished as Manūf al-'Uūyā and Manūf al-Suflī. The latter was situated on the right bank of the western Nile arm, while the former lay more to the east on a smaller canal. Both are described by the geographers as large towns, surrounded by fertile districts and inhabited by wealthy people, especially Manūf al-'Uūyā, where, according to Ibn Hawkal (p. 92), there resided a governor. The kūra of Manūf al-'Uūyā is often called the kūra of Damis and Manūf, while the kūra of Manūf al-Suflī is designated as Ţawwa and Manūf (cf. e.g. al-Maqrīzī, ed. Wiet, i. 507). Both the ancient towns have been destroyed since the tenth century; Yāqūt only knows a village of that name. The name has survived, however, until our day, in the name of the province al-Manṣūfīya; the capital of the muḍirīya of his name is now Shībin al-Kawm, and the modern Manūf is a provincial town, situated to its southwest.

Manūf al-‘Uūyā is known in Greek sources as οὐκέτις οὐκέτω, the Coptic name being Panouf Rīs; the other Manūf is not mentioned in Greek documents and is called in Coptic Panouf Līs.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MÄPPILLAS (Molapha), a group of Muhammadans, of mixed Arab and Hindu descent, on the west coast of Southern India, numbering 1,099,453 according to the Census of 1921. Their name is said to be derived from the Malayalam mā ("great") and pilla ("child"), an honorary title originally bestowed upon all foreigners and
first applied to Christians, Jews and Muslims, but now confined to the last; this derivation, however, is disputed (Thornton, p. 460—461). They owe their origin to Arab merchants, who were attracted to this coast by the trade in spices, ivory, etc.; settling in various commercial centres, they intermarried with the natives of the country and added to their numbers by proselytising; but fresh accessions of the Arab element having ceased long ago, the Moppilla were now approximate to the aboriginal type and exhibit no signs of any admixture of foreign blood. The earliest date of their settlements is uncertain, and the legendary accounts given by the Moppilla themselves are of no historic value (Zain al-Din, p. 21—25). The foreign traders appear to have been encouraged by the Hindu rajahs, who made use of them to man their fleets, and by the beginning of the xvith century the Moppilla were estimated to have formed one-fifth of the population of Malabar (Barbosa, p. 310), but the arrival of the Portuguese in this part of India checked the growth of Muslim power and ruined the Arab trade. The Moppilla are still successful traders, especially on the coast; inland, many of them are agriculturists. There are both Sunni and Shiites among them; the former belong to the Shariat school. Their religious leaders are called Tangal (an honorific title of the personal pronoun, commonly used in addressing superiors) and are treated with profound respect; many of them receive their training in a college attached to the Lijama mosque in Ponnani, the chief centre of their religious organisation; the Tangal of Ponnani is an Arab who claims descent from the Prophet; in accordance with local custom he inherits his sacred office in the female line i.e. his nephew and not his son succeeds him.

The history of the Moppilla is full of incidents of fanaticism and turbulence. In 1524 they attacked the Jews in Cranganur and massacred them without mercy, so that in 1565 the remnant of the Cherrikkal Jewish settlement that survives to the present day (Zain al-Din, p. 50—51; Francis Day, p. 351—352). The Moppilla also persuaded the Zamorin of Calicut to expel the Syrian Christians from his dominions (Francis Day, p. 357). Even their co-religionists found them to be turbulent subjects: they joined the Hindus in fighting Haider Ali [q.v.] after he had extended his power over the Malabar coast, and they rose in rebellion against Tipu Sultan [q.v.] in 1785, and frequently plundered his territories (Francis Day, p. 368). During the last hundred years as many as 51 fanatic outbreaks have taken place among them, especially in the Ernad sub-division of the district of Malabar. Some Moppilla generally begin by murdering a Hindu landlord and then seek martyrdom by slaying kafirs; others join them, after divorcing their wives, and clad in the white robes of the martyr (shahid, q.v.) go out to die fighting against the infidel, with a complete contempt for death. They desecrate and burn Hindu temples, and forcibly circumcise such Hindus as they do not murder. Some of these outbreaks appear to have been stimulated by agrarian discontent at the oppressive action of Hindu landlords, but the last (1921) was entirely political in character, and was excited by the Khilafat movement; it differed from all preceding ones in its wide extent and clear evidence of systematic preparation and organisation; the outrages committed upon Hindus were of a specially revolting character.

The Moppilla of South Malabar generally observe Muhammadan law but in North Malabar follow the local Marumakkattayam system of inheritance, according to which the sons of a man's sister inherit his property, and his wife is not regarded as a member of the husband's family but resides in her mother's home and only receives periodic visits from her husband. On the other hand, a man's self-acquisitions usually descend to his wife and family in accordance with Muhammadan law.

The Moppilla speak the Malayalam language, but use a modified form of the Arabian script in writing it. The majority of them are illiterate, and few only can read and write. Their literature is mainly composed of songs descriptive of religious war, and they are fond of singing them in order to stir up fanatical zeal. Their mosques are quite unlike those of other Muhammadans, having no minarets and often consisting of several stories, with two or more roofs; they often resemble Hindu temples in style, and in fact many Moppilla mosques were once Hindu temples.

The Moppilla are also found in the Laccadive Islands, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements and Burma.

Bibliography: Zain al-Din, Tafslains T-Mughalain; Historia dos Portuguezes no Malabar por Zamarin, publicado e traduzido por David Lopes, Lisbon 1898; The Tekstafeul-Mughaldeos, translated by M. J. Rowlandson, London 1833; Odoardo Barbosa (who called them Mapuleres) in Rumusio, Navigazioni et Viaggi, Venice 1563, i. 310 E; L. K Anantha Krishna Iyer, Caucas Tikes and Costes, Madras 1912, ii. chap. xvi.; Kailas Iyappan Khant, South Indian Muslims, Madras 1910; E. Thurston, Costes and Tribes of Southern India, Madras 1909, iv. 455 sqq.; C. A. Innes, Malabar (Madras District Gazetteer), Madras 1886, p. 82 sqq.; 186, 1863, 1865, Les Mopilhas do Sud de l'Inde (K. M. M., xlvii. 65 sqq.); P. Holland-Puyor, Moppilhas ou Mopilhas, Calcutta 1904; F. Fawcett, A Popular Mopilhas word (Indian Antiquary, xxvii., p. 64—71), Bombay 1899; War Songs of the Moppilahs of Malabar (ibid., xxx., p. 499—508), Bombay 1901; Correspondence on Mopilah Outrage in Malabar, for the years 1839—1853, Madras 1863; Parliamentary Papers, East India (Mopilah Rebellion), London 1911; J. J. Hanning, The Mopilah Rebellion of 1921 (The Muslim World, xiv. 372—373), New York 1923. (T. W. Arnold)

MARBUT. [See MARRUBY.]

MARAGHA, the old capital of Arab badiyan.

Position. The town lies at a height of 5,500 feet above sea-level on the southern slope of Mount Sahand (11,800 feet high) which separates it from Tabriz [q.v.]. This explains the very considerable difference in climate between the two towns which are only 50 miles apart as the crow flies (by the high road 80 miles). The climate of Maragha is mild and rather moist (Hamid Allah and Meerupuru, 1904). The plentiful water supply makes the vegetation rich. The fruit of Maragha is celebrated in Persia and a good deal of it is exported to Russia via Arslab. The district is watered by the stream which comes down from the Sahand and then
turns west to Lake Urmiya which is 20 miles from Marāgha. The town is built on the left bank of the Soğanlı-čai which then courses into Bībī. A little distance to the east runs the parallel river Murdi-čai which waters the district to which Mecquenem gives the name Pahindur (Bayandur); on the left bank rise the heights of Manliders (= with head bound). The next stream is the Lešān which flows into the Daghhatu [cf. sawdī-bulāk]. The rivers farther east (Karanghū and its sources which water the Haşārdū district) belong to the system of the Saifūd-rud [q.v.], i.e. the basin of the Caspian Sea.

From the geographical point of view, Marāgha is quite independent of Tabriz. It lies a little off the great road from Tabriz to Kirmānshāh which runs near Lake Urmiya (via Bībī); the direct bridle-path Tabriz—Marāgha by the passes of the Sahand is only practicable in summer. There is also a direct route along the Sahand on the south and southeast side, joining Marāgha to Ardabīl and Zandān. This road has always been of importance whenever Marāgha was the capital of Ardharbādīān. The important place on the route was Kūltās (cf. below).

At the beginning of the 16th century, Marāgha had 6,000 families (Bustūn al-Sūrihā), in 1298 (1836) it had 13,239 inhabitants of whom 6,885 were men and 6,394 women (H. Schindler). Mecquenem (1904) gives Marāgha 15—20,000 inhabitants.

At the present day the inhabitants speak Ardhan Turkish but in the 16th century they still spoke “arabicised Pahlawi” (Nīchāt al-qulībī: pahlavī-yi mowārab) which means an Iranian dialect of the northwestern group.

The walls of the town are in ruins. Its gates have the following names: Aḩmad, Kūrā-Khānā, Aḵdāsh, Pul-i Būnā (or Gāšik) and Hādīj-mīnāz. The quarters are: Ağa-beg, Mīldān, Darwāsza, Sālār-Khānā.

Prehistory. The valley of the Murdi-čai is famous for its deposits of fossil vertebrates discovered by Khānūv in 1852. Excavations have been conducted by Goebeel (Russia), Strauss, Rodler, Pohlh (Austria), Gunther (England) and Mecquenem (France). On the Murdi-čai have been found remains of the hippopotamus, of the rhinoceros etc. dating from the period before the eruption of the volcano of Sahand. Cf. J. F. Brandt, Über die von A. Goebeel . . . bei der Stadt Marāgha gefundenen Seegehechte, in Denksti. d. Naturforsch. Ver. zu Ràgö, 1876, and the bibliography in Mecquenem. Contribution à l'étude du jurassique des côtes du Marāgha, Paris 1915; cf. Steinruck, Genterzyklogeosynkline, 1916, p. 135—160.

The name. According to Balādhūri, the town was at first called Aḵtāridī (Ibn al-Fākhrī, p. 284: Aḵtārīdī: Yaḵūt, iv. 476: Aḵtarābīdī). This name which means in Persian the “river of Aḵūšī” recalls very much the name of the town taḵšāz which Mark Antony besieged in this region on his campaign against the Parthians in 36 B.C. (Plutarch, Vīna Antonī, ch xxviii., Paris 1854, p. 1113 and F.-ed. Appian, Pamthūc, ed. Sweng-haner, Leipzig 1855, iii. 77—99). It has long been supposed that the name Oke in Strabo xii., ch. xiii. and Index, p. 935, taḵšāz, Ptolemy, v., ch. ii. 276, taḵšūz, Dio Cassius, xiii. 25 are variants of the same name which was probably that of the ancient capital of Arapotene; cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, ii., p. 770. If the identification of Yaḵūt (summer capital, Strabo) with Tālib Īlāhī, suggested by Rawlinson has been accepted (cf. Hoffman, Auszüge aus syrischen Acten, p. 252; Marquart, Erasm., p. 108; William Jackson, Persia, Past and Present, p. 136), the identification of taḵšāz is still uncertain. On general principles it is improbable that a town like Marāgha so advantageously situated by nature was not in existence in Roman times as the ancient name of Marāgha increases the probability of the identification taḵšāz = Marāgha (of course with a reservation as to the exact site of the ancient town).

A place-name Marāgha is mentioned in Arabī (Yaḵūt) and a little town of the same name is in Egypt near Tanī. The etymology “place where an animal rolls” (from m-r-g-) proposed itself to the Arabs here, but in Ardharbādīān (cf. also the village of Marāgha near Abarkhūr, Nīchāt al-qulībī, p. 132) the name is rather a popular Arab etymology of some name. It is local to be observed that Ptolemy, vi., ch. 2, calls Lake Urmiya Margiane (marghīnā; Margianā) and gives the same name to the country along the coast of Assyria. Lastly Marquart in Erasm., p. 143, 221, 313 retains the variant Marqīyūn but Marqīyūn seems also to be based on a good tradition (cf. Ptolemy, ed. Wilberg, 1838, p. 391).

The Arabs. Marāgha must have been among the towns of Ardharbādīān conquered by Maghārī b. Shaḵūr al-Ṭakāfi in the year 22 (Balādhūri, p. 325; Yaḵūt, Kitāb al-Bulān, p. 271). Marāghā b. Mughāmār returning from his expedition to Muṣān and Gīlān in 123 (740) (cf. Yaḵūt, Historia, ii., 365) stopped here. As the place was full of dung (ṣūraqīn Pers., sirīn) the old village (fārāz) was given the name of Marāgha (cf. above). Marwān did some building there. The town later passed to the daughters of Ḥārūn al-Rašīd. On the rebellion of al-Wādīn b. Rawwād, lord of Tabriz [q.v.], Khānūnā b. Kāsīm who was appointed governor of Ardharbādīān and Armenia (probably year 127) cf. Vasmor, Chronologia monarchorum Armeniarum, 293, 163, 1855, i. 397, built walls round Marāgha and put a garrison in it. When Bābā rebelled in 201 the people sought refuge in Marāgha. Maṭmān sent men to restore the walls and the suburb (rābaq) became inhabited again (Balādhūri, I.c.). In 221 Marāgha is mentioned as the winter-quarters of Afṣaf in his campaign against Bābā (Tabari, i., 1180).

In 280 (893) the Ṣājid Mūhammad Afṣaf b. Dīwād seized Marāgha from a certain Awld Allah b. Ḥasan, who was killed (Tabari, ii., 2137; Maṣḥūd, Maḥānī, viii. 143). In 296 (908) the Caliph confirmed Yūsuf b. Dīwād in possession of Marāgha and the whole of Ardharbādīān. A dhīman is known of this year struck by Yūsuf at Marāgha (Vasmor, O moneteck Sagitār, Baku 1927, p. 14). According to Ibn Hawqal, p. 238, there was at Marāgha a military camp (wašākar), a governor’s palace (dār al-imāra), a treasury (kūhān) and government offices (dārātān al-nāhilāyā) but Yūsuf razed the walls of Marāgha and transferred the capital to Ardabīl (cf. Iṣṭakhri, p. 131). Marāgha is only mentioned as the place where the last Ṣājid Abū l-Masāfīr al-Fātī was killed in 317 (929) (ʿArīb, Tabari contin. ed. de Goeje, p. 145).

The Dālāmīs. In 332 (943) (during the rule
of the Dailami Musâ'arids) the Russians (Rus) had taken Bardâ'â [q. v.]. Ibn Miskawaih (G. M. S., vi. 100) speaks of the diseases which decimated them because they ate too much fruit in Marâ'âghâ. This reference to Marâ'âghâ is quite unexpected in the text and Margoliouth has tightly proposed to read ٍطُرُعَةٍ in place of ۙحَرَّنَةٍ. A coin struck at Marâ'âghâ in 337 by Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razâk is a record of the brief conquest of Ṣâdâbâdîn by the general of the Bu yi'd Kûn al-Dawla (Vasmer, Žur Chronologie d. Gestaânîen, Islamica, iii/2, 1927, p. 170). Of 347 we also have dîhams of Marâ'âgha in the names of the two sons of the Dailami Marzuban, ʿAbd al-Ḥim and Ḳusârîn (ibid., p. 172).

The Rawâwâdi and the Sâldjâqs. After the disappearance of the Dailamis we find in Tabriz the family of Rawâwâdi Kûrds who seem to have been related with the Musâ'arids by marriage only. On the other hand, it is very likely that the Rawâwâdis are the descendants of the Arab Rawâwâdi al-ʿAzîd, lord of Ṣâdâbâdîn (Marâ'âghâ, p. 331) who became assimilated by their neighbours in Ṣâdâbâdîn. The best known of these Rawâwâdis is Mâlîmân b. Mâlîmân (= Muhammad: the change of d to t in Kurdish is common) who is mentioned between 420 and 446 (Ibn al-ʿAthîr, ix. 379, 351, 410) and who in addition to Tabriz possessed other strongholds in the mountains (Ṣahand). When in 420 the Ghuzz reached Marâ'âgha and executed there a great number of Ṣohâlî Kûrds, the latter united under Ṣahâdîn and drove out the Ghuzz (Ibn al-ʿAthîr, ix. 270–272). This incident shows that the district of Marâ'âgha was within the sphere of influence of Ṣahâdîn. In 445 Ṣahâdîn became a vassal of the Sâldjâqs, but Ibn al-ʿAthîr, ibid., p. 410 says nothing about the extent of his possessions around Ṣahand.

In 497 the peace between the sons of Malik-Shîh, ʿArikîrâk and Muhammad was signed near Marâ'âgha and in 498, Muhammad visited Marâ'âgha.

The ʿAkhâdîlîs. In 505 we have for the first time mention of the Amir ʿAkhâdîlî b. ʿAbdallîh b. Wahsûdân al-Rawâwâdi al-Kurdi, lord of Marâ'âgha and Kûtîb (Kûrsâra: Ibn al-ʿAthîr, x. 361). He was the founder of a little local dynasty, which lasted till about 624. We know very little of the history of the ʿAkhâdîlîs which has never been closely studied.

ʿAkhâdîlî was certainly the grandson of Wahsûdân b. Mâlîmân of Tabriz (cf. above) and explains the insistence with which the atâbegs of Marâ'âgha tried to retake Tabriz. Only intranscendental hereditary rights can explain the strange fact of the wish of a Kûrd to become the amirs of the Sâldjâqs. The name ʿAkhâdîlî is a peculiar formation; the name of Mâlîmân, a village to the south of Marâ'âgha, belongs to the same category of diminutives. The ʿAkhâdîlîs however very soon adopted Turkish names.

ʿAkhâdîlî with a large army took part in the Anti-Crusade of 505. During the siege of Tell ʿAjrī, Joscelin came to terms with him (ṭurâqīh) and he withdrew from the town (Kamal al-Din, Târikh Ḥalab, Rec. des hist. des croisades, ii. 599). ʿAkhâdîlî soon abandoned Syria entirely, for he coveted the lands of Sukmân ʿAbârî-ʿArman who had just died. We know that Sukmân had extended his sway over Tabriz [q. v.] and the reference is probably to this town. According to ʿAbî b. al-Dawza, ibid., p. 556, Ahmadî had 5,000 horsemen and the revenues from his fiefs amounted to 400,000 dinârs a year. In 510 (or 508) Almâdî was stabbed in Baghadât by the ʿIsâmîs to whom he had done much injury (ibid., p. 556; Ibn al-ʿAthîr, x. 561).

Akh-Sânedtyr I. In 514 Malik-ʿAbsâd, governor of Maʿsûl and Ṣâdâbâdîn, rebelled against his brother ʿAbsâd and gave Marâ'âgha to his atâbeg ʿAlînîn al-Dawla al-Bûsîkî but the rebellion collapsed and in 516 Ak-Sânedtyr al-Amadîlî (client of Ṣâdâbâdîn), lord of Marâ'âgha, who was in Baghdât, was authorised by Sulîn-ʿAbîd to return to his fief. As the amir Kun-tughîl, atâbeg of Malik Tughîl (lord of Arrân; Ibn al-ʿAthîr, x. 399), had died in 515, Ak-Sânedtyr expected to get his place with Tughîl. The latter ordered Ak-Sânedtyr to raise 10,000 men in Marâ'âgha and set out with him to conquer Ardabîl in which they failed. In the meanwhile Marâ'âgha was occupied by Djuysi- ʿAbîd, sent by Sulîn-ʿAbîd. The Geogian Chronicles (Boissot, i. 368) mentions under 516 (1123) the defeat of Ak-Sânedtyr (whom he calls, "Abgvan-thul, Atâbeg of Ram" = Arrân) during a demonstration against the Geogians carried out by Tughîl from Shurwân. In 532 Ak-Sânedtyr took a part but not a very active one in the suppression of the intrigues of the Marâ'âghâl lords. In 524 he was one of the promoters of the election of Sulîn-ʿAbîd, whose atâbeg he was. In 526 Tughîl, uncle of ʿAbsâd, defeated the latter and occupied Marâ'âgha and Tabriz (al-Bundârî, ed. Houtsma, p. 161). ʿAbsâd along with his uncle Maʿsûl and Ak-Sânedtyr sought refuge in Baghdât. With the support of the Caliph and the assistance of Ak-Sânedtyr, ʿAbsâd reoccupied Ṣâdâbâdîn. After the capture of Hamadân, Ak-Sânedtyr was killed there by the ʿIsâmîs (ibid.) instigated by Tughîl's viceroy (al-Bundârî, p. 169).

Akh-Sânedtyr II. The name of Ak-Sânedtyr's son is transmitted in different forms. Ibn al-ʿAthîr, xi. 366 and 177, calls him Ak-Sânedtyr (II); cf. also Taiûrî-i Gîzî, p. 472. The Bundârî, p. 231, calls him Al-Amir al-Kubrî Nusân al-Dîn Ḳâb-i al-Husaynî, p. 243, Nusân al-Dîn Ar-īlân Alâb (cf. al-Ḵâhîlî, Dârân Nuzhat al-Tawâṣ, i. 80). The Râwî al-Sânedtyr, p. 241, 244, 262 gives him the name of Atâbeg ʿAlâb Alâb. The Bundârî treats him as an equal of the great Amir Ḥâdîgūz [q. v.] whose family finally triumphed over the lords of Marâ'âgha. Ak-Sânedtyr II's adversary was the Amir Ḳâb-i al-Husaynî (qab-eri?) who was the favourite of Sulîn-ʿAbsâd and sought to establish himself in Arrân and Ṣâdâbâdîn. This Ḳâb-i al-Husaynî had besieged Marâ'âgha in 541 (al-Bundârî, p. 217). In 545 Sulîn Maʿsûl took Marâ'âgha and destroyed its walls (ṭaṣâwîr) but a reconciliation later took place between Ḳâb-i al-Husaynî and Ak-Sânedtyr II who renewed the alliance between them (al-Bundârî, p. 215). On his deathbed (554) Maʿsûl Mahammad entrusted his young son (Malik ʿAbsâd, cf. the genealogical tree in the Râwî al-Sânedtyr) to Ak-Sânedtyr. As Ḳâb-i al-Husaynî was furthering the interests
of his ward Sullivan Aıslən, Pahlawán b. Ildiguz advanced against Aı Sultan II but the latter with the help of Sühbə Arman defeated him on the Sef-i Rūd. In 556 Aı Sultan sent 5,000 men to the help of the governor of Rayy, Ianduj, who was fighting Ildiguz. The latter gained the upper hand and in 557 Aı Sultan II took part in the expedition of Ildiguz against the Georgians (Ibn al-Aatham, xi. 189). In 563 however, Aı Sultan II obtained recognition for his ward from Baghdād. Pahlawán b. Ildiguz at once besieged Aı Sultan in Maragha (ibid., p. 213) but a peace put an end to hostilities.

In 564 the amir of Rayy, Ianduj, was killed (Ibn al-Aatham, xi. 250). The Tārikh-i Givāda, p. 72, seems to suggest that the rebellion in Maragha of Kutluğ b. brother of Aı Sultan II), was due to Ianduj's influence. He was punished by the Aı Sultan Pahlawán b. Ildiguz and Maragha was given to his brothers 'Ala al-Din and Kūn al-Din.

Under 570 Ibn al-Aatham (xi. 250) mentions at Maragha Falak al-Din, son of Ibn Aı Sultan (i.e. son of Aı Sultan II), to whom his father had bequeathed his estates. Pahlawán besieged the fortress of Rūyindiz and Maragha. On this occasion peace was concluded on the cessation of Tābūz to the family of Ildiguz. This important detail shows that in 570 the seat of the Aı Mandat included the country round Mount Shandāh including Tabūz [q.v.].

In 602 the lord of Maragha 'Ala al-Din came to an agreement with the Aı Sultan of Arbil Mashāf al-Din Gok-buri to deprive the Ildiguz Aı Bakr of Adıbarzdijān on the pretext that he was incapable of ruling. From Maragha they marched on Tabūz but Aı Bakr called to his aid the former slave of his family Ay-doghmish (cf. Defrémyre, Rechercher sur le prince d'Hamadan, J.A., 1847, i. 160). Gok-buri returned to his own lands and Aı Bakr with Ay-doghmish came to Maragha. 'Ala al-Din had to surrender the fortress which was in the possession of the towns of Urmija and Hushū. In 604, 'Ala al-Din whom Ibn al-Aatham, xii. 157, 158, here calls Kara-Sultan died and left one son, a minor. A brave servent of 'Ala al-Din assumed the guardianship of the child but the latter died in 605. Aı Bakr then took possession of all the lands of the Aı Mandat except Rūyindiz where the servent already mentioned had entrenched himself with his late master's treasures.

It is not clear if 'Ala al-Din Kara-Sultan is identical with the brother of Aı Sultan II mentioned in 564. For the date of his accession and the title he bore we have a hint. According to the preface of the Haddżm-i Naqīm [q.v.], this poem (intended in 593) was composed at the request of 'Ala al-Din Kuba (7) Ar-Sal (the Kim and the Rūz paied him tribute [kurbād]; the Georgians suffered reverses at his hands). This manqabbah was definitely identified by Khan. Cattel, i, 577 and Supplement, 1895, p. 154 with 'Ala al-Din of Maragha. Naqīm mentions two sons of 'Ala al-Din, Naqīf al-Din Muhammad and Ahmad, but to reconcile this with Ibn al-Aatham we should have to suppose that both died before their father. The family of the Aı Mandat was continued for some time in the female line. In 618 the Mongols arrived before Maragha and the town was stormed on the 4th Safar. The Mongols sacked and burned the town and massacred the inhabitants (Ibid., xii. 246, 263) but the lady of Maragha (daughter of 'Ali al-Dīn), who lived in Rūyindiz escaped the catastrophe.

Djalal al-Dīn. In 622, the Khwārzmshāh Djalal al-Din came to Maragha via Dakhana. He entered without difficulty for the inhabitants were complaining of all kinds of oppressions and raids by the Georgians (Nasawi, Sirat Djalal al-Dīn, ed. Houjas, p. 110). Djalal al-Din tried to restore the prosperity of Maragha; cf. Ibn al-Aatham, xii. 280, 282.

In 624 (1227) while Djalal al-Din was in the Persian Trak, his vizier Sharaf al-Mulk was forced to reconquer Adıbarzdijān. In the course of his campaign he besieged Rūyindiz, the lady of which was a grand-daughter (min haşvāt) of the Aı Sultan 'Ali al-Din Karabā (7) (Nasawi, p. 129). This princess was married to the deaf-mute Khamiš, only son of the Eldiguzi Ozbek. The Aı Sultan Nasat al-Din, son of Khamiš, incidentally by Djawal, G.M.S., ii. 242, must have been his son. As a way out, she offered her hand to Sharaf al-Mulk. Djalal al-Din suddenly arrived from the Trak and married the princess himself. Rūyindiz was given to a certain Sa'd al-Din. The citadel contained some thousands of houses (aşār min dār) occupied by the former inhabitants of the town (kudamā). Sa'd al-Din decided to evacuate them but as a result of his tactlessness the fortress closed its gates again (to Sa'd) (Nasawi, p. 129, 157). Ibn al-Aatham, xii. 322 seems to deal with the course of these events. Under 627 he says that the troops of Djalal al-Din besieged Rūyindiz for some time. The fortress was about to capitulate when some malcontents summoned the assistance of a Turkoman amir Sewindji (Swendi) of the tribe of Kusi-yalwa. The domination of this chief and his relatives who succeeded him only lasted two years.

Rūyindiz. This fortress lay "near Maragha" (Ibn al-Aatham, xii. 322). According to Zakariya Kazwini who gives a very accurate description of Rūyindiz, it was 3 farahks from Maragha. Its proverbial impregnable position (kurba taĥistanatika al-ma'kād) suggests that it was built on the side of Shandāh. The Russian map marks on the Sofi-cāi 10 miles (c. 3 farahks) above Maragha a place called Yay-shahar (in Turkish = "summer-town") besides which two streams flow into the Sofi-cāi (on the left bank) and between them is written the corrupted name "Res or Eris". It is very probable that this is the site of the famous fortress on either side of which there was a stream (nahr); for Res one should read Dez i.e. Rūyindiz. The date of the final destruction of Rūyindiz is unknown. As late as 751 the Cobeind Aıfsah imprisoned his vizier there (v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Khs. ii. 357) but the Naqīf al-Kalbā, in 1340 only knows the other Rūyindiz, that of Sawalīn (there is still a Rūyindiz 4 farahks N.E. of Ardabil).

Kūlasra. Ibn al-Aatham, x. 340, calls Aı Mandat "lord of Maragha and of Kūlasra". This last name (Kūlasra) seems to be a corruption of Khūlasra (Kūsarr) or Kūsara, a little town well known to the Arab geographers on the Maragha-Arabdāl road (10-12 farahks from Maragha and 20-27 from Ardabil); cf. Ibn Kürdādshīh, p. 120; Kū-
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dāna, p. 213; İstakhrī, p. 194; Ibn Hawkal, p. 252, in particular from his own experience talks of the importance of Kulâsra and its flourishing commerce. This place may correspond to the village of Kul-tâpa "hill of cedars" (popular Turkish etymology) which lies on the Karângah about 35 miles (c. 55 km) east of Marâgha. The fort of Kul-tâ-pâl-Zâbîl notable ruins of which were discovered by Momothu c. 15 miles below Kul-tâpa (cf. Morier, et. cit., p. 296), must have been a bulwark for Kulâsra and Marâgha against invasion from the northeast. Rawlinson, J.R.S.G., 1841, p. 120 sees a Sâsâniân fortress in Kulâ-yl-Zâbîl.

The Mongols. Marâgha was definitely taken by the Mongols in 628 (Ibn al-Athîr, xii, 3:4). After the taking of Bahgâdî in 656 (1258) Hü-lâgî took up his quarters in Marâgha and ordered an observatory to be built there from the plans of Naṣîr al-Dîn Tûsî (who had as advisers four astronomers one of whom, Fakhr al-Dîn, was a native of Marâgha) (Kashf al-Dîn, ed. Quatremère, p. 344). The observatory was built on a fortified hill to the west of the town where only traces of foundations of the walls are still visible. According to Schindler's plan (1883), the levelled area on the hill measures 137 X 347 metres. On the observatory cf. Jourdain, Memoire sur les instrumentes employés à l'observatoire de Marâghâ, in the Magacan encyclog, edifice par A. L. Millin, Paris 1809, vol. vii, p. 4:1-101 (transl. of an Arabic ričâla belonging to the Bibî National and attributed to Naṣîr al-Dîn's colleague Mu'ayn al-Dîn al-Attâr) and Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, p. 859-856. To contain his treasures Hü-lâgî built a castle on the island of Šâhî 1-2 days distant from the capital. Here he was burned. On the fortifications of Šâhî cf. Tabari, iii, 1171. The handsome sepulchral towers of which there are four at Marâgha (McGeogh, 1908) date from Hü-lâgî or his immediate successors: 1. the one at the entrance to the bridge of Šâfî-čâl is built of red brick on a square foundation and has a vaulted cellar (Gundad-čehâl); 2. similar, situated in the gardens to the south of the town on the road from Khângâ; 3 and 4 near the old cemetery in the interior of the town: the octagonal tower No. 3 is of red brick overlaid with blue enameled fac- ience (Gundad-čehâl) and No. 4 is round, covered with plaster which is decorated with arabic-persian (Koîh-bâdz, "Tower of the Ram"). There is a photo- graph of No. 1 in de Morgan (1890), p. 337 and Sarre, op. cit. text, p. 16; of No. 3 in Sarre, ibid. and of 6 in de Morgan, ibid. p. 340. II. Schindler claimed to have read on the Gundad-čehâl (No. 2) the name of Alî Bakr şâhâli Zangî (atâbeg of Fars. 623-638). According to Sarre, No. 4 is later than 1350. The monuments require to be again studied on the spot. Lehmann-Haupt says that inscriptions can still be seen in their interiors.

The early Mongol Ilkâns led a semi-nomadic life which explains the absence from Marâgha of any kind of memory. It was only with (Jaizân that a regular capital was built at Tabriz [v. v.]. Marâgha continued to be of some importance on account of its pastureage and was a station on the road between Adharbâjîn and Mesopotamia. Its name continually appears in the history of the Ilkâns. In 703 (1304) Elîjdâr received at Marâgha the ambassadors from the Khân of China and installed at the observatory the son of Naṣîr al-Dîn Tûsî.

In 1212 (1312) Kara-Sânkâr, amir al-nâwarî of Aleppo, fearing the wrath of the Sultan of Egypt, Naṣîr, sought an asylum in Persia with Elîjdâr who gave him Marâgha. Ibn Bajîtî who tells this (i. 179) sởs that this town was known as "Little Damascus" (Dornicî al-tâghînî). Kara- Sânkâr died in 728 (1328) (d'Ollson, Hist. des Mongols, iv, 69). The Geographers of the Mongol period. Zakârîya Kazwini (1257) seems to be personally acquainted with the town. According to him there were in the town menemouns of the pre-Islamic period. He describes the mineral springs (near the village of Kiyamât-âlâd) and a cave which must correspond to the Ĥaförhî visited by Morier, Lehmann-Haupt, Minorsky etc. Kazwini also mentions the mountain of Zandârân with a gar- cearose spring, the village of Lîbîdî (Gumbadî) with a bottomless well (p. 350) and gives a description of Kâyîm-dîr (p. 359).

The Nusrât al-Kulhâ (written in 1340), G.M.S., p. 27 estimates the revenues of Marâgha paid to the treasury at 70,000 dinârs (Arabâl paid 20,000) and those of its vilayat at 155,000 dinârs. The town of Marâgha comprised all the southern part of Adharbâjîn, in the north it was bounded by the town of Tabriz, in the west by that of Khân (Urmîyân), in the south by the lands of Kuran- dan (Daranar) and in the east by Irâk-î Adham (Zandârân, Sulâpî). All the lands now under the modern Savad-Jaulîk [v. v.] were then ruled from Marâgha. As dependencies of Marâgha, Hamd Allah gives the town of Dihî Khûsravân (in popular Turkish-Tukhorjîgan) to the south of Tabriz, Lulain on the right bank tributary of the Elâghatu (cf. Rawlinson, 1841, p. 39: the ruins of Khâ-ya-i Bâhîtâ and Pâwî in Lâhîdîn, in the valley of the Tigris [cf. savad-yalu]. The town comprised six cantons (the names are much mutilated): Sarâdân (i.), Nâshardo (ii.), Duzâbar (cf. the mountain Duzâbî on the middle course of the Elâghatu). Gâwîdî (at the confluence of the river of Lulain with the Elâghatu [the name is also read Gâwâlî, Gâwâdî. It is remarkable that Firdawsi (ed. Mohî, xii. 141, 151) mentions in these region- the inaccessible Dihî-Khûzî and Kûhî Dûr where Bahram Ghûr was defeated by Khusrawj), Bûhî-tân (probably the district of Bûhî on the Tatars, Hâshhâ- rîd to the east of Shâhâr on the Kuranlûn). The district of Angûzân on the Kish-lân was also a dependency of Marâgha.

Christianity at Marâgha. In the Mongol period, Marâgha had become an important centre of Christianity. The celebrated Mir Er Hebreus (Jacobe Molphian) located in 1208 on Euclid and in 1272 on Psalms in the "new monastery" of Marâgha; there he wrote the Kitâb al-Dawrâ. When he died on July 30, 1286, as a sign of mourning the Greeks, Armenians and Nestorians, closed their shops in the market-place (Assemani, Bibl. Orient. i, ii. 266; Wright, A short History of Syriac Literature, 1894, p. 267, 271, 276, 279). The history of Mar Yahbalâhî III (patarch of the Nestorians, 1281-1317, transl. Chabot, Paris 1895) contains valuable notes on Marâgha. Yahbalâhî rebuilt the already existing church of Mar Şâhî and built a house beside it. In 1289 Ar- ghân had his son baptized in Marâgha. In 1294 the patriarch laid the foundations of the monastery.
of John the Baptist 2/3 of a farsakh north of Marāgha. After the accession of Ghazān (1295) the persecution of the Christians began, instigated by the amir Nawrūz. The mob plundered the residence of the patriarch and the church of St. George built by the monk Rabban Šawmān (it had been furnished with articles from the portable church of Arūgān’s camp). The patriarch sought refuge in the suite of the Armenian king Hacet. On his return to Marāgha, Ghazān punished the fomenters of the troubles. In 1298 Vahābīlāh was confirmed in his rights. In Sept. 1301 he finished the monastery of St. John. His biographer and contemporary gives an account of the beautiful buildings, the numerous relics and riches of the monastery (Chahot, ap. cit., p. 133). The village of Dālih (?) to the east of Marāgha was purchased to serve as a zāwī of the monastery (to the N.E. of the town there is still a village of Kīlī-ki-kāndī “village of the church”). Ghazān and his successor Ukhāvjāt visited the monastery. Vahābīlāh died and was buried there in 1317.

After the Mongols. In 1337 (1337) the Djalāyirīd Shaik Šahān inflicted a defeat on Tugha-Timūr [q. v.] near Marāgha (or at Hashūlād). The pretender Muhammad was buried at Marāgha in 1378 (Mīrāzī al-Attār, p. 315). Later the political struggles of the Turkmans had their principal arena in the northern part of Ardbarbādjan. In the same period the Kurid-Ichkhīliens discharged the kings of the六个 districts of the south of Lake Urmīa became consolidated and received reinforcements from the districts of Mawsīī (Mawson-nāmī, i. 288). The Mūkī Kurid amirs extended their influence over Marāgha and even as far as Dih-Khārākān. The Turks during their rule over Ardbarbādjan included Marāgha with Tabriz and levied 15 kharwats of gold per annum on it which caused its inhabitants to go away (ibid., p. 294). In 1502 (1503) the name of the fortress of Sūrsa-kurghān (demolished in 795 by Timūr; cf. Zafar-nāmā, i. 628 and rebuilt by the Mūkī) in the region of Marāgha often occurs in the Mawson-nāmā, p. 294—296; this name recalls that of the Nārū, the right bank tributary of the Dijlūt. During the second Ottoman occupation (1725) Marāgha was governed by Ṭubl al-‘Azn Pāda; this administrative unit consisted of 5 sandjaks, of which 2 were hereditary and 3 granted by the government (v. Hammer, iv. 228; according to Cebesbi-zade). In 1492 (1729) Nadir defeated the Ottoman at Miyanlūlī on the Dijlūt and occupied Dīmūn, Sawy-ul-bulāk, Marāgha and Dih-Khārākān (Mahdi-Khan, Tūrkēlī Nādīr, Tabriz 1284, p. 66; transl. Jones, i. 104). According to the recently discovered history of Nadir, the monarch transplanted 3,000 inhabitants from Marāgha to Kūlay (Rastbūd, in Zep., xxv., p. 88).

The Mukaddam. As early as the time of Nadir the Turkish tribe of Mukaddam is mentioned as settled in the region of Marāgha (Macdonald, Kinneir: 15,000 men). Ahmad Khān Mukaddam played a considerable part in the affairs of Ardbarbādjan. Jauber, Voyage, p. 160 knew him in 1805 as beztegboi of Ardbarbādjan under prince ‘Abbās Mirzā. In 1810 he exterminated the Bīlāshīs whom he had invited to Marāgha [cf. Sawdī-bulāk]. According to Morier, Second Journey, p. 293, this patriarch was aged 90 in 1815 (cf. Brydges, Dyesty of the Kajors, p. 90). The governor of Marāgha Šāmad-Khan, a partisan of Mūhāmmed ‘Ali Khān who besieged the town in 1809, was of the family of Ahmad-Khān. At the present day the Mukaddam are concentrated round Miyanlūlī.

In 1828 Marāgha was occupied by Russian troops. In 1881, the Kurid invasion by Shaik Ūbaidalī reached the gates of Marāgha. The town was not taken but the whole country round was in ruins when H. Schindler visited it in 1882. During the war of 1914—1918, Marāgha was within the zone of the Russo-Turkish operations [cf. Tanzt].

Bibliography: In addition to that sources quoted in the text: Samānī, Kitāb al-Ansār, G.M.S., xx, fol. 519; he also derives the nisba Marāghī from the clan al-Marāgh of the tribe of al-Azd); Hājjī Kahlīf, Diḵān-nāmā, p. 389; cf. also the rocok, 1295, 133, 333 (confused and of doubtful value); Zain al-Abīdīn, Būstān al-Siyāh, p. 555.


(Y. Minorsky)

MARAND (t.), a town in the Persian province of Ardbarbādjan.

Position. The town lies about 40 miles N. of Tabriz, halfway between it and the Araxes (it is 42 miles from Marand to Djulfa). The road
from Tabriz to Khoi also branches off at Marand. A shorter road from Tabriz to Khoi follows the north bank of Lake Urmia and crosses the Mishowdagh range by the pass between Tasādī [q.v.] and Dīyā al-Dīn. Marand, which is surrounded by many gardens, occupies the eastern corner of a rather beautiful plain, about ten miles broad and sloping slightly to the west. To the south the Mishowdagh range (western continuation of the Sawsān) separates it from the plain of Tabriz and from Lake Urmia. The pass to the south of Marand often mentioned by historians is called Yam (Mongol = post-station). The pass between the plain of Marand and Tasādī [q.v.] takes its name from the village of Wadliyān. To the east of Marand lies the wild and mountainous region of Karādādagh (capital: Ahar). To the north, the plain of Marand is separated from the Araxes by a range, a continuation of the central heights of the Karādādagh which is crossed by the defile of the Darādiz. The plain of Marand is watered by the river of the southern arm of which called Zilbir runs quite near Marand. The combined waters of Zunār and Zilbir flow into the Kūtor-lāi (an important right bank tributary of the Araxes) about 20 miles N. E. of Khoi. The length of the Zunār is about 40 miles (Hamd Allah Mustawfi: 8 farsakhs). History. A lofty tell which rises beside the town is evidence of the great antiquity of this site; it must have existed in the time of the Vannie (Khad) and Assyrian kings. Its Greek name Μεσσοδέα is perhaps connected with the people Μασουδ, who, according to Ptolemy VI. 2, occupied the lands as far as Lake Urmia. A legend of Armenian origin based on the popular etymology nair and "mother of" locates in Marand the tomb of Noah's wife (Hübischmann, Die altertümlichen Ortsnamen, 1904, p. 346 and 451; Ker Porter, Travels, i. 217). Moses of Chorene places Marand in the district of Bakurakert. There was another Marand mentioned by the Armenian historian Orbelian (c. 1300) in the province of Sinnik (north of the Araxes) and a village of Marand still exists east of Tīghāt in the khānate of Mālik [q.v.]. Ibn Baʿthī. After the Arab conquest a certain Halbas of the tribe of Rabīʾa took Marand. His son Baʿthī, a soldier of fortune (sulṭāni) in the service of Ibn al-Rawwād, fortified Marand. Muhammad b. Baʿthī erected castles there (kastār) (Baladhuri, p. 330). This had acquired considerable notoriety. In 200 (815) he had taken from the family of Kawsī, the stronghold of Shāhī and Tabriz (Tabari, iii. 1711). (In another passage, Tabari, iii. 1379, mentions Yaktur [?] in place of Tabriz). Ibn Baʿthī lived at Shāhī which stood in the centre of Lake Urmia (the peninsula of Shāhī, where at a later date Hūlāgh Khan kept his treasure and where he was buried). Ibn Baʿthī was at first on good terms with the Khurrami Bālbak, whose authority must have prevailed in the Karādādagh in particular, in the north-eastern corner of which was his residence al-Balābīh. Ibn Baʿthī suddenly changed his tactics and seized by a ruse Ḥanīa, one of Bālbak's generals whom he sent to the caliph al-Maʿṣūm. In 221 Ibn Baʿthī accompanied Bālbak on his expedition against al-Balābīh (Tabari, i. 1391). Under the caliphate of Mutawakkil, Ibn Baʿthī committed some crime (khīlaṣ) and was imprisoned in Surmanraʾa. On the intercession of Būhā al-Sharābhī, 30 people of repute became guarantors of Ibn al-Baʿthī's good behaviour and he must have been allowed considerable liberty. In 234 (848) he escaped to Marand. Ibn Khurādaḏībī, who wrote in 234, mentions Marand as being Ibn Baʿthī's fief. Tabari, iii. 1379—1380, gives a very graphic account of the expedition sent against this town. The wall which enclosed Marand and its gardens was a farsakh in circumference. The river flows within it. The dense forest outside was a further protection to the town. Ibn Baʿthī collected 2,200 adventurers who were reinforced by a number of non-Arabs (šālāt) armed with slings. He had ballistae constructed to repel the assailants. During the 8 months that the siege lasted, 100 individuals of note (mīrzā al-sulṭān) were killed and 400 wounded. When Būhā al-Sharābī (Baladhūrī, p. 330: Būhā al-Saghīr) arrived, he succeeded in detaching the men of the Rabīʾa tribe from Ibn Baʿthī. Ibn Baʿthī and his relatives were seized and his house and those of his partisans plundered. In Shawwāl of 235 Būhā arrived with 150 prisoners at the caliph's court. They had not been bestirred, but the latter recited verses in Arabic and the caliph was astonished by his poetic gift (raʾya maʾālūka lā-taḥal), and gave him his life. Ibn Baʿthī died in prison and his sons entered the corps of mercenaries (al-shahābīyān). According to one of Tabari's authorities (iii. 1388), the shaikhs of Marāqqa who praised the bravery and literary ability (ṣadūq) of Ibn Baʿthī also quoted his Persian verses (bi bīrāfīya). This important passage already quoted by Baṭthold, Bull. School of Oriental Studies, vol. ii., Pt. iv., 1923, p. 536—538, is evidence of the existence of the cultivation of poetry in Persian in the N.W. of Iran at the beginning of the ninth century. Ibn Baʿthī must have been incised to a considerable extent, and, as has been mentioned, he relied for support on the non-Arab element in his rustak (šālāt, raḵwāl). Later History. The Arab geographers of the tenth century (Iṣākhrī, p. 182; Ibn Hawāḵī, p. 239) mention Marand among the little towns of Aḏharbāḏjān where the material called ṭībāk was manufactured. Māḏāʾī, p. 51, 374, 377, puts Marand under Dābūl and notes its gardens, its flourishing suburb and a cathedral-mosque in the centre of the market. The same author, p. 382, mentions a direct road from Marand to Marāqqa (via Nūn [?], somewhere west of Tabrīz). Later, Marand must have shared the fate of Tabrīz [q.v.]. According to Yāḵtū, iv. 503, the town had begun to decline after it was plundered by the Georgians (Kurd) who carried off its inhabitants. This is valuable confirmation of the Georgian expedition to Persia, a detailed account of which is given in the Georgian Chronicle for 1208—1210 (605—607) [cf. Tabriz and Tihār]. Among the theologians, born in Marand, Yāḵtū mentions one who died in 216 and another who had studied in Damaḵ in 433. In 624 (1226) Marand which had not sufficient defences, was occupied by the Ḥājī Ṭāhā b. Aḥmad of Akhūt. Sharaf al-Mulk, governor for the Khwārizmshah, retook the town and wrought great slaughter in it (Nasawi, ed. Houcha, p. 166). The only historical monument in Marand is the old mosque now in ruins with a miḥrāb in stucco bearing the date of rebuilding 731 (1331) (regnum of the Ilkhan Abī Saʿūd). Cf. Sarre, Denkmäler pers. Baukunst, Berlin 1910, p. 24—25 and pl. xvii.,
and the observations by Herzfeld. Die Gumbahth-i 'Allahyan, in the Volumes... presented to E. G. Browne, 1922, p. 194-195. In the same period, Herzfeld, Mir, ed. A. C. H. Kitchin, 1890, p. 58, counted 60 villages in the district of Marand. The walls (gūrā) of the town were 8,000 yards around but the town only occupied half the area.

Marand is several times mentioned in connection with the Turk-Persian wars. According to Ewliya Çelebi (1647), Siyahat-nâme, ii. 242, Marand was a hunting-resort of the Timurid Shâhrukh. In spite of the damage done by the invasion of Sultan Murad, the town looked prosperous and had 3,000 houses. Ewliya enumerates a number of celebrated theologians buried near the town.

In the autumn of 1724 Abd Allah Pasha Kopru sent the Kird Khan of Eltim Muhammad 'Abid to occupy Marand the inhabitants of which had fled. Resistance centred round the town of Zandis (10 miles N. of Marand) which had 7,000 houses and a castle called Diza by the Persians. To dispose of the threat to their flank, the janissaries before advancing on Tabriz fought a battle here in May 1725 with the Persians of whom a large number were slain. Diza was taken and dismantled (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R. 2, iv. p. 226, following Çelebi-i-sade).

Marand has been often mentioned by European travellers since Chardin (1811 edition, i. p. 318); cf. the notices by Ker Porter, Joubert, Morier, Ouseley and Montele who of which a résumé is given in Rutter, Edirne, iv. p. 907. Marand has recently gained in importance since it lies on the main high road from Tabriz to Dijlah built by the Russians in 1906 and replaced by a railway in 1915.

(2.) A town in the district of Khuttal, to the north of the Oxus; cf. Mukaddesi, p. 49, 290-291. (V. Minorsky)

**MARASH, a town in Syria near the Asia Minor frontier.**

It lies about 2,000 feet above sea-level on the northern edge of the hollow (Amik of Marash; now Çakal Owa and south of it Sheker Owa or Marash Owa) which lies east of the Dijlah and is watered by its tributary, the Nahr Harsh (Ak-Su). As a result of its situation at the intersection of the roads which run to Antakya, to 'Ain Zarba and al-Ma'as, to Abbisain (Ahlu-l-taim) and Alanya, via Guban (Kokovan) to Kaşıyra, via Beheita (Bahasa) to Sumale, and via al-Hadadi and Zibra to Malata, Marash was from the earliest times one of the most important centres of traffic in the Syrian frontier region. It is repeatedly mentioned as early as Assyrian texts as Maršas, capital of the kingdom of Gurgum (cf. the name Marashma), and several Hittite monuments have been found there (cf. Unger, Marash, in Ebert's Klio, v. 1908, p. 217 sqq.).

In the Roman imperial period it was called Germanicca in honour of Caligula (on the coins Cae-aera Germanicca; cf. Gregoire, Rev. de l'Inst. fr. en Bég., xi. 1908, p. 217 sqq.). The identity of Germanicca and Marash is certain from numerous literary, especially Syrian, references. The Armenians probably knew, but probably from a learned tradition only, the name Garšas (Kermang in Vahram; cf. Math. of Edessa, ed. Diakou, p. 487 infra; St. Martin, Mem. sur l'Arm., i. 200). The statement in a description of the district of Halab (Paris MS., Arab., no. 1683, fol. 721) that the Armenian name of the town was 'Amān (Blochet, R.O.L., iv., p. 552, etc., note 6) is wrong; this is a mistake for Garšas. The name later given to the neighbouring al-Hadath [q.v.] The Emperor Heraclius passed the town in 626 (Theoph., Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 313; Ramsay, Class. Review, x. 140; Gerland, Byz. Zeitschrifte, iii., 1894, p. 352). The Emperor Leo III came from Marash (Germanitikia); later authors (like Theoph., op. cit., p. 391) wrongly called him the "Isaurian" (a confusion with Germanikopolis; cf. K. Schenck, Byz. Zeitschrifte, v., 1896, p. 296-298).

In the year 16 Abîb 'Abid sent 'Abd Allah b. al-Wald from Manbij against Marash and the Greek garrison surrendered the fortress on being granted permission to withdraw un molested; 'Abd Allah then destroyed it (Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, iii., 1910, p. 794, 806). Sulaymân b. 'Awf al-Châmidî in 30 (650-651) set out from Marash against the Byzantines. Ma'âmâya b. Ma'âmâya revolted against Marash and settled soldiers in this "Arabi Cayenne" (as Lammens, M. F. O. B., vi., 1913, p. 437 calls it). After 'Aziz I's death the attacks of the Greeks on the town became so severe that the inhabitants abandoned it.

After Muhammad b. Marwan in 74 (693-694) had broken the truce concluded by 'Abd al-Malik with the Greeks, in Diyâmadî I of the following year the Greeks set out from Marash against al-A'âmâk (= 'Amâk of Antakya; cf. Le Strange, Palestine etc., p. 391) but were again driven back in the 'Amâk of Marash. Marash was restored by al-'Abbas, son of al-Walid I, and fortified and repopulated; a large mosque was also built there. The people of Kinnassin (i.e. probably of the "kingdom of Kinnassin") had to send troops every year to Marash. During Marwan II's fighting against Hims, the Emperor Constantine again besieged Marash, which had finally to capitulate (746) and was destroyed (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 139; Theophanes, Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 422; Georg. Kedrenos, ed. Bonn, ii. 7). The inhabitants emigrated to Mesopotamia and the Djund of Kinnassin. After the capture of 'Umar, Marwan sent troops to Marash, who rebuilt the town in 130 (747); the castle in the centre of the town was henceforth called al-Marwâni after him (Vâkit, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 498 sqq.). But by 137 (754) the Greeks again sacked the town. Al-Ma'arî then had it rebuilt by Sultan b. 'Ali (d. 150 = 767) and gave it a garrison which al-Mahdi strengthened and supplied with ample munitions (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 139; Theophanes, Chron., p. 445: ε Σιη β η λ ε τ τ ώ τ ης περι τ ω τ ης της Παλατίνης). The Arabs in 769 (780) entered the 'Amâk of Marash and depopulated the inhabitants of the region who were accused of espionage on behalf of the Byzantines, to al-Ramla (Michael Syrus, Chron., ed. Chabot, ii. 526). According to the Syrian inscription of 'Eneh on the Euphrates, in 776-777 A.D. (1088 Sel.) the people of the hollow (Amâk) of Marash invaded Asia Minor (Beth Rhöymâ) to plunder ('Abî Chabot, J. t. s., ser. ii., 1901, p. 286 sqq.; Pogou, Invent. scir. de la Syrie et de la Mesopotamie, i. 148-150, no. 84). A Greek army of 100,000 men in 161-162 (775-779) under Michael Lachanodrakon besieged Marash which was defended by 'Isâ b. 'Ali (Theoph., op. cit., p. 451), grand-uncle of the Caliph al-Mahdi, destroyed al-Hadath and laid waste the Syrian frontier (Weil, Gesch. d.
Chalîf, ii. 98). In 153 (799) Hârûn al-Raşîd built the town of al-Hâsûniyâ near Marâsh (al-Baladhûri, op. cit., p. 171; Yâkıî, iv. 498, wrongly calls it a suburb of Marâsh); he also raised the prosperity of Marâsh and al-Maštûsa (al-Maṣûsî, Mursîd al-Ḍhâhâb, ed. Barbiere de Meynard, vii. 295). The amir Abû ʿAbd Allâh Muhammad b. Yûsuf in 841 invaded Asia Minor; the Greeks drove him back however, and took al-Ḥadâbah, Marâsh, and the district of Malatya (Michael Syrus, iii. 102; Weill, Gésch. d. Chalîf, ii. p. 315 sqq., note 1; considers this story unhistorical). The emperor Basil I in 877 passed via Konstânos (Gokçun) and the Taurus passes (στεμένα τοῦ Τάουρου) against Marâsh (Γεμφακασία) but could not take it and had to be content with burning and plundering the suburbs: the same thing happened at al-Ḥadâbah (Alârâz; Georg. Kedrenos [Bonn], ii. 214; Theophan. continuat., ed. Bonn, p. 280). According to the tariqāʾiyyaʾīs polémico (de victinione bellica, Migne, Patr. Græc. cxvii. 1000) shortly before the attack on Germanikeia he crossed the Παραβάτον ποταμός (cf. Pline, Nat. Hist., v. 93: one of the 'Taurian rivers' current in the 9th–11th centuries). The Byzantines under Abû Dhâr al-Ḥabbân, the cantator Meşmeçi, and Tomaschek, S. P. Ab. Wûn, cxxiv. 1891, Alâb. viii. 66, is therefore presumably wrong). The Byzantine Andronecus in 292 (904–905) invaded the region of Marâsh, defeated the garrison of Târús and Malatya and destroyed Kûrûs (Ibn al-ʿΑṭîr, ed. Torbern, vii. 378; al-Jâlâri, iii. 2298; Weil, op. cit., iii. 533; Vasilev, Vicintia et Arabi, i., 1902, p. 154). The Armenian Meḥr (Arab. Malîh) plundered Marâsh in 916; 50,000 prisoners were carried off from it and Târús (Weil, op. cit., ii. 634; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 203 sqq.). In the fighting against Saïf al-Dawla, the Greeks under John Kurkuas took Marâsh in the spring of 537 (949) (Kamal al-Dîn in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 187; Weil, op. cit., iii. 14, note 1; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 268). In 341 (952) the Ḥmadânî defeated the Domestikos at Marâsh and in June rebuilt the defences of the town (Freytag, op. cit., p. 191; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 291). When the Ḥmadânî Abû ʿl-ʾAṣghârîn in 956 was taken prisoner by the Byzantines, his father-in-law Abû Fîrâs followed as far as Marâsh in the attempt to rescue him but could not overtake his captors (Dâvûtî, Abû Fîrâs, Leyden 1895, p. 31; Vasilev, op. cit., p. 297). Nicephoros Phocas in Rabî I 535 (Aug. 962) occupied Marâsh, Dulûk and Rabîn (Freytag, op. cit., p. 199; Rosen, Zur Archiv Inst. Aabat, Nahal, xiv. 152, note 100). Bandjatkin in 582 (992) carried out a raid on Marâsh and came back with prisoners and loot (Freytag, p. 248; Rosen, p. 250, 263). The Armenian Philipatos Brachamios (Filaretos al-Ramî) who in the second half of the 13th century, as leader of a robber band and ally of the Byzantine emperor, conquered a little kingdom for himself on the Syrian frontier, belonged to the village of Shrabâz in the district of Marâsh (Michael Syrus, iii. 173, 174 note). After the Franks under Godfrey de Bouillon had taken Marâsh in 540 (1097), they installed a bishop there (Michael Syrus, iii. 191). Boemund of Antioch was taken prisoner in June 1100 in the 'umâq of Marâsh in the village of Gafnî (Michael Syrus, iii. 188) on his campaign against Malatya by Qumâšîgîn b. Dânisîmâd (Kaukût eis. hist. or. des crois., i. 589; Rohricht, Gesch. des Konigreich. Turks., p. 9; Weill, op. cit., i. 179). The emperor Alexandra later sent the general Butumius against Marâsh (το Μασσιο) who took the town, fortified the surrounding small towns and villages and gave them garrisons and left Monasteries there as ψηφιάζων (Anna Commena, Αφικαίδα ed. Reifferscheid, i. 152, sqq.; F. Chalandon, Les Comm., i, Paris 1900, p. 234). The town of Marâsh was placed under the Armenian prince Thathil, who had distinguished himself in its defence against Bohemund (Mattheos Ubrayeçî, ed. Dulaire, ch. xxxv., p. 110; Anna Commena, Les Comm., i. 104 sqq.). But by 1104 he had to abandon it and surrender it to Joscelin de Courtenay, lord of Tell Bashir (Mattheos, op. cit., p. 257, ch. clxxxvii.; Raoul of Caen, ch. 148; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 49, note 8; p. 52, note 4). Thathil is perhaps the same Armenian as had given his daughter in marriage to Godfrey's brother Baldwin (in William of Tyre, x. 1, he is called Tafuric; in Albert of Aix, iii. 31; v. 18; Tafurâz; cf. Chalandon, op. cit., p. 103). By 1105 Tancred of Antioch seems to have been in possession of Marâsh (Rohricht, p. 56) to whom it was allotted in the treaty of Sept. 1108 (Kaukkûs bih kheiz, ch. cxlv; Anna Commena, ed. Reifferscheid, i. 217; Rohricht, p. 66). In 1114 the widow of the recently deceased Armenian prince Kogh Vaast (γιος του τιθεν) of Marâsh submitted to Akg Sonkor of Mawûl (Weil, op. cit., iii. 199); on the 28th İmûnâdî (Nov. 27) of the same year, Marâsh was devastated by a disastrous earthquake in which 40,000 lost their lives (Michael Syrus, transl. Chabot, ii. 200; Recueil hist. et écréi, iii. 607; Mattheos Ubrayeçî, p. 259, ch. cxxvii.). King Baldwin granted a monk named Godfrey (Godfridus Monachus) a lieb consisting of Marâsh, Kašfan and Rabîn (Michael Syrus, iii. 211; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 161). In 1124 Godfrey was killed at the siege of Mamelîk in the train of Joscelin of Edessa. The Dânîshmand Muhammad b. Āmm Ghaîî in 1136–1137 laid waste the villages and monasteries near Marâsh and Kašfan (Mattheos, iii. 320, ch. cxxii.). The Sâljuq sultan Masûd in 1138 advanced as far as Marâsh, plundering the country as he went (Michael Syrus, iii. 216) as did Malik Muhammad of Malatya in 1141 (Michael Syrus, iii. 249) and Kilidj Arslân II in 1147 (Michael Syrus, iii. 275). The town then belonged to Raynald, son-in-law of Joscelin II of Edessa, who fell in 1149 at İnibî (Rohricht, op. cit., p. 260). On Sept. 11, 1149, Kilidj Arslân and his father Masûd set out from Abûlaitân against Marâsh, plundered the country around and besieged the town. The Frankish garrison capitulated on being promised a safe retreat to Anţiqîya; but the sultan sent a body of Turks after them, who fell upon them on the road and slew them. On this occasion the treasure of the churches of Marâsh was lost, which the pries-who had rebelled against the bishop had appropriated (Michael Syrus, iii. 290; Mattheos Ubrayeçî, p. 350, ch. cclv.; Chalandon, op. cit., p. 421; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 263). After the capture of Joscelin, Nûr al-Dîn of Halâb in 546 (1151–1152) took a large part of the country of Edessa including the town of Marâsh, Tell Bâshêr, Ṭiāzûr, Dâlûk, Kýrûs etc. (Recueil hist. et écréi, 29, 281; i. 54; Weil, op. cit., iii. 296; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 265, note 5). The district was then divided: the Sûlûn received Marâsh, Barzaman, Rabîn, Kašfan and Bahûnîa; the Urûkîd Kara Arslân of Ḥîm Ziyâd got Bûnhûlî, Gargar, Kûkhtâ
and Hüs-en Mansūr; Nūr al-Dīn kept the rest (Michael Syrus, ii. 297; Will. of Tyre, xvii. 16). When Marāš’s son Kīltīd Arsānūs, lord of Marāš (Michael Syrus, iii. 318), attacked an Armenian village, the Armenians under Stephan, brother of the prince Thūros, in 1156 revenged themselves by setting Marāš on fire and carried off the whole population into captivity, during the absence of the Sulfūn and his Turks (Michael Syrus, iii. 314 [expanded from Barbehaeus, Chron. syr.], differently in Abū Sha‘ib, Rec. hist. or. croiz. iv. 92; F. Chalandon, Les Commune., ii. [1912], p. 434).

Among those carried off was the bishop Diosýsios bar Sallīth, who escaped to the monastery of Kālsūr (according to Chaton, loc. cit., the kārērā Kālēzēṃ of Anna Comnena, ed. Reifferscheid, i. 219) and wrote three mūnṛ about the devastation of his former diocese of Marāš (Michael Syrus, loc. cit.; Baunstatt, Gesch. d. syr. Litt., p. 298), Thoras of Little Armenia in 1165 plundered Marāš (Barbehaeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bejgian, p. 331; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 319, note 8; Chalandon, op. cit., ii. 531, note 1). Nūr al-Dīn again took Marāš from Kīltīd Arsānu II when he was content a campaign against the Dhinshamandī Din lūn (Michael Syrus, iii. 350) in the beginning of Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dā 668 (June 14, 1173) and Bahānūn in Dhu ‘l-Hijdāja (Rec. hist. or. croiz., i. 43, 592; i. 158; Matthaeus Urahaye, ed. Dulaurier, p. 360; Abu l-Fīdā‘, Annal. Maml., ed. Reiske, iv. 4; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 303, who is followed by Chalandon, Les Commune., i. 465, wrongly puts these events as early as 1159).

Nūr al-Dīn perhaps handed Marāš over to his ally Mīhē of Little Armenia. When the dynast of Marāš raided the district of Kāṣān, al-Malik al-Zahrī in 592 (1195–1196) took the field against him, whereupon the lord of Marāš sought forgiveness and recognised his sovereignty (Kamāl al-Dīn, trans. Blochet, R. O. L., iv. 212). The Armenian ruler Rūpen III took Bohemund III of Antīkīya prisoner in 1185 and forced him to cede the territory from the Djināhūn up to Kāstīnūn (Michael Syrus, iii. 396 sq.; Rohricht, op. cit., p. 403, note 7, 661). Kīltīd al-Dīn Kātāshūr, son of Kīltīd Arsānūn II, in 605 (1208), when on a campaign against Little Armenia took Marāš (Abū l-Fīdā‘, Annal. Maml., ed. Reiske, iv. 232) and made Šānu—all al-Dīn Ḡānan governor of the town. He was succeeded in this office by his son Ḥāfrīnu, who in turn was succeeded by his son Nūrī al-Dīn, who ruled Marāš for 50 years. The long reign of his son Muẓaffar al-Dīn was followed by that of his brother İmād al-Dīn who however in 656 (1258) abandoned the town which was much harassed by the Armenians and Georgians, after failing to find support either from İzāl al-Dīn Kāl-Kābi of Rūm or al-Malik al-Salīt of Egypt. The town then surrendered to the Armenians (Ibn al-Shī‘a, Barūt, 1909, p. 192).

Marāš did not escape during the great Mongol invasion of Asia Minor. Baibars I of Egypt in his campaign against them in 670 (1271) sent from Ḥalāb a division under Ṭamānuṣ and Šāh bīl al-Maṣāḥ, who drove all the Tatārs from there and slew them (Rec. hist. or. croiz., ii. 246; Maṣrīn, ed. Quatremère, Hist. de Sult. Maml., i. 101). In the wars with the rulers of Little Armenia troops from Ḥalāb went as far as Marāš in 673 and destroyed the gates of the outer town (Weil, Gesch. d. Chal., iv. 77). In the next few years Baibars negotiated with envoys from Sīr, from whom he demanded the surrender of Marāš and Bahānūn; but he was satisfied instead with a considerable sum of money (Maṣrīn, ed. Quatremère, op. cit., i. 104 [year 673 = 1274]; i. 104 [688 = 1289]). It was not till 692 (1292) that sūltān Kāhilī by a treaty received Bahānū, Marāš and Tell Ḥamūnūn (Maṣrūfī b. Abū l-Fāqī‘ī, Hist. des Sultans Mamlucks, ed. Blochet, in Patrologia Orientalis, xiv. 357; Venet. Or. 1865, iv. 86; Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1901, p. 287). But the Armenians must have retained the two last named towns not long afterwards (Weil, iv. 213, note 1), for in 697 (1297) Marāš was again taken by the emir Bilbān Tabāshī, Nābis of Ḥalāb, for Lāḏūn. A treaty was then concluded with the ruler of Little Armenia by which the Djināhūn was to be the frontier between the two countries; Ḥamūnūn, Tell Ḥamūnūn, Kūbārū, al-Nukārī (on its position cf. L. Alīṣān, Siyānūn, p. 493–496), Ḥādār Shughlān, Šīrāzdākār and Marāš thus passed to Egypt (Maṣrīn, op. cit., i. 106; Abu l-Fīdā‘, Ann. Maml., v. 140).

In the second half of the viii (xivth) century Zain al-Dīn Karadja and his son Kāhilī, the founders of the house of the Dhu ‘l-Kadrāgūsh, conquered the lands along the Egyptian Asin Minor frontier with Malāṭyā, Abīṣīn, Marāš, Bahānūn and Ḥārīfū [cf. ib. ‘l-Kadr]. In the mosque of Marāš one of his successors, Malik Arslān, was murdered in 870 (1465–1466); his portrait with the inscription sūltān Arslān” and that of his sister Sittī Kāṭān with the legend ʿayyūn Xawrī are painted in the Codex Venetus 516 of the Geography of Ptolemy, which he apparently intended to dedicate to his father-in-law Mehmedīn II (Olahusen, in Hermes, xv., 1880, p. 447–448).

Conquered by Selīm I, Marāš became Ottoman; on his campaign against the Dhu ‘l-Kadrīya in 1515 he encamped on his way back before Marāš and then returned via Kar; Marāš (now Kar; Baṉūr or Kar Dhu ‘l-Kadrīya) and Goksun to Kaisanya (cf. Taeschner, Türk. Bibl., xxiii, p. 36, note 4).

From 1522 belonging to Egypt, Marāš passed finally in 1540 back to the Turks. The town was occupied by the French from 1915–1920; after its evacuation it was the scene of massacres of Armenians (F. Tournebière, in Dict. d’hist. et de geogr. eccl., iv., Paris 1925, col. 360–362).

Marāš is now the capital of a vilâyet which in 1928 had about 65,000 inhabitants; the town itself has about 50,000 inhabitants.

The extent of the territory belonging to Marāš was liable to vary considerably with the vicissitudes of the town in the middle ages. The following places are mentioned as belonging to the territory of the town.

Gabaldus (= Gerhaldus, Itin. Anton., ed. Parthey, p. 85; Kleyn, Jacobus Baradoseus, p. 191; corrupted in Michæl Syrus, ii. 256 to ‘Arbādis, in Barbehaeus, Chron. syr., ii. 707 to Gerbīd), 28 Roman miles from Nicopolis (Istāfiya) and 15 from Doliche (Tell Dūluk near ‘Aintāb).


Bebedin “which is now destroyed” was the
birthplace of Nestorios near Marash (Patrol. Orient., viii. 162 sq.).

Shiraz, the birthplace of Philetares (see above).

The monastery of Mar Shinaga (Michael Syrus, iii. 148).


The modern wilayet (formerly sanjak) of Marash consists of four kazas:

Zaitun, north of Marash, scene of the Armenian rising against Turkey in 1804-1805, noted for its rich iron mines (Aghassi, Zodiac, Paris 1897; Anatole Latino, Armi e Zestan, Florence 1897).

Albasian [q. v.], also north of Marash.

Andarin, west of the town and the Djahlpin (not to be confused with the Armenian steppe); the capital of the kaza is Koheun (Armen. [Zabah]), the capital of Leo of Little Armenia.

Razadik, between Marash and Antab; the capital is Baghdir.


(Homberg)

MARASH. [See SHISHIYARI.]

MARATHA, commonly misspelt in Hindit and in Indian Persian Maratha, is the name of a people of Western India inhabiting Maharastra, the country lying to the east of the Western Ghats between the seventeenth and the twenty-first parallels of north latitude and extending at one point as far east as the seventy-ninth degree of east longitude. The Maratha caste is an agricultural caste, of common origin and nearly identical with the great Kumbi caste, but sometimes claiming a Kabaritva descent. The Marathas served in the armies of the Muslim Kingdoms of Southern India, and there gained military experience, but their opportunity came with the decline of the power of the Mughal Empire in the seventeenth century, when their national hero, Shivadji Bhonsla, converted the peasant population of Maharastra into a military nation. Shivadji was born at Shiwmar, near Dhamra, in 1627 and while his father was conquering a great part of the Carnatic for Bidjapur obtained possession of many hill forts in the Western Ghats. The Sultan of Bidjapur was unable to subdue him, and in 1659 he slew Afsal Khan, commander of the army of Bidjapur, at a friendly conference. In 1664 he sacked the city of Surat, and was obliged to contend with an imperial army sent by Awrangzib to punish him. In 1666 he was induced to pay homage to the emperor at Dilli, but was so disgusted by his reception that he escaped and, returning to the Deccan, extended his authority there until, in 1674, he assumed the title of Raja, and was ennobled at Ravgarh. He gained possession of the grants of lands in the Carnatic which his father had received from Bidjapur, and in 1680 his eldest son and successor, Sambhaji, fell into the hands of Awrangzib, who put him to death, but preserved his infant son Shishir, whom he retained at his court, and Raja Ram, Shivadji's younger son, became the ruler of the Marathas, now a nation. On the death of Awrangzib in 1707 Shishir was liberated, and mounted the throne of his grandfather, but was never more than a puppet-king, and left all business of state to his Brabman minister, or Pishwa, Balaji Vishwanath, who reduced his sovereign to the condition of a state prisoner and founded the dynasty of the Pishwas. He led an army to Dilli and extorted from an effete government recognition of the Marathas as the power to be reckoned with, or one quarter of the revenue, throughout the Deccan. In the time of his two successors, Badji Rao I (1720-1740) and Balaji Rao (1740-1761), the Marathas conquered Gujerat, Malwa, Berar, Gondwana, and Ujara, and raided the Carnatic, Bengal, and the Paundjets. They seemed to be on the point of superceding the Mughal power in India when Ahmad Shah Abdali or Durrani [q. v.] crushed them at the battle of Panipat in 1761. The Maratha power survived, however, in the hand of the Pishwa's generals, Sindhya in Gwalior, Bhonsla in Nagpur, Holkar in India, and Gekwawa in Gwalior. The power of the Pishwas survived at Panja, and a disputed succession in 1775 tempted the Bombay Government to intervene. In 1778 the Marathas surrounded the Bombay army near Puna and compelled its leader to sign a humiliating convention, but the army sent from Bengal by Warren Hastings humbled Gekwawa and the Pishwa, and another force defeated Sindhya and captured Gwalior. Peace was restored on terms favourable to the Marathas, but their confederaoy was much weakened. In 1802 Badji Rao II, who had fled to Puna, took refuge with the Government of Bombay and entered into a subsidiary alliance with the Government of India. He was reinstated in Puna by
Major General Arthur Wellesley, but Sindhya, Bhonsla and Holkar, resenting the Pishwa's subservience to the British, took up arms, and the third Marathi War began. In the Deccan Arthur Wellesley captured Ahmadnagar, won the decisive victories of Assaye and Argadon, and stormed the strong fortress of Gawil. In Hindustan General Lake defeated Sindhya's army at Laswari, and occupied Dhub. Bhonsla lost Ursara and Berar, Sindhya his possessions in the Dhub and his guardianship of the emperor, and Holkar was humbled, but after the peace the freebooters known as the Fandars, whom the Marathas had employed, continued to ravage states under British protection, and even in the Maratha territory annexed to the British domain by the Marathas. The Marques of Hastings concentrated troops to deal with these marauders, the Pishwa, Bhonsla, and Holkar rose against the British Residents at their courts. The first was defeated at Khulf, the second at Sitalal, and the army of the third was destroyed at Mahipuri. The dominions of the Pishwa were forfeited and annexed to the Bombay Presidency, and Holkar and Bhonsla lost much territory. Bhonsla died in 1853, and his dominions lapsed, in default of male issue, to the British Government. The dethroned Pishwa also lived until 1853, and his adopted son, Bhonsla Pant, was the Nana Sahib of the Indian Mutiny. This was the Maratha state at this day: those of Sindhya in Cevilliyar, Holkar in Indur, and Gekwir in Gujjarat, but not one of them is in Maharseshtra.


MARDATES. These are the Djardjima [q.v.] singular Djardjumani, of the Arabs; they are sometimes confused with the Djardumika, singular Djarmeja, so called from the name of their town Djardjima. They occupied the rugged regions of the Amanus and of the Taurus, separating Syria from Cilicia, as well as the marshy districts of Antiochene [see NIGA]. They enjoyed a semi-independence nominally under the Byzantines to whom they furnished recruits and irregular troops. When the Arabs seized Antioch the Mardates agreed to serve them as auxiliaries and scouts and to supply this facility to pass the, so-called, "Palai" of the Amanus. In the small forts built on the heights beside the defiles, commanding, the entrance to or the exit from Syria, they, in conjunction with the Arabs, supplied the garrisons. Exempt from the poll-tax, they obtained the right to spill on the field of battle. They were in every sense of the word irregulars, living by war and by raids and asking only to fight for whoever paid for their services; half-nomads, they came and went again like a flash. Very lukewarm Christian Monomithites or Monophysites—we do not know exactly—towards the loyalty either to the Byzantines or to the Muslims; this quite intermittent. "Sometimes", says Baladuri, “they obeyed our officials, at other times they betrayed us for the benefit of the Greeks". The precarious nature of the Arab conquest in the North of Syria—a varying frontier region continually devastated by the Muslims and by the Byzantines—and the difficulty of gaining access to the land of the Mardates, made it impossible to chastise such fickle allies.

Towards the year 46 (666) the Greek Emperor succeeded in sending them against Syria. This was not a raid of the type usual to the mountaineers of the Amanus, but a regular invasion supported by a few squadrons of cavalry and led by officers of the Imperial army; their bands penetrated into the heart of the Lebanon and occupied its chief strategic points as far as Palestine. The natives, discontented with Arab rule and also the thousands of slaves whom the Muslim conquerors had collected in Syria, hastened in a body to take refuge with the invaders. The highlanders of this country, who had kept their independence, also threw in their lot with the Mardates. At all costs the Omayyad government had to put an end to this dangerous movement, limit the extent of the invasion and to make sure at once of the neutrality of Byzantium who had let loose this hurricane. Not for a moment did Mu'awiyah hesitate to subscribe to the onerous terms of the Emperor—an annual tribute of 3,000 pieces of gold, the liberation of 8,000 prisoners, the delivery of 50 thoroughbred horses. In return the Emperor agreed to withdraw from the Mardates his support in men, arms and money. There is, however, no evidence that these adventurers definitely evacuated from that time their strong positions in the heart of the Syrian mountains. The neutrality of the Empire, the partial checks sustained by them and finally the establishment on the border of the Mardatta territory of a strong colony of Zut [q.v.], reduced for the moment to inaction the Djardjima, abandoned by the Byzantines.

A quarter of a century later, they once more attracted attention. This was under 'Abd al-Malik, who was engaged in an interminable war with the anti-Khilafah of the Kharijites. He was taken by surprise by the sudden rising of the Omayyad Amr al-Ash'ail [q.v.] in the year 69—70 A.H. (688—689). The Emperor Justinian II took advantage of these difficulties to let the Mardates once more loose against Syria. The result was a repetition of the movement in the reign of Mu'awiyah I. Byzantium furnished them with subsidies and with arms. At the same time he sent the army of Anatolia to advance and support the irregulars. In the same manner as in the first invasion their ranks were swollen by the accession of thousands of slaves, fugitives and malcontents, amongst whom one could probably reckon the Maronites [cf. UMAR]. Taken unaware, 'Abd al-Malik's army followed the policy of Mu'awiyah. The Emperor increased his demands. In addition to the conditions previously agreed to by the Sufyani Caliph, the Arabs were forced to abandon to the Byzantines half the tribute of Cyprus, of Armenia and of Iberia. In return for this, Justinian agreed to withdraw the Mardates. The majority of the invaders agreed to evacuate Syria. One of their chiefs, who persisted in continuing the war on his own account in the mountainous massif in the districts of Homat and of Damascus, perished, treacherously assassinated by a partisan of the Caliph. A few Mardate bands remained in the country, where we find them again still feared
and handled carefully in the caliphate of Walid I. Entrenched in their manors, protected by the great marshes and the lake region of 'Umk in Antiochene, the Djarādājm lived in practical independence of the Empire and of the Caliphate. They chose their masters and their rulers at their own convenience. At the same time some of them were quite ready to put their swords at the service of the Arabs. Amongst these must be named a leader of a band called Mātima or Maimūn. He with his contingent (about a thousand men, probably all Mardaïtes like himself) perished at the siege of Tyane. His compatriots in the Amanus seem to have wished to profit by the death of 'Abd al-Malik to renew their raids upon the Syrian provinces. Maslama, the son of the Caliph, resolved to put an end to these rebels. He penetrated into their country, laid siege to their capital Djurdjuma, and forced it to capitulate. Thousands of Mardaïtes perished in this campaign. To the remaining few was granted the right to retain their Christian faith, to serve in the Muslim armies, in fact he gave them the same terms as were obtained by their ancestors at the beginning of the Arab conquest. After this severe lesson the Mardaïte peril, which had been the cause of incessant trouble during the reign of the preceding caliphs, was practically at an end. The people of Antiochene saw emigration begin to thin their ranks, many of them having decided to emigrate to Anatolia or to enter the service of the Emperor. This resolution, however, did not prevent the Mardaïtes, who remained in Syria, from fighting under the flag of the Caliph. We still meet them under Caliph 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-Rahmān II when they co-operated with the Syrian army in the suppression of the troubles of the 'Irāq.

**Bibliography:** Masudi, Muruj, ed. B. de Meynard, v. 224, 225; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, ed. Cairo, iv. 128; Tabari, Annals, i. 796; Baladhuri, Fihrist, ed. de Goeje, p. 159-167; Suuyūtī, Ta'rīh al-Khalīfa'ū, p. 87 (where Djurdjuma is to be read as Durjuma); Ibn al-Fakih, B.G.A., p. 35; Ash'ari, v. 158, vi. 76; Michael Syrus, Chronique, ed. Chatot, ii. 479; Theophanes, Chronograph, Bonn, A. M. 6491; Weil, Geschichte, 114, 116, and Die Kämpfe mit den Romern in der Zeit des Umayyads, p. 16-18, 24; H. Lammens, Études sur le règne du calife omeyyade Mūsā, i. 14-22; Van Gelder, Mōghrī de valich proiect, Leyden 1888, p. 98-99; Ibn al-Athir, Nihāya fi Gharib al-Hadith, Bulak, i. 213, 214.

(H. Lammens)

**MARDĀWĪD** b. Ziyār, Abu 'l-Harīrīādīn, the founder of the Ziyārid dynasty, was descended on his father's side from the rulers of Gilān and on his mother's side from the Isphahān of Kūyān. He had taken service under the 'Abid rulers of Tabaristān and was a captain in the army under 'Afsār b. Shihāb. In 948 Mardāwīd submitted to Sa'yid Abū Muhammad Hāšim b. 'Ali b. Dā'ūd, and shortly after that rebelled against 'Afsār, made himself independent at Zanjān which he held in ṣurūr and captured Kazwin. He then defeated 'Afsār, forced him to fly to Tabas in Kūhustān and put him to death in 319 when he was attempting to reach the castle of Alamut [q. v.].

Mardāwīd thus became master of Ray and Tabaristān. He then defeated Mākān [q. v.] and annexed Tabaristān. Mākān attempted twice to capture Tabaristān, with the help of powerful allies, but Mardāwīd defeated him on each occasion and forced him to take refuge in Khūrāsān. At this time (319 = 931) 'Ali, Hasan and Ahmad, the three sons of Buwālī, who were commanders of the army of Mākān, deserted to Mardāwīd who conferred on 'Ali the eldest the governorship of the province of Kārādīn.

Having consolidated his power over Tabaristān and Gurgān, Mardāwīd next turned his attention to Djibāl, defeated Hārūn b. Gharib the governor, in the neighbourhood of Hamadān in 319 (931) and conquered the whole of Djibāl up to the confines of Ḥulūl. In the following year Muqtadir, the Caliph, formally recognised him as ruler of the provinces which he had conquered on condition that he evacuated Isfahān, but as Muqtadir was assassinated shortly after this Mardāwīd evaded compliance. About this time 'Ali b. Buwālī, the governor of Kārādīn, rebelled and took possession of Isfahān. Mardāwīd sent his brother Waṣqūnūr against 'Ali who abandoned Isfahān and retired to Arradān. To deal more efficiently with 'Ali, Mardāwīd made an alliance of friendship with Yākūt, governor of Shīrāz, marched to Isfahān and threatened to take the field against 'Ali. 'Ali now offered submission and, as a guarantee of good faith, sent his brother Ḥasan as a hostage to Mardāwīd.

In 322 (934) the Caliph Kāhir confirmed Mardāwīd in his government on the condition of his evacuating Isfahān. Mardāwīd obeyed and sent instructions to his brother Waṣqūnūr, the governor of Isfahān, to deliver the province to the Caliph's agent, Muṣaffār b. Yūsūf, but as Kāhir was deposed shortly after this in Djuumādā l of the same year (April-May 934 A.H.) Mardāwīd again evaded compliance.

In Saḥāf 323 (Jan. 935) Mardāwīd was assassinated by his Turkish slaves at Isfahān. He was loved by his soldiers, who, it is stated, carried his coffin on their shoulders all the way to Kayrā for burial. Mardāwīd was a man of high ambition and had drawn up a plan for the conquest of Baghdad and the restoration of the Persian Empire in his own person, but he was murdered before he could carry out this scheme.


(M. Nazim)

**MARDĪN** (written Mārūdīn in Arabic, Syriac Marde), a town in upper Mesopotamia (Diyār Rabā').

**Position.** In upper Mesopotamia, the watershed between the Tigris and Euphrates is formed by the heights which culminate in Karradaq (5,000 feet) S.W. of Deh-e-Var-bakr. This lofty massif continues eastwards in the direction of Diyarbakr. Ibn O'mar by the limestone chain known in ancient times as Masius and later as Izala ('Izāla). The eastern part of this ridge forms the district of Djabal-Tūr or Tūr Aبدīn [q. v.] the capital of which is Midya. From the southern slopes of the Masius descend numerous watercourses, the majority of which join one another before flowing between the mountains of 'Abd al-Ariz (in the west) and Tell-Kawkab and Sinjar (in the east); their combined waters form the river Khabūr [q.v.].

**The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.**
Mardin lies near the point where there is an easy pass through the Marisias from the lands south of the Tigris [the rivers Gok-su and Shakhân] to the lands round the sources of the Khabûr [the stream called Zuwârak which rises north of Mardin], in other words Mardin commands the Diyar-bakr-Nisîrân road (which then turns towards Iṣszæta b. ʿOmar and Mawṣil). On the other side towards the west several (Ritter, xi. 356, gives three) direct roads connect Mardin via Urtâ with Biređik (on the Euphrates); to the S.W. a road runs from Mardin to Raʾs al-Ain (there is now a railway) and to Harrân. The direct distances are as follows: Mardin-Diyarbakr 55 miles; Mardin-Nisîrân 30 miles; Mardin-Sawur-Midyât 75 miles; Mardin-Biređik 160 miles; Mardin-Adana (by rail) 450 miles.

The advantages of this position at the intersection of important roads are enhanced by the very strong natural situation of the town, built at a height of 4,000 feet on an isolated eminence on the top of which is a fort 300 feet above the town (cf. the sketch in Cernik, pl. ii., No. 17.). Buckingham compares its position with that of Quito in South America. All travellers (cf. Ibn Hawâkî, p. 152) have been struck by the unique spectacle of the vast Mesopotamian plain which from the height of the town is seen to stretch southwards as far as the eye can see. Only a hundred years ago Mardin was still considered impregnable, but the difficulty of access sensibly affected its commerce. According to Cernik loaded camels could not ascend right up to the town. A modern line 15 miles in length now connects Mardin with the station of Darbaziya on the "Baghdîd" railway, but the station for Mardin is five miles from the town.

Ancient History. It is noteworthy that in spite of its remarkable situation Mardin does not seem to have been mentioned in the cuneiform sources. Ammianus Marcellinus (vi. 9, 4) is the first to mention two fortresses "Maride and Lorne" between which the road passed from Amid (Diyar-bakr) to Nisîrân. Theophanes Simokattu (iii. 1, 9) mentions τὰ Μαρίδης ἡπείρας and (v. 3, 17) τὸ Μαρίδης 3 para-ranges from Dérâ. Procopius, De Aedificiis, (ii. 4) mentions Σακραγέ (or Σακραγίς) and Ἀσσυρία and Georgius Cyprius, ed. Geller, 1826, p. 46: Μαρίδης της Ασσυρίας. This name in Ptolemy, vi. 1, however, refers to another place in Assyria to the east of the Tigris.

Muslim Conquest. The Muslims under ʿIyâǔ b. Ghaṃ occupied the fortress of Mardin along with Târ ʿAbūn and Dârâ in 940 (Baladurî, p. 176). In 133 Mardin is mentioned in connection with a rebellion in Upper Mesopotamia. The town formed part of the possessions of Burâka chief of the Kafān who was defeated by the Ābâbad ʿAbû Diŋfâr (Ṭâbur. ii. 53). In 279, Ājmâd b. Ṣâk took Mardin from Muhammad b. Iṣḥâq b. Kânsâk (ibid., i. 213). Hâmûn b. Hâmûn occupied it in 280 (873); seized Mardin in 284 the caliph ʿAlî made his march on the town. Hâmûn fled and left Mardin to his son. The latter surrendered the fortress which was dismantled (cf. l. c., ii. 716). The "grey fortress" (al-bâr al-abâqât) was later restored, for Ibn Hawâkî (356) attributes its erection to the Hâmûn b. Hâmûn Nâṣr al-Dâwâl b. ʿAbd Allâh b. Hâmûn. On the death of his father in 358, Hâmûn was dispossessed by his brother Faḏl Allâh Abu Taḡlıb. By the peace of 363, concluded between the Buṭûd Bâkhṭîyâr and Abu Taḡlıb, Hâmûn recovered his possessions with the exception of Mardin (Ibn Miskawaih, ed. Amedroz, ii. 254 and 319).

The Arab geographers give few details about Mardin but they emphasise its importance. According to Ibn al-Fâṣîh, p. 132, 136, the khabûr of Mardin was equal to that of Mâyârâfikân (865,000 dirhams). Ćstâḵrîrî, p. 76k, says that it is a large town on the summit of a peak the ascent of which is a farsâlî in length; Dunaïsar [q.v.] was one of its dependencies. Ibn Ḥâwâkî, p. 143, gives the ascent at two farsâlîs. The quarter of Mardin itself was flourishing, thickly populated with large markets. The water supply was brought by subterranean canals from the springs to the town. The rain-water was also collected in cisterns (jâhârdî yâb-biḥrâ). Yâqûtî, iv. 390 (cf. al-Kâzîmî, p. 172), speaks of the splendid of the quarters outside Mardin (i.e. below the town itself) and its many madasas, hâkâmâbâds, etc.; as to the ḫâlta there was nowhere in the world so strong a defence; its dwelling-houses rose in terraces one above the other.

The Mârwanî and the Saʿîdîs. It is probable that Mardin was within the influence of the Mârwanîs, for according to their historian (cf. Amedroz, J. R. A.S., 1904), their ancestor Bâdî (d. 380 = 990) had extended his power over Diyar-Bakîr (Nisîrân, Ṭîr ʿAbîn). The Saʿîdîs ruled there next. After the death of Malikîshâh, Tâṣbûh b. Alp Aṛān seized for a time all the lands as far as Nisîrân. Under Bârî-yârû Mardin was given to his old bard (muḫgâhîn).

The Ortoķîs. At this time arose the dynasty whose fortunes are especially associated with Mardin. The son (or grandson?) of Ortoķî called Yaḵāṭtî took by stratagem the fortress in which he had been imprisoned but it was taken from him by his brother Sukmân b. Ortoķî who died in 405. In 502 we find at Mardin Il-ḫâzî b. Ortoķî (Ibn al-Aḫtr, x. 269, 321) whose line ruled there till 811 (1405) (cf. the art. ORTOķîS). (On their coins struck at Mardin in 599, 600, 654, 657, 648, 655, 656 etc., cf. Qâhillî Edhem, Catalogue des monnaies turcomanes, Constantinople 1894 and S. Lane-Poëte, Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. iii. and x. [Index, s.v. Mardin].)

In 579 (1183) Salâdîn came to Harrâm (6 miles S.W. of Mardin) but was unable to take the town. In 594 Malik ʿAdîl b. Ayyâb seized the outer suburb which was pillaged but the siege of the town itself was abandoned in the following year. In 599, ʿAdîl sent against Mardin his son al-As̄hâf who appointed governors (ḵūmān) in its dependencies. The Ayyâbî of Aleppo al-Zâhir b. Šâhā al-Dîn offered his good offices and ʿAdîl was content with an indemnity of 150,000 dinars and the acknowledgment of his suzerainty by the Ortoķîd of Mardin (cf. Abu ʿI-Iṣfârâdî, ed. Pecocke, p. 425, 427).

The Mongols. In 657 the Mongol Hâllûs Kâhân demanded the homage of the prince of Mardin, Nâḍîn al-Dîn Gâḥît Sauṭî, who sent his son Muṭâfîr to him but maintained a neutral attitude. In 658 the town was besieged for 3 months by the troops of Yâshmût, son of Hâllûs. Famine and an epidemic raged in the town. Ac-
cording to Rashid al-Din (ed. Quatremère, p. 375), Muzafrar killed his father in order to put an end to the sufferings of the inhabitants (Abu l-Faraj and Wasiṣf give different versions, cf. d’Ohsson, ii. 308, 335). Muzafrar was confirmed as lord of Mardin; his descendants also received from the Mongols the insignia of royalty (crown and parasol). In the reign of Ṣalih b. Mansūr (769 — 1367) whose sister Duniya Khatūn was the wife of the Khaṭūn Khudāshuda, Ibn Batūta (ii. 142—143) visited Mardin.

Timūr. The Otoqkād Sultan Ṣāla (778—809) was king of Mardin at the invasion of Timūr in 796. Sultan Īsā came to pay his homage to the conqueror but the citizens attacked those of Timūr’s men who ventured into the town. Malik Īsā was put in chains and taken to Sulṭānīya (Zafar-nāma, i. 663, 671—672). In April 1304, Timūr returned to the attack and the town was taken by storm. Then the siege of the upper fortress (qal’at al-shakhla) was begun but it was never taken. Timūr was content with presents and promises of kharājī and returned westward to the Verenian circuit who travelled there in 1507 (sp. cit., p. 140), Mardin was occupied without bloodshed. The same traveller mentions the fine palaces and mosques of the town; there were more Armenians and Jews in Mardin than Muslims. The battle of Calibrān (914) shook the power of the Persians. In place of Ustādjūl Muḥammad killed at Calibrān, his brother Karakhan was appointed and established his headquarters at Mardin. Soon the Ottomans occupied Dayārak and then the town of Mardin, but the Persians who never lost the fortress restored the status quo.

Persian conquest. In 913 (1507) all the lands as far as Malayān were conquered by Shāh Isma’il who appointed his general Ustādjūl Muḥammad as commander to the Verenian circuit who travelled there in 1507 (sp. cit., p. 140), Mardin was occupied without bloodshed. The same traveller mentions the fine palaces and mosques of the town; there were more Armenians and Jews in Mardin than Muslims. The battle of Calibrān (914) shook the power of the Persians. In place of Ustādjūl Muḥammad killed at Calibrān, his brother Karakhan was appointed and established his headquarters at Mardin. Soon the Ottomans occupied Dayārak and then the town of Mardin, but the Persians who never lost the fortress restored the status quo.

Ottoman conquest. Finally in 922 (1516) Karakhan was defeated and slain in battle at Karghan-dede near the old town of Koc-ţur, 10 miles S.W. of Mardin. Persian domination in Upper Mesopotamia thus collapsed, but the fortress of Mardin still remained in the hands of Sulaimān Khaḥ, brother of Karakhan. The siege lasted a year and not till Bākli Muḥammad Pāsha arrived from Syria with reinforcements was it stormed and its valiant defenders put to the sword (Ajam-ţarā, p. 24; 32; this Persian source mentions Oğuz-i Pārāk’i in place of Koc-ţar) (s. Hammer. G. O. R. 2, i. 736—749, quoting Abū l-Fidā’ī, son of Ḥakīm Idrīs and continuator of his Hatib-e-bāalik). In the Baghdad campaign of 941, Mardin was created a sanjak and included in the vilāyat of Djiyarbāke. Ellyas Celebi, iv. 59 gives Mardin 36 timarlı and 465 timar notes; Mardin could put in the field 1,600 armed men (ayebeti). In the xvith century Mardin became a dependency of the Pāshā of Baghdad: Otter (1757) found at Mardin a rizāda appointed by Ahmad Pāsha. As late as the time of Kinnir (1810), Mardin was the frontier town of the pāshālik of Baghdad and was governed by a mārerān sent from Baghdad.

The reforms of Mahbrūd were badly received in Upper Mesopotamia. In 1832 (Anjwār) Mardin rebelled. Fāṭer in Mardin had passed to the Kurd bey, the ruler of the Khowār (1816) speaks of a here- diced family who ruled in Mardin. The two brother of the ‘ruling boy’ seized the power and refused to recognise the authority of the Porte. (It may be asked if these boys were not of the Mutt tribe; on their chiefs cf. Buckingham, op. cit., p. 156) Rashid Fāṭeh, the pachir of Kurdštān, besieged the town and blew up the great mosque.
Among the religious sects of Mardin the Shevita would merit a special study. In the time of Niebuhr (1766) there were about a hundred families in the town, and Buckingham (cf. cit., p. 192) and Southgate (1837) also mention them. The Shevita probably represent the last survivors of a local pagan cult. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century they were led to declare themselves Jacobite Christians but only formally (cf. Ritter, II, P. 303-305).

Christianity at Mardin. The district of Mardin has played an exceptionally important part in the development of Eastern Christianity. A brilliant period of the Nestorian church which begins in 755 is closely associated with Mardin. Towards the end of the eighth century numerous monasteries were established round the town by the bishop John of Mardin. In 717 the Jacobite patriarchate was transferred from Diyarbakr (Amid) to Mardin. In 1207 it was moved to Deir-Za'far, an hour's journey from Mardin, to return to Mardin in 1555 (Assmann, Bibl. Orient., in 1861 p. 74; Wright, A Short History of Syriac Literature, 1891 [Index] On the position of the Christians before 1914 cf. the works of Southgate, Parry, Cuinet etc.).

Antiquities. According to Niebuhr, there are many Arabic inscriptions at Mardin. Those of the Ortokids have been studied by ‘Ali Emiri Efendi who also examined the webk documents relating to the principal buildings of this dynasty at Mardin (cf. Kātib Fereidh [944], Mardin Mutlûk-Ürikevi Türkeli, ed. and annot. by ‘Ali Emiri, Stambul 1334). For the list of buildings cf. the article ortokios. The monuments of Mardin which must be of considerable artistic interest have never been described in detail. Buckingham (p. 191) gives a few details about the minaret of the “great mosque” (a cylinder decorated with carved arches, on a square base, etc.; a stone gallery with a pointed roof on the top) i.e. the Mosque of Naq$m al-Din Alp built in 568-573; but the buildings have never been studied. We do not know if the madrasa of Ka’sim Pāshā A.Koyunlu (Niebuhr) is still in existence. The domes of the mosques of Mardin are “ribbed and guttered”, their vertical ribs radiating from the summit.


The Travels of Josef Babaru (1431) and The Travels of a merchant in Persia (1517), in the vol. of the Hâkimî Society, publ. in 1873: P. della Valle, Viaggi, Brignon 1843, i. 515 (the traveller’s wife was a native of Mardin); Tavernier (1644), Les six voyages, 1602, i. 187; Niebuhr (1766), Reisebeschreibung, Copenhagen 1778, ii, p. 391-398, and plate xlviii; Oliver (1795), Voyage, ii, Paris 12, p. 242; Dupré (1808), Voyage, i. 77-82; Kinnell, A geogr. Memoir of the Persian Empire, 1813, p. 264-265; Kinnell (1814), Journey through Asia Minor, London 1818, p. 433; Buckingham, Travels in Mesopotamia, London 1827, p. 185-194 (with a general view of the

Kaṭtā Number of towns Corresponding and villages Naḥiyas

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Köhişār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawur (Awniya)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Omur ḫādī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niṣībīn</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ḥubāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādiyāt</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Ḥādīyān (Dirūn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādiyāt</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Ḥubāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra’s al-Ain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bā’d-jumān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direk</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Ḥasan-kef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēze</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Naḥil-i Matnān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ker-ḏūs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Slābā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wilāyat now marches with the zone of the French mandate.

Population. Niebuhr (1766) counted 3,000 houses in Mardin (of which 1,000 were Christian) with 60,000 inhabitants. Dupré (1808) estimated the population at 27,000 of whom 20,000 were Turks (i.e. Muslims), 3,300 Jacobites, 2,000 Armenian, and 500 Shem-yan. The statements of other travellers are as follows: Kinneir (1814): 11,000 of whom 1,500 were Armenians; Southgate (1837): 3,000 of whom 1,700 were Muslims, 500 Armenian Catholics, 400 Jacobites, 250 Syrian Catholics, 100 Chaldaen: Mullbach (1838): 12-15,000 inhabitants; Sachau (1879): 20,000; Cuinet (1891): 25,000 of whom 15,700 are Muslims.

According to Southgate, Arabic and Kurdish are the predominating languages in the town. The rural population of Kur Abdin speaks the “Toftani” dialect of Aramaic; cf. Prym and Soci, Der neumaronische Dialekt der Tur Abdins, Gottingen 1881.
MARDIN — MARDJ RĂHĬT 277


(M. V. MINORSKY)

MARĐ DĀ’BĪK, a battlefield near Dābīk [q.v.] on the Nahr al-Kuwaïk in northern Syria. On the history of the town of Dābīk, which was known to the Assyrians as Dabgyn (Sachau, Z. A., xii. 47) and is called Dabou by Theophanes (Chron. ep. de Door, p. 431, 451) cf. above vol. i., DABIK.


When in 941 (998) the Franks conquered Ḍāqīyā, Kerbhōlā of Mawsil assembled a large army on Mard Dābīk, with which he laid siege to Ḍāqīyā (Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, x. 188; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, Kamāl al-Din etc., in Rev. hist. or. crois., i. 3, 194; iii. 580). In the spring of 513 (1119) Ḥighāz on his campaign against the Franks crossed the Euphrates at Baddāyā (now Beldā on Sachau’s map) and Sandja and advanced via Tell Bahrī (q.v.), Tell Khālīd, Marj Dābīk and Musahmiya against Kiūsmān (Kamāl al-Din, in Rev. hist. or. crois., iii. 616). In the beginning of 1124 (1674) Marj Dābīk b. ʿAbdāl was defeated by Ḥusam al-Din Timūr, on the field of Dābīk (Rev. hist. or. crois., v. 645). On his campaign against Leo II of Little Armenia, al-Malik al-Zahīr encamped in 602 (1530–1536) on Mard Dābīk (Rev. hist. or. crois., v. 155). On Saif al-Dīn Tunguz’s campaign against the Tatars to Malṭaya [q.v.] in which Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī of Ḧamā took part, a halt was made on the way back on the field of Dābīk from the 3rd Āfṣar to the 2nd Rabīṭ 277 (May 9–July 6, 1315) (Abu ʿl-Fidāʾī, Rec. hist. or. crois., i, 335).

On the 25th Radjab 922 (Aug. 24, 1516) was fought at Mard Dābīk the battle which gave Selim I a decisive victory by which Syria passed for the direction four centuries under Ottoman rule (H. Jansky, Mitteil. u. ausm. Geschicht, ii., 1923–1926, p. 214–224).


(E. HONGMANN)

MARĎ RAḤĪT, the name of a plain near Damascus. On leaving Damascus in the direction of Homs, just before crossing the pass of the Eagle, al-ʿUḏāb, one reaches the village of Marjd ʿAḥrīt. To the east of this place stretches the plain, Marjd Raḥīt, which extends as far as the desert. It was here and not in the “High place of Qaṭīfa” (l. mora) that the Kūš of the Omajyads after the death of Muʿaṣṣa II was settled. This decisive battle since it was fought in the neighbourhood of Marjd ʿAḥrīt was named by the poet al-ʿRāfī after this place. With greater exactitude the contemporary poet al-ʾAkhṭal, who was more cognisant with Omajyad history, places this battle “between the ʿUḏāb and Raḥīt” namely in “the vast plain of Marjd” mentioned by the poets (Aḡīrtn, xvii. 112).

During the discussions of the congress of Ḥābiyā [q.v.] the concentration of the Kūš forces was taking place under the command of Darāb b. Kāis [q.v.] supported by the Yemen contingent and the Kūšā’s mercenaries to the south of Damascus. Their total—which has probably been exaggerated—has been placed at 30,000. Marwan b. al-Jakum had at his command about ten thousand and combatants, the majority of whom were Kalbi. The Kāisins seem to have taken up their position first at Marjd al-Ṣuṣfār [q.v.] to the north of ʿUḏāb. After an engagement in this place had ended to their disadvantage, they were forced to double back to the north. In the meantime a sudden attack launched against Damascus which was cleared of troops, had delivered into the hands of the Omajyads the treasury and the arsenals of this town. The Kāisins in order to avoid being caught between the capital and the Kalbi army advancing from Ḥābiyā retreated, while harassed at close-quarters by their adversaries. These engagements occupied nearly twenty days. On arriving on the heights of Marjd Raḥīt, trapped between the defiles of Qaṭīfa and the desert, they accepted battle. One must ask how the Kalbi succeeded in making up for their glaring inferiority in numbers. Maṣḥūd, without explaining further, speaks of a stratagem devised by Marwan. This stratagem, which is mentioned by the author of
the Ṣalṭ al-farād, should be described not as a ruse of war but as a crime. After the advantage gained at Mardj al-Ṣuffar, the Omayyads had had the time, and without doubt made use of it, to detach from the Kāisīs their temporary allies, the Yemenis and the Kuftās. The treasure of the state seized at Dūrūy and the immense amount of wealth brought from the ʿIrāq by the family of Ziyād b. ʿAbīth may have been of assistance in doing this. The Syrian Arabs, not at their ease in the camp of ʿAbīth, no doubt understood how much the triumph of Ibn al-Zubair would be prejudicial to their hitherto privileged position and to the hegemony wielded since the days of the Ṣufyānids by the Syrian tribes. Their defection must, we think, have determined the issue of the engagement at Mardj Kāḥīt and hastened the triumph of the Omayyad arms. Whatever was the cause this victory was decisive (the middle of July 684). 3,000 Kāisīs are said to have been killed. The death of ʿAbīth seems to have been the signal of defeat, which became a regular disaster, in which the principal chiefs perished. Flight alone saved the most prominent among them, Ziyād b. ʿAbīth and his men.

The memory of Mardj Kāḥīt was deeply impressed upon the Kāisīs. It detached them en bloc from the Omayyad cause. Under the first two Marwānī caliphs, their battle-cry became "Vengeance for the victims of Kāḥīt." From this time a smile is said never to have appeared on the countenances of the surviving chiefs. Between them and their ancient rivals of the Timāmīs the split became much deeper. The latter's songs of victory answered the cries of rage of the Kāisīs. In celebrating the battle of Kāḥīt the Kalbī poets gave more emphasis to their triumph than to that of the Omayyads. Their compositions compositely develop this theme without regard to the Marwānīs, their debtors rather than their sovereigns. This great victory afforded the aged Marwānūs the opportunity of proclaiming themselves as Caliph of Damascus before beginning the conquest of the old Ṣufyānī lands now under the authority of Ibn al-Zubair. In the bosom of the Caliphate, it nourished the most dangerous rebellion; it inaugurated a savage war of extermination between Kalb and Kāisūs. The tribes of Kufta's first, then the Yemenis and lastly the Taghlib saw themselves in turnfallaciously involved. These internal feuds in which the members of the Marwānī family had the impudence to take part, to the satisfaction of their maternal connections, precipitated the fall of the Omayyad dynasty by destroying the agreement and the unity amongst the Arab tribes, which had been but imperfectly realized by the Marwānī Caliph.


(MARDJ al-ṢUFFAR, a plain situated 20 miles south of Damascus near the modern Tell ʿArām; a stream called the Wādi Ṣarīran runs through it. The place plays a part in the military history of the first century A.H.; first, in the accounts of the Arab conquest of Syria, and later at the beginning of the Marwānī dynasty. The name has been sometimes confused with that of Mardj Kāḥīt [q. v.]. For the history of Syria in the first century A.H. we are exclusively dependent upon the ʿIrāq annalists. Forgetting that the name "Mardj" abounds in the topography of the Damascus region, writers have confused two distinct battles and made them one and referred them to Mardj Kāḥīt, a name which occurs frequently in the poets of the Marwānī period.

At the close of the year 13 A.H. the Arabs, victorious at Ṣifīl, endeavoured to reach Damascus by cutting across the ʿIrāq. One of their bands, under the command of the Omayyad Kāḥīt b. Saʿīd, encamped at Mardj al-Ṣuffar and allowed themselves to be taken by surprise by the Byzantine troops. The Arab leader was killed and his men dispersed. The presence of Muslim reinforcements enabled them to regain the advantage. The Greeks then proceeded to shut themselves in Damascus, to which the Arabs at once laid siege.

In the month of May 684 (64), supporters of the Omayyads joined with Dābiya [q. v.] in order to elect a successor to Muʿāwiya II. ʿAbīth b. Šaṣī, the leader of the rival section of the Zubairis and the governor of Damascus, was invited to the conference. He promised to come to the conclave and marched out of Damascus at the head of imposing forces. But, having gone about half way on the road to Dābiya, on the heights of Mardj al-Ṣuffar, he determined to await events there. The presence of water and of forage made it suitable for the encampment of an army. An excellent opportunity of observation, the site not only commanded the congress of Dābiya, but also commanded the road leading to Damascus. ʿAbīth b. Šaṣī brought about at this point the concentration of the Kāisīs of Syria, who were in revolt against the Omayyads. At Dābiya after 40 days' deliberation, the Kalbīs and the Omayyad partisans elected Marwān b. al-Hakam [q. v.] to be Caliph. Then in their advance upon Damascus, they attacked ʿAbīth and the Kāisīs encamped at Mardj al-Ṣuffar and succeeded in defeating them.

Of this campaign the ʿIrāq annalists and their copyists have only recorded and have only desired to record the decisive battle, namely that of Mardj Kāḥīt, to the north of Damascus. For a quarter of a century no mention is made of any battle between the Kāisīs and the Kalbīs but Mardj Kāḥīt. The extraordinary prominence given to this latter battle by the poets of both sides helped to throw into oblivion the preceding engagements commencing with that of Mardj al-Ṣuffar. Certain texts have however preserved its memory. Yākūt (Muḥdjam, iii. 400) locates in this place a "battle celebrated in the history and poetry of the Marwānī period". Otherwise there is no reference to Mardj al-Ṣuffar in the military history of the younger branch of the Omayyads. As regards poetry it has kept for us the testimony of the Taghlibī poet al-ʿAḥdāl [Dirāsh, ed. Salīh, p. 224, v. i.]. This contemporary poet, who was a habitué of the Omayyad court while praising the glorious deeds of his
tribe, claims for it "many victories even before Mardj al-Ṣuffār". As we know that the Ṭaghūbīs fought in the ranks of the Omayyads, for whom they showed themselves at all times strong partisans, the reference must be to this battle. Moreover the manner in which al-Akhṭal praises this victory suggests that he was not dealing with a small skirmish.

In the meanwhile an Omayyad partizan residing at Damascus had seized the capital. The position became untenable at Mardj al-Ṣuffār for the Kaisīs. It was to avoid being caught between Damascus and the victorious Khalībīs that Dājjāl fell back precipitously to Mardj Kāštīr where he was defeated and killed. On the 22nd June 681, the election of Marwān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was proclaimed at Dājjībī. It is probable then that the battle of Mardj al-Ṣuffār must be located in the early days of ʿAbd al-Ṣuffār. The situation became untenable at Mardj al-Ṣuffār for the Kaisīs. It was to avoid being caught between Damascus and the victorious Khalībīs that Dājjāl fell back precipitously to Mardj Kāštīr, where he was defeated and killed. On the 22nd June 681, the election of Marwān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam was proclaimed at Dājjībī. It is probable then that the battle of Mardj al-Ṣuffār must be located in the early days of ʿAbd al-Ṣuffār.
3. 'Omar Niẓām al-Din al-Farqānī. Two works by him are recorded: 1. Fawā'id (II. Khb., No. 9305); 2. Dīwān al-Fikhr, which he compiled from the Mutḥaṣṣar of Taḥawī and other works (II. Khb., No. 4291; MSS. in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 376, note 2, where the mark of interrogation should be deleted; cf. Kurāshī, ii. 394; Laknawī, p. 149).


Th. J. Arnaud (1843), J. Halévy (1869) and E. Glaser (1888), is situated in the plateau of Sāba, 3,900 feet above sea-level, which runs east of the Balaq range and is traversed by the Wādī Dženné (Adhāna) which in the course of millennia has deposited a thick layer of silt and thus made a luxuriant vegetation possible. The modern village of the same name stands on a large mound of ancient rubble within the old city walls and is situated about exactly in 15° 26' N. Lat. and 45° 16' East. Long., about 10 days' journey from the Red Sea and the same from the Gulf of 'Aden. This favourable situation destined Mārib to be the centre of the Sabean kingdom, the heart of which was the southwestern corner of the Arabian Peninsula and which at times also included the eastern hinterland of the Gulf of 'Aden including Ḥḍraṃwīt and Mahrā (E. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 18, 185). Mārib also lay on the important caravan-route which connects the lands which produced frankincense with the
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synopsis by Māḥmūd b. Șādīr al-Shārīa I
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II. Another family of Ḥanafī lawyers goes back to 'Abī Abī 'Alī b. 'Abī Abī 'Rāyāb b. Șādīr b. Djaṣār b. Sulaimān al-Marghīnānī, who died in 477 (1084-1085) in Marghīnān at the age of 68. Of his six sons who attained fame as multās we may mention Abū 'l-Ḥasan Ṣāhir al-Din 'Ali († 506 = 1112-1113). His son and pupil was Ṣāhir al-Din al-Ḥasan b. Abū Abī 'l-Ḥasan b. 'Ali Abī 'l-Marghīnānī. Four works by him are recorded: Akdīyya, Fawā'id, Fawā'id and Shārī'a, only the last of which survives in manuscript. He was the teacher of the famous Fakhr al-Din Kālidkhān († 592 = 1196) and of Burhān al-Din al-Marghīnānī (q.v.).

Bibliography: Samadhī, K. al-Anbāb, fol. 522; Kurāshī, No. 487, 850, 1010; Laknawī, p. 62, 97, 121; Flugel, Classen d. kanaf. Rechtsgesch. Leipzig 1860, p. 309; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 379. (Heffening)

Mārib (Mārīb), a town in the southwest of Arabia, formerly the capital of the Sabaeans and now the capital of the amirate of the same name.

The ancient town of Mārib, which so far has only been visited by three European travellers, Mediterranean (Gaza-Ghazze) and which ran from Shajwāt-Sabata via Thobma-Tumma near Darb Kōlān in the Wādī Bālān, through Wādī Ḥālib via Mārib into the Minaean Dīwaf, to Nadjiya and from there via Thirmālā, Abā al-Khadār, Ḥalālī, al-Qīṣa, Djalīl, Bedr, Wādī 'l-Ḥāfiz, Wādī 'l-Hāfizī, Wādī 'l-Pāīd, Ḥārādje, Kōtba, Banāt Ḥarb, Djaḥrā, Tēhā, Kān al-Mānūzil, Mēkā, Yathērīb (al-Medīna), Fakdū, Kḥībār, al-'Ula, Tāmā, Akra, Ūbah, al-Hijr, Maḏnā, Ḥamād, al-Ḥašī, Atām, Aḏhrūb to Petra and thence to Gaza while Mārib was also connected with al-Ṭaymān, the coast of the Persian Gulf and Babylonia, via Nēqrān by the route which followed the Wādī 'l-Dawāsir (cf. A. Grohmann, Historie-geographische Bemerkungen zu Gt. 418, 419, 1000 A. B., p. 116 sq.). It still forms an important junction and has good connections with Ḥadrāmōt, Redā, Verim, Šānṣa, al-Djaflāw, Šāfīd, Nēqrān and the Wādī 'l-Dawāsīr (E. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 26).

The ancient city wall, 3 feet thick, enables us still to recognise with more or less certainty 8 gates — not only 2, as Th. Arnaud (Plan de la ligne et de la ville de Mārib, in J. A., ser. vii,
vol. iii. [1874], p. 12) thought — distinct gate-like breaks in the stone wall. They are now called Bâb al-Ākîr (W.), Bâb al-Hâdî (S.W.), then along the south wall to the east and from here to the north, Bâb al-Nâṣr, Bâb Aḥâl Qâr, Bâb al-Mah-ram, Bâb al-Darb, Bâb al-Qibla, Bâb al-Majdîn. The names Bâb al-Nâṣr, Bâb al-Darb and Bâb al-Hâdî are still borne by the gates of the modern village of Mârib but the modern Bâb al-Nâṣr corresponds to the Bâb al-Ākîr of the ancient town, since from the latter by traversing the whole of the old town the village is reached through the Bâb al-Nâṣr.

The old town forms at the present day a considerable mound or rather a number of mounds of ruins, out of which project remains of walls and portions of columns. Excavations conducted here would, as Glaser pointed out, bring to light most unexpected things. Four distinct areas may be distinguished in the site: 1. The mound on which stands the modern village which stands in the eastern part, almost in the S.E. corner, of the old town and seems to consist entirely of refuse and rubble, beneath which at a considerable depth one comes upon old buildings. Glaser believed that these old buildings represent the oldest part of the town upon which in the later centuries the Sabaic wall was built. It is also possible that the town of Mârib or at least many of its buildings have been several times destroyed. The topmost stratum is of course of comparatively recent date if we exclude the many old stones with Sabaean inscriptions. The village, which, according to Glaser, can hardly have more than 600 inhabitants, consists of about 80 houses, usually in several stories on a rectangular plan narrowing a little as they ascend. Only the lower parts are of stone, the rest is of clay. Only the two fort-like houses of the amir are built entirely of hewn stone. The outer wall of the village consists simply of the walls of the outermost houses, which are built on to one another or linked up by connecting walls. The village has two gates of some size, one facing west and the other south, and several small doors. There is an old well outside the village between this and the eastern gate of the old town, and also the chief mosque (Masjid Sabâlim). 2. The Majdân Umm al-Kîs identified by Glaser in his Kartênbuch, p. 8 with Umm Billîs, in the S.E. corner with great mounds of ruins, which perhaps come from castles. 3. The S.W. area which apparently contained temples and castles. 4. A large round open space (Majdân) in the N.W. and western part of the mound which does not seem to have been built on in ancient times either. It stretches almost to the modern village and particularly on the south side is surrounded by portions of columns and other ruins (E. Glaser, Reise nach Mârib, p. 48 sq., 73). These faceted columns which still protrude 3—4 feet out of the ruins, one of which lying on the ground measured 12—15 feet, are also mentioned by Arnaud (p. 12). The place is probably identical with the "Champs de Mars" mentioned by the French traveller in his report to Frenzel (J. A., ser. iv., vol. i. [1845], p. 335).

The place in any case was at one time surrounded by large buildings which are now in ruins and form great mounds, which are also dotted with fragments of columns and Glaser leaves the question open whether there were here the palaces of the kings and notables or the temples of the ancient Sabaean. To the south of the Maidân in particular may still be seen the foundations of a colossal building which Glaser wanted to identify with the famous royal citadel of Sahîn celebrated by later tradition.

The old town which occupied an area of about 1,000 yards square, a calculation by E. Glaser, which agrees with Th. Arnaud's plan of the town (J. A., ser. vii., vol. ii. [1874], p. 11) [Glaser gives the distance between the two opposite gates as 1/4 hour], is built entirely on the left bank of the Wâdî Dhenne. It seems, to conclude from the remains of the 3 feet thick wall around it, which has only survived in places, to have practically formed an oblique angled parallelogram the longer sides of which follow the line of the Wâdî Dhenne while the eastern and western sides (breadth) run practically due north and south. The southern wall which runs parallel to the river bank turns from north to east at an angle of 60° and runs almost E.N.E. This fact is clear not only from E. Glaser's description of his Reise nach Mârib (p. 36 sq., 45) and the Mârib Tagebuch but also from Glaser's Skizzen (No. 51) upon which is based the appended plan of Mârib and vicinity. It is a striking contrast to Th. J. Arnaud's description and map (J. A., ser. vii., vol. ii. [1874], p. 11) [Glaser gives the wall around Mârib described a circle and also to Glaser's earlier sketches in his large Kartênbuch, p. 8 sq. and the map drawn up after investigations in the year 1888, which forms fol. 4 of E. Glaser's collection I. The foundation of the wall consists of cement blocks 5 feet long, 15 inches high and 2 feet thick. On the top of 8—10 layers of these blocks are placed regularly hewn blocks of marble of the same size. The wall which unfortunately is almost completely destroyed does not run in a straight line but at regular intervals there are rectangular projections, as is clearly shown in E. Glaser's already mentioned sketch No. 51 and in that of his Tagebuch, xi., p. 125, which moreover gives the plan of the town as a rectangle — Glaser notes here "the city wall was apparently built as a quadrilateral" —, while No. 51 shows rather a trapezium the base of which lies away from the river while the shorter side parallel runs along the river. The rectangular projections found at regular intervals were probably towers, which strengthened the defences and stood out at regular intervals in the style we know from Assyrian fortifications (cf. the similar quadrangular plan of a fortress in the Sulaymān inscription). Near the corner and towers covered by steplike battlements in B. Meiser, Babylonien und Assyrien, i., Kulturgesch. Bibliothek, i. 3, Heidelberg 1920). That the city walls of Mârib had towers is also evident from the great inscription (Glaser 418—419) which is older than the great Sirwâh inscription Gl. 1000. In this we are told in line 4 that the unknown ruler built "the two gates of Mârib (Mârib) and built towers for Mârib of Balâq stone" (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Altabarische Texte, i. 6 sq.).

Rhodokanakis suggests, presumably rightly, that this king was continuing the work of the unnamed son of the Sabaean mukarrab Sumuhr-Salāya Yânît (الللاه يانيت) who, according to the inscriptions Glaser 412 = Arnaud 41. 413 = Arnaud 42, 414. 427, 445. 500. 510. 537. 589. 600. 634 and perhaps also 751, "built a wall around Mârib
(Alqārā) by command of and with the help of 'Alqārā'. Whether the son of Sumuḥ-‘alayya Yanāf was the builder of Mārib seems uncertain; in any case he is the oldest builder of the town whom we know from the inscriptions.

Nor is it known who founded Mārib. That it was Saba‘, son of Yabhūb, as the Arab genealogists think, is of course quite an unfounded supposition (cf. Yāqūt, Muḥtabak, p. 239; Abu 'l-Fath, Historia antemelica, p. 114 sq.; A. v. Kremer, Uber die sudarabische Sage, p. 26 sq.; E. Osiander, Z. D. M. G., x. 68).

That the city wall was frequently restored is evident from the fact that inscribed blocks of the earliest period of Sabaean history were used as building material in any order without heeding the context of the inscription (cf. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 48 sq., 51, 74) which is the case e.g. in the texts Glaser 695—707, and as there were no inscriptions of a later period in the lower strata the renovation must have begun after the reign of the three Sabaeans mukarribas Yidr‘-Ibu-Bayn, Sumuḥ-‘alayya Yanāf and Yidr‘-Ishā‘a Watar. To the same period as these inscriptions must belong the old Sabaean boustrophedon text, Glaser 926 = 1350 + 1351 = 1736, which comes from al-Meshdāḥ, not far east of Sīrūḥ, in the second line of which there is mentioned the building of a road up to the gate of Mārib (Alqārā) (cf. E. Glaser, Allgemeine Nachrichten, i., Munich 1908, p. 98 sq. and N. Rodokanakis, Kitabīm An-Nasrī Texte zur Bodenwirtschaft, ii. 49, and note 3, 54—56). Of the three Sabaeans mukarribas mentioned here Yidr‘-Ishā‘a, Yidr‘-Ibu and Sumuḥ-‘alayya, the first, as N. Rodokanakis himself states, is identical with Yidr‘-Ishā‘a Watar, Yidr‘-Ibu with Yidr‘-Ibu-Bayin, the conqueror of Nashik, while Sumuḥ-‘alayya is perhaps the same as Sumuḥ-‘alayya Yanāf, in whose reign the inscription Glaser 926 was set up. Glaser must also be right in assuming (Stitzer, i. 68) that the town of Mārib is considerably older than the wall and a number of decades must have passed away before the town attained the extent indicated by the oldest remains of walls. This is also evident from the mention of independent kings of Mārib in the inscription Glaser 302 which is older than Glaser 418—419. A memory of this earliest period in Sabaean history seems to be preserved by the poet ‘Alqama Dhu‘ Di‘adan, who mentions kings of Mārib along with kings of Sīrūḥ (cf. D. H. Muller, Sabatische Denkmäler, p. 99).

According to al-Hamdāni (Kitāb, viii., in D. H. Muller, Burgen u. Schlosser, ii. 949 sq., 1038 sq.), there were in Mārib the three citadels Salḥin, al-Ka‘shib and al-Hadājir. For the former which is expressly stated to have been the royal capital and palace of Bilkis, cf. the article Salḥin. The question where this castle is to be located in Mārib has been very variously answered. D. H. Muller, Burgen u. Schlosser, ii. 968 thinks that Salḥin was on the site of the modern village of Mārib, which, as Arnaud had already suggested, had been occupied by an old citadel (J. As., iii. 1907, vol. iii. [1874], p. 12). Glaser (Reise nach Mārib, p. 73) on the other hand identifies Salḥin with the colossal building the foundations of which lie south of the Maidān. In connection with Salḥin, al-Ham-dānī also mentions the lower pillars of the throne (of Bilkis) — so D. H. Muller translates arq — which became celebrated in the Muslim world through Kurān xxvii. 23 and were still standing in his time and so firmly rooted in the ground that they could not be overthrown. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 139 however assumes that the reference here is to the Ḥaram of Bilqis with its pillars but admits the possibility that a citadel of the town proper is being described, since Salḥin is talked of immediately afterwards. Djiṟdí Zaidān, Kiṭāb al-‘Arab Ǧabīl al-‘Iṣlām, p. 143 also assumes that the palace of Salḥin is referred to. Sprenger, Post-u. Reisenreisen, p. 140 also tells of this throne of Bilkis that it stood on stone pillars 29 ells high which were still intact and the foundations were as deep as its height (this statement is erroneously attributed by Sprenger to Bakri but presumably comes from Ibn al-Mudjāwis). The Ḥaram-Ǧanāma also (cf. Jomard in F. Mengin, Histoire de l’Egypte, p. 344) says that the throne of Bilkis was built on columns 28 ells high in Saba‘ (Mārib). This sounds very improbable if we should really understand by arq a throne, which according to Nashwān al-Himyari, p. 50, stood in the palace of Bilkis in Mārib. When however we are told by Nashwān, p. 70, that arq is a castle which was built on columns of stone and the verse of As‘ād ‘Ibība‘ quoted gives the name arq to the palace of Bilkis, we may then in the above passages take it to mean a citadel rather than a throne and with Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 73, look for it in the S.E. corner of the old town. Legend has associated the name ‘Arq Bilkis with other localities also. According to Abu ‘l-Rabi‘ Sulaymān b. al-Raiḥān in Yāqūt, Mu‘jam, ii. 640, it is the name of a day’s journey from Dhamār on which stand six marble columns and the principal group of pillars of the old ruins of Sīrūḥ still bears this name (J. Halēvy, Rapport, J. A., ser. vi., xix. [1872], p. 67 sq.; Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 179). On the other hand, it is an open question where the two other citadels al-Kaṣhib and al-Hadjar mentioned by al-Hamdāni and Bakri (Mu‘jam, ii. 502) are to be located. According to Yāqūt, Mu‘jam, iv. 104, al-Kaṣhib was built by order of king Shahribol b. Yabhūb, who put up on it a copper plate inscribed “They who built this castle are Thwāib and Sīhar; its building was entrusted to them by Shahribol b. Yabhūb, the king of Saba‘ and of the Thāma and its Arabs”. D. H. Muller in Burgen u. Schlösser, ii. 1039, notes that he has already identified Shahribol b. Yabhūb with king Ilīshārah Yabīl of the Sabaean inscriptions (Glaser, N. 424, 220; Bibl. Nat., N. 2) and for Thwāib compared the Sabean Thwāib and for Sīhar (so to be read, not ḫwāb) the similar Sabean name. If the inscription given by Yaḥūf really goes back to a genuine muṣanāt inscription, Kaṣibb must have been built about the first century A. D. If the Sabean king here mentioned whose epithet in the Ḥimyar kaṣīṭa (verse 109) publ. by A. v. Kremer is to be read Ǧabīl, in the Sabean inscription Bibl. Nat., ii. 2 [cf. article Salḥin] speaks expressly of Salḥin, Glaser, and Sīrūḥ only and does not mention al-Kaṣhīb, this is not itself proof that Yaḥūf’s foundation inscription is not genuine. The building might easily be later than the inscription Bibl. Nat., N. 2. A difficulty however is raised by the fact that al-Hamdāni (in Muller, Burgen und Schlösser, ii. 1039) and Nashwān al-
HI fair (quoted ibid., note 1) give al-Khashib b. Dhi Hazfar as the builder. Glaser, Reise nach Marib, p. 139, goes so far to say that the name Khashib is derived from the verb khash, which occurs in dedicatory inscriptions, and the form of the king's titles points to the last period of Himyarite rule, and the king is to be identified with Sha'rubil Yaffur; indeed it must be conceded that the style and titles are quite unusual for a king of Saba' and Dhi Ridain and for this reason the muqadd inscription must be regarded as a forgery. This does not mean that al-Hamdani's note is to be rejected as worthless. F. Hommel (Ethnologie u. Geographie d. alten Orienten, p. 666 and note 2) has shown the possibility that the castle of Hadjar (the name means "the town") was perhaps the principal castle, on the ruins of which the modern village of Marib was planted and the older and more celebrated Salhin was a smaller castle. If we remember the meaning "new" given in Yaghi, iv. 104 and Nashind, p. 86, we khashib, al-Khashib might also be an epithet of the citadel as the "new" which came to be erroneously differentiated from al-Hadjar as the name of a third castle. Al-Bakri, Minhaj, ii. 502, 754 explains the difficulty by saying that al-Khashib was the last of the castles to be built in Marib and therefore called the "new". The Masjidul Sulaiman lies to the west, just below the village which is built on a great mound of rubble. This Masjidul Sulaiman b. Dabud, now the principal mosque of Marib, according to Arnaud (J. A., ser. viii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 13) an obviously modern building, square with a flat roof and built of hewn stones, is of interest because, according to E. Glaser (Reise nach Marih, p. 41, 73 sq.), its north side is built against 7 or 8 colossal columns (monoliths) which correspond exactly to those of the Haram Bilkins and the Aramid to be discussed below. Glaser suggests that there was once a temple here similar to the Haram Bilkins. F. Hommel, Ethnologie u. Geographie d. alten Orienten, p. 666) doubts this as well. The Masjidul Sulaiman was the temple of the chief deity. This principal temple in his opinion formed a group with the second temple, which lay on the south side of the Masjid — according to Arnaud (plan of Marib) local tradition thinks this was the site of an ancient temple. The length (2,000 yards), suggested by F. Hommel (op. cit., p. 666) for the distance of this second temple from the Masjidul Sulaiman, is however too high, as both Glaser and Arnaud put the distance between the two opposite city walls at only 1,000 yards. J. Halevy's figure (Kapiteln, J. A., ser. viii., 1872), p. 66, which puts the diameter of the Marib ruins at about 500 yards would give a much shorter distance but the estimate is certainly a very casual one and hardly to be taken seriously.

In the south and west outside the old town walls lies an old cemetery with a number of tombs, some vertical and some horizontal, the latter of which have a small opening at the top. It is now called Medjennat (or Djibat) Ghara. It is probably from here that have come a number of old Sabaean tombstones (Glaser, No. 654, 745). Glaser found the bust let into the stone still in its place (cf. Reise nach Marib, p. 75, 92; Tagteuch, xi. 59). We may probably find the models for these tombstones in the steles of Asur. Stone sarcophagi are also sometimes found. Glaser believes that Marib was before the great well of Marib as a drinking-trough for animals (Reise nach Marib, p. 74).

In the southwest of the old town outside the city walls, Glaser found a remarkable building still partly preserved (G on the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Marib) which was probably used for distributing the water and has on its north side the inscription Glaser 474 = 1671. It consists of two huge stretches of wall running due east and west in one line with a gap in the centre. The two corners of the northern entrance of this passage are angular while at the south side the two are rounded. The inscription, which is placed on the north side of the eastern wall states that Dimiri-ayya Watar, Makariib of Saba', son of Karaba-iln, built a WB (fist) opposite (or in front of) the sanctuary of Atharar. Glaser actually found some 300 paces N.W. or N.W.W. of this building, also outside of the old city walls but quite close to them, a ruin unfortunately reduced to a heap of rubble, which from its plan suggests a sanctuary, since on the N.E. side (the right stretch of wall) the niches, for an idol can still be seen (Reise nach Marib, p. 40; Tagteuch, xi. 47: H on the plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Marib).

S.S.E. of the modern village of Marib (D) at a distance of about 3 miles between the Wadi Dhene and Wadi 'Feledg is the Haram Bilkins (D) which was visited by Th. J. Arnaud on July 20, 1843 and by E. Glaser on March 25, 1888 (cf. J. A., ser. vii., vol. iii. [1874], p. 14 sq.; Glaser, Reise nach Marih, p. 41, 44 sq., 73, 157, 141); the latter corrects Arnaud on a number of essential points. The Haram is a large building, elliptical in form, the length of the long axis of which 300 ft can still be seen (Reise nach Marih, p. 44-46). The short axis runs N.E. to S.W. and is 250 ft in length. It is built of regularly hewn square blocks which are placed one above the other in 31 layers up to the frieze so that the height of the wall is 31 ft. This wall is finished off with a double cornice at the top which consists of two rows of blocks which follow one another at short intervals and look like dice on the top of the wall, the result being a mural crown-like frieze which recalls the relief found by Th. Bent in Jeha in Abyssinia (cf. Th. Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians, London 1893, p. 141) and the top of the Sabean relief in D. Nielsen, Hamilok de alto-african Altertumskunde (p. 157, fig. 44). The row of blocks below the lower cornice form a simple and effective decoration by placing the blocks four to six inches apart so as to leave little gaps. A similar kind of mural decoration is known from the Sabaean temple of Jeha (cf. Deutsche Akademie-Expedition, ii. 80, fig. 165). The frieze is still quite intact in place, especially on the east side. There is no trace of a roof. But it cannot be asserted definitely that there never was one. Glaser assumes; the windowless building could have been lit by skylights. There are two doors in the wall, the larger (a) at the northeast end of the shorter axis and the smaller (b) at the N.W. end of the building at the end of the larger axis.
Exactly N.E. of the centre of the building there are four other monolithic pillars in the wall itself. Originally there were a larger number here so that the main gateway (a) had a pillared way leading to it. N.E. of these at a distance of 32 paces are 8 columns which are also erected in a line running from S.E. to N.W. (E). They are rectangular prisms, smooth, 15 feet high without capitals and terminate in dice-shaped tops 4 inches long on which stood the architrave. On the S.S.E. side of the Haram just outside the

wall, four small pillars form a little square the sides of which lie W. to E. and S. to N. (c). Perhaps we have here the pillars for the canopy of a throne which was probably similar in appearance to the Aksumite king’s throne illustrated in Deutsche Aksum-Expedition, ii. 65, fig. 139. The floor of the building never seems to have been levelled, as a natural rock was almost in the middle. Unfortunately in the interior the walls are nowhere clear, so that Glaser could form no deductions as to what it must have looked like.

inside. He expressly states however that he could discover no chambers in the walls as he had expected. On the other hand, the fine inscriptions on the outside of the walls give us information as to the purpose of the building — it is a temple of the Sahaeen moon-god Almahah — as well as the history of its erection. Arnaud was only able to copy 3 of these inscriptions, two others whose existence he established were covered by sand, which has since made further progress, so that he could not copy them. The oldest in-

Plan of the immediate vicinity of the old town of Maryab.

A the modern village of Marib, B Umm al-Ks, C Masjid Sulaiman, D Haram Bilakis, E Amari, F Pillars E.S.E. of al-Merwath, G old Building not given a definite name, H Temple, L-K old city-walls of Maryab, L Wadi Dhene.

inscription Glaser 184 is on the 28th layer from above on the east side. It records that Yidi-lu Bahr, son of Sumaha-ka’an, makarrib of Soba’, built the wall of the temple of Almahah ‘Awm (cf. the latest definitive edition of the text in N. Rhodokinakis, Studien, ii. 7 sq.). Since the brilliant E. Osiander had previously recognised (Z. D. Jr. G., x. 70) that the Haram Bilakis was a temple of Almahah, Glaser (Skizze, i. 68) was able to deduce rightly from this inscription that the sanctuary ‘Awm frequently mentioned here
and in other Sabaean inscriptions was this very temple. From it the god Almahkah is called "lord of ‘Awm (אום)". The completion of this temple which was begun by Yidī-ilu Dharīḥ, by ‘Iššāriḥa, son of Sumuhu-‘alaya Dharīḥ, king of Saba, is recorded in the inscription Glaser, 475 = Arnaud 55, which is on the west side of the Haram on the 14th layer of stones (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, i. 12 sgg.) Glaser 481 = Arnaud 56, which is on the 13th and 14th layer on the north side records the completion of the wall from the inscription to the top by Tubakarib a prominent official and general of three Sabaean kings (N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 15 sgg.). Connected with this are two inscriptions of similar content, Glaser 482 = Arnaud 54 on the south side of the 13th layer and Glaser 483 = Arnaud 54 on the east side at the same height. They record the restoration of a ruined part of the wall (presumably the part of the temple) under King Karib-‘ul Uwar Yahudim of Saba and Dhū Rādān, the son of Dhimir-‘alaya Bayin, and his son Hulik-amara. Whether this concludes the history of the building of the Haram seems doubtful since, according to Glaser, Keit nach Mārib, p. 46, inscriptions may still be concealed under the sand on the north and west sides also.

The orientation of the building is of interest. The little door of the Haram (φ) faces that temple of the old town of Mārib on the site of which now stands the Masjid Sulaimān. On the prolongation of the shorter axis to the N. E. lies the ruin called al-Mikrāb, and Glaser has, perhaps rightly, suggested from this arrangement of the two buildings that there was some connection between their purposes. Both buildings are moreover oriented by the course of the Wādi Dhenne. On the south side of the old city wall may still be seen the remains of a bridge which was built almost exactly in the direction of the Haram and, according to the local tradition, once reached to it. Even if this is an exaggeration it is nevertheless probable that a bridge was built over the river Dhenne, and in the rainy season the floods must certainly have inundated the fields; the continuation of this bridge to the Haram was probably only a dam of which no trace now remains.

However unusual the elliptical form for the plan of a temple may appear, this is certainly not an isolated example in Southern Arabia. F. Fresnel (J. A., ser. iv., vol. vi., p. 223) mentions the great ruins of Kharib (Sirwah) which cover an even greater area than those of the Haram Bilḥis and include a semi-ellipse and long rows of pillars still in position. According to Arnaud, this elliptical plan has also been found by Halley (J. A., ser. vi., vol. xix., p. 67) and by Glaser, Keit nach Mārib, i. 110; also by Skizze, i. 67 sgg.). According to the inscription Glaser, N° 901-903, its builder was the Sabaean mukarrab Yidī-ilu Dharīḥ, who also built the temple of ‘Awm and the round temple of al-Masajidād.

F. Hommel (Ethisologie, p. 664 sgg.) has endeavoured to show how this temple came to have its modern name of Haram Bilḥis. In analogy to the Assyrian and Babylonian temples extra murus which were always dedicated to the wife of the chief deity and in which in the month of the new year his wedding ceremony took place, Hommel sees in the Haram Bilḥis the wedding house of Almahkah, the sanctuary of his wife Harimat and seems to assume that the name is also connected with this. D. H. Müller (Jüngen und Schlesier, ii. 972 sgg.) has shown how the Arab archaeologists transformed the god Almahkah into Yalmaḥak and then gave this name to the legendary Blikis and also made a haram (women's apartments) out of the sanctuary (sanctuary) of the god. F. Fresnel's reasoning moves on similar lines (J. A., ser. iv., vol. vi., p. 226 sgg., 334 sgg.). He assumed that Blikis was not the correct name of the queen of Saba but rather Balkamah (so Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, in the Iḥāl al-ḥarīd and Ibn al-Djawzi in the Miṣrī al-Zamān) which was formed from Almahkah. The queen of Saba was in this way deityed by the Sabaens and became the Isis of the Arabs.

In the S. S. E. of Mārib and according to Arnaud 1/2 hour E. S. E. of the Haram Bilḥis — while the latter, according to Glaser, Keit nach Mārib, p. 41 lies almost due east barely 1/2 hour from the five pillars — there stand on the opposite bank of the Wādi Dhenne, 1/2 hour or 1/2 miles (according to Glaser, Skizze, N°. 51) from the town, the pillars called 'A‘mā‘īd. Five are still upright; these are 25–30 feet high, 32 inches broad and 24 deep, pinnate, rectangular monoliths which were erected perpendicularly to the direction of the Wādi Dhenne. Two which have been overthrown lie beside them on the ground. The pillars had no capitals and were just like the other pillars (at the Haram Bilḥis and other ruins outside the town). On the fragments of the two fallen pillars Glaser discovered incriptions on each (Glaser 479 and 480 = Arnaud 53) from which it appears that a sanctuary Barān (בַּרוֹן) dedicated to the god Almahkah or some such sanctuary stood here. This name occurs not only in this inscription but is mentioned in Ottom Mus., N°. 17 (D. M. Gr., xxxi. 486, N°. 1, 3) where J. H. Mordtmann reads [הָרָון] and the name of this place is also found in Halley, N°. 43, 48, 4 (בַּרוֹן) and 534, 4 (בַּרוֹן). To the west just beside the pillars lies a mound of ruins, which perhaps represents the remains of this sanctuary. Arnaud (J. A., ser. vii., iii. [1874], p. 15) describes these pillars as pilasters of the Haram Bilḥis and puts their height at 28 spans. In contradiction to Glaser, Arnaud says they have square capitals. His illustration under the plan of the Haram Bilḥis shows a pillar with a stepped capital like those from Aksām and Kohato in Abyssinia (Deutsche Akimin-Expedition, i. ed. by D. Krenke, Berlin 1913, p. 102, fig. 224 and p. 155, fig. 319). Which of the two explanations is right, it is difficult to say as Glaser is usually very accurate, in his observations. On the other hand, Arnaud cannot possibly have invented this rather unusual but nevertheless typical form for ancient South Arabia and made his drawing accordingly. The only way out of the difficulty is to suppose that in Glaser's time the capitals — of which Arnaud says he cannot say definitely that they belonged to the pillars — had been broken off. According to Arnaud, the pillars stand close together at intervals corresponding to their thickness. That the pieces of stone on the ground near the row of pillars once belonged to the pillars was noticed by Arnaud (p. 16) although he copied one of the inscriptions on them (Arnaud 53 = Glaser, N°. 480) (cf. E. Glaser, Keit im Mārib, p. 401, 141).
The numerous separate finds made by Glaser in the neighbourhood of Mārib, sacrificial altars, masons’ workshops etc. cannot be discussed here. On the other hand, there is one erection which demands a rather thorough discussion as it surpasses all these already mentioned in magnitude and preserved the fame of Mārib down to the late Islamic period, namely the dam and works connected with it, known in Muslim tradition as Sudd Mārib or Sudd al-‘Ardim.

The Wādī Ḍhinne in the course of time had cut a way through the Bālah hills here and divided the two parts Bālah-Ṣa’il and Baḥr-Ḥay’al-Awsat. The Sabaean had built a dam of earth across the gap some 770 paces long behind which the water was collected. The dam, which Glaser (Reise nach Mārib, p. 58 sqq., 173 sq.) describes minutely, rises some 20—25 feet above the present level of the Wādī and is simply a mound of earth the section of which is an isosceles triangle the angle at the top of which is quite sharp. The angle of inclination of the two surfaces to the base is about 45° and the breadth of the base about 50 feet. The proper base and the height of the dam cannot be accurately ascertained as the mud has accumulated to the depth of many feet. But it can be assumed that the dam rested on a foundation of rock as the narrow passage between the two Bālah hills has a rocky foundation which comes up very nearly to the surface. But for this firm foundation of rock it would have been impossible to build the dam at all. The side of the dam which met the water (the western) is covered with small sharp unhewn stones, held together so strongly by mortar that it is impossible to detach one of them. The dam, which is 1½ hours from Mārib, is flanked in the north and south by two great sluices, the southern one of which is known as Marbaq al-Dīm. Here on the site of the dam a great rock (A) 95 paces long and 15 yard in width, at the narrow places 8—10 has been detached from the Djebel Bālah al-Awsat; it runs to the N.E. with a slight tendency to E.N.E. The main body of the rock, the northern wall, of which runs eastwards forms with this isolated rock a pair of lines converging towards the S.W. end of the latter. The two rocky walls do not meet here but are separated by a gap spanned by a wall six paces long and 12 feet high (C).

In the opening of the angle but within the eastern ends of the two walls is another detached block of rock (D) the north side of which runs parallel to the first mentioned detached rock and the south side parallel to the main rock (C) but quite close to the latter. All three rocks, particularly the main body (C) and the loose block (E), have steep sides, not however over 12 feet high. On the north side the great isolated rock (A) is very irregular in shape. It almost looks as if we had an artificial cleavage here; but Glaser does not think this possible because an earthquake is quite sufficient to account for the remarkable cleavage of the rocks. In any case it looks as if human hands had worked a good deal on the natural lines of fracture. The great block of rock (A) rises 20—25 feet above the present level of the river bed and has two inscriptions engraved on its south side (Glaser, No. 516, 523).

On all three rocks there are or were great buildings of hewn stone. The large block of rock (A) seems to have supported the main building.
which comes to be exposed. The square blocks in the dam are also held together by little blocks of lead about 10 cm. high and about 10 cm. in the section. These little rods of lead were placed in holes specially made for them about 4-5 cm. deep and the next block above was placed over with the corresponding cavity filled with the top half of the little rod. The Sabaeans only used mortar in the stone work of the dam as a top covering to prevent damage being done by the rain-water.

The northern system of sluices consists of three walls of which the northern and largest a kind of railing of masonry. The whole wall is coped with excellent cement.

Almost exactly S. E. about 11 paces from the S. W. end of the part, 114 paces long already described (b) runs to the S. E. a wall 38 paces long and 21 broad at its N. W. end, the S. E. end of which is narrow and rounded. This wall is exactly the height of the long wall. At the present there is on it a modern ḥērān (stone-house) built by the amir 'Abd al-Kalīmān which probably existed in Arnaud's time and certainly in Halevy's.

Between the two walls, four paces from either,

Marbat el-Dimm

0 Places where inscriptions are engraved on the rocks: 1 Gl. 513; 2 Gl. 514; 3 Gl. 523; 4 Gl. 525.

a Tower with staircase, of the same height as d and the highest part of the whole building.

b Staircase.

c Barrier between the tower and southwestern rocks.

d Tower exactly similar to a.

(a, b) with one end built against the rocks of Balāk al-Kibāl runs northeast, a little towards E. N. E. This wall, which is in all 184 paces long and 15 thick at the broadest point, although the average is about 11 and 15—20 feet high consists of two parts: The southwestern part 70 paces long (a) is somewhat lower (quite low beside the Balāk rocks, about 16 feet high at the point where it joins the N. E. part) and quite flat on the top. The N. E. part (b) 114 paces long and somewhat damaged towards its west end is not quite flat on the top and towards the south side the top shows stands a north wall only 18 paces long, 3 broad and of the same height as the others, the base of which forms a perfect rectangle. This wall somewhat damaged on the north side and now joined to the S. E. wall by two modern slight walls, which the Beduins use as a stable, stands back a little at its S. W. end as compared with the two neighbouring walls and like the S. E. wall shows a prism-shaped cutting about a yard from the west end, now filled in about 2 feet broad and deep which was intended to take the boards. On the northern side this groove is no longer to be seen. The three
walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the south form two channels of exit, both of which however, it is worth noting, flow into one and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for distributing water. This canal ran between two parallel dams of the same style and construction as the dam proper but the bed, which is paved with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially on the south side some 20—25 feet. The dam proper, barely higher than the two walls of this canal, joins the east side of the most southern wall, 38 paces long.

Similar distributing works existed throughout the whole plain of Marib. Glaser saw traces of aqueducts (with double dams) at different places. In the bed of the Dhenne not far below the dam he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which might have given us definite information had been removed some years before. Canals seem to have led the water from the great distributing centres to the smaller ones (manāṣīḥ) from which it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields. The most of the manāṣīḥ are in the form of cubes or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal leads out of them from the centre, usually walled on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which connected the manāṣīḥ with the larger distributing centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep furrows torn out of the ground by the periodic deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand are now the characteristic feature of the once flourishing plain of Saba'.

The great barrier of the dam between the two Balak mountains seems however not to have sufficed for the strain upon it. A second dam called Mābnā al-Hashrādī was therefore built N.E.
of the dam and west of Mārib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wādī ‘I-Sā‘īla (cf. Glaser, *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 49 sq.), which carried the waters of the north Balaq hill, the Djabal Hailān and the Khashab hills into the plain of Mārib and joined the Wādī Dheene below the village of Mārib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in 3 strata which perhaps point to 3 periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins just on the right bank of the Sā‘īla and runs 240 paces E N. E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (a) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N. W. to S. E. 7 feet N. E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S. E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (d) runs N. W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N. W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 268 paces, the space between it and the second building 10 paces (b). 21 paces N. E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N. E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S. E. end of the 36 paces long wall (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (B) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (f) runs in a curve to the north, 50 paces in length, to a third outlet exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (g, h) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N. E. On the S. E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied 10 Sabean texts at al-Hashrād which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, N°. 509).

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Mukarrīb period. Sufah-šārīya Jāfārī, son of Dhu‘n-‘alaya, Mukarrīb of Sufā, according to the inscription Glaser, N°. 513–514, made here an outlet in the barrage at Rāḥāb, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, N°. 418–419 (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, *Altästatische Texte*, i. 7; Studien, ii. 97, 99 sq.; Glaser, *Skizze*, i. 70 sq.; *Reise nach Mārib*, p. 59 sq.; Hommel, *Ethnologie*, p. 666). Where the barrage at Rāḥāb was not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rhodokanakis, *Studien*, ii. 100 sq. that it was built on the rib of rock (e) between A and B. About a generation later than the Rāḥāb barrage is the similar con-
walls thus formed, like the three rocks on the south form two channels of exit, both of which however, it is worth noting, flow into one and the same main channel, which runs almost exactly east for about 1,000 yards to a large building for distributing water. This canal ran between two parallel dams of the same style and construction as the dam proper but the bed, which is paved with cemented stones, runs above the plain, especially on the south side some 20—25 feet. The dam proper, barely higher than the two walls of this canal, joins the east side of the most southern wall, 38 paces long.

Similar distributing works existed throughout the whole plain of Marib. Glaser saw traces of aqueducts (with double dams) at different places. In the bed of the Dhenne not far below the dam he saw a remarkable erection of stone not unlike a weir. Unfortunately the inscription on it which might have given us definite information had been removed some years before. Canals seem to have led the water from the great distributing centres to the smaller ones (manâštih) from which it was taken direct to the palm gardens and fields. The most of the manâštih are in the form of cubes or shallow prisms and are rarely more than 6 feet

The Northern Sluice-system

Places with especially important inscriptions: 1 Gl. 554, 618; 2 Gl. 551; 3 Gl. 541.

Places with inscriptions,

a a little lower than b.

The canal, which led the water to the lower hasm, about 1,000 yards away, comes up to c and d.

d a large intervening wall standing by itself.

S.S.W. of Mabnâ al-Hashral, (see below) lies Haṣn al-Aṣfal, a later building erected on the remains of old water-works, which formed the end of the main channel, already mentioned in connection with the northern sluices. It lies at about exactly the same level as the dam and several yards above the surrounding country. It consists of several walls, some of hewn stone and of ordinary stones and cement, which sent the water out in eight different directions. The aqueduct runs practically westwards up to the northern sluices of the dam. Although perfectly preserved the bed of the canal has been in many places filled up with blown sand.

high and 12 to 15 feet long. As a rule a canal leads out of them from the centre, usually walled on one side. Nothing is left of the canals which connected the manâštih with the larger distributing centres and on the other side with the fields. Deep furrows torn out of the ground by the periodic deluges of rain and, like the greater part of the plain, becoming gradually filled with desert sand are now the characteristic feature of the once flourishing plain of Saba'.

The great barrier of the dam between the two Balak mountains seems however not to have sufficed for the strain upon it. A second dam called Mabnâ al-Hashral was therefore built N.N.E.
of the dam and west of Mārib which seems to have been intended to regulate the water of the Wādi 'l-Sā'īla (cf. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 49 sq.), which carried the waters of the north Balāt hill, the Djabal Hālān and the Khasab hills into the plain of Mārib and joined the Wādi Dhanne below the village of Mārib. This barrage consists of three walls of black porous stones, running very irregularly which are held together by mortar and arranged in 3 strata which perhaps point to 3 periods of building. The first of these walls (A) which dammed the river-bed begins just on the right bank of the Sā’īla and runs 240 paces E. N. E. where it joins a prism-shaped erection (a) 7 paces broad, 12 long and about 15 feet high, which lies N. W. to S. E. 7 feet N. E. stands a second similar building (b) parallel to the first and continued to the S. E. in a narrower wall (c) 36 paces in length. The space between these two buildings must have been an outlet. With a very small space between, the second mortared wall (B) runs N. W. from the second building (b) and with many windings turns N. and N. W. where it joins the rocks. Its length is 268 paces, the space between it and the second building 10 paces (d). 21 paces N. E. of the second building are two others (d, e) which give an outlet to the N. E. The southern of the two is only partly preserved. It points to the S. E. end of the 36 paces long wall (c); perhaps the two were once connected or there was a sluice between. From the building (d) which forms the northern boundary of the second outlet two walls run: the one (third) wall (C) runs with many windings almost parallel to the second great wall (B) and like it runs up to the northern hills; it is 182 paces long. The other building (f) runs in a curve to the north, 50 paces in length, to a third outlet exactly opposite the second, which however consists of buildings (g, h) 8 paces from each other, with the ground between them covered by a layer of stone masonry. The outlet is to the N. E. On the S. E. is a wall 12 feet long now partly collapsed. Glaser copied to Sabean texts at al-Hashradj which came from other ruins and show that these works belong to a later period, like the late tombstone built into the wall here (Glaser, N°. 509).

The various constructions date, as we learn from the inscriptions, from different periods. The southern system of sluices was erected as early as the Mukarrīb period. Sumu'ah-‘alayh Yānāt, son of Dhimri-‘alaya, Mukarrīb of Sāb'a, according to the inscription Glaser, N°. 513-514, made here an outlet in the barrage at Raḥāb, which was extended two generations later by the unknown author of the inscription Glaser, N°. 418-419 (cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Altertumsische Texte, i. 7; Studien, ii. 97, 99 sq.; Glaser, Skizze, i. 70 sq.; Reise nach Mārib, p. 59 sq.; Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 666). Where the barrage at Raḥāb was is not certain. Perhaps we should assume with Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 100 sq. that it was built on the rib of rock (e) between A and B. About a generation later than the Raḥāb barrage is the similar con-

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM. III.
How we are to interpret these statements of al-Hamdānī, we learn from the description of the reservoir of Kohaito in Abyssinia (Deutsche Aksum-Expedition, ii. 150 and pl. 23). There a central wall is flanked by two side walls, one of which is at right angles to a third. That the stones were bound together by iron is evident from Glaser's description. When Yākūt (Maḏjam, iv. 383), who pays very little attention to the dam itself, tells us that it lies among three hills, the reference is probably to the massif of the Dībel Balaḵ split into the three hills of the Wādīs Adhana and Masila. He also mentions that the blocks are bound together with lead and says that the water accumulated behind the dam is led as required to the fields by strong sluices and cunningly con-trived arrangements. According to al-Maṣafdī (Murūd al-Dhahab, iii. 368 sq.), the barrage was one parasang in length and breadth and contained 30 round openings, each of 1 ell in diameter through which the water was led to the fields.

Like many buildings in Arabia, the dam of Mārub is dated by later tradition to remote antiquity and attributed to Luḏmān b. Ād (al-Bakrī, Maḏjam, ii. 502; Yaḵūt, Maḏjam, iv. 383; al-Maṣafdī, Murūd al-Dhahab, iii. 366; cf. A. v. Kremer, Sūgūf, p. 19 sq; Dīḏḏī Zaidān, p. 151) or Sābā b. Yāḏḏūb b. Yaḏḏūb (Yaḵūt, iv. 382; cf. E. Osiander, Z. D. M. G., x. 68; E. Pococke, Specimen hist. Arabum, p. 498). Al-Hamdānī (Ikhān, viii.) mentions, besides Luḏmān, also the Himyar and al-Azd b. al-Ghawth as builders of the dam. Al-Maṣfdī, Murūd al-Dhahab, p. 369 sq., says that the dam was built by a wise king of the advice of learned men.

The importance of the dam for the prosperity of the country is evident from the descriptions of the Arab historians and geographers, who in this connection usually quote the reference in the Kurān to the two gardens of the Sabaeans, while, according to al-Hamdānī, this irrigated area included not only the plain of Saba but stretched to the borders of the desert of Saiḥad; Glaser (Reise nach Mārib, p. 52) held the view that the water accumulated by the dam would suffice to irrigate only all the land on the borders of the desert as far as Ḥadramāt, and transform it into a vast garden. It is therefore perhaps not to be regarded as an exaggeration when al-Maṣfdī (Murūd al-Dhahab, p. 366 sq.) describes the land of Saba as the wealthiest of all the lands and fields, broad meadows and extensive irrigation system as the most fertile part of Yemen, the beauty of which had become proverbial throughout the world.

According to him, a man on horseback would take more than a month to cross the rich cultivated country and any one travelling on foot or on horse need not fear the sun from one end of the land to the other, as he could always travel in the shade, so rich was the vegetation (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sūgūf, p. 10, note 1). According to ibn Rostā (I, 314), who also waxes eloquent over the fertility of the land of Saba, a basket on the head of a man walking between the fruit trees would very soon have filled itself with fruit without one pulling or gathering them.

Under such circumstances it was natural that the catastrophe of the bursting of the dam, known as silāl al-arīm throughout the Muslim world, should have the most far-reaching effects. The migration of Ḥimyar tribes to the north is con-
nected with the catastrophe and the Banū Qhashān took this event as the starting point of an era of their own (Cūm al-sa'il; al-Maṣūdī, Kitāb al-
Tanbih, p. 202). There is hardly any historical event of pre-Islamic history, that has become em-
bellished with so much that is fanciful and related in so many variations that are lacking. Besides, the bursting of the dam. Al-Maṣūdī alone (Maṣūdī al-Dhakāb, iii. 370 sq.) dared attribute it to natural
causes; he thought that the water had worn away the foundations of the dam and in tune under-
mined them without its being noticed. When the Masonry of the dam and the barrage had be-
come so weakened that they could no longer resist the force of the water, the waters when
unusually big broke through and flooded the plain. But even al-Maṣūdī sees in the catastrophe a
punishment for the arrogance of the Sabaeans and gives a good deal of space in his history to the
legendary version of this event (ep. cit., p. 375 sq.), which in the main agrees with that of
Yākūt, Muṣṭafā i.v, 485 sq. The name of the Sabaeans, according to Springer, Post- und Reisentr.
p. 153 sq.) tells the history of the destruction of the dam in quite a different way from the older
historians. According to al-Maṣūdī the story is briefly as follows: the king 'Amr b. 'Amir who
lived in Maṣūb was warned of the imminent catastrophe by his brother ʿImrān, who was a
soothsayer and by his wife Ẓarifat al-Ḥairān, also skilled in prophecy. ʿImrān foresaw that his people
would be scattered in different directions and told this to his brother. Ẓarifat on the other hand
dreamed of a great cloud which covered her country and sent forth thunder and lightning. It
burst and burned up everything upon which it fell. All this pointed to a terrible inundation and
Ẓarifat was confirmed in her idea by other signs that the catastrophe was imminent. She warned
ʿAmr and urged him to see to the dam. If he saw a mouse there tearing out holes with its fore-
paws and throwing out big stones with his hind feet, the misfortune was inevitable and imminent.
ʿAmr went to the dam and actually saw a mouse which turned over with its feet a stone which
50 men could not have moved from the position. ʿAmr himself then dreamed of an inundation by the
dam and now decided to realise his possessions and leave the country with his family which he
was able to do surreptitiously without arousing
suspicions. Soon afterwards the collapse came,
which destroyed the whole country, even high
lying fields and places a considerable distance off.
While there are considerable differences in detail
in the different versions of the story—the col-
lapse took place for example, according to Yākūt
not under ʿAmr but under his brother ʿImrān—,
there is still greater disagreement about the date.
Ḥamzah al-Iṣḥāḥī, for example, puts it 400 years
before Islam, i.e. in the third century A.D. Ac-
dording to Ibn Khaldūn, the catastrophe took place
under Ḥassān b. Ṭhūbān Azād, who (with A. v. Kremmer, Soge, p. 120 sq. and note 4) is to
be identified with Abū Karīb Asād and according to Glaser (Skizze, ii. 542) reigned from 385-420.
Among European scholars Gosselin goes farthest
back in putting the date at 374 B.C. While Reiske
thinks it took place 30-40 B.C. and Schulten
puts it at 30-40 A.D., Perron 553 years before
Muḥammad and Silvestre de Sacy 210 or 170 A.D.
Yākūt, iv. 383 comes nearest the truth; he says
it took place in the period of Abyssinian rule.
As the terminus post quem is 542 A.D., according
to the inscription Glaser, No. 618, we may put
the last disastrous breach in the dam as occurring
between 542 and 570 A.D. An exact date unfor-

unfortunately cannot be obtained as the necessary data
are lacking. Besides, the stories of the bursting
of the dam in Maṣūdī, p. 393 sqq., and Ibn Rosta,
p. 114 sqq. which speak of the land being twice
devastated by the waters of the dam, may contain
a memory of the actual course of events, and the
final collapse of the dam may have taken place
after the catastrophe of 542 A.D. when the dam
was carried away for the first time.

The various attempts to explain the etymology of Mārib are not satisfactory. When, for example,
Yākūt, Muṣṭafā i.v. 582 sees in Mārib, a place-
name from Arābān = aḥalatun or from araba or
aruba, this clearly shows what difficulties the
explanation of this name gave the philologists.
His further statement however that Mārib was
the name of the Sabaeans is worth of note (cf. H. Fleischer, Abuṣūbula hist. antiislamica,
p. 114), especially as in Naṣūhīn al-Himyarīa, a
gloss is preserved according to which Māriṣ in
Himyarite means "lord" (cf. Blau in Z. D. M. G.,
xxv. 591, note 7). Dīrūjī Zaidān, Kitāb al-Arab
kalb al-Islām, p. 142 explains Mārib as a loan-
word from the Aramaic, a compound of mūl and
rāb. E. Osander, Z. D. M. G., xix. 162 takes
Mārib to be connected with the root of the Sabean
proper name ḫuṣṭ to which Riṣāb and Riʾāb
correspond in Arabic. J. H. Mordtmann, who deals
in Z. D. M. G., xxx. 322 sq. at length with the
etymology of Mariaba, points to the ḫuṣṭ and
خطر of the inscriptions which he connects with
the Arabic raʾbaʿ = "dominus crassus, magus gentis".
D. H. Muller does not accept this derivation
(Burgen und Schlösser, ii. 968 sq.). Al-Bakri,
Muṣṭafā, ii. 502 says, following al-Hamdānī, that
Mārib was the name of a tribe of the ʿAd after
whom the town is called and in fact al-Hamdānī in
Ikhlī, viii. (Muller, Burgen und Schlösser, ii.
960, 1040) says that Mārib and Mārib are the
names of two Arab tribes. In the older Sabean
inscriptions the town is called ḫuṣṭ to which
the Greeks added an ζ to give it a Greek form.
Eratothenes and Artemidoros (Siraito, xvi. 768,
778) call the town Muṣṭafā. The later inscriptions
mention it under the name ḫuṣṭ in which we
have, with Rhodokanakis, to see a later contracted
form, from which comes the Mārib of Muslim
tradition. The Sabean capital is however known
to the classical authors and Arab geographers by
another name, viz. ḫuṣṭ (Agatharchides, p. 100
in Geogr. Gr. min. i. 188 and in Steph. Byz. s.
ḫuṣṭ and ṭaṭṭuʿ; cf. Tkač in the Art. Sabāʿ,
No. 1, R. E., ii. A., col. 1516). and Sabāʾ Tkač
(col. 1391 sq.) sees in contrast to J. H. Mordt-
mann (Sahājische Denkmaler, p. 3, note 1), E.
Glaser (Skizze, ii. 15, Sudarabische Stelzfragen,
p. 10) and A. Springer (Die alte Geographie Ara-
bieni, p. 159, 162) in this double name of the Sabean
capital not an error but believes that Sabāʾ, while not the usual, was not a wrong name
for the capital.
Against this Glaser, Skizze, ii. 15, rightly em-
phasised that the capital of the Sabean kingdom
Maryyab or Mārib was never known as Sabāʾ,
Sabāʾ was—so far as the inscriptions are con-
ceived — never anything but the name of the land or kingdom and of the tribe which had the hegemony in this land, to which the name Saba' has remained attached to the present day. This is quite clear from the inscriptions. Thus, in the inscription from the town of Saba' in the reign of King Shemar Yuharif, 'king of Saba' and Iby Ralifan, the name of the tribe of Saba', the reference is always to the "lords of the town of Mārib and its valleys."

Ancient Mārib. The association of the origin of the town of Mārib with Saba' b. Yashubh probably led to the name of this legendary ruler being transferred to the town or Saba' as a tribe being identified with Mārib, as Agatharchides had already done. The varying forms in which the name is handed down, sometimes town of Saba' and sometimes Saba' alone, makes this development very probable. Besides al-Hamdānī (Sīfa, p. 7, 1) identifies the Saba' of Ptolemy with Mārib and always calls the town Mārib.

The earliest history of the town is unfortunately wrapped in obscurity. The mention of kings of Mārib in the comparatively late inscription, Glaser, No. 302, 7, shows, it is true, that the town was still independent in the time of the older Sabean Mukarrabs — for these "kings of Mārib" are their contemporaries — but gives no clue to the date of its foundation. It probably arose about the same time as the old royal city of Sīrāwī. The great inscription Glaser, No. 418—419, shows Mārib already in possession of the Sabean Mukarrabs and not long afterward it became their capital; this at least seems evident from the inscription Glaser, No. 481, 2 where we are told that the founder of the inscription "brought as far as Maryab the peace between Saba' and Katabān". This we can only interpret with Rhodokanakis (Studien, ii. 24) as meaning that the general (he is called Tūbah-kariba, son of Dhamaryedah of the clan of Daiyalmun) returned to the capital of Saba' after the conclusion of peace. Not long after the foundation of the great Sabean kingdom, of which the inscription Glaser, No. 1000 A B relates, it must have replaced Sīrāwī, the oldest capital of the Sabean kingdom; indeed there seems to be evidence that this had already taken place in the reign of the king who set up the two great Sīrāwī inscriptions Glaser, No. 1000 A B, Kariba-lu Watar, founder of the great Sabean kingdom. For when we are told in Glaser, No. 1000 B, 5 (N. Rhodokanakis, Alterthalische Texte, 189) that he had built the upper part of his palace Slīm (Slīm) which is probably identical with the famous citadel Salām at Mārib, it may be assumed that this Mukarrab resided here in the great palace which went back to the older generation of Sabean Mukarrabs, must have then transformed Mārib and the country round it into the flourishing oasis which made the town the centre of a great kingdom. The Mukarrabs Sunamu-alaya Yansāf and his father Yidī-sīlu Dharīf as well as Yithī-amara Baysān also did much for the development of the town and the country around it.

We do not know exactly when Mārib ceased to be the capital of the Sabean kingdom. Glaser (Zeitschrift für die Dömmbruch von Mārib, p. 29) supposes that the capital was removed to Zafār (near Yarm) at latest towards the end of the third century A.D., but probably as early as the first century A.D., since the Peripitus maris Erythraei, § 25 already knows Zafār as the capital.

Indeed the evidence of the Peripitus which is supplemented by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 104, who knows Sophar as a royal residence, can hardly be interpreted otherwise than meaning that Zafār was already the residence of the Sabean kings about 60 A.D. With the transfer of the capital to Zafār, the cause of which Glaser finds in the attacks of the Axumites on the independence of the Sabean kingdom, while M. Hartmann (Die arabische Frage,
p. 469) supposes the reason to have been the victory of the Hamadânids over Hisyar (cf. C.I.H., 347 and M. Hartmann, op. cit., p. 146 sq.), Mārīb's glory had passed away: the decline probably did not set in at once but Glaser must be right in assuming that Mārib was now neglected and this is how the dam, so important for the cultivation of the land, fell into disrepair. Isolated references in Muslim sources show that the town had however not yet lost all its importance. Al-Bakri, Mu'ājam, i. 308 (cf. A. v. Kremer, Sage, p. 138) knows Mārib as one of the treasuries of the Ḥimyar, and according to the Ḥimyar čaṣṭa, verse 56 (A. v. Kremer, Sage, p. xii, note 1 and p. 69), Shamma Qūršah (c. 281 a.d.) kept his prisoners in Mārib. The two breaches in the dam which took place in 450 a.d. and under Byzantine rule in 542 a.d. must have done grave injury to the prosperity of the town. In this last period of its brilliant history Mārib was for a short time (certainly in 542 a.d.) the capital of the governor of the Ethiopian king Rambsu Altfrähmā, Adhra, and even had a Christian church (cf. Glaser, Zwei Inschriften über den Damburuch von Mārib, p. 47). The final catastrophe sealed the fate of the town. Its inhabitants left the sore tried town and migrated to the Ḥijāz.

Mārib was resettled in the Muslim period. The favourable situation of the place and perhaps the rich deposits of salt in the neighbourhood (5 days' journey east of Mārib at Sāfīr, mentioned in the time of the Prophet, who appointed Abū Mūsā al-Ąṣhāri governor of Mārib; E. Glaser, Reise nach Mārib, p. 26; al-Bakri, Mu'ājam, ii. 202; al-Ḥamadānī, Śīfā, p. 87, 102, 155, 201; A. Sprenger, Post- und Reisereisen, p. 139) also kept the place from being quite forgotten. Ibn Khudrādbihī (B.G.A., vi. 138) and al-Muṣaddasī (B.G.A., iii. 89) mention the village of Mārib: al-Ḥamadānī, Śīfā, p. 199 says the sesame of Mārib is a specialty of the Yemen. Al-Iṣrī, Géographie, p. 149 calls Mārib a bāyda, according to Ibn al-Mudjahwīr (in A. Sprenger, Post- und Reisereisen, p. 140), Mārib (c. 630 a.h.) had a market and a mosque and was of some importance as a resting-place for the night and fruit could be obtained there at any time of the year. Since Yākūt, Mu'ājam, iv. 436, also says, the district of Mārib is rich in palms, it seems to have in part at least regained its old fertility.

doubt the essential correctness of this story, as there is no particular bias in it and it contains all sorts of details which do not look like intentions, so that it is exaggerated scepticism when Lammens supposes that the "mother of Ibrahim", after whom the maghrafa was called, was some Jewess. On the other hand, in view of the fact that all the marriages of Muhammad after the Hijra were childless, it would have been surprising if evil-minded people had not cast suspicions on the paterinity of Ibrahim, and that this actually happened is evident from some traditions the object of which is to defend Maryia from this suspicion.

On the other hand, it is not so easy to justify the part which Kur'anic exegesis makes Maryia play in the exposition of Sura lxi. In this Sura, the Prophet speaks in a very indignant tone against one of his wives, because she has betrayed a secret to another, which he had imparted to her under a promise of the strictest secrecy. At the same time Allah blames him, because in order to please his wives, he has bound himself by oath to refrain from something which is not definitely stated and because he does not use the right granted him by Allah to release himself from his oath. In addition, there is a word of warning to the two women who had disobeyed him and a threat to all his wives that he might divorce them in order to marry more pious ones (cf. xxxiii. 28 sq.). According to the usual explanation, the two wives are Hafsa and A'isha and the revelation is said to have been provoked by the fact that Hafsa, on returning unexpectedly to her house, found Maryia and the Prophet in an intimate tête-à-tête and that on a day which by rotation belonged to her (or A'isha). In his embarrassment he pledged himself by oath to have no more intercourse with the Copt girl. But after Hafsa's breach of faith, Allah tells him to release himself from his oath. This explanation fits very well in some respects and that the promise of continence is connected with marital complications is illuminating. That there are hadiths, which explain his quarrel with his wives quite differently, does not mean very much, for they are not such intently or drive out of currency the popular, less edifying version. But, on closer examination, there is one flaw which makes the latter uncertain, for it does not answer the question how Muhammad could call the situation in which Hafsa caught him and Maryia a secret that he trusted to her. Bibliography: Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1561-1566, 1774 sqq., 1781 sqq.; Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, l./ii. 10 sq.; viii. 131-158, 153-156; the commentaries on Sura lxvi; Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte der Qu'ranen, i. 217; Caetani, Annali dell' Isla, ii. 211 sqq., 237, 311 sqq.; Lammens, Faïlama, p. 2 sq. — On the eclipse of the sun: Rhodokanakis, W. Z. K. M., xiv. 78 sqq.; Mahler, ibid., p. 100 sqq. (Fr. Bohl). Al-MARKAB (the Magrat, Merghatun of the Crusaders), a fortress near Baniyas on the coast of Syria. According to the chronicle of Abu Ghālib Humān b. al-Fadl al-Muhadhdhab al-Ma'ātrī (quoted in Yāʾṣūb, Muṣṭafā, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 500) and the Ta'dīkh al-Khitāba l-Hāfiẓ of Usāma b. Muḥammad (in Abu l-Fīḍā', ed. Reinaud and de Laine, p. 255); it was built by the Muslims in 454 (1062). Al-Dimashki (ed. Mehran, p. 208) wrongly attributes its foundation to Hārun al-
Raḥiḍ (van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 304, note 7) when the reference to Raḥiḍ (rather Raḥiḍ) al-Din in *Le Strange*, *Palestine* is shown to be wrong; his statement seems to be correct, however, that the citadel was built out of material from ancient ruins. The Byzantines occupied al-Maṣṭarab and other fortresses in the vicinity under the general Kantsukzenos in 1104 (Anna Comnena, *Διαλόγος*, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 138: τὸ τ' Ἀργυ- ρικέστρον [= Σάλια] τὸ καλούμενον Μαρκατό [al-Maṣṭarab], τὰ Τάβαλα [Διάβαλα] καὶ ἄλλα τεύχη). When in 1111 (1117–1118) the Crusaders approached the fortress, its lord Ibn Muhirz surrendered it on condition that he and his family were allowed to remain in it; but after a few days the Franks expelled him and allotted al-Manṣūr to him in exchange for al-Maṣṭarab; Franks and Armenians were settled in the latter. The first recorded lord of the fortress was Raimund Mansur, the constable of the prince of Antioch. After the earthquake of 1170, from which the fortress must have suffered damage, Bertrand of al-Maṣṭarab, perhaps out of fear of Saladin’s threats, handed it over on Feb. 1, 1186 to the Knights of St. John. In July 1186 Saladin passed below the watch tower (now Burdā al-Saḥbi), which from ancient times had commanded the road along the coast (cf. Dussaud, *Topogr.*, p. 127, note 5) below the fortress and was connected with it by a wall which protected a subterranean passage, but did not dare to attack Maṣṭarab any more than Taṣbīs (q.v.). Prince Isaac of Cyprus, a descendant of the Comnenos (not the Emperor Isaac Comnenos as van Berchem, op. cit., p. 296 sq., note 5 says), was taken prisoner by Giacomo de’Conti, seigneur of Saint-Louis, on May 31, 1191, and imprisoned in Maṣṭarab till his death (Neophytos, in *Recueil hist. crois., hist. grecs*, iii. 562 with note, ii. 489: en καστελλίῳ καλουμένῳ Μαρκατότη). Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir Ghazi of Ḥalab whose lands adjoined those of the Knights of St. John sent in 601 (1204—1205) troops against the fortress, who are said to have just succeeded in destroying the towers of the walls when their leader fell and they again retired without accomplishing their object. In 628 (1231) and 638 (1240—1241) the Knights were again at war with Yūsuf, Sultan of Ḥalab. From this period (1212) dates the very full description of the strong fortress by Willbrand of Oldenburg. Built on a high hill and surrounded by a double wall and many towers, it was regarded in the period when the power of the Crusaders was beginning to decline, as *maximum totius terrae illas solacium*; the bishop of Valenia (Baniyas) had moved into the fortress by 1212 out of fear of the Muslims. King Andreas of Hungary in 1217—1218 gave funds for the maintenance of the fortress which had given him an honourable reception (Rohricht, *Regesta Hierosolym.*, p. 243, No. 908). The straits to which the humiliating treaties with Baibars had reduced the Knightsly Orders is lamented by the Grand Master Hugo Revel in 1268 in a letter in which he says that the possession of its last two fortresses, Λωρίδαν and Mαργατόμ (= Ḥiss al-Akrād and al-Maṣṭarab) was one of the main grants of the Order on payment of oppressive taxes (Rohricht, *Regesta Hieros., Addi- mentum*, Oeniponti 1924, p. 91, No. 1535a). After the loss of Ḥiss al-Akrād, the Templars and the Knights of St. John in 669 (1271) by a treaty which they concluded in Ḥarka with Saif al-Dīn Balbān al-Dawāddār ("the secretary") al-Rūmī, the Sultan’s plenipotentiary, had to cede half of the coastland (gūlī) of Amurās, al-Maṣṭarab and Bāniyas and bind themselves not to build any new defences (Mufaḍdall b. Abī ‘Ibād al-Ḥaṣā, *Gesch. d. Mamlukkenskult.,* in *Patrol. Orient.*, xii. 536). After a raid by the Franks (Dec. 1279), the Emir Saif al-Dīn Balbān al-Tābāṣlāḫī, the governor of Ḥiss al-Akrād for Kālātun, in the beginning of 1281 sent troops against al-Maṣṭarab, but they were driven back with heavy losses (Mufaḍdall, *op. cit.*, xiv. 484, and the sources quoted in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 301, note 5). In the treaty between Kālātun and the Templars of 681 (1282) al-Maṣṭarab is mentioned among the districts half of which were to be ceded (Mufaḍdall, *op. cit.*, xiv. 443; van Berchem, *op. cit.*, p. 302, note 2). The pilgrim Burchardus de Monte Sion in 1283 mentions the "Custum Mariyaé fratriam hospitalis sancti Johannis"; it was still at this date the see of the bishop of Valenia (*Peregrina- natorum*, ed. Laurent, p. 36, 170). On 10th Safar 684 (April 17, 1285) Kālātun appeared before al-Maṣṭarab and began the attack as soon as the siege artillery arrived. On the 19th Rabiʿ I (May 25) the Emir Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥrūq received the surrender of the fortress. On account of its strategic value for defence against possible attacks from the sea, it was not destroyed but included in the "royal province of the fortunate conquests"; the capital of till 688, when Ṭarabulus was taken, was the Castle of the Kurds, still governed by Saif al-Dīn Balbān al-Tābāṣlāḵī al-Maṣṣūrī. Kālātun in 684 ordered him to repair the defences of the citadel as an inscription found *in situ* (van Berchem, *Inscriptiones de Syria*, p. 71 sq.). Among those present at the capture of the fortress were the 12 years old Abu ‘Īsā, who was then on his first campaign with his father, and the historian Ibn ‘ʿAid al-Ḵaṣām, the continuator of Ibn Wāṣīl’s chronicle. The best account of the taking of al-Maṣṭarab is in Kālāṭun’s biography entitled *Taṣḥīf al-Ayām wa l-Cīṯr bi-Sīrat al-Sulṭan al-Malik al-Mansūr* (Paris, Ms. ar., No. 1704, fol. 149 sqq., and transl. in van Berchem, *Voyage*, p. 310—320).

In the viiith (seventh) century al-Maṣṭarab belonged to the province of Taṣbīs (’Umar, *Tarif*, transl. by R. Hartmann, *Z. D. M. G.*, lx. 1916, 36; Kādī al-Zahrā, *Zubdat Knig al-Mumālik*, ed. Ravaisse, p. 48, Kāṣāshāndi, *Ṣabḥ al-ʾAbī*, ed. Cairo, iv. 145 sq); at this time it was used as a state prison (van Berchem, p. 305, note 2). Its harbour is mentioned in documents of 1193 and 1299 (van Berchem, p. 309, note 3); it was presumably at the mouth of the Wādi ʾAin al-Khraib (in Walpole: *al-Mīm*). As al-Maṣṭarab lies on the outer spurs of the Ansariye range it has often wrongly been included among the fortresses of the Ḥimṣīl (Kitāb al-Dalʿa wa) (so ’Umar, *op. cit.*, in the Berlin and Göttingen Ms. but not in the others; Hartmann, *Z. D. M. G.*, lx. 36, note 7). So far as we can judge from the brief visitor’s note, it was not till about the middle of the 19th century that it began to fall into ruins. About 1885 at the request of the kāṣmaš of the ʾadār of al-Maṣṭarab the seat of the government was transferred from the ruined ʾAyn al-Maṣṭarab to Bāniyas (M. Hartmann, *Z. D. P. V.*, xxii., p. 153, No. 27).

**Bibliography:** Yaḵut, Maḏḏam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 500; Saif al-Dīn, *Marāqd al-ʾUṯbān*,
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(M. MARAKSH, popular pronunciation Marākisch), a town in Morocco, and one of the residences of the Sultan.

The town, Marrakesh, adopted by the administration of the protectorate, is of recent origin in French. Town about 1890 the town was always known as Marrakech (Morocco) in French. The kingdom of Morocco, in a strict sense, is a state which was formed in 1912 by the union of the two parts, Marrakesh and Fès, finally gave its name to the whole empire.

At one time it only consisted of the country south of the wādi Umr Khabīr as far as the range of the Great Atlas.

Marrakesh is situated in 31° 17' 35" N. Lat. and 7° 50' 42" E. Long. (Greenwich). Its mean height above sea-level is about 1,510 feet. The town is 150 miles south of Casablanca. It is through the latter that almost all the traffic with the coast passes at the present day. It used to go via Sah which is the nearest port (100 miles). Sidi Muhammad b. Abd Allah in 1765 tried to supplant it by Mughdar (115 miles), where he built a town and harbour through which at the end of the 18th century most of the trade between Marrakesh and Europe passed.

Although Marrakesh is only 235 miles from Fès as the crow flies, it is over 330 by Casablanca. Rabat-Meknes which is the only road that has been used for over a century, the direct road by the Tâdia having been rendered impracticable by the traditional in-security of the country.

The temperature which is very mild in winter is very hot in summer. The average maxima of 30° 6 in the month of August 1927 have nothing unusual and imply extreme temperatures reaching or passing 50° on certain days. Rainfall is low (284.5 mm. in 1927, against 706.5 in Rabat and 1,007.3 in Tangier). But water fed by the snows of the Atlas is found at no great depth. It is collected by a system of long subterranean galleries (khaṭāfā, plur. khaṭāfīr) which bring it to the surface by taking advantage of the very slight slope of the surface. This method of obtaining water, which is described in the 12th century by Idrisi, has enabled the vast gardens which surround the town to be created. The Almohads and the dynasties which succeeded them also built aqueducts and reservoirs to supply the town with water from the springs and streams of the mountains.

Contrary to what was until recently believed, Marrakesh is by far the most thickly populated town of the empire. The census of March 7, 1926 gives 140,263 as the total population, 3,652 Europeans, 132,893 Muslims, 12,718 Jews.

The probable growth of the population is not sufficient to explain the difference between the present day figures and the old estimates, almost all far below the truth and varying greatly among themselves: from 20,000 (given by Diego de Torres in 1585 and Host in 1768), 25,000 (Saint Olen, 1693), 30,000 (Ali Bey el-Abbâsî, 1804), 40 to 50,000 (Gatell, 1854 and Eug. Aubin, 1902), 50,000 (Lambert, 1868), 60,000 (Beaumont, 1868), 80 to 100,000 (Washington, 1830) up to the obviously exaggerated figure of 270,000 given by Jackson in 1811.

About 40 miles N. of the Atlas, the vast silhouette of which, covered by snow for eight months of the year fills the background, Marrakesh is built in a vast plain called the Hâwz which slopes very gently towards the wâdi Tânsîf, which runs 3 miles north of the town. The extreme uniformity of the plain is broken only in the N.W. by two rocky hills called Gillîz (1,700 feet) and Kudayat al-Abîd. In 1912 at the time of the French occupation, there was built a fort which commands Marrakesh. The modern European town called the Gueliz lies between this hill and the walls of the old town.

The wâdi Issâl, a left bank tributary of the Tânsîf, a stream often dried up but transformed into a raging torrent after storms, runs along the walls of the town on the east. To the north of Marrakesh as far as the Tânsîf and to the east stretches a great forest of palm-trees, the only one in Morocco north of the Atlas. It covers an area of 13,000 hectares and possesses over 100,000 palm-trees but the dates there only ripen very imperfectly.

The town is very large. The walls which run all round it measure at least 7 miles in length. The town in the strict sense does not occupy the whole of this vast area. The part built upon forms a long strip which starting from the zawiya of Sidi bel Abdâs in the north runs towards the kasha which stands at the southern end of the town. On the two sides lie great gardens and estates among which we find in the neighbourhood of the chief gates inside the walls, isolated quarters grouped like so many villages around their sîk and their mosque.

The town consists mainly of little low houses of reddish clay, often in ruins, among which are scattered huge and magnificent dwellings without particularly imposing exteriors built either by the vicars of the old makhzen (e.g. the Bâhiya, now
the Résidence Générale, the old palace of the Bā Ḥmast, vizier of Mawlid al-Ḥasan or by the great ḥāris, chiefs of the tribes of the country round. The narrow and overhung streets in the central area broaden towards the outskirts into sunny and dusty squares and crossroads. The colour, the picturesque architecture, the palm-trees, the branches of which appear over the walls of the gardens, the presence of a large negro population, all combine to give the town the appearance of a Saharan ḥṣar of vast dimensions.

The centre of the life of the city is the Djāmaʿ al-Fnā, a vast, irregular, ill defined open space, surrounded until quite recently by wretched buildings and reed huts, overshadowed by the high minaret of the Kutubiyya Mosque. Its name comes, according to the author of the Tarīkh al-Sudān, from the ruins of a mosque which Aḥmad al-Mansūr had undertaken to build there "As he had planned it on a wonderful scale, it had been given the name of mosque of prosperity (al-ḥanā); but his plans being upset by a series of unfortunate events, the prince was unable to finish the building before his death and it was therefore given the name of mosque of the ruin (djāmaʿ al-fnā)." This origin having been forgotten; an attempt was later made to explain the name of the square from the fact that the heads of rebel leaders was to be exposed there (mosque or place of assembly of ruin, of death). It was there also that executions took place. Lying on the western edge of the principal agglomeration of buildings at its most thickly populated part, and close to the suks, connected with the principal gates by direct and comparatively quiet roads, Djāmaʿ al-Fnā is the point of convergence of the roads. At all hours swarming with people, it is occupied in the morning with a market of small traders: barbers, cloggers, vendors of fruit and vegetables, of medicines, of fried grasshoppers, of tea and of soup (ḥarira); in the evening, it is filled with acrobats and jugglers (Awdā Sidī Aḥmad u Mās of Tazerwālt), sorcerers, storytellers, fire-eaters, snake-charmers and zhikkh dancers. The audience consists mainly of people from the country who have come into town on business and want to enjoy the diversions of the town for a few hours before going back. These are the always numerous foreigners in Marrakesh. Besides the regular inhabitants there is a floating population the number of which has been put at 20,000 to 25,000. For Marrakesh is the great market for supplying not only the Ḥwaw but also the mountain country, the Sīls and especially the extreme south, Dades, Darra (Drâa) and the Anti-Atlas. A portion of this traffic will probably be diverted via Agadir when this port is opened to trade. Marrakesh used to be the starting-point for caravans going through the Sahara to trade with Timbuktu. They brought back chiefly Sudanic slaves for whom Marrakesh was an important market. The conquest of the Sudan by France has put an end to this traffic.

To the north of the Djāmaʿ al-Fnā begin the suks which are very large. As in Fas and in the other large towns, the traders and artisans are grouped by trades under the authority of the muḥāsb, a kind of provost of the merchants. The most important suks are those of the cloth merchants (ṣikārīya), of the sellers of slippers, of pottery, of basket work, of the embroiderers of harness, of the dyers and of the smiths. An important Thursday suk (al-ḵamis) is held outside and inside the walls around the old gate of Fas which has taken the name of the market (Bāb al-Khāmis). This suk was already in existence in the xvith century.

There is no industry to speak of in Marrakesh. The most important is the making of leather (tanning). The manufacture of slippers occupies 1,500 workmen who produce over 2,000 pairs each working day. There are the only articles manufactured in the town that are exported. They are sold as far away as Egypt and West Africa. The war interrupted communications and did great damage to this industry. For the rest, Marrakesh is mainly an agricultural market. The whole town is a vast fondāk in which are warehoused the products of the country, almonds, caraway seeds, goat-skins, oils, barley, wool, to be exchanged either for imported goods (sugar, tea, cloth) or for other agricultural produce (wheat, oil, which the tribes of the mountains and of the extreme south for example do not have).

The town is divided into 32 quarters: Zāwiya Abū Bāṣṣa, Sidī Ben Slimān, Aswal, Riyād al-ʿArūs, Sidī Abī ʿAmīr, Bāb Dukkāla (divided into two quarters), Sidī Abū al-ʿAzm, Rāḥbat Azḥbat, Dašābī, Kannāriya, Riyād al-Zītūn al-jadid, Djann al-Shogra, Ḫṣir, Mawṣān, Riyād al-Zītūn al-kadim, Arṣa Mawlitu Mās Khāra, Arṣa Mawli Mīsa Sīghira, Bāb Hallāna, Sidī Mimūn, Ben Śālah, Sidī Arūb, Bāb Zakāt, Kābat ben Moṣʿar, Bāb al-Dāblāgh, Ḥarāt al-Sūra, Makāfī, Arrattin, the kaṣaba containing the royal palaces (again subdivided into several sections: al-Badi', Kaṣbah al-Muṣīla), Berisma, Bāb Aḥmār, Maskinat Sidī ʿAmāra and the mellāḥ or Jewish quarter. We may further mention outside the walls near the Bāb Dukkāla, a quarter called al-Hāra where the lepers live. Until recent years the gates of the town were closed during the night. The superintendents of the quarters (muḥāsmin) have watchmen (ṣurāsā) under their orders. The old custom still survives of firing a salvo at midnight on the Djāmaʿ al-Fnā as a curfew.

Marrakesh being an imperial town, the sulṭān who only stays there at long intervals is represented in his absence by a ḥālīl or a prince of the imperial family (usually the son of the sovereign). The role of this khālfah is purely representative. His main duty is to preside at the ceremonies during the ritual celebrations. The governor of the town is a pasha, assisted by a delegate (māʾīl) and several khāhs. One of the latter supervises the prisons and the administration of justice. Another has the title of pasha of the kaṣba. He governs the southern part of the town which includes the imperial palace and the Jewish quarter. Formerly the pasha of the kaṣba was independent of the pasha of the town and served to counterbalance the power of the latter. He commanded the gish, an armed contingent furnished by the warlike tribes (Cīdāya, Aṯ Imnār etc.) settled in the vicinity of the town by the sulṭāns on the domain lands. At the present day the gish is under the control of the pasha of the town and the pasha of the kaṣba only retains of his former powers certain rights of precedence and honorary privileges.

Muslim law is administered in Marrakesh by three kadis: one is established at the mosque of Ibn Yūsuf; the other at the mosque of al-Mwāsin and the third at the mosque of the kaṣba. The latter's competence does not extend beyond the limits of
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his quarter. That of the others extends over the whole town and even over the tribes of the area governed from it who have no local kāḍī.

Marrakesh is not numbered like Rabat and Tetuan among the ẓāhirāt iwaṭ towns, i.e., it has no, like them, an old established citizen population, not of rural origin, with a bourgeoisie whose tone is given by the descendants of the Moors driven from Spain.

In the eighteenth century however, Marrakesh did receive a colony of Moroccans large enough to give one quarter the name of Ẓāhirāt aḥrāf from which they came. The foundation of the population consists of people of the tribes for the most part berber or Arabs strongly mixed with barber blood. Ẓāhir is much spoken in Marrakesh although the language of the tribes around the town (Rhamna, Ldaya) is Arabic. The movements of the tribes, the coming and going of caravans, the importation of slaves from the Sudan have resulted in a constant process of mixing in the population and the old Masmūdīan race which mixed with Almoravids into the Berbers.

The primitive population of Marrakesh is only found in combination with amounts difficult to measure of Arab, Saharan and negro blood. Even to-day this process is going on: the newcomers come less from the valleys of the Atlas than from the Sūs, the Drāa, and the Anti-Atlas, from the extreme south which is poor and overpopulated. The greater number of these immigrants soon become merged in the population of the town, but the Études sur les corporations marocaines, conducted by L. Masuzumon in 1923–1924 (Paris, 1925), yields some very curious information about the survival in Marrakesh of vigorous groups of provincials, specializing in particular trades: the makers of silver jewellery (at least those who are not Jews) owe their name of azméhitin to the fact that originally they came from Tāmgūt in Sūs; the Mesfiwa are charcoal-burners and greengrocers, the Ghābīya, salters; the people of the Toghba, gatherers of dates and salt. Also the diggers of wells, who specialize in water-channels (īdāṭī), the Tōffīla, porters and paviors; those of Warrāzāt, water-carriers, and of ‘Attā (Anti-Atlas), restaurateurs; of the Ḳara, water-carriers and ẓāhirātī, etc.

This division is not the result of specialization in their original home nor of privilege granted by the civic authorities but arises from the fact that artisans once settled in Marrakesh have sent for their compatriots when they required assistance. Thus groups grew up, sometimes quite considerable. The list of the corporations of Marrakesh gives a total of about 10,000 artisans. These corporations have lost much of their power under the pressure of the Māghūzen. Some of them however still retain a certain social importance: in the first place that of the shoemakers which is the largest (1,500 members); then come the tanners (430), the cloth (237) and silk (100) merchants; the Ḳāẓīs wholesalers, then some groups of skilled artisans (highly esteemed but of less influence), embers of the saddles, makers of mosaics, carpenters, sculptors, plasterers, etc.

Religious and intellectual life. Mosques are numerous in Marrakesh. Some of them will be the subjects of brief archaeological studies. Those which play the most important part in the religious life of the city are the mosque of al-Mawsīn, the mosque of ‘Ali b. Yūsuf, both close to the sūqs, that of Sīdī bel ‘Abbās and that of the kāba. Then come the Kutnūdīya, the mosque of the Bāb Duk-kāla, of the Bāb Aṭlān, of Berrima, and the Djāma’ Ibn Sālah. There are also many little mosques in the various faubourgs. But although it can claim illustrious men of learning, Marrakesh is not like Fās, a centre of learning and of teaching. The Almohads built schools and libraries there, brought the most illustrious scholars, philosophers and physicians from Spain, like Ibn Tufail, Abū Marwān Ibn Zuhīr (Avempace) and Abu ʾl-Walad Ibn Rūghī (Averroes) who died at Marrakesh in 595 (1198). These great traditions did not survive the dynasty.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, in the time of Leo Africanus, the library of the Almohad palace was used as a pottery house and the madrasa built by the Marinids was in ruins. At the present day in the town of the Kutubiyah there is not a single bookseller. A certain number of tālīf still live in the madrasas (Ibn Yūsuf, Ibn Sālah, Sīdī bel ‘Abbās, Berrima, Ḳaṣba) but the teaching in Marrakesh has neither the prestige nor the traditions which still give some lustre to the teaching at al-Karawīn and Fās, much decayed as it is. They attempt to imitate the customs of Fās (they celebrate notably the festival of the sūltān of the tālīf) [cf. Fās] every spring the students are far from holding in Marrakesh the position their comrades enjoy in Fās.

The devotion of the people of Marrakesh expends itself particularly on the cult of saints, not at all orthodox but dear to the Berbers. Their town has always been famous for the great number of wāḥāli who are buried in its cemeteries and who justify the saying: ‘Marrakesh, tomb of the saints’. It was built at the time of Mawlān Ṭāhir, Abū-ʾl Ḳaṣr al-Saṣār, Ali al-Ḥasan al-Yāʿīnī, by order of the prince organized, in imitation of the old established cult of the Sabʿatū Rujjāl (the seven saints of the Rāgrās, around the Djabal al-Ḥadīl, among the Ṣhāṭima) a pilgrimage to the Sabʿatū Rujjāl of Marrakesh including visits to seven sanctuaries and various demonstrations of piety. The following are the names of the seven saints in the order in which they ought to be visited: 1) Sīdī Yūsuf b. ‘Ali al-Sanhājī, a leper, d. 595 (1196–1197), buried outside the Bāb Ṭāḥmūt on the spot where he lived; 2) the kāba Ḳirīt, 1147–1144 (1053–1149), Ḳādī of Cuta, then of Granada, a learned theologian, author of the Shīfā, a celebrated collection of traditions, buried beside the Bāb Aṭlān; 3) Sīdī bel ‘Abbās al-Sahhīfī, patron saint of Marrakesh and the most venerated of the saints of the region 524—601 (1130–1204). He came to Marrakesh when the town was being besieged by the Almohads and settled there, at first in a hermitage on the Djabal Gilhīt where a hisba dedicated to him can still be seen. But the principal pilgrimage is to his tomb at the northern end of the town over which Abū Fāris b. Ahmad al-Manṣūr built a zāwiyah and an important mosque at the beginning of the xvii century; 4) Sīdī Muḥammad b. Simān al-Djaṭʿūlī, d. in 870 (1465) at Arjaghul among the Ṣhīʿa, a celebrated Sufī, founder of the Ḳaṭṭālī brotherhood. His body was brought to Marrakesh in 930 (1523) by Ahmad al-Najdī, the Saʿdī, d. 919 (1516). The Saʿdīs, a pupil of al-Djaṭʿūlī, d. in 914 (1508); 5) Sīdī ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz al-Tabbāh, a pupil of al-Djaṭʿūlī, d. in 914 (1508); 6) Sīdī ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghawzanī, popularly called Mawla Ḳurīf, d. in 935 (1528); 7) Sīdī Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suhailī, called the Imām al-Suhailī, a native of the district of Malaga, d. 581 (1185) and buried outside the Bāb al-Rabb.
MARRAKESH

It is quite an arbitrary choice that these seven individuals have been chosen as the Sab‘atu Rûdâl. Others could equally well have been chosen, as the town of Marrakesh and the country which the stretch before it, contain a very large number of other venerated tombs. The principal are mentioned in the article by H. de Castries, Les Sept Patrons de Marrakesh (Heptâria, 1924). Legend of course plays a great part in the cults of the various saints. We may mention for example the sayings and songs which perpetuate the memory of Lullûr ‘U’dâ, mother of the Sulûn Ahmad al-Mansûr, a real personage much transformed by the popular imagination. The various trade corporations have chosen patron saints. Thus Sidi Yiś’âbû is the patron of the tanners, Sidi Bel ‘Abbâs of the soap-makers and lacemakers, Sidi Mas˘‘ûd “slave” of Sidi Muhammad b. Sulmân is the patron of the masons, Sidi ‘Abd al-Azîz al-Tabbûs of the dyers, etc. The majority of the artisans are also affiliated to the religious brotherhoods. In Massignon’s investigation will be found details of the attraction which some of the latter have for certain trades.

The Jews. At the foundation of Marrakesh, the Jews had no permission to settle in the town. They came there to trade from Aghmât Aïlân where they lived. Al-Idrîsî relates that under ‘Ali b. Yusuf they had not even the right to spend the night in Marrakesh and that those, who were caught within the walls after sunset, were in great danger of being plundered. Their settled there at a later date. At the beginning of the xvth century there was, according to Marmol, in Marrakesh a ghetto of over 3,000 houses. It lay near the sîk on the site now occupied by the mosque of al-Mawâsin. When this mosque was built by Sulûn ‘Abd Allâh al-Ghâlibî, the more scrupulous refused to pray there for some time on the pretext that it occupied the site of a Jewish cemetery. It was ‘Abd Allâh al-Ghâlibî who, about 1560, settled the Jews on the site they still occupy, along the wall of the kasha to the east, where the stables of the palace had been. In the beginning of the xviith century, there was here, according to the French traveller Mocquet, “like a small rural character without a wind and having only one gate guarded by the Moors; here live the Jews who are over 4,000 in number and pay tribute.” A century later, there were about 6,000 Jews and many synagogues. The Jewish quarter, called mellâh after the example of the Jewish quarter of Fès (the name mellâh is attested for Marrakesh as early as the end of the xvth century), has 12,000 inhabitants at the present day. As regards policing, it is under the authority of the pasha of the kasha but otherwise is administered by an elected Jewish committee. Questions of personal law are judged by a rabbinical tribunal of three members nominated and paid by the Makhzen. The Jews of Marrakesh are beginning to leave the bounds of the mellâh. For the most part they wear the ritual costume: gaberine, skullcap and black slippers, but the younger generation shows a tendency to emancipate itself from this dress. They have little influence on the corporations of Marrakesh and are not allowed to settle in the sîkis. They are limited to certain trades (jewellers, tin-smiths and embroiderers of slippers) and share with the people of Fès the wholesale trade. They trade particularly with the Shûh of the mountains.

History. The Roman occupation never extended so far as the region of Marrakesh. It is quite without probability that some writers, following the Spanish historian Marmol, have sought at Aghmât or at Marrakesh the site of Beqûnûn Entûrûn (Béquen ‘Hissârim), the town of Tingitana, the site of which is now unknown. The earliest historians agree that the place where Marrakesh was built by the Almohads was a bare marshy plain where only a few bushes grew. The name Marrakesh gives no clue to the origin of the town. The etymologies given by the Arab authors are quite fanciful: according to al-Marrakushi, it was the name of a negro slave who escaped and set up as a brigand there. Another writer explains it by a punning interpretation: “the meaning of the name in the language of the Maâmûdîs is “go away quickly!”! The place was actually a place of ambush, i.e. for brigands.” It was, it appears, in 449 (1057–1058) that the Almohads advanced from Sûs north of the Atlas and took Aghmât Warika. It was there that they settled at first. But after the campaign of 452 (1060) in the course of which they conquered the country of Fazza, Meknes and of the Laâwata near Fès, they wanted to make their position more permanent and independent by creating a kind of camp, which could be used as a base for their further campaigns and would threaten the Maâmûdî of the mountains and could be used as a connecting link between the south from which they came and the kingdom of Fès. Yusuf b. Tâshûf therefore purchased from its owner an estate on the frontier between two Maâmûdî tribes, the Hâlâmûn and the Hâzmûn, and pitched his camp there. So far he was from thinking of founding a great capital, a thing for which this So the nomad felt no need, that at first he lived in a tent here, beside which he built a mosque to pray in and a little kasha in which to keep his treasures and his weapons; but he did not build a surrounding wall. The native Maâmûdûs built themselves dwellings surrounded by palisades of branches beside the Almohadj camp. The town grew rapidly to a considerable size, if it is true, that in the reign of ‘Ali b. Yusuf it had at least 100,000 hearths, but it did not lose its primitive aspect, without the threat of the Almohad movement revived by him forced ‘Ali b. Yusuf to defend his town and surround it by a rampart which was built in eight months, probably in 520 (1126). Some historians give the date 526 (1132) but it is certain that the walls were already built in 524 (1130) when the Almohads attacked Marrakesh for the first time. Marrakesh, the creation and capital of the Almoravids, was to be the last of their strongholds to yield. When Ibn Tûmart had established his power over the tribes of the mountains he tried to attack Marrakesh; he then sent an Almohad army under the command of Shaikh al-Bashîr, who, after defeating the Almoravids in the vicinity of Aghmât, pursued them to the gates of Marrakesh. The Almohads could not enter the town but established themselves before its walls. After 40 days’ siege, ‘Ali b. Yusuf received reinforcements and made a successful sortie which forced the attackers to retreat. This was the battle of al-Bebâira (524 = May 1130) from the name of a large garden, Bebâira al-Râdzîkî, near which it was fought. It lay to the east of the town before the Bab Dabbâsgh and the Bab Aïlân. Al-Bashîr was slain and Marrakesh repeated for 17 years. Ibn Tûmart died a few months
later. It is hardly likely that ʿAbd al-Muʾmin should have made soon after his accession, as the Kūfīs say, a new attempt to take Marrakesh. The memoirs of al-Bahāḵ which give such full details of all the events of this period make no mention of it. They show on the contrary the Almohad armies based at first on conquering the country before occupying the capital, taking Tadla, Sale, Taza, Tfrān, Tinjen and Fās and only returning to lay siege to Marrakesh after the whole country had been occupied and the capital alone held out as the last stronghold of the doomed dynasty. It was in the summer of 1146 that ʿAbd al-Muʾmin laid siege to Marrakesh. He made his headquarters at Gillīz and, seeing that the siege would be a long one, he once had houses built in which to install himself and his army. The siege lasted eleven months. An unsuccessful sortie by the Almoravids seems to have hastened the fall of the town. Disputed by lack of success and by famine, a number of the chiefs of the besieged went over to the enemy. ʿAbd al-Muʾmin had scaling-ladders made and distributed them among the tribes. The assault was made and, according to Ibn al-Athir, the defection of the Christian soldiers facilitated its success. The Almoravid Sultan, ʿIṣḥāq, a young boy who had sought refuge in the fortress, was slain, along with a large number of the Almoravids. This event took place in the month of Shawwal (March 6—April 3, 1147). according to the majority of the historians.

The Almohad dynasty which came from the south naturally took Marrakesh as its capital. It was here that ʿAbd al-Muʾmin and his successors usually resided when they were not in the country. The town prospered exceedingly under their rule. They gave it many important public buildings: the ḵāba, mosques, schools, a hospital, aqueducts and magnificent gardens. During this period of prosperity, there were very few events of particular interest in the history of Marrakesh. In 547 (1152—1153) according to Ibn Khaldūn, in 549 (1154—1155) al-Bahāḵ and the Almoravid Sultan, ʿIṣḥāq, brother of the Mawlid Ibn Tumart, entered the town and tried to raise the inhabitants against ʿAbd al-Muʾmin who was away at Sale. The rising was speedily put down and ended in the massacre of the rebels and their accomplices. But on the decline of the dynasty, i.e. after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212) and the death of al-ʿAsir, son of al-Manṣūr, Marrakesh became the scene of the struggle between the royal family decended from ʿAbd al-Muʾmin and the Almohad shāhīs descended from the companions of Ibn Tumart who, quoting traditions of the latter, claimed the right to grant investiture to the sultān and to keep them in tutelage Abū Muhammad ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, brother of al-Manṣūr, was strangled in Sept. 1211 (1224). His successor ʿAlī was drowned in a bath in the palace (Oct. 624 = 1227) and the Almohad shāhīs appointed his successor the young Yahyā b. al-Naṣr, while Abu Tūb Idrīs al-Maʾmūn, brother of ʿAbd al-ʿAwwāl was proclaimed in Spain. The whole country was soon in the throes of revolution. Yahyā, fearing the defection of the nobles Almohads, fled to Tinmal (April—May 626 = 1228). Disorder reigned in Marrakesh, where a governor named al-Maʾmūn was finally appointed. But four months later, Yahyā returned to Marrakesh with fresh troops, put al-Maʾmūn's governor to death and after staying seven days in the town was forced to go to Gillīz to fight a battle (Feb. 1230). For al-Maʾmūn had arrived from Spain to take possession of his kingdom. Ferdinand III, king of Castile, had given in return for various concessions, a body of 12,000 Christian horsemen with whose assistance al-Maʾmūn defeated Yahyā and his followers, entered Marrakesh and handled the anti-Almohad regime there, marked not only by a terrible massacre of the šāhīs and their families but by a new orientation in religious matters quite opposed to that of the preceding reigns. On his arrival in Marrakesh, al-Maʾmūn mounted the pulpit of the mosque of the ḵāba, recited the ʿIrāq, solemnly cursed the memory of Ibn Tumart and announced a whole series of measures, some of which are given by the Kūfīs and Ibn Khaldūn and which show he intended to do everything on opposite lines to his predecessors. His innovations revived the discontent so that two years later (1232) while al-Maʾmūn and his militia were besieging Ceuta, Yahyā again occupied Marrakesh and plundered it. Al-Maʾmūn at once turned back to the rescue of his capital but died on the way (Oct. 17, 1232 = 629 a. H.). His widow, ʿAbd al-ʿHabbāb, succeeded in getting her son al-Rašīd, aged 14, proclaimed by the leaders of the army, including the commander of the Christian mercenaries. In return she gave them Marrakesh to plunder if they could reconquer it. But the people of the town, learning of this clause in the bargain, made their own terms before opening their gates to the new sultān. The latter had to grant them the amīrūn and pay the Christian general and his companions the sum they might have expected from the plunder of the capital — according to the Kūfīs, 500,000 dinārs.

In 633 (1235—1236) a rebellion of the Khāṭīb drove al-Rašīd out of Marrakesh and he took refuge in Sidīlmāsa while Yahyā recaptured Marrakesh. Al-Rašīd however succeeded in retaking it and Yahyā finally was assassinated. It was in the reign of the Almohad al-Saʿīd (1242—1248) that the Marinids who had arrived in the east of the country in 1216, seized the greater part of the kingdom of Fās. His successor ʿUmar al-Murtādā, proclaimed in 646 (1248), found himself in 658 (1260) reduced to the solitary kingdom of Marrakesh, to the south of the Lāfīm Rāfī. In 660 (1261—1262) the Marinid Abū ʿUṯuf Yaḥyā, b. ʿAbd al-Ḥāṣib came to attack Marrakesh. He encamped on mount Gillīz whence he threatened the town. Al-Murtādā sent his cousin, the satyiʿd Abū Tūb Idrīs, surnamed Abū Dabbūs, to fight him. The emir ʿAbd Allāh b. Abū ʿUṯuf was slain in the battle and his father lost heart, abandoned his plans on Marrakesh and returned to Fās at the end of Kadjas 661 (beg. June 1262).

From this time one feels that the dynasty is lost although peace was made, which moreover showed the humiliation of the Almohads who consented to pay tribute; but they were not to destroy themselves. Falling into disfavour with his cousin al-Murtādā, Abū Dabbūs, this great-grandson of ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, who in the preceding year had defended Marrakesh against the Marinid sultan, sought refuge with the latter and obtained from him the assistance necessary to overthrow al-Murtādā, on condition that he shared the spoils. Victorious and proclaimed sultan in October 1266, Abū Dabbūs forgot his promises. Abū ʿUṯuf Yaḥyā came in person to remind him of them. He laid siege to Marrakesh in 1267 but Abū Dabbūs had a stroke of good fortune for
the Marinid had to raise the siege to go and defend the kingdom of Fāṣ against an attack by the sultan of Tlemcen, Vaghmūrān. The campaign being over, Abū Yusuf Ya‘qūb returned to Marrakesh. He entered it in Muharram 668 (Sept. 1269). The fi ḫāṣ tells us that he gave the amān to the inhabitants and to the surrounding tribes, whom he overwhelmed with gifts and ruled with justice and remained seven months to pacify and organise the country. By accepting Marinid rule, however, Marrakesh lost for two and a half centuries its position as a capital. The new dynasty made Fāṣ its capital.

Its sūlāns however, did not neglect Marrakesh especially during this period (end of the xiith and first half of the xivth century). The chronicles record many sojourns made by them there but its great days were over. The town began to lose its inhabitants. Abu l-Ḥasan ‘Alī was the only Marinid to undertake buildings of any importance at Marrakesh (a mosque and a madrasa). In the absence of the sovereign, the marābāt of Abū ‘Ianā became very strong and entrusted to powerful governors as befitted a large town remote from the central authority. For nearly 20 years, from 668 to 687 (1269–1288), this office was held by Muhammad b. ‘Ali b. Muḥallī, a chief greatly devoted to the Marinids, says Ibn Khaldūn, and allied by marriage to the family of their ruler. But in February 1288, fearing treachery from Muhammad b. ‘Ali, Abū Ya‘qūb Yusuf threw him into prison and gave his office to Muhammad b. ‘Atīū al-Dānnī, a client and confidant of the royal family, to whom the sūlān further entrusted his son Abū ‘Amīr. Abū Ya‘qūb had not left Marrakesh since Muhammad b. ‘Ali had rebelled there and proclaimed himself sovereign at the instigation of the governor Ibn ‘Atīū (Nov. 1228). Abū Ya‘qūb hastened to Marrakesh which he took after several days siege. The young Abū ‘Amīr had time to escape and seek refuge in the mountains among the Maṣmūdī tribes, after plundering the treasury.

The custom of giving the governorship of Marrakesh to a prince of the ruling family was kept up. Towards the end of May 1307, under the walls of Tlemcen, sūlān Abū Ḥabīb gave his cousin Yusuf, son of Muhammad b. Abū ‘Iyāq b. b. Abū al-Ḥāq, the governorship of Marrakesh and the provinces depending on it. By the end of the year, Yusuf rebelled and proclaimed himself independent at Marrakesh after putting to death the governor of the town, al-Ḥādji Maḥmūd. Defeated by the imperial troops on the banks of the Umam Rabī, the rebel fled to the mountains, plundering Marrakesh on his way (Jan. 1308). The punishment inflicted on the rebels was severe. Yusuf b. Abū ‘Iyāq, handed over by a shaikh with whom he had taken refuge, was put to death and the heads of 600 of his followers went to adorn the battlements of the town. Abū Sa‘īd Uṯmān stayed at Marrakesh on several occasions. He did much rebuilding in 720 (1320). Peace and comparative prosperity seem to have reigned there under the rule of Abu l-Ḥasan until this prince, as a result of reverses suffered in his struggle with the Ḥafṣids, found his own son, the ambitious Abū ‘Ianā, rebelling against him. During the troubles which now broke out, Ibn Khaldūn tells us, the town was seriously threatened with being sacked by the Maṣmūdāt of the mountains led by Abū ʿAllāh al-Saḵṣī. Abū ‘Ianā was able to consolidate his power and avert this danger. The struggle between father and son ended in the region of Marrakesh. Abu l-Ḥasan, defeated at the end of Safar 757 (May 1350) near the town, sought refuge in the mountains with the emirs of the Ḥafṣids and died there just after becoming reconciled to his son and designating him his successor (June 1352).

During the course of the xivth century, the emirs of the Ḥafṣids played a very important part in the country. The position of the tribe on an almost inaccessible mountain, from which it commanded Marrakesh, gave its chiefs comparative independence and predominating influence among the other Maṣmūdāt. Abū ‘Ianā took no steps against the emir ‘Abī al-ʿAzīz who had given asylum to the fugitive Abu l-Ḥasan. He retained him in the command of his tribe, which he gave a few years later to his brother ʿAmīr. In 1353 the latter, becoming chief of all the Maṣmūdāt tribes and sufficiently powerful to keep under his thumb the governor of Marrakesh al-Musṭamid, son of Abū ‘Ianā, very mostraɪnly resisted the attempt at enfeoffing himself completely independent. He received and for a time held as hostages two rebel Marinid princes Abu l-Fadl, son of the sūlān Abū Sālim, and ‘Abī al-Raḥmān, son of Sūlān Abū ʿAlī. Quarrelling with his protégé Abu l-Fadl whom he had made governor of Marrakesh, he retired into his mountains and for several years defended the armies of the sūlān. He was in the end captured and put to death in 1370.

After the death of Sūlān ‘Abī al-ʿAzīz, the pretender Abu l-ʾAbbas, son of Sūlān Sālim, had himself proclaimed in Fāṣ with the help of his cousin ‘Abī al-Raḥmān. Abu l-Fadl was named a pretender to the throne. The latter as a reward for his services was given the independent governorship of Marrakesh and the country round it (June 1374). The empire was thus completely broken up. The two rulers soon began to quarrel but then signed a treaty of peace in 1378. There was a new rupture and a new truce two years later after Marrakesh had been besieged for two months without result. Abu l-ʾAbbās in the end took Marrakesh in Djamād 584 (July–Aug. 1352), and ‘Abī al-Raḥmān was slain. Abu l-ʾAbbas, dispossessed in 1384 and exiled to Granada, succeeded in reconquering his kingdom in 1387 and sent to Marrakesh as governor his son al-Mutaṣir. This event is the last recorded by Ibn Khaldūn. From the time his record ceases and throughout the xivth century we are incredibly poor in information about the history of Marrakesh. The south appears to have continued to form a large governorship in the hands of princes of the royal family. The only information at all definite that we have comes from a Portuguese historian who records that during the three years which followed the capture of Ceuta by the Portuguese (1415—1418), Morocco was a prey to the struggles among the pretenders. While Abu Saʿīd Uṯmān was ruling in Fāṣ, Mawlyy Bāʾ Alī, king of Marrakesh, was fighting against another Marinid prince called Fāris. The “kingdom” or governorship of Marrakesh does not seem to have completely broken the links which bound it to the kingdom of Fāṣ for the governors of Marrakesh supplied contingents to the army which tried to retake Ceuta. But they very soon ceased to take part in the holy war in the north of Morocco and their name is not found among the opponents of the Portuguese,
Marrakesh by 1430 seems to have become de facto if not de jure independent; but we do not know within fifty years at what date the Hunfta emirs established their power; they were descended from a brother of 'Amir b. Muhammad. They were "kings" of Marrakesh when in 1508 the Portuguese established themselves at Safi, taking advantage of the anarchy prevailing, for the power of the Hunfta emirs hardly extended beyond the environs of their capital and they could not effectively protect their tribes against the attacks of the Christians. In July 1512 the Portuguese governors of Safi had succeeded in extending their power over the tribes near Marrakesh (Awdâd Maqû) and the town lived in fear of the raiders which on several occasions brought the Portuguese cavalry and their Arab allies into the district. The king of Marrakesh, overawed, entered into negotiations in 1514 but the terms were nothing less than his paying tribute as vassal and the building of a Portuguese fortress at Marrakesh. Agreement could not be reached. The occupation of Marrakesh remained the dream of the Portuguese soldiers. An attack on the town led by the governors of Safi and Azeitur failed (April 23, 1515). This was the period when the reaction against the anarchy and foreign invasions of the Sahid sharifs began to come to the front in Sâs. Ahmad al-Ajudj, who appeared in 1513 to the north of the Atlas, had himself recognised as leader of the holy war and accepted as such by the local chiefs, even by al-Nâzi, king of Marrakesh. In the month of April 1514, it is recorded that he was in Marrakesh with the king. At the end of 1521, al-Ajudj established himself peacefully in Marrakesh which he found partly depopulated by famine and marred the daughter of the king Muhammad b. Nâzi, called Bî Shenûfî. The latter in 1524 having tried to kidnap against the tutelage of his too powerful son-in-law, al-Ajudj and his brother Muhammad al-Shâhîk, seized the kašîla, which seems till then to have been held by Bî Shenûfî. They disposed of the latter by having him assassinated in the following year (1525). Marrakesh became the Sahidian capital. The king of Fas, Ahmad al-Wâfî, tried unsuccessfully to take it in June 1527. It remained in the hands of al-Ajudj till 1554, when it was seized by his brother Muhammad al-Shâhîk, up till then king of Sâs. After the ascension of Muhammad al-Shâhîk in 1557, al-Ajudj was put to death at Marrakesh with seven of his sons and grandsons, so as to secure the crown for Mawly 'Abd Allah al-âdîlî. The whole of the latter part of the century was for Marrakesh a period of great prosperity. 'Abd Allah al-âdîlî built a series of important public works: rearrangement of the palace and of the provision storehouses in the kašîla; in the town, the madrasa Ibn Yûsûf and the al-Maâzîn mosque etc. Ahmad al-Manûr finished his brother's work by building in the 69-82 from 1578 to 1591 the famous al-Badi' palace. The Sahid, enriched by several years of peace and good government, and by the gold brought from the conquest of the Suliûn (1591-1592) lived almost continually in Marrakesh, to which he restored a splendour and a prosperity that it had not enjoyed since the end of the sixteenth century. But the death of al-Manûr opened a period of trouble and civil war "sufficient to turn white the hair of an infant at the breast" to use the expression of the historian al-Îfrîînî. While Âbu Fâris, son of al-Manûr, was proclaimed at Marrakesh, another son, Zidân, was chosen sultan at Fas. A third brother, al-Shâhîk, came and took Fas, then sent against Marrakesh an army led by his son 'Abd Allâh, who seized the town in Dec. 22, 1606. But Zidân, who sought refuge first in Temenç, then made his way to Sûs, via Tâfîlât and coming suddenly to Marrakesh, had himself proclaimed there while 'Abd Allâh b. al-Shâhîk while escaping with his troops was attacked in the midst of the gardens (qayâna Ro‰îkûr) and completely defeated (Feb. 25, 1607). In October of the same year, 'Abd Allâh returned after defeating Zidân's troops on the Wâdî Tâfîlât (Oct. 2, 1607), fought a second battle with them at Râs al-'Ain (a spring in Tânsîfî), regained possession of the town and revenged himself in a series of massacres and punishments so terrible that a portion of the populace having sought refuge in the Gillîz, proclaimed as sultan, Muhammad, great-grandson of Ahmad al-Ajudj, 'Abd Allâh was forced to fly (Jan. 25, 1608). Zidân, recalled by a section of the populace, regained possession of his capital in a few days. The struggle between Zidân and his brother al-Shâhîk, in the near future, centred round the possession of Fas. Zidân failed in his plan to retake it and henceforth Fas, given over completely to anarchy, remained separate from the kingdom of Marrakesh. On these happenings, a marabout from Tâfîlât, named Abu Mahâlî, attempted to intervene (1611) to put an end to the fighting among the pretenders, which was inflicting great suffering on the people. His intervention only made matters worse. He took Marrakesh on May 20, 1612. Zidân took refuge in Sâs and succeeded in again gaining possession of his capital with the help of an influential marabout in Sûs, called Yâhyâ b. 'Abd Allâh. After a battle near Gillîz, Zidân withdrew into Marrakesh on Nov. 30, 1613. But Yâhyâ, succumbing to ambition, rebelled himself at the end of 1618, against the ruler whose cause he had once so well sustained. Zidân had again to take refuge in Sûs. He was soon able to return to Marrakesh, taking advantage of the discord that had broken out in the enemy ranks. 'Abd al-Malik (1627-1631), son and successor of Zidân, has left only the memory of his cruelty and debauchery. He was murdered in May 1631. The renegades, who killed him, also disposed of his brother and successor al-Wâlid in 1636. A third brother, Muhammad al-Shâhîk al-Askâhar, succeeded him but had only a semblance of power. He managed however to reign till 1655, but his son Ahmad al-Askâhar was completely in the hands of the Shab-ãnûn, an Arab tribe who assassinated him and gave the throne to 'Abd al-Qârim, called Karrâm al-Hâjûdû, in 1659. "The latter", says al-Îfrîînî, "united under his sway all the kingdom of Marrakesh and conducted himself in an admirable fashion with regard to his subjects". His son Abû Bakr succeeded him in 1668 but only reigned two months until the coming of the Filâli Sultan al-Kâshid, already lord of Fas, who took Marrakesh on July 31, 1668. Called to Marrakesh by the rebellion of his nephew Ahmad b. Mufrûz, al-Kâshid met his death there in the garden of al-Agâdî, his head having been injured by a branch of an orange tree against which his horse threw him when it stumbled.

Mawly Ismâ'îl had some difficulty in getting himself proclaimed at Marrakesh, which preferred
his nephew, Ahmad b. Muḥiriz. Ismaʿil forced his way in on the 9th Safar 1083 (June 4, 1672). In the following year, Marrakesh again welcomed Ahmad b. Muḥiriz. After a siege of two years (March 1675—June 1677), Ismaʿil reoccupied Marrakesh and plundered it. He passed through it again in 1683 on his way to Sūs to fight Ahmad b. Muḥiriz who was still in rebellion. Marrakesh was no longer the capital. Mawlay Ismaʿil took an interest in it and destroyed the palaces of the ḥāṣba to use the materials for his works in Meknes. In 1114 (Feb. 1703), a son of Mawlay Ismaʿil, Muhammad al-ʿAlīm, rebelled against his father, seized Marrakesh and plundered it. Zīdān, brother of the rebel, was given the task of suppressing the rising, which he did, plundering the town once more.

Anarchy again broke out after the death of Ismaʿil. Its centre was Meknes. Mawlay al-Mustadī, proclaimed by the Abīd in 1738, was disowned by them in 1740 and replaced by his brother ʿAbd Allāh who sought refuge in Marrakesh. His brother al-Nasīr remained his khālitja in Marrakesh till 1745, while al-Mustadī tried in vain to reconquer his kingdom. Marrakesh finally submitted in 1746 to Mawlay ʿAbd Allāh who sent his son Sīdī Muḥammad there as khālitja. The governorship and then the reign of the latter (1757—1790) formed one of the happiest periods in the history of Marrakesh. Sīdī Muḥammad completely restored the town, made it his usual residence, received many European embassies there, including a French one led by the Comte de Breugnon in 1767, and developed its trade. Peace was not disturbed during his long reign except for a riot raised by a marabout pretender named Qamar, who at the head of a few rebels attempted to attack the palace in order to plunder the public treasury. He was at once seized and put to death (between 1766 and 1772, according to the sources). On the death of Sīdī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, the situation remained very unsettled for several years. After taking the oath of allegiance to Mawlay Yazid (May 3, 1790) the people of Marrakesh took in his brother Mawlay Ḥishām and proclaimed him. On hearing this, Yazid abandoned the siege of Ceuta, returned to Marrakesh, plundered it and committed all kinds of atrocities (1792). Ḥishām, supported by the ʿAbda and the Dukkala, marched on Marrakesh. Yazid, wounded in the battle, died a few days later in the palace (Feb. 1792). Marrakesh remained faithful to the party of Mawlay Ḥishām, but very soon the Ḥāmma Ḧishām entertained the idea of capturing the kaṣba (1800 = 1794—1795). While the partisans of the two princes were exhausting themselves in fighting, Mawlay Slimān, sulṭān of Fās, avoided taking sides in the struggle. The plague rid him at one blow of both his rivals (July 1799) who had in any case to submit some time before. The last years of the reign of Mawlay Slimān were overcast by troubles in all parts of the empire. Defeated at the very gates of Marrakesh, he was taken prisoner by the rebel Shārda. He died at Marrakesh on Nov. 28, 1822. Mawlay ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān (1824—1859) did much for the afioresation of Agdāl and restored the religious buildings. His son Muḥammad completed his work by repairing tanks and aqueducts. This two reigns were a period of tranquillity of Marrakesh. In 1862 however, while Sīdī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān was fighting the Spaniards at Tetuan the Ṣāḥma rebelled, plundered the Sīk al-Ḥamīs and closely blockaded the town, cutting off communications and supplies, until the Sulṭān, having made peace with Spain, came to relieve the town (June 1862). Mawlay al-Ḥasan hardly ever lived in Marrakesh but he stopped there on several occasions, notably in October 1875, to punish the Ṣāḥma and the Bū ʿIṣāba, who had rebelled, and in 1880 and 1885, to prepare his expeditions into Sūs.

During the last years of the reign of Mawlay ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (1894—1908), it was at Marrakesh that the opposition to the European tastes and experiments of the Sulṭān made itself most strongly felt. The xenophobia culminated in the murder of a French doctor named Mauchamp (March 19, 1907), and the spirit of separatism in the proclamation as sulṭān of Mawlay ʿAbd al-Ḥaḍīz, brother of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and governor of the provinces of the south (Aug. 24, 1907). But ʿAbd al-Ḥaḍīz becoming ruler of the whole empire (Aug. 24, 1907) and having signed the treaty of March 24, 1912 establishing the protectorate of Spain over Morocco, the anti-foreign movement broke out again in the south. The Mauritanian marabout al-Ḥiba had himself proclaimed and established himself in Marrakesh. He only held out there for a brief period. His troops having been defeated at Sīdī Bū ʿUṭmān on Sept. 6, 1912, the French troops occupied Marrakesh the next day.

Relations with Europe. Five minor friars sent by St. Francis were put to death at Marrakesh on Jan. 16, 1220, for having attempted to convert Muslims and having insulted the Prophet Muḥammad in their discourses. Their martyrdom attracted the attention of the Holy See to Marrakesh. A mission and a bishopric were established by Honorius III in 1225 to give the consolations of religion to the Christians domiciled in Morocco: merchants, slaves and mercenaries in the sulṭān's army. In the Almoravid period, the sulṭāns had Christian mercenaries recruited from prisoners reduced to slavery or from the Mozarab population of Spain whom they had from time to time deported to Morocco by entire villages. In 1227, Abu l-ʿUla Idris al-Maʿmūn having won his kingdom with the help of Christian troops sent by the king of Castile found himself bound to take up quite a new attitude to the Christians. He granted them various privileges, including permission to build a church in Marrakesh and worship openly there. This was called Notre Dame and stood in the kaṣba, probably opposite the mosque of al-Mansūr: it was destroyed during a rising in 1232. But the Christian soldiery continued to enjoy the right to worship, at least privately, and the bishopric of Marrakesh filled an episcopal board at Seville, existed so long as there was an organised Christian soldiery in Morocco, i.e. to the end of the xvth century. The title of Bishop of Marrakesh was borne till the end of the xvth century by the suffragans of Seville (cf. Father A. Lopez, Los obispos de Marruecos desde el siglo XIII, in Archivo Ibero-Americano, N.º xli., 1920). A Spanish Franciscan, the prior Juan de Prado, who came to re-establish the mission, was put to death in 1631 at Marrakesh. A few years later (1637), a monastery was re-established beside the prison for slaves in the kaṣba. It was destroyed in 1659 or 1660 after the death of the last Sulṭān. Henceforth the Franciscans were obliged to live in the mellah
where they had down to the end of the xvith century a little chapel and a monastery. As to the Christian merchants, they had not much reason to go to Marrakesh in the middle ages. Trade with Europe was conducted at Ceuta from which the Muslim merchants carried European goods into the interior of the country. In the xviith century, 'Abd Allah al-Ghālib had a ζουνταλ of bonded warehouses built in the sīrār where the Christian merchants were allowed to live; but the majority of those who came to Marrakesh preferred to settle in the Jewish quarter. This was also that foreign ambassador usually lodged, at least when they were not made to encamp in one of the gardens of the palace.

Monuments. The present enclosure of Marrakesh is a wall of clay about 20 feet high, flanked with rectangular bastions at intervals of 250 to 300 feet. Bab Aghmat, Bab Mâbrouk, Bab Dhabbâgh which still exist more or less rebuilt, are mentioned in the account of the attack on Marrakesh by the Almohads in 524 (1130). Bab Vintâna, Bab al-Makhzen, mentioned at the same time, have disappeared. Bab al-Sâliha (no longer in existence: it stood on the site of the mellâk) and Bab Dukkala (still in existence) figure in the story of the capture of the town by the Almohads (1147). The plan of the wall has therefore never changed. It has been rebuilt in places from time to time, as the clay crumbled away, but it may be assumed that a number of pieces of the wall, especially on the west and south-west, are original, as well as at least three gates all now built up, to which they owe their survival, but have lost their name. According to Ibn 'I-Fida (xviith century), there were in Marrakesh seventeen gates, twenty-four at the beginning of the xvith century according to Leo Africanus. It would be very difficult to draw up an accurate list, for some have been removed, others altered, since the date of the names have been altered. Ibn Faṣūl Allah al-'Umarî (beginning of the xvith century) adds to the names already mentioned those of Bab Nisîr, Bab Muhîrî, Bab Mecûshî, Bab al-Kaṣâb all four of which have disappeared, Bab Taghātî, Bab Fâs (now Bab al-Khumes), Bab al-Khâbî which still exist. The only important changes, which have been made in the walls of Marrakesh since they were built, have been the building of the kaṣâb in the south and in the north the creation of the quarter of Sidi bel-'Abbâs. The râsîya, which as late as the xvith century stood outside the walls beyond the Bab Taghātî, was taken into the town with all its dependencies.

The Kaṣâb. The little kaṣâb and the palace of Dâr al-Kâmima built by Yaṣûf b. Tâshfin, lay north of the present "Mosque of the Book-sellers" of Kutubiyya. 'Ali b. Yaṣûf added in the same quarter other palaces called Sûr al-Ḫâdîjar, or Kast al-Hâdjar because they were built with stones from the Gilâk, while all the other buildings in the town were of brick or clay. It was here that the first Almohad took up their quarters. According to a somewhat obscure passage of the 'Irâqâ, Ābû Yaṣûf Yaṣûf seems to have begun the building of a kaṣâb in the south of the town but it was Yaṣûf al-Manṣîr who built the new kaṣâb (1189-97); that is to say he joined to the south wall of the town a new walled area within which he built palaces, a mosque, and a regular town. Nothing remains of the Almohad palaces, but one can from pieces of wall and other vestiges follow the old wall, at least on the north end the east side. There also the line of the wall has hardly changed. The magnificent gateway of carved stone by which the kaṣâb is now entered, must be one of al-Manṣîr's building, its modern name of Bab Agnâû (the Negro's Gate) is not found in any old text. It probably corresponds to Bab al-Kûllî (Gate of the Negroes), often mentioned by the historians.

Ibn Faṣūl Allah al-'Umarî, in the xivth century, Leo Africanus and Marmol in the xviith, have left us fairly detailed descriptions of the kaṣâb, in spite of a few obscure passages. In the Almohad period, the kaṣâb was divided into three quite distinct parts. One wall in the northwest, around the mosque of al-Manṣîr which still exists, contains the police offices, the headquarters of the Almohad tribes and the barracks of the Christian soldiery. From this one entered through the Bab al-Tûbâb, a second enclosure in which around a huge open space, the "Cercueil" of Marmol (âbârây), were grouped the guardhouses, the offices of the minister of the army, a guest-house, a madrassa with its library and a large building called al-sâqîf (the porticoes), the "Acequie" of Marmol, occupied by the principal members of the Almohad organisation, the "Tea", the "Fifty" and the jîlâ, the pages (âhî al-dâr). The royal palace, sometimes called the Alhambra of Marrakesh, in imitation of that of Granada, was entered from the Asârâg and occupied the whole area east of the kaṣâb. The palaces of al-Manṣîr were still in existence at the beginning of the xviith century when the Sa'dîans took possession. Ābû Allah al-Ghâlib incorporated them in the new palaces which he was building. Āhmad al-Manṣîr added, in the gardens to the north, the famous al-Bâdi' palace celebrated for its size and splendour. Only a few almost shapeless ruins remain of it, but its plan is perfectly clear. Mawlây Isâmîl had it destroyed in order to use its materials. The kaṣâb remained so completely in ruins that Sidi Muhammad b. Ābû Allah when he became governor of Marrakesh in 1746, was obliged to live in a tent until his new buildings were finished. It is to him that we owe an important part of the present palace with its inner garden, 'Arṣat al-Nil. Other works were later undertaken by Mawlây Slimân and his successors. Some large unfinished buildings date only from Mawlây 'Abd al-Hafîz. A number of gates, in addition to the Bab Agnâû give admittance to the kaṣâb: these are Bab Berrima and Bab al-Ahmâr in the east, Bab Ighîl and Bab Kaṣâb in the west. The palace has vast gardens belonging to it: Dînân al-Âfîyâ, Agdâl, Dînąn Râwât, Mânîâyîn, Mânârâ. The latter, two miles wide, was a pleasure house of the sultans. The palace of Dâr al-Ba'idâ, situated in the Agdâl, took the place of a Sa'dîan palace. It was rebuilt by Sidi Muhammad b. Ābû Allah and has since been restored. As to the gardens of the Agdâl, they seem to have been created in the xith century by 'Abd al-Mu'min.

Mosques. Nothing remains of the early Almoravid mosques, in the building of one of which Yaṣûf b. Tâshfin himself worked along with the masons as a sign of humility. But the cathedral mosque of 'Ali b. Yaṣûf, where Ibn Tûmârt had an interview with the sultan, although several times rebuilt, still retains its name. The Almohads, on taking possession of Marrakesh, destroyed all the mosques on the pretext that they were wrongly
oriented. The mosque of 'Ali b. Yūsuf was only partly destroyed and was rebuilt. ‘Abd Allah al-Ghālibī restored it in the middle of the xviith century. The present buildings and the minaret date from Mawlāy Sulaymān (1792–1822).

Kutubiyya. When the Almohads entered Marrakhes, Abd al-Mu'min built the first Kutubiyya of which some traces still remain and it has been possible to reconstruct its plan. As it was wrongly oriented he built a new mosque, the present Kutubiyya, in prolongation of the first but with a slightly different orientation. It takes its name from the 100 booksellers' shops which used to be around its entrance. It is a very large building with seventeen naves, which with its decoration in carved plaster, its stalactite cupolas, the moulding of its timberwork, its capitals and magnificent pulpit (minbar) of inlaid work, is the most important and the most perfectly preserved work of Almohad art. The minaret, begun by ‘Abd al-Mu'min, was only finished in the reign of his grandson al-Ma'nūr (1215). It is 230 feet high and its powerful silhouette dominates the whole town and the palm-groves. It is the prototype of the Giralda of Seville and of the tower of Hassān al-Rabat. It is decorated with arcatures the effects of which were formerly heightened by paintings still visible in places, with a band of ceramic work around the top.

The mosque of the kāba or mosque of al-Ma'nūr is the work of Ya'qūb al-Ma'nūr. It was begun in the xviith century by the general for the great mosque. It has been profoundly altered, first by ‘Abd Allah al-Ghālibī the Sa'dīn, then in the middle of the xviith century by Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah, then more recently by Mawlāy Abd al-Raḥmān (1822–1859). The minaret of brick is intact and magnificently ornamented with green ceramics. The lamp-holder supports a ǧāmūr of three bowls of gilt copper, which occupy a considerable place in the legends of Marrakesh. They are said to be of pure gold and to be enchanted so that no one could take them away without bringing on himself the most terrible misfortunes. This legend is often wrongly connected with the ǧāmūr of the Kutubiyya.

Among the religious monuments of Marrakesh of architectural interest, may be mentioned and the minarets of the mosque of Ibn Sahl (dated 731 = 1331) and of the sanctuary of Mawla b-93, built in the Marinid period in the Almohad tradition, and two Sa’dīn mosques: the mosque of al-Mواسم or mosque of the Sharifs, which owes its origin to ‘Abd Allah al-Ghālibī, and that of Bāb Dukkalā, built in 965 (1557–1558) by Lālā Maṣ‘ūda, the mother of the Sulṭān Ahmad al-Мa’nūr.

Madrasas. An Almohad madrasa, built "to teach the children of the king and others of his family in it", formed part of the buildings of Ya'qūb al-Ma'nūr. This royal school was presumably different from what later were the Marinid madrasas. It stood on the great square in front of the palace and was still in existence in the time of Leo Africanus. The Marinid Abu l-Hasan in 1347 built another madrasa, also described by Leo. It lay north of the mosque of the kāba, where traces of it can still be seen. The madrasa of Ibn Yūsuf is not, as is usually said, a restoration of the Marinid madrasa. It was a new building by ‘Abd Allah al-Ghālibī, dated by an inscription of 972 (1564–1565), the only surviving example of a Sa’dīn madrasa.

Sa’dīn tombs. The two first founders of the dynasty rest beside the tomb of Sīdī Muhammad b. Sulaymān al-Djazālī in the Rīyāḍ al-Ārus quarter. Their successors from 1557 were buried to the south of the mosque of the kāba. There was a cemetery there, probably as early as the Almohad period, which still has tombs of the xviith century. The magnificent kubbah which covers the tombs of the Sa’dīn dynasty must have been built at two different periods. The one on the east under which is the tomb of Muhammad al-Shaikh seems to have been built by ‘Abd Allah al-Ghālibī. The other, with three chambers, seems to have been erected by Ahmad al-Ma'nūr (d. 1603) to hold this tomb.


MARRAKESHI — MARTHIYA

with many new instruments for the Mongol Khan Hüläğü (1259) and the observatory of Samarqand, there Ulugh Beg employed the astronomers of his time. Following him in many points but also stimulated by European astronomy Dājī Singh in India built the great observatories, the remains of which still arouse admiration in Delhi, Dājīpur, Ujjain, Benares and Mathura.


MARTHIYA (A., plur. marlīb), translated variously by elegy or dirge, is a poem in Arabic (and other languages following Arabic tradition) in memory of a deceased person. The word elegy is hardly applicable in most cases as such poems differ somewhat from the style of Greek and Latin poems bearing this name; some notable exceptions exist and the finest example of a real elegy is perhaps the poem of a woman named Bara al-Kinawayi preserved in the Kitāb al-kītiyārīn, and still unpublished. It was the custom of the ancient Arabs after the usual nānūd or lamentation of women [1-v.] that a member of the family, gifted as a poet, should commemorate the noble qualities and deeds of the departed in a poem by enumerating them. These poems as a rule do not contain the taḥkīb or amatory introduction like ordinary ḵaṣādas and in many cases have a peculiarity in their diction, the introduction of a kind of internal rhyme resembling sadī, called tarsī. This has been fully discussed by Rhodospanax in his analysis of the poetry of al-Khānsī, but is found in many other marthiyas. Many poets, remembering the widespread, nay universal, belief of the ancient Arabs in fatalism, embellish their poems with descriptions to show that nothing can escape inevitable fate. A typical example is the long poem by Abū Dhu‘āb (Dīwān, N. 41, Muṣḏafat al-qādīn, N. 125) in which the sadī and pictures are drawn of the impossibility of escaping death, both for man and beast. This tradition has been followed by Arabic poets from the times of paganism to the present date and the quantity of poems produced for example upon the death of the Egyptian statesman Zaghīlī Pāsha proves that the taste for them has not abated. The collected poems of al-Zahwāwī, the most prominent living poet of
the 'Irāk, contain several pages mourning Zahgālū. As regards the earlier period, poems have been preserved in considerable numbers and from the Ḥamāma of Abī Tammām downwards nearly every anthology has a special chapter devoted to marṭūrī. Several early scholars in addition made special collections of this class of literature and one such collection has come down to us, made by the Kūfī grammarian Ibn al-'Arābī, and published from an incomplete manuscript by W. Wright. The poet par excellence in this class of poetry however was a woman, al-Khānṣā' [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** W. Wright, Opuscula Arabica, Leyden 1859, p. 97–116; Rhodokanakis, Al-Hamasa and ihre Trägerleiter, Vienna 1904; Ibn Raḥṣāḥ, Umda, Cairo, ii. 117–126; chapters on marṭūrī in the Ḥamāma of Abī Tammām, al-Baḥṭūrī and Ibn al-Shādārī.

(F. Krenkow)

**MARTOŁOSEN.** Lexicons explain marṭūrī and marṭūlī as "Christian soldiers, volunteers in the Ottoman army." The word apparently is not to be found in Turkish authors, but is often met with in Western books and documents.

Leunclavius (Annales, p. 142) says that marṭoūlī means "robber"; Ricaut (Italian translation by C. Belli, Storia stato presente dell'Impero ottomano) relates that Buda was garrisoned by 300 marṭoūlī "who are like infantry"; M. Sanudo (Diziarī, xxxvi. 271) mentions one Sbolo-vach "a very brave man and great marṭoūlī", who served the Turks and was killed in action near Zara in Dalmatia. According to Lazzaro Soranzo (L'Ottomano, 4th ed., Naples 1600, p. 110–111), marṭoūlī means spy and thief.

Sathas (Monum. Historiae Helmincas, iv., lvi., No. 4) derives the word (martorle, martorale, martorlēs, martolaili, armatolō) from ḥāmlābād and says that they were soldiers of fortune serving the Turks, often opposed the "Stradiottī", who fought for the Venetians.

Von Hammer (G.O.R., iv. 211–212) observes that the martorlo were bands of brigands, armed by the Turks on the frontiers towards the Venetians and Dalmatians; while, quoting Pouqueville, who favours the etymology ḥāmlābād, he inclines to an etymology from the Hungarian.

Pouqueville's and Sathas' explanations seem to us the most probable. The appellation was not limited to brigands on the western frontiers of the Ottoman empire, but was also given to armed bands of volunteers (xvith–xvith centuries) in the Danube region (Jorga, Geschichte der ömn. Reiches, iii. 419; Hurmuzzaki, Documente etc., xii., p. 130).

**MARUF AL-KARKHI.** Aṣṣīr, M.; Flüüz or Frużen, who died in 1200 (815–816), was a celebrated ascetic and mystic of the Baghdād school. The niḥa al-Karkhi probably refers to Karkh Bāḏjadda, a township in eastern 'Irāk (Šamˈān, Anāb, 478b, l. 10; cf. Vāqā, Mūṣhtarīk, ed. büstenfeld, p. 369, l. 8 ssg.), though some authorities connect him with the Karkh quarter of Bagdad. His parents are generally said to have been Christians; according to Ibn Taḥhirībdī (ed. Juynboll and Matthes, i. 575), they were Šabīˈāns belonging to the district of Wāsīt. Bār b. Ṣhunais al-Kūfī and Farkād al-Sābahī, also of Kūfā, are named as his teachers in Šīʿism (Abī Tālīb al-Makki, Kūt al-Kulāb, i. 9; Fihrist, p. 183).

Of those whom he taught or influenced the most famous was Sāri al-Saḵṣī [q.v.], who in his turn became the master of Djiunaid. The story that Maʿrūf was a client of the Shīˈī Imām, "Ali b. Mūsā al-Kīdā, before whom he made profession of Islam and induced his parents to do the same, deserves no credence. Among the sayings attributed to him are the following: *Love is not to be learned from men; it is a gift of God and comes of His grace*. "The saints 269, known by three signs: their cares are for God, their business is in God, and their sight is unto God". "Šīʿism consists in grasping the realities (duckāˈīḵ) and renouncing that which is in the hands of created beings". Maʿrūf was venerated as a saint, and his tomb at Baghdād on the west bank of the Tigri is still a great resort for pilgrims. Kūshārī relates that the people used to go there in order to pray for rain, saying: "The tomb of Maʿrūf is an approved remedy (tīryāz muqarrāb)".


(R. A. Nicholson)

**MÁRUF RŪṢAF.** One of the best of contemporary Arab poets, born in Baghdād of a Kurd father and a Beduin mother in 1292 (1575). His kojūdā have been collected in a Dīwān and edited by Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Khāyātī, Bāirūt 1910, following quite an original classification. I. Kānrātī, II. ʿIṣmaˈā′lī, III. Taʿrīkh, IV. Waṣīfāt. Ruṣayl Būṭū has devoted an excellent study to him (in al-ʿArab al-Afīfīt al-ʿArabī, Cairo, Salābīya 1922, p. 67–95).

(L. Massigion)

**MĀRŪT.** [See HĀRUT and MĀRUT.]

**MARW.** [See MERK.]

**MARWA.** [See AL-SAFI.]

**MARWAḤ B. AL-ḤAKAM.** The father of the Marwaḥī Caliph, was born at Mecca or at Tāʾīf, probably several years before the Hijra. Tradition, by placing his birth 2, 4, or 5 years later than the beginning of this era, aims at depriving him of a right to the title of "Companion" by showing that he could not have effectively accompanied the Prophet, as he must have followed his father who was exiled to Tāʾīf. Further, it endears it in its hostility to give him the epithet of tafīr ibn al-ṭarīf, "the banished son of the banished man". After becoming Caliph, his grand-uncle ʿUṭman adopted him as his secretary and under this title he is said to have governed in his absence. Seriously wounded on the "day of al-Dār", at the siege of the palace of ʿUṭman, he took part later in the battle of the Camel in which he received fresh wounds. All his life his health suffered from these terrible shocks. Muʿṣawī I heard him alternately with ʿAlī b. al-ʿĀṣ [q.v.], his cousin, to govern Medina and the Ḥijāz. He showed in this function a capacity and vigour, far above the ordinary.

Finally dismissed from office, he passed into obscurity during the later years of Muʿṣawī who dreaded his ambition. When Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī refused
to recognize the Caliph Yazid, Marwan advised Walid b. 'Uthman, his successor at Medina, to employ force against the rebel. The revolt of the people of Medina caused him to be expelled with all his followers from this town. He returned to it in the train of Muslim b. 'Uqba [q.v.] whose military operations he was supporting. Put to flight once more after the death of Yazid I, he took up his residence in Syria and attended the court of the Caliph Mu'awiyah II. After the disappearance of this prince, Marwan, desiring of the fortunes of the Omeyyads, was disposed to recognize Ibn al-Zubayr, when 'Abdallah b. Ziyad persuaded him to set upon himself as candidate. Acclaimed at the assembly of 'Abd Allah he defeated the Kaisi under 'Abd al-Rahman b. Massud [q.v.] at Marj al-Khaṭṭ [q.v.]. The submission of the whole of Syria was the first result of this victory.

The reign of Marwan may be epitomized as an uninterrupted series of battles. Immediately after his official installation at Damascus he was forced to take up the gauntlet. He laid it down only to die in his capital. His chief task was the conquest of Egypt. A rapid campaign gave him possession of it, while his lieutenant repelled a rapid Dalilain raid by Ibn al-Zubayr. At Djahiyah he was compelled to recognize as his eventual successor, Khalid the son of Yazid I and the Omeyyad Amr al-Ashtar [q.v.]. After laborious negotiations, he was able to end them to the advantage of his own son 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-Ashtar, the latter being nominated by him governor of Egypt. This was the last success of his adventurous career. Worn out, the septuagenarian caliph died at Damascus on the 27th Ramadan 65 (7th May 685). He is said to have been murdered by the wife of Yazid I, the mother of the Sufyanid Khalid, whom he had married after Marj al-Khaṭṭ.

The estimates of the length of his reign vary between 8 and 11 months, according as they count the first recognition of him at Djahiyah or the second — the exact date is not known — more ceremonious one at Damascus. We do not know his exact age any more definitely. The two extremes 61 and 51 years reveal the inconsistency of tradition. The 63 years sometimes given to Marwan are merely a lucky number which has been much abused to give the age of the other caliphs. It has the advantage that it takes us back to the year 2, often said to be the year of his birth Qur'an deserts him as an old man, kahiti kahit, when he ascended the throne and contract him with the Isma'il, middle-aged man, i.e. Ibn al-Zubayr who, however, was nearly sixty. There must therefore have been an appreciable difference of age between the two competitors. Marwan, therefore, seems to us to have been over seventy. The last five years of his life, filled with rebellions, his two exiles, his share in the campaign against Medina, and in those of Syria and Egypt and reconquest these provinces of his empire finally wore out the constitution of this vigorous old man, who had never been completely cured of the effects of his terrible wounds he received in his youth. This long slain wizened old man — these physical characteristics earned him the nickname kahiti kahit — was destined to fall a victim to the great epidemic that swept over the East. In 65 it the plague reached Syria from the 'Iraq; it had begun by carrying off Mu'awiyah II. the}

decreept predecessor of Marwan, as well as Walid b. 'Uthman, a relative of both; it ended by laying low the first of the Marwānī caliphs.

Marwan showed himself a statesman worthy of the highest rank. A contemporary of the great Mu'awiyah, he had under the Sufyanids to accept — without ever resigning himself to it — the part of a brilliant second. He attained the caliphate, ever the object of his wishes, at the moment he had ceased to care about it. He allowed himself to be raised to the throne, rather than mounted it himself. But once at the top he regained that power of lucid decision and spirit of initiative which had earned Mu'awiyah's appreciation, though he feared his ambition. The new ruler remained on the throne just long enough to save the Omeyyad fortunes from an imminent collapse and to save the future of the younger branch of this dynasty which bears his name. The work was continued by his favourite son 'Abd al-Malik. He early recognised the merits of this, the elder, man, and with a brutality and absence of scruple which was thoroughly Arab, he put him in the place of the young Khalid b. Yazid I, who was less well fitted for the difficulties of the restoration. This is sufficient to characterize his place among the Syrian caliphs. It will explain the hatred of 'Abd al-Malik and 'Abd al-Malik, a hatred adopted by Muslim tradition. In energy and knowledge of the art of government, Marwan, recalled his illustrious relative Mu'awiyah. He would have equalled him, if to these eminent qualities he had been able to add that variety of political knowledge, a mixture of cunning and bonhomie, so appreciated by the Arabs, which they call kālim. He became Caliph in most critical circumstances and had to display firmness above all things, to put down rebellions, and to defend himself against the ambition and resentment of his relatives, frustrated in their attempts on the throne, or spoiled by him of their rights to it. If it had been given to him to live longer, we may well believe that he would have rivalled the first of the Omeyyad Caliphs in nobility of soul.


(H. Lammers)

**MARWAN II b. MUHAMMAD**, the last of the Omayyad caliphs in Damascus. He was the grandson of the caliph Marwān b. al-Hakam. As governor of Mesopotamia and Armenia his
father Muhammad for several years directed the campaigns against the Byzantines. His mother was a Kūrish slave-girl, Maimama b. 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.]. She was one of those who followed Muhammad b. Marwan to war; it is not till 115 (733–734) that we find Marwan coming to the front as governor of Armenia and Adharbidjān. In this position, which he held for 12 years, he fought with success against the peoples of the Caucasus and thus acquired military experience which enabled him to reorganize the Muslim army. In place of divisions consisting of the different tribes he created regular, paid troops under professional commanders; the men levied for military service were divided up into smaller divisions (kāridis) which possessed much greater mobility and strength than the long Arab battle-lines. After the death in 126 (744) of Yazid III the succession passed to his brother 'Uthmān b. al-Walid; the latter however was only recognized in the southern part of Syria. Under the pretext of protecting the interests of the sons of the murdered Walid II, Marwan crossed the Euphrates into Syria where the Kaisis at once joined him. At Ain al-Djarr between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon he encountered the Kalbids under Sulaimān, a son of the caliph Hishām. In spite of his years of experience in war with the Byzantines the latter was no match for Marwan. He was defeated and fled to Damascus, where he put to death the two sons of Walid II. He then went with his father, the nominal caliph 'Abīraham to Palmyra, the capital of the Kalbids, whereupon Marwan entered Damascus and received the homage of the people (Safar 26, 127 = Dec. 7, 744). After arranging matters in the capital he made his headquarters in Ḥarrān, where he could rely upon the support of the Kaisis who were devoted to him. The result was a rising of the Kalbis in Syria. Marwan soon succeeded in restoring order; but when in the following year he was preparing a campaign against the 'Irāk not yet subject to him, he made the mistake of levying Syrian troops also who were to join the rest of the army on the march. On reaching al-Ruṣafa where Sulaimān b. Hishām lived, the Syrians deserted from Marwan and proclaimed Sulaimān commander of the faithful. When Sulaimān occupied Kummair, Marwan had to come back. A battle took place near the town. Sulaimān was defeated and fled first to Ḥums and then to al-Kūfa. After a siege of several months Ḥims was forced to surrender; Marwan tided its walls to the ground and also those of Ba‘albek, Damascus, Jerusalem and other large towns of Syria. In the summer of 128 (746) peace was finally restored in Syria.

In the eastern provinces however complete anarchy reigned. The governorship of the 'Irāk had been given by Yazid III to a son of the caliph 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, named Abū Allāh [q. v.]. The latter of course did not recognize the claims of Marwan to the caliphate and the 'Abd Allāh b. Ma‘wiya [q. v.] also rebelled in al-Kūfa. Marwan appointed a new governor Nādir b. Sa‘īd al-Harashi to restore peace and security; the latter however soon fell in battle with Abū Allāh b. 'Omar and only the approach of a danger that threatened both sides, the Khāridj movement brought the two opponents to terms. The Khāridjīs a little later seized the town of al-Mawālī: Abū Allāh, the son of the caliph, was defeated and had to retreat. In the late summer of 28 (746) however the Khāridjī leader al-Dāhīt b. Kais al-Shalībī [q. v.] fell in battle with Marwan himself and in the following year the power of these dangerous rebels was finally broken after one of Marwan’s generals Yazid b. 'Omar b. Ḥubaira had taken the 'Irāk from them.

Soon afterwards however a cloud that boded evil appeared in another direction. Nār b. Sāyīr al-Lātibī, governor of Khorāsān, had long before warned the caliph of the seditious activities of the 'Abbāsidū and urgently appealed for assistance to render their cunning agitators harmless. Marwan however had his hands full and could devote no attention to the distant east. In Kūmarān 129 (June 747) the long prepared rebellion broke out in Khorāsān. Apart from a few isolated successes, the government troops were defeated by the rebels and after the fall of al-Kūfa, Abu 1-'Abbās who with his brother 'Abī al-Djīfar had taken command of the 'Abbāsidū party had himself proclaimed caliph on the 12th Kabi I, 132 (Nov. 28, 749). In Djamād II of the same year (Jan. 750) Marwan was defeated on the upper Zāb. He then fled from one place to another till he was overtaken at Būṣir in the district of Gšmūsin in Upper Egypt. Here the last Damascus caliph of the Omayyad dynasty fell fighting bravely (end of 132 = Aug. 750).


(M. V. Zeiβerseeīnne)
success. In 402 (1011–1012) Abu 'l-Manṣūr was poisoned by one of his generals, whereupon Abū Naṣr was recognized as lord of Dīyār Bakt. During his rule of fifty years, peace and quiet as a rule prevailed, and poets and learned men found a hospitable welcome at his court. In 433 (1041–1042) the Ghurz (q.v.) who had invaded Mesopotamia in the previous year, raided Djuzarat Ibn Ommar; but Sulaimān, son of Abū Naṣr, succeeded in outwitting and capturing their leader whereupon the others dispersed; they soon returned however and continued their plundering, although Abū Naṣr released their chief and gave them a considerable sum to induce them to withdraw. They then occupied al-Mawzil, which was completely sacked while the emir was there. Karwāsh b. al-Maḫkallād (q.v.), saved himself by flight. In 435 (1044) he finally succeeded in driving out the Ghurz whereupon they withdrew to Dīyār Bakt and thence to Māhrūkān. When the Saljuq Sultan Ṭoghra Beg in 448 (1056–1057) advanced against Djuzarat Ibn Ommar, Abū Naṣr gained him over by gifts and a friendly relationship was established between them Abū Naṣr died in 453 (1061–1062) aged over 80. He was succeeded by his son Nuẓām al-Dawla Naṣr, who had however to go through a hard struggle with his brother Sa'id. The former was victorious in Mājīfānḳīn, while the latter had to be satisfied with Amid. In 463 (1070–1071) Naṣr submitted to the Saljuq Sultan Alp Arslān. After Naṣr's death (472 = 1080) his son Manṣūr was recognized as his successor. Soon afterwards the Saljuqs overthrew the Māyrānī dynasty. In 478 (1085–1086) Ibn Djujarat, Malik Sha'rī's vizier, and his son Za'im al-Ra'as Abū 'l-Kāsim conquered the towns of Amid, Mājīfānḳīn and Juṣżarat Ibn Ommar and then brought the whole province of Dīyār Bakt under the rule of the Saljuqs. Manṣūr, the last Māyrānī, died in Muharram 489 (Dec. 1095–Jan. 1096) in Juṣżarat Ibn Ommar.

Martyr, a tribe in the Western zone of Eritrea They are — for the most part — shepherds and inhabit the middle valley of the 'An-ábib river in the district of Karan. Their tribe is formed by two sections of nobles: Māryā Kayīh, "the Red Māryā" and Māryā Ṣallīm, "the Black Māryā"; and the families of the vassals. The "Red" Māryā have been traditionally in a lower position than the "Black" and they were obliged to pay on certain occasions special gifts to the "Black" as, for instance, when the chief of the "Black" died. The vassals were practically divided between the Red and the Black as every family of them lived under the patronage of the chief of a noble family. Both the paramount chiefs of the sections had some particular rights over all the vassals of the noble families of their sections as they had, for instance, the power to order that every vassal may give to them the same gift as to his individual patron or to oblige the patrons to pay, as a duty to the highest representative of the tribe, the tenth part of every gift or duty of their vassals.

The Māryā claim to be descendants of a warrior, Māryā, born from Saho stock, who emigrated with seventeen soldiers to the borders of the 'Ansbāb and was received there as a guest by the natives. But, afterwards, the sons of Māryā had so greatly increased that they were able to occupy the whole country and to drive the native tribes who became their vassals. These natives, who are called uṣrās on account of their origin, were really Abyssinians and Bedja. However, the Māryā and their vassals to-day speak only the Tigrē language; and the Saho, as the Bedja, has been wholly forgotten.

The Māryā were Christians but, about half a century ago, they were converted to Islam. Even their clans (as the 'Ad Te-mikātāl, a section of the "Red") and their ancestors till recent generations bore Christian names. In any case, Islamic law has gradually gained great influence, among the Māryā; and this has been from many points of view a real profit to the population, as the laws of Islam may moderate in a good way the ancient rough customs which entailed the privileges of the nobles and their mastery on the vassals. As a matter of fact, in the hereditary law, the prevalent right of the first born son and the exclusion of the daughters from the succession of their father's estates became gradually disused on account of the Islamic influences. In the same way, the custom of declaring slaves those vassals who could not pay their debts to the nobles and the great differences, in the penal law, as to the punishment of crimes perpetrated by the nobles or by the vassals, had already been diminished after the conversion of the Māryā to the Islam, when the occupation of Eritrea by Italy caused the complete abrogation of those rules.


MARYAM, Mary. The Arabic form of the name is identical with מרים and מריה which are used in the Syriac and in the Greek Bible in the New as well as in the Old Testament. In the latter it corresponds to the Hebrew מרים. This name, like other ones with the same suffix, such as Amram, Bil'am, points to the region between Palestine and Northwestern Arabia as its home. According to Muslim interpretation the name means "the pious" (al-‘āhid; cf. the commentaries on sūra iii. 31). It occurs frequently in the Qur'ān in the combination [Ths] Ibn Maryam "[Jesus] the son of Mary" (sūra ii. 81, 254; iii. 31 sqq.; iv. 156, 169; v. 19, 50, 76, 82, 109, 112, 114, 116; ix. 31; xii. 35; xxiii. 52; xxxii. 7; xlii. 57; lvi. 27; lxi. 6, 14), no father being mentioned, because, according to Muslim tradition also, Ḥsād had no earthly father. In the majority of these passages Ḥsā is clearly regarded as the higher of the two. Yet Maryam's place is important from a dogmatical as well as from a historical point of view.

Maryam is mentioned in the Qur'ān, from the oldest parts down to the later Madinese sūras. To the first Makkān period belongs sūra xxiii. 52: "And we made the son of Maryam and his
mother a sign; and we made them abide in an elevated place, full of quiet and watered with springs". Here is possibly the first allusion in the Kurân to the virgin birth. This idea is accentuated in sura xix. 20, where Maryam gives the spirit (i.e. the angel) who announces to her the birth of a male child, this reply: "How should I have a male child, no human man having touched me?" In sura lxi. 12 the conception is ascribed to this divine spirit (cf. Luke i. 34 sq.) Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee).

The virgin birth is also mentioned in sura lxi. 12 (Midianian): "And Maryam bint 'Imrân who kept her body pure. Then we breathed into it from our spirit. She acknowledged the truth of the words of her Lord and of his book and she belonged to the obedient'.

A third mention of the annunciation and the virgin birth is in sura iii. 37: "When the angels said, O Maryam, verily Allâh has elected and purified thee and elected thee above the women of all created beings. O Maryam, be obedient unto thy Lord and prostrate thyself and bow down with those who bow down" (cf. Luke i. 28). Maryam is indeed reckoned as one of the four best women that ever existed, together with Asiya [q.v.], Khadijâ [q.v.] and Fâtima [q.v.]. (Âmâd b. ʿHanîbî, Musnad, iii. 133), and the chief of the women of Paradise (Ibn ʿHanbîl, iii. 64, 63). According to tradition the annunciation took place in the following way: Djjibrîl appeared to Mary in the shape of a beardless youth with a shining face and curling hair, announcing to her the birth of a male child. She expressed her amazement; but, on the angel's reassuring answer, she complied with the will of God.

Thereupon the angel blew his breath into the fold of her skirt, which she had put off. When the angel had withdrawn, she put on the skirt and became pregnant. The announcement took place in the cavern of the well of Silwân, whither Maryam had gone, as usual, to fill her pitcher; she was then 10 or 13 years of age; and it was the longest day of the year. In Christian tradition also the voice of the angel was heard by Maryam for the first time when she had gone to fill her pitcher. According to a different tradition ʿIsâ's spirit entered Maryam through her mouth (Tabarti, Ta'hîrî, vi. 22).

A second important dogmatical feature is that Maryam belongs to the Trinity according to the Kurân. A glimpse of this conception is given in sura v. 79: "al-Masîb, the son of Maryam, is an Apostle only, who was preceded by other Apostles, and his mother an upright woman; and both were wont to take food". This verse is apparently meant as a refutation of the Christians who venerated ʿIsa and his mother as divine persons, elevated above human needs. With this verse may be compared sura v. 160: "O people of the book, beware of exaggeration in your religion and say of Allâh nothing but the truth. ʿIsâ b. Maryam is only the Apostle of Allâh and His word, which He conveyed unto Maryam, and a spirit that came forth from Him. Believe therefore, on Allâh and his Apostles and say not 'three'. Beware of this, this will be better for you. Allâh is but one God" etc.

Clearer is sura v. 116: "And when Allâh said, O ʿIsâ b. Maryam, hast thou said to the people, Take me and my mother as two Gods besides Allâh? He answered: Far be it, that I should say to what I am not entitled. If I should have said it, Thou wouldst know it" etc.

The commentaries also derive the Trinity as consisting of Allâh, ʿIsâ and Maryam. Al-Baidâwî, however, admits that in sura iv. 169 there could be an allusion to the Christian doctrine of one God in three hypostases: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

The question how Muhammad had come to conceive of Maryam as one of the persons of the Trinity, has often been asked. Maracci has made a reference to Epiphanius, Adv. Haereses, Haeres. lxxviii., § 23, where this author speaks of women in Arabia who venerated Mary as God, and offered to her cakes, from which the heresy is often called that of the Collyridians. Sale, in his Preliminary Discourse, p. 45, mentions the Martiâtes, who worshipped a Mary called Mary, the Son of God, Christ and Mary, referring to a passage to the work of al-Makîn. It may, however, be that Muhammad's conception was not influenced by any sect, but by the veneration of which Mary was the object in the Church itself. Or it may be an inference due to the identification of ʿIsâ with the Holy Ghost (cf. sura iv. 169 as translated above), which made a vacant place in the Trinity, which Mary seemed entitled to occupy. A different explanation is attempted by Sayous, l.c., p. 61 (see Bibliography).

A comparatively large place is occupied in the Kurân by the story of Maryam and ʿIsâ. Many of the features narrated agree partly or wholly, with narratives in the apocryphal Gospels. Sûra xxiii. 52 (see above) mentions the elevated place that was prepared for ʿIsâ and his mother. It is not clear which tradition is here alluded to. According to St. Luke i. 39, Mary went to the mountains to visit Elisabeth. In the Protevangelium Jacobi (chap. xxi; Syriac text, p. 20) it is Elisabeth who flees together with John to a mountain, which opens to protect them against their persecutors. The Muslim commentators mention Jerusalem, Damascus, Ramla, Egypt as being possibly meant by the "elevated place". Maracci thinks of Paradise.

In two passages of the Kurân there is a fuller narrative of ʿIsâ's birth and what is connected with it, viz. in sura xix. (which bears the title of Maryam), vs. 1–35, and in sura iii. 31–42.

Sûra xix. opens with the story of Zakariyâ and Yahyâ (vs. 1–15); on this follows the story of Maryam and ʿIsâ (vs. 16–34). Sûra iii. 31–42 contains a. the birth of Maryam; b. the annunciation of Yahyâ (vs. 33–39); c. the annunciation of ʿIsâ (vs. 37–41). The comparison of sura xix. with sura iii. makes it probable that Muhammad became acquainted with the story of the birth of Maryam later than with those of Yahyâ and ʿIsâ. The birth of Maryam goes back to a Christian tradition corresponding closely with that which is contained in the Protevangelium Jacobi and De nativitate Mariæ. Mary's father is called ʿImrân in the Kurân, Ioaichim in Christian tradition; Ibn Khaldûn (Iaur, ii. 144) is also acquainted with the name Ioaichim. It has been supposed that the name of ʿImrân, which apparently corresponds with the Biblical 'Amram, the father of Moses, as well as the fact that Maryam is called
a sister of Hārūn (sūra xix. 29), is due to a confusion between the two Biblical Maryam’s. Sale, Gerock and others think such a confusion improbable. At any rate Muslim tradition assures us that there is a distance of 4,500 years between the Biblical ‘Amram and the father of Mary.

‘Imrān’s wife, ‘Īsā’s grandmother, is not mentioned by name in the Kurān. In Christian as well as in Muslim tradition she is called Hanna. It is only in Muslim tradition that her genealogy is worked out. She is a daughter of Fākhūd and a sister of ‘Īshār, the Biblical Elisabeth.
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According to a different genealogy ‘Ībāh and Maryam were sisters, daughters of ‘Imrān and Hanna (Mas. Hārūn, l. 120 sq.; Tabari, Ṭafsīr, iii. 144).
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‘Īmran and Hanna were old and childless. One day the sight of a bird in a tree, which was feeding her young, aroused Hanna’s desire for a child. She prayed God to fulfill her desire and vows, if her prayer should be heard, the child to the temple. She had however forgotten that, according to the Jewish law, it would be impossible, to accomplish her vow, if she should give birth to a female child (cf. Protes. 1:20, chapters iii., iv., Syr. text, p. 4). Compare with this Sūra, in. 31: “How the wife of ‘Imrān said, O my Lord, I have vowed to Thee what is in my womb. Now accept [this vow] from me. Thou art the hearing, the knowing.” And when she had given birth to the child, she said, O my Lord, I have given birth to a female child... and I have called her Maryam.”

Then the Kurān relates how she invoked on behalf of Maryam and her posterity Allah’s protection from Satan. On this verse is based the well-known 3:40: “Every child that is born, is touched (or strung) by Satan and the touch makes it cry, except Maryam and her son (Dakhārī, ‘Arwāh, k. 44: Ṭafsīr, Sūra 3: 21: Muslim. Ṭafsīr: trad 140, 147; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, ii. 233-274, 303-378, 420, 368, 524). This tradition is used in support of the impeccability of Jesus of ‘Īsā, Maryam and the Prophet, in general of al-Nawawī of Muslim, i. c. and al-Bajjawi of Rāz in 31.”

The Kurān further relates (vs. 32) that the child grew up in a chamber in the temple (mubālā’): of the mubālā’ in Protes. 1: 20, etc.; Syr. text, p. 5 (c.) under the divine grace and under Zakariyā’s care. According to Muslim tradition, ‘Imrān had died before the birth of Maryam, and Zakariyā claimed authority over her on account of his being her uncle; the rabbis did not recognize his claim; his right was proved by an ordeal, consisting in the parties throwing their pens or arrows in a river; the only one that floated was that of Zakariyā. Sūra iii. 39 refers to this. Christian tradition knows of an ordeal only in the case of Joseph, who, because a dove comes forth from his staff, is recognized as Maryam’s guardian.

As often as Zakariyā enters Maryam’s mikrā, he finds her being provided with food in a miraculous way (vs. 32). This feature also belongs to Christian tradition (Protes. 1:20, chap. viii.; Syr. text, p. 7). The person of Joseph is not mentioned in the Kurān. In Muslim tradition he takes care of Maryam, his cousin, because Zakariyā is no longer able to do so, on account of old age. Maryam stays however in the temple, which she leaves during her monthly period only. According to Christian tradition, Joseph takes her into his house when she attains to womanhood, lest she should defile the temple.

b. The announcement of Yahyā. See this art. and Zakariyā.

c. The announcement and birth of ‘Īsā. The more detailed narrative is that of sūra xix. 16 sqq. Maryam retires to “a place situated eastward,” where she hides herself behind a curtain. The commentators do not know whether a place to the east of Jerusalem is meant, or the eastern part of her house, to which she retires every month. It is said that this is the origin of the biblia of the Christians.

In vs. 17—21 the story of the announcement is given (cf. above), followed by that of ‘Īsā’s birth, which, according to some Muslim traditions, followed the conception either immediately or very soon. The pains of childbirth came upon Maryam when she was near the trunk of a palm. “She said, would to God I had died before this, and had become a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion. And he was beneath her [i.e. the child, or Dībril, or the palm] called to her, saying, Be not grieved; God has provided a rivulet under thee; and shake the trunk of the palm and it shall fall ripe dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat and drink and calm thy mind.” This story may, perhaps, be considered as a variant of the Christian tradition in which it is related that, during the flight to Egypt, the babe Jesus ordered a palm in the desert to bow down in order to refresh Mary by its dates; whereupon the palm obeyed and stayed with its head at Mary’s feet, till the child ordered it to stand upright again and to open a vein between its roots in order to quench the thirst of the holy family (Apcryphal Gospel of Matthew, chap. xx.). The Kurān goes on (vs. 26): “And when thou seest any man, say, I have vowed a fast unto the Merciful; so I may speak to any man to-day.” The commentators say, this was meant to avoid importunate questions. This feature is not in Christian tradition; yet in the Protes. 1:20 it is said (chap. xii.; Syr. text, p. 11) that Mary, who was then 16 years of age, hid herself from the Israelites. According to Muslim tradition, she stayed in a cavern during forty days. “Then she brought him,” continues the Kurān (xix. 28), “to her people, carrying him. They said, O Maryam, now thou hast done a strange thing. O sister of Hārūn, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot. Then she pointed to the child.” Then the child begins to speak, one of the wellknown
miracles ascribed to 'Isa. The "very shameful calumny" which the Israelis brought forth against Maryam, is also mentioned in sūra 145.

As to the words "O sister of Hārūn" (cf. above), it may be added that, according to the commentators, Hārūn was not Moses' brother, but one of Maryam's contemporaries, who was either a wicked man, with whom she is compared in this respect, or her pious brother.

A legend about loaves of bread which Maryam gave to the Magi, is mentioned by al-Ma'sūdī, iv. 79 sq.

The flight to Egypt is not mentioned in the Korān, unless the "elevated place" (sūra xxii. 52; cf. above) should be an allusion to it. According to Muslim tradition which is acquainted with it, the abode lasts 12 years. After the death of Herod the holy family returns to Naṣrā.

After his alleged death 'Isa consoles his mother from heaven. According to others it was Mary Magdalene. The stories of the Transtilus Morias have not obtained a place in Muslim tradition. Instead of these, there is a narrative of how Maryam went to Rome in order to preach before Mārūt (Nero), accompanied by John (the disciple) and Šimʿūn, the coppersmith. When Šimʿūn and Tadhāwus (Thaddeus?) were crucified with their heads downward, Maryam fled with John. When they were persecuted the earth opened and withdrew them from their persecutors. This miracle was the cause of Mārūt's conversion.


(A. J. Wensinck)

**MARZUBĀN**, Arabic form of the title of provincial governors in the Sasanian empire, especially of the "wardens of the marches", the "markgraves". The word is derived from Marzūb, which still means in Persian a frontier district (Horin Grundriß der neuzeitischen Etymologie, p. 218) and is found in Pehlevi in the form marzptān (in the Kūrān; cf. H. S. Nyberg, Hilschau der Pehlevi, i., Upsala 1928, p. 54) which suggests a north Iranian origin (cf. Lentz, Z.I.R., iv. 255, 295), as we find alongside of marzā also marzī in Persian (Horn, loc. cit.). The title is not found, however, before the Sasanian period and in the great inscription of Paikuli, the warden-s are called bīdhakht (Arm. bēdakht), also a north Iranian title (Herzfeld, Paikuli, Berlin 1924, p. 155; cf. also Marguer, Érannahr, p. 165 sqg.). In Syriac we find the forms marzēh and marzēbānā (Payne-Smith) and the Armenian has marzēp and marzēn (Hubschmann, Armenische Grammatik, p. 193). Persian finally has kept the word as marzēh, marzēbān or marzēvān (cf. e.g. the Burhān-i Kāṭi'). It is from Arab sources that we are more particularly informed of the duties of the marzēbān. Al-Yaʿqūbī (Taṣfīr, ed. Houtsma, i. 201) says that it was the title of the ūrīs al-balad, while the four great divisions of the empire were governed by ūrīs ghaṣṣān. The historians al-Ṭabarī and al-Baladhuri tell us of the different marzēbān encountered by the Arabs in their conquests (cf. the list of provinces ruled by a marzēbān, drawn up by Baladhuri, and given by Noldeke in Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, Leyden 1879, p. 446). In this period we find these governors independently of any higher authority and concluding truces and treaties. They sometimes retained their offices after the Arab conquest. Under the Sasanians the marzēbān were far from having such an independent position. We sometimes find them acting as generals under the command of the ṣāḥib al-ṣafar (e.g. Joshua Stylites, ed. Wright, p. 61).

Although the title gradually fell into disuse, Muslim Persia still retained the word, used in its original sense of "warden of the marches". It is frequently found in literature (cf. Saʿdī, Ṣudān, ed. Graf, p. 73). On the other hand after the Sasanian period, marzēbān and its variants became the proper name (in Arabic sometimes al-Marzēbān) among Muslims and also among Persis (cf. the names of the copyists of Pahlavi manuscripts; cf. especially Justi, Iranisches Namengebuck, s. v. Marzēbān).

**Bibliography:** A. Christensen, L'Empire des Sassanides, Copenhagen 1907, p. 43 sq.

(J. H. Kramer)

**MARZUBĀN b. RUSIAM**, a prince of the Bawand dynasty of Tabaristan [q. v.] regarded as the original author of the Marzubān-nāma, a work in Persian prose containing a series of short stories and fails to be of a moral and didactic character. This book is known in two versions in elegant Persian of the sixteenth century, the author of one of which was Saʿd al-Din al-Warāwī; he dedicated it to Abu ʿl-Kāsim Ribāb al-Din, vizier of Uzbek b. Muhammad b. Idlegiz, Atabeg of Adharba içīan from 1210 to 1225. These dates give us probable limits for the composition of the book. The other version is the work of Muhammad b. Gāzī al-Malayawī, secretary and later vizier of Rukan al-Din Sulaiman-Shāh, Saddūkī of Rūm, who reigned from 1192 to 1204. It is called Rukn al-ʿāzīl and differs a good deal in form and contents from the other, which is called the Marzubān-nāma.

In the preface by Saʿd al-Din al-Warāwī we are told that the original work had been written in the language of Tabaristan and the ancient Pārsī, the popular language, but that thanks to him this valuable work had been given a new life after 400 years (p. 6 and 33 of Muṣṭa Muhammad Karwāni's edition). In the first chapter Marzūbān b. Sharīw, descendant of Kayūs, brother of the Sasanian king Anušīrwan, is mentioned as waḍīl
The Rawdat al-ʻUkāl on the contrary attributed the original book to a descendant of the Ziyārid Kābūs b. Wadhīqir and says simply that it is written in a coarse style. Apart from these, there are very few references to the book in Persian literature. The author of the Kābul-nāma (composed in 1082) says that the grandmother of his mother was the daughter of the prince Marzubān b. Rustam b. Shahrān, author of the Marzubān-nāma. Ibn Isfandiyār in his Tārīkh Tabaristān (written in 1216) speaks of the Isfahān Marzubān b. Rustam b. Shahrān Parīm as the author of the Marzubān-nāma, a work which is in every way better than the book of Kābul-nāma. He adds that this same Marzubān composed a Dīwān in Tabarī verse called the Nīkīn-nāma (cf. An abridged Translation of the History of Tabaristan, by E. G. Browne, London 1905, p. 86); finally the Persian bibliographer Rifāʿa Kulli Khān in the Foroughi-Nāṣirī speaks of the Marzubān-nāma as having been written by Marzubān b. Rustam and dedicated to (muntazāmī) the emir Kābul Shams al-Maṣūlī; in the Majmuʿ al-ʻUkālī the same author incidentally mentions the Marzubān-nāma.

These very incomplete and sometimes contradictory statements have caused Mirzā Muhammad Kazwini to suggest that the individual who gave the book its name was Marzubān, son of the "king" of Tabaristan, Rustam b. Shahrān b. Shahrān b. Rustam b. Sarīšt, a descendant of Bāb, son of Kayās, brother of Anushirwān. This genealogy is based on Ibn Isfandiyār’s work and seems more probable than that given by Schefer (Christ. pers., iv, p. 194), who thinks that Marzubān was the son of the son of Rustam. The date of Rustam b. Shahrān b. Shahrān, who was in all probability the father of Marzubān, is only known from a coin of the year 355 (966) (H. L. Rabino, Marzubān and Astarābād, London 1928, G. M. S., N.S. vi, p. 136); Marzubān must have therefore flourished about 1000 A.D., i.e. during the period of the Persian renaissance.

In the first chapter of the Marzubān-nāma Marzubān is described as the brother of the reigning "king" (peydaft Darā b. Rustam, who reigned for 8 years; cf. Rabino, loc. cit.) who begged to be allowed to live a life of seclusion and to compose a book containing "wise counsels and useful directions for the conduct of life in this world". In this connection he has a dispute with the king and his vizier in the course of which he relates several anecdotes. The other chapters continue in the same style. Several of the fables and anecdotes are found in other books just as we find similar stories in the book of Kābul-nāma and in the Arašīn Nāṣirī. The collection therefore belongs to an essentially Persian literary type, which has had considerable influence on Arabic literature. Since its contents have not been examined for comparison, it would be too hazardous to express an opinion on its relation to similar collections and popular Persian stories. It is very possible that a number of the stories are of Turanian origin. On the other hand, we ought perhaps not to credit the statement that originally it was written in the Tabarī dialect; for then we should have to believe that the two authors of the new recension knew this dialect, about which however, we only have the notes in the Tārīkh Tabaristān of Ibn Isfandiyār. Perhaps the reference is to a text in archaic Persian like the probable language of the Khudā-nāma which Firdawsi used (cf. Noldke, Geschichte des Artachsrī Pāhpān, Gottingen 1879, p. 27) and the source of a poem like Wīs u-Kārūn, a text which no longer pleased the taste of the literary connoisseurs of the sixth century.

The Marzubān-nāma was published by Mirzā Muhammad Kazwini in 1908 (G.M.S., vii.) from a manuscript in the British Museum (Or. 6476) with the help of two other MSS. in the same collection, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale and another sent from Persia. The Paris manuscript had already been used for the publication of extracts from the Marzubān-nāma (Ch. Schefer’s Christliche Persen, Paris 1885, p. 172—199). The Rawdat al-ʻUkāl is represented by a manuscript in Leyden (cf. M. Th. Houtsma, Eine unbekannte Bearbeitung des Marzubān-nāma, Z. D. M. G., li, 359—392) and another in Paris. Mirzā Muhammad has given extracts from it in the preface to his edition. There is also an Arabic version of the same work from the pen of Ibn ʻArabshāh, based on a Turkish version of Sa’d al-Warāwīn’s recension; this Arabic text was lithographed at Cairo in 1278.

Bibliography: The philological data have been collected by Mirzā Muhammad Kazwini in the preface of his edition; Schefer’s observations (p. 194—211) are to be utilised with caution. Cf. also: H. Ethé, Neupersische Litteratur, in Grundris. d. iran. Phil., ii, 328 sqq., and E. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii, 115, 489.

(M. KRAMERS)

MASCARA. [See SA‘IY.]

MASAGAN. [See MAZAGHĀL.]

MASCARA, a town in Algeria (department of Oran), 50 miles S.W. of Mostaganem and 60 S.E. of Oran. Its position is 35° 26' N. Lat. and 8° 16' E. of Greenwich. It lies on the southern slope of the Beni Shīrīn range, called by the Arabs Shārīb al-Rīh and is built on the edge of a ravine at the bottom of which runs the Wādī Sīdi Tūdjman on the other side of which to the N.W. lies the native faubourg of Bāb ʻAli. Mascara commands the plain of Egbrīn, which measures 25 to 50 miles from W. to E. and 10 to 12 miles from N. to S. and is one of the most fertile regions of Algeria. The natives have grown cereals here from the earliest times and the Europeans have introduced tobacco and created vineyards, the production of which is celebrated. It is the market for a region, becoming more and more prosperous, and by the census of 1926 had 30,669 inhabitants of whom 16,630 were natives.

Mascara is of considerable antiquity. According to Bakri (Masālīk, transl. de Slane, rev. by Fagnan, 160), it included among its inhabitants people who came from Tihert (Tīret) some of whom went and settled at Iqaq, a day’s journey S., when this town was founded by Yaḥyā b. Mūḥammad, son of Sallāh the Irānīd, in 338 (949—950 A.D.). Ibn Hawqal (Description de l’Afrique, transl. de Slane, Journ., Av., 1842) and Idissi (transl. de Goeje, p. 96) mention Mascara as a large well watered village rich in fruits. The Almohads seem to have built a fortress there. The Ziyānids of Tlemcen kept a governor and a garrison there. Leo Africanus (Bk. iv, ed. Schefer, vol. iii, p. 34) notes the importance of the market which was held at Ma-cara "one of the towns of the Beni Rasi‘ (Rāsā Rażīd) where one could buy, along with cereals in large quantities, cloth and articles of
harness manufactured in the country. The rulers of Tlemcen drew considerable revenues from it: 40,000 pistoles, according to Marmol (Africa, vol. ii., p. 350).

The Turks established themselves at Mascara in the xvith century and placed a garrison there. In 1701 they made it the capital of the beylik of the west, which had hitherto been Mazmûn in Dabra. The beys lived there till Oran was reoccupied by the Algerians in 1792. During this period, Mascara, which had hitherto only been an insignificant place, began to look like a regular town. The beys built two mosques and a madrasa, a wall and a kasaba and brought in a water-supply. The manufacture of burnouses and háls, celebrated throughout the Regency, enriched the inhabitants. This prosperity began to decline after the beys left Mascara and especially after the risings, which broke out in the province of the west in the beginning of the xith century. The Darkâwi Ben Sherif seized the town in 1805 and held it for a time. In 1827 it was attacked by the marabout Muhammad al-Tijjâni. Supported by the Hashim he gained possession of the faubourg of Bâb 'Ali but was killed by the Turks when preparing to storm the town itself. At the end of Turkish rule, 'Abd al-Kâdir [q. v.] who had proclaimed Şulfân by the tribes of the plain of Egiris, established his seat of government at Mascara, but barely lived there. An expedition, in the month of December 1836 led by Marshal Claudel, occupied Mascara which the French abandoned next day, after burning down part of it. The emir returned to the town and held it till May 30, 1841, when a column under Bugeaud occupied it finally for the French. Mascara, then half in ruins, had only a population of 2,840 inhabitants.

Bibliography: César-Caupenne, Mascara, Paris 1856; Gorguès, Notice sur Mohammed el Kebir, Rev. Africaine, 1857; Lespinasse, Notice sur les Hachem de Mascara, Rev. Africaine, 1877; Correspondance du capitaine Dammas, Algiers 1912; Tableau des Établissements français dans l'Algérie, year 1839.

(G. YVER)

MASDJD (A.), MOSQUE.

I. (JOHNS. PEDersen)

A. Origin.
B. Foundation of mosques after Muhammad's death.
C. The mosque as a religious centre.
D. The building and its equipment.
E. The mosque as a state institution.
F. The mosque as a school.
G. Administration.
H. The staff.

II. (R. A. KERN)

The mosque in the Dutch Indies.

III. (E. DIEZ)

Architecture.

A. Origin of the Mosque.

The word MASDID is found in Aramaic, the earliest occurrence being in the Jewish Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238). The word formed from הדר "to prostrate oneself" seems to mean in Nabatean a stele, a sacred pillar, although the meaning "place of worship" has also been suggested. In the Elephantine Papry (ed. Sachau, pl. 32, ed. Ungnad, No. 35; Cowley, Aramaic Papry of the Fifth Cent. E. G., No. 44), also frequently in Nabatean (Corp. Inscrip. Semit., ii. 161, p. 179, 185, 188, 190, 218; ed. Schwally, Z.D.M.G., lii., 1898, p. 134; Liddel, Handbuch d. nordem. Epigr., p. 152, 328; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions, p. 238).
ship of God in "God's own mosques" (Sūra ii. 108). The result was that it was revealed in the year 9: "It is not right for polytheists to frequent the mosques of God" (Sūra ix. 17 sq.) and the opponents of the new religion were therefore excluded from the sanctuary. The Sūra agrees with the Kūfān, that the sanctity of al-Masjid al-Haram, on which it had been used from childhood was always regarded by him as indisputable. Like other Meccans, he and his followers regularly made the ḏāwīf around the Ka'ba and kissed the Black Stone (e.g. Ibn Hīšām, p. 183, 12 sq.; 239, 8, 251, 13); it is frequently stated that he used to sit in the masjid as his fellow-citizens, alone or with a follower or disputing with an opponent (Ibn Hīšām, p. 233, 61: 251, 13: 252, 14: 259, 260, 294, 15 sq.). It is related that he used to perform the ʿalāf between the Yamūn corner and the Black Stone, apparently from the narrator's context very frequently (Ibn Hīšām, p. 196, 13 sq.). After his conversion, 'Umar is said to have arranged that behind the Ka'ba he performed the ʿalāf; and in the Kūfān (Ibn Hīšām, p. 224, 43 sq.; 17 sq.) it is strongly Muhammad felt himself attached to the Arab sanctuary is evident from the fact that he took part in the traditional rites there before the ḥijra (Sūra xviii. 21; in the year 1, one of his followers, ʿAbd b. Muṣā'īd, took part in the pilgrimage ceremonies and in the year 2 he himself sacrificed on the rost Dhū al-Ḥijja on the muʿāṣa of the Bani Salīma. He therefore, here as elsewhere, retained ancient customs where his new teaching did not directly exclude them. But when an independent religion developed out of his preaching, a new type of divine service had to be evolved.

In Mecca, the original Muslim community had no special place of worship. The Prophet used to perform the ʿalāf in secret in the narrow alleys of Mecca with his first male follower 'Abī Ali and with the other earliest Companions also (Ibn Hīšām, p. 159, 160, 1 sq.). The references are usually to the solitary ʿalāf of the Prophet, sometimes beside the Ka'ba (Ibn Hīšām, p. 190, 9 sq.), sometimes in his own house (Ibn Hīšām, p. 203, 15 sq.). That the believers often prayed together may be taken for granted; they would do so in a house (cf. Ibn Hīšām, p. 202). Occasionally also 'Umar is said to have conducted the ritual prayer with others beside the Ka'ba (Ibn Hīšām, p. 224) because 'Umar was able to defy the Kūrāsh. When the Prophet recited in the mosque the revelation, later abused, recognising al-Lāt, al-ʿUzza and Maʿāṣir, according to the legend, not only the believers but also the polytheists present took part in the sujud (Tabari, i. 1192 sq.). 'Abū Bakr is said to have had a private place of prayer (masjid) in Mecca in his courtyard beside the gate; the Kūrāsh, we are told, objected to this because women and children could see it and might be led astray by the emotion aroused (Ibn Hīšām, p. 246; Bukhārī, Šaīlāt, B. 86: Kāfī, B. 14 etc.; Missed, B. 22).

In the dogma taught by Muhammad a sanctuary was not a fundamental necessity. Every place was the same to God and humanity in the presence of God, of which the ritual prayer was the expression, could be shown anywhere; hence the saying of the Prophet that he had been given the whole world as a masjid, while earlier prophets could only pray in churches and synagogues (Wāqid, transl. Wellhausen, p. 403; Corpus juris di Zaid b. ʿÂli, ed. Griﬃni, p. 50 and clixix; Bukhārī, Šaīlāt, B. 56; Taʾwīrūn, B. 1; Muslim, Masjid, B. 11; Thabrānī, Tr. 1) and also the saying: "Wherever the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt perform the ʿalāf and that is a masjid." (Muslim, Masjid, Tr. 1). That he nevertheless remained firmly attached to the traditional sanctuary of the Ka'ba, produced a confusion of thought which is very marked in Sūra ii. 136 sqq. When in Medina he was able to do as he pleased, it must have been natural for him to create a place where he could be undisturbed with his followers and where they could perform the ritual ʿalāf together.

2. The Foundation of the Mosque in Medina.

According to one tradition the Prophet came riding into Medina on his camel with Abū Bakr as ṣibāf surrounded by the Banū Nadījarra. The camel stopped on Abū Aiyūb's ṣuqān. Here (according to Amma) the Prophet performed the ʿalāf and immediately afterwards ordered the mosque to be built and purchased the piece of land from two orphans, Sālih and Siyāh, who were under the guardianship of Muqādī b. Aʿfā', for 10 dinārs, after declining to accept it as a gift; he lived with Abū Aiyūb until the mosque and his houses were completed. During this period he performed the ʿalāf in courtyards or other open spaces (Bukhārī, Šaīlāt, B. 48; Muslim, Masjid, Tr. 1; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, iii. 212 above; Ibn Hīšām, p. 336; Tabari, i. 1258 sq.; Masʿūdī, Muqādī, iv. 140 sqq.). According to this tradition, the building of the mosque was intended by the Prophet from the first and the choice of the site was left to the whim of his mount. According to another tradition the Prophet took up his abode with Abū Aiyūb, but during the first period of his stay in Medina he conducted the ʿalāf in the house of Abū Umāma Aṣād, who had a private masjid, in which he used to conduct ʿalāfs with his neighbours. The Prophet later expressed the desire to purchase the adjoining piece of ground and he bought it from the two orphans, who, according to this tradition, were wards of Aṣād (Bahlūl, Fustāt al-Bulūš, ed. de Goeje, p. 6; cf. Wustenfeld, Gesch. d. Stadt Medina, p. 60).

The site was covered with graves, ruins (khirāt; also barth, Tabari, i. 1259, 17; 1260, 1; cf. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Muṣnad, iii. 212, 7, perhaps due to an old misreading) and palm-trees and was used as a place for keeping camels (and smaller domestic animals, Bukhārī, Wudā', B. 66). The site was cleared, the palms cut down and the walls built. The building material was bricks baked in the sun (latīn) (Ibn Hīšām, p. 337; Bukhārī, Šaīlāt, B. 62, 65; according to one tradition they were baked at the well of Fāṭima, Wustenfeld, Stadt Medina, p. 31); in places it was a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall on a stone foundation with three entrances: the gateposts were of stone. On the šībāa side (i.e. the north wall) at first two, the stems of the palm-trees which had been cut down were soon set up as columns and a roof was put over them of palm-leaves and clay. On the east side two cuts of similar materials were put for the Prophet's wives Sawāda and Aʿīsha; their entrances opened on to the court and were covered with carpets: they were later increased so that there were nine
little houses for the Prophet's wives. When the *kibla* was moved to the south, the arbour at the north wall remained; under this arbour called *ṣaffa* or *ṣula* the homeless Companions found shelter (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, B. 48, 62; Wustenfeld, *Medina*, p. 60 sq., 66; Dīyārībāriz, *Ṭairīḥ al-Ḳamīs*, Cairo 1302, i. 387 sqq.; on the *ṣaffa*, p. 387 in the middle; 391 after the middle; cf. L. Caetani, *Annales dell’Islam*, i. 377 sqq.). In seven months the work was completed (Wustenfeld, *Medina*, p. 59), according to others in the month of Safar of the year 2 ( Ibn Ḥishām, p. 339, 18 sq.). The mosque was very simple. It was really only a courtyard with a wall round it; the *ṣaffa* already mentioned supplied a shelter on the north side, while on the south side, later the *kibla* side, an arbour was probably built also, for the Prophet used to preach leaning against a palm-trunk and this must have been on the *kibla* side. How large the arbours were cannot be ascertained. The mosque was the courtyard of the Prophet's houses and at the same time the meeting-place for the believers and the place for common prayer.

According to the sources, it was the Prophet's intention from the very first to build a mosque at once in Medina; according to a later tradition Gabriel commanded him in the name of God to build a house for God (Khamīs, i. 387 infra); but this story is coloured by later conditions. It has been made quite clear, notably by L. Caetani (*Annales dell' Islam*, i. 432, 437 sqq.) and later by H. Lammens (*Mecca*, p. 8, note 5, 62 etc.; do., *Ziād*, p. 30 sqq., 93 sqq.) that the earliest mosque had nothing of the character of a sacred edifice. Much can be quoted for this view from Ḥadīth and Sira (cf. *Annales dell' Islam*, i. 440). The unconverted Ḥaḍākhīs were received by the Prophet in the mosque to conduct negotiations and he even put up three tents for them in the courtyard (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 916; Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, p. 352) and envoy's from Tamīm also went freely in the mosque and called for the Prophet, who dealt with them after he had finished prayers (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 933 sq.; Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, p. 356). Ibn Unais brought to the masjid the head of the Hudhaylī Sufyān, threw it down before the Prophet and gave his report (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 981 sq.; Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, p. 225). After the battle of Uḥd the Medina chiefs spent the night in the mosque (Wāṣīkī-Wellhausen, p. 149). The Awsīs tended their wounded here (ibid., p. 215 sq.; Tābārī, i. 1491 sqq.); a prisoner of war was tied to one of the pillars of the mosque (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, B. 76, 82; cf. 75). Many poor people used to live in the *ṣaffa* (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, B. 58); tents and huts were put up in the mosque, one for example by converted and liberated prisoners, another by the Banū Ghifār, in whose tent Sa'd b. Muʿādh died of his wounds (ibid., B. 77; *Uṣd al-Qāhiba*, ii. 297). People sat as they pleased in the mosque or took their ease lying on their backs (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, B. 63; Saḥīḥ, bāb 85; Ibn Sa'd, i. 124, 14); even so late as the reign of 'Umar it is recorded that he found strangers sleeping in a corner of the mosque (*Kāmil,* p. 118, 13 sqq.); the Prophet received gifts and distributed them among the Companions (Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, bāb 41); disputes took place over business (ibid., bāb 71, 83) and in general people conducted themselves as they pleased. Indeed, on one occasion some Sudanic or Abyssinian with the approval of the Prophet gave a display with shield and lance on the occasion of a festival (do., *Ṣaḥīḥ*, bāb 69; *Idāīn*, bāb 2, 25; Līḥādh, bāb 81) and on another a stranger seeking the Prophet rode into the mosque on his camel ( do., *Ṣaḥīḥ*, bāb 6). So little "sanctified" was this, the oldest mosque, that one of the Munājahīm, ejected for scoffing at the believers, could call to Abī Ayyūb "Are you throwing me out of the *mīrqāb bani Thā'labah*?" (Ibn Hishām, p. 98).

All this gives one the impression of the headquarters of an army, rather than of a sacred edifice. On the other hand the mosque was used from the very first for the general divine service and thus became something more than the Prophet's private courtyard. Whatever the Prophet's intentions had been from the first, the masjid with the increasing importance of Islam bound to become very soon the political and religious centre of the new community. The two points of view cannot be distinguished in Islam, especially in the earlier period. The mosque was the place where believers assembled for prayer around the Prophet, where he delivered his addresses, where he carried on transactions. It not only appeals for obedience to God but regulations affecting the social life of the community (cf. Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, bāb 70, 71); from here he controlled the religious and political community of Islam. Even at the real old sanctuaries of Arabia, there were no restrictions on what one could do; what distinguished the mosque from the Christian church or the Meccan temple was that in it there was no specially dedicated ritual object. At the Ka'ba also people used to gather to discuss everyday affairs and also for important assemblies, if we may believe the Sīrah (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 183 sq., 185, 1, 229, 3, 248, 257, 12). Here also the Prophet used to sit; strangers came to visit him; he talked and they disputed with him; people even came to blows and fought there (Ibn Ḥishām, 183 sq., 185 sq., 187 sq., 202, 13, 257, 259; *Chron. d. Stadt Mecka*, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 223, 11). Beside the Ka'ba was the Dūr al-Nadwa, where important matters were discussed and justice administered (ibid., see index). From the Medina mosque was developed the general type of the Muslim mosque. It depended on circumstances, whether the aspect of the mosque as a social centre or as a place of prayer was more or less emphasised.

3. Other Mosques in the time of the Prophet.

The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was not the only one founded by Muslims in his lifetime and according to tradition not even the first, which is said to have been the mosque of Kūba. In this village, which belonged to the territory of Medina (see Wustenfeld, *Geschichte der Stadt Medina*, p. 126), the Prophet on his Hajj stayed with the family of 'Amr b. 'Awf; the length of his stay is variously given: 3, 5, 8, 14 or 22 days. According to one tradition, he found a mosque there on his arrival, which had been built by the first emigrants and the Ansār and he performed the salah there with them (see Wustenfeld, op. cit., p. 56; Baladhurī, *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, p. 1; Dīyārībāriz, *Ṭairīḥ al-Kamās*, Cairo 1302, 1, 380 sqq.). According to another tradition, the Prophet himself founded the mosque on a site, which belonged to his host Kūhām and was used as a *mīrqāb* for drying dates or according to others,
to a woman named Labba, who tethered her ass there (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 131; Ibn Hisham, p. 335; Tabari, i, 1260; 6; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 6; Masudi, Muruj, iv, 139; Diyarbakr, Khamsi, i, 381; al-Sira al-Halabyya, Cairo 1920, ii, 58 sq.).

But of this tradition arose a legend based on the story of the foundation of the principal mosque in Medina: The Prophet makes (first Abū Bakr and 'Umar without success), then 'Ali mount a camel and at the place to which it goes builds the mosque with stone brought from the Hara; he himself laid the first stone, and Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān the next ones (Khamsi, i, 381). The Prophet is said to have henceforth visited the mosque of Kūba' every Saturday, either riding or walking and the pillar is still shown beside which he conducted the service (Bukhārī, Fadl al-Salāt fi Masjid Makkah zai 'l-Madina, bāb 2, 4; Muslim, Ḥadīṯ, tr. 94; Khamsi, i, 382. Bādhur, p. 5). We are occasionally told that he performed his salat on the Sabbath in the mosque at Kūba' when he went to the Banū Salām in Kūba' 1 of the year 4 (Wākidī-Wellhausen, p. 161).

It is obvious that the customs and ideas of the later community have shaped the legend of this mosque. The only question is whether the old tradition that the mosque was founded either by the Prophet himself or even before his arrival by his followers is also a later invention. We thus come to the question whether the Prophet founded or recognised any other mosques at all than that of Medina. I. Caetani, in keeping with his view of the origin of the mosque, is inclined to deny it, pointing to the fact that there was later an obvious tendency to connect mosques everywhere with the Prophet and that 'ūmarī 108 strongly condemn the erection of an opposition mosque' (M. al-Dīrārī). The Kūrān passage is as follows: 'Those who have built themselves a masjid for opposition (dīrār) and unbelief and division among the believers and for a refuge for him who in the past fought against God and his Prophet, and they swear: we intended only good. God is witness that they are liars! Thou shalt not stand up in it, for verily a masjid which is founded on piety from the first day of its existence has more right that thou shouldst stand in it; in it are men who desire to purify themselves and (God loves) those who purify themselves' (Sūra, iv, 108–109). According to tradition this was revealed in the year 9: when the Prophet was on the march to Tabābīk, the Banū Sālim said to him that they had built a mosque to make it easier for their feeble and elderly people, and they begged the Prophet to perform his salāt in it and thus give it his approval. The Prophet postponed it till his return, but then this revelation was made, because the mosque had been founded by Maaṣira al-Qāhi, at the instigation of Abū 'Amir al-Kāhīb, who fought against the Prophet. According to one tradition (so Ibn 'Umar, Zu'd) the mosque was founded on piety' was that of Medina from which the people wi-hed the penitent themselves: according to another (Ibn 'Abbas) the reference was to that of Kūba'; Abū 'Amir and his followers were not comfortable among the Banū 'Amir b. 'Awwīf and therefore built a new mosque. According to some traditions it was in Dūh Awān. The Prophet however had it burned down (Tabari, i, 1704 sq.; Ibn Hishām, p. 357 sq.; 906 sq.; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 6; Wākidī-Wellhausen, p. 410 sq.; Tabari, Tafrīr, xl, 17 sqq.; Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 131; al-Sira al-Halabyya, ii, 60; Bādhur, p. 1 sq.; Muslim, Ḥadīṯ, tr. 93). If the connection with the Tabābīk campaign is correct, the Masjid al-Dīrārī is to be sought north of Medina; 'the mosque founded on piety' would then be the mosque of Medina rather than that of Kūba' which lies to the south of it. There is in itself nothing impossible about the rejection in principle of any mosque other than that of Medina. We should then have to discard the whole tradition, for, according to it, the Prophet is at first not unfavourably disposed to the new mosque and his wrath, according to the tradition, arises from the fact that it had been founded by a refractory party. But as a matter of fact there are indications that a number of mosques already existed in the time of the Prophet; for example, the verse in the Kūrān: in houses, which God hath permitted to be built that His name might be praised in them, in them men praise Him morning and evening, who neither business nor pleasure nor praising God and performing the salāt and the giving of alms' etc. (Sūra xxiv. 36 sq.). If this revelation, like the rest of the Sūra, is of the Medina period, it is difficult to refer it to Jews and Christians, and this utterance is quite clear: "Observe a complete fast until the night and touch thou them (i.e. women) not while ye are in the mosques" (Sūra ii. 183). This shows that there were already in the time of the Prophet, several Muslim mosques which had a markedly religious character and were recognised by the Prophet. That there were really public places of prayer of the separate tribes at a very early date is evident from the tradition that the Prophet in the year 2 offered his sacrifice on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja on the Musallā of the Banū Sālima. In addition there are constant references to private masjid where a few believers, like Abū Bakr in Mecca, made a place for prayer in their houses and where others sometimes assembled (Bukhārī, Sīrāt, bāb 46, 87; Tahādīḏīna, bāb 30; cf. also Aisha, bāb 50).

B. Origin of Mosques after the Time of the Prophet.

1. Chief Mosques.

What importance the Medina mosque had attained as the centre of administration and worship of the Muslims is best seen from the fact that the first thought of the Muslim generals after their conquests was to found a mosque as a centre around which to gather.

Conditions differed somewhat according as it was a new foundation or an already existing town. Important examples of the first kind are Bāṣra, Kūfa and al-Fusṭāt. Bāṣra was founded by 'Utb b. Nāfi' as winter-quarters for the army in the year 14 (or 16 or 17). The mosque was placed in the centre with the Dār al-Imārā, the dwelling of the commander-in-chief with a prison and Diwan in front of it. Prayer was at first offered on the open space which was fenced round; later the whole was built of reeds and when the men went off to war the reeds were pulled up and laid away. Abū Ṣa'id al-Asbāhī, who later became 'Umar's Wali, built the edifice of clay and bricks baked in the sun (lāhin) and used grass
for the roof (Baladhouri, p. 346 sq., 350; B.G.A., v. 187 sqq.; Yākūt, Muddām al-Dīlānā, i. 67, 6 sqq.; cf. Tabari, i. 2377, 4 sqq.). It was similar in Kūfah which was founded in 17 by Sa’d b. Abi Waqqās. In the centre was the mosque and beside it the Dār al-Isfārār was laid out. The mosque at first was simply an open quadrangle, jawb, marked off by a trench round it. The mosque was large enough for 40,000 persons. It seems that reeds were also used for building the walls here and later Sa’d used tabin. On the south side (and only here) there was an arbour, zulūl, built (cf. Baladhouri, p. 348, 1; zuffā). The Dār al-Isfārār beside the mosque was later by ‘Umar’s orders combined with the mosque (Tabari, i. 2481, 7 sqq.; 2485, 16; 2487 sqq.; 2494, 14; Yākūt, Muddām, iv. 323, 10 sqq.; Baladhouri, p. 275 sqq.; cf. Annali dell’Islam, iii. 546 sqq.). The plan was therefore an exact reproduction of that of the mosque in Medina (as is expressly emphasised in Tabari, i. 2489, 4 sqq.); the importance of the mosque was also expressed in its position and the commander lived close beside it. There was no difference in al-Fusṭāt, which, although there was already an older town here, was laid out as an entirely new camp. In the year 21, after the conquest of Alexandria, the mosque was laid out in a garden where ‘Amr had planted his standard. It was 50 dhūra long and 30 broad. Eighty men fixed its kibla, which however was turned too far to the east, and was therefore altered later by Kurra b. Sharik. The court was quite simple, surrounded by a wall and had trees growing on it; a simple roof is mentioned; it must have been identical with the above mentioned zulūl or zuffā. ‘Amr b. Abi ‘Asi lived just beside the mosque and around it the Ahl al-Ra’aya. Like the house of the Prophet, the general’s house lay on the east side with only a road between them. There were two doors in each wall except the southern one (Yākūt, Muddām, iii. 898 sqq.; Makrizi, Khatīb, iv., Cairo 1326, p. 4 sqq.; Ibn Duqmāt, K. al-Inṣār, Cairo 1893, p. 59 sqq.; Suyūṭī, Ḥusn al-Muddāhara, i. 63 sqq.; ii. 135 sqq.; cf. Annali dell’Islam, iv. 554, 557, 563 sqq.). We find similar arrangements made in al-Mawsil twenty years earlier (Baladhouri, p. 331 sqq.).

In other cases the Muslims established themselves in old towns either conquered or surrendered by treaty; by the treaty they received a site for their mosque (e.g. Baladhouri, p. 116, 14, 147, 5). But the distinction between towns which were conquered and those which were surrendered soon disappeared and the position is as a rule not clear. Examples of old towns in which the Muslims established themselves are al-Madā’in, Damascus and Jerusalem. — In al-Madā’in Sa’d b. Abi Waqqās after the conquest distributed the houses among the Muslims and Kisra’s Iwān was made into a mosque, after Sa’d had conducted the Salāt al-Fath in it (Tabari, i. 2443, 15 sqq.; 2451, 7 sqq.). In Damascus which was occupied in 14 or 15 by capitulation, according to tradition, the Church of St. John was divided so that the eastern half became Muslim from which Muslim tradition created the legend that the city was taken partly by conquest and partly by agreement (Baladhouri, p. 125; Yākūt, Muddām, ii. 591; Ibn Dhubair, Kifah, p. 262; J. A., ser. 9, vii. 376, 381, 404). As a matter of fact however, the Muslims seem to have laid out their own mosque here just beside the church [(cf. Damascus); and close beside it again was the Khāṣa’, the commander-in-chief’s palace, from which a direct entrance to the maqṣūra was later made (B.G.A., iii. 159, 4)]. Conditions here were therefore once more the same as in Medina. But the possibility of an arrangement such as this, by which tradition cannot be rejected, for there is good evidence of it elsewhere; in Hims for example, the Muslims and Christians shared a building in common as a mosque and church, and it is evident from al-Iṣṭākhri and Ibn Hawkal that this was still the case in the time of their common authority, al-Balqhi (309 = 921) (B.G.A., i. 61, 7 sqq.; ii. 117, 5; iii. 156, 139), and a similar arrangement is recorded for Dābil in Armenia (B.G.A., i. 188, 3 sqq.; ii. 244, 21; cf. iii. 577, 3 sqq.). There were special conditions in Jerusalem.

The Muslims recognised the sanctuary there, as is evident from the earlier Kibla and from Sūrat xxvii. 1 (in the traditional interpretation). It must therefore have been natural for the conquerors, when the town capitulated, to seek out the recognised holy place. Indeed we are told that ‘Umar in the year 17 built a mosque in Jerusalem on the site of the temple of Solomon (F. Bachtgen, Fragmenta syr. n. arab. Hist., p. 17, 110, following Ishū’dīnāh, metropolitan of Baṣra after 700 a.d.; cf. for the viiiith century Theophanes quoted by Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 1890, p. 91 note). That the Kubbat al-Sharḥa (q.v.) which the Mosque of ‘Umar replaced, stands on the old site of the Temple is undoubted. How he found the site is variously recorded (cf. al-Qādisī). The building was, like other mosques of the time of ‘Umar, very simple. Arculf who visited Jerusalem about 670 says “The Saracens attend a quadrangular house of prayer (domus orationis, i.e. masjid) which they have built with little art with boards and large beams on the remains of some ruins, on the famous site where the Temple was once built in all its splendour” (Itinerar Hierosolimitana, ed. P. Geyer, 1898, p. 226 sqq.; transl. by P. Mickley, in Das Land der Bibel, ii/2, 1917, p. 19 sqq.). It is of interest to note that this simple mosque, like the others, was in the form of a rectangle; in spite of its simple character it could hold 3,000 people, according to Arculf.

As late as the reign of Mu‘awiya we find a new town, Kairawān, being laid out on the old plan as a military camp with a mosque and Dār al-Isfārār in the centre (Yākūt, Muddām, iv. 213, 10 sqq.). As Baladhouri, for example, shows, the Muslim conquerors even at a later date always built a mosque in the centre of a newly conquered town, at first a simple one in each town, and it was a direct reproduction of the simple mosque of the Prophet in Medina. It was the exception to adapt already existing buildings in towns. But soon many additional mosques were added.

2. Tribal mosques and Sectarian mosques.

There were mosques not only in the towns. When the tribes pledged themselves to the Prophet to adopt Islam, they had also to perform the salāt. It is not clear how far they took part in Muslim worship, but if they concerned themselves with Islam at all, they must have had a Muslim place of meeting. Probably even before Islam they had, like the Meccans, their madda‘ or nādi or dār shūrā, where they discussed matters of general importance (cf. Lammens, Mo‘awiya, p. 205; Zād
t. 576, p. 30 sqq.) and the fact that it was also used for the common zakat found to be natural for tribal mosques to come into existence. Thus we are told that a, early as the year 5 the tribes to the east b, later formed mosques and used the aqsha (Ibn Sa'd, (n. 44, 9 not mentioned in Ibn Hisham, p. 945 sqq.) Tabari, i. 1722) it is also recorded of the Banu Udhaima who lived near Mecca that they built mosques in the year 8 and introduced the aqsha (Wakif-Wellhausen, p. 351). How far one can rely on such stories in a particular case is however uncertain. A late writer like al-Diyarbakri says of the Banu-6-Mustaklik that they aslum webanu masjidhina (Tariikh Khamis, i. 132, 20; cf. Annali dell' Islam, u. 221): in the early sources this is not found. Nor is the story, told by Ibn Sa'd at all probable, that envouts from the Banu Hanifa received orders to destroy their churches, sprinkle the ground with water and build a mosque (Ibn Sa'd, j. ii. 56, 11 sqq., while Ibn Hisham, p. 945 sqq.: Tabari, i. 1737 sqq. and Baladhuri, p. 86 sqq. say nothing about it). But that there were tribal mosques at a very early date is nevertheless quite certain. The mosque at Kufa was the mosque of the tribe of 'Amr b. 'awi (Ibn Sa'd, j. ii. 6, 6, and cf. above) and according to one tradition the Banu Ghannam b. 'awi were jealous of it and built an opposition mosque (Baladhuri, p. 3, 6, 21 infra). A companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, 'Abd an-Nasir b. Majah, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the masjidh of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 46, Muhammad, Masjid, bab 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the masjid of the Banu Zaraka (Bukhari, Djrash, bab 56-58) and in the masjid of the Banu Salama during the prayer, there was revealed to him Sura ii. 139, which ordered the words kafir therefore it was called Masjid al-Kubbatul (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 62).

The tribal mosque was a sign that the independence of the tribe was still retained under Islam. Indeed we hear everywhere of tribal mosques, for example around Medina that of the Banu Qua'afa, of the Banu Hanija, of the Banu Zafar, of the Banu Awl, of the Banu Harim, of the Banu Zaraka, said to have been the first in which the Koran was publicly read, that of the Banu Salama etc. (see Wustenfeld, Gesch. d. Stadt Medina, p. 29, 37 sqq. 44, 50, 57, 136 sqq.); the mosue of the two Kifahs belongs to the Banu Sawad b. Ghannam b. Ka'b b. Sa'd (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 41). This was the position in Medina the tribes had usually their own mosques and one mosque was the chief mosque. This was probably the position within the Prophet's lifetime: for in the earliest campaigns of conquest, mosques were built on this principle. 'Umar is said to have written to 'Abi Musa in Basra telling him to build a mosque at and Mondays and Fridays the tribe, and on Fridays the people were to come to the chief mosque. Similarly he wrote to Sa'd b. Abu Waqas in Kifas and to 'Amr b. al-Asi in Mi'raj. On the other hand in Syria where they had settled in old towns, they were not to build tribal mosques (Maktab. Kitab. iv. Caro 1326, p. 4 infra). It is actually recorded that the tribes in each city had their own mosques around the mosque of 'Amr in al-Fuqaydh (cf. Ibn Dujinha, p. 62 infra sqq.) and even much later a tribal mosque like that of the Rashida was still in existence (Maghrir. Kitab. iv. 64, 4 sqq.). Even in the chief mosque, the tribes had their own places (ibid., 9, 12 sqq.). We have similar evidence from the 6th Ibr. In Basra for example there was a Masjid Banu 'Ubad (Baladhuri, p. 356, 8), one of the Banu Kifa'a (B. G. A., vii. 201, 16), one of the Banu 'Adi (ibid., v. 191, 4) and one of the Ansar (cf. Goldziher, Mukhammadanische Studien, i. 77, note 5); in Kufa we find quite a number such as that of the Ansar (Tabari, i. 284, 13 sqq.), of the Aba al-Kais (ibid., ii. 657, 29), of the Banu Duhman (ibid., p. 670, 4), of the Banu Makhdum (ibid., p. 734, 15), of the Banu Hilal (ibid., p. 1687, 4), of the Banu 'Adi (ibid., p. 1703, 4), of the Banu Dhuhal and Banu Hudhir (ibid., p. 532, 8 sqq.), of the Dhuqaina (ibid., p. 533, 8), of the Banu Hilal (ibid., ii. 2509, 10) and the Abas were on the Banu Masjid (Baladhuri, p. 278, 12 sqq., also p. 285 and Goldziher, loc. cit.).

During the wars these tribal mosques were the natural rallying points for the various tribes; the mosque was a madressa, where councils were held (Tabari, i. 532, 6 sqq.) and the people were taught from its minbar (ibid., p. 284); battles often were centred for this reason round these mosques (e.g. Tabari, i. 130, 148, 6, 960). The people of your mosque, al-masjideq, ibid., p. 532, 10) became identical with your party. Gradually as new sects arose, they naturally had mosques of their own, just as Musilins before them is said to have had his own mosque (Baladhuri, p. 90, 4 from below) (Ibn Hanzal, Aynar, p. 404 infra). Thus we read later of the mosques of the Hanbalis in Baghdad, in which there was continual riot and confusion (Hilal al-Salihi, Kitaab al-Wusara, ed. Amdeuss, p. 335). It sometimes happened that different parties in a town shared the chief mosque (B. G. A., iii. 102, 5 sqq.) but as a rule it was otherwise. In particular the Sunni and Shi'a as a rule had separate mosques (cf. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islams, p. 63). It sometimes even happened that Hanafis and Shafiis had separate mosques (Yakut, Hist. ijamam, v. 509, v; cf. B. G. A., iii. 323, 11). These special mosques were a great source of disruption in Islam and we can understand that such mosques should be permitted at all. But the question whether one might talk of the Masjid Banu Fu'ah was answered by saying that in the time of the Prophet, the Masjid Banu Zaraka was recognized (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 41; cf. Dhishak, bab 56-58 and Tabari, Tafsir, xi. 20 after the middle of the page).

3. Adaptation to Islam of Older Sanctuaries; Memorial Mosques.

According to the early historians, the towns, which made treaties with the Muslims, received permission to retain their churches (Baladhuri, p. 121, in the middle; Tabari, ii. 2405, 2407) while in the conquered towns the churches fell to the Muslims without any preambles (cf. Baladhuri, p. 120 infra). Sometimes also it is recorded that a certain number of churches were received from the Christians, e.g. fifteen in Damascus according to one tradition (ibid., p. 124, 8; otherwise p. 121; cf. F. A., 9 Ser., vii. 403). It is rather doubtful whether the process was such a regular one; in any case the Muslims in course of time appropriated
many churches to themselves. With the mass- 
conversions to Islam, this was a natural result. 
The churches taken over by the Muslims were 
occasionally used as dwellings (cf. Tabari, i. 2405, 
2407); at a later date it also happened that 
they were used as government offices, as in Egypt 
in 146 (Makrizi, iv. 35; cf. for Kufa, Baladurgy, 
p. 286). The obvious thing, however, was to 
transform the churches taken into mosques. It is 
related of 'Amr b. al-Asi that he performed the 
Salat in a church (Makrizi, iv. 6) and Zaid b. Ali says 
regarding churches and synagogues, "Perform 
the Salat in them; it will not harm thee" (Corpus 
inscriptionum, p. 417, ed. Grifoni, No. 364). It is 
not clear whether the reference is to 
conquered sanctuaries; it is evident, in any 
case, that the saying is intended to remove any 
misgivings about the use of captured churches and 
synagogues as mosques. The most important example 
of this kind was in Damascus where al-Walid 
b. 'Abd al-Malik took in 86 (705) the 
took of St. John from the Christians and had it rebuilt; 
he is said to have offered the Christians another 
church in its stead (see the references above, B. 1, 
and also J. A., 9 Ser., vii. 369 sqq.; Quatremere, 
Hist. Sult. Maml., l/ii. 262 sqq. and the article 
DAMASCUS). He is said to have transformed into 
mosques some of those churches which had been particularly in the villages, with 
the gradual conversion of the people to Islam, that 
the churches were turned into mosques. In the 
Egyptian village there were no mosques in the 
earlier generations of Islam (Makrizi, iv. 28 sqg., 
30). But when al-Mamun was fighting the Copts, 
many churches were turned into mosques (ibid., 
p. 30). It is also recorded of mosques in Cairo 
that they were converted churches. According to 
to one tradition, the Khidima mosque was an unfinished 
Jacobeite church, which was surrounded by Jewish 
and Christian graves (Makrizi, iv. 63, 64) and in 
the immediate vicinity al-Hakim turned a Jacobite 
and a Nestorian Church into mosques (ibid., p. 265). 
When Djawhar built a palace in al-Kabura, a djer 
was taken in and transformed into a mosque 
(ibid., p. 269); similar changes took place at later 
dates (ibid., p. 240) and synagogues also were transformed in this way (Masjid Ibn al-Banna', 
ibid., p. 265). The chief mosque in Palermo 
was previously a church (Yahya, Mi'dam, i. 719). 
After the Crusades several churches were turned 
into mosques in Palestine (Sauvage, Hist. de Jérusalem et d'Iléron, 1876, p. 77; Quatremere, Hist. 
Sult. Maml., i/ii, 40). 

Other sanctuaries than those of the "people of the 
scripture" were turned into mosques. For example, a 
Masjid al-Sham between the two 
was the successor of an old temple of Samas (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii. 331 sqg.) 
Not far from Iṣṭakhr was a Masjid Sulaimān which 
was an old "fire-temple", the pictures of which 
would still be seen in the time of Mas'udi 
and al-Maḳdisi (10th century) (Mas'udi, Murūdīj, iv. 
77; B.G.A., iii. 444). In Iṣṭakhr itself there was 
a džamī', which was a converted fire-temple (ibid., 
p. 436). In Miṣṣa, the ancient Mopsuestia, al-Mansūr in 
146 built a mosque on the site of an ancient 
church (Baladurgy, p. 165 sqg.) and the chief mosque 
which the Dāhlī were originally a temple (Ibn Batūtā, iii. 
154); as to Tāʾīr cf. Abū Dāwi, Salāt, b. 36; 
Thus also the old rule holds that sacred 
places survive changes of religion. It was especially 
easy in cases where Christian sanctuaries were 
associated with Biblical personalities who were also 
recognised by Islam: e.g., the Church of St. John 
in Damascus and many holy places in Palestine. One example is the mosque of Job in Shēkh Sa'id, 
associated with Sūra xxxi. 83, xxxviii. 40; here 
in Silvia's time (fourth century) there was a church 
of Job (Mas'udi, i. 91; Baezler, Paäst. u. Sprich., 
1910, p. 147).

But Islam itself had created historical associations 
which were bound soon to lead to the building of 
new mosques. Even in the lifetime of the 
 Prophet, the Banū Sālim are said to have asked 
him to perform the Salāt in their masjid to give 
it his authority (see above A. 3). At the request of Ibn b. Malik the Prophet performed 
the Salāt along with Abū Bakr in his house and thereby 
consecrated it as a musallā, because he could 
not get to the tribal mosque in the rainy season 
(Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 47; Tirmidhī, bāb 56; 
Muslim, Masājd, tr. 46; a similar story in 
Bukhārī, Aṣbān, bāb 47, Tirmidhī, bāb 33 is 
perhaps identical in origin). After the death of the 
Prophet, his memory became so precious that 
the places where he had prayed obtained a special 
importance and his followers, who liked to imitate 
him in everything, preferred to perform their Salāt 
in such places. But this intensification of what had existed in his lifetime; and so it is not easy to decide how far the above 
stories reflect later conditions. Mosques very quickly 
 arose on the road between Mecca and Medina at 
places where, according to the testimony of his 
Companions, the Prophet had prayed (Bukhārī, 
Salāt, bāb 59; Wāṣsid-Wellhausen, p. 421 sqq.); 
the same was the case with the road which the 
Prophet had taken to Tabuk in the year 9 (Ibn 
Hishām, p. 907; Wāṣsid-Wellhausen, p. 394; 
there were 19 in all, which are listed in Annali dell'Islam, ii. 246 sqq.). Indeed wherever he had 
taken the field, mosques were built; for example 
on the road to Badr, where according to tradition 
the Prophet himself built a mosque in Khāibar during the campaign of 
the year 7 (Diyārbakrī, Taʾīrīs al-Khamm, ii. 49 sqq.; 
cf. Annali dell'Islam, ii. 19). Outside Taʾīr a mosque 
was built on a hilltop, because the Prophet 
had performed the Salāt there during the siege in 
the year 8, between the tents of his two wives, 
Zainab and Khawtham (Ibn Hishām, p. 872; 
Wāṣsid-Wellhausen, p. 369): In Iṣṭanbul the 
Prophet is said to have himself built a mosque 
while on the campaign against Taʾīr (Ibn Hishām, 
p. 852; Wāṣsid-Wellhausen, p. 368 sqq.). Mosques 
 arose in and around Medina, “because Muhammad 
prayed here” (Wustenfeld, Gesch. d. Staats Medins, 
p. 31, 35, 132 sqq.). It is obvious that in most 
of these cases later conditions are put back to 
the time of the Prophet; in connection with the 
war of the Istāḥ they are told that: “he prayed 
everywhere where mosques now stand” (Wāṣsid- 
Wellhausen, p. 208). Since, for example, 
Masjid al-Fāṭih is also called Masjid al-Shams 
(Wustenfeld, Medins, p. 132) we have perhaps 
here actually an ancient sanctuary.
Masjid became associated with the Prophet in many ways. In Medina, for example, there was the Masjid al-Baqi’ where footprints of the Prophet’s mule were shown in a stone, the Masjid al-Dirya where the Prophet’s appeal was answered, the Masjid al-EPark which received the victory over the Ikhshidis, etc. (see Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 136 sq.). In Mecca there was naturally a large number of places sacred through associations with the Prophet and therefore used as places of prayer. The most honoured site, next to the chief mosque, is said to have been the house of Khadijida, also called Masud al-Sa’aya, in Medina, because the daughter of the Prophet was born there. This house, in which the Prophet lived till the Hijra, was taken over by ‘Abd, ‘Ali’s brother, and bought by him through Munawiya and turned into a mosque (Chen, Mecca, iii. 112, 440). She also purchased the Prophet’s burial-place, Masjid al-Nabii, and made it into a mosque (ibid., i. 422; ii. 439). It Munawiya really bought the Prophet’s house from his cousin, it was probably the right one, but the demand for places associated with the Prophet became stronger and stronger and we therefore find more and more places referred not only to the Prophet, but also to his Companions. Such are the burial-places of Hamza, ‘Aban and Ali (Chen, Mecca, iii. 445), the house of Mariya, the mother of the Prophet’s son, ‘Abdullah (ibid., i. 447, 490) which also had a mosque at Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 153). There were also a Masjid Khadijida (ibid., i. 324) and a Masjid ‘Aisha (ibid., ii. 454), a Masjid of the “granted appeal” in a narrow valley near Mecca, where the Prophet performed the jadid (ibid., ii. 453), a Masjid al-Najm, where the Djinn overheard his preaching (ibid., i. 424; in 453), a Masjid al-Najmah, where he planted his standard at the conquest (ibid., i. 68 infra and 71 supra; ii. 453), a Masjid al-Baqa’ where the first homage of the Medinees was received (ibid., i. 428; ii. 441). In the Masjid al-Kharif in Minma is shown the mark of the Prophet’s head in a stone into which visitors also put their heads (ibid., iii. 438). Persons in the Bible are also connected with mosques, Adam, Abraham and 1-Ma’i with the Ka’ba, besides which the Masjids Ibrahim is shown and ‘Arafah there is still a Masjid Ibrahim (ibid., i. 475, 475) and another in al-Zahir near Mecca (Ibn Dubair, Khefa, 1927, p. 113). To these memorial mosques others were later added, e.g., the Masjid Abu Bakr, Masjid Bilal, the Mosque of the Splintering of the Moon (by the Prophet) etc. (Ibn Dubair, Khefa, p. 114 supra; B.G.A., iii. 192 sq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 27; al-Batani, al-Khefa al-Jahdigen, Cairo, 1339, p. 52 infra). In al-Hijaz the Muslims thus acquired a series of mosques which became important from their association with the Prophet, his family and his Companions, and made Muslim history live. On the other hand, in lands formerly Christian, they took over sanctuaries which were associated with the Biblical history which they had assimilated (see Le Strange, Palestine, p. 145). Other mosques soon became associated with Biblical and Muslim story. The mosque founded by ‘Umar on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem was, as already pointed out, identified as al-Masjid al-Aqsa mentioned in Sura xvii. 1 and therefore connected with the Prophet’s Night Journey to Paradise. The rock is said to have greeted the Prophet on this occasion and marks in a stone covering a hole are explained as Muhammad’s footprints (sometimes also as those of Idris; cf. Le Strange, Palestine, p. 136; al-Batani, Khefa, p. 165; Baedeker, Palestine, 1910, p. 52 sq.; cf. Ya’qubi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 311). The name al-Masjid al-Aqsa was used throughout the early period for the whole Haram area in Jerusalem, later partly for it, and partly for the building in its southern part (B.G.A., v. 160; Sauvage, Hist. Jérusalem, p. 95, 121; cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Medimeens, p. 96 sq.). Then there were the mosques which had specifically Muslim associations, like the Masjid of ‘Umar on the Mount of Olives where he encamped at the conquest (B.G.A., ii. 172). In Egypt not only was an old Christian sanctuary called Ma’bad Masi (Ma’kri, iv. 269), but we are also told, for example, that the Mosque of Ibn Talun was built where Masi talked with his Lord (Ma’kri, iv. 36); according to al-Ku’ahi there were in Egypt four Masjids of Masi (Ibn Dukmakh, ed. Volland, p. 92); there was a Masjid Ya’kub wa-Yusuf (B.G.A., ii. 209) and a Joseph’s prison, certainly dating from the Christian period (Ma’kri, iv. 315). There was also a Mosque of Abraham in Masy in Syria (Ibn Dujair, p. 58). The chief mosque of San’a was built by Shem, son of Noah (B.G.A., vii. 110). The old temple near Iṣaakhan mentioned above was connected with Sulaiman (Mas’udi, Muradi, iv. 77; Ya’qubi, i. 299). In the mosque of Kufa not only ‘Ishaq but one thousand other prophets and one thousand saints, described as wa’af, are said to have offered their prayers; here was the tree Yakta (Sura xxxvii. 146); here died Yaghuth and Ya’qub, etc. (Ya’qubi, iv. 325; also Ibn Dujair, p. 311 supra; and in this mosque there was a chapel of Abraham, Noah and Idris (Ibn Dujair, p. 212); a large number of mosques were added with Companions of the Prophet. What emphasis was laid on such an association is seen, for example, from the story according to which ‘Umar declined to perform the A’la’ in the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, lest the church should afterwards be claimed as a mosque.

4. Tomb Mosques

A special class of memorial mosques consisted of 1097, which were associated with a tomb. The graves of ancestors and of saints had been sanctuaries from ancient times and they were generally adopted into Islam. In addition there were the saints of Islam itself. The general tendency to distinguish places associated with the founders of Islam naturally concentrated itself around the graves in which they rested. In the Kurra, a tomb-masjid is mentioned in connection with the Seven Sleepers (Sura xviii. 20) but it is not clear if it was recognised. As early as the year 6, the companions of Abu Bakr are said to have built a mosque at the place where he died and was buried (Ya’qubi-Wellhausen, p. 262). The Prophet is also said to have visited regularly at al-Madina in Medina the tombs of the martyrs who fell at Uhud and paid reverence to them (ibid., p. 143).
Whatever the exact amount of truth in the story, there is no doubt that the story of the tomb-mosque of Abū Basir is ante-dated. The accounts of the death of the Prophet and of the period immediately following reveal no special interest in his tomb. But very soon the general trend of development stimulated an interest in graves which led to the erection of sanctuaries at them. The progress of this tendency is more marked in al-Wāqidi, who died in 207 (623), than in Ibn Ishaq, who died in 151 (768).

The collections of Ḥadīth made in the third century contain discussions on this fact which show that the problem was whether the tombs could be used as places of worship and in this connection whether mosques could be built over the tombs. The Ḥadīths answer both questions in the negative, which certainly was in the spirit of the Prophet. It is said that “Salāt at the graves (jā ‘maḥārīr) is makrūh” (Bukhārī, Sahīl, bāb 52); “sit not upon graves and perform not salāt towards them” (Muslim, Qawātul Inbān, tr. 33); “hold the salāt in your houses, but do not use them as tombs” (Muslim, Sahīl al-Musāfīrīn, tr. 29). On the other hand it is acknowledged that women performed the salāt at the cemetery (Bukhārī, Sahīl, bāb 48). We are also told that tombs cannot be used as masjīd (Bukhārī, Sahīl, bāb 48; Qawātul Inbān, bāb 62). On his deathbed the Prophet is said to have cursed the Jews and the Christians because they used the tombs of their prophets as masjīd. Ḥadīth explains this by saying that the tomb of the Prophet was not at first accessible (Bukhārī, Sahīl, bāb 48, 55; Qawātul Inbān, bāb 62; Ahbāb, bāb 50; Muslim, Masāḥid, tr. 3); as a matter of fact its precise location was not exactly known (Qawātul Inbān, bāb 66).

The attacks in Ḥadīth insist that tomb-mosques are a reprehensible Jewish practice: “When a pious man dies, they build a masjid and set up his tomb” etc. (Bukhārī, Sahīl, bāb 48, 54; Muslim, Qawātul Inbān, bāb 71). Although this view of tomb-mosques is still held in certain limited circles (cf. Ibn Taimiyya, the Wahhābi), the old pre-Islamic custom soon became a Muslim one. The expositors of Ḥadīth like al-Nawawi (on Muslim, Masāḥid, tr. 3, lith. Dīlī 1319, 3. 201) and al-Qaṣīṣī (Cairo 1329, 3. 354) explain the above passages to mean that only an excommunicated mujāhīn of the dead is forbidden so that tombs should not be used as a khāla; otherwise it is quite commendable to spend time in a mosque in proximity to a devout man.

The name given to a tomb-mosque is often khāla, a word which is used of a tent (Bukhārī, Qawātul Inbān, bāb 62; Ḥadīth, bāb 64; Fard al-Khums, bāb 19; al-Qaṣīṣī, bāb 15; Tārafa, Dīlī, vii. 1), but later came to mean the dome which usually covers tombs and thus became the general name for the sanctuary of a saint (cf. Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 114, 115; cf. Dory, Supplement, s.v.). Maṣjīd also means a little chapel and a saint’s tomb (v. Berchem, Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicum, 3. 72, etc.; cf. index). The custom of making a khāla at the tomb of a saint was firmly rooted in Byzantine territory, where sepulchral churches always had a dome (Herod-Hauch, Réalités chrétiennes, 3. 784). The usual name however for a tomb-sanctuary was maṣjīd; this is applied to places where saints are worshipped, among Muslim tombs particularly to those of the friends and relations of the Prophet (v. Berchem, Corpus Inscriptionum Arabica, i., 3. 32, 63, 417, 544; Makrīzī, iv., p. 265, 309 sqq.) but also to tombs of other recognised saints, e.g. Mashhad Diyarjīsa in Mawṣil (Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 236) etc.

The transformation of the tombs of the Prophet and his near relatives into sanctuaries seems to have been a gradual process. Muhammad, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar are said to have been buried in the house of ʿĀisha; Fāṭima and ʿAli lived beside it. ʿĀisha had a wall built between her room and the tombs to prevent visitors carrying off earth from the tomb of the Prophet. The houses of the Prophet’s wives remained as they were until al-Wāqidi rebuilt them. He thought it scandalous that Ḥasan b. Ḥasan b. ʿAli should live in Fāṭima’s house and ʿUmar’s family close beside ʿĀisha’s home in the house of Ḥafsa. He acquired the houses, had all the houses of the Prophet’s wives torn down and erected new buildings. The tombs were enclosed by a pentagonal wall; the whole area was called al-Rawāya “the garden”; it was not till later that a dome was built over it (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 66 sqq., 72 sq., 78 sqq., 89). In the cemetery of Medina, al-Raṣāʿ, a whole series of Mashhads came to be built where tombs of the family and clan of the Prophet were located (Ibid., p. 140 sqq.; Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 195 sqq.). It is often disputed whether a tomb belonged to one or the other (e.g. Tābarī, iii. 2436, 2 sqq.). Such tomb-mosques were sacred (makādīs; Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 114, 13, 17); they were visited li ʿ-‘arabā. The name al-Rawāya of the Prophet’s tomb became later applied to other sanctuaries (Ibn Djbair, Rīḥā, p. 46, 56, 52, 11). Separate limbs were revered in some mosques, like the head of al-Ḥusain in Cairo, which was brought there in 491 from ʿAskānān (ʿAlī Pāšā Muṣṭafā, al-Khiṭat al-Qudūd, iv. 91 sqq.; cf. Sauvage, Hist. Jérusalem, p. 16); his head was also revered for some time in the Mashhad al-Ra’s in Damascus (according to Ibn Shākir, J., 9th ser., vii. 385).

Gradually a vast number of Muslim tombs of saints came into existence; and to these were added all the pre-Islamic sanctuaries which were adopted by Islam. No distinction can therefore be drawn between tomb-mosques and other memorial mosques. It was often impossible to prove that the tomb in question ever really existed. In the Mashhad ʿAli for example, ʿAli’s tomb is honoured but Ibn Djbair leaves it in doubt whether he is really buried there (Rīḥā, p. 212) and many located his grave in the mosque of Kufa and el-Merere (Masāḥid, tr. 289; v. 68; B. G. A., ii. 162). In Ḥanǧa, a part of the mosque near ʿAkkā there was also a Mashhad ʿAli (Yāqūt, iii. 759) and also in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn Djbair, p. 267); on this question see R. G. A., ii. 46. Names frequently became confused and transferred. In Mecca between Safa and Marwa there was a Khāla, which was associated with ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭab but Ibn Djbair says that it should be connected with ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (Rīḥā, p. 115, 11 sqq.). In Êṣa there was a Mashhad Abū Hurayra, where the memory of this Companion of the Prophet was honoured; it is said to have been placed in the grave of another Abū Hurayra (Makrīzī, i. 335, etc.). Wherever Shiʿi is ruled, there arose numerous tomb-mosques of the Abī al-Bait. In Egypt Ibn Djbair gives a list of 14 men and five women of the Prophet’s
family, who were honoured there (Rikhl, p. 46).

Islam was always creating new tombs of saints and had been distinguished for learning or asceticism or miracle-working, e.g. the tomb of al-Shāfi’ī in Cairo and Aḥmad al-Badawī in Taṭṣ. There were mosques, chiefly old established sanctuaries, of Biblical and semi-Biblical personages like Kūbal (Reuben) and Ṣayyida the wife of Pharaoth (ibid., p. 46). In and around Damascenus were a number of mosques, which were built on the tombs of prophets and unnamed saints (Ibn Dujbair, Rikhl, p. 273 sqq.). In Palestine could be seen a vast number of tombs of Biblical personages (cf. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, Index and Conder in Palestine Explor. Fund, Quarterly Statement, 1871, p. 89 sqq.), usually mosques with a kubah.

After the sanctuaries of persons mentioned in the Bible came those of people mentioned in the Qur‘ān. For example, outside the Djemāliyya in ‘Akkā was shown the tomb-mosque of the prophet Ṣallāh (Nasirī Khurraw, Sefer Namech, ed. Schœfer, p. 15, 49), and in Syria that of his son (Ibn Dujbair, p. 49); that of Hūd was also shown near ‘Akkā (Sefer Namech, p. 16, 52), farther east that of Shu’ab and of his daughter (ibid., p. 16, 49); the tomb of Hūd was also pointed out in Damascus and in Hadramawt (Yākūt, ii. 595, 6); then we have peculiarly Mu‘āmmar saints like Ḥujj al-Kabīr, the son of Job (ibid., p. 16, 52). Then there are the sanctuaries of saints who are only suprahumans, but who have their origins in old popular superstitions, like al-Khājiqī, who had a masjid in Damascus (Yākūt, ii. 595, 9), or a saint like ‘Akkā, the tomb of whose town Nasirī Khurraw visited outside the town (Sefer Namech, p. 15, 49, from below = 52). Such tombs were much visited by pious travellers, and are therefore frequently mentioned in literature on Maḥājil al-shajā‘a, the kinds mentioned here in the Islām, see B.G.A., ii. 130; for Mawsil etc. ibid., p. 146). In this way ancient sanctuaries were turned into mosques and it is often quite a matter of chance under what names they are adopted by Islam. (cf. Goldziher, Moh. Sitten, ii. 325 sqq.). It therefore sometimes happens that the same saint is honoured in several mosques. Abī Hurayra, who is buried in Medina, is honoured not only in the above-mentioned tomb-mosque in Dīrā but also at various places in Palestine, in al-Kamāla and in Yubnā south of Lābraṭayn Khallī ed-Dāhirī, Zoubid Kuchf al-Mamlik, ed. P. Ravaise, p. 42, from below; Sefer Namech of Nasirī Khurraw, ed. by Ch. Schœfer, p. 17, 49, from below = 59; Yākūt, iii 512, ztd. iv. 1007, 12. cf. Simḥalī Osayyas, Ent. Sūfīyīt, ii. [1928, 31]. The tomb of the Prophet ‘Isā is revered not only in the ancient Nīnveh but also in Palestine.

Just as the kubah under which the saint lay and the mosque adjoining it were sanctified by him, so vice-versa a kubah and a mosque could cause a deceased person to become considered a saint. It was therefore the custom for the mighty not only to give this distinction to their fathers but also to prepare such buildings for themselves even in their own lifetime. This was particularly the custom of the Mamūkūl sūlūn, perhaps stimulated by the fact that they did not want dynasties in which power passed from father to son. Such buildings are called kubah (van Berchem, C.I.A., i. N°. 82 sqq., 96, 126, 138 etc.), exceptionally zāwiyā (ibid., N°. 98), frequently turba (ibid., N°. 38, 88, 106, 117, 116 etc.); the formula is also found: “this kubah is a turba” (N°. 67); the latter word acquired the same meaning as masjid, partly saint’s grave and partly sacred site (cf. Ibn Dujbair, Rikhl, p. 114, 199); but this word does not seem to be used of ordinary tomb-mosques, although the distinction between these and mosques in honour of saints often disappeared. In these kubahs the regular recitation of the Qur‘ān was often arranged and the tomb was provided with a kūrwa. The mausoleum might be built in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yākūt, iv. 509, 6 sqq.).

5. Mosques deliberately founded.

In the early period the building of mosques was a social obligation of the ruler as representative of the community and the tribes. Very soon a number of mosques came into existence, provided by individuals. In addition to tribal mosques, as already mentioned, there were also sectarian mosques and prominent leaders built mosques which were the centres of their activity, for example the Masjid ‘Aṭī b. Hātit (Tabari, ii. 130), the Masjid Simak in Kūfah (ibid., i. 2653), the Masjid al-Shābath etc. As old sanctuaries entered Islam, the mosque received more of the character of a sanctuary and the building of a mosque became a pious work; there arose a hadith, according to which the Prophet said: “for him who builds a mosque, God will build a home in Paradise”; some add “if he desires to see the face of God” (Corpus juris di Zaid b. ‘Ali, ed. Griffith, N°. 276; Buḫṣārī, Sūrūt, bāb 65; Muslim, Masjid, tr. 4: Zark, tr. 3; Maḳṣīri, iv. 36). Like other sanctuaries, mosques were sometimes built as a result of a revelation in a dream. A story of such a kind of the year 557 is given by al-Saḥmādī for Medina (Wastenfeld, Medina, p. 91 sqq.); and a similar one is a mosque in Damascus (F. A., Ser. 9, vii 354); a mosque was also built out of gratitude for seeing the Prophet (al-Maḍarṭa al-Sharī‘īyya, Maḳṣīri, iv. 209). It was of course particularly an obligation on the mighty to build mosques. Even in the earliest period the government took care that new mosques were built to keep pace with the spread of Islam (cf. Balāḏurī, p. 178 sqq.). About the year 1000 the governor of Media, Badr b. Ḥasanawalīj, is said to have built 3,000 mosques and hotels (Mer, Die Renaissance des Islāms, 1922, 24). The collections of inscriptions, as well as the geographical and topographical works, reveal how the number of mosques increased in this way.

In Egypt, al-Ḥākim in the year 403 had a census taken of the mosques of Cairo and there were eight hundred (Maḳṣīri, iv. 264); al-‘Uṣayrī’s (d. 454 = 1062) also counted the mosques and his figure is put at 30,000 or 36,000 (Yākūt, iii. 901; Ibn Dujbair, ed. Voller, p. 92; Maḳṣīri, iv. 264) which seems quite a fantastic figure (there is probably a vacating between B.I.D. i.e. 1098). Ibn al-Mutawwād (d. 730) according to al-Maḳṣīri counted 480 and Ibn Dujbair (about 550) gives in addition to the incomplete list of djémāli a list of 472 mosques, not including madrasī, khanāqāhs etc.; the figure given by Maḳṣīri is smaller. The fantastic figure of 30,000 for Baghdad is found as early as Yaḳūt (B.G.A., vii. 250). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn Dujbair was told in
Alexandria that there were 12,000 or 8,000 mosques there (p. 43). In Bāṣra where Ziyād built 7 mosques (B. G. A., v. 191), the number had also increased rapidly; but here again an exaggerated figure (7,000) is given (B. G. A., vii. 261). In Damascus, Ibn Asākir (d. 571 = 1176) counted 241 within and 148 outside the city (J. A., Ser. 9, vi. 383). In Palermo Ibn Hawkal counted over 300 and in a village above it 200 mosques. In some streets there were as many as 20 mosques within a bowshot of one another; this multiplicity is condemned: everyone wanted to build a mosque for himself (Yaḵtū, i. 719; iii. 409, 410). As a matter of fact, one can almost say that things tended this way; Yaḵtū mentions in Baghdad a mosque for the Anbārī officials of the tax-office (B. G. A., vii. 245) and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672 Ṭādh al-Dīn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the ṣalāt alone and meditated (Maḵrīzī, iv. 90). The mosques thus founded were very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (Maḵrīzī, iv. 97, 265 sqq.) and a madrasa might be called after its head or a teacher (ibid., iv. 235; Yaḵtū, Ilaḵī, vii. 82). Lastly a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣallā. In addition to the mosques proper, al-Maḵrīzī mentions for Cairo 8 places for prayer (muṣallā) mainly at the cemetery (iv. 334 sqq.). The word muṣallā may also mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. Sūra, ii. 119; cf. Maḵrīzī, Khiṭāt, iv. 25, 16; do., Iṣṭiʿāż, ed. Bunz, p. 91, 17; Yaḵtū, Muṣṣāwa, iv. 326, 2 sqq.) or a particular place of prayer within a mosque (Tabāri, i. 2408, 16; Bukhārī, Ghusl, bāb 17; Ṣalāt, bāb 91). In Palestine, there were many open places of prayer, provided only with a miḥrāb and marked off, but quite often in the open (cf. for Tiberias, Sīfer-Nāmeh, transl. Schefer, p. 36). It is recorded of the Prophet that he used to go out at the two festivals (al-Fitr and al-Aḍḥa) to the place of prayer (al-muṣallā) of the Banū Salima. A lance which the Negus had presented to al-Zubair was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as suṭra. Standing in front of it, he conducted the ṣalāt, and then preached a khutbah without a minbar to the rows in front of him (Tabāri, i. 1281, 14 sqq.; Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 6; Ṣalāt, bāb 90; Ḥadīth, bāb 6). He also went out to the muṣallā for the ṣalāt al-istiqbā (Muslim, Iṣtikā, tr. 1). This Muṣallā was an open space and Muḥammad is even said to have forbidden a building on it (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 127 sqq.). This custom of performing the ṣalāt on a muṣallā outside the town on the two festivals became sunna. There is evidence of the custom for several towns. In Medina however, a mosque was later built: the muṣallā (ibid., p. 128 sq.) which also happened in other places. An early innovation was the introduction of a minbar by Marwān (ibid., p. 128; Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 6). When ʿAbū Wāqīṣa built a mosque in Xisrā’s Iwan in al-Madrīʾin, at the festival in the year 16 it was expressly stated that it was sunna to go out to it: Sa’d, however, thought it was a matter of indifference (Tabāri, i. 2451). Shortly after 300 a muṣallā outside of Hamadān is mentioned (Maṣṭūḥ, Marāj, i. 25). There was al-Muṣallā al-ʿAtīq in Baghdad; here a dakka was erected for the execution of the Karmaṭian prisoners (Tabāri, ii. 2244 sq.; cf. 1569, 18; in Kūfa, several are mentioned (ibid., ii. 628, 16; 1704, 5; iii. 367, 8 sq.), two in Merv (ibid., i. 1931, z. 1964, 15; cf. Sīfer-Nāmeh, transl. Schefer, p. 274), one in Farghāna (B. G. A., ii. 393, 16). In Tārīm, the muṣallā was within the walls (B. G. A., ii. 349, 16) which also happened elsewhere (ibid., 378, 6 sqq.). In Cairo the two festivals were celebrated on the Muṣallā Khawālan (a Yemen tribe) with the Ḫūṭa of the Mosque of ʿAmr as leader: according to al-Ḳudāʾi the festivals were to be celebrated on a muṣallā opposite the hill Yalḥūm, then on al-Muṣallā al-Ḳadīm where ʿAbdād b. Ṭullūn erected a building in 256. The site was several times changed (Maḵrīzī, iv. 334 sqq.; cf. B. G. A., ii. 200, 11 sqq.). In 302, 306 and 308 the salāt al-ʿid was performed for the first time in the Mosque of ʿAmr (Maḵrīzī, iv. 20, 8 sqq.; Ḥasan al-Muṣṣāwa, i. 137 infr.; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii. 194, 9 sqq.). Ibn Butṭūtā notes the custom in Spain (420) and Tunis (i. 22) and also in India (iii. 154). Ibn al-Ḥadīdī (d. 737) says that in his time the ceremonies still took place on the muṣallā but condemns the biṭaʾa’s associated with them (K. al-Madkhāl, ii., Cairo 1320, p. 82 sqq.). It is also laid down in Muslim law, although not always definitely (see Juynboll, Handbuch d. islam. Ges., 1910, p. 127; I. Guidi, Il Meḥtaṣar, i., 1919, p. 136). The custom seems in time to have become generally abandoned. In the ninth century the Masjid ʿAṣḵonkor was expressly built for the khuta at the Friday services and at festivals (Maḵrīzī, iv. 107, 16).

C. The Mosque as the Centre for Divine Service.

1. Sanctity of the Mosque.

The history of the mosque in the early centuries of Islam shows an increase in its sanctity which was intensified by the adoption of the traditions of the church and especially by the permutation of the cult of saints. The sanctity already associated with tombs taken over by Islam was naturally very soon transferred to the larger and more imposing mosques. The expression Baṭt al-Aṭāʾah “house of God”, which at first was only used of the Kaʾba came now be applied to any mosque (s. Corpus iruri d. Zaid b. ʿAbi, N. 48, cf. 156, 983; Chron. Mekk., ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 146, 19; Balūm, Corpus Insr. Arab. 1, N. 10, i. 18; Ibn al-Ḥadīdī, K. al-Madkhāl, i. 20, 23; i. 64, 68; cf. Bait Rabīḥ, ibid., i. 23, 73; ii. 56). The alteration in the original conception is illustrated by the fact that the Muḥammad al-Malik al-Zahrāʾ Baḥbars declined to build a mosque on a place for tethering camels because it was unseemly, while the mosque of the Prophet had actually been built on such a place (Maḵrīzī, iv. 91; Abū Dāwud, Ṣalāt, bāb 22).

In the house of God the Miḥrāb and the Miḥnar (see below) enjoyed particular sanctity, as did the tomb, especially in Medina (Bukhārī, Fadʾ al-Ṣalāt fi Masjid Maṣṭūḥ wa ʿl-Madīna, bāb 5). The visitors sought ṣanāʾa, partly by touching the tomb or the railing round it, partly by praying
in its vicinity: at such places "prayer is heard" (Civ. Mos. ii. 441, 442). In the Masjid al-Kabir in Medina the visitor laid his head on the print of the Prophet's head and thus obtained "siadik kurni" (iii. 435). A mosque could be built on a site, the sanctity of which had been shown by the finding of hidden treasure (Maqāmir, iv. 75). There were often places of particular sanctity in mosques. In the mosques at Kufah and Medina, the spots where the Prophet used to stand at prayer were held to be particularly blessed (Baladurri, p. 5; Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 91; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 65, cf. 82, 109). In other mosques, places where a saint had sat or where a divine phenomenon had taken place e.g. in the Mosque of 'Amr and in the Aḥār Mosque (Maqāmir, iii. 14, 52) or the Mosque in Jerusalem (Masjid, B. G. A., ii. 170) were specially visited. Pious visitors made tawaf between such places in the mosque (Maqāmir, iv. 20). Just as in other religions we find priests dedicating their children to the service of a sanctuary, so we find a Muslim woman vowing her child or child yet unborn to the mosque (Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 74; Maqāmir, iv. 20). The fact that mosques, like other sanctuaries, were sometimes founded after a revelation received in a dream has already been mentioned (B. 5).

This increase in sanctity had as a natural result that one could no longer enter a mosque at random as had been the case in the time of the Prophet. In the early Umayyad period, Christians were still allowed to enter the mosque without molestation (cf. Lammens, Mosquée, p. 13). But after the tenth century, forbidden to Christians and this regulation is related to 'Umar (Lammens, op. cit., p. 13, note 6). A strict teacher of morality like Ibn al-Haddād thought it un-earnly that the monks who were the masters of the mosques should be allowed to lay them in the mosques (Maqāmir, ii. 57). Conditions were not always the same. In Herat, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 1204 (1892) Barbarus forbade it (Quatremere, Histoire, iii. 22, 27).

Although in some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abu Dawūd, Tabarī, bāb 92; Ibn Mādhaja, Tabarī, bāb 123) and in any case only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, Maqāmir, tr. 49: Coque I. iv. 65, 66, 68), and in a later period it is specially mentioned that the zujāf cannot enter in the mosque itself (Maqāmir, ii. 47 infra) nor could slaves (ibid., p. 58, etc.)

It is always necessary to be careful not to spilt in a mosque, although some traditions which are obviously copies of the old state of affairs, say, "not in the direction of the kibla, only to the left" (Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 53 sq.). The custom of taking off one's sandals in the mosque is found as early as the time of Abu 'Ubayda (second century). (Ya'qūb, Istīlāb, bāb 272, etc.) and according to an Maqāmir (see below) is also mentioned by Abu Dawūd. Al-Tabarī puts the custom back to the time of 'Umar (i. 2405). That it is based on an old custom observed in sanctuaries is obvious (cf. on the history of the custom, F. Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos, 1926, p. 60 sq.). The custom however seems not to have been always observed. In the viiith century in the Mosque of the Umayyads the shoes were taken off only in the mawqūf, because the khurūf was covered with mats; but in 827 an Egyptian superintendent ordered that the mosque should only be entered with bare feet (f. A., ser. 9, vii. 211, 217). The visitor on entering should place his right foot first and utter certain prayers with blessings on the Prophet and his family (which Muhammad is said to have done) and when he is inside perform two raka's (Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 47; Tahāfudzī, bāb 25; Muslim, Sunan al-Musāfīrīn, tr. 12 sq.; Tabarī, iii. 2464, 2532). Certain regulations for decent conduct came into being, the object of which was to preserve the dignity of the house of divine service. Public announcements about stray animals were not to be made, as the Beduins did in their houses of assembly, and one should not call out aloud and thereby disturb the meditations of the worshippers (Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 83; Muslim, Maqāmir, tr. 18: more fully in Maqāmir, i. 19 sqq.). One should put on fine clothes for the Friday service, rub oneself with oil and perfume oneself (Bukhari, Dāmūs, bāb 3, 6, 7, 19) as was also done with ṭīb for the Ḥadījī (Bukhari, Maqāmir, bāb 143).

A question which interested the teachers of morality was that of the admission must not enter to the mosques. That many did not desire their presence is evident from the hadīth that one cannot prevent them as there is no ābu with it, but they must not be perfumed (Muslim, Sunan, bāb 29; Bukhari, Dāmūs, bāb 13; cf. Chron. Moskova, iv. 165). Other hadīths say they should leave the mosques before the men (al-Nāṣir, Sahih, bāb 77; cf. Abu Dawūd, Sunan, bāb 14, 48). Sometimes a special part of the mosque was railed off for them; for example, the governor of Mecca in 856 had ropes tied between the columns to make a separate place for women (Chron. Moskova, ii. 197 infra). According to some, women should not enter the mosque during their menstruation (Abu Dawūd, Tabarī, bāb 92, 103; Ibn Mādhaja, Tabarī, bāb 117, 123). In Medina at the present day, a wooden grille shuts off a place for women (al-Batanūnī, Al-Khīla al-Hājīzīya, p. 240). At one time the women stood at the back of the mosque (Yākūb, Cāblah, vi. 400). In Jerusalem there were special maqāmas for them (B. G. A., vi. 100). Ibn al-Haddīd would prefer to exclude them altogether and gives ‘Ābās as his authority for this.

Although the mosque became sacred it could not quite cast off its old character as a place of public assembly and in consequence the mosque was visited for many other purposes than that of divine service. Not only in the time of the Umayyads was considerable business done in the mosques (Tabarī, ii. 1118; cf. Lammens, Ziyād, p. 68) which is quite in keeping with the ḥadīth (Bukhari, Sunan, bāb 70 sq.) which, actually found it necessary to forbid the sale of wine in the mosque (ibid., bāb 73), but a writer in the viiith century, Ibn al-Haddīd, records with disapproval that business was done in the mosques: women sit in the mosques and sell thread, in Mecca hawkers even call their wares in the mosque. The list given by
This author gives the impression of a regular market-place (Mashhāl, ii. 54). Strangers could always sit down in a mosque and talk with one another (see B.G.A., iii. 205); they had the right to spend the night in the mosque; according to some, however, only if there was no other shelter available (Mashhāl, ii. 43 infra, 49 supra; see below D. 18). It naturally came about that people also ate in the mosque; this was quite common, and regular banquets were even given in them (e.g. Makrīzī, iv. 67, 121 sq.; cf. in Hadīth: Ibn Māqdūla, Fāmina, bāb 24, 29; Āhmūd b. Hāmil, ii. 106, 109; from below). Ibn al-Hādhājī laments that in al-Ăskās people even threw the remains of their repast down in the mosque; animals were brought in, and beggars and water-carriers called aloud in them etc. (Mashhāl, ii. 53 sq.). It is even mentioned as a sign of the special piety of al-Shirāzi (d. 476 = 1083) that he often brought food into the mosque and consumed it there with his pupils (Wustenfeld, Der Imam Schārī, iii. 298). Gradually the mosque became the center of religious and social activity (see D. 20). In the Azhar Mosque it was the custom with many to spend the summer nights there because it was cool and pleasant (Makrīzī, iv. 54). This was the state of affairs about 800 A.H. Similar conditions still prevail in the mosque.

2. The Mosque as a Place of Prayer.

Friday Mosques.

As places for divine service, the mosques are primarily "houses of which God has permitted that they be erected and that His name be mentioned in them" (Sūra, xxiv. 36), i.e. for His service demanded by the holy ceremonies of worship (maṣlāh), for assemblies for prayer (dīnār) and other religious duties (cf. Chron. Akhbar, iv. 164). The mosques were mawla bāb (Makrīzī, iv. 119, 140). In Medina after a journey, the Prophet went once to the mosque and performed two rakās, a custom which was imitated by others; and became the rule (Bukhārī, Šāfīt, bāb 59 sq.; Muslim, Šāfīt al-Musnadīn, tr. 11; Waḳīdī-Wellhausen, p. 412, 436). In this respect, the mosque played a part in public worship similar to that of the Ka'ba in Mecca at an earlier date and the Kaaba sanctuary in Ẓūfīn. The daily salāt, which in themselves could be performed anywhere, became especially meritorious when they were performed in mosques, because they expressed adherence to the community. A sala al-dīmā'a, we are told, is twenty or twenty-five times more meritorious as the sala of an individual at home or in his shop (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 42; Bukhārī, Šāfīt, bāb 87; Būyā', bāb 49). There are even hadiths which condemn private sala: "Those who perform the sala in their houses abandon the sunna of their Prophet" (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 44: but cf. 48 and Bukhārī, Šāfīt, bāb 52). If much rain falls, the believers may, however, worship in their house (Bukhārī, Dīmā'a, bāb 52). In this connection a blind man was given a special sala: it is particularly bad to leave the mosque after the adhān (Muslim, Masājid, tr. 45). It is therefore very meritorious to go to the mosque; for every step one advances into the mosque, he receives forgiveness of sins. God protects him at the last judgment and the angels also assist him (Muslim, Masājid, bāb 49-51; Bukhārī, Šāfīt, bāb 87; Adhān, bāb 36, 37: Dīmā'a, bāb 4, 18, 31; Corpus juris di Zaid b. 'Ali, N. 48, 156, 983).

This holds especially of the Friday sala (salāt al-dīmā'a), which can only be performed in the mosque and is obligatory upon every free male Muslim who has reached years of discretion (cf. Juyuboll, Handbuch, p. 86; Guidi, Sommario del Diritto Malechita, l. 125 sq.). According to Ibn Hishām (p. 290) this sala, which is distinguished by the kūfīiya, was observed in Medina even before the Hijra. It is hardly probable and besides is not in agreement with other sources (see Bukhārī, Dīmā'a, bāb 11) but the origin of this divine service, referred to in Sūra lxxvi. 9, is obscure. The assemblies of the Jews and Christians on a particular day must have formed the model (cf. Bukhārī, Dīmā'a, bāb 1). Its importance in the earlier period lay in the fact that all elements of the Muslim camp, who usually went to the tribal and particular mosques, assembled for it in the chief mosque under the leadership of the general. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of al-Masājid al-dīmā'a (Tabari, i. 2494; ii. 734, 1701, 1702, Kâfar, Bahā' al-Dīn, Taťūr, xi. 21, centre; ibid. also al-Masājid al-akhbar, Medina; cf. al-Masājid al-kabīr, B. G. A., v. 245) or Masājid al-Dīmā'a (Yākūt, iii. 896, al-Fusūr; also Tabari, i. 1119; Ibn Kutabba, Mawāfi, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 106; Masājid li-l-Dīmā'a (Makrīzī, iv. 4); Masājid Dīmā'an (Bahā' al-Dīn, bāb 259, Madā'īn; Yākūt, i. 643, 647, Bāṣa); then Masājid al-Dīmā'a (Yākūt, iii. 899; iv. 895; B. G. A., ii. 295, 315, 387; vii. 110 etc.). As an abbreviation we find also al-Dīmā'a (Yākūt, i. 400; Ibn Batūţa, iv. 343; cf. Masājid al-Dīmā'a, Bâddurri, p. 348) and especially Dīmā'an. As the kūfīiya was the distinguishing feature, we also find Masājid al-Khūţa (Makrīzī, iv. 44, 454, 87); Dīmā'an al-Khūţa (ibid., iv. 55) or Masājid al-Minbar (B. G. A., iii. 316 for Dīmā'an, l. 8).

Linguistic usage varied somewhat in course of time with conditions. In the time of 'Umar there was properly in every town only one Masājid Dīmā'an for the Friday service. But when the community became no longer a military camp and Islam replaced the previous religion of the people, a need for a number of mosques for the Friday service was bound to arise. This demanded mosques for the Friday service in the country, in the villages on the one hand and several Friday mosques in the towns on the other. This meant in both cases an innovation, compared with old conditions, and thus there arose some degree of uncertainty. The Friday service had to be conducted by the ruler of the community, but there was only one governor in each province; on the other hand, the demands of the time could hardly be resisted and, besides, the Christian converts to Islam had been used to a solemn weekly service. As to the villages (al-kusur), 'Amr b. al-Ănais in Egypt forbade their inhabitants to celebrate the Friday service for the reason just mentioned (Makrīzī, iv. 7). At a later period then the kūfīiya was delivered exceptionally without minbar, and only with stāl, until 'Marwān in 132 introduced the minbar into the Egyptian kūfi also (ibid., p. 8). Of a mosque in which a minbar had been placed, we are told Dīmā'a masājid li-l-Dīmā'a (Tabari, i. 2451) and a village with a minbar is called kūfrah Dīmā'a (Bukhārī, Dīmā'a, bāb 15; cf. Madīna Dīmā'a, B. G. A., iii. 321), an idea which was regarded by Bukhārī (d. 256 = 870).
as quite obvious. In introducing minbars into the Egyptian villages, Marwān was apparently following the example of other regions. In the fourth century, Ibn Hawkāl mentions a number of μηναί in the district of Isfahān (R. G. A. ii. 152 sq.) and a few in the vicinity of Marw (ibid., p. 316) and in Transoxiana (ibid., p. 378; cf. p. 384), and al-Maḥdī does the same for different parts of Persia (R. G. A., iii. 309, 317) and he definitely says that the kūtas of Palestine are ِبَنْتُ النَّاسِ (ibid., p. 176; cf. i. 58): Bāldūšari (p. 331) also uses the name minbar for a village mosque built in 230 in general, when speaking of the ِمَنْذَة, one talks of ِمَنْذَة and not of ِفَلَوَامِنْ (cf. R. G. A., n. 63) Later however the term Masjīd ِبَنْتُ is used for a Friday mosque (Ibn Djabār, p. 217). The conditions of primitive Islam are reflected in the building of the ِهَمَامَس, who only permitted the Friday service in large towns (cf. al-Mawardi, al-İṣlaḥ al-falsafī, ed. Enger, p. 177).

As to the towns, the ِشَفَّقات on the other hand have retained the original conditions, since they permit the Friday service in only one mosque in each town (cf. ِجُمِائد and of. cit., p. 178 sq.), but with the reservation that the mosque is able to hold the community. The distinction between the two sites was of importance in Egypt: When in 859 ِال-'Amr became supreme in Egypt, he appointed a ِشَفَّقات chief ِكَبَّر and the Friday service was therefore held only in the ِهَكِمَس mosque, as the large; but in 865 (1266) al-Malik al-'Alā' ِبَعْر ِلَدَار  gave the ِهَمَانَس preference and many mosques were therefore used as Friday mosques (McKrizi, iv. 52 sq.; al-Baysūnī, Ibm. ِلاْ-ِمَكِرْتِ, n. 1305; Quatremere, Hist. Sulf. Maml., n. 39 sq.). During the Umayyad period and to some extent in the ِأَبَعَسَد period, the number of ِفَلَوَامِنْ in the towns was still very small. The geographers of the third and fourth centuries in their descriptions of towns as a rule mention only ِبَنْتُ (Ibn al-Fakhri, c. 200 (903), sometimes ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ ِبَنْتُ, R. G. A. iv. 304-306, also ِبَنْتُ, simply, p. 305. In keeping with the oldest scheme of town planning, it was very often in the middle of the town surrounded by the business-quarters (R. G. A. ii. 298, 325; iv. 274 sq., 275, 280, 314, 316, 375, 376, 413, 426, 427 etc.; cf. al-Maqrizi, ed. Schefer, p. 35, 41, 56) and the ِبَنْتُ was still frequently in the immediate vicinity of the chief mosque (R. G. A., ii. 208, 314; iii. 426).

Iṣṭakhrī mentions as an innovation in Isfahān that al-Hādijī built a ِبَنْتُ in the western part of the town, although there was already one on the east bank (R. G. A., i. 82 sq.; cf. iii. 118; viii. 329). Ibn Djabār (R. F. A., p. 211 sq.) mentions only one ِبَنْتُ in Kūfsa, called Masjīd al-Kūfsa by Ibn al-Fakhī, although he also mentions other mosques (R. G. A., v. 173; cf. 174, 183 and iii. 116). In Kūfa where Yāʾkīn (278 = 891) already mentions 7,000 mosques (T. G. A. vii. 361), al-Maḥdī 575 = 958 gives 2 ِفَلَوَامِنْ (R. G. A., iii. 117). In ِنَماَرَة among many mosques, there was one ِبَنْتُ (R. G. A. vii. 258, 259), which was later replaced by another ِبَنْتُ (p. 360 sq.); al-Mutawakkil also built one outside the original town (ibid., p. 265; see also P. Schwarz, Die 'Ahl-ʿɪn-Kisā in Sīrāj, 1909, p. 32). In Bālid d, Yāʾkīn (278 = 891) mentions only one ِبَنْتُ for the eastern town and one for the western R. G. A., vii. 240, 245, 251, 253, the almost contemporary Ibn Rosta just mentions the old western town and its ِبَنْتُ, ibid., p. 109) although he gives the fantastic figures of 15,000 mosques in the east town (ibid., p. 254) and 30,000 in the west (or in the whole town; ibid., p. 256). After 280 there was added the ِبَنْتُ of the eastern palace of the caliph (Mez., Renaissance, p. 388 quoting al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, ِطَرِيقَ بَغْدَادِ; a private ِبَنْتُ of Hārīn al-Rashīd in the ِبَنْتُ عَامُ مَسْجِد is mentioned by Ibn al-Kīfī, ِطَرِيقَ al-ʿIṣlam, ed. Lippert, p. 433 infra). These ِفَلَوَامِنْ are mentioned about 340 (951) by Iṣṭakhrī (R. G. A., i. 84), who also mentions one in the suburb of Kābāl wādī. Ibn Hawkāl in 367 (977) mentions the latter and also the ِبَنْتُ al-Bārāthī (R. G. A., i. 164 sq., of 329; Mez., loc. cit.), a fifth was added in 379, a sixth in 383 (Mez., p. 389); thus al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī in 460 (1058) gives 4 for West Bagdad, 2 for the east town (cf. Le Strange, Bagdad, p. 324). Ibn Djabār in 581 (1185) gives in the east town 3 ِفَلَوَامِنْ (Rīhā, p. 228 sq.) for the whole of Bagdad. For Cairo, Iṣṭakhrī gives two ِبَنْتُ: the ِأَمَر and ِتَلْوِيَان mosques (R. G. A., i. 49) besides that in al-Kārāfa, which was regarded as a separate town (cf. Ibn Rosta, c. 290 = 903; R. G. A., vii. 116 sq.). Al-Maqrīzī, who writes 586 = 985 shortly after the Fātimid conquest, mentions the ِأَمَر and ِتَلْوِيَان mosques, the new mosque in al-Kārīrah (al-Azhar), also one in al-Djizra, in Dīṣa and in al-Kārāfa (R. G. A., iii. 198—200, 209; the ِبَنْتُ in al-Djizra, also ِبَنْتُ Miṣrūn (cf. al-Maqrīzī, iv. 75), is mentioned in an inscription of the year 485; see van Berchem, Corpus i., n. 39). As these places were all originally separate towns, the principle was not abandoned that each town had only one ِبَنْتُ. The Fātimids however extended the use of Friday mosques and, in addition to those already mentioned, used the ِبَنْتُ al-Ḥākim, al-Maṣrūn and ِكَبَّر al-Maqrīzī, iv. 2 sq.). Naṣirī al-Khuṣraw (p. 439 (1047) mentions in one passage the ِفَلَوَامِنْ of Cairo, in another seven for Miṣr and fifteen in all (ed. Schefer, p. 134 sq., 147). This was altered in 569 by ِال-'Aṣār (see above) but the quartier, being still regarded as separate towns, retained their own Friday mosques (cf. for the year 607 in al-Kārīrah: Naṣirī al-Khuṣraw, p. 86).

After the Friday service in Egypt and Syria was freed from restriction, the number of ِفَلَوَامِنْ increased very much. Ibn Dukmāk (about 800) gives a list of only eight ِفَلَوَامِنْ in Cairo (ed. Völlers, p. 59—78), but this list is apparently only a fragment (in all he mentions something over twenty in the part of his book that has survived); al-Maqrīzī (d. 845 = 1442) gives 13 ِفَلَوَامِنْ (iv. 2 sq.). In ِDamascus, where Ibn Djabār still spoke of the ِبَنْتُ, al-Naʿīmī (d. 927 = 1521) gives twenty ِفَلَوَامِنْ (T. A., ser. 9, vii. 213 sq.) and, according to Ibn Bāṭīṭa, there were in all the villages in the region of Damascus ِبَنْتُ (i. 236). The word ِبَنْتُ in Maqrīzī always means a mosque in which the Friday service was held (p. 76, 115 sqq.) but by his time this meant any mosque of some size. He himself criticizes the fact that since 794 the ِال-'اَبَعَسَد al-ʿAṣār was performed in al-Akmar, although another ِبَنْتُ stood close beside it (iv. 76; cf. also 86).

The great spread of Friday mosques was reflected in the language. While inscriptions of the viiith century still call quite large mosques ِبَنْت, in
the ninth most of them are called ġāmi⁵ (cf. on the whole question, van Berchem, Corpus, i. 173 sq.); and while now the madrasa begins to predominate and is occasionally also called ġāmi⁵ (see below, F. 4), the use of the word masjid becomes limited. While, generally speaking, it can mean any mosque (e.g. Maģāri, iv. 137, of the Mu‘ayyad mosque), it is more especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques. While Ibn Dūbagai gives 472 masjid in addition to the ġawām‘i, madarīs, etc., al-Maţārizi only gives nineteen, not counting al-Karāfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. ġāmi⁵ is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size as is now the usage, in Egypt at least. In Ibn al-Hādji (d. 737) al-Ċawām‘i is occasionally used in this general meaning in place of al-masājid (Madkhal, ii. 50). Among the many Friday mosques one was usually distinguished as the chief mosque; we therefore find the expression al-Ċawām‘i al-ţir‘am (Ibn Bāṭrīq, ii. 54, 94; cf. the older al-masājid al-ţir‘am, ibid., p. 53). The principal ġāmi⁵ decided in such questions as the beginning and ending of the Fast of Ramaḍān (Madkhal, ii. 68).

3. Other religious activities in the Mosque.

"The mentioning of the name of God" in the mosques, was not confined only to the official ritual ceremonies. Even in the time of the Prophet, we are told that he lodged Thākīfī delegates in the mosque so that they could see the rows of worshippers and hear the nightly recitation (Wāṣālī-Welhausen, p. 382). Although this activity (which is not given in Ibn Hādji, p. 96) may simply be a reflection of later conditions, the recitation of the Kur‘ān must have come to be considered an edifying and pious work at quite an early date. In the time of al-Maţārizi the ġurra‘ of Nisābūr used to assemble on Fridays in the ġāmi⁵ in the early morning and recite till the ġūfah (B.G.A., iii. 328), and the same author tells us that in the Mosque of ‘Amr in Egypt the ā‘immat al-ġurra‘ sat in circles every evening and recited (ibid., p. 205). In the time of Ibn Dūbagai, there were recitations of the Kur‘ān in the Umayyad mosque after the Şalāt al-ţabih and every afternoon after the Şalāt al-ţā’ir (Rīhā, p. 271 sq.). Besides the recitation of the Kur‘ān there were praises of God etc., all that is classed as ġhibr, and which was particularly cultivated by Şūfīsm. This form of worship also took place in the mosque. The Akh al-Tawḥīd wa l-‘A‘ma‘īfa formed niyājdīs al-ţāhkr, who assembled in the mosques (al-Makkī, Kūt al-Kūlih, i. 152). In the Mosque of the Umayyads and other mosques of Damascus, al-ţāhkr held the day before Friday (Maţārizi, iv. 49). In the Masjid al-ţāhkr the ġanāfis held al-ţāhkr, and recited at the same time from a book (B.G.A., ii. 182). In Egypt, Ahmad b. ‘Ullān and Khamārāwālah allowed twelve men to form a chamber near the minaret to praise God, and during the night four of them took turns to praise God with recitations of the Kur‘ān and with pious ġasādām. From the time of Šalāb al-Dīn an orthodox ġasādām was recited by the mu‘ājdīs in the night (ibid., iv. 48). Ibn al-Hādji demands that the recitation of the Kur‘ān aloud should take place in a mosque for the special purpose (masjid ma‘ājdī) as otherwise pious visitors are disturbed (Madkhal, ii. 53, 67). Mosques and particularly mausoleums had as a rule regularly appointed reciters of the Kur‘ān. In addition there was, e.g. in Hebron and in a mosque in Damascus, a šāhik who had to read Būkhi‘ (or also Muslim) for three months (Sauvain, Hist. Jum. Hul., p. 17; J.A., ser. 6, iii. 261). In Tunis, al-Būkhāri was read daily in a hospital (Zarkashi, transl. Fagyan, Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantin, 1894, p. 188).

Sermons were not only delivered at the Şalāt al-ţam‘a‘. In the Īrāk, even in al-Maţārizi’s time, one was preached every morning, according to the tımn of Ibn ‘Abbās (B.G.A., iii. 130), it was said. Ibn Dūbagai, in the Niţāmīya in Bagh- ādī, heard the Şāhi‘ ra‘is ‘preach on Friday after the ‘a‘ir on the minbar. His sermon was accompanied by the skilled recitation of the Kur‘ān which sat on chairs; they were over twenty in number (Ibn Dūbagai, p. 219, 222). In the same way, the calls of the mu‘ājdīs to prayer to the Friday khatba were delivered to a musical accompaniment (see below, H. 4). The unofficial sermons, which moreover were not delivered in mosques alone, were usually delivered by a special class, the kūṣā (plur. of kūṣ), on these cf. Goldscheber, Muh. Stud., ii. 161 sqq.; Mek, Die Renaissance des Islams, p. 314 sqq.; and the article kūṣa). The kūṣās, who delivered edifying addresses and told popular stories, were early admitted to the mosques.

Tamīn al-Di‘rī is said to have been the first of these; in Medina in the caliphate of ‘Umar before the latter’s decease, he used to deliver ‘in the minbar at the Fridaysalat and was not allowed to talk twice a week in the mosque; in the reign of ‘Alī and of Mu‘āwiyah the kūṣās were employed to curse the other side (Maţārizi, iv. 16 sqq.). In the Mosque of ‘Amr in Cairo by the year 38 or 39, a kūṣ was appointed, named Sulāmn b. İtr al-Du‘ābi‘, who was also kāji (ibid., iv. 17 wrongly: Sulāman; Kindi, Governors and Judges, ed.Guest, p. 303 sqq.). There are occurrences of the combination of the offices (Ibn Hādji, d. 83), Kindi, p. 317; Khair b. Na‘ām in the year 120, ibid., p. 348; cf. Hān al-Maţārī‘a, i. 131, Dīr, according to Thawba b. Nimr, Hān, i. 130 infra; Ibrahim b. İbāsh al-Kārī (d. 204), Kindi, p. 427; see also Makṣīrī (d. 18), which shows that the office of kāji was quite an official one. There is also evidence of the employment of kūṣās in the mosque of the ‘Irák in the ‘Abbasid period (Yākūt, Cs‘ahī‘, iv. 268; v. 446). The kūṣ, read from the Kur‘ān standing and then delivered an explanatory and edifying discourse, the object of which was to instill the fear of God into the people (Maţārizi, iv. 18).

Under the Fātimids also, kūṣās were appointed to the mosques; for example, in 403 the umm undertook the office in the Mosque of ‘Amr (Maţārizi, iv. 18 infra) and the rulers had also a kūṣ in the palace. The kūṣās were called asḥāb al-ţāhkr, because they delivered their discourses on the kur‘ān (al-Makkī, Kūt al-Kūlih, i. 152; Ibn al-Hādji, Madkhal, i. 159; cf. Makṣīrī, i. 121). Their discourse was called ġāhbr or wūz‘ or me‘āṣa‘, whence the kūṣ was also called mu‘ājdīkīr (B.G.A., iii. 205) or wūz‘ī. Specimens of their discourses are given by Ibn ‘Abd Rabbībi (al-Fīrās al-farq, Cairo 1321, i., p. 294 sqq.). It was not only the appointed officials who delivered such discourses in the mosque. Ascetics made
public appearances in various mosques and collected interested hearers around them (cf. e.g. Makrizi, iv. 135). In the Džamija al-Karšâ, a whole society, the Imam Ijawhari, delivered wâqî discourses on a kurd for three months on end; their servant collected money in a begging-bowl during the discourse and the šâkî distributed some of it among the poor (ibid., i. 121).

The šarî'ah was completely taken over by popular ši'ism and later writers would hardly reckon, as al-Makki does, the “story-tellers” among the mu'takallimin (Kâtât al-Kuliûb, i. 152). The whole system degenerated to trickery and charlatanism of all kinds, as may be seen in the Makâma literature (cf. thereon Yâ'qûb, edchi, vi. 167 sq., and see also Hider and Goldhâr, op. cit.). Al-Makrizi therefore distinguishes between al-šarî'ah al-šajâ'ah, the regular and seemingly edifying discourse in the mosque, and al-šarî'ah al-dînâmi, which consisted in the people gathering round all kinds of speakers, which is šekebî (Makrizi, i. 17). Others also have recorded their objections to the šarî'ah. Ibn al-Hadjîj utter a warning against them and wants to forbid their activities in the mosque completely, because they deliver “weak” narratives (Mudâkhil, i. 138 sq.; ii. 113 sq., 50). He says Ibn Umar, Makki and Abu Dâwûd rejected them and “Ali ejected them from the madjûl of Başân. It is of little significance that al-Mu'taqlîj in 284 forbade them to sit in the mosques and forbade people to gather round them, for he issued a similar interdict against the fâhîsh and the reasons were evidently political (Tabari, iii. 2165); it was for political reasons also, but with a very different motive, that 'Abd al-Dawla forbade their appearing publicly in Baghdad shortly before 400, because they increased the tension between Sunnis and Shi'is (Maz. op. cit. p. 319). As late as 580 the ʻu'wâ' still flourished in the mosques of Baghdad, as is evident from the Kifâ of Ibn Djaibar (p. 219 sqq.; 224), and in the ninth century there was in the A'har mosque a madâjîya al-wâ'â as well as a hâlî al-dâlî (Makrizi, iv. 54).

When Ibn al-Hadjîj denounces speaking aloud in the mosque, it is in the interest of the pious visitor who are engaged in religious works and meditation. Fâlîn [q. v.], retirement to a mosque for a period, was adopted into Islam from the other religions.

The word šarî' means in the Kûran the ceremonial worship of the object of the cult (Sûra vii. 134; xv. 91, 97; xxi. 53; xxxi. 71; cf. H. St. J. Toynbee, ed Horovitz, p. 86, 15) and also the ritual stay in the sanctuary, which was done for example in the Meccan temple (Sûra ii. 119; xxi. 25). In this connection it is laid down in the Kûran that in the month of Ramadân believers must not touch their wives “while ye pass the time in the mosques” (âkîf in l'marâj, Sûra x. 153), an expression which shows, firstly, that there were already a number of mosques in the lifetime of the Prophet and secondly that these had already to some extent taken over the character of the temple. The connection with the early period is evident from a ḥadîth, according to which the Prophet decides that ‘Umar must carry out a vow of ṣīmaf for one night in the Mâjdîd al-Harîm made in the Džahlîya (Bukhari, ṣīmaf, báb 5, 15 sq.; Fard al-Khamsa, báb 19; Makrizi, báb 54; Alman 54; A'bardhî, báb 29). It completely agrees in keeping with this that the Prophet, according to the ḥadîth, used to spend ten days of the month of Ramadân in ṣīmaf in the mosque of Medina (Bukhari, ṣīmaf, báb 1; Fard lâlîl al-Kâdâr, báb 3), and in the year in which he died as many as twenty days (ibid., ṣīmaf, báb 17). During this period the mosque was full of booths of palm branches and leaves in which the fâkîn lived (ibid., báb 13; cf. 6, 7). The Prophet only went to his house for some very special reason (ibid., báb 3). This custom was associated with the asceticism of the monks. The faithful were vexed, when on one occasion he received Ṣafîya in his booth and chatted for an hour with her (Bukhari, Fârîd al-Khamsa, báb 4; ṣīmaf, báb 8, 11, 12). According to another tradition, his ṣīmaf was broken on another occasion by his wives putting up their tents beside him and he postponed his ṣīmaf till Shawwâl (Bukhari, ṣīmaf, báb 6, 7, 14, 18). According to Zaid b. ‘Ali, the ṣīmaf can only be observed in a chief mosque (dżamû). Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ‘Ali, n. 1047). During the early period, it was one of the initiatory rites for new converts. In the year 14, ‘Umar ordered the retreat (al-ṣiyâm) in the mosques during the month of Ramadân for the people of Medina and the provinces (Tabari, i. 2377). The custom persisted and has always been an important one among ascetics. “The man who retires for a time to the mosque devotes himself in turn to salaât, recitation of the Kûran, meditation, ḥikîr etc.” says Ibn al-Hadjîj (Mudâkhil, ii. 50). There were pious people, who spent their whole time in a mosque (aḥmâma fîhi; Makrizi, i. 87, 97); of one were told that he spent his time in the madjûl of the Masjûd (Ṭustâfa, ibid., p. 44). Al-Samâhî says that during the month of Ramadân, he spent day and night in the mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 95). Sa’d al-Din (d. 644) spent the month of Ramadân in the Mosque of the Umaiyyads without speaking (Ibn Abî ʻUshâfîbî, ii. 192). Nocturnal vigils in the mosque very early became an established practice in Islam. According to Hadîth, the Prophet frequently held nocturnal salaats in the mosque with the believers (Bukhari, ḥijâmâ, báb 29) and by his orders ʻAbd Allâh b. Ūnaï al-Ansârî came from the desert for twenty-three successive nights to pass the night in his mosque in rites of worship (Ibn Kutaiba, Maśrîf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 142 sq.). Out of this developed the taḥâdîjâdn [q. v.], salaat, particularly recommended in the law and notably the tarâviqâ salaat [q. v.]. In Dihlî on these occasions women singers actually took part (Ibn Bâṭîqâ, iii. 155).

During the nights of the month of Ramadân there were festivals in the mosques and on other occasions also, such as the New Year, sometimes at the new moon, and in the middle of the month. The mosque on these occasions was illuminated; there was eating and drinking; incense was burned and ḥikîr and kirâa performed.

The Friday salaat was particularly solemn in Ramadân, and in the Fârîdî period, the caliph himself delivered the khitâba (see Makrizi, ii. 345 sqq.; Ibn Taghribîrî, ii/ii., ed. Juybû, p. 452–456 and ii/i., ed. Popper, p. 331–333). The mosques associated with a saint had and still have their special festivals on his mawlid [q. v.]; they also are celebrated with ḥikîr, kirâa etc. (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs, ch. xxiv. sqq.). The saint’s festivals are usually local and there
are generally differences in the local customs. In the Maghribi for example in certain places the month of Ramadan is opened with a blast of trumpets from the manâbî (Madkhâl, ii. 69).

The mosque thus on the whole took over the role of the temple. The rulers from 'Umar onwards dedicated gifts to the Ka'ba (B. G. A., v. 20 sq. and GI., sv. Starâ), and as in other sanctuaries we find women vowing children to the service of the mosque (Bukhârî, Salât, bâb 74; Makrîzî, iv. 20). jâwâf was performed, as at the Ka'ba, in mosques with saints' tombs as is still done, e.g. in Hebron; Madjîr al-Din sees a pre-Islamic custom in this ('Savaire, Hist. jérâr. et Hébr.), p. 5). Especially important business was done here. In times of trouble the people go to the mosque to pray for help, for example during drought, for which there is a special Salât (which however usually takes place on the qunâlîa), in misfortunes of all kinds (e.g. Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 19–20; Makrîzî, iv. 57); in time of plague and pestilence, processions, weeping and praying with Kur'ân uplifted, were held in the mosques or on the qunâlîa, in which even Jews and Christians sometimes took part (Ibn Taghibirdî, ii/I., ed. Popper, p. 67; Ibn Ba'tîta, i. 243 sq.; Ch. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii/I., 35; ii/I., 199) or for a period a sacred book like Bukhârî's Saheb was recited (Quatremère, op. cit., ii/I., 35; al-Dâhâbî, Miroullis Biographiques, French transl., vi. 13). In the courtyards of the mosques in Jerusalem and Damascus in the time of Ibn Ba'tîta solemn penance was done on the day of 'Afâra (i. 243 sq.), an ancient custom which had already been introduced into Egypt in the year 277 by 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Marwân (Afâra after the Ayr); cf. Kindi, Wulât, p. 50). Certain mosques were visited by barren women (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 133). An oath is particularly binding if it is taken in a mosque (cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p. 144); this is particularly true of the Ka'ba, where written covenants were also drawn up to make them more binding (ibid., p. 143 sq.; Chron. Mekka, i. 160 sq.). It is in keeping with this idea of an oath that Jews who had adopted Islam in Cairo had to take oaths in a synagogue which had become a mosque (Makrîzî, iv. 266). The contracting of marriage (jâd al-'nîzâh) also is often concluded in a mosque (Santillana, II. Muâsârî, ii. 548; Madkhâl, ii. 72 infra; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 163 sq.), and the particular form of divorce which is completed by the Lâb[q.v.] takes place in the mosque (Bukhârî, Salât, bâb 44; cf. Joh. Pedersen, Der Eid etc., p. 114).

It is disputed whether a corpse may be brought into the mosque and the Salât al-qâmilî performed there. According to one hadîth, the bier of 'Sâ'd b. Abî Waqâs was taken into the mosque at the request of the Prophet's widow and the Salât held there. Many disapproved of this, but A'sîsha pointed out that the Prophet had done this with the body of Suhail b. Bâdî' (Muslihî, Pynain, tr. 1. 1/1. 504). The discussion on this point is not connected with the discussions regarding the worship of tombs. In theory this is permitted by al-Shâhî, while the others forbid it (see Juynboll, Handbuch, p. 170; I. Guidi, II. Muâsârî, i. 151). The matter does not seem to be quite clear, for Abû al-Din says that only Abî Hanîfa forbids it, but he himself thought that it might be allowable on the authority of a statement by Abû Yusuf (Chron. Mekka, iii. 208–210). In any case, it was a very general practice to allow it, as Abî al-Din also points out. 'Umar conducted the funeral Salât for Abû Bakr in the Mosque of the Prophet and 'Umar's own dead body was brought there; later it became a general custom to perform the ceremony in Medina close to the Prophet's tomb and in Mecca at the door of the Ka'ba; some even made a sevenfold jâwâf with the corpse around the Ka'ba. This was for a time forbidden by Marwân b. Abî al-Hakam and later by 'Umar b. 'Abî al-'Azîz (Abû al-Din, loc. cit.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 77). The custom was very early introduced into the Mosque of 'Amr (Makrîzî, iv. 7, 1 sqq.). That later scholars often went wrong about the prohibition is not at all remarkable; for it is not at all in keeping with the ever increasing tendency to found mosques and tombs. Even Ibn al-Hashî, who was anxious to maintain the prohibition, is not quite sure and really only forbids the loud calling of the fu'ûrî, dhâkirûn, mukâkhirûn and maridûn on such occasions (Madkhâl, ii. 50 sq., 64, 81). When a son of Sulîn al-Mu'ayyad died and was buried in the eastern qubbah of the Mu'ayyad mosque, the khatib delivered a khatûba and conducted the Salât thereafter and the fu'ûrî recited for a week at the grave, while the amirs paid their visits to the grave (Makrîzî, iv. 246, 2 sqq.). In Persia, it was the custom for the family of the deceased to sit in the mosque for three days after the death and receive visits of condolence (B. G. A., iii. 440 infra).

4. Mosques as Objects of Pilgrimage.

As soon as the mosque became a regular sanctuary it became the object of pious visits. This holds especially of the memorial mosques associated with the Prophet and other saints. Among them three soon became special objects of pilgrimage. In a hadîth the Prophet says "One should only mount into the saddle to visit three mosques: al-Masjid al-Hârâm, the Mosque of the Prophet and al-Masjid al-Aqâ'a" (Bukhârî, Fadî al-Salât â Masjid al-Mekka wa l-Madinah, bâb 16; Tâfarî al-Clinton, bâb 26; Sarrûm, bâb 67; Muslim, Hadîd, tr. 93; Chron. Mekka, i. 303). This hadîth reflects a practice which only became established at the end of the Umayyad period. The pilgrimage to Mecca had been made a duty by the prescription of the Hadîdj in the Kur'ân. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a Christian custom which could very easily be continued, on account of the significance of al-Masjid al-Akâ'a in the Kur'ân. This custom became particularly important when 'Abd al-Malik made it a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca (Yâkîbî, ed. Houtsma, ii. 311). Although this competition did not last long, the significance of Jerusalem was thereby greatly increased. Pilgrimage to Medina developed out of increasing generation for the Prophet. In the year 410 Abî Dâ'fân, Ma'nî, on his hadîdj visited the three sanctuaries (Tabari, i. 129) and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina however still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognised as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, Masâ'dî, tr. 1: Chron. Mekka, i. 301), the Prophet however is reputed to have said "A Salât in this
mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 šālāts in others, even the Al-Masjid al-Harām (Bukhārī, Bāqi al-Ṣaḥābī fi Masjid Makka wa 'l-Masīna, Bāb 1; Muslim, Ḥadīṣ, tr. 89; Chron. Mecka, i, 303). The ḍādhir is aimed directly against Jerusalem and therefore probably dates from the Umayyad period. According to some, it was pronounced because someone had committed performing the ḍādhir against Jerusalem, which the Prophet was against (Muslim, loc. cit.; Wāḥidī-Wellhausen, p. 349). The three mosques however retained their pride of place (Ibn Khūlān, Kitāb al-Madā'ī, fasc. 4, 6; Ibn al-Hadīdī, Madā'ī, ibid., p. 55), and as late as 662 (1264) we find Balbars founding ʿawāfī for pilgrims who wished to go on foot to Jerusalem (Quintemère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i, 1, 248).

Although these three mosques officially hold a special position, others also are highly recommended, e.g. the mosque in Kāfā (see Al-Madhīa). A šālāt in this mosque is said to be as valuable as an ʿawāfī or two visits to the mosque in Jerusalem (Ibn Khūlān, Kitāb al-Madā'ī, p. 381 sq). Attempts were also made to raise the mosque of Kāfā to the level of the three. ‘Abī is said to have told someone who wanted to make a pilgrimage from Kāfā to Jerusalem that he should stick by the mosque of his native town, it was "one of the four mosques" and two ʿawāfī's in it were equal to ten in others (B. G. A., i, 173 sq; Yākūt, Muṣūm, iv, 525); in another tradition, šālāts in the provincial mosques are said to be generally worth as much as the pilgrimage (Maṭrīz, i, 4), and traditions arose about the special blessings associated at definite times with different holy places of Islam (B. G. A., iii 183) and especially about their superior merits (B. G. A., i, 174). The Meccan sanctuary, however, always retained first place, which was marked by the Ḥadījī. It was imitated by al-Mutawakkil in Sūmarīya, he built a Ka'bah as well as a Mihrāb and an ʿArafār there and made ʿAbī anṭūr perform his ḍādhir there (B. G. A., iii, 122).

D. Equipment of the Mosque.

1. The Development of the Edifice.

Except in the case of Mecca the earliest mosques as described above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a ʿawāfī. The space was sometimes as in al-Ṭā'if, planted with trees and usually covered with pebbles, e.g. in Medina (Muṣūm, Ḥadīṣ, tr. 95; Baladāhuri, p. 6) and al-Ṭā'if (Maṭrīz, iv, 8; Ibn Ḥukmāk, iv, 62; Ibn Ṭaghrībirdī, i, 77) which was later introduced in Bāṣrā and Kūfa the courtyards of which were otherwise dusty (Baladāhuri, p. 277, 348). These conditions could last only so long as the Arabs retained their ancient customs as a closed corporation in their simple camps. The utilisation of churchyards was the first sign of a change and was rapidly followed by a mingling with the rest of the population and the resulting assimilation with older cultures.

ʿUmar made alterations in the mosques in Medina and in Mecca also. He extended the mosque of the Prophet by taking in the house of ʿAbbās, but like the Ḥerām, he still built of ṣawāwī, palm-trunks and leaves and extended the booths (Bukhārī, Ṣawāwī, fasc. 62; Baladāhuri, p. 6). In Mecca also his work was confined to extending the area occupied by the mosque. He brought the surrounding houses and took them down and then surrounded the area with a wall to the height of a man; the ʿArab was thus given its firāz like the mosque in Medina (Baladāhuri, p. 46; Chron. Mecka, i, 306 sq.; Wustenfeld, Medina, i, 68 sq). ʿOthmān also extended these two mosques but introduced an important innovation in using hewn stone and plaster (ṭībī) for the walls and pillars. For the roof he used tekī (ṭībī). The books, which had been extended by ʿOmar, were replaced by him by pillared halls (arwaṭī, sing. riwaṭī) and the walls were covered with plaster (Bukhārī, Ṣalāt, Bāb 62; Baladāhuri, p. 46; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 70 sq). Saʿd's abī Ṣajāḥ is said to have already taken similar steps to relieve the old simplicity of the barely equipped mosque in ʿArab. The ʿawāfī consisted of pillars of marble adorned in the style of Byzantine churches (Tabari, i, 2498; Yākūt, iv, 324).

This was little in keeping with the simple architecture of the original tents for Bāṣrā and Kūfa had originally been built of reeds and only after several great fires were they built of ṣawāwī (see above Bāb 1; cf. Ibn Khutbā, Muṣūm, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 279). As to Kūfa, Saʿd by 'Omar's orders extended the mosque so that it became joined up with the Dār al-Ināra. A Persian named Ṭuṣbēb b. Buzqurjmiśr was not only against the Khība. The original plan of the mosque was therefore still retained although the pillared hall, which is identical with the ʿawāfī already mentioned (200 ʿawāfī broad), replaced the simple booth and the materials were better in every way (Tabari, i, 2491 sq.; 2494). Already under the early Caliphs we can therefore note the beginnings of the adoption of a more advanced architecture.

These tendencies were very much developed under the Umayyads. Even as early as the reign of Muʿawiyah, the mosque of Kūfa was rebuilt by his governor Ziyād. He commissioned a pagan architect, who had worked for Khīsā, to do the work. The latter had pillars brought from al-Ahwāz, bound them together with lead and iron clamps to a height of 30 ʿawāfī and put a roof on them. Similar halls, built of columns (here like the old booth in Medina called ʿawāfī: Tabari, i, 2492, 14; but also ʿawāfī, plur. ʿawāfī: Tabari, ii, 259 sq.) were added by him on the north, east and western wall. Each pillar cost him 180 dirhams. The mosque could now hold 60,000 instead of 40,000 (Ṭabarī, i, 2492, 6 sqq., cf. 2494, 71; Yākūt, Muṣūm, iv, 374, 376; Baladāhuri, p. 276). Al-Hajjāj also added to the mosque (Yākūt, iv, 325 sq). Ziyād did similar work in Bāṣrā. Here also he extended the mosque and built it of stone (or brick) and plaster and with pillars from al-Ahwāz, which were faced with teak. We are told that he made al-ṣafta al-muṣākadda, i.e. the khība hall, with 5 columns. This seems to show that the other sides also— as in Kūfa—had pillared halls. He erected the Dār al-Ināra close to the khība side. This was taken down by al-Hajjāj, rebuilt by others, and finally taken into the mosque by Ḥārūn al-Kaṣhāb (Baladāhuri, p. 347, 348 supra, 349; Yākūt, i, 642, 643). In Mecca also in the same period
similar buildings were erected. Ibn al-Zubair and al-Hājiqādī both extended the mosque, and Ibn al-Zubair was the first to put a roof on the walls; the columns were gilt by ʾAbd al-Malik and he made a roof of takaft (Chowan. Mekkā, i. 307, 309). The Mosque of ʾAmr was extended in 53 with Muʾāwiyā's permission by his governor Maslama b. Mukhballāt to the east and north; the walls were covered with plaster (mūrā) and the roofs decorated; it is evident from this that here also the original booth of the south side was altered to a covered hall during the early Umayyad period. A further extension was made in 79 in the reign of ʾAbd al-Malik (Maqrizi, iv. 7, 8; Ibn Duʾlāmah, iv. 62). Thus we find that during the early Umayyad period and in part earlier the original simple and primitive mosques were some extended, some altered. The alteration consisted in the old simple booth of the Mosque of the Prophet being gradually enlarged and transformed into a pillared hall with the assistance of the arts of countries possessing a higher degree of civilisation. In this way what had originally been an open place of assembly developed imperceptibly into a court, surrounded by pillared halls. Very soon a fountain was put in the centre of the court and we now have the usual type of mosque. The same plan is found in the peristyle of the houses and in the atrium of a basilica like that of Tyre (Herschel-Haufl, Realencyclopaedie, x. 780).

The great builders of the Omayyads, ʾAbd al-Malik and his son al-Walid I, made even more radical progress. The former entirely removed the old mosque in Jerusalem, according to Byzantine architects erected the Dome of the Rock as a Byzantine building (cf. Sauvain, ʾIrūr, et ibn Hārūn, p. 48 sqq.). Al-Walid likewise paid equal attention to the most ancient form of mosque, when, in Damascus, he had the church of St. John transformed by Byzantine architects into the Mosque of the Omayyads. As al-Maʾādī distinctively states, they wanted to rival the splendid churches of the Christian churches (B. G. A., iii. 159). The new mosques, which were founded in this period, were therefore not only no longer simple, but they were built with the help of Christians and other trained craftsmen with the use of material already existing in older buildings. Al-Hājiqādī, for example, used materials from the surrounding towns when building his foundation of Wāsif (Tabaki, iii. 321; Balādhuri, p. 290). Columns from churches were now used quite regularly (e. g. in Damascus: Masʿūdi, Murādī, iii. 408; Ramla: B. G. A., iii. 165; cf. Balādhuri, p. 143 sqq.; for Egypt see Maqrizi, iv. 36, 124 sqq.). Sometimes remains of the older style remained alongside of the new. In Ṣanāʾah, al-Maʾādī found in the chief mosque wooden columns of the time of Abū Muslim along with round columns of brick of the time of ʾAmr b. al-Lath (B. G. A., iii. 316). The building activities of al-Walid extended to al-Fuṣāl, Mecca and Medina (cf. B. G. A., v. 106 sqq.) where no fundamental alterations were made, but complete renovations were carried out. With these rules, the building of mosques reached the level of the older architecture and gained a place in the history of art. There is also literary evidence for the transfer of a style from one region to another. In Ṣanāʾah, for example, there was a djāmi in the style of the Syrian mosques with round columns, on which was a kabara (B. G. A., iii. 436 sqq.; cf. Shīrāz, p. 430). Al-Walid also rebuilt the Mosque of the Prophet, in part, in the Damascus style (B. G. A., iii. 88; Ḥaẓwini, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 71).

This revolution naturally did not take place without opposition any more than the other innovations, which Islam adopted in the countries with a higher culture which it conquered. After the Mosque of the Prophet had been beautified by Christian architects with marble, mosaics, shells, gold etc. and al-Walid in 93 was inspecting the work, an old man said: "We used to build in the style of Mosques; you build in the style of Churches" (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 74). The discussions on this point are reflected in Ḥāḍīth. When ʾUmar enlarged the Mosque of the Prophet, he is reported to have said: "Give the people shelter from the rain, but take care to make them red or yellow lest you lead the people astray", while Ibn ʾAbbās said: "You shall adorn them with gold as the Jews and Christians do" (Dhahār, Šalīh, bāb 62). Ibn Ṭabrān here takes up the Omayyad attitude and ʾUmar that of old-fashioned people, according to whom any extension or improvement of the zulla was only permissible for strictly practical reasons. The conservative point of view is predominant in Ḥāḍīth. It is said that extravagant adornment of the mosques is a sign of the end of the world; the works of al-Walid were only tolerated from fear of the ḥīna (Ibn Ḥanbal, Minhāj, iii. 134, 145, 152, 230, 283; al-Nasawī, Masjid, bāb 2; Ibn Madja, Minhājī, bāb 2). The lack of confidence of pious conservatives in the great mosques finds expression in a Ḥāḍīth, according to which the Prophet (according to Anas) said: "A time will come over my umma when they will vie with one another in the beauty of their mosques; then they will visit them but little" (al-ʾAshqālānī, Fath al-Bārī, i. 562). In the Fikr, we even find divergence from the oldest quadrangular form of the mosque condemned (Guide, ʾIl-Muhājir, i. 71). Among the types which arose later was the "suspended" (mawlaṭak) i. e. a mosque situated in an upper storey (e. g. in Damascus, ʾIl A., ser. ix., vol. v. 409, 415, 422, 424, 427, 430).

2. Details of the Equipment of the Mosque.

a. The Minaret (see also MANARA).

The earliest primitive mosques had no minaret. When the adhān call was introduced, Bilāl is said to have summoned the faithful in Medina to the early ʾāshūr from the roof of the highest house in the vicinity of the mosque (Ibn Hisāb, p. 348; Wüstenfeld, p. 75); on the day of the conquest of Mecca, the Prophet instructed Bilāl to utter the call to prayer from the Kaʿba, according to al-Azraqī, from the roof (Chron. Mekkā, i. 192: cf. Ibn Hisāb, p. 822). During the early days of Islam, the muʾaddhin did not however utter his summons from an elevated position (cf. below G 2 d). It is doubtful in the first place when the minaret was introduced, and in the second whether it was adopted into Islam, expressly for the call to prayer.

The Omayyad caliph al-Walid (86–96) undoubtedly had considerable influence for the history of the minaret, although even earlier in 84 (703) Sīdī ʿUkba in Kairawān had been built by Ḥassān b. Nuʾmān with a minaret (so according to Bakri: H. Salādim, La Mosquée de Sidi Oktba, 1899, p. 7, 19). There was also a minaret in the
Omayyad mosque in Damascus. At the present day, the mosque has 3 minarets as was the case in the time of Ibn Dhibair, who mentions two on the west and one in the north (Rīḥā, p. 266), while Ibn Mākki also says there were three, and adds that one was in the west, another in the east and another in the north (i. 203), which agrees with present day conditions. One of the earliest authorities, Ibn al-Ṭaligh (d. 289 = 902), however mentions only one minaret (miṣḥana) and says that in the days of the Greeks it had been a watch-tower (ṣāfūr), which belonged to the church of St. John and was left standing by al-Walid (B. G. A., v. 108, 5). Al-Makdisi (d. 375 = 955) mentions only one minaret, which was above the Bāb al-Farādisi: when he calls it a manāra unāqi láti'a (B. G. A., ii. 159) he may perhaps mean a renovated minaret (cf. U. Stranger, Palæstina under the Moslems, p. 229) and besides, his description does not exclude the existence of other minarets. The tradition that the minaret of the Omayyad mosque was taken over from the predecessors of the Muslims long survived: for Vāqūr, who mentions the east and west minarets, says that the western belonged to a fire-temple and a flame used to be visible on it (Miṣḥām, ii. 596) and according to Ibn Bagdādi, the east and west minarets were built by the Byzantines while only the north one was built by the Muslims (ib. 203 sq.; a story also given by al-Bozairi [d. 1003 = 1394] quoting Ibn Asākir [d. 571 = 1171], see J. A. var. vii. 423; Quatremère, Histoire des Musulmans, p. 273). In Mecca also, al-Walid built turrets (ṣāfūrāt; Cāsim, Mekkā, i. 510), sometimes minarets (a) is evident from ibid. (p. 310, 311). They were later increased so that Kubl al-Din mentions 7 minarets (ibid., i. 424-426). According to al-Samhūdi, he also built in Medina 4 towers, but Sulaimān b. 'Abd al-Malik, in the year 979 had the southwestern tower taken down, because the shadow of the muqarnān from it fell upon him, when he was in the house of Marwān b. al-Ḫakam. While al-Samhūdi says that there were no minarets in Medina before al-Walid, he asserts on the other hand that Omar had already built towers in the four corners of the mosque (Wustentfel, Medīna, p. 75; cf. Ibn Bagdādi, i. 272). In the time of Ibn Dhibair (d. 580) there were still only 3 minarets there (Rīḥā, p. 195). It was not until 706 that Muhammad b. Khalīfa rebuilt the fourth minaret (Wustentfel, op. cit., p. 76).

After the time of al-Walid, minarets became more and more numerous. In Ramla his brother al-Hašem built a beautiful minaret (B. G. A., i. 165, v. 1). For the mosque in Jerusalem Ibn 'Abd al-Kabīr relates about 400 mentions 4 minarets (Iṣf. Cairo 1331, iv. 274 sq.) which al-Malān al-Din claims to go back to the time of al-Malik (Sauvage, Histoire, iv. 288. iv. 289, 125). Ibn Hawqāl (367 = 977) expresses notes of the 'Adhamī in Fārāyāh in Khirbād that he did not have a minaret (B. G. A., i. 321) and he seems to consider it būta'a to build two minarets: (iv. 13, 14). Apart from the isolated reference by al-Samhūdi to 'Omar's building activities, to which very little importance can be attached, it is probable from this evidence that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret into Syria and the Hijāz. That he introduced it into Islam itself, however is not certain. According to al-Baladhurī (d. 279 = 892), Ziyād b. Bahāra, when he was governor in 45, built the minaret of stone, when he built the mosque of brick (p. 348). This seems to suggest that there was already a minaret there. According to the Egyptian historians, al-Maslama b. Muḥammad in al-Fuṣāṣ'ī's orders in 53 built a tower at each corner of the mosque to 'Amur (ṣawwānā'a), which had not been done before (Makrizī, iv. 7 sq., 44; Ibn Taghribirdī, i. 77). The staircase leading up to the minaret was originally outside the mosque, but was later put inside it. Maslama is said to have introduced the minaret into other mosques in al-Fuṣāṣ'ī (i.e. in all except those of Ṭūbāb and Khawlān; cf. Makrizī, iv. 44; Ibn Taghribirdī, loc. cit.). How old this story is, cannot be ascertained, but the view often put forward that al-Walid was the first to introduce the minaret (cf. Schwauly, in Z. D. M. G., ii., 1898, p. 143-146), is in any case not certain.

There are three names in common use for the minaret Miṣḥana or Miṣḥāna, "place of the adhan call", which is in general use in Egypt and Syria at the present day, is frequently found in literature and inscriptions (B. G. A., iii. 225, 15; v. 108, 5; Makrizī, iv. 13, 20, 4, 25, and pass.; Ibn Asākir, ii. 204, 2 from below; v. Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 25, 63, 88, 89 and others from the 8th century onwards). Sawwānā'a, especially used in North Africa (Mārqaṣ, Les Monuments arabes de Tlemcen, 1903, p. 45), is frequently found (Ibn Dhibair, Rīḥā, p. 91, 100, 145, 195, 266; Ibn Bagdādi, i. 203, 272; ii. 2, 12, 13; Makrizī, iv. 7 sq.; Ibn Taghribirdī, i. 77). This word means also cloister or cell and in the older literature is used as the equivalent of dāir (Sūr xxii. 41; Ibn Hāšim, p. 115; Bagdādi, al-Manā Initialization 35; Arragā'ī, bah. 48; B. G. A., ii. 154; Makrizī, iv. 389; Ibn al-Farraj, Tafsīr v. 561). Manāra is the most usual word in literature (Makrizī, iv. 7; manār; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 63; K. al-Maslama, ii. 63, 67). This word has the same meaning as Syr. maṣīna but is probably an analogous, independent formation. The word means light, position in which a light is put (Inmārāṭ, Dīwān, 148, 37; Abū Dha'aib, Dīwān, ed. Bell i. 60; B. G. A., iv. 132); also lighthouse (B. G. A., i., 177; Kindi, Wulūd, p. 64; Ibn Dhibair, Rīḥā, p. 41). Maṣīna (a) also means a boundary stone or a signpost (Ṣalām, Lisān, 99, from below; Kās al-Rukāyāt, p. 377; 70.; Ibn Surī, i. 135; Fraẓn. Hist. Arab., ii. 12 and 42) or a watch tower (Ṭabarī, i. 864; 878); the boundary stones of the barak area, for example, are called Manār al-Furān (B. G. A., ii. 25) and Abraha was called Dān 'īl Maṣīna, because he put up signposts (Ṣalām, vii. 105, 4; Dīwān Barhāsh, i. 410); obelisks are also called maṣīra (B. G. A., vii. 117, 30, 118, 8). The derivation of the last named maṣīra from milliārion (Franke, Frommata, p. 283) is likely little and still less probable is a derivation from a Persian building for fire-worship (v. Berchem in E. Diez, Der alemannisch Brandenmüler, i. 1908), 131 sqq. also distinguishes rather ingeniously between maṣīra "light", from nār and maṣīra "fire-tower" from nār). Probably there is only a single word in question and the signpo-sts received their name from the watch-tower (note that ṣalām also is used of the minaret: Ibn 'Arabshāh, Visī Timūrī, ed. Manger, 1767, i. 704). There are a number of references to the exi-ence on the coasts of a series of maṣīra and each maṣīra gave warning by light-signals of the movements of the enemy (B. G. A., ii. 177). According to al-Baladhurī
architect, Maslama b. Mukhallad, used it for the *Fitqaf (ibid., p. 44).* An ascetic who died in 469 lived in the manara of the Mosque of ‘Amr (Yākūt, *Culāb*, iv, 274). This suggests the meaning of minaret expressed by the word *sawmā'* (cf. also *Maṭrīzi*, iv, 7, 8) as a saint’s cell. According to one source, rather late however, al-Walid is said to have found a monk in the tower of the church of St. John who lived in the *sawmā'* there (cf. *J. A.*, ser. 9, vii, p. 189; Quatemère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii, 264). This use of the minaret was kept up during the golden age of Islam. Thus Ibn Djabar records that he saw in the west minaret of the mosque of the Omayyads cells for devout Maghribis and in the topmost chamber, where al-Chasīf had lived in *Fitqaf* there was now a *sākīd* (Rikha, p. 266, 18 sqq.). Ibn Tumant also lived there (Yākūt, *Muṣāmāt*, ii, 596, 18 sq.) and ‘Abd al-Latif also found another devotee living there (Ibn Abi ‘Uṣāila, ii, 204, 2 from below). According to al-Maṭrīzi, the Egyptian minaret was not introduced in a purely architectural way, but even from his account it appears most likely to be Syrian in origin.

If the minaret did not have a single origin, it is improbable that a single type of tower served as the model for it. Ziyād is said to have built the minaret in *Baṣra* of stone. The quadrangular Syrian Omayyad type (*B. G. A.*, iii, 182), which was taken over from the church-tower, was also of stone. In Egypt, on the other hand, according to al-Maṭrīzi, minarets for many centuries were only built of brick and the earliest stone minarets in this country were not built till shortly before 700 in al-Mansūriyya and al-Kāhāgawāwī (Maṭrīzi, iv, 224). In North Africa where the Omayyad, Syrian type was introduced, a round minaret of brick in 7 stories with pillars was built in *Abbahā* south of Kairawān in 184 (800) (Yākūt, *Muṣāmāt*, iv, 119). Ibn al-Hādījī condemns minarets of his time as being built too high. It is interesting to note as throwing a light on what was considered *bid‘a* that he regards the round form as the old and genuine one (Maṭrīzi, ii, 61 below). — For literature see Fraenkel, Schwall, v. Berchem, K. Hartmann, Horovitz quoted above; Doutté, in *K. Afs.*, iv, 1900, p. 339 sqq.; J. H. Gottheil, in *J. J. J.*, xx, 1908, p. 132—154; N. A. C. Creswell, in *Burlington Magazines*, xlviii, 1926, p. 134—140, 252—258, 290—296.

6. The Chambers.

The old mosque consisted of the courtyard and the open halls running along the walls: these were called *al-muḥāqṣāt* (*B. G. A.*, iii, 82, 158, 105, 182) because they were roofed over. When we are told that in Palestine, except in Jericho, towers were placed between the *muḥāqṣāt* and the courtyard (*ibid., p. 182*), this seems to suggest that the halls were closed, which would be quite in keeping with the winter climate of this region.

The halls were particularly extensive on the *kibla* side, because assemblies were held here. The space between two rows of pillars was called *riwātik* or *riwātā*. (B. G. A., iii, 158, 159: Maṭrīzi, iv, 10, 11, 12, 49). Extension often took the form of increasing the number of the *arṣikā*; in some districts a sail-cloth was spread over the open space as a protection from the sun at the time of the service (*B. G. A.*, iii, 205, 430).

The courtyard was called *baṣn*. The open space around the *Kaʿba* is called *Fitqaf al-Kabā*
MASDJD

(Cover, Mekkâ, i. 307; Ibn Hishâm, p. 322; cf. Finâ' Zâirizân: Yâkût, Idrîsî vi. 376). Finâ' is also the name given to the open space around the mosque (Makrîzî, iv. 6). Trees were often planted in the courtyard: e.g. in the mosque of 'Amr (see B 1; when we read in Makrîzî, iv. 6 that it had no şâns, this probably means that this space, planted with trees, between the covered halls was very narrow). In Medina, at the present day, there are still trees in the Kajûda (Batamûnî, Kitâb, p. 249) and in Ibn Djabbar's time there were 15 palms there (Kitâb, p. 194). Other mosques in Cairo had trees growing in them (Makrîzî, iv. 54, 64, 65, 120); in al-Masджid al-Kâfirîn, there were as many as 516 trees (ibid., p. 13), as it is still the case today. In other cases the court was covered with pêbbles (see above D 1); but this was altered with a more refined style of architecture. Al-Ma'âzî mentions that this was only found in Tiberiâs, out of all the mosques in Palestine (B. G. L., ii. 182). Frequently, as in Ramla, the halls were covered with marble and the courtyard with flat stone (ibid., p. 165). In the halls also the ground was originally bare or covered with little stones; for example in the mosques of 'Amr and Maslama b. Makh'allad covered it with mats (see below). The door of the Mosque of 'Amr was entirely covered with marble in the Mamluk period (Makrîzî, iv. 13 sq.; cf. in Sharh: Ibn Batúlû, ii. 53). But in the mosque of Mecca, the şâns is still covered with little stone (Batamûnî, Kitâb, p. 99 below), 400 dinars used to be spent annually on this (Cover, Mekkâ, ii. 19 sq.). In Medina also little pêbbles were used (Ibn Djabbar, Kitâb, p. 190, Ibn Batúlû, i. 263).

There were not at first enclosed chambers in the halls. A change in this respect came with the introduction of the maşṣûrâ [v. v.] on this word cf. Quartemière, Histo. Sult. Maml. i., p. 164, note 46. This was a box or compartment for the ruler built near the mihrâb. Al-Samânhûl gives the history of the maşṣûrâ in Medina (Wustenfel, Medina, p. 71 sq.; 89 sq.). The traditions all agree that the maşṣûrâ was invented to protect the ruler from hostile attacks. According to some men, 0thman built a maşṣûrâ of Istân with windows, so that the people could see the Imam of the community (ibid. and Makrîzî, iv. 7). According to another tradition, Marwân b. 'Abd al-Hasam, governor of Medina, after an attempt had been made on him by a Yaman in the year 44, was the first to build a maşṣûrâ of dressed stone with a window (Baldisbari, p. 6 below; Tabari, ii. 70). Ma'âwiya is then said to have followed his example. Others again say that Ma'âwiya was the first to introduce this innovation. He is said to have introduced the maşṣûrât with the accompanying guard as early as the year 40 or not till 44 after the Khurriji attempt (Tabari, ii. 349 sq.; F. G. I. v. 109, 1; Makrîzî, iv. 12, 1 sq.); according to one story because he had seen a dog on the mûbar (Bahâkî, ed. Schwall, p. 393 below; cf. on the whole question: H. Lamsens, M. M. Schwaîb, p. 202 sq.). This much seems to be certain, that the maşṣûrâ was at any rate introduced at the beginning of the Umayyad period and it was an arrangement so much in keeping with the increasing dignity of the ruler that, as Ibn Khallûn says, it spread throughout all the lands of Islam (Muqaddima, Cairo 1322, p. 212 sq.; 338). The governor built themselves compartments in the principal mosques of the provinces, e.g. Ziyâd in Kufa and Baṣra (Baldisbari, p. 277, 348) and probably Khurra b. Sharik in al-Fustâṭ (Makrîzî, iv. 12). In Medina, we shall be told that 'Omar b. 'Abd al-Aswâ as governor (86–93) raised the maşṣûrâ and built it of teak, but al-Mahdi had it taken down in 160 and a new one built on the level of the ground (ibid., p. 7; Wustenfel, op. cit.: Baldisbari, p. 7 centre). We are further told that in 161, al-Mahdi prohibited the maşṣûrâ of the provinces and al-Ma'a'mûn even wanted to clear all the boxes out of the masджâd al-Kabirâ, because their use was a sunna introduced by Mu'âwiya (Makrîzî, iv. 12; Ya'qûbî, ed. Houtsoum, ii. 571). But this attempt did not succeed. On the contrary, their number rapidly increased. In Cairo, for example, the lâq-d or al-A'skar built in 169 had a maşṣûrâ (Makrîzî, iv. 33 sq.) and the mosque of Ibn Tâlûn had a maşṣûrâ beside the mihrâb which was accessible from the Dar al-Imârâ (ibid., p. 36, 37, 42; Ibn Taghribirdî, ii. 8, 14). The maşṣûrâ was found in the larger mosques. In the Dîmât al-Kabîr, Muhammad b. Ka'ûlûn in 718 built a maşṣûrâ of iron for the Suljûq's şâltât (Makrîzî, iv. 152). According to Ibn Khaldûn, the maşṣûrâ was an innovation of Islâm's own. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there may not be some connection with the boxes of the Byzantine court, at least, for example, when the Turks in the Yâshîl Dîmât in Brusia put the Suljûq's box over the door (R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anatabl., p. 27).

Although the maşṣûrâ was introduced with the object of segregating the ruler and was therefore condemned by the strict as contrary to the spirit of Islâm (e.g. Makbâlî, ii. 43 sq.), maşṣûrâ were probably introduced for other purposes. Ibn Djabbar mentions three in the Mosque of the Omayyads: the old one built by Mu'âwiya in the eastern part of the mosque, one in the centre, which contained the minbar, and one in the west where the Hânâfîs taught and performed the şâltât. There were also other small rooms shut off by wooden lattices, which could be sometimes called maşṣûrâ and sometimes zâwiya. As a rule, there were quite a number of zâwiya connected with the mosque which were used by students (Ribâb, p. 265 sq.). We find the same state of affairs in other mosques.

While the groups of the kûrûd, the students, the lawyers etc. had originally to sit together in a common room, gradually the attempt was made to separate the rooms for some of them. Small compartments were either cut off in the main chamber or new rooms were built in subsidiary buildings. In the former case we get the already mentioned maşṣûrâ or zâwiya. Ibn al-Hâlîddî says that a madrasa was often made by the simple process of cutting off a part of a mosque by a half-strade (darbasîn) (Makbâlî, ii. 44). Thus in the hall of the Mosque of 'Amr there were several compartments for teaching, which are called maşṣûrâ and zâwiya, in which studies were prosecuted (Makrîzî, iv. 20, 4 sq.). In the Azhar Mosque a maşṣûrâ or Fustâًtî was made in the time of the Fatimids, where she had appeared, and the emir in the following period made a large number of such maşṣûrâ (ibid., p. 52, 53). In the Askî Mosque about 300 A. H. there were three maşṣûrâs for women (F. G. A. i. 100). These divisions might be a nuisance at the great Friday assemblies and this is why al-Mahdi wanted to remove them in 161 from the masджâd al-Djâma'î (Tabari, iii. 486),
and Ibn al-Hājīdī condemned them as works of the musâl and numbers them then other embellishments with the ashâbī al-sâlā (Makrizī, ii. 43 syq.).

The mu`adhîhins not only lived in the minarets, where, at any rate in the Tūlūnīd period, they held vigil (Makrizī, iv. 48). They had rooms (zawâf, sg. zahrâf) on the roof and these rooms in time came to be numerous (ibid., p. 13, 14).

All kinds of rooms were put in subsidiary buildings, for the khatib (ibid., p. 15), for judges, for studies, etc. In addition there were dwelling-houses, not only for the staff but also for others. As already mentioned, devout men used to take up their residence in the mosque for a considerable period for ṣīkâf and any one at any time could take up his quarters in the mosque; he could sleep there and make himself at home. It therefore came quite natural to the devout to reside permanently in the mosque. Ascetics often lived in the minaret (see above), a ṣâhid lived on the roof of the Azhar mosque, others made themselves cells in the mosque, as a shaikh in Naṣīrīd times (Ibn Dujair, p. 240; cf. in Harrân, p. 245) and as happened in Ṣalâh al-Dīn’s time in the mosque of the Omayyads (Ibn Abî ʿUsâbi’ā, ii. 182). It was however very usual for them to live in the side rooms of the mosque, as was the case for example, in the Mosque of the Omayyads (Ibn Dujair, p. 269; Ibn Battûta, i. 206). In particular holy mosques like that in Hebron, houses for al-mu`tazâlim were built around the sacred place (Sauvage, Hist. Jérus. et Hébron, p. 11 sg.) and also beside the Masjid Yamîn at the ancient Nâsir (B. G. A., ii. 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (zabīgha) and 14-15,000 loaves (raghîf) were daily distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvage, p. 20 sq.; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i., 231). Bread was also baked in the mosque of Ibn Tūlûn (Quatremère, op. cit., vi., 233) and kitchens were often found in the mosques (for al-Azhar, see Dujairi, Merceille, iii. 238 sg.; Sulaimân Raṣâd, Kanz al-Dujauri fi Taʾrikh al-Azhar, p. 71 sqq., 107 sqq.).

Those who lived in and beside the mosque were called mawṣûlin (cf. B. G. A., ii. 146; for Jerusalem, Naṣīr Khusraw, p. 82, 91; for Mecca, Ibn Dujair, p. 149; for Medina, Ibn Battûta, i. 279, where we learn that they were organised under a ḥadîm, like the North Africans under an amīn in Damascus; Ibn Dujair, p. 277 sqq.). They were pious ascetics, students, and sometimes travellers. The students generally found accommodation in the madrasî but large mosques like that of the Omayyads or al-Azhar had always many students who lived in them. The name of the hâssâmî, plur. arwâjî, was later used for these students’ lodgings (cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., 43, note 1; perhaps Makrizī, iv. 54, 23). Strangers always found accommodation in the mosques (cf. C 1). In smaller towns it was the natural thing for the traveller to spend the night in the mosque and to get food there (Yâkūt, iii. 385; al-Kifî, Turīkh al-Hukma, ed. Lippert, p. 252).

Travellers like Naṣīr-i Khosraw, Ibn Dujair, Ibn Battûta, al-Abdârî (J. A., ser. 5, iv. 154, p. 174) were wont to travel the whole Muslim word from one mosque to the other (or madrasî or ṣâbî). The traveller could even leave his money for safe keeping in a mosque (Ṣafar-nâme, p. 51). Large endowments were bequeathed for those who lived in the mosques (Ibn Dujair, op. cit.; Ibn Taghibirdî, ii. 105 sqq.).

In later times the rulers often built a lodge or pavilion (maqâra) in or near the mosque (Makrizī, ii. 345; iv. 13; cf. on the word: Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i., 11, 15).

There was often a special room with a clock in the mosques; this also is probably an inheritance from the church, for Ibn Rosta (290 = 903) talks of similar arrangements in Constantinople (B. G. A., vii. 126 supra). Ibn Dujair (p. 270) describes very fully the clock in the mosque of the Omayyads (cf. J. A., ser. 9, vii. 205 sqq.). It was made in the reign of Nâr al-Dîn by Fâhr al-Dîn b. al-Sârî (Ibn Abî ʿUsâbi’ā, ii. 185 sg.; an expert was kept to look after it: ibid., p. 191).

There was a clock in the Mustanjîrîya in Rayyâd (Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Reise, ii. 175) and the Moon of ‘Amr also had a gharîf al-sâlî (Makrizī, iv. 13, 15). In the Mosque of Ibn Tūlûn is still kept a sundial of the year 696 (1296-1297; cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 514) but the clocks were usually mechanical (see also Dossy, Supplement, s.v. mîdâna and on the clock generally E. Wiedemann, in Nova Acta der K. Leop. Carol. Akad., vol. C, Halle 1915). In the Magribî also we find mosque-clocks, e. g. in the Bû’ânîya (J. A., ser. 11, xi. 357 sqq.).

The very varied uses to which the mosques were put resulted in their becoming storehouses for all sorts of things. In 668, the Mosque of the Omayyads was cleared of all such things; in the courtyard there were for example stores for machines of war and the zâwiya of Zain al-Abîdîn was a regular khân (J. A., ser. 9, vol. vii. 225 sqq.).

I. Miḥrâb [q.v.].whether the Prophet considered it necessary to erect an indicator of the direction of prayer in Medina may be considered doubtful. According to Tradition, when the revelation of the alteration of the kâba came to him, he turned round in the middle of the prayer without further investigation (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 41, 62; Ṭabarî, Tarîf, xi. 25 centre; Muslim, Musâjd, tr. 2). On the musâllâ however and on journeys he used a spear, which was stuck in the ground, in front of him, but this satora [q.v.] was not intended so much to give the direction as to be a substitute for the wall, to mark off the area of the worshipper; it could therefore also be an animal or some living thing (Bukhârî, Sahîh, B. 18, So. 90-92; Muslim, Sahîh, tr. 43; Zuḥrayîn on Musâjd, iii. 285; Abu Dîwâlî, i. 69; Aḥmad b. Ḥambal, Musâjd, ii. 106). At the present day the miḥrâb is often called kâba (and as early as Ibn Taghibirdî, i. 351; Yâkût, i. 642).

In al-Fûṣût ‘Amr is ṣâfî to have ascertained the kâba very carefully with the help of many other‘ (Makrizī, iv. 6 supra: B. G. A., viii. 359; Ibn Taghibirdî, i. 75 sqq.). But we are not told how it was indicated, probably by a pole or something of the kind. The kâba was established too far to the east, so that during the prayer the worshippers turned more to the south. At first they were probably content with the direction, roughly correct, in keeping with a hadîth of Abû Hurairah, according to which the kâba in general lies between east and west (Tirmidî, Musâjd, al-Salât, p. 139; Makrizī, iv. 24). The first mosque in I-fâhûn was built where Abû Mâsâ had performed the sa’î, and a brick placed in position
by him was taken as the kibla (B. G. A., vii, 200). But later the problem was tackled seriously. Mašriq mentions the different solutions of it in Egypt (iv. 21—33). Al-Azhār had the kibla accurate; the mihrāb al-ṭalabīa, i.e. that of the Mosque of ‘Amr and those of the mosques in Dījāz, Bīlis, Alexandria, Kūus and Assuan were too far to the east, that of the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn was found by a committee to be 14 darājī too far west, those of the villages too far west. The direction was ascertained from the stars. Many however followed the kibla of Syria. In the transformation of churches into mosques, frequent under al-Mamūn, their orientation from east to west was decisive. The door on the east side as a rule was made the mihrāb (Mašrīq, iv. 30). The word mihrāb is said to have introduced it into Medina (Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 74; B. G. A., iii. 80—87) however it takes for granted that ‘Omar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz only revived it; similarly his governor Kūra b. Shāfīr (90—96) is recorded to have introduced the prayer niche (mihrāb nūqajawwot) into Egypt (Mašrīq, iv. 6, 149, 91; Ibn Dukmāk, iv. 62, 12 sq.; Ibn Tāghhīrīd, i. 70; Suyūṭī, Ḥasan al-Maḥfūrāt, ii, 135 sq.). Only occasionally is Muḥammādi’s governor Mašlama b. Makhkālīd (47—62) or ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān (65—84) mentioned as having introduced this innovation (Mašrīq, iv. 6). It therefore seems not to be wrong when one of the mihrāb in the Mosque of the Omayyads is described as the oldest in Islam. But it is an anachronism to call it mihrāb al-ḍalabīa and attribute it to Muḥammādi (Ibn Djūbi, p. 265; Ibn Batṭūṭa, i. 203). The mihrāb is however said not yet to have come into general use in the second century (see Lammens, Zīlād, p. 94, note 1); on the other hand, Tābārī presupposes a mihrāb in the Muslim sense as early as David (Ṭābanī, i. 2408, 71, 15; B. G. A., ii. 112, 10 sq.; other prophets also had their mihrābs in Jerusalem, ibid.). In the larger mosques there were usually several mihrābs, used by the different madhāḥīb; in the mosque of ‘Amr, for example (according to Ibn Tāghhīrīd, i. 79), in Hebron (Sauvage, Hist. Jér. et Hébr., p. 17), in the mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 213 sq.; Ibn Djbūtī and Ibn Batṭūtā as above). They might be of wood, but as a rule they were built of masonry or put on pillars. They were often highly ornamented. In the mihrāb of al-Walīd, a looking-glass that had belonged to ʿAṣīrah is said to have been placed (Kāzmaī, ii. 71). A Fāṭimīd adorning a mihrāb in the mosque of ʿAmr and one in the Azhār mosque with a silver girdle which weighed 5000 darāms (Mašrīq, iv. 52). The general objections to adorning mosques were also applied to the mihrāb. A haddih is said to have forbidden this as an inheritance from the churches; it is compared with the altars (see Lammens, Zīlād, p. 33, note 7), but even a puritan like Ibn Rabī’-repeat does not reject the mihrāb in principle; he only condemns its adornment (Majdīr, ii. 48). In fact the mihrāb was held in special respect as the most important part of the mosque which found expression in the erection of a kūbba over it (e.g. Mašrīq, iv. 91; cf. v. Berchem, Conjug., i., No. 79). The special importance of the mihrāb is shown from the fact that its position was occasionally revealed in dreams, e.g. in Kārāwān (Yākūt, iv. 213) and in the Mosque of Ibn Tulūn; here the Prophet appeared to Aḥmad b. Tulūn and showed him the mihrāb and the spot was surrounded by ants (Mašrīq, iv. 39). In the principal mosque of Saʿābī there was a prophet’s tomb under the mihrāb (B. G. A., vii. 110), which recalls Christian altars. As the most sacred part of the mosque, the mihrāb is compared not only with Christian altars, but the word is used of the sacred, place of presence in any sanctuary, e.g. in the pre-Christian temple, which stood on the site of the later mosque of the Omayyads (J. A., ser. 9, vii. 371). In Palestine, in keeping with this idea, very many mihrābs are said to have been the mihrābs of Biblical personalities (see Sauvage, Hist. Jér. et Hébr., p. 42, 76, 96 sq., 102; Le Strange, Palestine, Index).
d. Minbar [q.v.]

In contrast to the mihrāb, the minbar was introduced in the time of the Prophet himself. The word, often pronounced minbar (cf. Brockeßmann, Grundriss, i. 161), comes from the root n-b-r 'high'; it could be derived from the Arabic quite easily with the meaning 'elevation, stand', but it is more probably a loanword from the Ethiopic (Schacler, Z. D. M. G., ii., 1898, p. 146—148; Noldeke, Neue Reitlinger s. sem. Sprachen, 1910, p. 49). Its case is therefore somewhat similar to that of masjid. It means 'seat, chair' (e.g. Chron. Mekka, ii. 8; Aṣḥābiyya, Cairo, xiv. 75) and is used, for example, for sattle (Tabari, Gloss.) and of a litter (Aṣḥābiyya, xiii. 155; cf. Schwally). It is therefore identical with madī'a (Bukhārī, Qīna'a, B. 25), with sārir (Kīmīl, p. 20; Aṣḥābiyya, iii. 3), tukht or kusri (Ibid., i. 214; cf. also Becker, Kanzel, p. 8). The use of the word for the pulpit is in keeping with its history.

When the khutba [q.v.] spoke among the Arabs, he usually did so standing (cf. Masjidhilayāt, ed. Lyall, xci. 23; Dājījīb, Bayān, Cairo 1332, i. 129; in. 143) frequently beating the ground with bow and lance (Ibid., i. 198; Bālaq, 7, 135, 9, 45; or be sit on his couch (Ibid., ed. e.g. Kussb. Sāʿīda (Bayān, i. 25, 31; ii. 141). The Prophet did both of these things. In 'Arafah he sat on his camel during his khutba and on other occasions, when addressing the community during the early period, even as late as the day of the capture of Mecca, he stood (cf. Sūrah ixi. 11). The people sat on the ground around him (Bukhārī, Qīna'a, B. 28; Tālibin, B. 6). In the mosque in Medina he had a particular place, as is mentioned in the stories of the introduction of the minbar. Sometimes, we are told, he stood beside a tree or a palm-tree (Bukhārī, Manāṣik, B. 25; ed. Krei, ii. 400); as a rule however, beside a palm-trunk (Gūbād, so Ibn Sa'd, i. 9, 10, 11, 12) and on a few occasions beside one of the pillars (Bukhārī, Manāṣik, B. 25, ed. Krei, ii. 401; Dīyābākri, Khāmis, ii. 75). This is undoubtedly the original tradition: the Prophet stood beside one of the palm-tree trunks used as pillars in the mosque. For "beside" (usually kāna ilā; Bukhārī, Bayān, B. 32; 'indā) "up" (kāna `alā; already in Bukhārī, Qīna'a, B. 26) is sometimes found later and for the column or trunk, we find a stump on which he sat.

Various passages record how the minbar was introduced, notably the following: Ibn Sa'd, i. 9—13; Bukhārī, Sahih, B. 18, 64, 91; Qīna'a, B. 26; Bayān, B. 32; Hība, B. 3; Manāṣik, B. 25; Muslim, Manāṣik, tr. 10; s. also Wiesner, Handbuch zum Islam, p. 63; Udt al-Qādirah, i. 43; infra, 214; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 62 sqq.; Ibn Baṭlūba, B. 275 sqq.; the whole material is in Dīyābākri, Khāmis, i. 129; ii. 75 sqq. and Sirat al-Halābī, ii. 146 sqq. The details are variously given. The minbar, we are told, was built of tāfār wood or tamarisk from the woods near Medina; the builder was a Byzantine or a Copt and was called Bāqīm or Bāqī, but the names Ibrahim (Ibid., i. 43); Maimūn, Şāhāb, Kūlāb, Minor (see Khamīs) are also given. He was a carpenter, but a slave of the wife of one of the Anṣūr (Bukhārī, Hība, B. 3) of the Muhājirūn. Others say he belonged to al-'Abbās. The suggestion is sometimes credited to the Prophet and sometimes to others. The palm-trunk is said to have whined like a camel or a child when the Prophet mounted his new seat but was calmed by stroking and kind words from the Prophet. Most stories take it for granted that the minbar was primarily intended for the khutba; in some it is added that the object was to enable the large assembly to hear him (Ibn Sa'd, i. 10, 11). We are told also that the Prophet performed the sālit on it and, during the suḥail, he came down from it. He also took care that the people could see his sālit and follow him (Bukhārī, Sahih, B. 18; Qīna'a, B. 26). This last tradition however presupposes the standing of the minbar (note that the same idea of the palm-stump occurs in Qīna'a, B. 26).

In this connection it is interesting to note a tradition in Ibn al-Āṣfār, according to which the Companions asked the Prophet to take up a raised position as many suhail were coming (Udt al-Qādirah, i. 43). Another tradition is in keeping with this, according to which the Prophet, when he was visited by a man named Tānim, stood on a kusri and addressed him from it (Ibid., p. 214; cf. Lammens, Medīnā, p. 204, note 5). Here we have a seat of honour on which the ruler sits. This is undoubtedly in keeping with the character of the minbar; while the raised seat was in general use among the northern Semites the Arabs usually sat on the ground, often leaning against a sattle. The raised seat was the special mark of the ruler or, what is the same thing, of the judge. We are told that Ṭābāb's Muḥṣin was the first to sit on a minbar or sārir when acting as judge (Aṣḥābiyya, 2nd Cairo ed., iii. 3; Muṣtaṣir, iv. 6 sq.). Al-Haddād, for example, when he addressed the people (hardly in the mosque) sat on a chair which belonged to him (kusrā labr: Tabari, i. 959) and when he tried and condemned his enemies, a sārir was erected for him (Ibid., p. 1119); in the same way a kusri was placed for Yazīd when he issued his orders for a battle (Ibid., p. 1167; see also Becker, Kanzel, p. 8).

If tradition usually suggests that the minbar was introduced exclusively for the khutba, this seems to be a somewhat one-sided view. The minbar was primarily, as Becker was the first to point out, the throne of the mighty Prophet in his capacity as a ruler. In keeping with this is the tradition that it was introduced in the year 7, 8 or 9 (Tabari, i. 1591; Khāmis, ii. 75; Udt al-Qādirah, i. 23). The Prophet used it for the publication of important announcements, for example, the prohibition of wine. That he should also make his public speeches to the community from the new seat was only natural. His khutbae however were not confined to the Friday service and he could still deliver a khutba without a minbar, e.g. at the festival on the muṣalla, where Marwān was the first to put up a minbar (Bukhārī, Khāmis, B. 6) and beside the Ka'bah after the capture of Mecca (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 823).

The Prophet's minbar is often called arādā from its material (Bukhārī, Sahih, B. 64; Qīna'a, B. 26). It consisted of two steps and a seat (madīṣas: Khāmis, ii. 75; Bukhārī, Qīna'a, B. 23; Maṣḥaṭ, Tabari, i. 1591). After the time of the Prophet, it was used in the same way by Abū Bakr, 'Omar and 'Uthman (see below). Its significance as a throne is seen from the fact that in the year 50 Mūṣāwiya wanted to take it to Syria with him: he was not allowed to do so but he raised it by 5 steps. At a later date, 'Abd al-
Malk and al-Walid are said to have wanted to take the Prophet's minbar to Damascus (Tabari, ii, 92 sqq.; Khânî, ii, 75; Ya'qûbî, ed. Houtsm, ii, 283; B. G. A., v, 23 sqq.; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 63). In the time of the Prophet, it stood against the wall so that a sheep could just get past (Bukhârî, Saḥâbat, i, 91). In the time of al-Ma'âdî, in the middle of the mosque. This was however found inconvenient because the Inâm had to cross from the minbar to the kibla "over the necks of the (seated) believers." Ziyâd then placed the minbar against the wall (Ya'qûbî, i, 642). On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allah b. 'Abîâs (governor of Ba Tưr 36-40) was the first to mount the minbar in Ba Tưr (Dîja'et, Bayân, i, 179). When Ziyâd had to fly from Ba Tưr he saved the minbar which he put up in his Masjid al-Hûdât (Tabari, i, 3414 sqq.). The minbar was the symbol of the ruler and the governor sat upon it, as representative of the ruler. It therefore formed a feature of the Masjid al-Djâmâ', where the community was officially addressed. In the year 64 the other provinces, there were minbars in all the provinces. In this year homage was paid to Marwan b. al-Ḥakam not only in the capital but in the other provinces in the Ḥîdâjat, Miṣr, Shām, Dāzirat, Ibrâq, Khurâsân, and other asâmî (B. G. A., viii, 207). Special mention is made of the fact that Tabariya had no minbar.

In the first century and beginning of the second, we find the wall in the smaller towns, delivering the kibla standing, with the staff only. But in 132 the governor 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwan had minbars put up in the kûrâ of Egypt (Mâkri, iv, 8, 17 sqq.; Ibn Taghrîbîrî, i, 350 sqq.). When the kibla became purely a divine service and the ruler was no longer the kibla (q.v.), the minbar became the pulpit of the spiritual preacher and every mosque in which the Frisday service was celebrated was given a minbar. At the same time, i.e. after al-Râshîd, the change was gradually completed and the preacher spoke, standing on the pulpit. Hadîths therefore came into existence, according to which the Prophet used to deliver two kîhbat on Friday, standing "just as is done to-day" (Bukhârî, Li'man, p. 27, 30 and 'Omar, ibid., p. 2).

The minbar was thus now quite analogous to the Christian pulpit. It is very probable that this latter also influenced its form. We have already noted above, of a minbar in the mosque of 'Amr, that it was said to be of Christian origin. The same thing came to be said of the Prophet's minbar (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 63). Marwan put the Medina minbar larger, while the one brought by him to Mecca had only 3 steps and was of course portable. We again hear of portable minbars later, which did not exclude their being large (cf. above on the minbar of Mecca). Thus the minbar in al-Maghrib is said to have been portable. Ibn al-Ḥâdîd regards this (the oldest) custom as hidâ'a and therefore ascribes it to al-Hâdhâjî (Madkhâl, ii, 47, 13 sqq.). The oldest minbars were all of wood. There is however one hadîth which says that the Prophet had a kûrâ of wood with iron legs made for the reception of Tamîm (Cud, i, 214, sq from below; cf. Lammens, Mu'awia, p. 273, note 3); it is however uncertain whether this had to the minbar. A minbar of iron was made as early as the Omayyad period (Ibn Taghrîbîrî, i, 78, 8; al-minbar al-ḥâdîd probably correct in
spite of Becker, Kanzel, p. 10, note; cf. 79, 4, see below); and also of stone (Goldziher, Mub. Stud., ii. 42, note 5 with a reference to Ibn Ḥadīdāj; later they were also built of bricks (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 64, 96). As a rule the minbar stood against the kiblah wall beside the mihrāb. Al-Mahdī had tried to reduce the minabār to their original small size (Ṭabarī, iii. 486, 13; Ṣaḥīḥ, iv. 12, 13 sqq.), but he could not arrest the development. In the larger mosques several minabār were even built. Ibn al-Faqqīh about 1000 A.H. already mentions 5 minbars in the mosque in Jerusalem (B. G. A., v. 100, 8 sq.). In the Sūlān Ḥasan mosque in Cairo 4 were planned and 3 erected when a minaret fell down in 762 and diverted attention to other work (Ṣaḥīḥ, iv. 117, 18 sq.).

The importance, which the minbar already had in the time of the Prophet, caused special reverence to be paid to it and the sanctity of the mosque was concentrated round this and around the mihrāb. The governor of Kūfah Khālid b. Ṣā hil Allāh al-Kārī (105—120) received a letter of censure from the caliph because he had prayed for water on the minbar (Ḥārīṣ, p. 20, 15 sqq.). A false oath taken on the minbar of the Prophet led to the Prophet's hatred to hell absolutely (Ibn Ṣa'd, s.v. 10, 3 sqq., 12, 19 sq.; Ibn Ḥanbal, ʿUsūd, ii. 329; cf. Jehovah, Der Eik, p. 144, 147). Legends grew up which represented the Prophet seeing into the future from the minbar (Bukhārī, Ḏ qm'a, bāb 29) and being able to follow the battle of Mu'ta from it (cf. Wākīdī—Willhauseen, p. 311; Ibn Ḥīṣām, p. 796) and also telling how his prayers on the minbar were specially efficacious.

Just as the kāba was covered (kāṣa) so was the same thing done to the minbar. Oṭmān is said to have been the first to cover the minbar of the Prophet with a kūffā (Khamās, ii. 751, 1 from below). Muʿāwiya did the same thing when he had to give up his attempt to abolish it (Ibid., p. 76, 4; Ṣiār, ii. 92, 1). It was not quite the same thing when al-Ḥākim rediscovered the already mentioned iron minbar and covered it with gilt leather because it was covered with dirt (read: fādhīr or i.e. rust (Ibn Taghrībrīdī, i. 79, 5 sq.). Under the Abbāsids a new kūlla was sent every year for the minbar of the Prophet from Baghdad; the Sūlāns later did not renew it so frequently (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 64). We find other references to the covering of the minbar on special occasions (Ibn Djbair, p. 149, 10). Ibn al-Ḥādīdī (Madkhl, ii. 74) demands that the imām should put a stop to the custom of putting carpets on the minbar. — On the question of the minbar see: C. H. Becker, Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam, Noldde-Festschrift, i. 331—351 = Islamstudien, i. 450—471; Caetani, Enciclopedia dell' Islam, i. 533, 739; ii. 68 sq., 87, 213 sqq.; H. Lammens, Māʾ Ḏawīn, p. 63, 204—208, 273; J. Horovitz, in Lyceum, xxvi., 1927, p. 257—260.

t. Dākka

In the larger mosques there is usually found near the minbar a platform to which a staircase leads up. This platform (dākka, popularly often dikke) is used as a seat for the muʿādhīnīn who prepare the call to prayer in the mosque on the Friday service. This part of the equipment of a mosque is connected with the development of the service (cf. below under H. 4 and C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus, iii. 1912, P. 374—399 = Islamstudien, i. 472—500; E. Mittwoch, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus, Abb. Fr. Ak. W., 1913, Phil.-Hist. Cl., Nr. 2). The first ḍākhan call is pronounced from the minaret, the second (when the khāṭīb mounts the minbar) and the third (before the ʿalākūn, ʾiḥāmmah) in the mosque itself. These calls were at first pronounced by the muʿādhīnīn standing in the mosque. At a later date raised seats were made for them. Al-Halābī records that Maslama, Muʿāwiya's governor in Egypt, was the first to build platforms (here called ʿanākhīb) for the calls to prayer in the mosques (Ṣūʿa Ḥalābīya, i. 111 below). This story however, given without any reference to older authorities, is not at all reliable. It seems that a uniform practice did not come into existence at once. In Mecca the muʿādhīnīn for a time uttered the second call (when the preacher mounted the minbar) from the roof. As the sun in summer was too strong for them, the emir of Mecca, in the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, made a little hut (ẓūilla) for them on the roof. This was enlarged and more strongly built by al-Mutawakkīl in 240, as his contemporary al-Maʿṣūrī relates (Chron. Mekka, i, 322 sqq.). The position in the minbar of Amr in Cairo was similar. Here also the ḍākhan was uttered in a chamber (gūffūf) on the roof and in 336 there is a reference to its enlargement (Ṣaḥīḥ, iv. 11). As late as the time of Bahbars, when the many chambers were removed from the roof of the Mosque of ʿAmr, the old gūffūf of the muʿādhīnīn was left intact (ibid., p. 14; cf. al-Kindī, Ṣuʿūd, ed. Guest, p. 469, note 2). In the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn the ḍākhan was pronounced from the cupola in the centre of the ʿīrāq (Ṣaḥīḥ, iv. 40). Al-Maḏkīsī records in the fourth century as a notable thing about Khurāsān that the muʿādhīnīn there pronounced the ḍākhan on a sārīr placed in front of the minbar (B. G. A., iii. 327). The ḍākhan “platform” in front of the minbar in the mosques of Shahānān must have had the same purpose (ibid., p. 357).

In the viiiith century, Ibn al-Ḥādīdī mentions the dākka as a bidā in general use, which should be condemned as it unnecessarily prevents freedom of movement within the mosque (Madkhl, ii. 44 above). In the year 277 a dākka in the mosque of al-Ḥākim is mentioned (Ṣaḥīḥ, iv. 61): the dākka mentioned in inscriptions from Cairo all date from the period before and after 900 a.n. Ibn al-Ḥādīdī mentions that in addition to the large dākka used for the Friday service there was sometimes a smaller one for ordinary ṣalāt (Madkhl, ii. 46 sq.) and says that in the larger mosques there were several dākka on which muʿādhīnīn pronounced the ḍākhan in succession so that the whole community could hear it (tablūz; ibid., p. 45 sq.). Lane also mentions several muʿābdallāzāgīn in the Azhar Mosque (Manuscripts and Customs, Everyman's Library, p. 87, note 2). j. Kursī, kūrān and Relics.

In the mosques there is usually a kūrsī, that is a wooden sānī with a seat and a desk. The desk is for the Kūrān, the seat for the kūrāz. But reader, kūrsī. Ibn Djbair attended a divine service performed in Baghdad at which a carpet was placed from the minbar, but only after the kūrsī, sitting on kūrsī had recited portions of the Kūrān (Rīhhā, p. 219, 222). The kūrsī, often identical with the kūsāt, is a kūrsī made of teak (Ibn Djbair, p. 200; Yākūt, Uddatī, ii. 319; Maḏkīsī, iv. 121);...
sometimes he spoke from the minbar to which the wāli often had access (cf. Ibn Djibair: see Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 320). The ḫāṣṣā are called by al-Makki ʿāǧāb al-ḥārāsī which is in keeping with this (Kātal-Ṣūḥāb, i, 152, quoting K. al-Madāḥi, i, 159). Several ḫāṣṣā are often mentioned in one mosque (cf. for the Mosque of ʿAmr Makrī, iv, 19). Whether the ḫāṣṣā mentioned for the earlier period always had a desk cannot be definitely ascertained. The ḫāṣṣā with dated inscriptions given by van Berchem in his Corpus all belong to the ixth (yxlth) century (N. 264, 302, 338, 359bis, 491). According to Lane, at the Friday service while the people are assembling, a ḫāṣṣā on the ḫūṣr recites the 18th Sūra up to the aḏghān (Manners and Customs, p. 86). The same custom is recorded by Ibn al-Ḥādījī and condemned because it has a disturbing effect (K. al-Madāḥi, ii, 44, middle).

The Qurān very soon received its definite place in the mosque like the Bible in the church (cf. Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bab 91: they prayed at a pillar orāda al-muṣlīḥ). According to one tradition, orthodox had several copies of his Qurān sent to the provinces (cf. Noldeke-Schwall, Gesch. d. Mus., i, 112 sqg); al-Ḥādījī, a little later, is said to have done the same thing (Makrī, iv, 175). The mosques had many other copies besides the one kept on the ḫūṣr Al-Ḥākim put 814 aḏghān in the Mosque of Ibn Tāmir, where the founder had already put boxes of Qurāns (Makrī, iv, 36, 40, cf. Ḥusn al-Muḥādara, ii, 138) and in 403 he presented 1,289 copies to the Mosque of ʿAmr, some of which were written in letters of gold (Makrī, iv, 12; Ḥusn al-Muḥādara, ii, 136). Even earlier than this there were so many that the kaṣī al-Ḥārīdh b Miskīn (237–245) appointed a special awnīn to look after them (al-Kindī, Wulīz, p. 469); there are still a very large number in the Mosque of the Prophet (see Banūnānī, Riḥāb, p. 224 above). Of particular value was the muḥāf ḥammā, belonging to the Mosque of ʿAmr, prepared by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān, later bought by his son and afterwards by his daughter Asmāʿ; her brother left it in 128 to the mosque and it was used for public readings (see its whole history in Makrī, iv, 17 sqg). Besides it, another copy was for some time also used for reading, which was said to have lain beside Ṭūḥmān, when he was killed and to have been stained with his blood, but this one was removed by the Fatūmīs (Ṭāḥī, p. 19) in the time of Ibn Būṭrī, a Qurān for which the same claims were made was kept in Baṣrā, iii, 16. On New Year's Day when the ʿūlāmāʾ used to go in procession through the town, the Caliph at the entrance to the Mosque of ʿAmr took up in his hand a muḥāf ḥammā said to have been written by ʿAlī and kissed it (Ibn Taghhrīrdī, ii, i, p. 472 middle); it was perhaps the muḥāf ḥammā. In Syria, Egypt, and the Ḥudayrā, in the fourth century, there were Qurāns which were traced back to Ṭūḥmān (F. G. A., iii, 143; cf. ii, 117). One of the Qurāns made for Ṭūḥmān was shown in the Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus in the time of Ibn Dībār. It was produced after the daily salāts and the people touched and kissed it (Riḥāb, p. 268). It was brought there in the year 507 from Tīberiās (Dībār, Ṭelḥīz, Haidārīz, 1337, ii, 25). Other Qurāns of Omayyads were shown in Baghdad and Cordova (see Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 327) and Ibn Dībār saw another in the Mosque of the Prophet; it lay in a desk on a large stand, here called miḥmāl (Riḥāb, p. 193; cf. thereon Dozy, Supplement, s. v.). The Fādhilya Madrasa also had a Muḥāf ḥ Ummānī bought by the Kaḥl al-Dīlī for 30,000 dinārs (Makrī, iv, 197) and there is one in Fāṭ (Archives Marocaines, xviii, 1922, p. 362). Valuable Qurāns like these had the character of relics and belonged to the ḥāṣṣām of the mosque. They were often kept in a chest (ṣāṭābir) (Ibn Dībār, Ṣaḥīḥ, for al-muṣlīḥ, Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bab 95. Makrī has al-muṣlīḥ; see al-ʿĀṣīlānī, Fath al-Bārī, i, 358); also called tābir (Ibn Dībār, p. 104). In the Kaḥl, Ibn Dībār saw two chests with Qurāns (p. 84, 3). Ibn Dībākī mentions 16 chests with Qurāns in the Jerusalem mosque (B. G. A., v, 100). In the mosques there were also āḏghān for other things, such as lamps (Makrī, iv, 53; Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 82 = Ibn Dībār, p. 194), a tābir for alms (K. al-Madāḥi, ii, 44, infra), for the kātā al-mal or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also chests for rose-wreaths (Makrī, ii, 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ʿAmr there was a whole series of tābirāt (Makrī, iv, 9).

The Qurāns were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of the bodies of saints (cf. B. 4, C 1) and other ʿāṯār were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses, (in Kāfā, Vakūt, iv, 325) previously in Mecca, see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 361), the Prophet's sandals (in Hebron, B. G. A., v, 101, also in Damascus, where the Ashrafīya Madrasa had left his heart and the Dammiqya his right sandal; F. A. ser. 9, iii, 271 sq., 402), his cloak (in Adhūr, B. G. A., iii, 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, Banūnānī, Riḥāb, p. 165) and many other things (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 358 sqg; Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 325 sqg). These relics were often kept in valuable reliquaries. The head of Husain was buried in a tābir in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Dībār, p. 45). There was a black stone like that in the Kaḥl in a mosque in Shahrāz (B. G. A., iii, 433).

On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from Ḥadīth (Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, bab 45, 54; Liʿwāzī, bab 71; Masmūdī, Masādigh, tr. 3; cf. on the question Becker, Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung, Z. A., xxvi., 1831, Islamstudien, i, 445 sqg). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās had no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the Iwān of ʿAbbās i at Madāʾin standing, when it was turned into a mosque (Ṭabari, i, 2443, 2451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Delhi which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Būṭrī, iii, 151) although even this is remarkable (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, ii, 451 sqg.—Z. D. M. G., lii, 1907, p. 186 sqg). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Taimiyya condemned the reverence paid to the Prophet's footprint, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascus mosque also (Quaternaire, Hist. Selt. Musul., tli, 245 sqg). These carpets were used to improve the appearance of the mosques. The custom of performing the
salát upon a carpet is ascribed by Ḥadīth to the Prophet himself. Anas b. Mālik performed the salát with him in his grandmother’s house, and the Prophet used a cloth or mat (ṣāfar), which had become black through wear; as a rule, he used a mat woven of palm leaves, ḫumra (Baḥṣarī, Salāt, b. Aḥmad, 20, 21; Muḥammad, 47; Hāfiz, Ḥanbāl, Muṣnād, 3, 145). In any case, it is clear from Balādhurī that the salát was at first performed in the mosque simply in the dust and then on pebbles (Balādhurī, p. 277, 348; cf. al-Zurkīn, Ṣaḥīḥ ʿala-l-Mawṣuṭi, i. 283 sq.). Later, when the halls were extended, the ground, or the paving, was covered with matting.

The first to cover the ground in the Mosque of ‘Amr with ṣafir instead of ḥozāf was Muḥammad’s governor Mālam b. Muqallad (Maḥrūz, iv. 8; Ḥasan al-Maḥṣūfa, ii. 136; Ibn Taḥrīrī, t. 77). The different groups which frequented the mosque (cf. above) had their places on particular mats: when a kād (middle of the third century) ejected the Shīʿīs and Ṣafarīs from the mosque, he had their ḥusūr torn up (al-Kindī, Wuhāṣ, p. 466). Ibn Tūlūn covered his mosque floor with ʿAbdānī and ʿAmrīnī mats (Maḥrūz, iv. 36, 38). For the mosque of al-Mālik in the year 405, al-Ḥākim bought 1,966 ḏirāt of carpeting for 5,000 dinār (Maḥrūz, iv. 56; cf. for al-Aṣhar, ibid., p. 50). In the year 439 in the Mosque of ‘Aṣhar, there were ten layers of coloured carpets, one above the other (Nāṣiri Khosrow, ed. Schefer, p. 31 (text), p. 149 (transl.)). In the Mosque at Jerusalem 800,000 ḏirāt of carpets were used every year (R.G.A., i. 100). In the Mosque in Mecca they were renewed every Ramadān (R.G.A., i. 100). On ceremonial occasions the miḥrāb was also draped with a carpet (ṣafṣaf, q.v.); in Medina, the miḥrāb and the sacred tomb was always covered like the Ka’ba in Mecca (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 83; cf. Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., i, ii, 91) and some, especially the teachers, had their skins (ṣarwa), in some cases also a cushion to lean upon. The doors were also covered with some material (Maḥrūz, iv. 56). On feast-days, the mosques were adorned with carpets in a particularly luxurious fashion (see Ibn Taḥrīrī, t. 41, 453). The Puritans rejected all this as bidʿa and preferred the bare ground (Maḥrīṣṭal, ii. 46, 49, 74, 74, 79) as the Wāhawkās still do.

k. Lighting. Where evening meetings and vigils were of regular occurrence, artificial lighting became necessary. Al-ʾAzrāqī gives the history of the lighting of the Meccan Mosque. The first to illuminate the Ka’ba was ʿUkba b. Al-ʾAzrāqī, whose house was next to the Mosque, just on the Maḥkīm; here he placed a large lamp (miḥdāḥ). Omar, however, is said previously to have placed lamps upon the wall, which was the height of a man, with which he surrounded the mosque (Baḥṣarī, p. 46). The first to use oil and lamps (ṣawādīl) in the mosque itself was Muḥammad (cf. R.G.A., i. 203). In the time of ʿAbd al-Malik, Khaṭīb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kaṣī placed a lamp on a pillar of the Zemzem beside the Black Stone, and the lamp of the Azrāq family disappeared. In the reign of al-Maʿmūn in 216 a new lamp-post was put up on the other side of the Ka’ba and a little later two new lanterns were put up around the Ka'ba Hārūn al-Raschīd (268–271) placed ten large lamps around the Ka’ba and hung two lanterns on each of the walls of the mosque (thawriyyāt; cf. Ibn Dhibbūn, Ḥiṣb, p. 149, 150, 155, 271; v. Berchem, Corp. Inscrip. Arabi, i, N° 506). Khālid al-Kaṣī had the masāʿ also illuminated during the pilgrimage and in 219 the torches called naṣṭāṭ were placed here and ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-Qays ordered the people, who lived in the streets of Mecca, to put up lamps on the 1st Muharram for the convenience of those visiting the Ka’ba (Chron. Mekk, p. 200–202, cf. 458 sq.). In 253 Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Muṣṭaf adorned a wooden pole in the centre of the qibṣ and ṭūwālī on ropes were hung from it. This was however very soon removed (ibid., ii. 196 sq.). About 100 years later, al-Mājṣīsī saw around the Tāwāf wooden poles on which hung lanterns (ṭūwālī) in which were placed candles for the kings of Egypt, Yemen, etc. (B.G.A., iii. 74). Ibn Dhibbūn describes the glass ṭūwālī, which hung from hooks in the Meccan Ḥanām (Ḥiṣb, p. 103) and lamps (ṭūwālī) which were lit in iron vessels (ibid., p. 103, cf. i. 143). Similar silver and gold ṭūwālī were seen by him in Medina (ibid., p. 192 at the top; see also Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 83 sqq.). According to al-Fakhrī (before 300), 1,000 lamps were lit every evening in Jerusalem (R.G.A., i. 100) and in the next century al-Maḥmūdī says that the people of Palestine always burn ṭūwālī in their mosques, which were hung from chains as in Mecca (R.G.A., iii. 182). The illumination was thus very greatly increased. In the year 60, when Ibn Ziyād was searching for his enemies in the mosque of Kāf, the lamps were not sufficient, and large torches had to be used in searching the pillared hall (Tabarī, ii. 21). Thus, it has already been said about Mecca, shows out of what modest beginnings this part of the mosque’s equipment developed.

In the time of the ʿAbbāsids, lamps and lanterns were part of the regular furniture of the mosque. Al-Maʿmūn is said to have taken a special interest in this. He ordered lamps to be put in all the mosques, partly to assist those who wanted to read and partly to prevent crime (Bahaṣī, ed. Schwally, p. 473). For this purpose, the ṭūwālī, already mentioned, hung on chains were used as at the building of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (Maḥrūz, iv. 36, 38), in the Azhar Mosque and elsewhere; they were often of silver (ibid., p. 56, 65). Golden ṭūwālī were also used and were of course condemned by Ibn al-Hādījī (Maḥrīṣṭal, p. 54) as ostentations. At the same time, candles (ṣāman or ṭūwaṣ) were used in large numbers, the candlesticks (ṭāwārī, sing. ṭawra) often hung of silver (Ibn Dhibbūn, Ḥiṣb, p. 45, 151, 194; cf. Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 95, 100. About 400, large candela were made in Egypt, which from their shapes were called tawārī, stoves. Al-Ḥākim presented the Mosque of ‘Amr with a tawārī made of 100,000 dirhams of silver; the mosque door had to be widened to admit it. He also gave it two other large ones (Suyūṭī, H. G. A., i. 206 inference). Nāṣiri Khosrow, ed. Schefer, p. 51 (text); p. 148 (transl.); Ibn Taḥrīrī, ed. Pepper, ii, iii. 105). In the Mosque of al-Ḥākim, in addition to lamps and candle-lanterns, he also put a silver tawārī and he made similar gifts to the Azhar and other mosques; the lamps were of gold or silver (Maḥrūz, ii. 51, 56, 63; cf. Ibn Taḥrīrī, ii. 105). The tawārī and other lanterns could also be made of copper (see v. Berchem, 343.
Corpus, i., No. 502, 503, 506, 507, 511), as, for example, the celebrated candelabrum of the Mosque of Mu'ayyad (Mekkâ, p. 137) which was made for the mosque of Hâshân but sold by it (ibid., p. 118).

This great interest in the lighting of the mosque was not entirely based on practical considerations. Light had an added divine in the divine service and Idrîs here, as elsewhere, was taking over something from the Church. When, in 227, the caliph was on his deathbed, he asked that the sabâṭ should be performed over him with candles and incense (bi 'l-’ishâna wa ‘l-bûkhrû) exactly after the fashion of the Christians (Ibn Abî ‘Uchina, i. 165; cf. ii. 89). The dependence of Idrîs on Christianity is also seen in the story that 'Othman, when he was going to the evening sabâṭ in Medîna, had a candle carried in front of him, which his enemies condemned as bâdan (Vatâqibî, ed. Houtsmma, ii. 197). The Shîa bias does not affect the significance of this story. A light was used particularly in the mihrâb, because it represented the holy cell, to which light belongs (cf. Sûra xxiv. 35). Then, in Mecca, lamps were placed before the imāms in the mihrâb and there were considerable endowments for such mihrâb lamps (Ibn Djubah, ribâh, p. 103. 144). Light, as was everywhere the custom in ancient times, was necessary in mausoleums and the documents of endowment show that a large number of oil-lamps was used in this way (cf. eg. the document for al-Mallik al-Ashraf's mausoleum, v. Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 525). But in the mosque generally the use of lights had a deeper symbolic significance and lamps might be endowed for particular individuals (cf. B.G.A., iii. 74, quoted above). The lamps mentioned in the prayers and minacat, were therefore placed in the mosques with great ceremony, with blasts of trumpets and beating of drums (Ibn Taghribîdî, ii. 105).

On ceremonial occasions a great illumination was therefore absolutely necessary. In the month of Râmâdân, says Ibn Djubah, the carpets were renewed and the candles and lamps increased in number, so that the whole mosque was a blaze of light (Ribâh, p. 143); on certain evenings trees were lighted with vast numbers of lamps and candles and the minaret illuminated (Ibid., p. 149–151. 154. 155). In the Mosque of the Prophet in the time of al-Sâmî, forty white candles burned around the sacred tomb, and three to four hundred lights in the whole mosque (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 100). On the masjid al-nâbi, says Kutb, Ibn Al-Dîn, a procession went from the Ka'ba in Mecca to the birthplace of the Prophet with candles, lanterns (wâqôf), and lamps (mu'âsir, see Chirn Meke, ii. 439). In the haram of Jerusalem, according to Mâakhir al-Dîn, 750 lamps were lit by night and over 20,000 at festivals (Sauvaire, Hist. Firm. et Hébron, p. 158). In the dome of the Sâkhrâ in 452 a chandelier and 500 lamps fell down (Ibid., p. 69); at the taking of the town in 492 (1099) the Franks carried off 42 silver lamps, each of 3,600 dirhams, 23 lamps of gold and a tenant of 40 rîf of silver (Ibid., p. 71). It was similar and still is in Cairo and elsewhere in the Muslim world. For the lâtail al-awlaqî in the Mosque of 'Amr, 18,000 candles were made for the Mosque of 'Amr and every night eleven and a half kilogram of good oil were used (Mâakhir, iv. 21 and more fully ii. 345 sqq.). The four "nights of illumination" fell in the months of Rajãb and Shabîn, especially Mâakhir (Quatremerie, Hist. Sult. Mant., i/ii. 131; cf. also Snouck-Hurgronje, Mekkâ, ii. 77). Quite recently (1908) electric light has been introduced into the Mosque of the Prophet (al-Batânîm. Ribâh, p. 245 sqq.).

[On the question in general see Clermont- Gammeau]. La lampe et l'olivier dans le Coran, in Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale, viii., 1924, p. 183–228; on the copper candelabra see A. Wingham, Report on the Analysis of various examples of Oriental Metal-Work etc. in the South Kensington Museum etc., London 1802; F. R. Martin, Altere Kupferarbeiten aus dem Orient, Stockholm 1902; on glass lamps see G. Schmoranz, Allorientalische Glas-Gefasse, Vienna 1898; v. Berchem, C.I.A., i. 678 sqq.; Max Herz Bey, La Mosquée du Sultan Hâvan (Comité de Conservation des Monuments de L'Art Arabe), 1899, p. 8 sqq.; see also the Bibliography in Ist., xvii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.).

i. Incense.

According to some traditions, even the Prophet had incense burned in the mosque (Tâmidî, i. 116; see Lammons, Moawwim, p. 367, note 8) and in the time of 'Omar, his client 'Abd Allâh is said to have perfumed the mosque by burning incense while he sat on the minbar. The same client is said to have carried the censer (muqamer: cf. Lammons, loc. cit.) brought by 'Omar from Syria before 'Omar when he went to the sabâṭ in the month of Râmâdân (A. Fischer, Biographie von Gewährsmännern etc., p. 55, note). According to this tradition, the use of incense was adopted into Islam very early as a palpable imitation of the custom of the Church. In keeping with this, the tradition that in al-Fusâl as early as the governorship of 'Amr, they 'lighed in the mosque to burn incense in the mosque (‘Abd al-Hakâma, p. 132; cf. Annali dell' Islam, iv. 565). The Sâkhrâ Mosque had incense burned in it during the consecration ceremony (Sauvaire, Hist. Firm. et Hébron, p. 53).

Under the Ommâyads, incense was one of the regular requirements of the mosque (tîb al-masjid; Tabari, i. 1234, 10). Mu'âwîya is named as the first to perfume the Ka'ba with perfume (bâdkûh) and censer (pisheba: B.G.A., v. 20, 12). It became the custom to anoint the sacred tombs with milk and tîb (Chron. Mekkâ, i. 150, 10). Ibn Djubah, Ribâh, p. 191, q. Baibars washed the Ka'ba with rose-water (Mâakhir, iv. 96, 14). Incense, as well as candles, was used at burials (cf. de Goeje, Z.P.M.G., 1905, p. 403 sqq.; Lammons, Moawwim, p. 436, note 9). Al-Mu'tasim's desire to be buried with candles and incense (bâdkûh) exactly like the Christians (Ibn Abî 'Uchina, i. 165, 12 sqq., cf. above) shows that they were aware that the custom bore much the same relation to the Christian usage, as the mosque building did to the church. The consumption of incense in the mosques gradually became very large, especially at festivals (see for the Fâtimids: Ibn Taghribîdî, ii/ii., 484, 12; ii/ii., ed. Popper. p. 106, 33; Mâakhir, iv. 51; on vessels for holding incense see the Bibliography in Ist., xvii., 1928, p. 217 sqq.).

j. Water-Supply.

Nothing is said of a water-supply in connection with the oldest mosques. The Mosque of Mecca occupied a special position on account of the Zamzam well. In the early days of Islam, two basins (baqar) are said to have been supplied by it, one behind the well, i.e. just at the side of the mosque for ta'anî and one between the well
and the ṭukan for drinking purposes; the latter was moved nearer the well by Ibn al-Zubair. In the time of Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Malik, a grandson of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbdās for the first time, built a ǧubba in connection with the Zemzem (Chron. Mecca, i. 299). At the same time, the governor Khalīl al-Kasrī laid down lead-piping to bring water from the well of al-Thābir to the mosque, to a marble basin (ṣbīḥa) with a running fountain (fawāara) between the Zemzem and the ṭukan, probably on the site of the earlier ǧubba.

It was intended to supply drinking-water in place of the saltish water of Zemzem, but a branch was led on to a birka at the Bāb al-Ṣafā, which was used for ritual ablutions. The people, however, would not give up the Zemzem water and immediately after the coming to power of the Ḥabbāsids, the provision for drinking-water was cut off, only the pipe leading to the birka being retained (ibid., i. 339 sq.). In Ibn Djbair’s time, there was, in addition to the Zemzem, a supply of water in vessels and a bench for performing the wudu’ (Rihla, p. 89). Khalīl’s plan, arrangements for ablutions at the entrance and a running fountain in the ǧubba seems to have been a typical Omayyad one and to have been introduced from the north. Such fountains were usual in the north, not only in private houses, but also for example in the aṭḥiron (strutum) surrounded by pillars, which, from Eusebius’s description, formed part of the church of Tyre (see Hauch in Herzog-Hauch, Realencycl. p. prot. Theol. u. Kirche, x. 782).

The usual name for the basin, ṣbīḥa (in Egypt now ṣaṣiḥa) is ṣīṭīna, which in the Miṣrīna and in Syria takes the form ṣīṭīn (see Levy, Nahrī, u. child. Worterbuch, iv. 81); Francken, Fremdwörter, p. 124; ṣīṭīna, found in al-ʿIrāqī, Chron. Mecca, i. 340 (probably due to a slip). At the same time, however, birka or ṣbīḥa or ṣbīḥi, which probably comes from the Persian (cf. Francken, op. cit., p. 287) or the old Arabic ḥawād are also used.

The arrangements for ablutions were called maṭābih or maṣṣāḥa, sing. niḍāla (now usually niḍāla), “place for wudu’”. The accommodation in Mecca just mentioned was later extended. Ibn Djbair mentions a building at al-Zāhirī, 1 mil north of Mecca which contained maṭābih and ṣīṭīna for those performing the minor ṣamāʿa (Rihla, p. 111).

In Medina, Ibn Djbair mentions rooms for ṣawṣaw at the western entrance to the mosque (Rihla, p. 197, 13 sq.; cf. the plan in al-Batanunī, Rihla, facing p. 244). At the same time Ibn Zāhid mentions seventeen receptacles for water in the ǧubba in the year 199, probably for drinking-water; later (vii cent.) a large basin in front of a railing is mentioned in the centre of the court. It was intended for drinking purposes, but became used for bathing and was therefore removed. Baths and latrines were built anew by al-Nāṣir’s mother (Wustenfeld, Medina, p. 99 sq.).

In Damas, where every house, as is still the case, was amply supplied with water, Yākūt (d. 626 = 1229) found no mosque, madrasa or ḫānakāh which did not have water flowing into a birka in the ǧubba (Yākūt, ii. 590). Ibn Djbair describes the arrangements in the Mosque of the Omayyads. In the ǧubba, as is still the case, there were four large ǧubbas. The centre one rested on four marble columns, and below it was a basin with a spring of drinking-water surrounded by an iron grille. This was called qafṣ al-māʾ “water-cage”.

North of the ǧubba was a Masjd al-Kaʾlaṣa in the ǧubba of which there was again a ẓībīd of marble with a spring (Ibn Djbair, Rihla, p. 267). There was also running water in an adjoining maṭṣḥad (p. 269), in the ḥānakāh and madrasa (p. 271), and in a hall beside the living apartments there was again a ǧubba with a basin (ḥawād) and spring water (p. 269). There were also ṣīṭāyāt against the four outer walls of the mosque, whole houses fitted up with lavatories and closets (p. 275); a century earlier, we are told that at each entrance to the mosque there was a niḍāla (B. G. A., iii. 159). The whole arrangements correspond exactly to those made by Khalīl al-Kasrī in Mecca in the Omayyad period and must therefore date from the Omayyad.

It was the same in other Syrian and Mesopotamian towns. In Sūrār, al-Mutawakkil built in his new djamāʿ a fawāara with constant running water (B. G. A., vii. 265). In Nasirin, the river was led through the ǧubba of the mosque into a ṣīṭīd; there was also a ṣīṭīd at the eastern entrance with two ṣīṭāyāt in front of the mosque (Ibn Djbair, Rihla, p. 239). In Mawsil in the mosque, which dated from the Omayyad period, there was an entrance with a marble throne over it (ibid., p. 235). In Hadrān, there were in the ǧubba three marble ǧubbas with ḥawād and drinking-water (ibid., p. 246), in Haleb (ibid., p. 253).

In Rihla there were three ḥawād with Euphrates water in front of the djamāʿ (ibid., p. 212) but in the mosque in a ṣīṭīna a domed building with running water (Yākūt, iv. 325, 326, here called ṣināʾin; cf. R. G. A., v. 173; Ibn Djbair, p. 89, 267). It was the same in Amid (Nāṣir-i Ḵhosrow, ed. Schefer, p. 28) and in Zarand in Sīḡistan (B. G. A., ii. 298 sq.). The principal mosques of the ʿIrāq had ṣīṭāyāt at the entrances, for which, according to a remarkable note by Makdisi, rents were paid (B. G. A., iii. 129, read ṣawṣaw; cf. maṭābih; Ibn Djbair, p. 89). In Palestine also, in al-Makdisi’s time, there were conveniences for ablutions at the entrances to the djamāʿ (muṭābih: R. G. A., iii. 182; Maṭṣḥīd: ibid., i. 68) and in Ṣan’a in the fourth century, beside each mosque, there was water for drinking and for ṣawṣaw (B. G. A., vii. 111). In Persia also, it was the custom to have a ḥawād in front of the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 318) and there was drinking-water in the mosque itself on a bench (kursī) in iron jars into which ice was put on Friday (ibid., p. 327). Not only at the Zemzem well but also in the mosques of the ʿIrāq, men were appointed whose duty it was to distribute drinking-water (B. G. A., iii. 216). The regular custom, however, was to have at the entrance to, or in front of the mosque, conveniences for ṣawṣaw, in the court of the mosque itself a fountain as the traditional ornament and for drinking water. It was the exception for the ṣawṣaw to take place in the mosque itself.

In Egypt at first the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was arranged similarly to the Syrian mosques. In the centre of the ǧubba there was a gilt dome, supported by sixteen marble columns and surrounded by a railing. This upper storey was supported by nineteen marble columns and below was a marble basin (ṣaṣṣa) with a running fountain (fawāara): the ṣawṣaw was called from the dome (Miṣrī, iv. 37, the description is not quite clear). People complained that there were no arrangements for washing (niḍāla) there. Ibn Tulun replied that
he had not made them because he had concluded the mosque would be polluted thereby. Therefore he made a miṣrā'a with an apothecary’s shop behind the mosque (ibid., p. 38, 39; Ḥusayn al-Muḥājir, ii. 139; Ibn Taḥḥān, i. 14). This suggests that previously in Egypt the washing arrangements had been directly connected with the mosque. After the fire of the year 376, the ʿājziyya was renovated by al-ʿAziz (Maḳrizī, iv. 401, in 666 again by al-Ḥanīf, whose inscription still exists (C.F.L., i. 31, p. 106). A new miṣrā'a was built in 792 beside the old one on the north, outside the mosque (Maḳrizī, iv. 42).

The Mosque of ʿAmr first got a ʿājziyya in the time of al-ʿAziz. In 378-379 his vizier Yaḥyā b. Killis installed one in the cupola, already in existence for the bālt al-māl. Marble jars were put there for the water (probably drinking-water) (Maḳrizī, v. 9, 11; cf. Ḥusayn al-Muḥājir, ii. 130; Yaḥyā, iii. 899). A new water basin was installed by Saʿlāl b. ʿAbd Allāh at the times of the ʿājziyya from the Nile. This was prohibited in the reign of Ḥaḍīr al-Ḥanūfī (658-676) by the chief ʿājziyya himself, because the building was being filled with clouds of dust (Maḳrizī, iv. 14; Ḥusayn al-Muḥājir, iv. 47). The emir, who restored it, brought the water for the ʿājziyya from a well in the street (Maḳrizī, iv. 15).

Like Ibn Ṭūlūn, the ʿAjamīs do not seem to have considered the miṣrā'a indispensable. For the Aḥār Mosque had originally no miṣrā'a: as late as al-Maḳrī's waqfīj document for the provision of miṣrā'a, money is given only with the provision that something of the kind should be made (Maḳrizī, iv. 51, 54). At a later date we hear of two miṣrā'a's, one at the adjoining Aḥbāqawiyya (ibid., p. 54). On the other hand, there was already a ʿājziyya in the centre of the court, but whether it had existed from the first is not known. It had disappeared, when traces of it were found in 827 in laying-out a new ʿājziyya (ibid., p. 54). Theexcavations of the Mosque of al-Ḥākim were not erected by the founder. I see that of the Mosque of ʿAmr, it was removed in 660 by the ʿājziyya b. ʿAbd Allāh at the time of the ʿājziyya; but after the earthquake of 702, it was again rebuilt and provided with drinking-water from the Nile (ibid., p. 56, 57) and again renovated after 780 (ibid., p. 61). A small miṣrā'a, later replaced by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (ibid., p. 61). Other ʿAjamī mosques had basins in the ʿājziyya, which were supplied from the Nile and from the Khaṭṭ (ibid., p. 76, 81, 120).

The traditional plan was retained in the period following also. For example, we know that the emir Tūḥān in 815 placed a bālt in the centre of the ʿAjamī mosque, which was covered by a roof supported by marble pillars and supplied by the same pipe as the already existing miṣrā'a as (Maḳrizī, iv. 107, cf. 124, 128, 130 etc.). At the ceremonial dedication of mosques, it was the custom for the patron to fill the bālt in the ʿājziyya with sugar, lemonade or other sweet things (e.g. al-Maʿayyid, in 822. Maḳrizī, iv. 139; Mawḍūʿat Djamāl al-Dīn in 811: ibid., p. 253; another in 757: ibid., p. 256).

The importance of the ʿājziyya of the mosque, as a drinking-place, diminished as pious founders erected drinking fountains everywhere (cf. for Mecca, Cron. M. M., ii. 116-118; also P.G.L., iv. 211, v. Ṣuḥayl, p. 258, v. al-Maʾṣūrī) and especially when it became the custom to build a sabil with a boy’s school in part of the mosque (see below, E 4 end). A ḥawd for watering animals was also sometimes built in the vicinity of the mosque (Maḳrizī, iv. 76). Sometimes also the birka of the ʿājziyya was used for washing. In the year 799 the emir Yelbughā made arrangements for this in the Aḥmar mosque so that one could get water for ṣahrū from taps from a birka put up in the ʿājziyya (Maḳrizī, iv. 76). Maḳrizī condemns this addition, but only because there was already a miṣrā'a at the entrance and the ʿājziyya was too small for the new one (ibid.) and not on account of the water; and it was only because the wall was damaged that the emir’s gift was removed in 815 (ibid., p. 77).

The custom of using the water supply of the ʿājziyya for ṣahrū survived in many places in Egypt. The arrangements were therefore usually called miṣrā'a or rather mālī (which is not found in the inscriptions).

If they had taps, they were called ḥanəfīyya; according to Lane’s suggestion because the Ḥanafis only permitted ablutions with running water or from a cistern 10 ells broad and deep (Lexicon, s. v.; cf. Manners and Customs. Everyman’s Library, p. 69; cf. on the question: Max Heriz, Observations critiques sur les bassins dans les Šahrs des Mosquées, P. L. E., iii 7, 1896, p. 47-51; do., La Mosquée du Sultan Ḥasan, p. 2; Herz wrongly dates the modern usage from the Turkish conquest in 1517). In quite recent times the miṣrā'a’s have often been moved outside to special buildings. Ibn al-Ḥaḍīdījī condemns bringing water into the mosque, because the only object is for ablutions and ablutions in the mosque are forbidden by “our learned men” (Maḳḳāl, ii. 47 sqq. 49); like shaving, ablutions should be performed outside the mosque in keeping with the Prophet’s saying: “ṣahrū maṭbūḥakum ʿalā ʿaṣabī maṣjadiyyakum (ibid., ii. 58).

It was in keeping with this principle that in earlier times the miṣrā'a was usually put at the entrance and the barbers took up their places before the entrance (cf. the name Bāb al-Muṣayyinin “The Barbers’ Gate” for the main entrance to the Aḥmar mosque). Miṣrā'a’s were also to be found in hospitals; thus the “lower hospital” was given two in 346, one of which was for washing corpses (Ibn Daḳḳāḳ, p. 99 infra).

E. The Mosque as a State Institution.

1. The Mosque as a Political Centre. Its Relation to the Ruler.

It was inherent in the character of Islam that religion and politics could not be separated. The same individual was ruler and chief administrator in the two fields, and the same building, the mosque, was the centre of gravity for both politics and religion. This relationship found expression in the fact that the mosque was placed in the centre of the camp, while the ruler’s abode was built immediately adjacent to it, as in Medina (and in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, Damascus, Baya, Kūfa). We can see how this dār al-mārār or ḥawd (so for Kūfa: Tabari, ii. 230 sqq; ḥawd al-mārār: ibid., p. 234) with the growth of the mosque gradually became incorporated in it in al-Fuṣṭāṭ and Damascus and was replaced by a new building. The tradition remained so strong that in Cairo, where the main chief mosque Djamāl al-Akṣar was being planned in 169, a Dār Ummara Miṣr was built beside it with direct access to the mosque (Maḳrizī, iv. 33...
and when Ibn Tūlūn built his mosque, a building called the Dār al-Imāra was erected on its south side, where the ruler, who now lived in another new palace, had rooms for changing his dress, etc., from which he could go straight into the maqṣūra (ibid., p. 42).

The ʿAbbasids at the foundation of Baḥdādd introduced a characteristic innovation, when they made the palace the centre of the city; the case was similar with Fāṭimid Cairo; but Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik in Ramla had already built the palace in front of the mosque (Ballādhuri, p. 140). Later rulers who no longer lived just beside the mosque, had special balconies or something similar built for themselves in or beside the mosque. Šalāḥ al-Dīn built for himself a manṣūra under the great minaret of the mosque of ʿAmr (Maḥrūz, iv. 13; Ḥusn al-Muḥāṣṣara, ii. 137) and just to the south of the Azhar mosque the Fāṭimids had a manṣūra from which they could overlook the mosque (Maḥrūz, ii. 345).

The caliph was the appointed leader of the Ṣāfāt and the khāṭib of the Muslim community. The significance of the mosque for the state is therefore embodied in the minbar. The installation of the caliph consisted in his seating himself upon this, the seat of the Prophet in his sovereign capacity. When homage was first paid to Abū Bakr by those who had decided the choice of the Prophet’s successor, he sat on the minbar. ʿOmar delivered an address, the people paid homage to him and he delivered a khutba, by which he assumed the leadership (by Ḥizb al-Muʾād� ibn Ḥisham, i. 1828 sq.; K. al-Ḵalīṣ, ii. 75; Yaḥṣūb, i. 142); it was the same with ʿOmar and ʿUthmān (ibid., p. 157, 187).

The khutba, after the glorification of God and the Prophet, contained a reference to the caliph’s predecessor and a kind of formal introduction of himself by the new caliph. It was the same in the period of the Omayyads and the ʿAbbasids (see for al-Walīd: Ṭabari, ii. 1177 sq.; ab-Amin: ibid., iii. 764; al-Mahdi: ibid., iii. 386, 451, 457; cf. on this question also Bukhārī, Aḥkām, bāb 43).

The minbar and the khutba associated with it were still more important than the imāmate at the ʿāṣr, it was minbar al-mulk (Hamza, ed. Freytag, p. 659, v. 4). According to a hadith, the Prophet mentioned the little Hasan up to the minbar and said, “This my son is a chieftain” etc. (Bukhārī, Manāṣīḥ, bāb 25). This reflects the later custom by which the ruler saw that homage was paid to him to his successor-designate; this was also done from the minbar (cf. khutba yaraa al-djumʿa li ʿl-Muʿā-ṣaff bi-waḥlāyat al-ʿāṣr, Ṭabari, iii. 2131). The Fāṭimids showed honour to a distinguished officer by allowing him to sit beside them on the minbar (Huṣn al-Muḥāṣṣara, i. 91); in the same way Muʿāwiya allowed Ibn ʿAbd Allāh b. Maʿmūn and the deputation of Muḥammad b. Hūrin (Ṭabari, iii. 861 sq.; cf. for al-Mahdi: ibid., p. 389). There are other cases in which the formal installation of the ruler took place on or beside the minbar (Aḫlāṣi, 2nd ed. Cairo, i. 12; Wüstenfeld, Medina, p. 15). Even at much a later date, when spontaneous acclamation by the populace was no longer of any importance, the ceremonial installation on the minbar was still of importance (Maḥrūz, iv. 94). It had become only a formality but still an important one. Homage was paid to the ʿAbbasid caliphs in Egypt in the great ṣawāma of the palace or in a tent in which a minbar had been put up, and similarly to the sultan whose investiture was read out from the minbar (cf. Quṭramēr, Ḥift. Sull. Maml., i/ii. 117, 149 sqq., 183 sqq.). If one dreams that he was sitting on the minbar, it meant that he would become sultan (ibid., ii/ii. 103). — The ʿAbbasid caliph had however long had his own throne after the old Persian fashion in his palace (al-Tādīr fi Abīlāk al-Malik, ed. Aḥmad Zāki, Cairo 1914, p. 7 sqq.) and so had the Fāṭimids (Ibn Ṭaghrīrdī, ii. 457) and the Mamluks (Quṭramēr, cf. cit., i. 17; cf. 147). When later we find mention of the kuriṣ ʿl-ṭalīfā (v. Berchem, Corpus, i., no. 33), sarir al-mulk (Chron. Mekka, iii. 113), sarir al-sulṭana (Maḥrūz, ii. 157; cf. al-saṣādir, royal throne: B. G. A., ii. 228, 285; kuriṣ similarly cf.: Ibn ʿArabshāh, Vīta Timurī, ed. Manger, ii. 486) or marṭabat al-mulk (Quṭramēr, cf. cit., i/ii. 61), the reference is no longer to the minbar. This does not mean that the ruler could no longer make public appearances in the mosques: thus in 648 Muʿāz Abāk regularly gave audiences in al-madīrān al-ṣāliḥiya (Quṭramēr, Ḥift. Sull. Maml., i/ii. 17) and memorial services for Ṭabari were held a year after his death in several mosques, madāris and khanāqāhs in Cairo (677 = 1278; ibid., ii/ii. 164 sq.).

The caliph spoke chiefly from the minbar of the capital, but when he made the pilgrimage he also spoke from the manābīr in Mecca and Medina (cf. e.g. Ṭabari, ii. 1234; Yaḥṣūb, ii. 341, 501; Chron. Mekka, i. 160). Otherwise in the provinces, the governor stood in the same relation to the mosques as the caliph in the capital. He was appointed “over al-ṣalāt and sword” or he administered “justice among the people” and the ʿāṣr (Ṭabari, iii. 860), he had “province and minbar” under him (ibid., ii. 611), ab-lavāya ta l-ʿāṣr (B. G. A., iii. 337). Speaking from the minbar was a right which the caliph had delegated to the provincial governor and this was done in the name of the caliph. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ therefore refused to allow people in the country to hold ḍjuma’ except under the direction of the governor (Maḥrūz, iv. 7). This point of view was never quite abandoned. The khutba was delivered “in the name of” the caliph (ibid., p. 94) or “for” him (ii: ibid., p. 66, 74, 198; Ibn Ṭaghrīrdī, i/ii. 85 infra: B. G. A., iii. 485 infra) and in the same way an emir delivered a khutba “for” a sultan (Maḥrūz, iv. 213, 214). The sultan did not have the “secular” and the caliph the “spiritual” power, but the sultan exercised as a Muslim ruler the actual power which the caliph possessed as the legitimate sovereign and had normally entrusted to him. During the struggles between the different pretenders, there was thus a confession of one’s politics if one performed the ʿāṣr with the one or the other governor (Ṭabari, ii. 228, 234, 258; Chron. Mekka, ii. 168). The pretenders disputed as to whether the one or the other could put up his standard beside the minbar (Ṭabari, iii. 2009).

The caliph, the governor also made his formal entry into office by ascending the minbar
and delivering a khutba; this was the symbol of his authority (e.g. Tabari, ii. 91, 228, 242; Chron. Mkh., ii. 173; cf. Harawi, p. 660, v. 2-3; Iskand., ii. 132). After glorifying God and the Prophet, he announced his appointment and read the kätir from the pulpit and the remainder of his address, if there was a war going on, was exclusively political and often consisted of crude threats. The khutba was not inseparably connected with the Friday service. The commander-in-chief could at any time issue a summons to the sälät and deliver his khutba with admonitions and orders (see Tabari, iii. 379, s.v. 298, 300, 875, 1179) and it was the same when he left a province (ibid., p. 241); a governor who could not preserve his authority with the khutba, was dismissed (ibid., p. 592).

Since war was inseparably associated with early Islam and the mosque was the public meeting-place of rulers and people, it often became the scene of warlike incidents. While the governor in his khutba was issuing orders and admonitions relating to the fighting, cheer and counter-cheers could be uttered (ibid., p. 538) and councils of war were held in the mosque (Tabari, i. 314; ii. 287). Soon after his election, Abd al-Malik asked from the minbar who would take the field against Ibn al-Zubair and al-Hajjaj b. Yashair; he was ready to go (Chron. Mkh., ii. 20). After the battle of the Camel, Ali sent the body to the mosque of Basra and A'isha looked for another mosque (Tabari, i. 317, 323). Rowdy scenes occasionally took place in mosques (Kindi, Waw., p. 18); Yazid was stoned on the minbar (Tabari, ii. 88); one could ride right into the mosque and show no respect to the governor sitting on the minbar (ibid., p. 682); fighting often took place in and beside the mosque (ibid., p. 600, 1701 sqq.; Wustenfeld, Med. und Kultur, p. 13 sqq.); sometimes for this reason, the governor was surrounded by his bodyguard during the sälät or on the minbar or even clothed in full armour (al-Walid; Tabari, ii. 1234; Yâkub, ii. 341; al-Hajjaj b. Yashair; Tabari, ii. 254; sälät and sword were thus closely associated in reality).

It thus came to be the custom for the enemies of the ruler and his party to be cursed in the mosques. This custom continued the old Arab custom of regular campaign of obscenities between two tribes but can also be paralleled by the Byzantine ecclesiastical anathematization of heretics by Becker, Med. und Kultur, i. 485; Girsh. d. d'Eth. Chrétiens)

The first to introduce the official cursing of the Alids from the minbar of the Kâba is said to have been Khalid al-Karri (Chron. Mkh., ii. 56). The first cursing of the Alids was because of special events. al-Mansur, v. 102. Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 248; see also Ibn Isma'îl, p. 180 sqq.) Like the blessing upon the ruler, it was no longer a custom (Tabari, iv. 164). It was also recorded in inscriptions in the mosque (Ibn Abul-Hajjaj, ii. 61, ed. Popper, p. 62, 64; cf. also Mec. 9.9-10. According to this idea, Tabari, in 2164; Anathemata were also pronounced on other occasions; for example, Salih made al-Hajjaj b. Yashair attabulate in the minbar, and al-Ma'mun Ibn Tulun solemnly cursed from the minbar Tabari, in 2048). And other rulers had Mu'tazili heretics cursed from the pulpit (see Mez, op. cit., p. 198, cf. against Ibn Taimiya: Quatremère, Hist. Sulf. Islam., ii. 256). Ibn Baṭṭuṭa describes the tumultuous scene with thousands of armed men uttering threats in a mosque in Bagdad when a Shī' khutba was on the minbar (ii. 58).

It was very natural to mention with a blessing upon him the ruler in whose name the Friday khutba was delivered. Ibn 'Abbas, where governors of Basra are said to have been the first to pronounce such a dâ'âd over Ali (Ibn Khaldun, Makhdum, i s. 37, end); it is not improbable that the custom arose out of the reciprocal obligations of 'Alids and Omeyyads; the khutba, who had to curse the 'Alids in the mosques, used to pray for the Omeyyads (Maqrizi, p. 17). Under the 'Abbasids, the custom became the usual form of expressing loyalty to the ruler (Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 11, 151). After the caliph, the name of the local ruler or governor was mentioned (ibid., p. 156, 161); even in Bagdad in 396 by order of the caliph al-Muktafi, the actual ruler 'Abd al-Rahman b. Ja'far was mentioned in the dâ'âd (Ibn Miskawaih, vi. 499; Cairo 1915, p. 396) and the Bâyids, according to al-Maqrizi, also mentioned the khutba in the remote parts of the kingdom (this is evident from the above-mentioned expression khutba tahtâ, for which we also find 'ashâr: see F. G. A., ii. 20; iii. 337, 338, 400, 472, 485; cf. Glossary, s. v.). There is also evidence that prayers used to be uttered for the heir-apparent (Maqrizi, iv. 37; Kindi, al-Waw., ed. Amerdori, p. 420). Under the Mamlikus also, the sultan's heir was mentioned (Quatremère, Hist. Sulf. Islam., ii. 101; iv. 3). Under the Fatimids, it was even the custom to call 'alamân upon the ruler from the minaret after the afdâân al-sulâm (Maqrizi, iv. 45); this also took place under the Mamlikus (e.g. in 966 = 1269, when the aman was elected: Quatremère, Hist. Sulf. Islam., iv. 45). The prayer for the sovereign in the khutba did not find unanimous approval among the learned (see Snouck Hurgrone, Veroordelde Geschriften, ii. 214 sqq.).

In general, the mosque, and particularly the minbar, was the place where official proclamations were made, of course as early as the time of the Prophet (Bukhari, Sahih, bab 70, 71); 'Othman's bloodstained shirt was hung upon the minbar (Tabari, i. 255); messages from the caliph were read from it (ibid., in 2084). Al-Walid announced from the minbar the deaths of two distinguished governors (Ibn Taghribirdi, i. 242); the results of battles were announced in khutbas (Yâkub, ii. 647; 'alîf 'al-farîd, ii. Cairo 1321, p. 149 sqq.). In the Fatimid and 'Abbasid periods also proclamations, orders, edicts about taxation etc. by the ruler were announced in the principal mosque (Tabari, ii. 40; iii. 2165; Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 68; Maqrizi, ittisâh, ed. Bünz, p. 87; Hâmid, Quatremère, Hist. Sulf. Islam., vii. 892; vii. 44, 151); documents appointing the more important officers were also read upon the minbar (Kindi, Wâd., p. 580, 599, 603, 604 etc. par.: Maqrizi, ii. 246; iv. 43, 88); frequently the people trooped into the mosque to hear an official announcement (Kindi, Wâd., p. 14; cf. Dors, Gesch. d. Mecr. in Spanien, i. 170).

After the position of the caliph had changed, tradition was so far retained that he still delivered the khutba in the principal mosque on special occasions,
particularly at festivals. Thus the Fātimid al-Aziz preached in the mosque of al-Hākim on its completion (Maqrizi, iv. 55) and in the month of Ramaḍān he preached in the three chief mosques of Cairo, one after the other (ibid., p. 53; cf. 61 sq.), Ibn Taghribirdi, ii. 482 sqq.; exceptionally also in al-Kāshidī: Maqrizi, iv. 63). The Abbāsid caliph also used to preach at festivals (e.g. al-Kāshī, al-Idrāk, ii. 349 sqq.); it was the exception when a zealot like al-Muhādi (257) followed the old custom and preached every Friday (Masūdī, Muṣāf, viii. 2). Even the caliphs faisamit in Egypt preached occasionally (Maqrizi, iv. 942; Quatraro, Hist. Sittl. Moul. 1/si. 158 sqq.). Although the mosque lost its old political importance in its later history, it has never quite lost its character as the place of assembly on occasions of public importance. This is evident from al-Ijārizī’s history and even quite recently large meetings have been held in the mosques of Egypt on questions of nationalist politics.

2. The Mosque and public administration.

The actual work of government was very early transferred from the mosque to a special diwan or magistracy (see Talbar, G., 1, x), and negotiations were carried on and business frequently done in the qāṣ al-imāra (cf. Talbar, ii. 230 sqq.) but when financial business had to be transacted at public meetings, the mosque was used; of this there is particular evidence from Egypt. Here the director of finance used to sit in the Mosque of ʿAmr and auction the farming out of the domains, with a crier and several financial officers to assist him. Later the Ḍiwān was transferred to the Ḥāʾim ʿAḥmad b. Tūlūn but even after 300 A.H. we find Abū Bāk al-Mādhara’ī sitting on such occasions in the Mosque of ʿAmr. Under the Fātimids the vizier Yaḥyā b. Killis—used first the dār al-imāra of the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (see above), later his own palace and afterwards the caliphs’ qāṣ was used (Maqrizi, i. 131 sqq.). In the same way, in the reign of Muʿawiyah, the Coptic churches were used and the taxation commission took up their offices in them (Papakyx Erzherzog Rainer, Führer durch die Ausstellung, No. 577); and Ibn Rosta (c. 290 = 900) says that the officials in charge of the measurement of the Nile, when they noticed the rising of the river, went at once to the chief mosque and announced it at once bālī after another, at the same time scattering flowers on those seated there (R. G. A., vii. 116).

The connection with administration was also seen in the fact that the treasure-chest, the baḥt al-māl, was identical with the qāṣ. Kindi, Wulatt, p. 70, 117 was kept in the mosque in al-Ṭustal Usama b. Zaid, the director of finance, in 97 and 99 built in the Mosque of Amra qubba on pillar in front of the minbar for the baḥt al-māl of Egypt. A drawbridge was placed between it and the roof. In the time of Ibn Rosta (c. 300) it was still possible to move about freely below the qubba but in 378–379 al-Aziz put up a running fountain below it (R. G. A., vii. 116; Maqrizi, iv. 9, 11, 13; Ḥmān al-Mādhara’ī, ii. 135; Yaḥyā b. Sahn). Al-Kindi records an attempt to steal the chest in 145 (Wulatt, p. 112 sq.). In the disturbed years about 300, the wall al-Nāşirī closed the mosque between the times of sālāt for the safety of the chest, which was also done in Ibn Rosta’s time (Kindi, Wulatt, p. 266: R. G. A., vii. 116). New approaches to the Baḥt al-Mal were made in 422 from the khūzā of the mosque and from the Diwān (Maqrizi, iv. 13).

In Kufa, the baḥt al-mālāʾ was, at least during the early period, were in the Ṣar al-Imāra (Tabari, 1 2459, 2491 sqq.); in the year 58 during the fighting, it was saved from Ḥayra and taken with the minbar to the Mosque of al-Haddān (ibid., p. 3414 sqq.). In Palestine, in the chief mosque of each town, there was a similar arrangement to that in the Mosque of ʿAmr (R. G. A., ii. 182). In Damascus the baḥt al-mālāʾ was in the most western of the three qubbas in the court of the Mosque of the Omayyads; it was of lead and rested on S columns (R. G. A., iii. 157; Ibn Ḥajjāh, p. 264, 267; Ibn ʿAṯār, i. 200 sqq.); it is still called qubba al-ʿlāʾīna (“treasure-cupola”), earlier qubba ʿalīha (cf. Baedeker, Palestina und Syrien). In the time of the two travellers mentioned, the qubba only contained property of the mosque. Ibn Ḥajjāh saw a similar qubba in the chief mosque of Ḥarrān and says that it came from the Byzantines (p. 246). In Ashkhabad also by the time of ʿAḥšārī, the Syriac church had been everywhere introduced (R. G. A., i. 18). In Ḥamah in the centre of the town, there was a building with marble columns and doors (R. G. A., in 316) which perhaps points to a similar statement of affairs and in Armenia it is recorded that the baḥt al-mālāʾ was kept in the Ḥamah in the time of the Omayyads as in Nis and elsewhere (R. G. A., ii. 241). The qubba was usually of lead and had an iron door and Ibn al-Hadżycli considers it highly illegal to shut off a diwan in a mosque, which is the same as forbidding entrance to it. This shows that the custom still survived in his time.

Ibn Ḥajjāh’s remark about Ḥarrān suggests that here again we have an inheritance from Byzantium. It was probably the building belonging to the pisamaw (cf. above) that the Musulim put to a practical use in this way. For Byzantium had the treasure caelis in the palace, and the treasure-chamber of the church (skepophylakion) were built in this way (cf. Fr. Dolger, in Byzantinischer Arch. Heft p. 1297, p. 26, 34).

3. The Mosque as a court of justice.

That the Prophet used to settle legal disputes in his mosque was natural (see Bakht, T. sâm 19, 29 etc. of Ṣalāt, i. 71, Komite, i. 41); but he could also deliver judgments in other places (ibid. pass. In Ḥajjāh it is recorded that some kāfis of the earlier period from Ṣabrah, al-Shāh, Yaḥyā b. ʿUmar, Marāzhī, at judgment beside the minbar, ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣan, Zaynā b. Afṣaf on the open square outside the mosque (Bakht, T. sâm, i. 18). The coutoms had all the better chance of survival, as churches were used in the same way (Joshua’s styli, ed. Wright, p. 29; cf. Mir, Komite, p. 223). Sitting in judgment was primarily the business of the royal ruler but he had to have assistants and Abū Bakr’s kāfi was mentioned as assisting ʿOmar (Tabari, i. 2155) and a number of judges appointed by ʿOmar are mentioned (R. G. A., vii. 227). In the reign of ʿOthmān, ʿAbd Allāh b. Māṣūf is said to have been judge and financial administrator of Kufa (Ibn Kaita, M. sâm, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 128). On the other hand, we are told that ʿAbd Allāh
b. Nāṣāf, appointed by Marāwa in 42, was the first kādi in Islam (Ṭabarî, ii. 2477): it is recalled that in the year 132 the kādi of Medina administered justice in the mosque (ibid., p. 2505). In Bāṣra, we are told that al-Aswād b. Sarī al-Tamīm immediately after the building of the mosque (i.e., in 40) worked in this capacity (Baladhurî, p. 349). In the early period 'Omar wanted to choose a kādi, who had been already acting as a judge before Islam (Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 301 sq.; Ḥasan al-Muḥājīra, ii. 86). Even the Christian poet al-Aslāmī was allowed to act as arbiter in the mosque of Kufa (see Lummens, Mu‘āwīya, p. 435 sg.).

In al-Fuṣṭāl, as early as 23 or 24 H. by command of 'Umar b. al-‘Aṣ, appointed a kādi named ‘Abd (Ḥasan al-Muḥājīra, ii. 86; Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 300 sq.). The kādi held his sessions in the Mosque of ‘Amar but not exclusively there. The kādi ‘Abd b. Ṣu‘d (120–127) held his sessions sometimes before his house, sometimes in the mosque and for Christians on the steps leading up to the mosque (Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 351 sg.). A successor of his (177–184) invited Christians who had lawsuits into the mosque to be heard (ibid., p. 391); of another judge (205–211) it is recorded that he was not allowed to sit in the mosque (ibid., p. 428). It seems that the kādi could himself choose where he would sit. A judge, officiating in the year 217, sat in winter in the great pillared hall turning his back towards the kiblah wall and in summer in the sān near the western wall (ibid., p. 443 sg.). During the Fātimid period, the weekly building on the north-east of the Mosque of ‘Amar was reserved for the judge. This judge, called from the year 376 onwards kādi al-fāṣīf (cf. Ḥasan al-Muḥājīra, ii. 91; Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 590), sat on Tuesday and Saturday in the mosque and laid down the law (Maqārī, ii. 246; iv. 26, 22; cf. Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 587, 589; cf. Ma‘sūm, trans. Schefer, p. 149).

Ya‘qūb’s time in Baghdad, the judge of the city used to sit in his chief mosque (B.G.A. viii. 82; cf. in Damascus the vice-kādi in the fourth century had a special iwal in the Mosque of the Omayyads (F.G.I. iii. 158, and the notables (al-shu‘ā‘īn) also sat in the Mosque of the Omayyads at the Bab al-Ṣalāh (ibid., p. 17)). In Nisābūr, every Monday and Thursday, the mālekh al-kāmis was held in a special mosque (ibid., p. 528). In course of time the judge was given a ma‘līkh al-kāmis of his own (cf. Ḥusayn, ii. 99) and in 279 al-Muṭahhīd wanted to forbid the kādī to hold sessions in the mosques (Ibn Kahrîbîrî, i. 57 infra): perhaps however we should read ‘īrāq; see Goldziher, Mat. Stud., ii. 163, note 4). Justice was also administered in the dār al-dār (qubātāri, Hist. Sult. Iran., ii. 79). But the administration of justice did not at once lose all connection with the mosque. Under the Fāṭimid the custom had been introduced that the kādi should hold sittings in his house, but Ibn al-Awāsim, appointed just after 400 H., held them either in the Fāṣarī at the Bait al-Mal or in a side-room (Kindī, Wulâ‘a, p. 612; cf. Ibn Taghribirdî, ed. Popper, ii. ii. p. 69; Kāshāshānî, Sharh 'Al‘ī, li. 457; for 439 = 1048, see Nāṣīr Khān, c. 54, text, p. 149, transl.) In Mecca, the dār al-fāṣīf was in direct connection with the mosque (Ibn Dhu‘ayr, p. 104). In the sixth century Ibn Baṭṭārī attended a court presided over by an eminent juris in a mosque (madrasa) in Shirāz (ii. 55, 63; cf. also al-Ma‘ṣūm, ii. 54 infra), and in Damascus the Shāfi‘i chief kādi held his sessions in the ‘Adilīya Madrasa (so Ibn Khalīkīn, Qantumêre, Hist. Sult. Mant., i/ii. 22; cf. also for Egypt, ibid., p. 87; i/ii. 253), the vice-kādī sat in the Zāhirīya Madrasa (Ibn Baṭṭārī, i. 218). The judgment might even be put into execution in the madrasa (ibid., p. 220). During the Mamlūk period in Egypt, we occasionally find a small mosque being used as a madājiṣ for judges (Makrizî, iv. 270; Ibn Dū‘ayr, p. 98 supra); Ibn Khalīkīn held legal sittings in the Madrasa al-Ṣāhiyya (Ibn ‘Abī ‘Aṣîr, vii. 453).

A mufti, especially in the large mosques, was also frequently appointed; he sat at definite times in a hāza li ‘irfātāt, e.g. in Cairo (al-Ḵawānî, al-Muḥājīra, i. 182; Djīlàlî al-Dîn, ibid., p. 157), in Tunis (Zarkashi, Chroniques, transl. Fagnan, Rev. Min. Soc. Arch. Constantîne, vol. xxi, 1895, p. 197, 202, 218, 248). In Baghdad Abū Bākî al-Dīnawai (d. 408) was the last to give fatwas in the Mosque of al-Mansūr according to the madhab of Sufyān al-Dhawî (Ibn Taghribirdî, ed. Popper, i/ii., p. 152).

F. The Mosque as an Educational Centre.

I. Islamic studies in the Mosque to the end of the Fātimid period.

The new studies stimulated by Islam were from their nature associated with the mosque. The learning by heart and the understanding of the Qurâ‘ân formed the starting-point and next came the study of Hadîth, by which the proper conduct for a Muslim had to be ascertained. The Prophet was often questioned on matters of belief and conduct, in or outside the mosque (Bukhârî, Ḥim, bāb 6, 52; 23, 24, 26, 46). After the death of the Prophet, his Companions were consulted in the same way and scientific study began with the collection and arrangements of hadîths, as has been shown, notably by Goldziher. This process is reflected in the hadîths themselves. According to them, even the Prophet in his lifetime was asked about hadîths (ibid., bāb 4, 14, 33; tr. 9, 51, 53); the Prophet sits in a mosque surrounded by a hâza and instructs his hearers; the latter repeat the hadîths three times until they understood them (ibid., bāb 8, 30, 35, 42). The necessity of Ḥim is strongly emphasised and the ḥalîl al-‘im is recommended; a man is held up as a model because he undertook a month’s journey for the sake of a single hadîth (ibid., bāb 19–22; cf. Goldziher, Mat. Stud., ii. 32 sq., 175 sq.). Jewish influence is perhaps to be recognised when learning is compared with the drinking of water (Bukhârî, Ḥim, bāb 20; cf. Proverbs, xviii. 4; Gen. 31, 41) and the teachers are called nābulājam (Bukhârî, Ḥim, bāb 10). A special class of students, Akh al-‘im, was formed who spread the knowledge of traditions throughout Muslim lands (ibid., bāb 7). They collected people around them to instruct them in the most necessary principles of the demands of Islam; ‘Abd Allah held one of the czasirat every Thursday, only once a week, in order not to tire the people (ibid., bāb 12). In this simple form of instruction which was indistinguishable from edifying admonitions lay the germ of Islamic studies. The teacher (ulama) his hearers; elsewhere it is called fakîh or qâla and the knowledge imparted is
Such knowledge was imparted to the tribes by the Prophet (ibid., bāb 25) or by teachers sent to them. In the year 17, Omar sent teachers of the Kurān in all directions and ordered the people to appear every Friday in the mosque. The complicated nature of the subjects of study resulted at the principal centres of Islam in the formation not only of a guild of teachers but of a regular system of instruction. The typical scholar, in addition to the Kurān, was the muhaddith (ibid., bāb 29) although new branches of study were soon added as a result of contact with lands with older cultures, notably linguistic studies and in this connection the study of the old poetry, philosophical and speculative studies, logic, etc. The learned man of the old period was also called faštik (Huṣn at-Maḥfāra, i. 131; Taḥāri, ii. 1183, 1266; Aqāhīn, viii. 89; Ibn Sa'd, v. 167 etc.). Even after the new branches of learning were added to the older studies, the mosque remained the chief centre of instruction. This may have been facilitated by the fact that in the old Christian countries it had been the custom for studies to be prosecuted in connection with monasteries and churches (on the university connected with the Church of the Castles in Constantinople cf. A. Heisenberg, Gießekirche und Apostelkirche, ii., 1908, p. 17 sqq.).

We hear of a madrīs for educational purposes in the Medina mosque in the first century A. H. (Aqāhīn, i. 48; iv. 162 sqq.). Yazid b. Abī Ḥuṣayn sent by Umar b. Abī Ḥaṣīm to Egypt (d. 128) is said to have been the first to teach in Egypt (Huṣn at-Maḥfāra, i. 131); he is mentioned along with another as teacher of al-Laith (Kindi, Wafā, p. 89) and the latter, upon whose pronouncements fatwās were issued had his ḥālāk in the mosque (Huṣn, i. 134). Omar II had before this sent al-Nāšir, the Mawla of Ibn Umar, to Egypt to bring them the sunna (ibid., p. 150). He also sent an able reciter of the Kurān to the Maghrib as kādī to teach the people kāfira (ibid., A.i. 130). Education was arranged for by the government by allowing suitable people to give instruction in addition to their regular office. From the very first, education in Egypt was closely connected with admiration to right living. The first teachers in the mosques were the kāfira, as a rule kādīs, whose discourses dealt with the interpretation of the Kurān and the proper conduct of divine service (cf. C 3). Their masāʾiṣa was the direct continuation of the moral instruction given by the old Companions (cf. Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 12). The instruction started in the mosque of ʿAmr was continued for centuries. In the third or fourth century A. H., al-Shāfiʿi taught various subjects here every evening (294) (Huṣn at-Maḥfāra, i. 134; Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, vi. 388). It was after his time that the study of fiqh came markedly to the front and the great teachers used at the same time to give fatwās (cf. Huṣn, i. 182; ʿAbd Allāh al-Kazwīni, d. 315: i. 183: ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Kāzī, d. 339). In the year 326 (938), the Ṣāḥibīs and Mālikīs had each 15, the Ḥanāfīs 3 groups in the mosque of ʿAmr (Ibn Saʿd, ed. Tallquist, p. 24). The Mālikī Muḥammad al-Naʿālī (d. 380) had so many hearers that the class occupied the area which 17 pillars included (Huṣn, i. 207). In the fourth century, al-Maḥdāl mentions the groups (halaq of fudhāl, kūroṣ and ahl al-adāb wa l-ḥikma, who sat in the mosque (B. G. A., iii. 205; cf. for the fifth century Nāṣirī Khosraw, ed. Schefel, p. 50 [text], p. 148 [transl.]). He also mentions that the followers of Abū Ḥanīfah held meetings in the Masjid al-ʿAṣrā with faštik, which here must mean something like lectures, where they read out of a volume and the fudhāl used to sit in the mosques of Palestine generally, to teach between the salāt (B. G. A., i. 182). In the third century, Ibn al-Fākīh tells how the faštik sat in the mosques of Sūqīy, al-Balīk and Irāq, while the people crowd around them (ibid., ii. 317). The madrasah which later lost their importance had also their study-circles in the mosques. For example al-Maḥdī al-Ḥāfīz says that the Ḥanafīya had study-groups in Fāṭā (ii. 439) and the Awāzīya had even a madrīs in the mosque of the Omaiyads (ibid., p. 179).

Arabic philological studies were ardently prosecuted in the mosques. The interest of the early Arabs in rhetoric survived under ʿĀlūs; the faštik Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab (d. 95) (cf. Taḥāri, ii. 1260) discussed Arabic poetry in his madrīs in the mosque in Medina; but it was still thought remarkable that poems should be dealt with in a mosque (Aqāhīn, i. 48; iv. 162 sqq.). In the year 256, al-Taḥāri, by request dictated the poems of al-Jirāmī beside the Bait al-Mal in the Mosque of ʿAmr (Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, vi. 432 infra). As the bāb al-Maṣrīs bāb al-ʿAṣrā, the Aṣfāb al-Arābiyya sat together and were visited by Ḥusayn b. Salama (d. 167 or 169) while he made Ḥasan al-Baṣrī give lessons (ibid., iv. 155). In Granada we hear of a ṣāḥib who gathered many pupils around him in the ḍāmī (Maḥāni, ii. 254). In Tunis in the viiith century, the Ṣāḥibīs of al-Harīrī were actually read in the ḍāmīs Zaiṭūna (Zarkaḥi, transl. Fagnan, Rev. Soc. Arch. Constantine, 1894, p. 111). In Baghda b. ʿAbd al-Malik gave his lectures in the mosque, which bears his name and the pupils used to take their places in front of him after the morning salah (Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, iv. 243 sqq.). About 200 a. H. we hear of lectures on ṭafṣir in the principal mosque of this same town (ibid., vii. 168). At the same time, the study of Ḥadīth still retained its importance (Wustenfeld, Schrift, iii. 362). The Mosque of al-Manṣūr remained the most distinguished school, the goal of all the learned (Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, i. 246 sqq.). When a traveller came to a new town, he could go to the ḍāmī in the confidence that he could attend lectures on Ḥadīth there (B. G. A., iii. 415, in Sās). In Mecca, for example, al-Shāfiʿī lectured (Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, vi. 391), in Medina Ibn Ḥašāb, who died in 234 (ibid., p. 400. 401). In Damascus we hear of some one who lectured on ṭafṣir (Huṣn, i. 182) and of another, Mālik Tahir al-Iṣkaḍārī (d. 359). One lectured on Ḥadīth in the same place (ibid., i. 183). Teachers went from one town to another. Mālik b. Abī Ṭalib came from Kairawayn to Mayer Mecca and Kūrjba, in the last named place he put up in two rūwās of the chief mosque, where he lectured on ṭafṣir, afterwards in another mosque, and he was much sought after on account of his ʿilm (Yākūt, ʿUṣūl, vii. 174). At quite an early date we read of special apartments (which were certainly also lecture-rooms) for authorities on the Kurān, for, according to al-Wākīlī, Abū Allāh b. Umm Maktūm lived in Medina in the Dār al-Kūrā (Huṣn at-Maḥfāra, i. 142).

As is evident from the examples quoted, studies were not only prosecuted in the chief mosques but also in other mosques. In Egypt, not only
the Mosque of 'Amr but also the chief mosques of later date were important centres of study. As soon as the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was founded, a pupil of al-Shābi began to lecture in it in Hādīth (Ibn al-Muqaffa'a, ii, 139). During the Fātimid period this was continued. In the year 361 (722), the Azhar Mosque was finished. Soon afterwards, the new Shī'a Kādí, 'Alī b. al-Nu'mān, lectured in it on Fīqh according to his school; in 378 al-'Aziz and his viceroy Ya'qūb b. Killis founded 35 lectureships and in addition to their salaries, the lecturers were given quarters in a large house built beside the mosque (Maqrizi, iv, 49; Sulaiman Rayad al-Hanafi, Kunz al-Qaṣṣār: 'i Ta'rīkh al-Ashar, p. 32 sqq.). Immediately after the foundation of the Mosque of al-Hākim, the jā'ātātā (taḥqīqāt) Maqrizi, iv, 55) in it. In the Fātimid Mosque of al-Akmar, also founded in 519, teaching was carried on from the very first (Ibid., p. 77).

We can therefore say definitely that mosques were from the beginning through the centuries educational institutions, that learned men occasionally used to live in mosques and that under the Fātimids and probably much earlier, there were special houses for the learned teachers. The mosque therefore corresponded to church, town hall and school and sometimes hostel. It was, then, a public place of assembly for the town. Nasrī Khosrow in 439 (1047) gives a vivid picture of the activity in the Mosque of 'Amr which was visited by 5,000 people daily, teachers, kurām-teachers, students, strangers, scholars, who drew up bills of exchanges and contracts etc. (ed. Scheler, text, p. 50 and transl., p. 148). It was therefore an exception when the Sakhra Mosque was open only on Mondays and Fridays (Saunare, Hist. Épisc. et Écol. P. 54) which happened with very few other sanadaries and also unusual for the mosque only to be opened for prayer, as sometimes happened out of consideration for the safety of the bāt al-ālam. The people demanded unrestricted access to the mosque at all times (cf. Maqrizī, iv, 54).

2 Special Educational Institutions.

In the descriptions of the larger mosques the libraries are often mentioned. These collections were gradually brought together from gifts and bequests, and it was a common thing for a scholar to give his books for the use of the Muwaffq or Aḥr al-ālim (e.g. al-Khanq al-Baghdādi, Yākūt,USB, i, 252; cf. iv, 287). Many other libraries were semi-public. These often supplemented the libraries of the mosques, because they contained books in which the mosques were not much interested, notably on logic, falsafa, geometry, astronomy, music, medicine and alchemy; the latter were called al-ālim al-khulima (Ibn Abī USB, t. 113; use this already for the pre-Islamic period) or al-ālim al-āsaf (on them see Golzheiser, in Ašr Fr. Ak II, 1915, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N° 8, Berlin 1916). The academy, Bāstah-i Ḥism, founded by al-Ma'mūn (98–202) in Baghdad, deserves first mention. It recalls the older academy founded in Tabari, to which Muṣār had invited Gorgias. Gūrīlī, as head of the hospital; he also translated works from the Greek (Ibn Abī USB, t. 123 sq). In the new academy there was a large library, and it was extended by the translations which were made by men qualified in the above-mentioned fields; there was also an astronomical observatory attached to the institution in which there were also apartments for the scholars attached to it (Fihrist, ed. Flusel, p. 243; cf. Ibn al-Ḳif, Ta'rīkh al-Haḳam, p. 98). When the caliph al-Mu'tadīd (279–289) built himself a new palace, he had apartments and lecture-rooms in an adjoining building for men learned in every science, who received salaries to teach others (Maqrizī, iv, 192, 355; Ibn al-Muqaffa'a, ii, 142).

Private individuals of wealth continued benefactions on these lines. 'Alī b. Yaḥyā, who died in 275 and was known as al-Munadidj, had a palace with a library, which was visited by those in search of knowledge from all lands; they were able to study all branches of learning in this institution, called Khasīn al-Ḥikma, without fee; astronomy was especially cultivated (Yākūt,USB, v, 467). Al-Munadidj also presented a whole library to Fāṭi b. Ḥakām (ibid., p. 459, infra; on al-Ṣūr's library, see ibid., vii, 136, 11 sqq.). In Mawṣil, Dā'far b. Muḥammad al-Mawṣili (d. 323) founded a dār al-ilm with a library in which students worked daily at all branches of knowledge which were even supplied with free paper. The foundations were lectured on poetry in it (Ibid., ii, 420). In the fourth century al-Majdīsī visited in Shirāz a large library founded by Aṣūd al-Dawla (367–372) to which people of standing had access. The books were arranged in classes and listed in catalogues, and the library (khāṣīn al-kutub) was administered by a director (wakīl), an assistant (khāsim) and an inspector (mughrīf) (B. G. A., iii, 449; cf. a little later: Yākūt,USB, v, 446, 12 sqq.). In the fourth century, a certain Ibn Sawwār founded both in Bāṣra and in Rāmān-Hurmuz a large dār al-kutub with stipends for the scholars who worked in it; in Bāṣra a shākīt used to hold classes (muḍarīt) on Muṭazili kalām (B. G. A., ii, 413, 18). In al-Ra'y, there was at the same time, a bāt al-ālim with over four hundred camel-loads of books, which were catalogued in a ten volume fihris and included many Shi'i works (Yākūt,USB, ii, 315 sqq). In the year 335; the vizier Sādir b. Arḍāshīn founded a dār al-ilm in Karkh with a large library for scholars (Ibn Taghibirdi, ed. Popper, p. 51, 16 sqq.; Ibn al-Ṣūr, ix., Cairo edition, p. 35, 7).

Many of the libraries had a strongly, but by no means exclusively, Shi'i character. As the fihris al-wāṣib, the 'Abbāsids, as already mentioned, were interested in them and the Omayyad Khālid b. Yarīd b. Mu'āwiyah studied alchemy and medicine along with Ḥadiṯh (Ibn Taghibirdi, i, 246, 5 sqq., USB, v, 165). But the connection between the Shi'i systems and Hellenistic science of which we have evidence, for example in the Khwān al-Safā, perhaps caused a greater interest to be taken in this branch of knowledge among the Shi'is than among the Sunnis. In Cairo, the Fātimid founded similar institutions in the interests of the Shi'i. In their palace, they had a library which was said to be the largest in Islam. It had about 40 rooms full of books and all branches of knowledge were represented; they had for example 1,200 copies of al-Ṭabarī's History and 18,000 books on the "old learning" (Maqrizī, ii, 255–255). The vizier Ya'qūb b. Killis founded an academy with stipends for scholars and spent 1,000 dinars a month on it (Yaḥyā b. Sa'id, ed. Tallmu-t, fol. 108; Ibn Khallīkān, Wafa'yāt, Cairo 1310, ii, 334; cf. Maqrizī, iv, 192, 61). It was
and one built by Abū Sa‘d Ismā‘il al-Astarabādī and another built for the teacher Abū ˙Ishākh al-
Sijarātīn. A Niğmāniya was also built here by Niğm al-Mulk for the İmām al-˙Ismā‘īl and the Ṣu‘ubānī (Makrizī, iv. 192; Ḥasan al-Muhāsabān, ii, 141 ff.). It was an
of great importance when Niğm al-Mulk (456–485, viceroy of the Saljuq sultāns Alp Arslān and Malik Shāh) founded the celebrated
Niğmāniya Madrasah in Baghdād; the building was begun in 457 and on the 10th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 459 (Sept. 1067) it was consecrated. It was founded for the Shāfi‘i teacher Abū ˙Ishākh al-˙Sijarātī; but he at first refused to accept the call, because the
foundation on which it was built was said to have been acquired illegally, and Abū Naṣr Ibn al-Sabbākh therefore held the office for the first twenty
days (ibid.; and Wustenfeld, Schätzi, iii. 297; Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt, Cairo, i, 143 sq.).

The Muslim historians are in some doubt about the history of the madrasas. Niğm al-Mulk is
said to have founded it, but Al-Makrizī and Al-Nuṣayrī point out that mu‘addarīs were already
in existence before him and mention the four above-named, but, as we have seen, even they were
not innovations. Al-Sulki thinks (says Al-Nuṣayrī) the new feature was that Niğm al-Mulk endowed
scholarships for the students. But this again was
nothing new as we have already seen. But the enthuseaism and energy of Niğm al-Mulk meant
the beginning of a new period of brilliance for the
Madrasah. The sultān and men of high rank
had now interested in it and the type evolved
by Niğm al-Mulk, a school in which the students
were boarded, became the prevailing one after his time. We may presume that the other schools
also had a place for prayer in them, i.e. they
resembled mosques. The type of school known
to us is built as a complete mosque. Since even
the older mosques containing living-rooms which
were frequently used by students, there is no
difference in principle between the school and
the ordinary mosque; only the school were especially arranged for study and the maintenance of students.

This character is expressed by the name madrasa,
plural mu‘addarīs; it is a genuine Arabic formation from the word darasa, “to read,” “to study,”
taken from Hebrew or Aramāic (Sāra lviii. 37
and elsewhere; Ḥabashyāṭ, ed. Haroutyoun, p. 53,
18; Aghānī, xiv., 2nd Cairo ed., p. 78; cf. darasa to teach; Būkhārī, Bād‘ī ‘l-Wahr, bab 5 and elsewhere; to study; Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 171),
where Bāst Ma‘ṣūr is used of a Jewish school
(Būkhārī, Ḏa‘QA, bab 6; Ibn Ḥiṣām, p. 383,
388); it is therefore an analogous formation to
Masjid (cf. also Heiser, Klein. Schriften, ii.
122 sq.; Noldeke, Neue Berichte z. sem. Sprache, p. 38).

In the time of Niğm al-Mulk and immediately
afterwards, the madrasa spread in the Trak, Kurhāsān, al-Ba‘ṣra, etc. He was not content with the two
he founded in Niğm and Baghdād. There was also
a Madrasa Niğmāniya in Balkh (Wustenfeld,
Schätzi, ii. 240). In Ṣawwāl (ibid., p. 319),
Herat to which al-˙Sijarātī (d. 485 = 1092) was
called from Ghazna and in Mawz (Vākūt, iv. 509).
Ibn al-˙Sabbākh, who had to give up his position in
favour of al-˙Sijarātī, received a promise from
Niğm al-Mulk that he would build a madrasa for
him in Baghdād, but the death of this scholar
prevented this being done (477; ibid., p. 304).
The great vizer’s rival Tād‘ī al-Mulk (d. 486 =
1093) in Baghdād founded a Madrasa Tād‘īya
(ibid., p. 311). In Nisā‘IR, other madrasas were
founded at the same time, for example one by
al-Manṣūr who died in 463 (ibid., p. 277) and a
Shāfi‘i madrasa (ibid., p. 327). In Mawz, al-Manṣūr
also died in 488, and a Shāfi‘i madrasa (ibid., p.
321; cf. above). In Marw al-Rudh, Ṣeṣmad al-
Manṣūr (d. 512) built a madrasa (ibid., p. 326).

The prosperity of the madāris stimulated by
Niğm al-Mulk in the fifth century survived for a
long time in the east. In the sixth century Ibn Ḍubair (580 = 1184) mentions some thirty madāris,
all in the eastern part of the town, the most
notable being the Niğmāniya, renovated in 504
(Riḥāta, p. 229). In 631 (1234), the caliph al-
Mustanṣūr founded the magnificent Mustanṣūrya
as a school for the four rites, each with a teacher
and seventy-five students and a teacher for Kurān
and one for Ḥadīth, as well as a physician. Attached
to it were a library, baths, hospital and kitchens;
there was a clock at the entrance; beside it was a
“green where the call to prayer was given from
which he could survey the whole building
(cf. Le Strange, Baghdād, p. 266 sq.; Wustenfeld,
Akademien der Araber, p. iv. and 29).

The Niğmāniya and the Mustanṣūrya survived
the destruction of Baghdād by Hulagū and both
are mentioned at the beginning of the viii th century by Ibn Baṭṭūta (ii, 108 sq.) and the building
of the latter still exists. Ten others are known of
the viii th–ix th century including the Madrasat ‘Abd al-˙Kādir al-˙Jallānī (688 = 1286), Madrasat
Abū Ḥanifa (of about the same date) and al-˙Mīr-
djānīya (758 = 1357), all still in existence, which
were founded for al-˙Sijarātī, Ḥanafis and for the
study of Kurān and Ḥadīth. Besides these three there
still exist seven madrasas founded in Baghdād in
the xv th and xvi th centuries (L. Maission,
Les Madrècques de Bagdad, B.I.F.A.O., vii, 1909,
p. 77–86; the inscriptions, do., in M. I.F.A.O., xxxi.,
1912). Although the Tatars in 699 (1300) destroyed
many madāris (Quattremère, Hist. des Sult. Maml.,
i, i. 163 sq.), Ibn Baṭṭūta shows that in the eighth
century there were still flourishing schools in the east. In Wāṣīt there was a madrasa which specialised
in taḥfīz al-˙Kurān; it had three hundred rooms
for foreign students (ii. 3). In Tustar, the sultān
expended one-third of the revenues on madrasas
and monasteries (ii. 31) and in Şahrāz and other
Persian towns he also found madrasas (ii. 62
and pass.).

For Niṣā‘IR, he mentions four madāris beside the chief mosque (iii. 86); according to
Ibn Baṭṭūta (c. 820 = 1417), this town had still
eight madāris under the Ḳabūsids and he mentions
seventeen in which al-˙Sijarātī’s fiqh was taught (Sefer Namen, ed. Schefer, p. 281). For Marw, Vākūt
about 600 mentions, in addition to the Niğmāniya,
the school founded by Abū Sa‘d al-Muh. b. Manṣūr
al-Mustawfī (d. 494), also the ˙Amidiya and the
Khatānīya (iv. 509). Large madrasas were still being
built in Persia in the xvi th century and they
are still to be found there in modern times
(G. Browne, A Year amongst the Perzians, 1916, p. 108, 217 sq.). Although the institution
had for a long time been in decline, it could of course
take place even now in the ši‘a world without any difficulty.
In 728 (1328) in Baghdād ˙Aṭī, Ibn Baṭṭūta found
a large Şahrā madrasa (i, 415). The Mongols also
built madāris, e.g. Karaka ˙Khān, the descendant
of ˙Citgb ˙Khān (Quattremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., ii.
56). Hulagū’s mother built two madrasas in Bakhārā
where 1,000 students studied daily in each (J.A., ser. 4, xx. 389). The period of greatest prosperity of the madrasa in Central Asia was under the Timurids, notably in Samarqand, where Timur built a džamí 'in the Indian style', and his wife a madrasa (ibid. 'Arabshâh, Vita Timuri, ed. Manger, 1767, p. 444 sqq.; see also Diet. Kunst der islam. Welt, p. 99 sq.).

In the towns of Mesopotamia and Syria the movement spread from the fifth century onwards. Nur al-Din b. Zangi founded madrasas for Şâfîîs in Damascus, Halab, Hamâ, Hims, Ba'albek (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii., p. 428; cf. 488; Maqrizi, iv. 192).

Kamāl al-Din (d. 572) founded a madrasa in Mawsîl, two in Naṣîbin and one in Damascus (Wüstenfeld, Schäfî, p. 317). Taqi al-Din, the nephew of Şâlî al-Din, built a madrasa in al-Ruha (Maqrizi, iv. 195, 195). Ibn Ijâbîr who travelled from 578 (1183) to 587 (1191) mentions two in Naṣîbin (p. 240), one in Harrân (p. 247) and a large Hanafi madrasa in Halab and four or five others (p. 253), three in Hamâ (p. 257); one in Hims (p. 258) and six in Damascus. Likewise in Damascus were the great Şâfîîs (p. 283, both 284, and six or more) and six in Mawsîl (p. 236, 4 sqq.); a madrasa in the last-named town was built in two stories with a Dār al-Hadîth on the ground floor (Ibn Aibu Usâîbâ'î, ii. 204, in the year 585).

The development in Damascus was of particular importance. Information about this is contained in the Tanbih al-Tâlib wa Irjâd al-Dârîs of Muyîha l-Dîn al-Nu'aimî (d. 927 = 1521), the synopsis of which by 'Abîd al-Bâsît al-'Ilâmî (d. 1059 = 1549) has been published by Sauvare (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii.—vii.), the substance had already been given by Fleischer from Mkhâlîf Meshâka (Al. Şriften, iii. 306 sqq. = Z.D.M.G., viii., 1854, p. 346 sqq.; cf. iii., 1894, p. 123; there are a few differences in points of detail between Fleischer's and Sauvare's publications). A Dâr al-Kurân, the Rishâiya, was founded here about 400 (J.F.A., ser. 9, ii. 252) and the first madrasa for fikh studies was the Hanafi Şâfiî, which was founded beside the Mosque of the Omayyads by Shujûa' al-Dawla Şâdir in 491 (1097) (ibid., iv. 266); next came, sometime before 520, the likewise Hanafi Tarâkhâniya (ibid.) and in 514 the Şâfiî Aminîya founded by the Aṭâbeg Amin al-Dawla (ibid., iii. 395), then the Hanbalî Şâfiî, founded by a scholar who died in 536 (iv. 467), the Hanafi Şâfiî built extra muros by a princess in 526 (ibid., p. 254), the Hanbalî 'Omarîya founded by a shaikh who died in 528 (ibid., p. 473; cf. Fleischer, Al. Şr., iii. 328).

The two rulers Nur al-Din b. Zangi (541—569 = 1146—1163) and Şâlî al-Din (570—589 = 1174—1193) displayed a magnificent activity in this direction as did their emirs and relatives. Nur al-Din founded a Dâr al-Hadîth, the Nîrîya (ibid., iii. 280), and the following Şâfiî madrasas: al-Şâliyya (ibid., p. 414), al-'Usrâniya (ibid., p. 425), al-'Imâdiyya (ibid., p. 430), al-Kâllasa (ibid., p. 439), and he began the building of the 'Adilîya (completed by al-Şâlih, ibid., p. 425), and as a Hanafî madrasa, the large and small Nîrîya (ibid., 388, 291).

In his reign an emir also built the Asadîyya for Şâfiîs and Ḥanâfîs (ibid., iii. 387), another emir a Şâfîî Muhâdîhidîya inside and another outside the town (ibid., 440); of Hanafî madrasa, an emir al-Duṣkâ built two, al-Balkîha and al-Nāshîya (ibid., 425 sqq.); a slave of Nur al-Din, the Râhîniya in 565 (ibid., p. 259), an emir the Mu'niyya in 555 (ibid., p. 281); a lady built a Ḥanbali madrasa with a Dâr al-Hadîth, the 'Alîma (ibid., p. 477; a Ḥanbali Šâhî, who died in 556, the Musâmîria (Fleischer, op. cit., p. 329).

Şâlî al-Din rebuilt the Şâfiî Kâllâsa, which had been burned down (J.F.A., ser. 9, iii. 439) and himself founded the Mâlikî Şâliha and a Mâlikî zawiya in the Mosque of the Omâylâds (ibid., iv. 400 sqq.). There were also built in his reign a Dâr al-Hadîth by the Kādistânî (ibid., iii. 277), a madrasa for Şâfîîs and Ḥanâfîs, the 'Âdhawîya, by his daughter or brother's daughter in 580 (ibid., p. 425), six Şâfîî madrasas (ibid., p. 391, 399 sqq., 403, 435, 442), some five Ḥanâfî including one founded by his (previously Nur al-Din's) wife (ibid., iv. 256, 266, 277, 284 sqq.). This building activity was continued into the seventh to ninth centuries so that al-Nu'aimî can give the following totals: seven Dâr al-Kurân, sixteen Dâr al-Hadîth (one, the Kûsha, is not given in Fleischer), three for both Kurân and Hadîth, sixty Šâfîî (two of them also for Ḥanafîs); in Fleischer, Ns. 16 and 31 and are not given), fifty-two Ḥanâfî (two of them also for Šâfîî); Fleischer, one of them, the Dammâghîya, is not given; it appears among the Šâfîî as Dâbbâghîya), four Mâlikî and ten Ḥanâfî madrasas (in Fleischer, one of the two Dîyâya is not given; on the other hand he has the Musâmîria), also three Mâlikîs al-ţibb, all of which belong to the seventh century. The founders were mainly rulers and emirs, but also included merchants and quite a number of men of learning, and a few women also. As in the east, especially in earlier times, a madrasa was often founded for a particular scholar (ibid., iii. 400, 488) and one sometimes finds a learned man handing over his house to be a madrasa (al-Dawla'ya, ibid., p. 405, cf. 439, iv. 470). According to Mkhâlîf Meshâka, in his time (1848) these madrasas had practically all disappeared or were used as dwelling-houses, because their endowments had disappeared and there were only five left in his time (Fleischer, op. cit., p. 307—311).

Şâlî al-Din introduced the madrasa into Jerusalem. In 585 (1189) he endowed the Kânānî Şâliha, in 587 the Zâwīya Khatînîya south of al-Akâsâ for a particular scholar and in 588 he turned the Church of St. Anna into the Şâliha Madrasa; in 589, 583 and 598 emirs built similar institutions and in the seventh—ninth centuries a whole series of them came into existence. According to Mudjîr al-Din (d. 927 = 1521), there were thirty-one madâris and monasteries (which were in part used in the same way as madrasûs) in direct connection with the Haram area or near it, and sixteen at some distance. Of these some were especially called ma'drasa; one a Dâr al-Kurân and one a Dâr al-Hadîth (Sauvare, Hist. Jûrûs. et Hîbr., 1876, p. 139 sqq.; v. Berchem, Corpus, ii. 1; cf. for Şâlî al-Din: Ibn Khallîkân, Wâfiyât, ii., Cairo 1310, p. 402 sqq.). In Hebron there was also a madrasa, that of al-Malîk al-Nâsîr (Sauvare, op. cit., p. 23).

Next to Nîjâm al-Mulk, Şâlî al-Din has the greatest reputation as a builder of madrasas. He owes this mainly to the fact that his great activity as a builder lay in countries, which became of great importance in the Muslim world, Syria with Palestine, and Egypt. Even before the fall of the Fatimids he had founded in the year 566 in the vicinity of the Mosque of 'Amr, the Nâsîrîya
overshadowed by the “House of Knowledge” (dār al-Ṭūlā or dār al-Ṭiḥkama) founded by al-Hākim in 395 (1005). It was at the northern end of the west palace and contained a library and reading-room as well as rooms for meetings and for classes. Librarians, assistants, with their servants administered it and scholars were given allowances to study there; all branches of learning were represented — astronomy, medicine etc. in addition to the specifically Islamic subjects. Al-Hākim built similar institutions in al-Fustāṭ (Maqrizi, ii. 334 sqq.; according to Ibn Dukkām, ed. Volleni, p. 509 infra, there still existed in his time about 600 books, a building called the Dār al-Ṭūlā in al-Fustāṭ). In the year 435, al-Sanbādi saw in Cairo a library with 6,500 books on astronomy, handasa and falsafa (Ibn al-Kīfī, p. 440, 13 sqq.). We do not learn very much of the subjects taught there but occasionally hear of someone who lectured on Arabic philology in it (Kindi, Walī, p. 610, 13). But the whole institution was closely associated with Shi‘a propaganda, which is obvious from the fact that it was administered by the Dā‘ī ‘l-Dhā‘īr who held conferences with the learned men there every Monday and Thursday (Maqrizi, iv. 226; Kākāshandī, Shub al-Ṭihkā, ii. 487); occasionally he was a kāfī (Kindi, Walī, p. 605, 11). A similar missionary institute (dār al-Ṭihkā) was built in Halab in 507 by the emir Fakhr al-Mulk (Ibn Taghrībrīdī, ed. Popper, p. 360, 17). We may assume that these buildings were also arranged for the performance of the sălāt.

With the dār al-Ṭihkā, Islām was undoubtedly continuing Hellenistic traditions. Al-Maqrīzī mentions a dār al-Ṭihkā of the pre-Islamic period, where the learned men of Egypt used to work (iv. 377, 4); Ibn Abī Usayba‘, also mentions pre-Islamic seminars in Egypt where Hellenistic learning was cultivated (dār al-Ṭihkā, i. 104, 16, 22; Athens is also called dār biḥnāt al-Yunānīyn: B. G. A., ii. 135, 14) and the similarity with the Alexandrine Manus, which was imitated in Persia and Antioch, for example, is apparent (John W. H. Walden, ed., Universities of Ancient Greece, New York 1919, p. 49–50). Al-Hākim’s institution was closed by the vizier al-Afšāl on account of political and religious disputes, but shortly afterwards (517 = 1123) reopened by the vizier al-Ma‘mūn in another building, south of the east palace (Maqrizi, ii. 313, 337, 17 sqq.). But it was now considerably smaller. During the famine in the reign of al-Mustansir, the library was plundered. In 461 (1068) an eye-witness saw twenty-five camels carrying books from the palace library (Maqrizi, ii. 254; cf. Wustenfeld, Fātimidenhalsen, p. 261). The institute was finally closed with the end of the Fātimid dynasty (567 = 1171). Ša‘bār al-Dīn had all the treasures of the palace, including the books, sold over a period of ten years. Many were burned, thrown into the Nile, or thrown into a great heap, which was covered with sand so that a regular “hill of books” was formed and the soldiers used to sole their shoes with the fine bindings. The number of books said to have disposed of varies from 120,000 to 2,000,000 but many were saved for new libraries. The Kāfī of al-Fadil is said to have procured 120,000 volumes (Maqrizi, ii. 253–255; Abu Shāma, Kitāb al-Ru‘udatāin, Cairo 1287, i. 200, 268). Ša‘bār al-Dīn also allowed anyone interested to take what he liked from the khāṣṣat al-Ṭīlāb in Halab for example (Yākūt, Udāba‘, vii. 20). These attacks on libraries did not mean they were tired of books as Yākūt (Udāba‘, v. 389) suggests, but was only one expression of the reaction against the Shi‘is.

3. Origin and spread of the Madrasa.

While the institutions called the Dār al-Ṭūlā developed in Fātimid countries into centres of Shi‘a propaganda, the madrasa grew up in the east out of similar Sunni institutions. It is interesting to note that in 400, al-Hākim built a Sunni dār al-Ṭūlā in Cairo. In it lived two Mā‘likis scholars, who gave instruction and gathered round them men learned in hadīth and šī‘a (Ibn Taghrībrīdī, ed. Popper, ū‘lī, p. 64, 105, 106; al-Jihālah, Dīwān al-Islām, Hai‘ardābād, 1337, i. 186). As the instruction (see the first reference) was given in the Dā‘ī ‘l-Dhā‘īr, the institute must have been connected with a mosque, probably that of ʿAmr. It owed its existence however only to a passing fancy and after three years, the institution was abolished and the two learned teacher-executed. With the growing strength of the Sunni, especially in the Shāfī‘ī and Ḥanafī form, many educational institutions arose in the east which had a pronounced Sunni character; the Sunna in the fourth century wanted to have influence with the other schools (R. G. A., iii. 332, 365, 415). Many teachers built houses of their own, where they dictated hadīths and held lectures on šī‘a, e.g. a teacher who died in Merv in 420 (Wustenfeld, Imām Shā‘īrī, ii. 232). Abū Hātim al-Rustī born in 277 (890) founded in his native town a school with a library with apartments and allowances for the maintenance of foreign students (ibid., p. 163). In Amul, al-Rāyī (d. 502) built a school; he himself taught in the mosque, also in al-Ra‘i (iii. 245). In Tābarān a school was built for al-Hātimi (d. 593 = 1003) (ibid., ii. 202). In Bāghbād, al-Isma‘īlī (d. 396 = 1006) founded two lecture-ships in šī‘a studies, one of which was filled by al-Isfārā‘ī, who otherwise lectured in the mosque of Ibn al-Mubarak, and the other by al-Khāṭir (ibid., p. 204, cf. p. 217). The philosopher and bīḍjī- poet al-Zawānī who died in 463 lived with other learned men in a madrassat al-Suyūtī (Yākūt, Udāba‘, vi. 409).

In Niṣābūr especially, where studies were vigorously prosecuted in the mosque (e.g. Wustenfeld, Schā‘īrī, iii. 236) many such institutions arose. Thus a special school was built for the Shāfī‘ī šī‘a-scholars al-Sā‘īgh al-Nisābūrī (340 = 960; ibid., ii. 156; cf. 160). Abū ʿAlī al-Husainī (d. 392) himself founded a school in which to teach Ḥadīth and it was attended by 1,000 scholars (ibid., p. 293). Ibn Fūrak (d. 406; ibid., p. 216) did the same and in the year 437 Abū ʿAlī-khaṣṣat al-Dīn al-Isfārā‘ī (ibid., iii. 284) and for Rukn al-Dīn al-Isfārā‘ī (d. 418 = 1027) a school was built which surpassed all others (ibid., i. 229). As early as the fourth century, we thus find al-Ma‘ṣūlī praising the very fine madrasa of ʿalā‘al Jāhār (R. G. A., iii. 315). In the first half of the fifth century, there were four especially famous madāris in Niṣābūr: al-Madrasa al-Bihāshīya, founded by al-Bihāshī (d. 384), when he became a teacher in Niṣābūr in 441 (Wustenfeld, Schā‘īrī, iii. 270; al-Suyūtī is therefore wrong in ascribing its foundation to before the birth of Niẓām al-Mulk [in 408]; see Ḥamīn, ii. 141). al-Sa‘diyā founded by the emir Naṣr b. Subuktakīn (governor of Niṣābūr in 389)
for Şahîs and the Kâmiyya for Malikis; for Şahîs also the Sharifiya (called after its head also Madrasa Zain al-Taḏjîj) and notably the great Sahliyya or Nasîrîyya (for the identity of the two of Malikis, iv. 228 sqq., especially the second), beside Şahî’s mausoleum; he also built a madrasa beside the Mashhad al-Ḫusain and in 572 a Hanâfi madrasa, the Suyûfiyya, and he turned the house of an emir named Sa’d al-Ṣu‘āda into a khānasîkh (Husn al-Mahdawâra, ii. 141 sqq.; Ṭakrîzî, iv. 192 sqq.; Ibn Ḫallîkîn, ii. 402 sqq.). Those around him emulated this activity. His vizier the Šahî ‘Afîf al-Dîn in 580 built the Fâlidîyya for Şahî’s, Malikis and for Ḫâfî (Mâktrî, iv. 197), a brother the Sâfî (ibid., p. 199), another, al-Malîk al-Ashî, the Madrasat al-Ashî (ibid., p. 195), his nephew Taḳî al-Dîn built in Cairo the Masjid al-‘Izz or Taḵwiyâ for Şahî’s (ibid.; ibid., p. 194; Ibn Ḫukmûn, p. 93) and two others in the Faiyûm (Mâktrî, iv. 195). Other emirs and their relatives followed his example (ibid., p. 196, 199 sqq.) and even a merchant, al-Ḫâṣî, founded a madrasa in 570 (ibid., p. 194). Ibn Ḫubârî, who travelled through Egypt in the time of Şalâl al-Dîn, speaks of several madrasas in Alexandria (Khibâ, p. 42) and particularly of one beside Şahî’s tomb, which looked like a whole town (ibid., p. 48).

During the period of the Ayyâbîs and Mamlûks the number of madrasîs increased to an extraordinary degree. In this period, called Bain al-Kayr, there were two long rows of madrasîs on the site of the old Fatâmid palace in Cairo (cf. P. Ravaissie, in M. M. A. F., i. 1889, p. 409 sqq., pl. 3). As a rule, the madrasa was in the street in line with the houses. Ibn Ḫukmûn mentions that in Cairo only two stood isolated (p. 98). Al-Nâ‘îmî and Ibn Ḫukmûn describe several madrasîs (and madâsjîd) as mulâ‘alâka i.e. above the ground-floor. Ibn Ṭaṭṭûs, who travelled at the beginning of the eighth century, found madrasîs even in quite small towns, e.g. in Dîmayt, Muniyât b. ‘Abî ‘Ubayd, Ḳina, Kâs, Aṣna (i. 65, 96, 106, 108). Ibn Ḫukmûn (p. 92-99) about 800 gives a list of twenty-four madârsîs; this is obviously very incomplete; on the other hand, it contains nine names, not given by al-Mâktrî. This author (d. 845 = 1442) mentions 75 madârsîs, fourteen for Şahî’s, four for Malikîs, ten for Hanafîs, three for Şahî’s and Malikîs, six for Şahî’s and Hanafîs, one for Malikîs and Hanafîs, four for all four rites, two exclusively used as dâr al-Ḳâta, while the rite of twenty-five is not mentioned and four remained unfinished. Of these madrasîs, according to him, about thirteen were founded before 600, twenty in the seventh century, twenty-nine in the eighth century and two after 800. To the two schools of Ḥâḏî (al-Kâmîlı of the year 622 and al-Ḵârîyâ of about 750, see iv. 201, 211 sqq.) is to be added the Maṣûghiyya mentioned by Ibn Ḫukmûn (p. 99). A notable feature is the decline of the Hanbalîs and in contrast to Damascus the large number of schools which included all four rites. The first Egyptian madrasa to include all four rites was the Sâhîyya, founded in 640-641 by al-Malik al-Sâhî (Mâktrî, iv. 209 sqq.) probably on the model of the Mustânsîrya.

In Şalâl al-Dîn’s time, the madrasa was also introduced into the Ḥîdâya. In the year 579, the governor of ‘Aden built in Mecca a madrasa for the Hanafîs and in the following year a Şahî’s madrasa was also founded there (Chron. Mekkâ, ii. 104). Up to the beginning of the ninth century, eleven madârsîs are mentioned (ibid., p. 104-107) but others were added (ibid., iii. 177 sqq., 211 sqq., 225 sqq., 351 sqq., 417), in the ninth century they ceased to be used for their original purpose (see Snouck Hargronje, Mekkâ, ii. 229 sqq.). Madrasa were also built in Medina (Wustenfeld, Medina, i. 58, 98, 112).

In Asia Minor, madrasas spread over the Seldjûks; the oldest known date from the seventh century. In Konya for example there were the Sîr çifti Madrasa of the year 640 (1242-1243), Karaîay Madrasa 649 (1251-1252) and İndjemi-nâré Madrasa 674 (1274-1276) (Ch. Huart, Konia, 1897, p. 156, 160, 175; Fr. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasien, 1896, 48 sqq., 51 sqq.; R. Hartmann, in Deutscher Arch. Zeitung, 1899, 87, 119; in Swäf three madrasa date from the year 670 (1271-1272) namely the Sâhîyya or Gok-Madrasa, founded by Fakhr al-Dîn, that of Muẓaffar Barûqîrî and that of Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad. The first mentioned is probably identical with the Dâr al-Tâbrîs described by Ewliyâ, which contained eighty rooms in two stories (see v. Berchem, Corpus, ii. i, 18 sqq., 26 sqq., 31 sqq.). In Diwîgî, a madrasa has been built in the Jâmi‘ Ahmad Şah erected in 620 (1228-1229) (ibid., p. 71 sqq., 80). About 733 (1333) Ibn Baṭṭûs found madrasa all over Asia Minor, even in quite small towns (ii. 260, 267, 269, 285, 296 sqq., 340, 345, etc.). Building activity was continued under the Ilkhan, Huart, Konia, p. 59, 92, 109; Sarre, Reise in Kleinasien, index; R. Hartmann, op. cit., p. 24 sqq.). According to the Kürsâs, the madrasa was brought to North Africa as early as the time of Şalâl al-Dîn, for we are there told that the Almohad Yâqûb b. Yusûf (580-595 = 1184-1199) built mosques, hospitals and madrasas in Ifriqiya, the Maghrib and al-Anadâs (Tornberg, Annales Regni Mauritaniae, Upsala 1843, i. 143); but no exact details are given to corroborate this statement. The Maghribi madrasas were exclusively Malikî. In Tunis, many madrasa were erected (cf. the Hafsîs (625-941 = 1228-1534), the oldest being the Madrasat al-Maḍrâṣa, 1150. In the Chronicle of Tunis (Zarkashî, in Chronique des Almohades et des Hafsides, transl. E. Fagnan, in Rec. Nat. et Mêm. Soc. Arch. Cons., xxii, 1895, see index) eleven are mentioned including the Madrasat ‘Unṣ al-Djamal of 742 (1341), the Madrasa Ibn Taḥfildîn, founded by a learned man in 766 (1364), the Madrasa Shammâ-ya (before 734 = 1333; see op. cit., p. 105, 106, 221), Madrasa Belhafa-fîn in 795 (1393) (ibid., p. 183), and six of the ninth century (see op. cit., index; cf. also Marçais, Manuel d’Art Musulman, ii, 900, n. 2). Ibn Ḫukmûn mentions at the beginning of the eighth century the Madrasat al-Kutubîn (i. 20). There is no trace of madrasa of the Almohads and the statement in the Kürsâs regarding them does not agree with the other sources. The first madrasa in the Maghrib was, according to Ibn Marzûk, Muṣnâd, the Madrasa al-Sahfîrî built by the Marinid Abû Yusûf Ya‘kûb b. Abâl al-Hâkî (656-658 = 1258-1260) in Fâs in 684 (also called al-Halâfîya, in Swäf, the edition by Lévi-Provençal, in Hêpîrîs, v., 1925, p. 34 (Arabic) = p. 44 (French)). In Fâs, we are told by the same source, Abû Sîd (757), and his son Abû l-Hasan (731-749) built several madrasas: the M. al-Madinâ al-Baiḍâ‘ (= M. Dâr al-Mâktrî in Fâs al-Ijâdîd) in 721 (1321), the M.
al-Šīrāzī in 723 (1321), the M. al-ʿAttārīn in 725 (1325) later called M. al-Wādī and in 747 (1346–1347) M. Miṣḥāb after the teacher; the next Marinid Abū ʿIynān (749–759) built in 750 (1351) the Banānīya (Tornberg, Annals Reg. Murn., i. 280 infra; Ibn Maruzkī, in Ḥujjārī, v. 34 and 68; Ed. Petworth, Inscriptions de Fīṣrū, in J. A., ser. ii., x. 1917; xii., 1918; Maqrīzī, Manṭal al-Muslamān, ii. 1927, p. 465 sqq.). No longer in existence is the M. al-Lebbādī (Bell, J. A., ser. ii., x. 143); the M. al-Šīrāzī consisted of a larger and a smaller madrasa; the latter is now the M. al-Ṣīrāzī (ibid., p. 215 sqq.). Others were built under the Sharīʿ, notably the M. al-Ṣāḥīrīn in the xiiith (xviiiith) century, now the largest in Fīṣrū (ibid., p. 114): Bell writes Shaghhrā Ḍān). In other towns also Abū l-Ḥasan built madrāsī: in Tākā Nakās, Salū (742 = 1340), Tākā, Sābī, Afīn, Amīnr, Abū ʿAqīl, Mārākāsh, al-Naṣr al-Kahī, Bel Ummān in Tīmīsān (714–715), Tīmīsān and al-Dīmāzārī (Ibn Maruzkī, Ḥujjārī, v. 35 and p. 69). That of Nakās was completed by the son of Abū l-Ḥasan, Abū ʿIynān, who was a great builder of schools (Ibn Baṭṭūtā, i. 84). In Tīmīsān, the Ţālīnī Abū ʿAbd Allāh Māsī I had already built a mosque in 710 (1310) and before 737 Abū Taṣḥīfīn founded the similar institute, which bore his name (Maqrīzī, Monumenta arabica de Illumenc; do., Manṭal al-Muslamān, 1927, ii. 483, 515).

In Spain according to Ibn Saʿīd (viith = xiiith century), there were no madrasas; instruction was given in the mosques (al-Maṣkaṣi, ed. Dozy, i. 136); but in the following year, however, a large madrasa was founded in Granada by the Nasīr Wābāf Abū l-Haḍjasdārī in 750 (1350) (Almanzor Cardenas, in Bolletin de la Real Acad de la Hist., xxvii. 490; Maqrīzī, op. cit., p. 517.) According to Ibn Saʿīd, men of learning were held in high esteem in al-Andalus; the Marinids in the Maghrib also built madrasas in their enthusiasm to further learning. The traveller al-ʿAbbarī (688 = 1289), however, found no interest in learning in Tīmīsān, al-Ḍiṣṭārī or Constantinople (with one exception); it was only in Tunis that he found any enthusiasm (J. A., ser. v., iv., 1554, p. 154, 157, 158, 161, 169). This is certainly connected with the fact that the madrasa had just then been introduced into Tunis. But not even the madrasas brought about any deepening of interest in study in the west. Ibn Khaldūn (580 = 1479) testifies to the spread of madrasas in Tunis and the Maghrib but laments the decline in education. In al-Andalus, Muslim culture was dying out and after the decline of Kurūba and ʿAqārīn, education in the Maghrib was on a low level; while the old schools in the Ibrāk were no longer of importance, Cairo was a centre of learning to which all made their way and studies also flourished in Persia (Muṣǧaddima, Cairo 1322, p. 342–344, fasc. 6, No. 2). This decline in interest in learning soon became general. The learning of the time lacked vitality and international scholarship was affected by political conditions. In 1517 A.D., I. 264 Afrounīn says that the lecture-rooms in Cairo were large and placed under the masters who attended them were small. Some still studied fiqh, but very few the arts (Descr. de l'Afr., iii. 372, in Rev. de Voy. et de Doc., ed. Schéfer, Paris 1896–1898). In Egypt, interest in the specialised madrasa decreased considerably and the great builder of the xiiith (xviiith) century, the emir ʿAqūdī, still built madrasas, but his real interest was in the mosque (see below). Lane only mentions the ʿAṣ̣̄har Mosque as an important centre of study in Cairo. The development in Mecca was similar, where in modern times studies are only prosecuted in the mosque (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 17, and cf. above). On education and the madrasa in general cf. also F. Wustenfeld, Die Akademien der Araber und ihrer Lehrer, Göttingen 1837; Kremer, Kulturgeschichte, 1877, ii. 479 sq.; Haneberg, Abhandlung über das Schul- und Lehrwesen der Muhammedanen im Mittelalter, 1850; v. Berchem, Corpus Inscri. Arab., i. 252–266; G. Gabrieli, Manual de Bibliographia Musulmana, i., 1916, p. 109 sqq.

4. Development of the Madrasa and similar Institutions.

a. Madrasa, Masjid and ʿĀṣ̣̄harī.

There was, as already mentioned, no difference in principle between the madrasa and other mosques. Even after the introduction of madrasa, the regular mosques remained schools as before. Ibn Baṭṭūtā, who travelled in the eighth century, in the period when madrasa flourished most, attended lectures on ʿAṣ̣̄har in the Madrasa of ʿĀṣ̣̄harī, but also in the ʿĀṣ̣̄harī Maṭṣūrī in Baghdad (ii. 83, 110). In Damascus in 580, Ibn Ḍubair refers to rooms in the Mosque of the Omayyads, which were used for ʿĀṣ̣̄harī and Māliki students, who received considerable stipends (ʿudrā, maʿalī′) and among whom were many Mālikīs; the mosque had large endowments (waṣlī) for strangers as well as for students (Omar, p. 266 supra, 272 supra). Ibn Baṭṭūtā also speaks of the halākāt at-ṭabarīs in the mosque in the different sciences (i. 212). In Egypt in the time of al-Ḥakīm (ninth century), there were 8 rooms for fiqh studies in the Mosque of ʿAmr and before 749 there were over 40 halākāt in it (Maṣẖūrī, iv. 20, 21). In the Mosque of Ibn Tīlūn after its renovation in the reign of Lāḏīn (696–708) courses of fiqh, according to the four madhāhabit, and other studies were arranged (ibid., p. 41; cf. Quatremer, Hist. Sult. Maml., iv/ii. 47 sqq.) and in 767 an emir appointed 7 teachers in Ḥanāfī fiqh there (Maṣẖūrī, iv. 42). In al-ʿAṣ̣̄harī in the seventh century and later after the earthquake of 702 many lecture-rooms with paid teachers were built (ibid., p. 52), likewise in the Mosque of ʿĀṣ̣̄harī, where, after the earthquake, lecture-rooms in fiqh for each madhab and for ʿAṣ̣̄harī were founded with salaries for the teachers and scholarships for the students (ibid., p. 57). In Fāṭimid mosques, like the ʿĀṣ̣̄harī, the ʿĀṣ̣̄harī ʿĀṣ̣̄harī Maks built by al-Ḥakīm, Mālikī emirs founded new lectureships (ibid., p. 66, 81) and not only in the Maghreb al-Ḥaṣānī but also in the Maghreb the Naṣīrīs were studies carried on in the eighth century (Hāṣīn al-Muḥammadī, i. 195; Muḥlī l-Dīn).

When a particular room was set apart for teaching purposes in a mosque, this was often called a madrasa; for example 6 of the Damascene madrāsā were in the Mosque of the Omayyads: the Shāhānīya, Ghazālīya, Khiṣṣā, Sāfinīya, Munāḍīya, of which the first and third were also known simply as Ḥakāk (J. A., ser. 9, iii. 410, 432, 437; iv. 262, 270, 481; others: vii. 230); al-Ḥakīm's Māliki madrasa was
in the Mosque of 'Amr (see above) and Ibn Du`ānī (p. 100 sg.) mentions 8 zawāyā in this mosque, which were excavated for Aqīl. These madrasas were often also built close beside the large mosques so that they practically belonged to them. This was the case in Mecca (Chron. Mokht., ii. 104 sgg.; cf. Ibn Batūta, i. 324), in Damascus where there was a Shāfi`i madrasa beside the western gate, Bāb al-Bard (Ibn Djuibār, p. 271), in Ni`ābūr (Ibn Batūta, ii. 50) and in Cairo where al-Madrasa al-Taibasīya in 709 and al-`Akbūhghātīya about 730 were built so close to the Āzhar Mosque that they had common walls and windows in them, which was specially permitted by a fatwā; they were afterwards completely incorporated in the Mosque (Makrizi, iv. 223 sg.). In Fās, the chief madrasas are arranged round the great mosque al-Karaṣīya and the same arrangement is found in Marrakāsh (Pauté, in Hepheris, 1923, p. 515 sgv., 523).

If the madrasa, as a building, had little independence, its character as a home for students and place of instruction was very marked. But even where it was quite an independent institution, the distinction between madrasa and ordinary mosque was very slight, all the less as sermons were also preached in the madrasa. In the fifth century the minbar had already been introduced into a large number of mosques. In the Ni`āmīya in Ni`ābūr, services were held as soon as it was finished (by `Abd al-Raḥīm: Wustenfeld, Schaftf., ii. 285.) and the Ni`āmīya in Baghdād had a minbar (Ibn Djuibār, p. 219). A problem was however raised by the fact that these madāris were Shāfi`ī and this school held that only one mosque in a town could celebrate the Friday service, unless the town had been of very considerable size and we are definitely told that al-Djuwainī conducted the Friday service in the madrasa in Ni`ābūr although he was also khaṭīb at the Manīfī mosque (Wustenfeld, Schaftf., iii. 251). In Egypt from 609 to 665 there was only one Friday khatta, but after this time there was usually a minbar in the larger madrasas. The caliph actually preached in the madrasa built by Kalān in 678-658: Makrizi, iv. 221. The minbar for the djamī` in many mosques is expressly mentioned, e.g. the Ḥijāzīya 761 (ibid., p. 222 sg.), the Bakrīya 776 (ibid., p. 230), the Zāmānīya 797 (ibid., p. 241), the Djāl (ibid., p. 249). The Schiβīya, which had not a minbar at first, was given one in 758 and was henceforth used for the Friday service (ibid., p. 205). In Fās the mixed type of djamī` and madrasa was found in the Bū`anānīya (Bel., J., etc., ser. ii, xii. 339).

It was only natural that the madrasa should also be called masjīd (cf. Ibn Djuibār, p. 48, 49, with line 19, 20). Ibn al-Hādhīdī in the viiith century still wants to distinguish between masjīd and madrasa and give more importance to the former (Marāghī, ii. 3, 48). The distinction remained however quite an artificial one and this is also true of the distinction between madrasa and djamī`. The name madrasa was decided by the main object of the institution and the special style of the building. The name djamī` was only given if the Friday service was held in it. Thus, as late as 772, we find the emir Bābālī building a madrasa and opposite it a djamī`; but in the year 815, the madrasa was given a minbar and used as a djamī` (Makrizi, iv. 235 sg.). If these two uses of the building are equal) either name may be used (cf. the double name in an inscription of the emir Muqīb: van Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 201). In some cases a Friday mosque can be said to be in the madrasa (Ibn Batūta, ii. 39). The great Djamī` Ḥasan began in 757 was also one of the largest madāris in Cairo (Makrizi, iv. 117 sg.) and on the other hand, the Djamī` Khaṭīb in Bālāk built in 737 and the Djamī` Aṣlam founded in 746 were educational institutions (ibid., p. 106, 111; Husn al-Maḥādāra, i. 192). In the ninth century the Djamī` al-Mu`ayyadi was the most important new madrasa in Cairo (Makrizi, iv. 139). The same variation in nomenclature is often found in this century (cf. v. Berchem, Corpus, i., No. 235, 248, 253, 262). On the other hand Makrizi, in the ninth century, only uses masjid as a name for quite insignificant mosques (iv. 263 sg., where 19 masjid is mentioned). In the xith century the emir Kāthkūdā built 18 large mosques and many smaller ones and his interest in the furtherance of learning was specially displayed in his buildings at the Āzhar mosque, which had developed at the expense of the specialist madāris (al-Djabarti, Merveillles Biographiques, iii. 230 sgg.; Sulaimān Rasād, Kanz al-Djuwāhar fī Ta`rikh al-Āzhar, p. 74 sg.); for the similar situation in Mecca cf. above.

The connection between māusoleum and mosque was also found with the madrasa. The tomb of the founder was placed in Nūr al-Dīn's madrasa in Damascus (Ibn Djuibār, p. 284, 4 sg.) and during the Manlūk period it was the regular custom for the founder of a madrasa to be buried under a kūba in it.

h. Monasteries.

A close connection arose between the monastery and the madrasa. As already mentioned, it was quite a common thing for devout men to live permanently in the mosque e.g. in the minaret or somewhere else on the roof or in subsidiary buildings or in a cell in the mosque. Such a cell which can be used for teaching or for meditation is called zāwa`ya, lit. corner (Ibn Djuibār, p. 240, 245, 266; Makrizi iv. 20; cf. Greek θορυβον; see Dozy, Supplement, s. v.). Pious ascetics however had retained from the older religion the custom of living in special monasteries e.g. in Djuwāln in the fourth century (B. G. A., i. 188); Muslim historians trace these back to the time of the Companions (Makrizi, iv. 272 sg.). In the fourth century ascetics and Sufis, especially the Karrāmīya (q. v.) or Kirmāmīya (cf. Mez. Renaiscance, p. 273), had quite a number of monasteries (khwānāwī, also khwānīmī, sing. khwānākī) in Farghāna, Marw al-Rūdh, Samarkand, Djurdān, Tabaristān etc. (B. G. A., iii. 323, 365); in Jerusalem and in Egypt also the Kirmāmīya had their monasteries in which they held ḥakhr (ibid., p. 179, 182, 202).

The distinction between khwānākī and ribāt (plur. rubūt) is one of origin rather than fact. Ribāt was simply a dwelling for men who waged the gīhād on the frontier but the word was also used by the Sūfis who waged a spiritual gīhād (cf. Makrizi, iv. 292 sg.). There was a ribāt at the Magribī in the fourth century in the town of Salā (B. G. A., ii. 56). When Ibn Makrizi says that they had only two rubūt of the eastern kind (in Safi and Salā, Hepheris, v. 36, 71), it is doubtful whether he means an establishment of Sūfis or of ghāzīs. In the viith (xith) century there were several military rubūt on the river Niger, from
which the Almoravids originated. From the xvi century onwards many were built in Morocco against the Spaniards and Portuguese. *Mārīs* is the usual word for *riwāt* (see Bel, *J. A.*, ser. 11, ix, 1917, p. 325, N° 1). In the east in the fourth century, rubūt are frequently mentioned, which probably had a military character (*R. G. A.*, iii, 303, 334, 415). The original distinction between *khānaqāh* and *riwāt* is never quite forgotten; as late as the beginning of the eighth century we find *riwāt* used of a barracks (Maḍrīzī, iv, 276). Ibn Batūta says that the word *khānaqāh* had not reached the west; here the old Arabic term *ṣāwiyā* was used (Ibn Batūta, i, 71; *khānaqāh* however in Ibn Murtuza, *Hujjatīs*, v, 39 sq.). Usually we find the three terms used without any definite distinction being made between them (ṣawma'ā also seems to be used in the *Kīfās* of a Muslim monastery, see Tornberg, *Annales*, p. 143; cf. p. 18); for all three names are applied to *Ṣūfī* monasteries, which also take in strangers, i.e. are used as hospices.

Ibn Batūta mentions many monasteries in the 'Irāq and Persia. Beside the tomb of al-Rifā'ī, not far from Wāsīt was a *riwāt*, which he calls *riwāt*, where "thousand of poor men", i.e. *Ṣūfīs*, lived (ii, 4). In al-Lūr especially, he found a vast number of monasteries; the *ṣūfī* there built 460 *ṣawma'ā* and spent 1/3 of his revenues on them and the *madāris* (ii, 31).

For *Ṣūrīya*, Ibn Djubair testifies to the flourishing monasteries which were often regular palaces and he says that the names *khānaqāh* and *riwāt* are used indiscriminately (p. 243, 271, 284); the word *khānaqāh* sounded strange to him as a westerner, as to Ibn Batūta (p. 284). Nevertheless al-Nu'ānim distinguishes the three terms and mentions 29 *khānaqāhs*, 23 *rubūts* and 26 *ṣawma'ās*. The oldest *khānaqāh* mentioned by him (Duwaira) was founded for a learned man who died in 401 (Sauvaise, in *J. A.*, ser. 9, v, 269, 377, 387 sqq.).

It was similar in Egypt. The first *khānaqāh* was built by Ṣalāh al-Dīn in 560 in Cairo (al-Ṣālihiyya, originally called Dār Sa'īd al-Ṣu'ūdā: Maḍrīzī, iv, 273), the next in the seventh century by Baibars al-Bunduqdārī, who also founded new monasteries in Syria (Ibid., p. 282, 298). Of *khānaqāhs*, al-Maḍrīzī mentions 22 (Ibn Duwēmak only one), of the sixth century: one, seventh: one, eighth: 18, ninth: one. Of *rubūts* 12 (Ibn Duwēmak 8), of the seventh century: 9, of the eighth: one, besides 50 of *ka'ba*. Of *ṣawma'ās* 26 (Ibn Duwēmak, 9); these were mainly outside the town and were obviously quite small, often being simply the house, later the tomb of some devout man. The oldest dated from the sixth century. In Jerusalem also Salāh al-Dīn built a *khānaqāh* (v. Berchem, *Corpus*, ii, p. 87 sqq.). Among the *khānaqāhs*, *ṣawma'ās* and *rubūts* in this city the last named seem to have been specially intended as hostels for pilgrims (Ibid., p. 197 sqq.: see also Sauvaise, *Jurs. et Isb., index*). In Mecca 50 *rubūts* are mentioned; the oldest dated from 400 (Chron. Mecca, i, 108—115). At places of pilgrimage, the monasteries played an important part as hostels but even in other places they also gave accommodation to strangers. Ibn Batūta on his travels usually stayed in them (he calls them *ṣawma'ās*) but he also lodged in madāris, which were generally used as hospices (cf. Quatremerre, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, viii, 35; note). Some of these institutions were convents for single *Ṣūfīs* (Maḍrīzī, iv, 293 sqq.).

The main object of monasteries, however, was to afford *Ṣūfīs* a home and place for their devotional exercises. In the *khānaqāh* of Baibars founded in 706, 400 *Ṣūfīs* were maintained (Maḍrīzī, iv, 276 *infra* and in the *khānaqāh* Siryūkūs 100 *ibid.*, p. 285). They were given lodging, food, clothing and money; there were often baths attached to them. The building was arranged for *dākīs* exercises, and al-o for *ṣāwīs* so that it was a kind of mosque. Ibn Djubair mentions a *riwāt* on the summit of Abū Kabbās in which there was a mosque (p. 108). A *riwāt* may be actually called a madrīzī (Maḍrīzī, iv, 294; cf. *khānaqāh* and *madrasah*, p. 283 and the term madārib al-*riwāt*: Ibn 'Arabīshī, *Vita Timuri*, ed. Monger, iii, 890). The monastery founded by Šalāh al-Dīn was actually given a minaret in 780 (mī'ār-ad-ša'ī) and it is recorded that people used to wear sandals to walk in the *ṣawm* (Maḍrīzī, iv, 275 *infra*). Sometimes only the occupants of the monastery are admitted to the *ṣawm* (Ibid., p. 277: *khānaqāh* *liābīs*: There was therefore an imām on the staff of the *khānaqāh* (Ibid., p. 287). Like other sanctuaries the monasteries sometimes preserved relics; the *Rihāt* al-Āharī, for example, preserved a piece of iron and wood which had belonged to the Prophet (Ibid., p. 293). We sometimes find a *khānaqāh* built close to a large mosque like the *khānaqāh* of Aḥbūghā beside the *Arāh* Mosque (Ibid., p. 297; cf. p. 289: Kūsīn) or the founder built a madrīzī for the Friday *ṣawm* beside the monastery (Sīyākus, Ibid., p. 285). The occupants of the *Ṣālihiyya* *khānaqāh* took a prominent part in the Friday service in the mosque of Ḫākim (Ibid., p. 274). At a later date, we find the monasteries themselves arranged for the Friday *ṣawm*. This was the case with the Rihāt al-Āfrām, which in 663 was given a minbar for the Friday and festival *ḥuṣbā* (Ibid., p. 297) and al-Mu'ayyīd made a house, that had been begun before he came to the throne, into a *gāmā' wa-*khānaqāh (Ibid., p. 134 *infra*) just as *ṭīr ṭīr* a *gāmā* could be built with living-rooms for *Ṣūfīs*, e.g. the *ṣāwī* al-Ṭāṣī (beginning of the xth century, like the preceding, *Ibid.*, p. 140 *infra*) and in the xth century, the *ṣāwī* Shāikhū (before the building of his *khānaqāh*, Ibid., p. 113) Baibars al-Bunduqdārī was buried in his *khānaqāh* and the monasteries had as a rule tombs, either of the founder, or of devout men who had lived in them.

The development of the monastery is therefore quite analogous to that of the madrasa: the one institution merges into the other, because learning and manifestation of piety are inseparable in Islam. Learning was also cultivated in the monasteries; at the present day, we find students living in a monastery and attending lectures in a madrasa. Some scholars lectured on Ḥadīth in their rooms in a monastery (Ibid., p. 294, 295, 303) but instruction was also arranged for in some monasteries just as in the madrasa. 'Abd al-Ḥāfiẓ (d. 629 = 1231) lectured in a riwāt in Baghdad on *nīqāl, Ḥadīth*, etc. (Ibn Abī Uṣābīa, ii, 203) and a Rībāt al-Khātāmī is mentioned here, which had a library (Ibn al-Kīfī, ed. Lippert, p. 269). There are many references to libraries in monasteries (see for Marwān: Yākūt, iv, 509). In Khānaqāh Shāikhū founded in 756, an extensive course of lectures, Fīlsh according to all four Madhāhib, Ḥadīth and...
Ibrāhīm (Maṭriz, iv. 283) was given. In the Ribāt al-Āṭārī in the eighth century, instruction was given in Shāfi‘ī Fiqh (ibid., p. 296) and in the Ḍāmt al-Fālāqī built in 821, arrangements were made for students as well as for Sāffī (ibid., p. 136); the İḫṣāṣ madrasa al-İḫṣāṣīyya (730) was also a hānāṣaḥ (ibid., p. 238 sufrā); they had a common director.

In the eighth and ninth century this combination of the two institutions became quite frequent, for example in the Nafṣāsī in Cairo of the year 757 (v. Berchem, Corpus, i. 242 sqq.), in the mausoleums of Barsbā 835 (ibid., p. 365 sqq.; cf. Ibn Iyās, ii. 21, 22, 41), of al-İrāqī in Qustul in 835–838 (ibid., No. 371 sqq.) and of Ka‘īr Bā‘ı 879 (ibid., p. 431 sqq.). The same institution thus came to be given different names (cf. ibid., p. 172 sqq.) and al-Suyūṭī deals with the ḥānąniyyāt under the madāris. In the east, Ibn Batūṭā found the same relationships, for example in Shāfa‘ī and in Kerbelā’ (ii. 78 sqq., 88, 99) and this is what he means when he says the Persians call the ḥānaws madrasa (ii. 30, 32). In the west, he lauds his own sovereign, who had built a splendid ḥānaws in Fās (i. 84); here also learning and Sufism were associated (see the quotation in Dress, Supplement, s.v. ṣawwā), and the ḥānaws still plays an important part in North Africa (see Depont and Coppolani, Les Confréries Religieuses Musulmanes, Algiers 1897; El-Hachiche, Voyages au Pays des Senoussas, trans. Serres and Lasram, Paris 1912). Cf. on the monasteries: v. Berchem, C. A. I., i. 163 sqq., 174 sqq.; c. Hospitals.

We commonly find, e.g. in Ibn Dujair and al-Maṭriz, the hospital, bimaristan, mārīsīn, mārīsīn, mentioned in close connection with the madrasa, probably because it was administered by learned men and as a rule also contained a medical school. Al-Walīd is said to have been the first in Islam to build a hospital in the year 88 (Maṭriz, iv. 256 sqq.; B. A. II., v. 106). In Cairo in 259 or 261 (i.e. before the mosque) Ibn Ťūlūn built a hospital for the poor. At the same time he installed a dispensary behind the mosque and a physician used to sit there to be consulted every Friday. According to al-Maṭriz, his mārīsīn (called in Ibn Ḍuḳāḳ, p. 99 the “upper”) was the first in Egypt; this probably means the first free public hospital; it is improbable that this Hellenistic institution did not already exist in Egypt (Maṭriz, iv. 38, 39, 258; Hum, i. 139). Al-Maṭriz (iv. 259 sqq.) mentions in addition to this hospital in Cairo the Mārīsīn Ǧa‘fūr (in 346. perhaps identical with that called the “lower” by Ibn Ḍuḳāḳ, p. 99), al-Magḥfira (232–247), al-Manṣūr (682), al-Ma‘ūnaydā (821). To these must be added the two which Sāẖīf al-İn maintaine in Müsir and Ǧa‘fūr (Ibn Dujair, p. 51, 52; cf. Ibn Ǧaḥlākān, Cairo 1302, n. 202 sqq.). In Damascus Ibn Dujair found two hospitals: one of them the Bimaristan al-İnṣār (p. 283, 284; cf. Ibn Ǧaḥlākān, ii. 403). He also mentions two hospitals in Nablus (p. 249), in Harrān (p. 247), in Ḥalab (p. 253), in Ǧa‘mā‘ x (p. 257); in Bāḡdād he refers to a number without particularising them but we know of hospitals here from the third century and in 304 Sāẖīf b. Thāḥtāt was director of the hospitals of Bāḡdād; he was responsible for the foundation of three more (Ibn al-Kifīr, ed. Lippert, p. 193; cf. Kīrāb al-Wusāsār, ed. Amedroz, p. 21 and on the whole question: Mez, Renaissance, p. 326 sqq.). There was a hospital attached to the great Mustānṣīrīya madrasa (Le Strange, Baghdad, p. 268).

As regards the teaching of medicine, Ibn Abī Usābīa shows (i. 103 sqq.) that it was continued without interruption in Islam: for example, he mentions ʿAbd al-Malik b. Abūjar, who was in charge of the medical school in Alexandria, and after the conquest adopted Islam. At a later date, the chief medical schools were in Anāǧīya and Harrān, among others places (i. 116 infra). For a long period most of the physicians were Christians (cf. also B. A. II., iii. 183). Teaching was usually given in connection with the hospital. The student around whom they trained (akhiradda) and they assisted him (e.g. the Georgios, summoned from Gundeshāpūr to Baghdad by Maṣṣūr: Ibn Abī Usābīa, i. 124). Khalīfān had installed his hospital in his house, the Maṣṣūrī, where the rā‘is al-aṣifactāb lectured on medical science (Maṭriz, iv. 260); instruction was also given in the great al-Bimaristan al-Nūrī in Damascus (Ibn Abī Usābīa, ii. 192). Lectures on medicine (ṭib) were sometimes also given in but in this case it was for the most part a theoretical science closely connected with philosophy. Ibn al-Ḥaṭīām (d. c. 430) lectured on ṭib in the reign of al-Ḥakim (ibid., ii. 90) and when Lāḏūn restored the mosque of Ibn Ǧūlūn he also endowed lectureships on this subject (Maṭriz, iv. 41); which shows that ṭib should be read in Fourquare, Hist. Sci. Med., v. i. 47). Ṭibb could also be studied in a madrasa; for example, al-Dūjī, who died in 641 lectured on it in the ʿAḍārāwīya in Damascus (Ibn Abī Usābīa, ii. 171). At the same time there were special madārīs al-ṭibb; thus in the seventh century three were built in Damascus (J. A., ser. 9, iv. 497–499; Fleischer, Kst. Schr., iii. 329). The teachers in them could also be physicians at the hospitals (Ibn Abī Usābīa, ii. 266).

d. Children’s Schools.

These were older than Islamic science, since at the very beginning of Islam, reading and writing were taught in Arabia. In Medina the teachers were often Jews (see Balādhūrī, p. 473 infra; cf. the name rabbānī for the teacher: Ṣūrā, iii. 73; 48, 68; Balādhūrī, Al-Maţiz, hāb 10; Yaḥshū‘ī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 2143); but the ability to write was not so common here as in Mecca (cf. on Mecca Noldeke–Schwally, Gesch. d. Qurān., i. 15 sq.; Goldzider, Muh. Stud., i. 110 sq.; Goldzider, Muh. Stud., i. 110 sq.). After the battle of Ḍārūr, several captured Moeccans were released to teach writing in Medina (Kūmāl, ed. Wright, p. 171; cf. Goldzider, op. cit., p. 111; Sprenger, Leben Muh., iii. 131). After the capture of Kaṣīrātā, the prisoners were settled in al-Ḍūrj and some were employed in the school (kuttāb) (Balādhūrī, p. 142). Another contemporary of ʿOmar’s, Dujair b. Haiya, who was later an official and governor, was a teacher (muallīm kuttāb) in a school in Tāfīr (Ibn Ḍaiḍar, Iṣbatā, Cairo 1323, i. 235). Maṭāwīya, who had acted as the Prophet’s amānūna, took a great interest in the education of the young. They learned reading, writing, counting, “wumming” and a little of the Qurān and the necessary observances of religion. Famous musicians like al-Ḥaḍjīlājj and the poets Kaẓmāt and Tīrīmātā are said to have been schoolmasters (Lammens, Maṭāwīya, p. 329 sqq., 360 sqq.). The main subject taught was adab, so that the schools of the children were called maḍāliṯ al-adāb (Iṣbatā, xviii, 2nd Cairo ed., p. 101); and the teacher was called
often said to be "to teach them the Kur'ān." In the Maghribi also, the children only learned the Kur'ān, i.e. to recite it, while in Andalus they also learned reading and writing (bītāb), poems and a little grammar. In Ifni they learned, beside the Kur'ān, some Hadith and a little of other sciences (Ibn Khaldūn, Muqaddima, p. 447 sq.; fayl, vi. 32).

The children's school is called maktab (e.g. Yaqūt, Udbah, iv. 272; Makrisi, iv. 41. 201) or kuttab (Buḫṣahī, Diyyāt, bāb 27; Bahā'īnī, p. 142; Makrisi, iv. 197, 240); those founded for poor children were called almatāb (cf. e.g. Makrisi, iv. 53, 117, 199, 201). The word maktab characterizes the schools as a public benevolent institution; cf. the expression: "she made a maktab li ʿīsābī" (ibid., p. 223; of Kālātūn's hospital, ibid., p. 260; s. also Dozy, Supplement, s. v.; Quintemerve, Hist. Sult. Maml., i./i., 229 note and B. G. A., iv. 211, 258). — Cf. on elementary education: Goldziher, Art. Education, in Hastings, Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics; Mez, Renaissance, p. 177 sq.; Lane, Manners and Customs; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 144 sqq.

5. Libraries.

In Mecca, as well as in Medina, there were large collections of books in the mosques (Ibn Ḏu'bair, p. 89, 193); on modern conditions in Medina, see Bətānūn, Rihla, p. 254 sqq.). The Djāmi Zaitūnā in Tunis had a large library (Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine, 1894, p. 287). The Niṣāmiya in Baghda'd had a library of which al-Farā'īnî (d. 488) was librarian (Wastenfeld, Shībʿa, ii. 314). The Muṣṭanṣirīya was better supplied in this respect than any other madrasa (Chron. Mekka, iii. 174). In Marw there were in the sixteenth century to public endowed libraries in the mosques and madaris, two of them in the chief mosque, one of the latter containing about 12,000 volumes (Yaqūt, iv. 509). Among the madāris in Cairo, the Fādiyya was particularly well endowed in this respect; it contained 100,000 volumes (Makrisi, iv. 197); these were acquired by al-Kāfiḍ al-Fāḍil from the Fādiyya Madrasa (Shībʿa al-Dīn Abū ʿĪṣa, K. al-Raṣūlīyān, Cairo 1287, i. 200; 268; Makrisi, ii. 253 sqq.) and in Kālātūn's hospital there were according to Ibn Taghribirdī (ibid., 482), 100,000 volumes from the same library. These libraries were often broken up and portions put in other madaris. During the famine of 694, the students of the Fādiyya sold the valuable books for a loaf a volume (Makrisi, iv. 197; cf. also p. 252). In Syria, Asia Minor (v. Berchem, Corpus, iii./i. 108 sqq.). Ibn Ḏu'bair says that in these eastern countries, the Kur'ān was only taught orally (by tālīkhn) while writing was practised with poems etc., out of respect for the Kur'ān (Rihla, p. 272). This did not hold generally however. At a later date (sixteenth century) we are told that a pipe was led from a school in the Azhar Mosque to the tomb of the founder so that his grave could be watered by the water in which the slates, on which sentences from the Kur'ān had been written, were washed (Sulaiman Rāṣdād, Kanz al-Dīnawar fī Tawālik al-Azhar, Cairo 1329, p. 73). As a rule the school was placed close to the mosque and beside a drinking fountain. During the Mamlūk period, nearly every founder of a madrasa built in connection with it a similar institution for orphans and poor children, who received free instruction and sometimes also maintenance in it (see Makrisi, s. v. madāris, passim). The object of one such school beside the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn is thus defined by Lādur as "to teach the orphans of the Muslims to recite the Book of God, the Exalted and also for other works pleasing to God and the various kinds of piety" (Makrisi, iv. 41). Elsewhere it is

6. The subjects taught and the methods of instruction.

As already explained, in the earliest period the principal subjects studied in the mosque were Kur'ān and Hadith to which was added the study of the Arabic language. In Buḫṣahī (K. al-Riʿa)
As above remarked, medicine was not only taught in special schools but also in the mosques; about 600 A.H., 'Abd al-Latif lectured in the Azhar Mosque but it is not quite clear whether his instruction in fiqh was also given there (Ibn Abi Usbah, ii. 207) and in any case the "philosophical sciences" in particular were cultivated in the mosques. Another division which still prevails, developed, that into principal sciences, those having a definite aim (maqāṣīd) and instrumental sciences (al-fāsiḥ wa-maṣūḥ) to the former belong kalām, al-khākhāt al-imāmiyya (ethics, practically the same as taqawwuf), fiqh, usūl al-fiqh, Kurān (tajwid and tafsīr), hadith. The later comprise linguistics, (ṣarf, faṣūlah, kayb, hay'ah) and in addition metrics and prosody (ṣurūt, faṣīya), logic (mantiq) including the theory of proof (uṣūl al-khākh), probably the same as the older mudhakara and marāj, mathematics (hiyāh and dhakhr), muṣūlah al-hadith (cf. Muṣūlah al-Bairum, Risāla, Cairo 1902, p. 20; Snouck Hurgronje, Meekk, ii. 200 sqq.). There are no hard and fast lines drawn. When in 1162 A.H. Pasha came to Cairo as governor, no şaḥīḥ in the Azhar could give answers to simple questions on mathematics and astronomy, because they knew only as much arithmetic as sufficient to deal with questions raised by the law of inheritance; a very few studied these subjects privately. The Pasha pointed out that astronomy was necessary for the study of religious duties, to settle the times and seasons (al-Dhahbī, Mervelle's Biographiques, ii. 110 sqq.; cf. also A. Sprenger, Die Schriftführer und die Schelastik der Muslime, Z.D.M.G. xxiii., 1878, p. 1—20).
The method of teaching was by lectures which had to be learned by heart afterwards (takhìm). The first task was to learn the Kur‘ān by heart and then acquire as many traditions as possible. The ḥadīth was repeated three times so that the student could remember it (Bukhārī, 71, p. 30). Lecturing soon became dictation (mat‘à), when the student wrote down what was said, except in the case of the Kur‘ān (approved: Bukhārī, 71, bāb 34, 36).

The method was the same for linguistic or literary subjects as for Ḥadīth, Tafsīr, etc. The philologists did not only to dictate their grammatical works, for example Ibn Duraid (Wustenfeld, Schähī, p. 127) or ‘Amm b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid (d. 744) who dictated from memory 30,000 folios on Ṭūḥa (Yaḵūt, 5,6, 7; 7, 26) but also the text of the poets, like al-Ṭabarī, who lectured on al-Ṭirāmīkh in the Mosque of ‘Amm in 526 (ibid., vi, 432). Abū Bakr b. al-Anbārī (d. 327 or 328), who dictated in one part of the mosque and his father in another, knew by heart 300,000 ḥawwāhid for the Kur‘ān and 120 commentaries on verses of the Kur‘ān with their ināsād (ibid., vii. 73). Dictation was specially important in the case of Ḥadīth, as the exact establishment of the text was the first necessity. It is therefore always said “he dictated Ḥadīth” (Husn al-Mughāra, ii. 139; Wustenfeld, Schähī, p. 210, 224, 242; 257, 287, etc.; Ibn Kuṭlubā, Ṭabarī al-Ḥanafīya, ed. Flügel, p. 51; Yaḵūt, 5, 6; 7, 24). The position of a teacher is therefore magfīl al-mati‘a (ibid., ii. 242; viii. 74), and his tumult among the students is al-mustamīl (cf. ibid., vii. 282; viii. 74). Problems of fiqh were also dictated (so Abū Yūnuf, Ibn Kuṭlubā, ed. Flügel, No. 249).

Instruction frequently began immediately after the salāt and the students performed the salāt along with the teacher. The class (dār) began with the recitation of the Kur‘ān by a hāfiz, with blessings on the Prophet, and other religious formulae (Madkhāl, i. 56; cf. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 172 sq.). At the present day, the teacher as a rule simply pronounces the basmala himself. Dictation alone was not everywhere the custom. In time, there came to be so many copies of the chief texts that the students were able to get copies for themselves. The text was in this case recited aloud and the teacher gave his comments and emendations on the text (Yaḵūt, 5, 6, i. 255). It was only natural that the dictation of texts was first abandoned in philology; it is said to have been dropped as early as the fourth (tenth) century (Mez, Renaissance, p. 171 with a reference to Subki, Ṭabarī al-Ṣāḥīfa, iii. 259; Suyūtī, Mushīr, i. 30). This does not mean that dictation was completely abandoned for the teacher still made his pupils write down his comments; for example Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān (d. 584) dictated a commentary on Ḥarīrī (Yaḵūt, 5, 6, vii. 29), and the method of having a text read aloud, while the lecturer explained any remarkable phrases was used as early as by the teacher of Ḥadīth, Ibn Kaisān (d. 99; ibid., vi. 282). At the present day, either the teacher or his familiar reads the text to be expounded from printed copy.

Cooperation between teachers and taught by questioning one another has always been an important feature of method. Ibn Khaldūn laments that so few teachers in his time understood the correct methods of teaching (ṭurūk al-ta‘ālim). They put difficult questions at once to the pupil instead of which the takhim must be arranged systematically, so that it is always combined with exposition and it is a fundamental principle that the pupil should not mix the different subjects. In Spain and North Africa in particular in his time, the instruction was not particularly good, and they laid too much stress on learning by heart (kiff) (Muḥaddīna, p. 342, 448 sq.; 450 = faṭ l. 6, N. 2, 29, 30; cf. Subki, Mu‘īd al-N‘ām, ed. Myhann, p. 151 sq.). Mechanical learning by heart is recognised for the Kur‘ān. It is therefore regularly said “he dictated and expounded” (e. g. Wustenfeld, Schähī, p. 220, 326). When the above mentioned Ibn Kaisān expounded Ḥadīths, he also asked his hearers about their meaning (Yaḵūt, 5, 6, i. 282). Vice versa, the class was at liberty to catechise the teacher. Al-Šāhī’s used to sit in his great ḥalqā in Mecca and say: “Ask me what you want and I will then give you information on the Kur‘ān and sunna” (ibid., iii. 379; cf. F. G. A., iii. 379). The teacher was sometimes overwhelmed with questions (Yaḵūt, 5, 6, i. 272). Ibn Ḫūṣair wrote questions being handed to a teacher in the Niẓāmiya in Bagdād (p. 191 sq.). Both practices are still in vogue and even in large classes the student may interrupt with questions. Ibn al-Ḥājī谴责s irregular interruptions of the lecture (Madkhāl, i. 57).

7. The Teachers.

The name for a teacher is muqtorī (also used in the pre-Muhammadan period) (Ibn Abī Uḥayrā, i. 104); ustād is a kind of honorary title (see Yaḵūt, 5, 6, i. 113, 209; ii. 271; v. 353, 354, 358, 448) and is still in use and applied also to students. There were a very large number of teachers in the great mosques. In the madrasa at first only one was appointed, for example in the Niẓāmiya in Bagdād (see above), in the first of those founded by Šalāb al-Din in Cairo (al-Naṣirīya: Makrizī, iv. 193) and in many others. A madrasa frequently took its name from a distinguishing teacher (e. g. the Gharaṭīya in Cairo: Maṣrī, iv. 235; the Sharīfīya, originally the Naṣīrīya: ibid., p. 193; M. Ibn Rashīd: ibid., p. 195; cf. Madkhāl al-Kāsī in Bagdād). In the larger madrasā, however, several teachers were appointed; Šalāb al-Din appointed 4 lectures to the Kamhīya in Cairo (ibid., p. 193 sq.); in this case a definite number (20) of students was allotted to each teacher (cf. Chen. Memba, ii. 105 sq.).

It is easily understood that the conditions in the older mosques, where every one could come and go, were freer than in the madrasā, which were built for particular teachers and students. There was certainly no official recognition of the teachers in the earliest period. After text-books had come into use, the certificate of qualification was the iḍīsā, and so it has remained to modern times. Any one who had studied with a teacher could get permission from him to teach from the book, which he had copied out and studied from his dictation: the teacher wrote this permission (iḍīsā) in the book (e. g. Yaḵūt, 5, 6, i. 253; ii. 272). A teacher could also give an iḍīsā ṣāma, which permitted the individual concerned to teach from all his works (Ibn Batṭūta, i. 251). In Damascus, Ibn Batṭūta was given quite a number of these “diplomas” (i. 251–253). It was the usual thing for a travelling scholar to collect numerous iḍīsāt;
thus 'Abd al-Latīf had certificates of this kind 
from teachers in Baghdad, Khurāsān, Egypt and 
Syria (Ibn Abī Usāhī, ii. 202). As late as about 
1700 we find al-Najmāni acquiring ājīzāt on 
his travels (Z. D. M. C., xvi. 690). There were special 
formulæ for the ājīzāt on fardīs and fawā'id (al- 
Kalkashandi, al-Abā'ī, 1542, xiv. 322 sq.). Some 
scholars only gave occasional lectures. 'Abd al- 
Wāḥib (d. 494) lectured on Ḥadīth every Friday 
in the Niẓāmīya (Wustenfeld, Schāfī, p. 287) 
and originally this was the case in the Ahāzār 
Mosque (see above).

The caliph al-Ḳadr, in his earlier days, used 
to lecture every Friday in a mosque in Baghdad 
(ibid., p. 233). Some scholars only dealt with 
a very limited subject; thus one was appointed to 
the Niẓāmīya to lecture on Bukhārī’s Sahīh because 
he had attended lectures on this from a celebrated 
teacher (ibid., p. 288). There were however many 
learned men who devoted themselves mainly to 
teaching and taught several subjects. Thus 
Shaftī began his hādīth immediately after the qālāt 
al-lasūf and taught students of the Kurān, at 
sunrise the students of Ḥadīth came to him and 
heard his comments; later in the day he lectured on 
method (masūkhara wa l-nuzūr); at the ājīz 
the ahl al-Ḥadīth came to him and he lectured on 
ṣūrā, msāhīt and shīr. He went off at midday 
(Yāqūt, l-dā'ī, vi. 383). About 300 a. h. we 
find Ibn Kāsān lecturing for the best part of the 
day on a number of subjects in somewhat the 
same order (ibid., vi. 282); others lectured 
from early morning till late in the evening (ibid., vii. 
176): Ibn Abī Usāhī, ii. 207 supra) and pious 
teachers even spent the night in the mosque in 
prayer (Wustenfeld, Schāfī, p. 258). Sometimes 
a young teacher began by dictating hadīth and later 
receiving a post with a wider scope in a mosque 
(ibid., p. 239).

The distinction between teacher and taught was 
not absolute; any one could have an ājīzāt in one 
subject, while he was still a student in others 
and even men of ripe scholarship attended the lectures 
of notable teachers. This led students to travel 
from one seat of learning to another, just as they 
used to travel in early days to collect hadīth (Bukhārī, 
ibn, p. 7, 19, 26). All the biographies of 
learned men give examples of this; the old 
Hellenistic custom was thus continued (cf. J. W. H. 
Walden, The Universities of Ancient Greece, 
New York 1910) and royal courts still played 
the same part; at them learned guests received 
donations, which enabled them to appear as teachers 
in the mosques (e.g. Ibn Ḥaṣṣa, ii. 75 sqq.; Ibn 
Khālidīn, 'Alī, al-'Ilār, Būkhārī 1284. vii. 452; 
Ibn Abī Usāhī, ii. 205; cf. Mommsen, Kemptische 
Geschichte, v 589). Distinguished scholars were of 
course much visited by lovers of learning; of 
one of the latter, it is said rīhāta ṣūrā or ṣūrā 
ḵanīd al-ṣūrā “they used to travel to him” (Yāqūt, 
p. 141). 4–600 fāṭhā had gathered round a 
teacher in the Maghreb in the time of Ibn al- 
Hādhaj (Ma‘ṭbā‘, i. 5). Sometimes a scholar 
attended another’s class to try him with questions 
(see e.g. for al-Bukhārī: Brunnw-Fischer, Christo- 
mathes, p. 103) and disputations often took place 
in which the pupils used to support their teachers 
very vigorously. If the stranger was recognised, 
the teacher might receive him with marks of 
honour (al-Abā‘ī, al-Kns`i: Yāqūt, l-dā‘ī, 
iv. 243 sq.). As in the Christian universities of 
Europe, public disputations were held in the mos- 
ques, in which considerable feeling might be 
displayed, e.g. in the disputations in the Ruṣāfā 
mosque in Baghdad between Ibn Sairajī (d. 306 = 
918) and the son of Dāwūd al-Zāhīrī in which 
the former was victorious (Wustenfeld, Schāfī, p. 110 
sq.). The teachers of the Niẓāmīya also used to 
hold disputations (ibid., p. 309). Celebrated teachers 
were not only visited by other scholars. When 
(about 300) Ibn Kāsān was lecturing, about 100 
horses etc. used to stand outside the mosque 
because prominent men were listening to him 
(Yāqūt, l-dā‘ī, vi. 282). The teachers made up the 
class of “the turban-wearers” (ma‘āshāmām, 
mu‘āshāmām, ārāb al-imāmah, asāb al-imāmah; 
see Ma‘ṭbā‘, ii. 246; Quatremère, Hist. Sult. Maml., 
ii. 244 sqq.; ‘ulūd, ii. 266; Dozy, Supplement, ii. 169); 
in eastern Andalus, they did not wear the ‘imāmah, 
but this was exceptional (Ma‘ṭbā‘, i. 137). The 
Rāsī Abū Yūsuf (d. 82) is said to have settled 
the dress worn by learned men (Ibn Ḥusayn, 
ed. Flügel, Ν. 249).

In spite of all this flexibility a certain stability 
developed in the teaching staff of the mosques. 
This was connected with the question of pay. It 
was for long in dispute whether it was permitted 
to accept payment for giving instruction. In 
the collections of Ḥadīth, the practice is both 
supported and condemned and it is said that 
the teacher may accept money, but not demand it, 
and avaricious teachers are strongly condemned. 
There are continual references to people who gave 
lectures without payment (Bukhārī, lqāna, bāb 16; 
Abū Dāwūd, Būyād, lāb 36; Ibn Mājah, Tafsir, 
bāb 8; cf. Goldscher, Mah. Stud., ii. 181 sqq.; 
Art. Education, Ν. 3–4 in Hastings, Encyc. of 
Rel. and Ethics; Lammens, Mamlūk, Ν. 360 sqq.; 
J. A., 1901, p. 143; Wustenfeld, Schāfī, p. 295; 
Mez, Renaissance, p. 176). The custom of the older 
Jewish scholars of exercising a handicraft was not 
common among the Muslims but was found 
ocasionally. Among men of learning we find shoe- 
makers, locksmiths, sandal-makers (Wustenfeld, 
Schāfī, p. 227, 231, 267; cf. also Mez, Renaiss- 
ance des Isl., p. 179). It was the rule however for 
the teacher to be paid for his work. This 
might be quite a personal donation from a prince 
or other rich man, for example al-Ṭabari was 
given a sum of money when he taught in the 
Mosque of ‘Amr (Yāqūt, l-dā‘ī, vi. 428; cf. 
the remarks above on wandering scholars); it was as 
a rule however a regular salary which was paid out of 
endowment, so that the position was a regular 
professorial chair (see under 8); this was especially 
the case in the madāris. The salaries of the teachers 
(ma‘āshām, also ṣawād, ṣawār, yāmā, see Dozy, 
Supplement, s. v.) varied considerably, 
according to the endowment. The lecturer in the 
Sayyūfiya received 11 dinars a month (Ma‘ṭbā‘, 
i. 196) but in another of Salaḥ al-Dīn’s schools, the 
Sa‘lāhya or Naṣrīya, the pay was much higher; 
the principal teacher received 40 dinars (of 13½ 
dinārs) a month and 10 dinars as principal, 
along with 60 ṭīf of bread and two beasts of 
burden, to bring water from the Nile (ibid., p. 251). 
In the Djamāl al-Dīn madrasa, each teachers 
got 300 dirhams a month (ibid., p. 253). The teachers 
also received donations in kind on special occasions; 
in the other Naṣrīya school they received sugar 
and meat every month at the festivals (ibid., p. 222),
in the Ḥidā'iyya on 'ld al-khr different kinds of bread and biscuit (ka'k and khunkūnīk), at the feast of sacrifice meat and in Ramadān food was prepared for them (p. 225). According to al-Maqrīzī, learned men might have 50 dinār's worth of food, in addition to allowances in kind (iii, 364). On ceremonial occasions, they often were given special marks of distinction, such as gifts in money and robes of honour.

The men of learning were organised in a guild. How the organisation worked in detail is not known. At the end of the third century we find the institution of the rīāsā established in Egypt. While Yazīd b. Ḥalib (d. 128) is called faqīh Miṣr wa-shābīkhū bi-siyādāt wa-shā'īnātān wa-tāhib al-qāsīn (al-Husn, i. 131), it is said of a series of scholars beginning with 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḳāsim (d. 191), ʿAṣghāb b. Ḥubbād b. 'Abd al-ʿĀzīz (d. 204), ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakām (d. 214 or 215) that they had rīāsā in Egypt (al-Husn, i. 135 sq.)—which seems to mean that they belonged to an organisation. The position is also called rīṣat al-ṭūm, as, for example, with reference to Yūnus (d. 264) (ibid., i. 136). When the madhhab arase, each school had its own rīṣ of the kind. The formulae for this was intahat ilāhi “rīṣās fi madhhab mālik; e.g. of Ibn al-Mawāz (d. 281), and others (al-Husn, i. 136; Ibn Taghibardi, ii/ii. 116); for the Shāfīʿī e.g. of Isfānīyīn, died 406 (Ibn Taghibardi, ii/ii. 122 sq.; cf. al-Husn, i. 196; Ibn Dībar, p. 219, 220); for the Ḥanafī e.g. of the Karkhī, died 340 (Ibn Kuṭlūbghā, i/ii. 115; cf. Nūr, 11, 13; Ibn Taghibardi, ii/ii. 116); for the Ḥanbalīs of the Barbahārī (d. 329) (Ibn Māshwala, l., Cairo, 1905, p. 260). Besides rīṣ we find other names like Imām al-Ḥanafiyya bi-Qadi dār bi-Qasīm Sur or Shāfiʿī Shīrāzī bi-nāfir ward al-Nahr (Ibn Kuṭlūbghā, Nūr, 96, 96, 196; cf. Shaikh al-Ḥanafīyya: Ibn Taghibardi, ii/ii. 116; Shaikh al-Mālikīyya fi Wāḥiba: al-Husn, i. 209). With such names it is not clear whether they are simply epithets like Imām Wāthikī, Imām ʿAṣriḥī (Ibn Kuṭlūbghā, i/ii. 206, 217), Uṣṭād Ẓanānī (al-Husn, i. 141), Rāʾi fi ʿUṣṭād al-Ḳalām (ibid., i/ii. 192), al-Sayyidīn (ibid., i/ii. 190), “the teacher of the Ḥanbalis and their Faṣīḥ” (Ibn Taghibardi, ii/ii. 114). There is also evidence of the ṭiyāsā within the special subjects, e.g. Shaikh al-Kurābī bi-Mīr (al-Husn, i. 230), Ṭiyāṣat al-Ḥadīth bi-Mīr (ibid., i. 163; al-Raḍīṣ), Ṭiyāṣat al-Fatwā (Quatremère, Hist. Sull. Maml., iii/ii. 27), Ṭiyāṣat al-Kūra bi-ṣāh (al-Husn, Chapters 123; R. al-Ḳalām for (Quatremère, cp. cit., i/ii. 68, note; ii/ii. 270, 280; Ibn Taimiyya, probably also used earlier (Mez, Renaissance, p. 179), while Shaikh al-Shāfiʿīyya means the highest distinguished leader of the Ṣafīʿī (al-Ṭārīkh, iv. 285).

It is not clear what real importance the organisation of teachers had in the early period. In different districts there was a principal director of the organisations, a rāʾis al-ṭūmān, in Medina (Ibn Dībar, p. 200, s.), in Baghdād (ibid., p. 220, s.), in Cairo and Upper Egypt (al-Husn, i. 141, 143,
somewhat modernised, was still given. The education in the madrasas is linked up with the new universities in Calcutta and elsewhere (Calcutta University Commission, 1917–1919, Report, Calcutta 1919, pp. 143–187; VI, 60–70). In 1922 there were already 14 universities of which five were founded after 1919 (Oriente Moderno, ii., 1922, p. 60; on earlier discussions on the foundation of a university see R. M. M., xxi. 1912, p. 268 sqq.). The older universities, founded on the model of that of London, are those of Calcutta 1857, Madras and Bombay 1857, Lahore 1882, Allahabad 1857 (R. M. M., vi. 4; on Chiefs’ Colleges, ibid., p. 1–51; ix. 44–81). The essential feature of the reforms is the new method of instruction, the systematic organisation of the courses, which are concluded by examinations, and the creation of a qualified body of competent teachers.

Inspired by the same spirit, if not so thoroughly, were the reforms which were carried through at the capital of Islamic studies, the Azhar in Cairo, without the assistance of a European power. In 1872 an examination for those beginning teaching was instituted and the ordinance expanded by new regulations in 1885, 1888 and 1895. The principal could however appoint teachers without examination. The students had to be registered so that unworthy persons should not share the stipends. On June 4, 1895, a council of five members was appointed to prepare reforms. They dealt with the finance and organisation. In 1896 the mosque-schools in Tanta, Damietta, and Dussuk and in 1903 those of Alexandria were put under the Act. On July 1, 1896 (supplemented in 1897 and 1898) examinations for candidates for higher history, geography and mathematics were introduced as voluntary subjects and it was forbidden to read glosses and super-commentaries in the first four years. The driving power in the council was one of its members, Muhammad ’Abduh, but he retired in 1905. The Khdive ‘Abbas II Hilmi in 1908 and in 1911, after several commissions had been working at the subject, promulgated a new law which is still (1928) practically in force. The administration of the Azhar Mosque and the institutions connected with it (particularly other mosques and the Khd School) were reorganised. The organisation is based on the old organisation of the staff with the principal as head of the ‘ulama’ and the heads of the madrash as members of the committee of management. New subjects were instituted, such as ‘Ilm in combination with the sira, history, especially Muslim, geography, natural history, chemistry, mathematics, drawing, hygiene, education Instruction is given in three divisions, each of which is estimated to cover 5 to 7 years. To obtain admission a student must be 10–17 years of age, be able to read and write and know the Qur’an by heart (by the law of 1911 he was allowed to learn half of it in his first six months in the Mosque, but this was abolished in 1921). Each year ends with the examination in the month of April; the final examination of the first section enables the successful candidate to teach in elementary schools, that of the second to obtain an appointment in certain offices or as imam or khateb in the mosques; by the examination, the candidate obtains the highest degree of ‘ilm, and can become a teacher in the Azhar, or judge or council in the Shar’a courts. By new laws of 1921, 1923 and 1924, the examinations were reformed and the relationship to the Khd School, Ddr al-Ulum and other educational institutions reorganised so that in the Azhar, a kism al-takhassus for Fikb, Tajf, Hadith, Tawhid, Mantik, Waj’, Bayan, Akhlq, Islamic history and practical courses in teaching and court practice were instituted. When by the law of Aug. 26, 1927, a university was founded with faculties of arts, law, scien ce, and medicine (Oriente Moderno, v., 1925, p. 110 sqq., 434–436; vii., 1927, p. 627 sqq.), the question of education in the mosque again came up and a new commission on Nov. 27, 1927 was charged to consider new proposals (for the reforms of Egyptian institutions see P. Arminjon, L’enseignement, la doctrine et la vie dans les universités musulmanes d’Egypte, 1907; Mustafa Bairam, Risale, 1902; Sulaiman Ra’sad al-Zayyati, Diwan jah fi Tur’ik al-Ashar, 1330, p. 147 sqq.; A mid Madjiz Isarat al-Ashar, Cairo 1333, anonymous, but by Abu al Karim Salim, cf. al-Manarih, xxv., 1372, p. 703; Commission de la Réforme de l’Université d’El Ashar, Projet de Réforme présenté par Muh. Pasha Sa’d, Cairo 1911, and the official regulations; Joh. Pedersen, al-Ashar, Copenhagen 1922, p. 65 sqq.; A. Sékaly, in Revue des Études Islamiques, i., 1927, p. 95 sqq., 465 sqq.; ii., 1928, p. 47 sqq. etc.; Oriente Moderno, v., 1925, p. 113 sq.; vii., 1927, p. 634). In Morocco the ruler in 1844 introduced European subjects into the Madrasa in Fès Djadid (whence its name Madrasa al-Muhaddisin); these innovations did not become permanent but in 1916 the madrass in Fès and Rabat were reformed (Bell, in J.A., ser. xi, p. 152; Pérete, in Arch. Maroc, xviii., 1912, p. 257 sqq.; see for Tunis: R. M. M., iii. 385). Since these reforms were arranged everywhere, their reaching reforms in education have been introduced the results of which cannot yet be surveyed.

G. The Administration of the Mosque.

1. Finances.

The earliest mosques were built by the rulers of the various communities and the members of the community did all the work necessary in connection with the primitive mosques. The later mosques as a rule were erected by rulers, emirs, high officials or other rich men in their private capacity and maintained by them. The erection of the mosque of Ibn Tulin cost its builder 120,000 dinars, the Mosque of Ma‘ayad 110,000 (Ma‘zik, iv. 32, 137, 138). The upkeep of the mosque was provided for by endowments (asa‘f, kasb) (cf. therewith besides the Fih-Books: I. Kremsik, Das Waqfrecht, Z.D.M. G., xlv., 1891, p. 511–576; E. Mercier, Le code du hawqan ou asa‘f selon la législation musulmane, 1899). In the third century we thus hear of houses which belonged to the mosques and were let by them (Papyrus Ercherzog Rainier, Führer, N°. 773, 837) and Ibn Tulin handed over a large number of houses as an endowment for his mosque and hospital (Ma‘zik, iv. 83). This custom was taken over from the Christians by the Muslims (see Becker, in Isl., ii. 404). According to Ma‘zik, states were not given as waqf endowments until Muhammad Abü Bakr al-Madhbara‘i (read thus) bequeathed Birkat al-Habab and Suyfit as endowments (about 300 A.H.); this was however cancelled by the Fidsams again (ibid.). Al-Jukim made large endowments not only for his own,
but also for mosques previously in existence, such as the Ašhar, al-Hākimi, Dār-al-Ila and Dājjāli al-Maṣṣ and Dājjāli Rāshida; the endowments consisted of dwelling-houses, shops, mills, ḫāṣṣārā and ḥawāsqal, and the document (ibid., p. 50 sq.) specifies how and for what purposes the revenues are to be distributed. Bathes were also given as endowments for mosques (ibid., p. 76 for 529; cf. 81 of the year 543). Sulṭān al-Dīn granted lands to his madāris: in 556, for example, a qaṣr in the Kaḥmiyya and a ḥār in al-Fayyum and the teachers received wheat from al-Fayyum and in the same year he endowed the Naṣṣiriyya with goldsmiths’ shops and a village (ibid., p. 193 sq.; cf. another document: p. 196 sq.). During the Mamlūk period also, estates were given as endowments (for documents of this period see van Berchem, C.I.A., i, No. 247; Maḥrīzī, vi, 107, 137). Not only were mosques built and endowed but already existing ones were given new rooms for teachers, minbars, stipends for ḥanāfī reciters, teachers etc. There were often special endowments for the salaries of the inam and the muḥdāḥsins, for the support of visitors, for blankets, etc. (see Ibn Djbāir, p. 277 with reference to the Mosque of the Umayyads). The endowments and the purpose for which they might be used was precisely laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the kādī and the witnesses (cf. Maḥrīzī, iv, 50, 196 ināf). The text was also often inscribed on the wall of the mosque (cf. ibid., p. 76; the above mentioned inscriptions amongst others. Documents from Taḥkent see K.M.M., xi, 111, p. 278 sqq.). Certain conditions might be laid down, e.g. in a madrasa that no Persian should be appointed there (Maḥrīzī, iv, 202 ināf) or that the teacher could not be dismissed or some such condition (v. Berchem, C.I.A., i, No. 201), that no woman could enter (F.A., ser. q., iii, 589), that no Christian, Jew or Ḥanīfī could enter the building (ibid., p. 251), etc. Endowments were often made with stipulations for the family of the founder or other purposes. That mosques could also be burdened with expenses is evidence from an inscription in Edfu of the year 797 (1395) (v. Berchem, C.I.A., No. 539). If a mosque was founded without sufficient endowment, it decayed (e.g. Maḥrīzī, iv, 115, 201, 203) or the stipends were reduced (ibid., p. 251), but in the larger mosques as a rule the rulers provided new endowments. According to al-Mawardi, there were also special “Sulṭān-mosques” which were directly under the patronage of the caliph and their officials paid from the Bait al-Māl (al-Abākūm al-Sulṭāniyya, ed. Enger, p. 172 supra, 176 supra).

Just as the Bait al-Māl of the state was kept in the mosque, so was the mosque’s own property kept in it; e.g. the ḥanū or ẖirṣūn al-Ḳaṭib, which is mentioned in ‘Omar’s time and may be presumed to have existed under his predecessors (Bāṣḥīr, p. 43 supra; C.M., i, 307; ii, 14). The Bait Māl al-Dājjāli in Damascus was in a ḥubbā in the ṣahe (B.G.A., iii, 157; Ibn Djbāir, p. 267; Ibn Baṭṭaṣ, i, 201; cf. for Medina: Wustenfeld, Medīnī, p. 86). Rich men also had their private treasure-chambers in the mosque (see E 2) as used to be the case with the Temple (see E. Schurer, Gesch. d. jud. Völk., ii, 1907, p. 322-328; P. Camunot, Feuille de Donau-Europa, 1926, p. 495 sqq.).

2. Administration.

As Imām of the Muslim community, the caliph had the mosques under his charge. This was also the case with the sulṭān, governor or other ruler who represented the caliph in every respect. The administration of the mosques could however not be directly controlled by the usual government offices. By its endowment the mosque became an object sui generis and was withdrawn from the usual state or private purposes. Their particular association with religion gave the kādīs special influence and on the other hand the will of the testator continued to prevail. These three factors decided the administration of the mosque but the relation between them was not always clear.

a. Administration of the separate mosques.

The mosque was usually in charge of a nāṣir or wali who looked after its affairs. The founder was often himself the nāṣir or he chose another and after his death, his descendants took charge or whoever was appointed by him in the foundation charter. In the older period the former was the rule and is said to have applied especially in the case of chief mosques, if we may believe Nāṣir-i Ḵhosraw, according to whom al-Ḥākim paid the descendents of Ibn Ťullān 30,000 dinārs for the mosque and 5,000 for the minaret and similarly to the descendents of Amr b. al-Âzī 100,000 dinārs for the Mosque of Amr (Seffīr-Nāmē, ed. Schaefer, p. 39 and 146, 40 and 148). In 578 we read of an administrator (unīsawālī) of the mosque in Jerusalem (Maḥrīzī, iv, 11). In the case of mosques and madāris founded during the Mamlūk period, it is often expressly mentioned that the administration is to remain in the hands of the descendents of the founder: e.g. in the case of a mosque founded by Baibars (Maḥrīzī, iv, 89), in the Dājjāli Maṣṣ when the vizier al-Maṣṣ renovated it (ibid., p. 66), the Šāhīyya (ibid., p. 205), and the Karānzūnūriyya (ibid., p. 232) etc. so also in the lādīriyya in Jerusalem (‘to the best of the descendents’, cf. v. Berchem, C.I.A., ii, 129. Other cases are also found. Sometimes an emir or official was administrator e.g. in the Muʿayyad (Maḥrīzī, iv, 140), the Taibarsiya (ibid., p. 224), the Aṭhar, (ibid., p. 54 sq.) or the Mosque of Ibn Ťullān (Kalkaşandī, Šāb al-ṭārīkh, xi, 159-162). In Dijmāl al-Dīn’s madrasa, it was always the kādī al-ṭāṣrī (Maḥrīzī, iv, 256). In the Khanāqā of Baibars the kādīnāḥīs and his successors (v. Berchem, C.I.A., i, No. 252); but it was more frequently a kādī; for example in the mosque of Baibars just mentioned, the Ḥanafī kādī was to take charge after the descendents (Maḥrīzī, iv, 89); in the Aḵbūḡawīyya, the Šāfī kādī was appointed but his descendents were expressly excluded (ibid., p. 225). In the Mosque of the Umayyads during the Mamlūk period, the Šāfī chief kādī was as a rule the nāṣir (Kalkaşandī, iv, 191) and in the Nāṣir mosque in Cairo (ibid., xi, 262-264). In this city we find during the Mamlūk period that emirs and kādīs alternately acted as nāṣirs in the large mosques (e.g. the Mosque of Ibn Ťullān:}
Their governors built extensions and extended renovations (cf. C. M., i. 145; iii. 85 sqq.). During the 'Abbasid period, the kādi occasionally plays a certain part in these connections; for example, in 188-16 he presented the kādi with the necessary money to extend and repair the Meccan mosque (C. M., i. 312; ii. 43). In 263, Al-Muwaffak ordered the governor of Mecca to undertake repairs, at the Kalba (ibid., ii. 200 sqq.). In 271 the governor and the kādi of Mecca co-operated to get money from Al-Muwaṭṭak for repairs and they saw the work through (ibid., iii. 136 sqq.). In 281, the kādi of Mecca wrote to the vizier of Al-Mu'taḍād about the Dar al-Nadwa and backed up his request by sending a deputation of the staff there (sadaqa). The caliph then ordered the vizier to arrange the matter through the kādi of Baghdad and a man was sent to Mecca to take charge of the work (C. M., iii. 144 sqq.).

The importance of the kādi was based primarily on his special knowledge in the field of extradition, and he was, like the kādi of Basra, called Harith. Miskin in Cairo (237-245) forbade the kāra of a mosque to recite the Qur'an melodiously; he also had the masāḥif in the mosque of Amr inspected and appointed an amir to take charge of them (Kindi, Wulat, p. 469). After the building of the Ţulūnid mosque, a commission was appointed under the kādi l-Mu'āḍ to settle the kibla of the mosque (Mārkīz, iv. 21 sqq.). But at a quite early date they also obtained a say in the management of the funds. The first kādi to lay his hands on the al-ḥāṣa was Tawba b. Nāmir al-Iṣṭaḍāti, who hitherto every endowment had been administered by itself by the children of the testator or some one appointed by him, in 218 Tawba brought about the centralisation of all endowments and a large sum was created for the purpose (Kindi, Wulat, p. 346). How this system of centralisation worked is not clear at first, but it was carried through under the Fatimids.

Al-Muṣṭaṣrī created a special dīwan al-ḥāṣa and made the chief kādi head of it as well as of the dīwan al-masāḥif (Mārkīz, iv. 75 and 75; cf. Kindi, Wulat, p. 585, 587, 589, according to whom al-'Aṣir specially appointed the chief kādi over the two dāmīs); and a special bazīt al-māl was instituted for it in 363; a yearly revenue of 150,000 dirhams was guaranteed; anything left over went to form a capital fund. All payments were made through this office after being certified by the administration of the mosques (Mārkīz, iv. 83 sqq.). The mosques were thus administered by the kādās, directly under the caliph. The dīwan al-ṣabār wa l-maṣūdāba in Baghdad (Mer. Koresis sine, p. 72) perhaps served similar purposes.

Al-Iṣṭaḍām reformed the administration of the mosques. In 403 he had an investigation made and when it proved that 800 (or 930) had no income (zahīla), he made provision for them by a payment of 9,220 dirhams monthly from the Bazīt al-Māl; he also made 405 new endowments (of estates) for the officials of the mosque (Mārkīz, iv. 84, 264). Under the Fatimids, the kādās used to inspect all the mosques and maṣūdāba in and around Cairo at the end of Ramadān and compare them with their inventories (ibid., p. 84).

The viziers of the Fatimids, who also had the title kādi, did much for the mosques (Eljawhar, Wulati b. Kiliš, Bār al-Iṣṭaḍām; cf. v. Berchem, C. I. A., i., No. 11, 576, p. 631).
Under the Ayyubids, conditions were the same as under the Fatimids. The diwan al-ahdab was under the kāfiṣ (Makrizi, iv. 84). Sulāḥ al-Dīn gave a great deal to the mosques, especially the madārīn (cf. above) 20,000 dirhams a day is a figure given (ibid., p. 117). When Ibn Dhihār says that the sultan paid the salaries of the officials of the mosques and schools of Alexandria, Cairo and Damascus (p. 43, 52, 275), he must really mean the Diwan already mentioned.

The same conditions continued for a time under the Mamluks. In the time of Baibars, for example, the chief kāfi Tādj al-Dīn was nāṣir al-ahdab. He caused the Mosque of 'Amr to be renovated and when the funds from the endowments were exhausted, the sultan helped him from the Bait al-Mal (Makrizi, iv. 14); after conferring with experts, the chief kāfi forbade a water-supply brought by Sulāḥ al-Dīn into the mosque (ibid., p. 14; Ṣayhūt, Hun al-Maḥāba, ii. 137). In 687 the chief kāfi Taṣqū al-Dīn complained to Kašhin that the 'Amr and Azhar mosques were falling into ruin, while the ahdab were much reduced. The sultan would not however permit their restoration but entrusted the repairs of the mosques to certain emissaries, one to each (Makrizi, iv. 14, 15). This principle was several times applied in later times and the emissaries frequently gained influence at the expense of the kāfiṣ. Thus after the earthquake of 707 (1103) (cf. theron Quatremere, Hist. Solt. Maml., ii. 214 sqq.), the mosques were allotted to emirs who had to see that they were rebuilt (Makrizi, iv. 15, 53). From the middle of the seventh century, we often find emirs as administrators of the chief mosques. The kāfiṣ had however obtained so much authority that he was conceded "a general supervision of all matters affecting the endowments of his madīḥah" (al-Umari, Tādj bi l-Muṣafah al-Shaṭiṣ, p. 117; cf. Z. D. M. G., xlv, p. 559); according to this theory the kāfiṣ could intervene to stop abuses. In Syria in 660 (1262) Ibn Khalīkān became kāfi over the whole area between al-Arīṣ and the Euphrates and supervised the affairs of wakfs, al-ahdab, madrasas, etc. (Quatremere, Hist. Solt. Maml., ii. 170).

Sulān Baibars reformed these endowments and restored the office of nāṣir al-ahdab or nāṣir al-ahdab al-maṭruṣa or n. dīyun al-kāfiṣī (Kalka-bandi, iv. 34, 38; v. 465; ix. 256; xi. 252, 257 sqq.; cf. Khalil al-Zahiri, Zuhūt Kāfī al-Mumalik, ed. Raiski, p. 109). According to Makrizi, the endowments were distributed among the Mamluks in three departments (dīyun): 1. dīyun al-ahdab, managed by an emir, the Dawdār; this looked after the funds of the mosques, in 740 in all 130,000 faddān; 2. dīyun al-ahdab al-hākimiyah bi-Mus vīl kāfīṣī, which administered dwelling-houses; it was managed by the Shī‘ī Kāfī l-Kāfī, with the title Nāṣir al-Aqṣāfī. This department came to an end in the time of al-Malik al-Nṣir Farājī, but an emir supported by the opinion of the Hanafī chief kāfi, spent a great deal and misused the funds; 3. dīyun al-ahdab al-mādīḥa, comprised all the endowments which still had particular nāṣirī, either descendants of the testator or officials of the Sultan and the kāfiṣ. The emir seized their lands and Barāḳ, before he became Sultan, sought in vain to remedy the evil by appointing a commissar. The endowments in general disappeared somewhat later because the ruling emirs seized them (Makrizi, iv., pp. 83—86). In modern times, as a rule, endowments in Muslim lands have been combined under a special ministry.

To be distinguished from the administrators of the mosque is the nāṣir who is only concerned with the supervision of the erection of mosques. Any one could be entrusted with the building of a mosque (e.g. Makrizi, iv. 92). Under the Mamluks there was also a clerk of works, mutawalli al-wāṣīr wa nāṣir al-musāla: he was the overseer of the builders (ibid., p. 102; see Zuhāt Kāfī al-Mumalik, ed. Raissi, p. 115 of p. 190; v. Benchem, l’s t. A., t. 742 sqq. 751).

The caliph or the ruler of the country was in this, as in other matters, supreme. As we have seen, he intervened in the administration and directed it as he wished. He was also able to interfere in the internal affairs of the mosque, the number of prayers in the month of Ramadān was cut down, the akhūn from the minaret abolished (cf. Maḥiṣ al-Māhīṣ, no. 788). In the year 214, the governor Ṭūsī al-Nuṣairi had the mosque of ’Amr closed except at the salāt because the Bait al-Mal was kept in it, which however produced protests from the people (Makrizi, iv. 11; Kindi, Walsis, p. 266; B. G. A., vii. 110). Many similar examples could be mentioned, especially during periods of unrest. In 821 the nāṣir in conjunction with the kāfiṣ revised the budget of the Mosque of the Omayyads and made financial reforms (7. A., ser. 9, vi. 220). The aḥān formalities were laid down in details by the ruler (Makrizi, iv. 41, 45).

In the year 253, the aḥâr in Bagdād had a man whipped who had tried to disturbance of the Karim in the minaret, after he had been heard in his defence in the presence of the kāfiṣ and several learned men (Wūyāt, t. dāīt, vi. 500). The importance of the sovereign in connection with the mosque depended on his personality. As a rule he recognised the authority of the regular officials. When for example al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī asked the Caliph al-Kārim for authority to read Ḥadith in the mosque of al-Masārı́, the latter referred the question to the nāṣir al-adabī (Wūyāt, t. dāīt, i. 210 sqq.; cf. Wustenfeld, S. t. A., iii. 280).

The consecration of the mosque was attended by certain ceremonies. When for example the midday service was conducted for the first time in the Dīmān al-Salih in Cairo, a representative from Bagdād was present (Makrizi, iv. 181). At the consecration of the Mosque of Ibn Ţālib, the builder gave al-Kānim b. Salama, a pupil of al-Shafī‘ī, who lectured on Ḥadīth there, a purse of 1,000 dinars (Sa‘īdī, Hun al-Muṣafah, ii. 130). Al-Makrizi describes the consecration ceremony at several mosques. In the M. al-Muṣaffa the Sultan was present seated on a throne surrounded by his officers; the basin of the š İyyān was filled with sugar and ḥālwa, the people ate and drank, lectures were given, then the š İyyān was read and ḥālwa delivered and the Sultan distributed robes of honour among the officials of the mosques and Sūfīs (Makrizi, iv. 139); similarly at the Zahrīyya (p. 662), were poems also recited of Quatremere, Hīt Sālt. Maml., iii. 11, p. 225 sqq., Madāra al-Dīn, p. 811; al-Saγhīmīshīya, p. 757 (Makrizi, iv., p. 217 sqq. 253, 256).
H. The Personnel of the Mosque.

1. The Imām.

From the earliest days of Islām, the ruler was the leader of the šālik; he was imām as leader in word, head of the government and leader of the common šālik. The governors of provinces thus became leaders of the šālik and heads of the kharāj when and where a special financial official took over the fiscal side, the governor was appointed šul al-šālik wa la-ḥarb. He had to conduct ritual prayer, especially the Friday šālik on which occasion he also delivered the khattāb. If he was prevented, the chief of police, šālik al-šarṣa, was his khalīfa (cf. Maqrizi, iv. 83). Ameer b. al-Ąṣām permitted the people of the villages to celebrate the two festivals, while the Friday divine service could only take place under those qualified to conduct it (who could punish and impose duties; iṣnād, p. 7). This was altered under the 'Abbāsid caliph.

The caliph no longer regularly conducted the šālik (after the conquest of the Persians: Maqrizi, iv. 45), and Anbaša b. Ishāk, the last Arab governor of Egypt (238–242), was also the last emir to conduct the šālik in the 1. This imām, paid out of the baṭt al-mul, was now appointed (ibid., p. 83), but the governor still continued to be formally appointed šul al-šālik. Henceforth the ruler only exceptionally conducted the service, for example the Fātūns on ceremonial occasions, especially in the month of Ramādān (Ibn Taghibi, ed. Juyboli, ii. 482 sqq.; Kalkashandi, Sudh al-Jāl, i. 599 sqq.); in many individual mosques probably the most prominent man conducted the service; according to the Hadith, the one with the best knowledge of the Kurʾān and, failing him, the eldest should officiate (Bukhārī, Adhān, bab 46, 49).

The imām appointed was chosen from among those learned in religious matters; he was often a Ḥaṣmī (Mez, Renaissance, p. 147); he might at the same time be a kādī or his nāsir (see Kindī, Wālid, p. 575, 589; Ibn Batūtā, i. 276 sqq.). During the šālik he stood beside the māḥarij; al-Maqrizi mentions the anomaly, that in Syria one performed one's šālik "in front of the imām" (R.C.s. i., i. 202); he could also stand on an elevated position; on one occasion Abū Hurairā conducted the šālik in the Meccan mosque from the roof (Bukhārī, Nābāt, bab 17). In Mecca, in Ibn Ḥujairā's time, each of the four recognized māḥarij (with the Zaidīs in addition) had an imām; they conducted the šālik, one after the other each in his place, in the following order: Šulānī, Mālikī, Ḥanafīs and Ḥanbalīs; they only performed the šālik al-maṣṣāṣ together: in Ramādān they held the šālik in different places in the mosque, which was also often conducted by the kurrā (Kittān, p. 101, 102, 143 sqq.). This is still the case; very frequently one performs the šālik, not after the imām of his own madhhab (Smuch Hurgrone Mekki, ii. 79 sqq.). In Jerusalem according to Mudīr al-İbn the order was: Mālikī, Šulānī, Ḥanafīs, Ḥanbalīs, who prayed each in their own part of the Haram; in Herōn the order was the same (Sauvaire, Hist. Jér. o Herōn, p. 136 sqq.). In Ramādān extraordinary imāms were appointed (ibid., p. 138).

When the imām no longer represented a political office, each mosque regularly had one. He had to maintain order and was in general in charge of the divine services in the mosque. In al-Maṣṣāṣ's time the šulān of the Mosque of 'Amr read a qūd of the Kurʾān every morning after the šālik (B.G.A., iii. 205). It was his duty to conduct every šālik, which is only valid fi ḥaram. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law; but it is disputed whether the šālik is invalid in the opposite case. According to some, the leader of the Friday šālik should be a different man from the leader of the five daily šālik (Mawardi, al-Āṣām al-Sultāniyya, ed. Enger, p. 171 sqq.; Ibn al-Hādījī, K. al-Madāʾiq, ii. 41, 43 sqq., 50, 73 sqq.; al-Suhki, Mīʿād al-Nām, ed. Myhrman, p. 163 sqq.; Ḥadīthīs s. Wensinek, Hand- buok, p. 109 sqq.). Many cherished misgivings against payment being made for religious services and quoted in support of their view a saying of Abī Ḥanīfa (B.G.A., iii. 127).

2. The Khāṭib.

The development of this office is analogous to that of imām. When the 'Abbāsid caliph no longer delivered khattābs regularly, a man learned in religious matters was appointed to the office of khāṭib [see D i and the article Khatib]. It could be pointed out that the Prophet himself had a khāṭib namely ʿUṯairī b. Ḥadhīj (Dāʾī, Bayān, i. 178) and sermons outside the Friday service had in any case become quite usual. Thus Ḥasan al-Bray was already a noted preacher (ibid., p. 190). Later it sometimes happened that a general like Dāʾīhār himself acted as imām at the šālik, while the khatta was left to a learned man (Maqrizi, iv. 44).

As the khāṭib in theory represented the ruler, he uttered a blessing upon him; to this extent the office had a political significance. The caliph was blessed and the heir-apparent and the king of the country (cf. above D i). When the caliph himself preached, he also pronounced a prayer for himself (Yāṣīf, 'Uḍâba, i. 349 sqq.) and the Fātūns mentioned their fathers. The sermons gradually became quite stereotyped; Ibn Batūtā (i. 348) praises the khāṭib in Mecca, because he gave a new sense to the mawṣūmah of Friday. A kādī was frequently chosen as khāṭib and a chief kādī a number of times preach in a large mosque (Kindī, Wālid, p. 589; Maqrizi, iv. 132; Ibn Dājabār, p. 156; according to Guettère, Hist. Sult. Mawli, ii. i, 25, a kādī was for the first time appointed khāṭibs in 604 [1225] in Damascus). The khāṭib could also be a "winnah" (Hilāl al-Silī, K. al-Wuzūra, ed. Amedroz, p. 421 s.) or hold another office like that of kādī atarrī (Maqrizi, iv. 137, 138, 139, 140); in the last mentioned case the office was hereditary, which we also find elsewhere (ibid., p. 9, 98 sqq.; Ḥanīfī, Ḥan al-Maṣṣāṣa, i. 185: al-Ṭakāṣī). The khāṭib had frequently a khāṭīfī. In the Rāshidī mosque, where in 414 two khāṭībīs were deliberately appointed, they both preached at the same time on the minbar (Maqrizi, p. 63 sqq.). We find in the larger mosques a number of khāṭībīs being appointed who relieve one another.

In Mecca the khāṭib was a particularly imposing figure. In his black robe, trimmed with gold, and turban with yālačān, he went up to the minbar between two black banners carried by muʿādhābīs, while a servant walked in front of him cracking a whip; after he had kissed the Black Stone, the chief muʿādhābīn went quickly in front of him with the sword with which he girded him on the minbar (Ibn Dājabār, i. 376 sqq.).
The whip (fa'ka'a: Ibn Djbair, p. 96, 97, 144, 156; Ibn Ba'tiya, i. 376, 379, 390, 394; see B. G. A., iv., s. v.) is also used as he goes out and on other occasions. The black was the colour of the 'Abbásids; it was also used in Egypt (Ibn Djbair, p. 56). The Fātimid khāṭib wore a cap (Satamaa'n: Makrizi, iv. 185.). The dress of the khāṭib varied with time and country (cf. ibid., p. 90; B. G. A., iii. 129, 416; Ibn al-Hādīj, Madhhab, i. 73). In Mecca there were celebrations when a young man became a khāṭīb (Ibn Djbair, p. 149). Very frequently the khāṭib and the imām were one and the same, especially in the smaller mosques, but sometimes also in larger ones (Yākūt, Udaa'da, vii. 174, 179; Makrizi, iv. 124). Ibn al-Hādīj even regards this as the normal thing (A. al-Madhhāb, ii. 59, 60, 73, 74); s. also al-Sukī, Mu'tid, i. 160 sq. and the article khāṭīb.

3. Kā'īb and Kā'īb. On these see C 3. Sometimes, in the later usage, wā'ir, which is used of the official speaker, very like khāṭīb (cf. Ibn Ba'tiya, i. 9), while al-kā'īb is only applied to the street-story-teller (al-Sukī, Mu'tid al-N'am, p. 161 sq.). The kā'īr are also frequently appointed to madrasas and particularly to mausoleums (Makrizi, iv. 223; Yākūt, iv. 509; Subki, Mu'tid, i. 162; v. Berchem, C. I. A., i, no. 252).

4. The Mu'adhdhin.

According to most traditions, the office of mu'adhdhin was instituted in the year 1, according to others only after the irād, in the year 2, according to some weak traditions while Muhammad was still in Mecca. At first the people came to the salāt without being summoned. Trumpets (būk) were blown and rattles (mūkūs) used or fires lit after the custom of Jews, Christians and Mādhūs. Abū Al-Ḥusān Zaid leaves the earliest period for the prayer as a dream; it was approved by the Prophet and when Bilāl proclaimed it, it was found that 'Omar had also learned the same procedure in a dream (Ibn Hishām, p. 357 sq.; Khāmis, i. 404 sq.; Bukhārī, A'dāhān, bāb 1; Zuruqā, i. 121 sqq.). There are also variants of the story, e.g. that the Prophet and 'Omar had the vision, or Abū Bakr or seven or fourteen Aṣ-ṣā'ir; according to some, the Prophet learned it at the mi'raj from Gabriel, wherefore the introduction of the aḍhān is dated after the irād; among the suggestions made, the hoisting of a flag is mentioned (Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 100 sqq.). Note-worthy is a tradition which goes back to Ibn Sā'd, according to which at 'Omar's suggestion at first a mu'ādhdih, Bilāl, was sent out who called in the streets: al-qalāta (almukātān). Only later were other possibilities discussed, but the method already in use was confirmed by the dream, only with another formula, the one later used (Khāmis, i. 404; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii 100 sqq.). According to this account, the consideration of other methods would be a secondary episode and probably the tradition in general represents a later attitude to the practices of other religions. But in Islam other methods were certainly used. In Fā's, a flag was hung out in the minarets and a lamp at night (F. A., ser. 11, xii. 341). The flag is also found in the legend of the origin of the practice.

The public crier was a well-known institution among the Arabs. Among the tribes and in the towns important proclamations and invitations to general assemblies were made bycriers. This crier was called Munādī or Mu'adhdhin (Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 170; Lammens, La Maqṣūm, p. 62 sqq., 146; B. G. A., i. 229 note; Širāzi, p. 150). Aḍhān therefore means the proclamation, Sūra vii. 50 "to proclaim" and "crier", Munādī (Bukhārī, Fārād al-Khunās, bāb 15) and Mu'adhdhin (ibid., Šarī'ah, bāb 69; Širāzi, bāb 10 = Līsīya, bāb 16; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 270) are names given to a crier used by the Prophet or Abū Bakr for such purposes. Official proclamations were regularly made by criers (cf. Tabari, ii. 1121, 1123; Annals of Islam, i. 410 sq.; 638 sq.). It was therefore a very natural thing for Muhammad to assemble the believers to common prayer through a crier (nūḍa lillah or 'iẓālāt, Šūrā v. 63; κι. 9); the summons is called Nidā' and Aḍhān, the crier Munādī (Bukhārī, Mu'ādhdih, bāb 5; Abū Bakr, bāb 7) and Mu'adhdhin; the two names are used quite indiscriminately (e. g. in Širāzi, bāb 5; 'Abū Bakr, bāb 5; Tabari, ii. 297 sq.). Munādī l-tālāt (B. G. A., i. 182, 192, also Sūrī "crier" is used (Tabari, i. 861; Chron. Mekk, i. 340).

In these conditions, it was very natural for the crier in the earliest period to be regarded as the assistant and servant of the ruler; he is his mu'adhdhin (Ibn Sā'd, i. 7; Muslim, Šalāt, tr. 4: Mādhūs, iv. 43, etc.; cf. Tabari, ii. 1120). 'Umar sent to Kūfah 'Ammar b. Yā'-ir as emir and 'Abd Allah b. Mas'ūd "as mu'adhdhin and waqir" (B. G. A., i. 165); he is thus the right hand of the ruler. Al-İ'tsān had his munādī with him and the latter summoned to the saʿlāt on al-İtsān's instructions (Tabari, ii. 297, 298; cf. Ibn Zayyād, ibid., p. 260 and in the year 196 the āmil in Mecca, ibid., ii. 861, 13; also Chron. Mekk, i. 340). During the early period the mu'adhdhin, when summoned by his masters in the streets and the call was very short: al-qalāta ḍjamāʾan (Ibn Sā'd, i. 7; Chron. Mekk, i. 340; Tabari, ii. 861; cf. also in the year 196, Sīra Ḥalabīya, i. 101; Khāmis, i. 404 sqg.). This brief summons was, according to Ibn Sā'd, also used later on irregular occasions (i. 7 sqq.; cf. the passage in Tabari). Perhaps also the summons was issued from a particular place even at a quite early date (see D 2a). After the public summons the mu'adhdhin went to the Prophet, greeted him and called him to prayer: the same procedure was later used with his successor: when he had come, the mu'adhdhin announced the beginning of the saʿlāt (ābāma 'ṣalāt: cf. Bukhārī, Mu'ādhdih, bāb 5; Abū Bakr, bāb 48; Sīra Ḥalabīya, ii. 104 sq.; Mādhūs, iv. 45). The activity of the mu'adhdhin thus fell into three sections: the assembling of the community, the summoning of the imām and the announcement of the beginning of the saʿlāt. With time changes were made in all three stages.

The assembling of the community by crying aloud was not yet at all regular in the older period. During the fighting, Ibn Zayyād in the year 60 called his munādī with threats to the evening saʿlāt in the mosque and when after an hour the mosque was full he had the rāma announced (Tabari, ii. 260). When a large number of mosques had come into existence, the public call to prayer had to be organised lest confusion arose, and the custom
of calling from a raised position became general after the introduction of the minaret. While previously the call to prayer had only been preliminary, it was now called the iḥāma and the iḥāma now formed two distinct phases of the call to prayer. Tradition has retained a memory of the summoning in the streets, now completely fallen into disuse, when it tells us that ʿOthmān introduced a third adḥān, a call in al-Zawr, which was made before the call from the minaret: this call however was transferred by Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik to the minaret (Bukhāri, Ḥumṣ, bāb 22, 25; Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 110; Ibn al-Hāджdī, Madkhal, ii. 45). This may be evidence of the gradual cessation of the custom of summoning the community by going through the street, Ibn Baṭṭūta, but this is exceptional, tells us that the muʿaddhdhīn in Khwārizm still fetched the people from their houses and those who did not come were whipped (lit. 4 sq.), which recalls Wāḥīdī measures. When exactly the Sunnī and in distinct steps to the šaykh’s formula can hardly be ascertained (see Aḥsan). The call biwaʿalā tawlahā is known from the time of ʿAbd al-Malik (65–85) (Akhtal, ed. Ṣaḥḥānī, p. 254; see Horovitz, in Isl., xvi. 297, 1924, p. 157; on ṭabāb see ibīd.; on adḥān formulae see further Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 105 sq.). At first the call was only made at the chief mosque, as was the case in Medina and Mift (Maṭrīzī, iv. 43 infa) but very quickly other mosques were also given muʿaddhdīn: their calls were sufficiently audible in the whole town. The chief mosque retained this privilege, that its muʿaddhdīn called first and the others followed together (Maṭrīzī, iv. 43 infa, 44).

The summoning by the imām in Medina was therefore quite a natural thing. The custom, at first associated with the ruler’s mosque, was not observed in Medina only (see for ʿOthmān and ʿĀli: Taḥārī, u. 3059 sq.), but was also usual among the Omanīs. The formula was: al-Salām ʾalīsī biwaʿalā tawlahā al-Maʾṣūma al-Wāḥidīyya, biwaʿalā ʾal-Salāt, biwaʿalā ʾal-Fāṣir al-Salāt, yuṣnūna Ṭabīb (Maṭrīzī, iv. 45; Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 105). After the alteration in the adḥān and the greater distance of the ruler from the mosque, to summon him was no longer the natural conclusion to the assembling of the community. In the ʿAbbasid period and under the Fatimids there was a survival of the old custom, in as much as the muʿaddhdīn ended the adḥān call before the ṣalāt al-fāṣir on the minarets with a salām upon the caliph. This part of the muʿaddhdīn’s work was thus associated with the first adḥān call. When Salāḥ al-Din came to power, he did not wish to be mentioned in the call to prayer, but instead he ordered a blessing upon the Prophet to be uttered before the adḥān to the ṣalāt al-fāṣir, which after 761 only took place before the Friday service. A muḥta-ḍī ordered that after 791 in Egypt and Syria at each adḥān a salām was to be uttered over the Prophet (Maṭrīzī, iv. 46; Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 110). Ibn Dījahī relates that in Mecca after each salāt al-maghribīr, the foremost muʿaddhdīn pronounced a duʿa upon the Ābedādūn and on Salāḥ al-Din from the Zemzem roof, in which those present joined with enthusiasm (p. 103) and according to Maṭrīzī, after each ṣalāt prayers for the ṣaltan were uttered by the muʿaddhdīn (iv. 53 sq.). Another relic of the old custom was that the trumpet was sounded at the door of the ruler at times of prayer; this honour was also shown to ʿAḍud al-Dawla in 368 by order of the caliph (Ibn Maskawī, al-Rāsūlīyya, Cairo, 1915, p. 396).

The iḥāma always remained the real prelude to the service and is therefore regarded as the original adḥān (Bukhāri, Qumma, bāb 24 sq.). In the earliest period it was fixed by the arrival of the ruler and it might happen that a considerable interval elapsed between the summoning of the people and the iḥāma (cf. Taḥārī, ii. 260, 297 sq.). The times were later more accurately defined; one should be able to perform 1–3 šalāts between the two calls (Bukhāri, Ḥumṣ, bāb 14, 16). Some are said to have introduced the practice of the muʿaddhdīn calling biwaʿalā tawlahā at the door of the mosque between the two calls (Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 105). From the nature of the case the iḥāma was always called in the mosque; at the Friday service, it was done when the imām mounted the mimbar (Bukhāri, Qumma, bāb 22, 25; Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 105); Makhzūn describes this custom, which is in front of him. This muʿaddhdīn, according to some, ought to be the one who called the adḥān upon the minaret (Sīra Halābiyya, ii. 109), while Ibn al-Hāʤdī, ignoring the historical facts only permits the call from the minaret (Madkhal, i. 45). In Tunis, the iḥāma was announced by ringing a bell as in the churches (Zarkashī, trans. Fagnan, in Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine, 1894, p. 113 sq.). A similarity to the responses in the Christian service is found in the fact that the call of the muʿaddhdīn, which contains a concession of faith, is to be repeated or at least answered by everyone who hears it (Bukhāri, Qumma, bāb 23); this is an action which confirms religious merit (Ibn Kuṭlabugha, Taḥāṣt al-ḥanâfa, ed. Flugel, p. 30). It is possible that we should recognise in this as well as in the development of the formulae the influence of Christians converted to Islam (cf. Becker, Zur Gesch. d. islam. Kultur, in Isl., iii. 1912, p. 374 sq. and Islamstudien, i. 472 sqq. who sees an imitation of the Christian custom in the iḥāma in general; on the possibility of Jewish influence see Mittwoch, in Abb. Pr. A. W., 1913, Phil.-Hist. Cl. 2). The muʿaddhdīn thus obtained a new importance. His work was not only to summon the people to divine service, but was in itself a kind of religious service. His sphere of activity was further developed. In Egypt we are told that Masmāʿa b. Mukhallad (47–62) introduced the taʿlīhī. This consisted in praises of God which were uttered by the muʿaddhdīns all through the night until faḍrī. This is explained as a polemical imitation of the Christians, for the governor was troubled by the use of the naʿābārī at night and forbade it during the adḥān (Maṭrīzī, iv. 48). In the time of Ṭūlūn and Khūmrāwī, the muʿaddhdīns recited religious texts throughout the night in a special room. Salāḥ al-Dīn ordered them to recite an aʿṣīrah in the night adḥān and after 700 ḏākir was performed on Friday morning on the minarets (ibīd., p. 48 sq.; Sīra Halābiyya, i. 110). In Mecca also the muʿaddhdīns performed ḏākir throughout the night of the first Sawwālī on the roof of the kūfba of the Zemzem well (Ibn Dījahī, p. 155, 156; cf. for Zemzemīs, Maṭrīzī, iv. 49). Similar litanies are kept up in modern times as well as a special call about an hour before dawn (Ehli, Tarhīm; see Lane, Maṭnāt al-Kadima, s.v. Eman, Lane, Maṭnāt al-Kadima, s.v. ʿEman).
The original call of the mu‘adhdhin thus developed into a melodious chant like the recitation of the Kurān. Al-Maḍṣīṣī tells us that in the fourth century in Egypt during the last third of the night, the adhān was recited like a dirge (B. G. A., iii. 205). The solemn effect was increased by the large number of voices. In large mosques, like that of Mecca, the chief mu‘adhdhin called first from a minaret, then the others came in turn (Chron. Mecca, iii. 489 sq.; Ibn Dubair, p. 145 sq.; cf. B. G. A., v. 111, i. 399, et supra). But in the mosque itself the adhān was pronounced by the mu‘adhdhīn in chorus on the dakkā (see D 26) erected for this purpose, which is also traced to Maslama. In the third and fourth centuries we hear of these melodious recitations (taṭtīb) of the mu‘adhdhīn on a raised pulpit in widely separated parts of the Muslim world (Sa‘dā, Egypt, Khurāsān: B. G. A., iii. 327; vii. 111; the expression al-mula‘adhdhīn, “the musicians,” if correct, probably refers to the mu‘adhdhīn: B. G. A., iii. 205; cf. also Kindl, Wafāt, p. 469; for Fāirs we are expressly told that the mu‘adhdhīn call without taṭtīb: B. G. A., iii. 110 sq.). In other ways also the mu‘adhdhīn could be compared to deacons at the service. The kāfāth on his progress to the minbar in Mecca was accompanied by mu‘adhdhīn and the chief mu‘adhdhin girded him with a sword on the minbar (Ibn Dubair, p. 96 sq.).

The new demands made on the mu‘adhdhīn necessitated an increase in their number, especially in the large mosques. The Prophet in Medina had two mu‘adhdhīn, Bilāl b. Rukhāb, Abū Bakr’s mawłā, and Ibn Umm Mākūm, who worked in rotation. ʿOthmān also is said occasioned to have called the adhān in front of the minbar (i.e. the ikāma) (Maṭrīzī, iv. 45). It is therefore regarded as condensable to have two mu‘adhdhīn at a mosque (Muslim, Šafāt, tr. 4; cf. Subki, Miṣrī, p. 163). Abu Mahdiyā was also the Prophet’s mu‘adhdhin in Mecca. Under ʿOmar, Bilāl’s successor as mu‘adhdhin was Sa‘d al-Ḵurṣānī, who is said to have called to prayer for the Prophet in Kūta (Maṭrīzī, op. cit.; cf. Sira Halābiyya, ii. 107 sqq.). In Egypt under ʿAmr, the first mu‘adhdhin in al-Fustāṭ was Abū Muslim: he was soon joined by nine others. The mu‘adhdhīn of the different mosques formed an organisation, the head (ṣarf) of which, after Abū Muslim, was his brother Shurāḥbīl b. ʿAmīr (f. 65); during his time Maslama b. Muḥallid built minarets (Maṭrīzī, iv. 44). The office of the mu‘adhdhin was sometime hereditary. The descendants of Bilāl were for example mu‘adhdhīn of the Medina Mosque in al-Rawda (Ibn Dubair, p. 194); we also find in Medina the sons of Sa‘d al-Ḵurṣānī officiating (Ibn Katāiba, Ḥanḍāb, d. Gesch., ed. Wustenfeld, p. 132, 279), in Mecca the sons of Abū Mahdiyā (ibid., p. 278; Sira Halābiyya, ii. 106), in Bayṣa. the sons of al-Mundīdh b. Ḥassān al-ʿAbdī, mu‘adhdhīn of “Ṭabād- ʿAllāh b. Ziyād (Ibn Katāiba, p. 279): it is however possible that this was really the result of a system of guilds of mu‘adhdhīn. In the džawārīn of the Magribī in the eighth century each had regularly four mu‘adhdhīn who were stationed in different parts of the mosque during the salāt (K. al-Majdīḥl, ii. 47 supra); but there were often quite a large number. In the Azhar mosque in the time of al-Ḥākim there were fifteen, each of whom was paid two dinārs a month (Maṭrīzī, iv. 51). Ibn Baṭṭūtā found seventy mu‘adhdhīn in the Mosque of the Omayyads (i. 204). About 1900, in Medina there were in the Mosque of the Prophet fifty mu‘adhdhīn and twenty-six assistants (Iba- ṭānī, Ṭibā‘ī, p. 242). Blind men were often chosen for this office; Ibn Umm Mākūm for example was blind (Bukhārī, Jāmī‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ, book 4, hadith 2411; Ibn Katāiba, ii. 104; cf. Ṭanānī, Ṭibā‘ī, p. 75). The Prophet is said to have forbidden the ʿAbdī to pay a mu‘adhdhin (Wāḥid-Wellhausen, p. 385). ʿOthmān is said to have been the first to give payment to the mu‘adhdhin (Maṭrīzī, iv. 44) and Āḥmad b. Ṭūlūn gave them large sums (ibid., p. 48). They regularly received their share in the endowments, often by special provisions in the documents establishing the foundations.

The mu‘adhdhīn were organised under chiefs (ruṣūṣ): Maṭrīzī, iv. 434). In Medina the sa‘d al-munīdīn were identified with the mu‘adhdhin al-Žāmānī who had charge of the singing in the upper story of the Zāmān building (Chron. Mecca, iii. 442 sq.; Ibn Dubair, p. 145; cf. Snouck Hurgrone, Mecca, ii. 322). The ra‘ī was next to the Imam but subordinate to him; in certain districts, it was the custom for him to mount the pulpit during the sermon with the Imam (when the latter acted as kāfāth) (K. al-Majdīḥl, iii. 74; correct above p. 928, l. 34 in keeping with this). The position which they originally occupied can still be seen from the part which they play in public processions of officials, e.g. of the ʿAbbāsī ʿAlī-khatār, when they walk in front and lead the ruler and his vizier (Maṭrīzī, ii. 246).

Closely associated with the mu‘adhdhin is the mu‘awwad, the astronomer, whose task it was to ascertain the kahlā and the times of prayer (Subki, Miṣrī, p. 165 sq.); sometimes the chief mu‘adhdhin did this (Snouck Hurgrone, Mecca, ii. 322).

5. Servants.

According to Abū Ḥansāla, the Mosque of the Prophet was swept by a negro (Bukhārī, Sahīḥ, vii. 72, cf. 74). The large mosques gradually acquired a large staff of servants (khālidīn), notably buwāb, farā‘īd, and water-carriers (cf. e.g. v. Berchem, C. I. A., i. No. 252). In Mecca there have always been special appointments, such as supervisor of the Zamzem and guardian of the Ka‘ba (ṣahīḥ, pl. sudāna, also used of the officials of the mosque: Maṭrīzī, iv. 76; cf. Ibn Dubair, p. 278). In Ibn Baṭṭūtā’s time the servants (khālidīn) of the Mosque of the Prophet were numerous, particularly Abyssinian; their chief (ṣamīl al-khālidīn) was like a great emir and paid by the Egyptian-Syrian government (i. c. 778, 548), cf. the title of an emir of the year 798: ʿabhū mālik b. al-ṣamīl al-khālidīn b. Ṭāʾīr b. ʿalī al-natrūsī (v. Letchen, C. I. A., i. No. 201). In the Mosque of Jerusalem about 300 A. H. there were no less than 140 servants (khālidīn: B. G. A., v. 100); others give the figure 200 (Le Strange, Palestine, p. 165) and according to Maṭrīżī al-Īmām Abū al-Malik appointed a guard of three hundred black slaves here, while the actual menial work was done by

In other mosques superintendents (kāyim, pl. ḵārāmā) are mentioned, a vague title which covered a multitude of duties; thus the Madrassa al-Madīna had a kāyim who looked after the cleaning, the staff, the lighting and water-supply (Mārkīzī, iv. 251), the Azhar Mosque had one for the miḥḍa, who was paid twelve dinārs (ibid., p. 51) and also 4 kāwānas, who were paid like muʿaddhīns (two dinārs a month) and are mentioned between them and the imāms, probably supervisors of the staff (ibid., p. 51). In other cases a kāyim al-ḥākimī, sometimes a kāṣī, is mentioned, who is apparently the same as the imām, the khaṭīb or some similar individual of standing (ibid., p. 75, 121, cf. 122; cf. Ibn Dujayrī, p. 51). A muḥārafi, inspector, is also mentioned, e.g. in the Azhar (Mārkīzī, iv. 51).

*Bibliography:* given in the article.

(Johns Pedersen)

II.

The Mosque in the Dutch East Indies.

In the Dutch East Indies, two kinds of mosque have to be distinguished, the mosque for the Friday service — these alone are called mosques (masṣāṣīt, also miḥṣīḍ) — and simple houses of prayer. This second category is found all over the country, especially in smaller villages, and owes its origin, partly to private initiative and partly to public efforts; they have native names (laṭār [Javan.], laṭaj [Sum.], laṭaj [Mad.]). The laṭār, or whatever it may be called, of the village is a centre at which the laṭārī can be performed, but it also serves other purposes of general interest. The upkeep of the building is the affair of the community and in particular one of the tasks of the religious official of the village. The upkeep of the other laṭārīs, erected by private individuals, is left to them. The building stands on its own site and is maintained by the founder or his descendants. The owner cannot however refuse admission to strangers who desire to use it for the laṭārī or as shelter the night. Such private chapels are always found beside the Muḥammādīn seminaries [Javan.]. We, however, sometimes find that these laṭārīs are endowed as waṣīf (Jav. Mal. waṣīf). The village laṭārī on the other hand has a more public character.

The mosques, i.e. the masṣāṣīt ḵāṣīmi, are found in larger places, usually in those which are also centres of administration. Their erection and maintenance is regarded as a duty of the Muḥāmmādī community; everyone contributes his share in materials, work or money, according as he is requested and is able to do. When a new mosque is to be built, not only is the site necessary for the building raised off, but also that for the dwellings of the staff and other people, whose piety induces them to seek a dwelling-place near the mosque; here they find the spot, where in their opinion they can be best benefitted by the atmosphere of their faith, spiritually and socially. This mosque area, at least the mosque itself and its immediate neighbourhood, is popularly regarded as waṣāṣīf although the conditions necessary to make it an endowment in the sense of the shāriʿa are not fulfilled. In waṣāṣīf affairs, the sharia is regarded as authoritative and not affected by common law.

Each mosque has its own staff, of the size it requires; in the large mosques there may be 40 or more. In Java and Madura, they form a regular hierarchy; this holds also for the relation of the larger and smaller mosques to each other. A mosque serves the requirements of a definite area; the staff of the mosque at the chief place in a smaller district is subordinate to that of a larger one and so on up to the capital of a regency (which is the highest native administrative unit). At each mosque a superintendent is appointed and the head of the mosque at the capital of the regency is regarded as head of all the mosque officials in the whole district. On the other islands the native, political organisation is less developed, the hierarchy of the secular power therefore less influenced by it. Generally speaking the personnel of the mosque is the same everywhere; the more the secular hierarchy is graded, the more noticeable is the classification of the personnel of the different mosques into various ranks; but we always find one recognised as the head of the staff.

The superintendent of a mosque in Java and Madura bears the general name paḥ[h]ulu. His main duty is to see that the Friday service is held; he can act as imām at itself but usually he leaves this to someone else. Besides him there are a large number of other officials, whose names usually are taken from the Arabic and whose duties are very varied; among them however we find the khāṭīb (Jav. Ar. khaṭībī). He delivers the sermon; but this also can be done by some one else. The maintenance of the building is also the duty of the superintendent. The expenses have to be met from the money collected by the staff, of which he has control (see below).

In Java and Madura generally, and very often elsewhere, the superintendent of a mosque is also an official, i.e. he is the legal authority who is present at the marriage ceremony; sometimes he acts as waṣīf of the waṣāṣīf. He is also authorised to give in marriage women who have no blood-relative to act as waṣīf; in this capacity he is called waṣāṣīf ḥākimī. Marriages are concluded in the mosque; it is exceptional for the paḥ[h]ulu himself to perform the marriage ceremony in person; he usually leaves this to one of his subordinates. People of high rank marry in the house; on these occasions the paḥ[h]ulu himself acts. The same holds mutatis mutandis of ṭalāk and ruqūṭ; these also are reported to the paḥ[h]ulu and recorded by him along with marriages in a register.

In smaller centres, where there are only laṭārī (chapels) there is an official, who assists the villagers in matters of Muḥammādīn law; he belongs to the village administration and may be regarded as the lowest rank of the mosque hierarchy; people desirous of matrimony apply to him; he accompanies them to the mosque of the district to which his village belongs; he also acts for the paḥ[h]ulu as amīl of the ṭakāt (zakāt) and fitra (ṣakāt al-ʿfitr) (see below). From this capacity comes the same he bears in some parts of the country: amīl.

The appointment of the mosque officials (as distinct from the village officials in whose cases the local customary law is followed) is not done everywhere in the same way. In Java and Madura, it is in the hands of the native chiefs who are also the highest state officials; on the other islands of the East Indian Archipelago, in so far as Islam prevails on them, the wishes of
the Muslim community are more or less respected; the secular authorities however exert a great influence.

The revenues of mosque officials come from various sources: donations, freewill offerings, in cases where their services are required: — at religious festivals, burials, etc. — need only be mentioned. The chief source of revenue is the so-called marriage fees, less from *djakat* and *pitra*; these are administered and distributed by the superintendent of the mosque. As already mentioned the mosque and its accessories have to be maintained out of the income. Neglect of this duty has induced the chiefs in Java and Madura to intervene and form a special fund, the so-called mosque fund for this purpose. This was arranged as follows: a certain percentage of marriage fees and of the *djakat* and *pitra* was set aside; the chiefs took charge of these funds. The revenues of the mosque officials earmarked in this way were however only a small fraction of the total; the greater part, perhaps 2/3 or more, remained at the disposal of the officials. This same procedure is found here and there on other islands but is not general.

The Dutch government maintains a neutral attitude to Islam, in all business matters of the mosque also. It takes no part in the building or restoration of mosques; only very exceptionally does it give a contribution in money for such purposes. This was done for example in Kuta Raja (Atjeh), where the chief mosque, which had been destroyed during fighting, was rebuilt from government funds in 1881. But this act of the authorities was not appreciated by the Muslim population; in general, the government officials only see that no compulsion is used to procure materials or funds for the building or maintenance of mosques.

With the end of the sixteenth century the Colonial administration began to pay some attention to the regular organisation of the staffs of the mosques, primarily in Java and Madura. Their measures aimed at maintaining things as they were and at getting rid only of abuses and such customs as had tended to be a burden on the people. *Djakat* and *pitra* are regarded as “freewill offerings” by the colonial authorities; the native chiefs and village authorities were therefore forbidden to interfere with them. It is left to the individual to give them or not; he is also free to give his gifts to whom he pleases. The giving of *djakat* varies very much with places and persons and is smallest in Central Java. It is concerned almost entirely with agricultural produce, especially with the staple product and even then it rarely happens that the legal quantity is given. In practice the *djakat*, where it is levied, is collected by the village mosque officials and handed over to the pa$h[h]ulu; he then distributes it in a certain proportion among his subordinates. The proceeds go almost entirely to the staff of the mosque and the village officials, firstly because they are *zmiit* and secondly because they consider themselves *fâbir* and *maslîm*; they have, as they say, no means of livelihood like other people.

*Pittra* is paid regularly; it happens very frequently with this “donation” that it is paid direct to those entitled to it and not through the officials. Nevertheless a considerable portion goes the same way as the *djakat*.

The government confined itself to seeing that

the *djakat* and *pitra* collected by the *pa$h[h]ulu*, was distributed as it ought to be according to custom but this was not always done.

Marriage, *tâlâk* and *ruđâf* have been regulated by a colonial law. The *pa$h[h]ulu* or his deputy was confirmed in his already mentioned functions as an official with legal standing. At the same time, others than the appointed *pa$h[h]ulu* were forbidden by the secular authority to perform marriages. The registration of marriages, *tâlâk* and *ruđâf* was improved. The fees and their distribution among the staff were fixed according to local custom. Every effort is made to keep these as low as possible. Similar regulations were later promulgated for the other islands.

As to the funds of the mosques, it was ascertained that there was more money in them than was required for the maintenance of the building and that they were being used for other purposes than the traditional ones. This caused the government to place the funds of the mosques under the joint control of European and native authorities. This holds particularly of Java and Madura; but wherever else the mosque had funds, these were retained.

The regulations promulgated for Java and Madura have recently been attacked by Muslims; they wanted as far as possible to withdraw everything relating to marriage from government interference. The intervention of the government is now (since 1929) limited to the fact that parties who wish to enter into matrimony have to report themselves to a registrar. *Tâlâk* and *ruđâf* have also to be reported to him. The marriage ceremony may be performed by others, but they are under the control of the registrar; this last method is now the exception: the majority continue to go to the district officer.

In one other respect the mosque has come under the control of government regulations. In Muslim districts of the East Indian Archipelago hardly a mosque is built without the consent of the local secular authority. Although it does not have to give its approval expressly, no work will be begun until the plan is approved. In Java and Madura the chiefs have long held themselves entitled to decide on the question whether a new mosque should be erected, though they justified this claim by saying among other things that a new mosque, if not desired by the entire community, may easily lead to jealousy and disputes about the validity of the Friday service etc., which might result in general unrest.

The custom of making the site of a mosque *waksaf* — or at least regarding it as such, — results in it being impossible to use such pieces of ground for public purposes, even if it is long since the mosque buildings had been removed from them.

These and other difficulties induced the government to require the approval of the chiefs for the building of new mosques on Java and Madura and also that the sites should become *waksaf*. It was however expressly laid down that there can be no possible question of interfering with the religious requirements of the Muslims; the chief can only refuse his consent in the public interest.

The law of the Dutch Indies demands the presence of the *pa$h[h]ulu* or some one with similar functions, at the courts for Muslim natives and also when a native appears as accused or plaintiff
in a court, to assist the court as adviser. An 
endeavour is made to get the most suitable people 
as advisers: they are officially appointed. It was 
found to be desirable to combine this office and 
that of the administrator of the mosque in the 
one individual: and this is now the usual practise. 
The influence of the government on the appoint-
ment of the personnel of the mosque, which 
otherwise is reserved for the chief, has thus been 
increased, especially as in the appointment of the 
assistant[s] of the paib[ka]hu, the ability of acting 
as adviser is also taken into account.

The bonds which connect the personnel of the 
mosque and the secular authority are thus fairly 
dense; — in the opinion of some too close. In 
recent years the effort has been made in nationalist 
Muslim circles, to loosen or even break all secular 
connections in the fulfilment of religious duties. 
One way of doing this is to get private individuals 
to found mosques with the help of similar-minded 
people. This is quite possible in the conditions 
developed and is still was.

Bibliography: C. Snouck Hurgronje, 
Nederland en de Islam, 2nd ed., Leyden 1915 
[French transl., in R. M. M., xiv. (1911) = 
Vest. Gesch. Bonn 1924, iv/2, p. 221 
sgg.]; Th. W. Ilyabull, Handteg der Mo-
hammadansche wet., 3rd ed., Leyden 1925, 
p. 71, 
54, 194 sgg., 253; A. Erich Mundt, vii. 297 
sgg.; x. 309 sgg.; xii. 287, where other works 
are given. 
(R. A. Kern)

III. 
Architecture.

The mosque with an open quadrangle was 
the natural form for the hot southern lands of Islam, 
and is simply a continuation of the many types 
of pillared halls and chambers which were to be 
found all over the near east, beginning with the 
Egyptian temples and coming down to the apadanas 
of the Persians and the stoas of the Greeks, 
of which of course only the latter influenced the 
development of the early Muslim mosque. This 
consists of a courtyard or quadrangle (gār) usually 
very large which is surrounded by colonnades (makār) 
which are either connected by flat beams, or 
more usually by arches and covered by a flat 
roof. At the kiblah side the mawās were deeper so 
that the rows of worshippers could find shelter 
from the sun. The supports were at first very 
often columns taken from ancient buildings and 
where these were not obtainable, were of wood 
or brick. The pillared hall at the kiblah side was 
called al-tawm al-afihi or rīwān. A portion of the 
ṣumr was shut off by a railing and reserved for 
princes and priests. On the quadrangle side of 
the rīwān is a podium (dikāk) supported by pillars 
and reached by a staircase or ladder; this is for 
the officials of the mosque, who repeat the words 
of the imām during the service to make them 
audible on all sides. At the end of the rīwān the 
makārā is set into the middle of the wall and 
herein it is the minbar. In the centre of the 
court is a well, originally intended for ritual ablutions 
but these were as a rule performed in 
rooms specially set apart for the purpose.

These mosques with open quadrangle were built 
in the first century A.H. on a large scale, as they 
were primarily intended to be mosques for the 
troops, whence they were called askar mosques.

The Djamīʿ Ibn Tulun in al-Ḳatāʾ, Cairo is a 
comparatively well preserved specimen of one of 
these askar mosques. It was built in 264—267 
(876—879) and measures 466 × 385 feet and its 
court is 300 feet square. The principal liwān had 
originally five rows of pillars but has now only four 
since the first fell down, the others still two rows 
each, which are connected by pointed arches, parallel 
to the walls, thus still following the type of the 
Hellenistic agora. The piers are built of brick 
and into the corners are let small columns. Between 
the pillars are pointed arches and ornamental 
walls with little pillars at the sides. Similar windows 
with stucco gratings pierce the outer walls. The 
roof, most of which is now modern, was made of 
palm trunks with sycamore planks nailed over 
them. In front of the makārā was a makārā for 
the ruler. This makārā was as here usually 
distinguished by its cupola. In the later mosques of 
this kind an aisle of some width led through the 
pillars up to the makārā, usually through the 
walls of the liwān so that the mosque was 
reserved for a ceremonial procession by the ruler into 
the mosque. In the Djamīʿ Ibn Tulun as in the askar 
mosques of the third (ninth) century in general 
there are no transepts as yet so that the succession 
of pillars is quite uniform. The makārā projects 
out as the wall juts out a little here and the niche 
have two steps cut into the wall and then projects 
in a semi-circle. Two marble pillars are built into 
the angles formed by the projection of the niche, 
which have been taken from older Christian build-
ings. The white stuccoed surfaces of the walls 
are ornamented along the upper margins and 
archivots with decorative strips, which were 
originally painted. The interiors of the arches 
were also originally decorated but are now for 
the most part whitewashed. Immediately below 
the roof on a wooden frieze runs a Kufic inscription 
two miles long with sūras from the Kurʾān, 
the letters of which are cut out of wood and nailed on 
to the boards. The mosque has a battlemented 
wall, which again was surrounded on three sides 
by a second outer wall so that the whole area 
was square in shape and the outer courtyards 
put some distance between the quadrangle of the 
mosque and the surrounding streets. The outer 
walls of these early army mosques looked like a fortress with round projecting towers even 
though not intended for defence. This was not 
the case with the Mosque of Ibn Tulun. On the 
mountain, which stood outside the mosque among 
the outer buildings on the north side and like the 
mosque itself was restored under the Mamluks Sultan 
Lajjin, cf. the article MANARA. Similar mosques 
for the troops were built in all the garrison towns 
of the young empire, like Baṣra, Kūfa, Baghādād, 
Samarra, Raʾka, in Cairo, Kairawān and elsewhere.

The type of mosque with quadrangle and piers 
or columns was however by no means limited to 
the mosques for the troops but was generally 
in the early centuries of Islam and survived much 
longer than this, just as the early Christian basilica 
had done. Many pillared mosques, the foundation 
of which dates back to the early centuries A.H. 
are still in use, like the mosque of the Umayyads 
in Damascus, the great mosque of Sidi Uiba in 
Kairawān, many mosques in the Maghrib, where 
they have frequently remained faithful to this type 
down to the present day, the Djamīʿ al-Azhār and 
others in Cairo. In towns that are cold in winter, the
The Dome Mosques. The great mosques built on piers — in so far as they were not simply army mosques — were primarily used for the Friday service in the larger cities. In addition to these, there were in every town several smaller mosques either for the use of the separate quarters or for special purposes. For these also in Egypt and the lands of the Maghrib the type of pierced mosque with open quadrangle persisted while in Mesopotamia, the lands of the Caucasus and Persia, suiting the ruder climate and undoubtedly stimulated by the influence of the Christian churches the closed domed mosque became the type. Some of these mosques (e. g. in Wārāmīn) reveal with their combination of a long building and a dome such a striking similarity to the older, mainly Nestorian, churches that M. Dieulafoy and van Berchem comprised them under a type to which they gave the name “mosque-réglée”. The type with a central domed chamber and internal piers are to be found in Tabriz, Erīvān, Dījār Bakr etc. It was only under the Ottomans in Asya Minor that the domed mosque attained the next stage in its development and it reached its zenith — not by chance — where the similar Christian style of church architecture had reached its final development, namely in Constantinople.

Madrasa. The foundation for the further development of the mosque with a great open quadrangle, as perfected under the Saldjikhs in the east, was the type of madrasa which had in the meanwhile been evolved (cf. the articles MADRASA AND ARCHITECTURE). The ideal plan of a madrasa is an open court with vaulted cloisters opening on a central quadrangle in the centre of the four façades, i. e. at the intersection of the axes. This plan however only became regular in Persia and we only find a few specimens exceptionally in Cairo. On both sides of these four iwāns are the cells and dwelling apartments of the teachers and pupils usually in two stories. In contrast to the pierced mosque with an open court, which arose out of a Hellenistic Mediterranean type of building, the model for the development of the eastern madrasa, which combined both school and monastery, was on the one hand the Indian Buddhist monastery and on the other the Khwarazmian iwān, while the madrasa of Syria, Egypt and the Maghrib was influenced by native types of mosque and house. The Turkish peoples, as representatives of the Sunna and its propaganda through the madrasa, before they invaded Persia and became Muslims, were mainly under the influence of Buddhism and Nestorian Christianity, which survived much longer in Turkestan and the Taif basin than in Persia and still was very important as late as the ninth century A. D., as is evident from the narrative of William of Rubruck. The Turks before they adopted Islam had, among the Buddhists and Nestorians, become acquainted with the missionary side of religion. This seems to explain the prominent part later played by them as propagandists of Islam in Persia and Asya Minor. It must, however, have seemed to them that the most suitable centre of propaganda was the same type of building as used by the Nestorians and Buddhists, namely the monastery. The Buddhist monasteries which were courtyards with cells built round them, numbered hundreds in Central Asia. They are as a rule oblong quadrangles with cells built round them and a stūpa in the centre and several large rooms for meetings. In Persia, under the influence of these buildings, the type of quadrangle and cells with four iwāns in the form of a cross became established as the ideal scheme of a madrasa. That this plan which was architectonic in origin was also the practical ideal for the fourfold doctrine of the Sunna, was a fortunate combination, which in some large state madrasas became of practical significance.

The Persian Mosque-Madrasa. The quadrangle surrounded by cells with four iwāns of the Persian Madrasa was now combined with the old pierced mosque and the result was a very happy combination: the mosque-madrasa (as we Europeans call it). The important result of this combination was from the architectonic point of view the monumental quadrangle with cells, which now replaced the old courtyard with pillars or piers which was no longer architectonically satisfactory and was also no foreign to types of the old type. But with this transformation of the quadrangle a change was brought about in the spiritual aspect of the mosque. It symbolized the transformation which had meanwhile taken place internally and externally in Islam from a combative, conquering religion organized on military lines into a spiritual attitude to life, controlled by theologians and men of learning. The fighting, however, which was still conducted by military forces, and the conquests had now become more or less the private business of the secular rulers, above whom was the religious propaganda of the Muslim clergy. The most instructive example of this penetration of the older type of mosque by the Persian quadrangle surrounded by cells is the Madrīd-i Husnā wān in Isfahan. This mosque, like all the Friday mosques in Persia was originally built as a pierced mosque and had been frequently enlarged. At the present day, as the plan shows, it consists of colonnades which have in course of centuries been added to one another from time to time. A great deal of wood must have been built into its framework, since Yākūt tells us that during the siege of Isfahan by the Saldjik Tughil Beg (142 = 1056/1057) the mosque was destroyed to obtain wood. From the contemporary accounts that have been handed down, we further learn that the Saldjik Būlān Malik Shāh when the mosque was completely restored by his orders began with roofing the walls of the courtyard. He is credited with building the southern iwān. The other three iwāns are over their present form of later origin. By covering over this huge quadrangle, the courtyard, the only characteristic architectural feature of the mosque, received the necessary unity and importance. (Around it, this mosque, like most Friday mosques, was completely surrounded by bazaars which made any external development impossible.) The quadrangle was therefore all the more important) The rows of cells had here no longer any practical significance as dwellings but became an architectural feature. Behind the southern iwān, directly towards the large domed hall was built as a sanctuary, in the south wall of which were the mūsābāb and pulpit. Here the solemn Friday service was held. Thus the Friday mosque was created of the type which became general in Iran and Turkestan. Mosques and madrasas were frequently combined with mausoleums (cf. the article ARCHITECTURE).
The Mosque building in the early period. Muhammad left no instructions as to how future mosques were to be built so that the earliest mosques varied considerably and we can hardly talk of a fully developed type before the third (nineth) century. The Prophet's house in Medina, where he performed the salah for his faithful followers and instructed them, was a dár of the usual local type quite unsuitable as a model for the future mosque. It consisted of a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall with living rooms and outhouses along the inner wall. As usual and still is in every house of this kind in Arabia and other tropical lands, palm trunks were put up in the courtyard and a flat roof of palmeleaves put over them and covered with a layer of clay. This is how the earliest accounts would lead us to picture the Prophet's house. In the courtyard was a reception tent furnished with fine carpets and materials, for Muhammad did not despise the nomadic luxuries and comforts of his Idrissian times (cf. Lamens, Inéma et les filles de Mahomet and de, in J. A., 1915, p. 238 sqq.). Around this establishment of the Prophet, his wife and daughters, lay the court in which his friends and followers used to assemble for the daily prayer and which thus became the first quadrangle of the first mosque. The use of a typical Arabian courtyard arranged in this way as a masjíd however gives us no idea of the future impound building. For half a century, it is true, they were content with this primitive mosque, during the patriarchal period of the first four caliphs, out of respect for the Prophet's home. But the first Omayyad caliph Walid I who in transforming the church of St. John in Damascus into the Mosque of the Omayyads had acquired experience "in matters of building" and connections with builders, on the occasion of his pilgrimage to Medina in 90 (709) ordered the primitive mosque which had served the purpose so far, to be removed so that an entirely new building could be erected on its site, which was extended. For this purpose, as Samhūdī tells us, he asked the Byzantine emperor for skilled workmen and shells for the ornamentation, which were sent to him. "The walls and columns of the new mosque were built of large hewn stones of equal size and bound with plaster, ornamentation in shell and marble was carried out and the roof built of palm wood and covered with gold paint". Instead of the early primitive mosque, Walid had thus given the Medinene a substantial pillared mosque, like the first mosques which he had built in Syria with the help of Byzantine arti-sans from pillars plundered from Hellenic colonies and Christian churches. It was only in this Hellenised form that the mosque of Medina could have influenced the further development of the mosque in so far as we can speak of such influence at all. (It was given its present form by the Mamlik Sultan Ka'īt Bey in 885 = 1483.) The ordinary Arab village mosque is different in appearance. It has retained the form of the Arab pre-Islamic māqālat. This "place of salah" was and still is a long hall supported by pillars, open on one side without a courtyard and having no mīhrāb and mimbar.

The lack of any generally binding or recognised rules for tradition is shown by the varying form of the mosque in the early centuries A.H. The earliest mosque of the general Amr ibn Fūsāf of 21 (642) was an enclosed rectangular hall without a courtyard, with a kibla which was not yet marked by a mīhrāb. The first mosque in Baṣrā was, like the whole city of encampments, built of reeds so that it could be taken down with the camp. In the year 16 or 17 A.H. Abu Abd Allāh the newly appointed governor of Baṣrā built a mosque of unbaked brick and clay with a roof of grass. It was only under the Omayyad governor Yazīd that a mosque was built of brick and plaster with a roof of teak and pillars, which came from the quarries of Ahwāz on the Karūn river. The first mosque in Kūfā on the other hand of 17 A.H. was "a covered hall... which had no side wings nor buildings behind it" (Tabari); before it was an open square "and so, continues Tabari, were all the mosques except the Masjīd al-Ḥarām (i.e. Mecca); out of respect for the sanctity of the latter, it was not copied in the other mosques". This mosque also was rebuilt by Yazīd, governor for the first Omayyad dynasty, in 661–680. For he had plans drawn up by Mazdaean architects: "Uno degli architetti gli fece un disegno sul modello degli edifici celtici dei rei sassanidi, ossia un vasto colonnato con tetto e chiuso ai lati" (cf. Annales d'Alislam, III, § 47, p. 857). When, on the other hand, the conquerors found buildings in towns which were suitable for masjīds from the point of view of space, they utilised them. In al-Madā'in, for example, the old twin-city of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the iwān of the white palace was used as a place of assembly for the Friday salah, and the pictures of men and animals in it were not destroyed by the Moslem conquerors. In Syria, however, the churches were turned into mosques by changing the orientation from east to south and placing a quadrangle in front of them. In this way the building of the mosque of any place in the early centuries A.H. was adapted to the traditions in existence and where there were no buildings, as in the newly founded camp-cities, it was on every occasion a problem for the governor requiring much consideration. In spite of this uncertainty, as one can deduce from the descriptions, they were more inclined, even as early as the first century A.H., to the type of pierced mosque with a quadrangle, to which all the prototypes as well as the climate pointed.

Development of the Masjīd and the Madrasa in the different countries.

Syria. As the place of residence of the first dynasty of the young Muslim empire and a land of ancient culture, Syria was naturally destined to build the first substantial mosques and to influence early developments. This influence exercised on the one hand indirectly through the Syrian mosque built by Walid in Medina, next to Mecca the most sacred and most visited city of Islam; on the other hand, the Mosque of the Omayyads in Damascus, as we know from Arabic sources, was taken as a model as far away as Cordoba. The earliest centre of Muslim building was Jerusalem, which the Omayyads endeavoured to play off against Mecca. Beside the rotunda of the Kūbat al-Sakhrā on the Harām al-Sharif, the sacred rock of which was to supplant the Ka'ba, Abu al-Mulik used the parts still standing of Justinian's Church of the Virgin to build the Dżumā al-ʿĀṣī (finished in 83 = 702). According to de Vogüé's plan, this building, later often restored or rebuilt, was a pil-
larded hall with three naves, of necessity oriented to the south with the mihrab in the long axis. At a later date the transept with the dome and four side naves was added. The *Mosque of the Omayyads* in Damascus arose out of the rebuilding of the Church of St. John, which had been built on this site by Heraclius and his son Constantine; after the other stones of the Antonine temple of Jupiter. We must assume that Walid had the pillars of the basilica moved so that three equal naves were built. These were crossed in the centre by a transept, which led up to the mihrab and had a dome over its centre. The rich decoration with mosaics was a suggestion from Syria and was probably done by Syrian workmen (plan and history of these buildings in Dicz, Die Kunst d. Islam. Volker, p. 14 sqq. of the first and p. 32 sq. of the second edition; with references to the literature). The mosque of Damascus was the first to have a transept, the prototype of which Thiersch no doubt rightly finds in the chalke of Byzantium (*Pharos*, p. 214), which frequently appears again in Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. The great mosque of Aleppo was also built after the plan of the Omayyads with a transept, as the latter can hardly have been added until the rebuilding of 365 (976) (pictures in Saladin, Manuel, p. 85). The mosque of Isâ in Ephesus, finished in 777 (1375), and the mosque of Dıyâr Bakr are northern outposts of this type, the influence of which can also be often traced in Cairo and the Maghrib.

Alongside of these principal mosques in Syria a series of smaller mosques arose, partly out of ancient temples (Aleppo, Hama, Homs, Ba'albek, Tripoli, al-Um'ayya), partly built out of material available from Christian buildings (Ramla, Kusair, al-Hallabât, Bosra). Some of these mosques may have been pre-Omayyad foundations, certainly the Mosque of 'Omar in Ba'ra. All these mosques, except Kusair al-Hallabât, have the same type of quadrangle with halls around it, two or more being on the kibla side, without transept. The development of these halls varies however, as a result of local tradition or the material available (e.g. the naves of Christian churches). They are as a rule vaulted with pointed arches but sometimes have gable roofs and thus, along with their closed façades, in front of which we exceptionally have a bowed corridor, bear a western or northern stamp in keeping with the ruder climate. The later Syrian mosques under the Ayyubids and Mamûlîks differ very much in their plans. The Mosque of Firdaws in Aleppo, for example, has a small pillared court and a broad nave, with a row of five small domes, as the harâm besides various side-rooms. The Ayyubid mosque of Dâr al-Imarat in Cairo (*Voyage en Syrie* (M. I. F. A. O., Cairo 1914, 2 vols.)).

**Madrasas in Syria.** A very complete study of the madrasa in Syria and Egypt by K. A. C. Creswell (*The Origin of the Cruciform Plan of the Cairoite Madrasas*, B. I. F. A. O., 1929) has brought some clearness into the question of its typical form etc. After an examination of eight madrasas built before 1270 A. D., the plans of which can still be traced in Aleppo, Damascus and Hama, Creswell shows that the symmetrical plan was unknown in Syria and that there was no regular scheme in the arrangement of the rooms, but it depended on the site available. A typical specimen is the always correctly oriented mosque: a nave of three vaulted rooms with three pointed arched doors to the court; a *iwân* in the court, rows of cells in the rest of the court and usually two tomb-capulas usually flanking the mosque; the rest of the area was used for rooms. Madrasas used by two rites had two iwâns. Of the 80 madrasas counted by al-Ilmawi in Damascus in the 19th century (*F. A.*, ser. 9, vol. iii.—iv.), 33 were Hanâfî, 31 Shâfi'i, 9 Hanbalî, 1 Malûkî, 6 used by Shâfi'îs and Hanafis. Creswell's investigation shows that in Syria there was not one madrasa of all four rites nor a cruciform one, a result, which suggests new deductions for the Egyptian madrasas.

**Arabia.** The indigenous form of the madjid in Arabia is a large hall formed of chambers with pillars and arches. The author found such oratories, more correctly to be described as musâllas, in *Masûnâ' on Bahrain* (picture in Dicz, K. d. d. F., p. 46). These praying chambers, open to the street without a courtyard, have no furniture, not even a minbar or mihrab. The latter was foreign to Arabia and in the larger madjuds its place was taken simply by a slab of stone with some adornment. But these pillared halls were only a more substantial form of the local native madjid of palm-trunks, which could probably often be found in the simple villages of the interior and whose sanctified precursor was the Madjd al-Nahawî in Medina built in this fashion. Alongside of this type of mosque which was indigenous to Arabia we find imported forms, like the madjad in Medina (see above), of slight importance from the archaeological point of view. Mention may be made of the ruins of a mosque near Manâmâ of 740 (1339/1430) described as an inscription as *maṣjid al-sharîf dîn 'l-imâmânât*, with old pillars of teak of the fourth (tenth) century; the Shi'a form of the crescent and also the inscriptions on the kibla stones of the sixth century mark it as a Shi'a edifice (cf. Dicz, Eine schiitische Moschee auf der Insel Bahrain, in Jahrb. d. ass. Kunst, II, 1925).

**Irák and Mesopotamia.** The earliest settlements of the conquering Arabs in the Irak were in the primitive camps built of reeds; equally primitive were the earliest mosques. Sásânian buildings were used for the purpose in conquered cities, like Ctesiphon. A pillared mosque was early built in Kûn (17 A.H.) which Tabari describes and which was rebuilt as early as the beginning of the Omayyad period by "Persian builders" in the form of a completely enclosed pillared hall (see above). In the capital of the caliphs also, as a result of its complete destruction by Timûr nothing worthy of note has survived. We know however that the Friday Mosque of al-Manṣûr (149–766) was built of pillars of wood and a flat roof. A wooden dome over the maṣjûra is probable. It was rebuilt under Hârûn in 192–195 (808). Al-Mu'tadîd began to enlarge it after the return of the troops from Samarrâ (280 = 893) (cf. Sarre-Herzfeld, *Arch. Revue*, II, 134 sqq. with plan). Outside of Baghdad the unlimited space available permitted great mosques for the soldiers to be systematically planned, as in Ka'kâ and Samarrâ; these were the great pierced mosques of the third (ninth) century, which were copied in the Mosque Ilân Tullûn in Cairo. Of the three large old mosques in Masûl, that of the Omayyads has completely disappeared; according to Yahûdî's description it was "completely vaulted, with alabaster slabs". This seems to be the origin of that type of pierced mosque
with vaulted arches which was later further developed by the Sālājūk and Ottomans (see below). The Mosque of Nūr al-Dīn (541–569 = 1146–1173) or Liwā dāl al-Kabīr was also vaulted from the first (with cross-vaulting) on piers (543 = 1148) and on its rebuilding in 568 (1170–1173) was completed in a cupola. The third Mosque of al-Mudhāzīd, Kāhir Iyās, has been completely modernised. Smaller mosques of the 7th (xiiith) century like the Dājmī Nābi, Dīrijīd have single domed chambers as praying-rooms.

In Baghādād the following madrasas were built under the 'Abdālīs: the Shāfī Niyāmīya in 549 (1066), the Tādjiya in 482 (1089), the 'Aṣaṣfī Tutuṣiyya in 508 (1114), the Nāṣirīya, c. 600 a.h. and the Mustaṣfījya about 630 a.h. Only the latter is still in existence and is used as a customs warehouse (sketch-plan in Sarre and Herzfeld, Arch. Rizm. ii. 161). Of remarkable oblong shape (86 ft. by 210 feet) it has six iwans, a large vaulted hall, rows of cells and side rooms. Besides the four iwan this, the first state madrasa, also accommodated a dār al-ḥadīth and a dār al-ṣurūān. If the Mustaṣfījya was not planned in a strictly symmetrical way with four iwans at the intersection of the axes, it nevertheless incorporated the same idea and may therefore have stimulated the development of the next type. In Mīṣūl there were several ʿAṣaṣfī madrasas.

Egypt. The type of pillared mosque imported from the 'Irāq under Ibn Tūlūn prevailed in Cairo along with the pillared mosque down to the Mamlūk period. It is the regular mosque that the large military and Friday mosques always have piers, the smaller mosques intended for the people of the quarter have pillars. Some of the latter however were on occasion also used as Friday mosques. The rows of piers were always parallel to the Kibla wall and connected by arches, a natural result of the rectangular form of the piers, which had to run parallel to the rows of worshippers. In the pillared mosques the naves might also be perpendicular to the Kibla wall, without inconveniencing the worshippers. The Cairo mosques of this group are:

The Mosque of ʿAmr b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in Fūṭāt, which received its present form as a result of repeated rebuilding and additions to the above mentioned hall of the year 21 (642) (cf. E. K. Corbett, The History of the Mosque of ʿAmr at Old Cairo, J. R. A. S., 1890).


The Mosque of al-ʿAzhar of 599–601 (970–972) on pillars: the first Mosque of Fāṭimīd Cairo, remarkable for the central nave, broader than usual with two domes (qalārat) probably borrowed from the Maghrīb and unival here; also for its stilted pointed arches which henceforth became frequent in Cairo; finally for the rich decoration of the plaster in the arches, which were recently cleaned. (They will be published by S. Hury in Creswell's great work on the architecture of Cairo). The ʿAzhar has long been used as a Dār al-ḥadīth (state madrasa).


The Mosque of al-ʿAṯmar, a small pillared mosque historically important for its façade built by Abū ʿAli al-Manṣūr al-ʿAmīr (965–954), finished 519 (1125); restored by Burūjī in 799 (1396–1397) and given a manārā which was removed in 535 (1142) (cf. M. v. Berchem, J. A., 1891, reprint, p. 81).

The Mosque of al-ʿAṣāṣī l-Tulāzī, built by the Fāṭimīd caliph al-Zāhir in 543 (1148–1149); completely restored in the Ottoman period.


The Mosque of al-Zāhir Bābās of the year 665–667 (1266–1269), a mosque with piers of brick, built for the troops with very strong stone wall and three portals jutting out like the Mosque of al-Ḥākim. The six rows of columns in the ārām are crossed by a transept with a dome of three naves broad in diameter before the mihrāb. Porticoes with double naves surrounded the court.

The Mosque of Sulīm Muḥammād al-Nāṣir on the citadel, of the year 718–735 (1318–1335) on pillars.

The Mosque of Amir al-Mās (Shāfī Hilmiya) of 730 (1339–1340).


The Mosque of Amir Akṣūnqīr of 747–748 (1346–1348) on pillars.

The Mosque of Muʿāṣir of 819–823 (1416–1420).

Of pillared mosques in Egypt outside Cairo we may mention the Mosque of St. Athanasius and the Mosque of the “Thou-and Pillars” in Alexandria the plans of which were recorded by the French expedition (Description de l'Egypte, Antiquités, v., reproduced in Thiersch, op. cit., p. 224). Shortly before the arrival of the French, Alexandria still had 88 mosques, 46 of which were large. Practically nothing of these is left at the present day. The two above mentioned were pillared mosques and particularly the second, also called the “Mosque of the Seventy”, with its iwāns of equal depth on all sides (only the northeastern one has 4 instead of 5 rows of pillars) the arches of which always run parallel to the outer walls, i.e. palm-like, continue the type of the Hellenistic pillared agora or the gymnasium as Thiersch has pointed out. The same type predominated in the towns of the Delta.

The second, later type of mosque in Egypt was decisively influenced by the madrasa, to which we may now turn our attention. As Creswell has shown, the Egyptian madrasa was by no means always cruciform, as was usually supposed previously. It is also distinguished from the Syrian type and cannot be at once said to have been introduced from Syria. It is true that the first madrasa for all four rites in Cairo was built by Sulīm Naṣīr al-Dīn Ayyūb, but this Sulībīya was a building divided into two halves and cannot be considered as the original of the later type (641 = 1243–1244). The first cruciform madrasa with 4 iwāns in Cairo was the Zāhirīya which was built on the site of a part of the old Fāṭimīd palace which was cleared for this purpose and consecrated in
The south liwān belonged to the Shāhīs, the north to the Hanafis; lectures on Ḥadīth were given in the east liwān and in the west liwān the seven ways of reading the Qurʾān were taught (Maḵrit, ʿĀṣīfāt, Ḥāṣibāt, Ḥāṣibāl Mawṣūʿī). While the Sāliḥīya held all four rites but was not cruciform, the Zāhiriya was cruciform but did not accommodate all four rites. The Nāṣiriya of 695 (1295–1296) was the first madrasa of the rare type which, cruciform and accommodating all four rites, allotted a liwān to each. Maḵrit also mentions a large number of other madrasas of one or two rites which have completely disappeared but probably were of different forms, as the existing madrasas and ruins show. One great difference in principle between the Syrian and Cairene madrasas was the installation of the mosque. In Syria this was always a broad chamber with a central dome and two tunnel vaults but in Cairo one of the liwāns was always used as a mosque and with this object was furnished with a miḥrāb. The Egyptian madrasas also always had minarets, which was the exception in Syria. Creswell’s assertion that the cruciform mosque is of Cairene origin, although it remained the exception, therefore will hardly find acceptance. Timūr and his successors certainly did not get the design for their numerous cruciform madrasas from Cairo but followed the old Kūjarānī tradition. It remains to be seen whether future excavations in Nīshāpūr, Tūs and other towns of Kūjarān will supply further information on this point. Creswell gives a chronological list of the madrasas of Cairo mentioned by Maḵrit and others, which were built between 566–811 (1170–1408); these number 55, 26 of which are still in existence. Two of these are devoted to four madhhab, the Madrasas of Sulṭān Ḥasan 757–764 (1356–1363) and of Dīmāl al-Dīn of 811 (1408) (Creswell, op. cit., p. 44). Further details of these madrasas will be found in Creswell, op. cit. and in Diez, Kunst d. isl. V. 2, p. 118–125.

Here we shall just mention the most celebrated building of this kind in Cairo, the tābīʾī mosque-madrasa of Sulṭān Ḥasan. It belongs to the group of buildings which contain several places of worship and are devoted to all four madhhab. The central liwān of which were however outside the central court at the four corners of the building, quite separate from one another. The four liwāns had therefore only an architectural significance. In keeping with the Cairo tradition, the kibla liwān was made much larger and arranged as a masjid. With this adaptation of the madrasa for use as a mosque, the foundations were laid for the further development of the mosque during the period of the Circassian Mamluks when it may be considered as a true mosque-madrasa. As a rule we can distinguish in it three compartments, the kibla liwān, a central chamber sunk a step lower occupying the place of the former open courtyard and a room at the back, as a rule a smaller one. Of little importance from the architectural point of view, these small mosques were elaborately decorated and formed fine specimens of the decorative art of Cairo. The tomb mosque of Kāḥl Bey of 880 (1475), the mosques of Kishmā al-Ishāṣi of 885–886 (1480–1481), of the Amir Aḥkār of the year 908 (1503), and of al-Muṣṭaṣf of the year 953 (1550–1554) are the outstanding building of this group. The Ottoman domed mosques from 935 (1528) follow the Turkish tradition. The Maghrib (North Africa and Spain).

The Maghrib (North Africa and Spain).

The typical mosque of the Muslim west is the mosque with courtyard, on pillars or columns. It was only under Turkish rule that the domed mosque became established in those parts of North Africa affected by it. The rows of pillars run, as a rule, perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by a transept. The axis of the latter is a continuation of the axis of the central nave which is always broader. Of the rows of pillars in the axis the two or three outermost ones are continued over the court and form the arcades, of which the inner entrance side of the court has as a rule only one. The beginning and end of the central nave are as a rule marked by a dome. The western mosques are given their characteristic features by the horsehoe and bulbous arch (a mixture of the horsehoe and the pointed arch). The miḥrāb of the western mosques is as a rule a pentagonal niche considerably deeper than the eastern semi-circular one. The oldest surviving large mosques in the west are in Kairāwān, Tunis and Córdoba (since the expulsion of the Church).

The foundation of the Great Mosque of Kairāwān like that of ʿAmr in Cairo goes back to the first century AH, but like that in Cairo also retains nothing from its founder ʿīkba b. Nāth except the name. By 76 (695) the original masjid was rebuilt, and later enlarged but in 221 (836) it was completely taken down by the Aghlabīd Ziyādat Allāh and rebuilt and in the third (ninth) century again enlarged on two occasions. In spite of many later restorations, the mosque has retained the form it was given in the third (ninth) century. Seventeen naves on pillars run perpendicular to the Kibla wall from which however they are separated by the transept. The central nave is broader and flanked by double columns and marked externally by two domes. It may be noted as a special feature that the first two travées of the hārām seem to be one with the court arcades while the part behind was shut off by doors. The arcades of the court rest on pillars with double columns in front of them, which, with their bulbous arches give the court its architectural character. The Dāmī Zaitūna in Tunis was built as early as 114 (732) by the Omayyad governor Ibn al-Habbāb but entirely rebuilt in 250 (864); in spite of many internal restorations, it has in the main retained to the present day its old form of the end of the ninth century. In Spain we have from the Omayyad period the (former) Mosque of Córdoba. It was built by ʿAbd al-Rahmān 1 (135–172 = 756–788) and several times extended by his successors until the hārām contained 19 naves. One special feature of this mosque is the double storied arrangement of its rows of arches, a bold innovation, which does not seem to have been imitated elsewhere. Recent investigations have revealed the original floor of the mosque at a much lower level, which is decorated with mosaic. This would alter the proportions. The horseshoe arch taken over from the Visigoths was varied in the clover leaf and indented arch and these arches were imitated in the Maghrib (mosques of Algiers, Tlemcen etc.). The domes swelling into various shapes were copied in Sanairawān and Córdoba. The mosque of Sūn (236 = 850) and Sfax (236 = 850) were founded in the Aghlabīd period but the latter was completely restored in the tenth century. The rise of
the Fāṭimid empire in North Africa (297 = 909)

brought about a new development of mosque
building. The mosque of the new Shī‘i capital
Mahdiya in Tunis however corresponds completely
to the preceding Aghlabid type. A novelty how-
ever is the use of cross vaulting which henceforth
we find frequently, first of all in the two mosques of
Monastir and in the new part of the Great
Mosque of Sfax. Of the great pillared mosque of the
Kal’a of the Bani Hammād, the minaret of
which still stands and was mentioned in the article
Mahdia, it is only possible to reconstruct the
ground plan, which had 13 naves with 8 travées
xvii, p. 13 sqq. and De Beylié, La Kasba des
Bent Hammada, p. 77 sqq.). A second mosque of the
Bani Hammād has been destroyed in Bourgic
but it is evident from an old description that it
belonged to the type of Kairouan (De Beylié, op.
cit., p. 102–104).

Mosques of the Almoravids (448–541 =
1056–1147) and Almohads (524–667 = 1120–
1267). The great mosques in Algiers and
Tlemcen, the Kutubiya of Marrakesh and the
mosque of Tinmâl are pillar mosques with
bulbous arches. On the other hand the Mosque
of Ḥasan in Rabat, now completely destroyed,
the largest mosque of the Maghrib, stood on round
pillars (1610 × 465 feet; begun 539 = 1196–1197).

A noteworthy feature is the mausoleum behind the
mihrāb in the mosque of Tlemcen, which now
becomes frequent in the Maghrib (but seems not
to have been known in eastern Islam, as
the plan of the madrasa of Kharga shows; cf. Dez, Charras, Bandenkerler, p. 73).

Marrakids in Morocco (1195–1470), suc-
cessors of the Almohads (xiii–xiv century): a large mosque in Taza, Morocco, piers,
broad central nave and transversal nave, finished in
693 (1294). A large mosque in Auida on
the Algerian-Moroccan frontier (696 = 1296). Sidi
Hassan in Tlemcen (696 = 1296), a
mosque with two naves on onyx columns, and
Awlad al-İmām in Tlemcen (710 = 1310), small, but
richly decorated. The great Maṣṣūra mosque in
Tlemcen (736 = 1336), a very regular
building, thirteen naves on onyx columns, a broad
central nave, a three naved transept, a maqṣūra
in the centre, a polygonal mihrāb with mausoleum
behind. Sidi bū Medyen of al-Awlad (739 =
1339) and Sidi al-Halwâ (754 = 1353), both
in Tlemcen, small, the former on piers, the second
on columns with slightly modified horseshoe arches
with a wide span. Shella (harbour of Rabâs),
Necropolis of the Marrakids, a tomb-mosque (739 =
1339) (plan in Marçais, Manuel, ii, p. 498). Around
Tlemcen are several small mosques of the xivth
century.

Mosques of the Ḥafsids in Tunis, xiiith–xvith century: Mosque of the Kasba in
Tunis, built by the founder of the Ḥafsīd dynasty
Abū Zakariyâ b. Yahyâ I (625–647 = 1228–1249),
finished in 633 (1235). Pillars with chapitres,
supporting horseshoe arches in the quadrangle
and cross vaulting, the usual form of roof in Ifriqiya
from the tenth century (cf. Sfax etc.) is similar. The
Mosque of al-Hawâ of the xith century is similar.

Mosques in Morocco under the Shāhīs
951–1311 (1544–1839).

In Morocco preference was given to the old
Almohad type of mosque as exemplified in the
Kutubiya. The Bāb Dukkâla 965 (1537) and
Moussy 976 (1562) mosques in Marrakesh
have seven naves at right angles to the kibōla, and
a transept along the kibōla wall. Innovations seem
to be, in addition to the broader central nave,
that the two outside naves left and right along
the side walls were broader and a dome was placed
at each of the four corners of the mosque. A
second transept on the court side of the Ḥarâm
seems to be exceptional, as in the Bāb Dukkâla.
The mosque of the Kasba of Marrakesh
dates from a foundation of the Almohad al-Mansûr.
After the explosion of 1574 it was rebuilt in and
the xvith and xivth centuries repeatedly restored
(cf. the monograph by H. Basset and Terrasse).
The mosques of al-Karawiyin and Mâliy
Idris in Fès have likewise been restored.

Mosques in Algeria under Turkish rule
(1518). In addition to the two mosques which
date from the Almoravid period, the Great
Mosque 490 (1489) and the M. Sidi Bouaḥîn in
Algiers, only two other mosques of the old type are
believed to exist; all the others, over 100 in
number, are Turkish. The oldest Turkish mosque
is 'Alî Bitshûnîn (1622), now Notre Dame des
Victoires. This building had a large central
dome, which is surrounded by small domes. It is
noteworthy that the square minaret was not
inspired by the Turkish type. All the later mosques of
Algeria show variations of this type, except the
"Mosque of the Fish-Market" 1070 (1660)
the plan of which recalls those of the Jezuit
churches of the xviith century; it may however owe
nothing to them but derive from Byzantine-Turkish models.

Mosques in Tunis under the last Ḥafsids and Turks (from 1334)
Under the last Ḥafsids the venerable Dā‘î Zaitiūn was again restored,
enlarged and given its present portico and the
outer gallery of arcades. The oldest Turkish mosque
is Yūṣuf Dâī (1610–1637). It is significant that
it is built after the old Tunisian type on pillars with
cross-vaulting, as are the later M. Hâmmâd a
Bey finished in 1067 (1654) and several mosques of
the xvith and xivth centuries. The Turkish style
(Ahmediya in Constantinoipoles) represented by
the Sidi Mahrez (second half of the xvith century)
remains the exception in Tunis.

The medersa in the Maghrib. Medersas
were first introduced into the western lands of
Islam by the Almohads but nothing of these seems
to have survived. The oldest medersas date from
the xiiith–xvith centuries. The Marrakids in
Maghrib al-Askâ were particularly active in
building and encouraging medersas, which, as in
Syria and Egypt, were also state institutions. This
evolution of the medersa was apparently a result of
the Sunnī, particularly Mâlikî, revival under the
Marrakids (1195–1470). Al-Saffârîn, the oldest
medersa in Fès, built by the great warrior and
champion of the ta’īr Yâkût b. Yûsuf (685–706
= 1286–1300) of the Marrakids who also built
a mosque (see above), was the prototype of all the
later medersas in the extreme Maghrib. An angular
gateway, such as is usually only found in private
houses leads into a court with a central basin and
the cells. A domed chamber with a pentagonal
mihrāb adjoins it. On the analogy of the true
tombs, it is called kubbâ. Adjoining it reached by a
corridor is a midâ‘a, with a basin in the centre for
ablutions and latrines. These three main parts of
the building, ta’dīn, kubbâ and midâ‘a and usually
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a separate mausoleum, are found continually in a number of variations, usually dependent on the space available, which Maqāṣid, ep. cit., ii. 504, divides into three groups. In Fes in addition to those mentioned there are other seven medersas of the eighteenth century. With the medersas of Meknes, Sale, Taza and al-Awba'd in Fesmen we have in all eleven medersas of the Marinid extant (cf. the list in Maqāṣid, ep. cit., ii. 504 sqq.). The most imposing and finest medersa in Fes is the Bū ʿAinīya, founded by Abū ʿAinī, 749–759 (1348–1358). With its madras of two transepts at the end of the square court and two domed chambers in the central axis of the court it recalls the mosque of Hasan in Cairo with its iwāns. The façades on the court display the wealth of wall adornment usual in the Maghribi tiles, stucco moulding and stalactites.

Medersas of the sixteenth century in Morocco. The Medersa of Ben Yūsuf in Marrakesh is comparable as the largest in the Maghrib and stands on the site of an originally Almoravid (3) and next Marinid Medersa Abū ʿl-Ḥasan. The plan seems to be old and in its regularity recalls the al-Ḥarīrī type of Arab palace and the palaces of the Omayyads and ʿAbbāsids built in this style in the desert (plan in Maqāṣid, ep. cit., ii. p. 762). The Medersa al-Sharrātīn in Fes, begun in 1670, shows a similar plan but is smaller and simpler.

Medersas of the sixteenth century in Tunis. In the sixteenth century the Hafsid built a number of medersas here. Of the Turkish, the most interesting is the Medersa al-Baḥyā of ʿAbbās Pasha (1740–1755): a court with cells, madras on pillars and miṣrāb, but, like the Egyptian madrasas, it has also the tomb of the founder and a public fountain. In Tunis, probably as the result of Egyptian or Oriental influence, it is common to find medersas and mosques associated with the tomb of the founder. The three varieties distinguished in Egypt by van Berchem, mosque-madras, madrasa-mausoleum and monastery-mausoleum were also built in Tunis.

Salṭḫā empire in Rūm, Armenia and Georgia. In Salṭḫa Anatolia (47700–10777). In the sixteenth century, according to the courtly māhrās madrasa and domed madrasa are to be distinguished. The pierced hall was used as the large public mosque. On account of the colder climate the open courtyard with pillars was not found here. The pillars were sometimes of wood (Eshref Rūm Ljāmi‘ī), usually however of stone. The flat wooden roof rested directly on the piers or on the arches which connected them, which run sometimes parallel, sometimes perpendicular to the qibba wall. The Ulu Ljāmi‘ī in Wān has a vaulted roof resting on pillars, a system later often used in the Ottoman empire. Of more importance architecturally are the smaller (mosque-madrasa), which played a prominent part in the Salṭḫā empire: but they fell far behind the Persian madrasas in impressiveness and harmonious development The model for the evolution of the māhrās madrasa was the Mesopotamian-Anatolian fara house. From the latter came the bowers along the sides of the court which were placed in front of the iwān and the rows of cells. The combination of school and mausoleum in which the builders, usually high officers of state, were interred, was the rule. The domed madrasa consists of a domed hall with a water basin in place of the open court with living rooms, a lecture-room and a mausoleum adjoining it. The external ornamentation of these Salṭḫā madrasas and mosques is confined to the gateways. The façades of the gates, irrespective of the material used elsewhere in building (brick or moulding), were always covered with slabs and the portals then ornamented with strips of decoration or inscriptions, fantastic looking candelabra of palmettes (Diwrigi), bundles of rods and convolutions in low and high relief and thus one of the highest points in Mamluk ornamental art was attained. The iwāns along the court, interiors of the comparatively low domes (which here usually bridge over the corners on triangular consoles), the frizes on the wall and the nihārās are frequently adorned with glazed brick and mosaic frizes in a style which in pattern and colour is readily distinguished as an independent pattern from the Persian decoration. Here we find geometrical network patterns, which were not usual in Persia, and a colour scheme which receives its special character from the much used black, alternating with bright and dark blue, although other colours are also found. The following is a list of the most important buildings, so far as they are known: 1. Pierced mosques: Mosque of ʿAbā al-Dīn Kūnāya, completed 616 (1220–1221), Ljāmi‘ī Kūnāya in Iṣṭābūr, sixteenth century; Ljāmi‘ī in Iṣṭābūr, sixteenth century, (with octagonal Minārā, Ulu Ljāmi‘ī in Wān, sixteenth century. — 2. Court iwān madrasas: ʿSirjāl Madrasa 641 (1243–1244), Gūk Madrasa, Barābūdiyya and Ṭijfet Minār, all 670 (1271–1272) in Sīwāḥ, Khabāsīya, 783 (1381–1382) in Ṣarāb, Ṭbrāhim Bey Madrasa, sixteenth century in Ṭekrīr, ʿTijfet Minār, sixteenth century in Ṭekrīr. — 3. Domed madrasas: Kārā Taʾl Madrasa 649 (1251) in Kūnāya. Iṣṭābūr Minār, 650–656 (1251–1256) in Kūnāya, Enjīrge Ljāmi‘ī 657 (1258) in Kūnāya, ʿSirjāl Madrasa 613 (1261) and 659 (1266) in Iṣṭābūr, Sulṭān Wālīde sixteenth and seventh century in Saiyādī Gharībi. The mosque of the Turcoman ruler Šāh I (1348–1390) in Aynalūk (Ephesus) is an exception in Asia Minor; it was finished in 777 (1375–1376) and its architect is said to have been ʿAbd al-Diābīškī. The interior is modelled on the mosque of the Ommayads in Damascus; the walls however are in the Turkish style of that period, as developed in the provinces of the Akbeks. The west façade is closely related to the façades of the mosque of Hasan in Cairo, which also drew inspiration from Northern Mesopotamia.

The Ottoman empire. The Ottoman Turks further developed the types of mosque built by their predecessors, the Salṭḫās. A second very important factor in the development was their expansion into Europe and the new model, the Byzantine domed churches, especially the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Here three main types of mosque may again be distinguished: the pierced hall, the cruciform domed mosque and the central or great domed mosque. The first and third were
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commonly used for Friday mosques and mosques for the people, while the second type was reserved for the Sultan's Friday service and religious instruction, and was more used for private mosques. The Ottoman piered hall mosque is distinguished from the Salljuk, principally by its vaulting, rows of cupolas over the piers. The court is limited to a hypaetral water-basin of the same size as the dome above it. The Ulu Djami in Brussa for example is an undorned pillared hall, rectangular in shape with five aisles each with four domes in a row. The second group of four pillars in the central aisle was originally uncovered (now it has a glass dome) and contains the basin for ablutions, the rudiments of a court. The domes of the five aisles rise one above the other to the central row.

The most important buildings of this group are: Ulu Djami 1370-1420 in Brussa, Uc Sheherefeli Djami 1389-93 (1484-1487) in Adrianople, Ulu (Eski) Djami ca. 1403-1420 in Adrianople, Ulu Djami 16th century (?) in Manissa (Magnesia on Sipylus), Djumaya in Filibe (Philippopolis), old mosque (now museum) 1512 (1477-1478) in Sofia, Sindjirlif Kuyu Djami ca. 1500, Ahmad Pasha Djami by Sinan ca. 1555 and Pitle Pasha Djami 1573, all in Constantinople, Eski Wadie in Scutari ca. 1570. The pierced hall as an unmixed form became extinct in the 16th century. The Ipek Golu Djami in 1734 in Constantinople is a mixture of the latter with the great dome. The origin of the cruciform domed mosque is rightly sought by Wulzinger in the Salljuk madrasas with courtyard halls which come in time to be covered over with a dome. The centre which lies somewhat below the level of the rest, is occupied by a square roofed with a dome, again the rudiments of the former courtyard, and still often containing a fountain. The Kibla chamber is vaulted with a barrel or dome, the praying chambers to right and left are either like twins open towards the centre or have barrel-vaulting. The similarity of these mosques to Byzantine churches (in plan, not in structure) is involuntary and lies in the system. On the other hand, the open pierced outer court (kaygali) may go back to Byzantine stimulation. These outer courts however are very general in the east to give shade. The most important buildings of this type are according to Wulzinger's list (op. cit., p. 186): Mosque of Murad I (1359-1389) in Brussa, fin. end of 14th century, two storied, Mosque of Bayazid I Yildirim (1389-1403), fin. after 1402, Yashil Djami in Brussa, fin. 1423, Mosque in the Koinmesh church in Isnik, beg. of 16th century, Nilufer Khatun Imaret, end of 14th century, Piruz Bey Djami in Milas, fin. 797 (1394), Mosque of Murad II (1421-1451), fin. 1447 in Brussa, Mosque of Murad II in Adrianople, Imaret Djami in Philippopolis 1359, Mosque of Hamza Bey before 1451 in Brussa, Ghazi Michel Djami ca. 1400 in Adrianople. The great domed mosques developed out of the more primitive single domed mosque which was very common throughout Asia Minor and Turkey as the simple village mosque, private mosque etc. and continued to survive. (In Ayasoluk alone 14 small single domed mosques were counted). This type of building was also used for the numerous turbes. The following are more important single domed mosques outside Constantinople: Yazi I-Isham Djami 794 (1392) and Mahmut Celebi Djami about 1400 in Isnik, Masjid of Khodja Yadygyar beg. 1369 in In Onu, Masjid of Elias Bey fin. 806 (1404) in Balat (Milet). The development of the great domed mosque from this type took place in part through combination with cruciform domed types, but its aim was however the elimination of all minor domes which at first it had for constructional reasons to put at the sides. A. Gabriel's table gives a good idea of the different variations. It gives the mosques of Constantinople, which number 42 (with Scutari), under six main types (Les Mosquées de Constantinople, in Syria, vii., 1926, p. 352-419).

D. Square or oblong halls with one or more domes, sometimes flanked by secondary domed chambers: Mahmut Pasha Djami 868 (1464), Murad Pasha Djami 870 (1466), Dativd Pasha Djami 890 (1485), Ai'th Ali Pasha Djami 902 (1497), Sultan Selim Djami 926 (1520).

E. Quadrangular single domed halls (continuing the list just given of the not yet very large single domed mosques from the city area of Constantinople): Firuz Agha Djami 896 (1491), Dzecen Kazim Pasha Masjid 921 (1515), Khaseki Khurem Djami 940 (1539), Mehmed Agha Djami 993 (1585), Chilli Djami 1050 (1640), Nurai Othmanija Djami 1169 (1755), Lalali Djami 1177 (1763), Wadie Djami 1287 (1870).

F. Square hall with a central dome, usually supported by two half domes: Sultan Bayazid Djami 906 (1500), Sultan Sulaiman Djami 957-964 (1550-1557), Kildj Ali Pasha Djami 988 (1580).

D. Square hall with a central dome supported by four axial half domes: Shakhzade Djami 955 (1548), Sultan Ahmed Djami 1026 (1617), Yeit Wadie Djami 1120 (1708), Sultan Mehmed Djami 867 (1463), reconstructed 1180 (1767); variants: oblong hall with a central dome supported by three half domes: Iskele Djami in Scutari 954 (1547).


F. Obong hall with central dome and aisles.

Group a. Central dome with square plan and pendentives: Ball Pasha Djami middle of 16th century, Mihremah Djami middle of 16th century, Zal Mahmut Pasha Djami 958 (1551).


Group c. Central dome on hexagonal basis: Ahmedi Pasha Djami 962 (1555), Sulus or Mehmed Pasha Djami 971 (1570), Ai'th Wadie Djami 991 (1583) in Scutari, Djembe Pasha Djami 1022 (1594), Hakim Oghlu Ali Pasha Djami 1147 (1734).

A survey of this list shows that the type given under A. is also the earliest. This was directly linked up with that in use in the older capital Brussa and already being built in Konya in the 14th century (Kara Tai Madrasa, Yildirim and Yashil Djami) which seems to be continued in the Mahmud and Murad Pasha Djami. But already the original Sultan Mehmed Djami (re-built in the 16th century)
which forms a striking anachronism in Gabriel’s list under D, with its date 1463 (only the second modern Mehemediya of 1797 belongs properly there), had made the first important step toward a single great chamber (cf. Agha Ogulu’s reconstituted plan in Diez, Kunst d. isl. Volker, 2nd ed., p. 105) and this plan was repeated for the ‘Atıkh ‘Ali Pasha Džami’, while the Dâvud Pasha Džami’ of 1485 had already used another variation (cf. the plans in Gabriel, op. cit.). This in brief is the historical development of the Constantinople mosque from the Anatolian Seldjük-Ottoman type. The next important step to the gigantic domed mosques of Constantinople given under D was completed by the greatest of Ottoman architects Sinan (1489–1588) step by step in the Shahzade Džami’, the Sulaimânîye and the Selimiye (1567–1574) in Adrianople. His guiding idea was, by thrusting the pillars of the domes as far back into the walls as possible, to get a single domed chamber of the largest possible dimensions, no longer interrupted by pillars; Sinan achieved this end in the Selimiye in Adrianople.

Persia, Turkestan and Afghanistan,

Old mosques or remains of them have not survived in Persia, as in Egypt, the Marghab and Syria, except perhaps for a few old parts still standing in the great complex of buildings, that forms the mosque of the Red want to be in Persepolis, the old Friday Mosque of Shiraz. We know however from literary sources that at the beginning of the 19th century, several mosques were built every where in the towns and some must have existed even earlier. Abu Muslim, the celebrated general and Abbâsid propagandist, built mosques in Merw and Nishabur. The latter was built on pillars of wood and similar structures are occasionally mentioned in Persia (e.g. at Kabâbîn in the province of Djrudjan, Siraf on the Persian Gulf etc.). In the ninth century, however, greater use began to be made of columns of brick or stone or marble columns taken from older buildings where they found them, as in Bagdad at Persepolis.

‘Amr b. al-Latîf (265–287 = 878–900), the second ruler of the Sassârid dynasty, renovated the Friday Mosque in Nishâbûr and among other mosques built the Džami’ ‘Atıkh in Shirzâbh, both mosques with columns of brick, of which parts are still standing in Shirzâz. The Friday Mosque of Balkh destroyed by the Mongols in 1220, is said to have had splendid pillars, as Ibn Banîthû records. An old mosque on piers of the fourth (tenth) century has survived in the remote desert town of Naiyrin, east of Isfâhan, and enables us to make deductions about the architecture of mosques in the Islamic world. The buttresses, the eleven barrel-vaulted aisles running perpendicular to the kibla wall, of which the central one is broader than the others. The court is flanked by four aisled riwaq which run parallel to the kibla wall, only the wall of the entrance has an arcade. The plan is therefore similar to that of the mosques of the Marghab. It is built on columns or piers of different forms. The part around the mihrâb is richly ornamented in stucco and has bands of inscriptions around it (cf. H. Viollet and S. Flury, Un monument etc., Syrie, ii, 1921). How securely the piered hall, as the type of Friday Mosque, maintained itself in the Sunni east, is seen from the rebuilding of Timur’s great mosque in Samarkand after his return from his raid on India in 1410, a mosque with columns, which was directly connected with the ma’mrâza of Bibi Khanum, but has now completely disappeared. The mosque had 460 columns of hewn stone, each seven els in height. The vaulting was covered with beautifully carved and polished slabs of marble. There was a minaret at each of the four corners of the mosque. The door was of bronze and the walls were covered inside and outside with inscriptions in relief (according to Sjarif al-Dîn ‘Ali Yâdî). How far there was any Indian influence here cannot now be ascertained. In any case, the İwan and mihrâb court became established in Persia in the fifth (eleventh) century and as the above described Friday Mosque in Isfâhan shows, became blazed with the piered court. The great Mosques of Herât (cf. Niedermer-Diez, Afghanistan, p. 55 and figs. 149–153) shows a similar mihrâb court adapted to the (probably older) pierced hall. In the completely new buildings of the Timurid and Safavid period, the pierced hall completely disappeared and the hârâm is extended by a central dome with vaulted halls at the side, when the kibla İwan itself does not fulfill the purpose. The mosque of the great sanctuaries in Kûm Ma’âhad, Kerbelât, the Madžd-dî Shâh in Isfâhan and many other urban mosques of Persia are built on this plan. Only in Eastern Khurasân, as in the Turkistan Shâhik Džami’, the mosque has always survived but with vaulted arches and a large dome in the centre of the hârâm, all of which betrays Indian influence (cf. the plan in Diez, Chauvannerische Baukunst, p. 79).

Of the already characterised type of domed mosques may be mentioned: the “Blue Mosque” in Tabriz and the Madžd-dî Shâh in Mašhâd, both similar in plan with a large central dome and two flanking minarets. The former was built during the reign of the Turcoman ruler Djhâhan Shâh (1437–1467), the latter by Amir Małik Shâh, the architect being Aymâd b. Shams al-Dîn Muhammed Tabrîzî (cf. F.R.A.S., 1910, 1911, 131). The Tabriz mosque had a dome only from the domed area with a second smaller dome. Both domes were decorated with tiles, the larger with white tondris on a black ground (Tavernier). Only fragments survive of the Blue Mosque, which show how splendidly it was once decorated; on the other hand, the Madžd-dî Shâh in Mašhâd is still standing, although the dome has lost its decoration. To this group belong also the mosques on the citadel mound of Eriwân, the mosque of Shâhîk Luʿî Allah in Isfâhan, the Kâlibân mosque used as a royal private mosque and the public Mosque of ‘Abû Bakr in Baghdad, both with high entrance İwan and without a court. At largely attended common prayer, the people assemble in front of such mosques. This is particularly the case in Turkestan; for the İwan and niches were simply very large mihrâbs and nothing further was necessary. In Balkh also there is a similar, formerly domed mosque probably intended for the ruler with a towering İwan (zvth century) (cf. Niedermer-Diez, Afghanistan, figs. 204–205). Besides these large main types, there were and are in these lands of eastern Islam hundreds of smaller mosques in the towns and villages, which sometimes show very interesting structures. Thus in Djadjarî in the Isfâhan steppe (northern Persia) there is a mosque with a small
open court and domed chamber in front of the mihrāb, and two triple yoked aisles, probably a reminiscence of Nestorian churches (cf. Diez, Churatas, Bakhūn, p. 83). We also find everywhere small masjids, which are simply little oratories, where the people can promptly worship at the proper time: flat-roofed large halls on wooden pillars, which are frequently richly carved in Turkestan, Afghanistan (Khābul) and Central Asia (Kashmir etc.).

The Madrasa in Persia, Turkestan and Afghanistan. Shāfi'i madrasas were built in the Abbāsid period in Nisābūr (where Ḥāfiz Abrū counted 17). Mev, Būgharā, Amol, Fās and other towns. Nāy, brother of Māljūd of Ghazna, is said to have built the first state madrassa. Under the Sādūqīs, Nīzm al-Mulk, vizier of Alp Arslān, and of Malik Shāh, built three state madrasas in Nisābūr, Fās and Bāghūd. None of these pre-Timūrid madrasas in Persia has survived; unless the ruined iwān in Khārgir is what is left of a madrasa, which is very probable (cf. Diez, op. cit., p. 71 sq.). The ruins of the Timūrid period however give us a picture of the Persian madrasa of the golden period of Muslim Persian architecture. The madrasa in Khārgir near Khāsh to the Afghan frontier, completed in 848 (1444-1445), still shows a pure unimixed madrasa design: a quadrangular court with four barrel-vaulted large iwāns, equal in size, at the intersection of the axes, each flanked by two or, with the upper storey, four cells, four vaulted corner-chambers, a narthex-like outer building, consisting of three successive domed chambers; low confined mihrāb façades with low flanking towers at the corners. The walls, especially of the court, were adorned with rich tiled mosaic, the walls of the domed chambers with ornamental frescoes (cf. Diez, Churatas, Bakhūn, p. 72-76, pl. 31-34). In contrast to the low façade of Khārgir built by a West Persian (Shāfī) architect are the Turkestan madrasas with their high iwāns, characteristic of the east in general, and gateways especially. In Samarqand we have the three Rigistan madrasas: Shīr Dār (c. 1610), Tīlya Kārī (c. 1610?) and Ulugh Beg (c. 1434); also the Madrasa Bibi Khanīm (about 1410) built by Timūr, all large courtyards with mihrāb courts and domed chambers, usually four minarets at the surrounding walls. In Būgharā, the Madrasa Mir Arab of the end of the xvi century is related to the Madrasa Shīr Dār. Of the madrasas in Herāt, e.g. the celebrated Ekklauissiya, nothing has survived, nor do we have anything left of the madrasa of Turbat-i Šahīd Dām in Eastern Khurāsān (cf. Diez, op. cit., p. 78). A ruin architecturally interesting is the state madrasa founded in the xvi century by Malik Ḥamze, the Gumbaz-i Surkh at Kaft-i Fath in Sīdjestan (cf. Tate, Seistan, fig. p. 78). The cells are vaulted with the typical Persian house and bazaar domes. The last fine Persian madrasa is the Mader-i Šah Sulṭān Husain in Isfahān built by the Safawī Shāh of this name (1694-1722). The tiled decoration of the court is among the finest of its kind, that has survived in Persia (cf. Tate, Seistan, fig. 2, and Pers. Arch., Special d. list, Vökel, p. 106-107). The dome still shows the original glazed tiles with foliage patterns: dark blue and white, changing to black stalks and yellow leaves on a turquoise blue ground.

India. In India the history of Muslim architecture so far known does not go beyond the xiii century. The two earliest mosques of which the ruins still survive, the mosques of Ajmīr and of Dehli, are large covered courts, built of pillars taken from Jaina temples. The domes on eight pillars found in all Jaina temples are here found ranged in rows. The richly sculptured pillars were simply cleared of any figures on them before being used. Vaulting on square piers continued in use after there were no more pillars to plunder (mosques in Kulbarga and Bidjāpūr). For the rest, Indo-Muslim mosque architecture developed in different ways according to various traditions and local conditions. In towns completely islamised like Māndū on the Nerbada, the capital of the sultanate of Mālwa founded by Dīlawar Shāh at the beginning of the xv century, or Dīlawarpur near Bīrāmar, which was founded by the sultan of Dehli in 1359, Muslim places of worship show a marked synthesis of Hinduistic tradition with the rigid forms of Muslim symbolism. Similarly in the Muslim towns of Gudjarāt, in Ahmedābād, Cambay, Dhoḷkā, Māhmūdābād, Muslim sacred architecture developed out of the local Hindu art so that the demands made by Islam on the shape of a mosque, such as an entrance-iwan and minaret, were carried through by purely Indian means and only the arch gave the building a Muslim stamp. In Bengal again, where the curved bamboo roof prevailed, mosques were built with curved roofs from the bricks in use there, as is shown, notably by the ruins in Gaur on the Ganges. Instead of glazed tiles, the walls were generally adorned with richly ornamented slabs of stone. South of the Vindhya range, in the region and in South India local schools of architecture grew up according to the same general principles. In Aḥmadānagar, Golkonda, Kulbarga, Bīdār, Awrangābād and other capitals of Muhammadan principalities, the building of mosques was much cultivated. Architectonically, the most important city was Bīdāpūr, the capital of the state of the same name, which became independent in 1490 under Vīsam ʿAḍīl Shāh and survived down to the xvii century, when its great period of building culminated in the gigantic dome of the mausoleum of ʿAḍīl Shāh. The mosque of Bīdāpūr (second half of the xvi century) consists of a pierced hall with small domes over each group of four piers and a large dome in the centre. In the Moghul period little change was made in this mixture of Hindu and Muslim methods, although the Persian elements are often more marked. The huge mosque with courtyard built by Akbar in Fathpur Sikri has the usual plan with slight variations. The Great Mosque of Agra built by Akbar still shows little Indian pavilions on the tops of the cornices. It was only under his successors that a Puritan reaction set in, which finds its fullest expression in the mosques of Dehli and Lahore. The process of assimilation thus attained its end.

China and Indo-China. From the Maghrib to the Pamirs and southeast of them the general character of the country, plains and deserts, linked the peoples of Islam together by certain common features, which also secured the mosque its uniformity of structure in the early centuries. In China where Islam was only the religion of a few isolated groups of immigrants the mosque soon adapted itself to the well marked Chinese style of architecture and the mosques of the south and western
According to late Arab writers the mosque was built by the caliph 'Abd-al-Malik (785–805), a statement which might simply mean that Justinian's church was rebuilt. On this compare AL-KUDS, ii, p. 1098 sqq. where the further history of the mosque is given.

For a picture of the site and the mosque see Pl. v. to the article AL-KUDS; plan and description of the interior in Travels of Abu Bey. London 1816, ii, 214 sqq.; Baedecker, Palastina und Syrien, p. 54 sqq.


AL-MASJID AL-ḤARAM, the name of the Mosque of Mecca. The name is already found in the pre-Muhammadan period (Horovitz, Kosmische Studien, p. 140 sqq.) in Kais b. al-Khatim, ev. Kowański, v. 14: "By Allah, the Lord of the Holy Masjid and of that which is covered with Yemen stuffs, which are embroidered with henna thread" (!) It would be very improbable if a Medina poet by these two references meant anything other than the Meccan sanctuary. The expression is also fairly frequent in the later Meccan period (Horovitz, op. cit.) and in various connections, it is a grave sin on the part of the polytheists that they prohibit access to the Masjid Haram to the "people" (Sūra ii. 214; cf. v. 33; v. 84; xvii. 25; xlvii. 25); the Masjid Haram is the pole of the new kițba (Sūra ii. 139, 144); contracts are sealed at it (Sūra ix. 7).

In these passages masjīd haram does not as in later times mean a building but simply Mecca as a holy place, just as in Sūra xvii. 1 Masjid ʿal-ṣāḥa [q. v.] "the remotest sanctuary" does not mean a particular building.

According to tradition, a ṭāḥā performed in the Masjid al-Ḥaram is particularly meritorious (Buḫārī, al-Ṣaḥīḥ fi Masjid Makka, bab 1). This Masjid is the oldest, being forty years older than that of Jerusalem (Buḫārī, Andāṣir, bab 10, 49).

This Meccan sanctuary included the Kaʿba [q. v.], the Zamzam [q. v.] and the Makāmah Ibrahim [see Kitaib], all three on a small open space. In the year 8. Muhammad made this place a mosque for worship. Soon however it became too small and under Yaman and 'Uthman, adjoining houses were taken down and a wall built. Under 'Abd Allāh Ibn al-Zabān, the Marjā' and 'Aḥād al-qulūb, successive enlargements and embellishments were made. Ibn al-Zabān put a simple roof above the wall. The Masjid had colonnades built around, which were covered by a roof of tile. The number of minarets in time rose to seven. Little columns were put up around the Kaʿba for lighting purposes. The mosque was also given a feature which we only find paralleled in a few isolated instances: this was the putting up of small wooden buildings, or rather shelters for use during the ᾱlāf by the ḫāmān, one for each of the four orthodox rites. The fact that one of these makkāns might be more or less elaborate than another occasionally gave
rise to jealousies between the Hanafis and the Shāfiʿis. Ultimately the ground under the colon-
nades, which was covered with gravel was paved
with marble slabs, in the maqṣf around the Kaʿba
as well as on the different paths approaching the
masjid.

The mosque was given its final form in the
years 1572—1577, in the reign of the Sūlān
Selim II, who, in addition to making a number of
minor improvements in the building, had the
flat roof replaced by a number of small white-washed
cone-shaped domes.

A person entering the mosque from the Masʿā
or the eastern quarters of the town, has to descend
a few steps. The site of the mosque, as far as
possible, was always left unaltered, while the level
of the ground around — as usual in oriental towns
and especially in Mecca on account of the Sīl —
gradually rose automatically in course of centuries
(cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i. 15—20).

The dimensions of the Ḥaram (interior) are given
as follows (al-Batānūmī, Riḥā, p. 96): N. W. side 545
feet, E. W. side 553 feet, N. E. side 260, S. W.
side 364 feet; the corners are not right angles,
so that the whole roughly represents a parallelogram.

Entering the maqṣf from the eastern side, one
enters first the Bāb Bani Shība, which marks an
old boundary of the masjid. Entering through the
door, the Maqṣf Ibrāhīm is on the right, which is
also the Maqṣf al-Shāfīʿī, and to the right of it is
the minbar. On the left is the Zemzem building.
As late as the beginning of the sixth century,
there stood in front of the latter, in the direction
of the northeast of the mosque, two domed buildings
(al-Kubbatayn) which were used as store-houses
(Kron. d. Stadt Mekka, ii. 337 sqq.). These Kubbas
were cleared away (cf. already Burchhardt, i. 265);
they are not given in recent plans.

Around the Kaʿba are the maqṣafs for the imāms
of the madhhabas, between the Kaʿba and the south-
est of the mosque, the maqṣf (or musalla) al-
Ḥanbali, to the south-west the maqṣf al-Mālikī,
to the north-west the maqṣf al-Ḥanafī. The latter has
two stories; the upper one was used by the
maʿādhidiin and the maballigh, the lower by the
imām and his assistants. Since Wahhābī rule has
been established, the Ḥanbali imām has been
given the place of honour. The maqṣf al-Ḥanafī stands
on the site of the old Meccan council-chamber
(dār al-nadwa) which in the course of centuries
was several times rebuilt and used for different
purposes. The maqṣf is marked by a row of thin
brass columns connected by a wire. The lamps for
lighting are fixed to this wire and in the colonnades.

The mosque has for centuries been the centre
of the intellectual life of the metropolis of Islam.
This fact has resulted in the building of madrasas
and riwaṭs for students in or near the mosque,
for example the madrasa of Kātīr Bey on the left as
one enters through the Bab al-Sulām. Many of
these waqfs have however in course of time become
dedicated to other purposes (Burchhardt, t. 282;
Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i. 17). For the staff
of the mosque cf. SHEBA (BANÜ); Burchhardt, i. 287—
291.
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MĀṢḤAF. [See MUSHAF.

MĀṢḤAFI, GHULĀM ḤAMDĀNI B. WĀLI MUḤAMMAD, a distinguished Urdu poet,
was born in Lucknow but went to Dihli in 1190
(1770), where he applied himself to the cultivation
of Urdu poetry. His house was resorted to by
the eminent poets of the capital. In 1219
(1795) he was made wazīr, one of the
rest of his life there under the patronage of Prince
Sulaimān Shāh, son of Shāh ʿAlām. He died in
1240 (1824). He is the author of several Divāns
in Persian and Hindustānī, and of biographies of
Urdu poets, called Tadhkīrā-ī Hind. He also
wrote another Tadhkīra of Persian poets who
flourished in India from the time of Muḥammad
Shāh (1131—1161 = 1719—1748) to the reign of
Shāh ʿAlām (1173—1221 = 1759—1806) entitled
ībād Tharīʿa, and a historical work in verse which
he entitled Shāhī-Nama.

Bibliography: Shīta, Gulshan Bihār, p. 138; Aṣād, Ab-i Hofīz (Lahore 1913), p. 309—
338; Garic de Tassy, Littérature hindoue, i.
373; Sprenger, Oude Catalogue, p. 182; Rieu,
(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MĀṢḤA-ALLĀH, the son of Aḥmad or Sirāyī, a
celebrated astrologer, who along with
Nawbakht fixed the day and hour for the foundation
of Baghdad by order of al-Maḥṣūr. According to
the Fīhrīst, he was a Jew whose original name
was Mīṣā (a corruption of Manāshī, i.e. Ma-
nasse); whether he later adopted Islam and for
this reason took the name Māṣḥa-Allāh is not
recorded. The date of his birth is unknown, but
it can hardly be later than 112 (730). He is said
to have died in 200 (815).

In numerous works Māṣḥa-Allāh covered the
whole field of astrology, and also the making and
uses of astronomical instruments. There has only
survived in Arabic fragments of a treatise on the
prices of various wares which was translated into
Latin under the title Māṣḥa-Allāh and speedily
Mercatorise. Many of his astrological works were
translated into Latin by Johannes Hispalensis and others and
later printed. Hebrew versions are also known. It
may be safely assumed that Arabic originals will
still be found in eastern libraries. The critical
study of the Latin translations existing in manu-
script and printed form is most desirable in view of
the early date of the author.

Flugel, i. 273; ii. 129; H. Suter, Die Mathe-
matikerverzeichnis, 1892, p. 61—62; H. Suter,
Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Araber,
1900, p. 5—6; Nachträge, 1902, p. 158; M.
Steinschneider, Die arab. Literatur der Juden,

**AL-MAŠIH, the Messiah;** in Arabic (where the root mš-h has the meanings of "to measure" and "strove") it is a loanword from the Aramaic where מָשִׁיחַ was used as a name of the Redeemer.

Horovitz (*Koránische Untersuchungen*, p. 129) considers the possibility that it was taken over from the Ethiopic (waswāb). Muḥammad of course got the word from the Christian Arabs. In Arabic writers we find the view mentioned that the word is a loan-word from Hebrew or Syriac. Ĥabari (Tafsīr on Sūra iii. 40: vol. iii., p. 160) gives only purely Arabic etymologies; either with the meaning "purified" (from sins) or "filled with blessing". Horovitz, op. cit., calls attention to the occurrence of the word in inscriptions, proper names and in the old poetry.

In the Kur'ān the word is first found in the Meccan sûras, a. alone: Sūra iv. 170; ix. 30; b. with Ibn Marya: Sūra v. 19, 76, 79; ix. 31; c. with ʿĪsā b. Marya: Sūra iii. 40: vol. iii., p. 156. None of these passages make it clear what Muḥammad understood by the word. From Sūra iii. 40: "Who is more entitled to the name of ʿĪsā b. Marya" one might suppose that al-Maših was here to be taken as a proper name. Against this view however is the fact that the article is not found with non-Arabic proper names in the Kur'ān.

In canonical Ḥadīth, al-Maših is found in three main connections: a. in Muhammad's dream, in which he relates how he saw at the Ka'ba a very handsome brown-crested man with beautiful locks, dripping with water, who walked supported by two men; to his question who this was the reply was given: al-Maših b. Marya (BUKHĀRĪ, Liwa', bāb 68; Tafsīr, bāb 11; Muslim, Ṣaḥīh, tr. rodp. 60); b. in the descriptions of the return of ʿĪsā (q.v.); c. In the Last Judgment the Christians will be told: "What have you worshipped?" They will reply: "We have worshipped al-Maših, the Son of God". For this they shall wallow in Hell (BUKHĀRĪ, Tafsīr, Sūra iv., bāb 8; Tafsīh, bāb 24; Muslim, Ṣaḥīh, tr. rodp. 302).

In Ḥadīth also we frequently find references to al-Maših al-Kadim (and al-Abdu) and al-Maših al-Daudījī; see the article AL-DĀDIM. Bibliography: given in the article.

(A. J. WENSSINK)

**MAŠKĀT, 1. a seaport on the Gulf of ʿOmaįn, on the east coast of Arabia in 25° 37' 26" N. Lat., and 56° 15' 26" Eas. Long.** Maškāt is the only harbour between `Aden and the Persian Gulf, which ships of any size can enter and next to `Ade and Djjidda, the best harbour in the Peninsula. The port is of considerable importance from its position commanding the entrance to the Persian Gulf. It lies at the end of a hor-o-shoe-shaped bay 900 fathoms long and 400 broad which is enclosed and sheltered from the wind by multi-coloured rocks of volcanic origin, devoid of any vegetation. Behind the white town rises a series of extensive ranges of mountains on the highest of which, the Djaqal Akhdar, 9,000 feet high, snow occasionally lies in winter-time. On the slopes we even find the Muscatel vine growing which is said to have been introduced by the Portuguese. The harbour is very busy; in the middle of the shore stands the sultan's palace, at the south end the offices of the British political agent. On either side the town is flanked by an old Portuguese fort, Marānī and Djalālī. The chapel in one of them bears the date 1588. The bazaar consists of low buildings and is of little importance. The mosques are remarkable for the absence of the usual tall minarets.

The climatic conditions are by no means favourable. With al-Ḥaināda and Ḥjjidda, Maškāt is one of the hottest towns in the world. In 1912 the maximum temperature was 45ºC, the minimum 17ºC; the rainfall varies between 75 and 150 mm. The high temperatures are caused mainly by the hot winds which at certain periods in the summer months usually blow from the Arabian desert and from the rocky hills for several hours in the night. From November to the middle of March the weather is however quite pleasant, but one must beware of malaria and fever.

Maškāt plays a considerable part as centre of trade with the nearer east. There are regular communications with India, Persia, East Africa and Mauritius. The ships of the various ship companies call regularly at Maškāt, e.g. the British India Steam Navigation Company on the route from London to India, the Bucknall Steamship Company and the Strick Line to Bāṭrā, the West Hartlepool Steam Navigation Company on the Aden-Bayrā route, the Hamburg-America Line monthly to the harbours of the Persian Gulf, the Arab Steamers Ltd. on the Bombay-Bayrā route, and the Compagnie Rusive de Navigation à Vapeur et de Commerce. In 1912–1913 the total tonnage entering port was 98 steamers with 127,885 tons and 63 sailing vessels with 5,021 tons and leaving 86 steamers of 90,850 tons and 50 sailing-ships of 2,379 tons. The ships in question were mainly British (86.7% of). Maškāt has a regular postal service with the rest of the world instituted by the British, as well as a cable connection which the Indian Government has laid to Djasāk. The population, which changes a good deal, is about 10,000 souls, primarily Arabs but there are also Persians, Hindus, Indian Muslims, Beludjīs and a few Europeans settled here, mainly traders.

Maškāt was at one time a flourishing centre of the silk and cotton trade but in recent years this has almost been destroyed by Indian and American competition. The gold and silver work done by Indians here is famous, notably richly ornamented swords and daggers. The imports of Maškāt in 1912–1913 were valued at £ 463,551 and the exports at £ 301,477. The former were mainly arms and munitions, cereals, dyers, precious metals, pearls, foodstuffs, textiles, tobacco, building materials, enamels, glass and porcelain, ironmongery, perfumes and soaps, the latter camels, horses and asses, weapons, cereals, dried and salt fish, dates, lemons and pomegranates, walks and dragon's blood, pearls, melted butter (ṣhe), muskels, mother-of-pearl and tortoise-shell, textiles, hides and leather. The chief importers were India, then Belgium, England and 'Adeyn, the exports went mainly to India, the Arabian coast, England, Persia, America and Zanzibar.

According to local tradition Maškāt was founded at an early period by Himyar colonists. A. Sprenger has identified Maškāt with the Μασκάτ Αίολος of Ptolemy, vi. 7, 12. As the harbour has only a narrow entrance on the north and is enclosed on
the east by rocky heights, it is, as a matter of fact, easy for sailors to overlook it, and the name 'the hidden' would be quite appropriate. Al-Mukaddasi (B.G.A., iii. 95 sq.) who mentions the part of al-Maṣṭān, says that it is the first place which the ships from Yemen reach and is a fine town, rich in fruits. Ibn-al-Fakih al-Hamadhani (B.G.A., v. 111) says of Maṣṭān that it is the very end of ʿOman, about 200 parasangs from Sirāf, the starting point for ships sailing to India and to Kālimbālī, a month’s journey beyond it. Ships take in water here and Chinese ships pay 1,000 dirhams for it, the other 10–20 dinārs. Idrīs briefly mentions Maṣṭān as a densely populated town. Ibn al-Mudawwir is fuller (in A. Sprenger’s Post- und Rezeption, p. 145 sq.) and tells us that Maṣṭān was originally called Maṣṭān—so also Ibnulbair, p. 296—and that it is a considerable centre of trade with Africa and the coast of the Persian Gulf, whence the wares are forwarded to Ṣūfīshān, Ḥafūz and Zābuluṣān. In the beginning of the eighth century A.D., Maṣṭān, whose history had hitherto been that of ʿOman, attracted the attention of European powers. In 1526, Allmünchberg appeared before the town and demanded that it should submit to the Portuguese. At the first the people seemed to be peacefully inclined and willing to accept his terms, but this attitude changed and the Portuguese admiral decided to attack and destroy the town. Forty large and small ships and many fish-hunting vessels and the Imam’s arsenal were destroyed, the mosque pulled down and the town burned. The Portuguese fortified the place and in 1527 built two forts, Marānī and Djalālī, and factories; the present buildings of these names were however only built after the union of Portugal with Spain in 1580 by direct instructions from Maḥruq. The Portuguese had not an easy position here. They were frequently attacked by the surrounding tribes and in addition by the Turks; in 1526 a rising in Maṣṭān was put down by Lopo Vaz, the governor of India. In 1530 a Turkish fleet under Pir Bey appeared before Maṣṭān, attacked the town and took it by storm after eighteen days’ bombardment. The Portuguese commander and chief were carried off to be Turkish galley-slaves, but in 1553 the Portuguese succeeded in destroying the Turkish fleet and re-establishing their sway in the Persian Gulf. Maṣṭān was now fortified as a naval base. But after 1631 Portuguese pre-emptive began to decline rapidly. At the end of 1649, Maṣṭān was attacked by the Imam’s army and had to surrender on January 23, 1650, as relief came too late. The town now lost much of its former importance, although under Dutch influence its commerce was still considerable. Towards the end of the eighteenth century it attained an unenviable notoriety as a meeting-place for pirates. In 1757 it was taken by the Persians, who were driven out by Ahmad b. Solīḥī, the founder of the dynasty still ruling in Maṣṭān, who was elected imām in 1741. Since 1705 Maṣṭān has been the capital of the sultanate of ʿOman. After 1747 the French began to be influential in Maṣṭān, the town played a prominent part as a base for attacking India in Napoleon’s grandly conceived plan for destroying England’s power; we need therefore not be surprised that England al- so showed increased attention to the town. In January 1807, Capt. John Malcolm was sent to Maṣṭān by the Indian government and concluded a treaty with the Sultan by which an earlier agreement with the East India Company was ratified and an agent of the company established at Maṣṭān. In 1807 and 1808 the French made treaties with the Sultan and also sent a consular agent to Maṣṭān. The town flourished under this sultan, Saʿīd b. ʿOman, and became a centre for commerce with the Persian Gulf. Maṣṭān repelled an attack of the Wahhābis with the assistance of the English in 1809, but in 1833 it became tributary to them. The change from sailing to steamships brought about a decline in the importance of the town. In 1863 Palgrave describes Maṣṭān as an important harbour with 40,000 inhabitants, but in 1895, Bent puts the population at only 20,000 and at present it can hardly be more than 10,000. In 1833 however, the sultan was able to negotiate a commercial treaty with the United States, followed by a similar one with England in 1839; in 1844 France and Maṣṭān drew up a commercial treaty by which France obtained the privilege of the most favoured nation and French subjects were given full freedom to trade in Maṣṭān. The independence of Maṣṭān, although expressly stated in the Anglo-French declaration of 1862, was however little more than nominal, for England, who had several times come forward to protect the sultanate, had through her political agent considerable control over the sultan. In connection with the slave-trade, which England was endeavoring to suppress, the sultan of Maṣṭān had bound himself in various ways to England and in 1844 even ceded to England the Khor-rūn-Māraḥ Islands of which France was endeavouring to obtain possession. When Sultan Saʿīd b. Saʿīd died in 1856, his kingdom was divided between his two sons Ṣawārah and Ḥamīd, to whom the former received Maṣṭān, while the latter was given Zanzibar which had belonged to Maṣṭān since the end of the eighteenth century. This division was negotiated by England through Lord Canning, the Viceroy of India. In 1861 Zanzibar was declared independent, but it still had to pay an annual tribute to Maṣṭān, which England in 1873 undertook to pay in compensation for various concessions of the sultanate of Maṣṭān in connection with the suppression of the slave-trade. When long as the sultan refused to pledge this friendship for England. This readiness to meet the English was also seen in a telegraph agreement of 1864. In 1871 Sultan Ṣawārah concluded a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation with England in which the Sultan bound himself and his successors not to cede, sell or let land except to England. The French opposed this and in 1894 succeeded in obtaining a coal mining station five miles S.E. of Maṣṭān. England raised objections and quoted the treaty with the sultan although France in the treaty of November 17, 1844, had secured the right to acquire land. Diplomatic negotiations finally brought about a settlement, by which France gave up the coal mining station in the Gulf of ʿOman, and in compensation was lent half the coal deposits of Maṣṭān. As France in 1916 again lent this coal mining station to the English, the dispute was finally settled in favour of the English. A second pretension was similarly settled, although for a time it caused grave diplomatic negotiations. The French consul of Maṣṭān and Zanzibar had given French papers and flags to a number of ships belonging to ʿOman. The captains of these ships, who often traded in slaves and smuggled arms, resented the jurisdiction of their sovereign, the
sultan of Maskat, and when the latter took steps to deal with them, they were protected by France. The affair finally became so serious that in 1903 there appeared to be danger of a conflict between England and France, but in 1905 the question was submitted to the Hague Tribunal which decided that only those sailing-vessels which had received the French flag before January 2, 1892, had the privilege renewed and licences later issued were cancelled as invalid, so far as they were not given to French protectes of 1863. As, in 1917, only 12 Omân sailing-vessels still carried the French flag, this privilege of France must soon die out. It was only natural that the active smuggling of weapons from Maskat not only to Persia and Afghanistan but also into the interior of Arabia, should cause anxiety to England. The flourishing trade in arms was put down in 1912 by the establishment of a depot for the sale of arms under government control, which alone could sell arms. It is true that the smugglers have now migrated to Birk, Shablain and Ruais, but the great decline in the import of arms into Maskat is best shown by the statistics of the year 1912–1913 when in the first half year 147,391 lbs. of arms were still imported while in the last five months the total was only 36,667. In 1913, the new ruler Sultan Taimur, who succeeded his father on October 4 and was recognised by England and France on November 15, 1913, met with serious opposition from the tribes in the south of Oman, who declared themselves independent under an Imam whom they chose themselves. It is only England's power that keeps these rebels from Maskat and thus secures the existence of the dynasty, whose rule has long been quite nominal.

Genealogical Table of the Imāms of Maskat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Sa'd</th>
<th>Ḥāmil</th>
<th>Ṣa'id</th>
<th>ʿĀṣim b. Kāis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sālim</td>
<td>(1219 A.H.)</td>
<td>(† 1273 A.H.)</td>
<td>(1283–1285 A.H.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭuwaínī</td>
<td>(1273–1283 A.H.)</td>
<td>(1285–1287 A.H.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭūrki</td>
<td>(1287–1305 A.H.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1888–1913 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fāṣal</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1313 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Maskat ad-Kamīl, a village on the road from al-Ḥmāh to al-Nībah. 3 Market town on the Black Sea (Bohr: al-Khazān), said to have been founded by Khūrāw Anūshirvān. 

Maslama ibn 'Abd al-Malik, son of the second Marwānid caliph. “His chivalrous figure seems to have made a vivid impression on the popular imagination; one might think he came out of a popular romance” (C. H. Becker). Few of the Marwānid princes were so active and gifted in so many divergent directions. He lived long enough to give proof that he was not unworthy of the high hopes placed upon him. His gifts earned him the confidence of all the Marwānid rulers, to whom he was a Nestor whose counsels were always heeded, from 'Abd al-Malik to Hishām, not even excepting 'Umar II, who was not at all favourably inclined to the sons of 'Abd al-Malik, nor the hysterical Yazid II nor the criminal and fanatic Walid II, who kept at his loss. He had been carefully educated by his father 'Abd al-Malik. His long career as a military leader revealed his personal courage and his knowledge of the art of war. A man of good counsel and excellent judgment, versed in literature, a patron of poets and an accurate critic of their merits, adored by his men, Maslama made use of his exceptional position to be a protector of all the oppressed, to maintain the unity and cohesion at the heart of his dynasty, which was threatened by the absurd law of seniority which regulated the succession to the throne.

The chance of birth — his mother was a slave-girl — prevented him from rising higher. Walid I gave his brother Maslama the task of conducting the military operations against the Greeks. Henceforth — with a few short intervals — he was to hold the office of commander-in-chief of the Arab armies in which he frequently had under him his able and valiant 'Abd Allāh (q.v.), son of the caliph Walid. In the year 91 (709–710), he succeeded his uncle Muhammad as governor of Armenia, a province not completely subdued, which required a military man to rule it. He also governed the gūnūl of Kinanān (q.v.), another frontier province continually exposed to the attacks of the enemy. He never spent much time in civilian appointments, for which his soldierly spirit seemed less adapted and in which the independent character of the Marwānid prince usually came into conflict with the central power.

His campaign was marked by the capture of the important fortress of Tyana (Tuwânâ), the vigorous winter of the high Alanian plateaus did not interrupt the operations of this long siege, in which the assailants suffered great hardships (for the chronology see 'Abd al-'Alā'ī ibn al-Walîh). The dis-mounted town remained de-serted, a serious loss for the Byzantines. Their enemies now held both slopes of the Cilician Taurus, the gateway to Anatolia. Under Maslama’s directions, his nephew 'Abd Allāh in the next two or three years completed the conquest of mountainous Isauria. In 95 (712) the fortress of Amass was taken and Maslama entered Galatia through Armenia. This opened up the road to Constantinople. In 98 he laid siege to the capital. The attack dragged on and caused unpalatable sufferings in the Arab army. Contemporary writers blame for their failure the lack of foresight and insufficient diplomatic skill in the commander-in-chief. 'Umar II recalled the besiegers to Syria and sent Maslama to the 'Irāq against the Khārijīs. Yazid II sent his brother to put down the rebellion of Yazid b. Muhallab [q.v.] in the 'Irāq. After the death of this rebel (102 = 720), Maslama became governor of the two 'Irāq.

Before this, he had very opportunely persuaded the caliph not to modify the order of succession so as to avoid the disadvantage of Hishām. Yazid was not long in finding fault with his brother, especially as he neglected to send him the taxes of his immense eastern vice-royalty. He recalled him to Syria, where Maslama endeavoured to combat the influence of favourites on this weak sovereign. Returning to the army in 108 he conquered Caesarea in Cappadocia. The following years were marked by Maslama’s great campaign in Armenia and the land of the Khazars. After partial successes in which the country was laid waste, the stubborn resistance of the natives and the Turkish tribes forced him to retire. The retreat was a disastrous one: with great difficulty Maslama succeeded in bringing back the remnants of his army to Arab territory by sacrificing all his baggage and equipment (115 a.h.). His intervention to support the claims of Walid b. Yazid [q.v.], heir presumptive to Hishām, compromised him at court. He died before this caliph and seems to have taken with him to his grave the fortune of the Marwānids, for they rapidly declined after his death.


(H. Lammens)

MAŞMUDA (the broken plural Maşmûda is also found), one of the principal Berber ethnic groups forming a branch of the Barānis.

If we set aside the Masmûda elements mentioned by al-Bâkiri in the neighbourhood of Bone, the post-Islamic Maşmûda seem to have lived exclusively in the western extremity of the Maghrib; and as far back as one goes in the history of the interior of Morocco, we find them forming with the Sanhāja [q.v.], another group of Barānis Berbers, the main stock of the Berber population of this country. Indeed from the first Arab conquest in the seventh century to the importation of the Hīlalus by the Almohad Sulṭān Yaḥyī al-Manṣūr in 1190, it was the Maşmûda who inhabited the great region of plains, plateaus and mountains, which stretches from the Mediterranean to the Anti-Atlas to the west of a line from N. E. to S. W. passing through Mknāsa (Meknès) and Imnān; the only parts of this territory which were not occupied by them were the three small Sanhaja enclaves: the Sanhāja of Tangier, of the valley of the Warghā and of Azamīnī. To the north and to the west, the land of the Maşmûda was bounded by the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. To the east and south it was bounded by the lands of the Sanhāja. To the north were the Sanhāja of the region of Tāzā and those of
Wargha; in the centre, the Zamaga or Sanhadja of the Central Atlas, to which should be added the Zanata of Fassa; to the south, the Haskura, the Lamta and the Guelala.

It was from the presence of this Maşmuda bloc, extending continuously from Süs to the Mediterranean, that eastern Morocco generally must have received the name of Süs, a name found for example in Yaqtin (cf. Mijyam, s. v. Süs) who distinguishes a Hither Süs (capital Tanger) and a Farther Süs (capital Taifa) separated from the other by two months' journey. It is also to this racial unity that are due the legends according to which all the N. W. corner of Morocco was once inhabited by the people of Süs (abl Süs). Before the coming of the Hilâli Arabs, the Maşmuda parties were divided into three groups:

1. In the north, from the Mediterranean to the Sabil and Wargha, the Ghamara (q. v.).
2. In the centre from the Sabil to the Wadi Umm Rabî, the Barahawta (s. Berghilawata).
3. In the south, from the Wadi Umm Rabî to the Anti-Atlas, the Maşmuda in the strict sense of the word.

Like the majority of the Barânis, who in this respect are a contrast to the Butr, who are inclined to be nomads, the Maşmuda were all settled; for if, in one passage, Ibn Khalid mentions two nomad tribes, the Lâghs and the Zaggan as forming part of the nomad contingents of the Hilâli, he also points out that they were tribes of the Lamta, i.e. of the nomadic Sanhadja, who finally became incorporated in the Dawâw Hassân, Maqâlik Arab nomads of Süs. Ibn Khalid further mentions that special mention of the fortresses and fortified villages (ma adapté nso-taou) of the Maşmuda who lived in the mountains of Daran or the Great Atlas. Other Arab historians and geographers mention the many little towns (karva) in the plains occupied by the Dukkala or the Barahawta, a pastoral and agricultural people; but these were gradually ruined and destroyed in the course of the fighting which went on without interruption in their country from the establishment of the Zanata principalities of Şâlîla, Tâdilâ and Âghmûn: the Almoravid and Almohad conquests, repeated campaigns against the heretical Barahawta, the Hilâli occupation, the struggle between the Almohads and the Marinids, the rivalry between the Marinid kingdom of Fas and that of Marrakesh and lastly the wars with the Portuguese. Exterminated as heretics, dismissed of their lands and driven from them by the Arab or Zanata nomads brought into their territory, transported to a distance (region of Fas) by the Waṭjasid sulûns, for whose taste they showed too little hostility to the Portuguese, the central Maşmuda of the original Maşmuda of Tamasnâ and of the land of the Dukkala finally disappeared: their place was taken by nomads, Hilâli Arabs (in the north, in Habî and Aqghar, the Riyâh; in the south, the Djuwân, Sufyan, Khulû, Banû Djaûr) and the Berbers (Zanata Hawwârâ); in the xviith century the coming to power of the Sa'dian dynasty brought about the immigration of Maqâlik Arab tribes to the same region: 'Abda, Aymar, Rahâmîna, Barâbêsh, Wadlaya, Awdâl Doulâm, Zu'aîr, etc.

From the xviith century onwards, as a result of the occupation of their central plains by the Arabs, Hilâli then Maqâlik, the Maşmuda only survived in the mountainous regions which formed the northern and southern extremes of their old domains. The Maşmuda of the north (or Maşmûta al-Sûlî): "M. of the shores of al-Kûyân were chiefly represented by the Ghamara group (q. v.). But, alongside of them, we find two small groups having the same racial origin:

a. The Maşmuda of the Straits, settled between the district of Cuta, which belonged to the Ghuwara and that of Tangier, a Sanhadja country. It was they who gave their name to the fortified port of Kûsàr Maşmûda, also called Kûsîr al-Madîjz, the modern al-Kûsîr al-Sâghir. Their presence here is attested in the tenth century, for it was while fighting here against them that Isâm Mînî, the prophet of the Ghuwara, was slain; al-Rûkî (xith century) knows them in the same area corresponding to that of the modern Aqzâq.

b. Al-Bakrî mentions another group of Maşmûda (tribe of the Aqzâq) settled in the land lying between al-Kûsîr al-Kabîr and Wâzzân; there is still a small Maşmûda tribe between these two towns.

The Maşmûda of the south, who inhabited the lands between the Wâdî Umm Rabî and the Anti-Atlas, were divided into two groups: those of the plain and those of the mountain.

a. The Southern Maşmûda of the plain lived to the north of the Great Atlas. The chief tribes were the Dukkala; the Banû Mâgûr (around Safi); the Hazîmâ; the Ragража and the Hadîya (to the south of that of the Tânsîf). The chief town in this region was Safi (Ar. Asîfî), for the town of Azemmûr (q. v.) and the rîba' of Tît (q. v.) were in the enclave of Sanhadja; besides the port of Safi, we must also mention that of Kûsîr (the Aguz of the Portuguese) at the mouth of the Tânsîf, which gave Agmân access to the sea and had a rîba', and that of Amadûli (the Mogador of the Portuguese) which served the district of Sûs. Besides these three centres, there were, as in Tamasnâ, a large number of fortified little towns (karva) many of which survived down to the xvith century; the Portuguese chroniclers, Leo Africans and Marmol have preserved for us many names of towns which have disappeared, their very memory being lost; the local hagiographic collections and notably the Kûtub al-Tâjsgawwass of al-Tâdîlî (xvith century) have preserved a good deal of valuable information on this subject. At the present day all the country to the north of the Atlas is arabised and if the old Berber element has not completely disappeared, it is at least overwhelmed by Arabs of whom the majority seem to be of Maqâlik origin. The Hadîya alone, between Mogador and Agadir, have maintained almost intact and have retained the use of the Berber language.

b. The Southern Maşmûda of the mountains occupied the Great Atlas (Zalahl Daraw), the massif of Surwâ (anc. Suswâ) and the Anti-Atlas or mountains of the Najâra (Beib. In Gis). In the Great Atlas, the Maşmûda extended to the east as far as the upper course of the Tânsîf (a pass called Tizin-Telwet). From west to east, the following were the chief groups: the Galfâwâ; the Hulûnâ (or Allâna), the Warika and the Hazradja, near Aqzâq; the Aqzânâ, including the Mgâfîa, the Maghâris and the Dagaîhû or Banû Daghbû; the Hinta, including the Ghaibû; the people of Tin-Mallâ, on the upper course of the river of Nâfis; the Sûda or Zanda, in the lower valley of the Asîf al-Mâl; the Gaddûnwa and
lastly in the west, the Gafsa, the chief tribe of which was the Sakstra or Saksawa.

The massif of Sirwa and the high valley of the Wadi Sint were inhabited by the Banū Wawazig and the Sakhāna. The N. E. part of the Anti-Atlas was occupied by the Hargha.

Farther to the south, the Sūs, properly so-called, was inhabited by heterogeneous elements of Masmūda origin (al-Idrisī, al-Butūn al-Dīr al-Masmūda). Describing the road leading from Ţarfūdant to Aqghmāt, al-Idrisī mentions between Ţarfūdant and the land of the Hargha, four tribes the names of which, corrupted by the copyists, are unfortunately hardly identifiable.

Besides these highlanders, who were strictly Masmūda, we must mention the Haskara (or Hasakara). These were highlanders of Sanhâja origin, brethren of the Lamta and Gair, who led a nomadic existence to the south and the Anti-Atlas. The Haskara settled in the high valley of Tānūfīt and the Wādī al-Abbīd, on the two slopes of the mountain range which locks the Great Atlas, the home of the Masmūda, with the Central Atlas, the home of the Zanîgā (Sanhâja) of Ţadilla; their chief tribes were the Zamīsawa, the Maghara, the Garmâna, the Ghudja-dama, the Fatwâka, the Mashâra, the Hultâna, and the Hantâna, who, as they lived on one slope or the other, belonged to the Haskara al-Ḳibla (H. of the south) or to the Haskara al-Dīl (H. of the north), Ibn Khâlidān, who calls attention to the Sanhâja origin of the Haskara, adds that as a result of their taking up the Almohad cause, it became customary to associate them with the Masmūda tribes, but that they never enjoyed the same privileges as these latter.

History. In 682, ʿUqba b. Nāfiʿ marched against the Masmūda of the Atlas with whom he fought several battles. On one occasion he was surrounded in the mountains and owed his safety solely to the help given him by a body of Zanîgā. In the same year he attacked and took the town of Nafsa which was occupied by ʿRûm and Berbers professing Christianity. Thence he went to Iglī, a town of Sūs which he also took.

Legend adds that he even thrust his way to the Atlantic where he rode his horse into the water, calling God to witness that there were no more lands for him to conquer. This first submission of the Masmūda does not however seem to have lasted after the departure of ʿUqba. In 707, Māʾāt b. Nūrār had to reconquer Morocco; his person took Iglī and Taḍīft and sent his son to the conquest of Sūs and the land of the Masmūda.

In 712 ʿAbd Allah b. al-Habībah was appointed governor of the Maghrib; he appointed his son ʿIsmāʿīl as assistant to the governor of Morocco and gave him particular charge of the district of Sūs.

In 725, the same ʿAbd Allah sent Ḥabīb, grandson of ʿUqba, to make an expedition into Sūs against the Masmūda and the Sanhâja (Masmūda). Later the latter's son ʿAbd al-Kahman al-Fifti (d. 715) became an independent governor of the Maghrib, occupied Iglī and built a camp there, the remains of which could still be seen in the Almohad time. It is to this same governor that is attributed the making of the well, which supply the road from Tānūfīt to Awādīghī through the modern Mauritania.

The land of the Masmūda then disappears from history till the ninth century. The conquests of Idrīs I did not extend in the south beyond the Tānūfīt and the Tādilla. But in 812 Idrīs II made an expedition against the town of Naffis; on his death in 828, his son ʿAbd (or ʿUbayd) Allāh obtained as his share of the kingdom, Aqghmāt, Naffis, the lands of the Masmūda and of the Lamta as well as Sūs. Al-Bakri records that some of his descendants ruled as lords of Naffis and among the Banū Lamta, not far from Iglī. Other Idrisiids, descendants of ʿUbayd b. Idrīs, were at this time lords of Darā.

With the decline of Idrisiid power in the tenth century, the Masmūda again became independent and were ruled by elected chiefs or inghârīn (= Arabic ṣawâdek); al-Bakri tells us that those of Aqghmāt were appointed by the people for a term of one year. When at the end of the tenth century, Zanîgā principalities became established in Morocco (at Fas, Shâlā and Tādilla), Maghrawa established themselves at Aqghmāt; but all we know of them is that they were attacked by the Almoravids. In 1057, after receiving the submission of Sūs and of the Masmūda (Zauda, Shâfīja, Gadrîwa, Kârānā and Hâla), the Almoravīd chief ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf took Aqghmāt; the last Maghrawa ruler of which, Lagūt b. ʿAlī, fled to the famous Zumâar, who was one of the Nafzawa, and became the wife of Yūsuf b. Tâshfin whom she initiated into the fine art of diplomacy.

From 1057 Aqghmāt was the capital of the Almoravids till 1062, when Yūsuf b. Tâshfin founded Marrakush [q. v.]. In 1074 the same ruler, having divided his empire among several governors, gave his son Tamūn the governorship of Marrakush, Aqghmāt, of the Masmūda and of Sūs, then of Tādilla and Tānūfīt.

The Masmūda seem to have remained subject to the Almoravids till the rebellion in 1121 provoked by the mabdi Ibn Tanart [q. v.] of the tribe of Hargha, who, supported by ʿUmar Inti, shaikh of the Hintāta, and by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin [q. v.], brought about the foundation of the Almohad dynasty [q. v.]. The history of the Masmūda is henceforth involved with that of the dynasty which they brought to power and which was to last till 1269. The Masmūda, together with the Almohad dynasty, thus contributed to the rise of the Hafsids [q. v.], who ruled over Ifriqiya from 1228 to 1574, through the descendants of ʿAbd al-Hāf ʿUmar Inti, shaikh of the Hintāta.

During the first half of the xiii rh century, the power of the Almohads, routed by the Christians of Spain at the battle of Hījān al-ʿUkhab (las Navas de Tolosa) in 1212 and vigorously attacked in Morocco by the Banū Marin, soon began to decline. The Masmūda of the Atlas, indifferent to the fate of the dynasty, took advantage of this plight to regain their independence. It was the tribes of the Hintāta and the Haskara, which in 1224, at the proclamation of al-ʿAdil assumed the leadership in the movement; frequently allied with the Ḥabīb Arabs of the plains, Sufyān and Ḥafṣ, we find them fighting in all the civil wars and supporting various pretenders to the throne.

When in 1260, the Marinids had definitely crushed the Almohads, the Masmūda retained a certain amount of independence and lived more or less in submission to the central power, ruled by chiefs chosen from the great local families: Awdāl Yūnis among the Hintāta; Awdāl Saʿīd Allāh among the Gadrīwa; among the Sakstra, ʿUmar b. Haddi.
was an independent chief who went so far as to claim the Berber title agellid (= king). In Sūs the Banū Yaddar founded an independent principality which lasted from 1254 till about 1340. As to the Haskūra, the power among them was exercised by the Banū Khattāb.

Down to the xvi century, except during the first half of the reign of the Almohad dynasty of which they had been the principal supporters, the Maşmūda of the Atlas were hardly ever under the direct rule of the Moroccan government; only the tribes of the plains, Dukkāla and Ḥaḷa, in a position to be of the greatest importance, were able to offer less resistance and had to submit. The later dynasties, Sa'dīan and 'Alawī, were no better able to subdue the Maşmūda of the highlands; but instead of gathering round local chiefs with temporal power, the latter now placed themselves under the leadership of holy men with religious prestige.

In the beginning of the xvi century, the land of the Maşmūda was in a state of anarchy. Some aṭṣṭāk of the tribe of the Hintāta held the lands of Marrākush; the most famous was Abū Shāmūt; to the south of Tāmnīf, the xvi century saw the rise of the group of the Kāṭrīgā in the xv century, the power of the mystic al-Dīzuḷi [q.v.] spread among the Ḥaḷa. In the adjoining country of Darā'a, the Sa'dīan dynasty was rising, which after occupying Sūs imposed its domination on the whole of Morocco.

But it did not however succeed in subduing completely the highlanders of the Atlas. The powerful Aḥmad al-Maṣrū himself had to fight against a pretender who had proclaimed himself king of the Ṣaksāwa.

After the death of al-Maṣrū, the Atlas and Sūs were all under the authority of local religious leaders of whom the most important were to be found among the Ḥaḷa and in Tāzarwāl (family of Aḥmad U-Mūsī).

It was the 'Alawīs Sulṭān Mawlāy Raḥā'id who restored Sūs and the Atlas to the Moroccan empire. The only episode to note is the constitution in Tāzarwāl, by a marabout Saiyīdī Hīṣām of a kind of independent kingdom, the capital of which was Ilīghat and which lasted from the end of the xvi century till 1886.

Henceforth the Maşmūda disappear from history. The Atlas remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power of the ruling sovereigns, but all the important events in the region took place among the Ḥaḷa or in Sūs [q.v.].

The French occupation found the old Maşmūda grouped, since the death of the 'Alawī Sulṭān Mawlāy al-Ḥasan, into three bodies each under the authority of a local family: the Gūwa in the east, the Gūnja in the centre, and the Mṭuğgā in the west. The only one who is now the Gūwa; as a result of the disappearance of their leaders, the two others were recently broken up.

The name Maşmūda, still preserved in the north of Morocco in the name of a small tribe of the Kašr al-Kabir, seems to have completely disappeared in the south, where the former Maşmūda peoples, continuing to talk Berber, bear the name of Shīḥā (χίνις). Ibn Ṭūṣī, however, speaks of the name Maşmūda, which is found so often in the Arab historians and geographers, was ever in regular use among the peoples to whom they apply it; it is, indeed, suggestive that it is not found in the long lists of ethnics given in the Kitāb al-Ansāb, published in the Documents inédits d'Histoire Almohade.

Sociology. The Maşmūda of the Atlas lead a settled life, living by a little agriculture and breeding a poor type of cattle; they live in villages or hamlets of stonehouses with clay roofs. Ibn Khāldūn notes the existence among them of numerous little strongholds and fortified villages (mādīiq wa-hayyūn), the ancestors of the modern tighrens and agādīrs. There were no towns among the mountains; Tin Mallal, famous for the mosque where Ibn Tāmūr was buried, was never a town. Before the Almoravid ruler Yūsūf b. Tāṣhīf founded Marrākush in 1062, built moreover in the plains out of reach of the highlanders, whom it was to control, the only urban centres in the district were situated at the foot of the Atlas on its lowest slopes. The principal towns were in the north, the double town of Aghmāt [q.v.] and that of Nafis on the river of the same name; in the south, in Sūs, Iglī and Tāʾūdant; as places of less importance we may mention in the north, Shīḥāwa (mod.: Shīḥāwā), Aʿṣīf and Tamarūrī; to the east, among the Ḥaḷa and in the borders of Sūs, Tadnaṭ, the great trade routes on which travelled the region started from Aghmāt for the port of Kūz (at the north of the Tāmnīf), Fās (via Tāllā), Sīdīmlās (through the land of the Ḥadżadja and the Haskūra), and Sūs (via Nafis, the land of the Banū Maǧhūs and Iglī; no doubt using the pass now called Tawi-n-Ṭesṭ). Al-Bakrī particularly mentions the industry and application and the thirst for gain, characteristic of the Maşmūda of the Atlas and of Sūs. The principal products of the country were fruits (nuts and almonds), honey and oil of argan (hargīn, argūn), a tree peculiar to the country, of which there were regular forests among the Ḥaḷa. The Maşmūda could eat and work iron and also copper, which they exported in the form of ingots or "loads" (gūntūl); they also worked and chased silver jewellery. In Sūs also the cultivation of the sugar-cane enabled sugar to be made.

From the intellectual point of view, the Maşmūda seem to occupy a place of first rank among the Berbers. Each of their three principal groups has produced a reforming prophet, the author of sacred works in the Berber language: Ḥā-Mīm of the Gūmārā; Sha'īb b. Ṭārīf of the Barāghwātā; Ibn Tūmart of the Maşmūda of the Atlas. It may also be noted that, Sūs is one of those few districts in which books were written in Berber down to a quite recent date (cf. H. Basset, Essai sur la littérature des Berbères, p. 73–81).

As regards religion, the Maşmūda were converted to Islam in the vii century by Ukhra b. Nafī', who left his comrade Shīkār among them to teach the new religion. The latter died among them and was burned on the banks of the Tāmnīf where his tomb is still venerated. The place is now called Rūḥ Saiyyīdī Shīkār near the confluence with the river of the Shīḥāwa. The Mosque of the town of Aghmāt of the Hailāna was founded at the beginning of the eighth century in 704.

Ibn Khāldūn describes the Maşmūda of the Atlas as being among the last to be converted from the first conquest, in which they differed from their brethren of the north, the Barāghwātā and the Gūmārā, who remained faithful to their heretical beliefs. At the beginning of the eighth century, several
of them accompanied ʿĀrif on his conquest of Spain: the best known of these was Ṭawāsī b. Wāzīṣ b. ʿĀrifī, of the tribe of the Aṣḥāda, who settled in Spain and was the grandfather of Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā, one of the rulers of the Musawwarī; many others also settled in Spain and their descendants played important parts under the Omayyads.

In the eleventh century however, al-Bakri notes Kutub al-ḥerētes among the Masūmāš; these were the ʿIrbān ʿĀrānī who settled to the north of the Ḥaritha and the town of ʿIgī. In this district he also mentions the existence of idolators who worshipped a ram: perhaps we have here a relic of the cult of the god Anmon among the ancient Berbers. The towns however formed important centres of Muslim culture, the influence of which was felt not only by the Masūmāš of the district but also by the ʿIrbān ʿĀrānī of the adjoining deserts: ʿIrbān and ʿAzāzā. We know that it was in the town of Xafqī, with Wāzīṣ b. Zallū, a learned jurist of ʿIrbān origin and a pupil of Abū Iʿrānī Abū al-ʿAffā of al-ʿAṣ ibn al-ʿArāmīn, that in 1039 Yaḥyā b. Ibrahim al-Gudārī recruited ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Gudārī who was the promoter of the Almoravī movement. For the Almohād period al-Tallīī’s hagiographic collection, entitled Kitāb al-Tālīī, shows us the land of the Masūmāš of the south full of wonder-working saints. Later the tribe of the ʿArāmīn, settled on the land occupied by the ʿIrbān ʿĀrānī, was the center of a movement at once religious and political, the details of which are little known but the memory still alive. In the first half of the xviith century, religious activity seems to be concentrated in the south of Sinā, in Ẓāwār where the descendants of the saint Sayyid ʿAbd al-ʿĀrānī ʿUṣārā carved themselves out an independent marabout principality.


AL-MAṢMUGHĀN, a Zoroastrian dynasty whom the Arabs found in the region of Dunīwān (Dunbāwind) to the north of Ray. The origins of the Masūmāsh. The dynasty seems to have been an old one though not particularly celebrated. As is shown by the legend recorded by Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 275—277, and in al-Brūkī, p. 227. The title of masūmghān is said to have been conferred by Fārūqī upon ʿArmālī, Bawārī’s former cook (ʿahāk), who had been able to save a large part of the men-de-tensed to perish for the tyrant’s serpents. ʿArmālī (according to Yaḥyā, ii. 606, a Naḥṣānī, a native of the Zabīhāj) showed to Fārūqī in the mountains of Dalām and Shīrī, a whole nation of these refugees which caused Fārūqī to exclaim: was mānī kāta ʿārānī (which is explained to mean: “What a large number of people of the house of ʿAbd Allāh thou hast saved”).

The first historical reference to a masūmghān is found in Tabārī’s (i. 2656) account of the taking of Ray by Naʿīm b. Mūkārin in the time of the caliph ʿOmar (according to Ibn al-ʿAthīr in the years 18, 21 or 22; ʿArbārī however puts these events as late as 98 (716—717). The King of Ray, ʿIyāwākāsh b. Mīhrān b. Bāhrām-ʿAbbās, had received reinforcements from the people of Dunūāwānd, but when he was defeated, the masūmghān of Dunūāwānd made peace with the Arabs and received the terms (al-kaʿārī maḥrūr wa-l-munīnī) promising an annual payment of 200,000 dīnār. The charter given by Naʿīm was addressed to the masūmghān of Dunūāwānd, ʿAbd al-Ẓāwār, to the people of Dunūāwānd, of Kūnār, of Lārīz (Lārgān) and of Shirīz. This gives us an idea of the extent of the masūmghān. His possessions included the country round Mount Damāwānd [q.v.] and stretched down the plains as far as the east of Ray. The district of Dunūāwānd (Dūbāwānd, the land occupied by) the ʿAbd ʿAlī clan did not form part of Tabārī. The Arabs mention it along with Ray (Tabārī, i. 2655—2656; Naḥṣānī, p. 209; Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 275—277) but as we have seen at the time of the conquest, Ray and Dunūāwānd were under different dynasties. The old capitol of Dunūāwānd may have been at Mandān where, according to Ibn al-Fakhrī, ʿArāmī had built a wonderful house of teak and ebony, which in the reign of ʿAbārīn al-Rahīd was taken to pieces and transported to Baghdad. In the Arab period there were two towns in Dunūāwānd: Ţīmā and Ṣhalānī (the latter is marked on Stahil’s map to the south of the modern town of Damāwānd, which lies on the slopes of Mount Damāwānd). According to Yaḥyā, the masūmghān’s principal stronghold was called ʿUṣārātān (or ʿArānī). This should be sought above the village of ʿArānī, which must correspond to the old ʿArānī al-Hadādīn. (Ibn al-Fakhrī’s story of the shops of ʿAwnānī in which worked the smiths, the noise of whose hammers exercised the encircling Bewārās must refer to the chambers carved out of the rock near ʿArānī; cf. Crawfay-Williams, Rock-Dwellings at Rīsān, J.R.A.S., 1904, p. 251; 1906, p. 217).

An attempt made by Abū Muslim in 131 to conquer the masūmghān was a disastrous failure: his general Māṣūr b. Kūnār was attacked by the masūmghān’s men and on account of the difficult nature of the country (li-dībi biḥṣādā) was forced to return to Ray (Ibn al-ʿAthīr, v. 304; cf. ʿIzār b. ʿAbd in Dorn, Ausweis, p. 441).

The principality was not conquered until 141. In this period there were dissensions in the family of the masūmghān. Abarwī b. al-Mansūr quarrelled with his brother and went over to the caliph al-Mansūr who gave him a pension (Tabārī, iii. 150). The Kitāb al-ʿĀrānīnb i-Haddāk, p. 228, teases out his bravery in the rising of the Rāwawīya and calls him “al-Masūmghān Māṣūr b. Dinār, makī al-dīn ʿArānī”. This Abarwī (or Māṣūr) had enjoyed considerable influence, for, according to Ibn al-Fakhrī, the appointment of ʿOmar b. ʿAlī as commander of the army sent against Tabārīstān was made on the advice of Abarwī who had known him since the trouble with Sunbāh (on the partisans of this “Khurrami” in Tabārīstān cf. Maṣūdī, Muṣnūt, vi. 158) and with the Rāwawīya.

In the year 141, the brother of Abarwī who occupied the throne of Dunūāwānd was at war with his father-in-law, the ispahāb Khurram of Ṭabaristan; but when he heard that the forces sent by al-Mansūr were on their way to Ṭabaristan, he hastened to effect a reconciliation with his adversary (Tabārī, iii. 136; Ibn al-ʿAthīr, v. 386).
The stories of the campaign against Tabaristān directed by al-Mahdi by order of his father al-
Maṣfir are very contradictory as is shown by their very detailed analysis in Vasmer, op. cit. After the defeat of the ispahbads, the Arabs con-
quered the masalmahān and captured him and his daughters Bakhhtariya (?) and Šnry (for Shokla). Of these princesses one became the wife of Mahdi b. Maṣfur and the other the amān-walad of ‘Ali b. Ra’ītā. According to a story in Ibn al-Fākhi, p. 314, Khālid b. Barmak (Vasmer, op. cit., p. 100, thinks that his expedition was sent especially against the lord of Dunbāwland) sent the masalmahān and his wife and his two daughters to Bagdad, but in another passage, p. 275, the same writer says that the masalmahān obtained amān from Mahdi b. Maṣfur and came down from the mountain of al-
Aiāin (?) He was taken to Ra’i and there Mahdi ordered him to be beheaded.

After the death of the masalmahān, the people of these mountain regions lapsed into barbarism (hawwa) and became like wild beasts (Tabari, i. i. 136). According to Ibn al-Fākhi (p. 276) however, the descendants of the masalmahān (zhumr al-maṣfur) were still well known.

Spiegel’s and Malqurt’s hypotheses. Yağūt i. 244 interprets masalmahān as kahib al-
maṣfur “the great one of the magi” (weis, “great”; N.W. Iranian form). Spiegel thought of connecting this dynasty with the prince-priests of Ra’i, whose existence is known from a well-known passage in the Avesta (Yasna, ix. 28, transl. Darmesteter, i. 170; cf. Jackson, Zoroaster, p. 202-205). In spite of Malqurt’s criticisms, who says it is impossible to quote the authority of Avestan traditions which relate to much earlier state of affairs, Spiegel’s suggestion is still of interest. We have certainly to deal with vague memories and not with actual facts. In the time of the Arab conquest the descendants of Bahram-Cōbīn were ruling in Ra’i, but the Arabs (Tabari, i. 2653-2656) installed there a certain al-Zainabī, son of Khwāja and father of al-Farrukhān. It remains to be seen if this family of Zainbād, “whom the Arabs call al-Zainabī” (Nadhirī, p. 317) is connected with Dunbāwland. The name was called ‘hriz (Ra’i) which resembles the name of the mountain al-
Aiāin from which the last masalmahān came down (cf. the note by de Goeje in Ibn al-Fākhi, p. 275). Mar-
quart wanted to connect the masalmahāns of the Bawandi dynasty, the eponymous ancestor of which Baw, a descendant of Kayīl, brother of Khuşraw I, is said to have lived in the time of the later Sāshānians. This Baw was a man of piety and after the fall of Yazdagird III had retired to his father’s fire-temple. Malquart regards him as a “magus” and identifies him with the father of the Christian martyr Anastasius, who bore this name (Bz6) and was a “master of magian lore.” Lastly he quotes the fact that the Bawandis appeared in 167 only after the disappearance of the masalmahān (after 141) as if to continue their line. Unfortunately several details of the ingenious arguments are not accurate: our sources (Ibn Isfandiyār, Zahr al-Din in p. 200-205) give not the slightest suggestion that Baw belonged to the priestly caste. According to Ibn Isfandiyār (transl. Browne, p. 98), his grandfather’s temple was at Kūsān, which Rabino, p. 160, locates a little distance west of Ashraf i.e. quite remote from Dunbāwland. The passage in Tabari, i. 1294, which Marquart quotes to prove the occurrence of the name Masalmahān among the Bawandis refers to the cousin of Mazīyar of the Kairīn dynasty, which is quite different from the Bawandis (cf. below).

The Kairīn masalmahāns. It is curious that neither Ibn Isfandiyār nor Zahr al-Din speak of the dynasty of the masalmahān of Dunbāwland, perhaps because they do not include this region in Tabaristān proper. On the other hand, they mention a masalmahān (masalmahān > masalmahān) Walsah, who was the marzubān of Miyān-dru-ru’d (Zahr al-Din, p. 42 says that this canton was near the Sāri between the river Kaliand and Mihbān and that on the east it adjoined Qara-
hūghān; Miyān-du-rū’d is thus quite close to where Rabino puts Kūsān). This masalmahān Walsah (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 101; Zahr al-Din, p. 42) lived in the time of Djamasp Farrukhān the Great (700–722) and belonged to the elder branch of the Kairīns descended from Zarmīr b. Sūkhās. (We do not know why Juzjī, p. 430, takes this Walsah to be the son of the last masalmahān of Dunbāwland?). The Kairīn Wändad Hurmuz (of the younger line, descended from Kāruz, brother of Zarmīr) in his rising against the caliph (cf. Mahdī, p. 158–169) had combined with the ispahbads Shahr-
win (772–797) and the masalmahān Walsah of Miyān-dru-ru’d. This latter (Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 126; Zahr al-Din, p. 155) seems to have been one of the successors of the masalmahān Walsah mentioned above.

Under 224 (838) Tabari (i. 1294) mentions a cousin of the Kairīn Mazīyar, who was called Shāhhrīyār b. al-Masalmahān. According to this, al-
Masalmahān would be identical with Wändad Ummid, uncle of Mazīyar (cf. Justi, p. 430). On the other hand under the year 250 (864), Tabari, i. 1529, mentions a Masalmahān (рез) among the allies of the ‘Alī Ḥasan b. Zaid. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 165 calls him Masalmān b. Wändad-Ummid. One must either suppose there is an error in Tabari’s genealogy or admit that the title of mas-
almahān was borne both by Wändad Ummid and his son, but the form of the designation of the latter (Masalmān) with the article) would rather suit the title that had become a simple proper name (Brown is wrong in translating ‘the Masalmahān’).

To sum up then: Alongside of the masalmahāns of Dunbāwland, we have the masalmahāns of Miyān-
dru’id. These marzubān, if we may rely on Zahr al-Din, belonged to the Zarmīrīn branch of the dynasty of Sūkhās (Ṣaṣānīn governor of Tabaristān descended from Kāruz, son of the famous smith Kāva) Later we find the title (or proper name!) of masalmahān recurring in the younger branch of the line of Sūkhās (the Kairīn branch), which occupied a position in Tabaristān subordinate to the Bawandi ispahbads (Zahr al-Din, p. 154, 4).

(V. MINORSKY)

MĀSSA (Berber Massat), the name of a small Berber tribe of Morocco of Sūs, settled some 30 miles south of Agadir at the mouth of the Wādī Māssa; the latter is probably the fiume Marzat mentioned by Piny the Elder (v. 9) to the north of the fiume Darat, the modern Wādī Darā, and the Māssat of the geographer would correspond to the modern ahl Māssat.

The name Māssa is associated with the first Arab conquest of Morocco; according to legend, it was on the shore there that, after conquering Sūs, Cūḥa b. Naḥi drove his steed into the waves of the Atlantic calling God to witness that there were no more lands to conquer on the west. In any case, Māssā appears very early as an important religious and commercial centre. Al-Yaḥṣūbī (end of the third = ninth century) notes that the harbour was, by one and another, renowned, that of Bahālib, Al-Bakri and al-Idrīsī mention the harbour of Māssat; al-Bakri emphasized the fame of the ribāt and the importance of the fairs held there. Ibn Khaldūn devotes several passages to his Kitāb al-ṭabaṣr to the ribāt of Māssā, where according to popular belief the expected Mahdi or Fātīmīd was to appear: this belief induced many devout people to go and settle in this ribāt and also sent many adventurers there to raise rebellions.

Towards the end of the ninth century, the religious movement begun by al-Iṣḥāqī made Māssā one of the great sanctuaries of Sūs. In the middle of the eleventh (viii) century Leo Africanus describes Māssā as a group of three little towns surrounded by a stone wall in the middle of a forest of palm-trees; the inhabitants were agriculturists and turned the raising of the waters of the Wādī to their advantage. Outside the town on the sea-shore was a very venerated “temple”, from which the Mahdi was to come; a peculiar feature of it was that the little boys in it were formed of ribs of whalebone: the sea actually throws up many cetaceans on this coast and ambergris was collected here; local legend moreover says that it was on the shore of Māssā that Jonah was cast up by the whale.

After the fall of the Sālṭians, the development of the Marabu principality of Tāzarwāl again made Māssā a commercial centre. The port was frequented by Europeans but it was soon supplanted by that of Agadir. The rapid decline of the principality of Tāzarwāl and the steadily increasing influence of the central Moroccan power finally destroyed almost completely any religious and economic importance of Māssā.


MASŪD Abū Sālih, the eldest son of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, was born in the year 588 (998). In 406 (1015—1016), Sultan Mahmūd nominated him his heir-apparent, and two years later made him governor of Herāt. In 411 (1020), at the command of his father, he led an expedition to Ghur and reduced the north-western part to submission. Shortly after this, he was disgraced and sent as a prisoner to Multān, but he was soon taken back into favour and was reinstated in his government at Herāt. When the province of Kājur was conquered in 420 (1029), Sultan Mahmūd placed it under Masūd who, after subjugating the outlying parts, conquered Hamadān and Isfahān from their Buwahīd ruler, Ālī al-Dawla b. Kākawail, in the beginning of 421 (1030), and was making preparations for further conquest when news arrived of the death of his father and the succession to the throne of his brother Abū Ahmad Muḥammad. Masūd hurried to Ghazna to claim the throne. In the meantime, the army tired of Muḥammad, deposed him, and had the khaṭba said in the name of Masūd. Muḥammad was blinded and sent to the fort of Mandish, and Masūd ascended the throne in Shawwal, 421 (October 430), about 6 months after the death of his father. The Caliph al-Ḫālid bin ʿAbdullāh conferred upon him the titles of ʿAbd al-Dāni b. ʿAbdullāh, Ḥārūn b. ʿAbdullāh, and Zahir Khāligi ʿAbdullāh.

In 422 (1031), Sultan Masūd sent an army to punish ʿĪsā, the ruler of Mukrān, for his rebellion. ʿĪsā was defeated and put to death, and his brother named Abū ʿImār al-Maṣāqi was placed on the throne. In 424 (1032—433), Masūd lied a siege to a fort named Sarasti in the southern Kāshān hills, took it by assault and returned to Ghazna in the spring. After this he attacked Tabaristān, as the ruler of that country, named Abū Kālimḏar, had adopted a hostile attitude, and captured Astārābād. Abū Kālimḏar was forced to offer submission and to promise to pay annual tribute. About the end of 426 (October 435), Abū Ahmad b. Ṯaylīḡīm, the governor of Lahore, rebelled. Masūd sent against him one of his Hindū generals who was defeated and slain in battle. He then sent another Hindū general named Ṭatāk, who defeated Abū Ahmad and forced him to fly to Sind where he was drowned while attempting to cross the river Indus. About the end of 427 (October 436), Masūd led an expedition to India, took the forts of Hānsī and Sonipat and returned to Ghazna, leaving his son Maṣūd as the governor of the Kundāb. In 430 (1039—40), Masūd crossed the Oxus to punish ʿĀṭīqīn, son of ʿAlī, ruler of Bukhārā, for his hostility, but before he could accomplish anything he received news that the Saldūjīs were advancing to Balkh to cut off his retreat, and he immediately returned to Khurāsān.

Early in his reign, Sultan Masūd had been called upon to deal with the Saldūjīs whose power had considerably increased during the period of disturbance following the death of Sultan Mahmūd. They raided Herāt as early as 422 (1031) but were repulsed with heavy loss at Farasāb and forced to take refuge in the Balkhān Mountains. This however did not stop their activities, and by 425 (1034) they had started to make systematic incursions into Khurāsān. In Shabān 426 (June, 1035) Masūd sent against them two of his generals, the Ḥādhib Baktrīḡīh and Husain Abū Mīḡāl, who inflicted a crushing defeat on them, while the Ghaznavī troops were engaged in plundering the camp of their vanquished foes, a body of the Saldūjīs under Dūwūd issued from the hills, fell upon their disorderly ranks, and made fearful slaughter among them. Husain ʿAli was taken prisoner, and
Baktohdh managed to escape. Instead of marching against the Saldjûks, Mas'ûd wasted his time in a fruitless expedition to India in 427, as stated above, and the result was that they became bolder and more powerful. In 428 (1036–1037), they captured Balkh, but retired to Marw at the approach of Sultan Mas'ûd, and sued for peace. Mas'ûd gladly consented to it, but it was only a shampeace and when Mas'ûd started on his return march to Ghazna, the Saldjûks fell upon his rear and put many of his soldiers to death. Mas'ûd turned round and took terrible revenge for this treachery. The Saldjûks redoubled their efforts against the Sultan, and won over the people of Sarâkh, Nasâ and Baward to their side. Mas'ûd now personally took the field against them. The Saldjûks advanced to meet him under their leader Tughîrî. The two armies met at Dandânakân on 8th Ramâdân, 431 (May 23, 1040). Mas'ûd fought bravely but being deserted by his generals and finding himself surrounded on all sides by the enemy, he fought his way out of the field of battle and managed to reach Ghazna in safety.

The Saldjûks had evidently become too strong for him, and he resolved to withdraw to India, possibly with a view to gaining a respite and preparing a large army there to retrieve his affairs. He left Ghazna with all his treasure, and accompanied by his captive brother Abû Ahmad Muhammâd. At Ribât-i Mûrikalah, shortly after crossing the river Indus, his slaves rebelled against him, plundered his treasure, and, being joined by the rest of the army, they seized Mas'ûd and acclaimed the blind Muhammâd as their sovereign. Mas'ûd was sent as a prisoner to a fort where he was put to death on 11th Djamâdâl 1, 432 (January 17, 1041). His reign had lasted 10 years and three months.

Mas'ûd was a man of strong build and great physical strength. He was brave and generous, but he lacked the wisdom of his father, and early in his reign, he lost the cooperation of his officers by foolishly attempting to bring about the ruin of the old servants of the House on the advice of his young and ambitious courtiers, and demanding the return of the money which Muhammâd had distributed to them at the time of his succession to the throne. Mas'ûd was a great lover of learning, and numerous scholars had assembled at his court, one of whom was the famous Abû Rahjân al-Bihâni who dedicated some of his greatest works to him. Several poets sang his praises and were given munificent rewards. He adorned his capital with beautiful buildings, and the New Palace with its magnificent throne was one of the wonders of the times.


MAS'UD B. MAWUDUD B. ZANGI, 'IZZ AL-DIN ASHKAF, son for Abu 'I-Mu'azzaf, 3rd of al-Mawjûl. Mas'ûd [q.v.] died in 595 (1170); he was followed by his son Saff al-Mawjûl [q.v.] as Atâbeg of al-Mawjûl. When the latter came into conflict with Saladin [q.v.] in 570 (1175) he gave his brother Mas'ûd command of the troops sent to relieve Halab, which was being besieged by Saladin. After Saladin had left Halab and seized the citadel of Hims, Mas'ûd, who had in the meanwhile attacked the Halabis to his side, attacked him but was defeated in Ramdân 570 (April 1175) at Kûrûn Hâmat. Saif al-Din died on 3rd Safar 572 (Aug. 11, 1176), or according to another less authenticated statement in 576 (began June 29, 1180), and Mas'ûd then became lord of al-Mawsûl. To this in 577 (1181) he was added Halab, which his cousin al-Malik al-Salih [q.v.] bequeathed to him shortly before his death; but Mas'ûd did not hold it very long. On the advice of the influential emir Muhammâd b. Zâmar, he ceded his new possession to his brother 'Imad al-Din al-Zangi who gave him Sindjâr in exchange, and in Muharram 578 (May 1182) the latter occupied Halab. Soon afterwards, Saladin took Edessa, al-Râkja, Sarujû and Naşibûn, and in Ra'djâb (November) of the same year he appeared before al-Mawsûl but could not take it by force; so he retired in the following month and turned his attention to Sindjâr. After he had taken this town, he forced 'Imâd al-Din to capitulate (Safar 579 = June 1183). In 581 (1185) Saladin again attacked al-Mawsûl but had once more to retire with his object unachieved. After the capture of the town of Maysâfarin, he made a third attempt to take al-Mawsûl, and encamped at some distance from the town but fell ill and was taken to Harrân. In spite of this, 'Izz al-Din did not dare to oppose him any longer but began negotiations. Saladin declared himself ready to make terms, and in Dhu 'l-Hijdja 581 (March 1186) peace was made on condition that 'Izz al-Din recognized the suzerainty of Saladin and gave him Shahrazur with the lands behind the Zâb. 'Izz al-Din died in al-Mawsûl on Sha'bân 27 or 29, 589 (Aug. 28 or 30, 1193) after designating his son Nûr al-Din Arslân Shâh as his successor. The Arabic historians pay him as high a tribute as they do to his father Mawûdûd.


MAS'UD B. MUHAMMAD ABU 'I-FADL GHU'ITH AL-DIN, a Saldjûk ruler in the 'Irâk (529–547 = 1134–1152). Like Muhammâd's other sons, Mas'ûd, when quite a child, was entrusted to an atâbeg to be educated, namely the celebrated emir Mawûdûd and when the latter was murdered, Aq Sokkor and Abâ Dju'yish Beg acted successively as Mas'ûd's tutors. The latter, an ambitious emir, in the beginning of Mahmûd's reign tried to secure the sultanate for his protege, then an eleven-year-old boy, but the attempt failed; in an encounter with Mahmûd's troops he was put to flight and Mas'ûd as well as his wazir, the famous Arab poet al-Tughrî [q.v.], were taken prisoners (514 = 1120). On the fate of the poet see the article on him. Mas'ûd was pardoned and later given Gandja by his brother (1130). After Mahmûd's death (525 = 1131), his son Dâwûd was at first recognised as sultan but Sandjar decided that Mas'ûd's brother Tughûrî should be sultan. Mas'ûd soon made peace with Dâwûd, after some fighting near Ta'bîrî, and sought to obtain from the caliph al-Mustârshid that the latter should mention him in the khutba in
Baghdad. The caliph, who had been approached with the same object by another brother of Mas'ud named Sahljuk and his atabeg Karajda, found himself forced to accede to both by having Mas'ud's name mentioned first, followed by that of Sahljuk. He also collected his forces to go in alliance with them against Sandjar; but when he moved in Khurasan, he withdrew so that Mas'ud and Sahljuk had to continue the struggle against their uncle alone and they were routed by him near a hill called Pandj Anghush in the neighbourhood of Dinawar (1132). Sandjar however allowed Mas'ud to return unhindered to Gandja and at the end of the same year Mas'ud found an opportunity to go to Baghdad where Dawud also now was. Both princes were received by the caliph in public audience and given robes of honour and other tokens of esteem. Homage was paid to Mas'ud as sulthan and to Dawud as heir-apparent. Thereafter he fought with varying fortune; his brother Tughril and after the latter's premature death (528 = 1134) was generally recognised as sulthan. Anushwarin b. Khalid, the caliph's vizier, now was given the office of vizier to the sulthan. Soon afterwards however, a number of Turkish emirs became dissatisfied with Mas'ud because they had felt themselves insulted by the advancement of Kara Sonkor, the powerful emir of Adharladjan, and were able to win the caliph over to their party. In the hope that Dawud would join him, he went with some 7,000 horsemen towards Hamadhan, where Mas'ud then was, but when the sulthan's troops met him at Daimarg, his own men left him in the lurch or even went over to Mas'ud so that he and his vizier and other high officials were taken prisoners (529 = 1135). The sulthan, it is true, treated him with deference, and began to discuss terms of peace, but he did not release him. He took him with him to Maragha, where in the same year (cf. the various dates given: Welt, Gesch. der Chalifen, ii. 231, note 4) he was murdered by a number of fidahis. The murderers were apparently hired by the sulthan, on the advice of Sandjar, who had been stirred up against the caliph by Dubaisi [q.v.]. The latter, who was also with Mas'ud, was soon afterwards treacherously slain by him. These deeds of violence naturally made a very bad impression Dawud and Sahljuk began again to bestir themselves; the new caliph Al-Kasid b. Illah, a son of Al-Mustansir, adopted a hostile attitude and other Turkish emirs, notably Zangi, the lord of al-Mawlid, began to insubordinate; in a word, anarchy soon prevailed everywhere. But when Mas'ud returned to Baghdad with his troops they all retired. Mas'ud thereupon had the caliph, who had escaped with Zangi to al-Mawlid, imprisoned by a fatwa of the kadi, and jurors and approved the appointment of al-Muqtasif (530 = 1136). After peace had in this way been at some extent restored, Mas'ud thought he might now devote himself to his pleasures and remained the whole year of 1137 in Baghdad in comparative inactivity, without allowing his leisure to be disturbed by a demonstration by the mob of the capital, which was intended to remind him that it was his duty to wage war upon the unbelievers. Once again several Turkish emirs rebelled and tried to bring Dawud to the front again; among them the most dangerous were 'Abd al-Rahman b. Tughyanerik, lord of Kalkhâli, and particularly the prince Mungabars, whom Sandjar after Karajda's death had sent to Fars and who was vigorously supported by his deputy in Khuzistan, Buzâba. Mas'ud, it is true, sent troops against them under Kara Sonkor but they had to retire, and a battle was only fought when Mas'ud himself came up, at Kurshahbâ near Hamadhan (532 = 1138). The sulthan was at first victorious and put Mungabars whom he had captured, to death; but when his troops were scattered plundering the enemy's camp, Buzâba fell suddenly upon them so that he and Kara Sonkor had narrow escapes and some twelve of the emirs with him were captured and all pat to death by Buzâba. Fortunately for Mas'ud, Buzâba did not pursue him, but was content with occupying Fars; the sulthan was also able to make peace with Dawud, and the deposed caliph was murdered in Isfahan on Rama'dân 25, 532 (June 6, 1138). The sulthan's position however was not one whit better, for the different provinces of the empire were in the hands of powerful emirs, who not only paid no heed to the sulthan, but occasionally appeared in open rebellion against him in the name of various Sahljuk princes whose atabegs they were. The most powerful of these was still Kara Sonkor who began a war on Buzâba to avenge his son, who had been murdered by the latter. When he approached, Buzâba withdrew into an inaccessible citadel and when Kara Sonkor retired, he took prisoner the prince Sahljuk whom he had appointed to rule over Fars and then continued to rule in Fars as atabeg of two sons of Ma'umud, Malikshah and Muhammad. After the death of Kara Sonkor, who died in 535 of a broken heart after the great losses he suffered in the terrible earthquake in Gandja in 533 (1138), Cavî al-Djandar took his place and like his predecessor was generally attached to Mas'ud. Buzâba's attempt along with another emir named' Abbâs [q.v.], who had gained an influential position in al-Kay, to put the sulthan's youngest brother Sulaimân on the throne therefore failed. Mas'ud invited this prince to come to him and when he came he found himself imprisoned in spite of the sulthan's promise. Cavî died in 541 (1146) in the same year as Zangi and in the following year 'Abd al-Rahman and 'Abbâs were disposed of by assassination so that Buzâba alone remained of the enemies of Mas'ud Buzâba now set out for Hamadhan to attack the sulthan, but not far from this city was taken prisoner in a fierce battle and executed (542 = 1147). The princes Muhammad and Malikshah who were with him escaped. Mas'ud afterwards sent for the latter, gave him his daughter in marriage and designated him his successor. In these negotiations the sulthan followed the advice of his favourite beg Arsân b. Balangari, best known by the title Khâbôvqeg, who in this way disposed of all his rivals, but at the same time aroused great discontent so that even the aged Sandjar once more to al-Rajî to remonstrate with his nephew (544 = 1149). But all this was in vain; and when in 547 (1152) Mas'ud died, Khâbôvqeg put Malikshah upon the throne; when in a short time the latter showed himself quite incapable, he sent for Muhammad, who had Khâbôvqeg treacherously murdered.

Bibliography: in the article SELJUKS. — Ibn Khallikân's article on Mas'ud (Bûla'î edition 1299, ii. 531) is of no importance.

(M. Th. Houtsma)
remained for a considerable time in the service of the kings of Ghazna and had become the possessor of great wealth and lands in Lāhore and other parts of India. After his father's death these lands were confiscated by the Governor of Lāhore and Mas'ūd was compelled to proceed to Ghazna to demand justice, but there also his enemies were able to put him to more troubles and bring against him a false accusation, which caused him to be imprisoned. He at last through the recommendation of Mas'ūd b. Sulṭān Ibrāhīm was permitted to return to India and take possession of his estate. When Sa'īd al-Dīn Māhmūd b. Sulṭān Ibrāhīm came in India as viceroy, Ma'ṣūd attached himself to this prince as courtier and panegyrist and became one of the special favourites of his court. But again, a false charge being brought against him, he once more fell upon evil days and loss of fortune. It was maliciously reported in 492 (1098) to Sulṭān Ibrāhīm b. Māhmūd that his son Sa'īd al-Dīn Māhmūd intended to go to ʿIrāq to Malikshāh. This report so much aroused the indignation of the Sulṭān that he ordered his son with all his courtiers to be arrested and put to prison. Our poet for the next ten years remained a prisoner. But on the intercession of Abu l-ʿKāsim Ḑhālib, the Sulṭān pardoned him and released him from prison. He returned to India and was again placed in possession of his father's lands and dignity.

He died in 515 (1121). He is the author of two diwāns, one in Arabic and the other in Persian.


(M. HIDAYET HOSAIN)

AL-MAṢŪDĪ, Aḥū b. ʿAbbās b. al-Husayn, Arab historian and geographer and one of the most versatile authors of the fourth century A.H. Information about his life can only be gleaned from occasional references in his works; as his activity lay outside the lines of the regular schools of learning, he gets little mention from their representatives. The author of the Fihrist regards him as a Maghrībi. According to his own statement, however, he was born in Baḥdād and descended from an Arab family which could trace its ancestry to a Companion of the Prophet. While still quite young he travelled through Persia where he spent part of 305 (915) in ʿIsṭakhr. Next year he went to India and visited Mulkān and al-Mansūra. He went by Khāhāya and ʿAṣmār as far as Ceylon, joined some merchants on a voyage to the China Sea and back to Zanjābīr from which he returned to ʿOmān. We again find him travelling along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea and in 314 (926) at Tiberias in Palestine. In 332 (943) he visited Antioch and the Syrian frontier towns and after a brief visit to his native province of Basra, he was staying in Damascus in 334 (945). Afterwards he seems to have lived sometimes in Syria and sometimes in Egypt. He was in al-Fustāṭ in 335 (947) and 344 (955) and he died there in Djamād al-ʿAṣr 345 (956) or 346.

His restless life is reflected in his literary activity. His travels were certainly stimulated not by thirst for adventure but by a strong desire for knowledge. But this was superficial and not deep. He never went into original sources, as did al-Bīrānī later, but contented himself with superficial enquiries and accepted tales and legends with out criticism. Nevertheless we owe him a good deal of valuable information about the lands on the periphery of Islam. His method of presenting his material has the same faults as his scholarship. He is never able to finish a subject he has begun but continually diverges from his theme. His literary activity, in addition to philology and theology in the narrower sense, touched on almost all the fields of interest of his time, particularly natural philosophy, ethics and politics as well as heresiography. His works, a list of which is given by de Goeje in the preface to the Kitāb al-Tanbih, p. vi., are for the most part lost because they were not of general interest. Posteriority was only interested in him as a historian. In the year 332 (943) he began his great history of the world Kitāb ʿAlḥāṣib al-Zamān wa-man abūlāha l-Ḥiththin min al-Wāqīāt al-Māʾīyāt wa-l-ʿAgīyāt al-Dīlāyīya wa l-ʿAṣimād al-Dālīyyā, which is said to have filled 30 volumes.

Brinkhard's statement, Travels in Nubia, p. 527, that twenty volumes of it are preserved at the Aya Sofā in Constantinople has unfortunately not been confirmed. Only a single volume, the first of the work, which A. v. Kremer obtained in Aleppo, is preserved in Vienna (see v. Kremer, S. B. W. A., 1850, p. 207–211; Flugel, Die ar. pers. u. turk. Hist. der K.K. Hofbibliothek, ii, p. 1262; another MS. of the same part is in Berlin, see Ahlwardt, No. 9426). The work begins with the creation and after a brief geographical survey discusses the non-Muslim peoples and goes fully into the legendary history of Egypt. He reproduced extracts from this work in the Kitāb al-anwaʿ of which one volume perhaps survives in Oxford (see G. Catalogus cod. MSS. or. i, 666). The substance of these two works he gave in a shorter form in the Murādīgī al-Dhahāb wa-Maṣrūdīgī l-Dhawārīkī, which he finished in Djamād al-ʿAṣr 330 (Nov.–Dec. 947) but revised in 352 (965). In addition to the manuscripts used for the Paris edition, a number of others are in existence, e. g. in the Ambrosiana (R. S. O., iv, 97), in Fez (Fihrist Mardīgī al-Karaśawī, No. 1208) and Muṣūl (Dāwāl, Mubāḥāt al-Muṣūlī, p. 122, No. 22; p. 173, No. 32); printed as Maçoud, Les prairies d'or (the more correct translation would be "Gold-washings"); see Gildemeister, W.Z.K.M., v. 202, Texte et Traduction par C. Barthez de Meynad et Pavet de Courtelle, 9 vols., Paris 1861–1877, Bâlûq 1283, Cairo 1313, on the margin of Ibn al-Athīr, Bâlûq 1301, of Maqārī's, Naḥīf l-Tīb, vol. 1–5, Cairo 1302. A synopsis of the Murādīgī al-Dhahāb down to the fall of the Omayyads was made by Ibrāhīm al-Nabiḥī in 1118 (1706) in MSS. Vienna, Flugel, No. 807. Another synopsis of which it has still to be ascertained whether the two works on which it was based had not been used in addition to the Murādīgī, with a continuation down to the year 638 (1238) was composed by Aḥū b. ʿAbbās Māḥmūd b. ʿAlī al-Shāṭībi of Tarā in Morocco under the title al-Dīnān fī Muhāqaq al-Qāhīr al-Zamān (wrongly ascribed by de Saucy, N. E., ii, 1787 to Maqārī; MS. Gyongos, 64, fol. 31–195; see Asin Palacios, Escatologia, p. 374; other MSS. in Cairo and
AL-MAS'UDĪ — MAŠYĀD

Damasca: see M. Kurd 'Ali, R. A. A. D., iii, 229–223. An anonymous synthesis of his magnum opus with special reference to travellers' tales from the Indian Ocean with additions from the Kitāb 'Adīqā' al-Hind of Kānhurmuzi, as well as from the legends of Egypt, entitled Kitāb Aḥkār al-Zanāt wa-Aḥkār al-Buldān, or Mubāqar aṭ-Adīqā' wa-l-'Idārāt is preserved in several MSS. in Paris (see Carra de Vaux, T.A., ser. 9, vol. vii, p. 133–144). Towards the end of his life, Mašīdī composed a survey of his whole literary activity and supplemented it where necessary from new sources in the Kitāb al-Tanbih wa-l-Ishyrāf (ed. de Goeje, in B.G.A., viii, Leyden 1894; additions to these in a Leipzig Ms., Z.D.M.G., i, 223–236; see Carra de Vaux, Magaeq, le livre de l'avertissement et de la revision, French transl., Paris 1897.)


(C. Brockelmann)

Mašyād, a town in Northern Syria on the eastern side of the Ḫibaḥ al-Nasirīye. The pronunciation and orthography of the name varies between the forms Mašīd, Mašūf (in official documents and on the inscriptions mentioned below of the years 646 and 870 A. H.), Mašyād and Mašīfāt (on the interchange of j and th see Kescher, Z.D.M.G., ixxv, 405; Praetorius, Z. D. M.G., ixxv, 392; Suassou, Topographie hist. de Syrie, p. 143, note 4; 209; note 3). The variant Mašūf (Yāqūt, Muqīmīn, ed. Wustenfeld, iv, 556), Mašyāf (Khalīf al-Zahiri, Zāhdīn, Rawāsīn, p. 49) and Mašiṣīf (al-Nābulūsī, in v. Kremer, S.B. Ak Wien, 1850, iii, 331) are both doubtful due to mistakes in copying (van Berchem, T.A., 9, iv, 1897, 457, note 2). At a later period, the pronunciation Mašīf, Mašyāf became usual (al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, p. 208; al-Kalashandī, Subh al-Qāda, Cairo, iv, 113; Ibn al-Shihāba, Barīr, p. 265; cf. Mašīqī f. Oppenheim's map in Petermanns Mitteilungen, Ibn [1911, ii, Taf. 11]). The name is perhaps a corruption of a Greek Mašīfār (= Māsēfā) or Māsēfō xáous, which presumably lay on the Mašīqī ama, the boundary river of the Nācarm, (ancestors of the Na'amānis, Plut. Hist., v 81) (cf. Fa'īl-Wissowa Kroll, Reiterzyklopädie, s. v., Col. 1859 sqq. s. Marās, N°, 3).

A number of ancient pillars and capitals built into the gates of the fortes (some reproduced in G. I. Bell, Syria: The Desert and the Scour, p. 212–220) are only remains of antiquity. An old Roman road (rebāf) from Hamā to the west passed the town (according to Miss Bell, loc. cit.).

Mašīd is not mentioned in the early midle ages; the first mention of the fortes is probably in a Frankish account of the advance of the Crusaders in 1099: Fenestruinus gradantes hostitari ad guadam Arabum castrum (Anonymi gesta Friderici et alia chronica Hierosolimitana, ed Hagenmeyer, 1890, p. 418 with note 29; Dussaud, Histoire et religion des Musulmans, Paris 1900, p. 21, note 4). When in 503 (1109–1110), the Franks advanced on Kafānīa, Tughtakīn set out to relieve it; by the terms of the peace concluded between them, the Franks bound themselves to abandon all designs on Mašīfāt and Hish al-Akrud and in compensation these two places and Hish Tufān were to pay them tribute (Shib b. al-Dīwān, Murātr al-Zamān, in Rec. Hist. Or. Crois., iii, 537). Before 521 (1127) the fortes was in possession of a branch of the Mirdūds, who sold it to the Bāṭī Manṣūrī. After the Nūsairī cātāl in Kādūs and al-Kahī had fallen into the hands of the Islamīls in 527 (1132–1133), the latter also seized the fortes of Mašīfāt in 535 (1140–1141), by outwitting the commandant Sunkūr, a manūkī in the service of the Bāṭī Manṣūrī of Shīrāz, who was surprised and slain (Abū 'l-Fālid, Mubāqar fī Aḥkār al-Buldān, in Rec. Hist. Or. Crois., i, 25; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, ibid., i, 438; al-Nawwāb, Cod. Leyden 2m, f. 222b, in van Berchem, T. A., 1897, p. 464, note 1). Mašīfāt now became the residence of the Syrian Master of the sect (as we may call him, with van Berchem, to distinguish him from the Grand Master in Alamūt, known as 'Abd Allāh al-Dībā, after the Master (Muḥaddim) Abū Muhammad had gathered round him the members of the sect in the hills of Kādūs, about 557 (1162) Kāshīd al-Dīn Sinān [q. v.] appeared in Syria, as envoy from the Persian Grand Master, took over command of the Assāssins [q. v.] there and displayed his unusual organising ability, by raising the sect to be a well equipped and dreaded force, the terror of the Crusaders. Saladin, who wanted to punish them for two attempts on his life, invaded the land of the Islamīls in Mašūrīm 572 (July–Aug. 1176), laid it waste and laid siege to Sinān in Kaṭāt Mašīfāt. Through the mediation of Saladin's uncle Shīhīd al-Dīn al-Hārīmī, lord of Ḥamā, Sinān however succeeded in obtaining Saladin's clemency; in the beginning of August, he went with his army to Ḥamā (Abū'l-Fālid and Ibn al-Athīr, in Rec. Hist. Or. Crois., i, 47, 626). Shortly before he raised the siege of Mašīfāt (about the 14th Safar), he received from Ustāma b. Munkīdī, who was in Damascus, a letter containing a narrative of his great patron (Dereburg, Vie d'Oclem, Paris 1893, p. 400 sqq.). Raṣīlī al-Dīn died in 558 (Sept. 1192). The Syrian Masters, as the official epithet al-Dannā y wa-l-Dīn henceforth regularly borne by them shows, were raised by him to a position with power and privileges equal to those of sovereign rulers (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 470). While Sinān had completely emancipated himself from the suzerainty of the headquarters of the sect in Alamūt, in 608 we find the old conditions completely restored (Abū Shīma, al-Dībhīlī fī Ruknān, in van Berchem, op. cit., p. 475 sqq., note 1). According to an inscription in the inner gate of the castle (van Berchem, T. A., 1897, p. 482 = van Berchem in Oppenheim, Beitrag z. Assyriol., v. 1, p. 17, No, 13), this building was restored by the Syrian Master Kāmil al-Dībā y wa-l-Dīn al-Ha-an b. Mašūf under the suzerainty of the Grand Master of Alamūt 'Alī al-līn Muhammad III (618–653). The reference is probably to the al-Kamālī who according to al-Nasawi (Hist. d. Sultan Yezdi al-Dīn Mankehriti, ed. Houwads, p. 132) was for a period before 624, governor for the Syrian grand master of, it is uncertain whether the commandant (mutawallī)
Majdī al-Dīn, who received in 624 the ambassadors of Frederick II (Hāmāwī in Amari, Bīlūb arabiciscula, App. ii., p. 30) was one of the Masters (van Berchem, J.F.A., 1897, p. 501, note 1) About 625/6 and still in 635, Sirāḍ al-Dīn Muḥarrar b. Abū-Ḥusain was Syrian Master of Naṣrī (op. cit., p. 168, inscription of al-Kahf, ed. van Berchem, in op. cit., p. 488). A Persian from Alamut, Tādī al-Dīn, was in 637 nanukāzam of the Syrian Iṣmāʿīlīs (Ibn Wāsīl, Geschichte der Asylhiden, Paris, MS. Ar. 1702, f. 333b in van Berchem, p. 466, note 2).

As Tādī al-Dīn Abūl-Futūḥ he appears in an inscription in Maṣyād of Dhu'l-ʿĀḏar 646 (Feb.–March 1249), according to which he had built the city wall of Maṣyād and its south gate. The commander of the fortress under him was Abī ʿAlāʾ b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh (inscriptions A and B in van Berchem, J.F.A., 1897, p. 456 = van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Assyri., op. cit., No. 19). It probably was Tādī al-Dīn to whom the Dominican monk Yvo the Breton, a member of an embassy sent by Louis IX to "the Old Man of the Mountains" in May 1250, sent a naive and fruitless appeal for his conversion (text de Joinville, Hist. de St. Louis, ed. Wailly, p. 246 sqq.; van Berchem, J.F.A., 1897, p. 478–480). In the time of the Master Ṣūbā b. Abūl-Maʿālī in 658 (1260) the Tatars seized and held the fortress for a time, but after the victory of the Egyptian Sulṭān Abūl-ʿĀṭā at Ṭāmūl, they abandoned it. About two years later Baibars began to interfere in the affairs of the Iṣmāʿīlīs and to demand tribute from them. He very soon deposed the Master Naḍīm al-Dīn Iṣmāʿīl and appointed his son-in-law ʿAlī b. ʿAlī as Master of Muḥārīr in his place and took Maṣyād from him. When the latter returned there, Baibars had him seized and brought to Cairo, where he was thrown into prison. Naḍīm al-Dīn was again recognised as Master for a brief period and then his son ʿAbd al-Salām al-Dīn, before the Sulṭān definitely incorporated Maṣyād in his kingdom in Raḍjāb 668 (1270) (Abū ʿl-Fidāʾ, in Rev. Hist. ar. croz., i. 153; Muḥāfiz b. Abī ʿl-Fidāʾ, Gesch. d. Mamluk-Konsulate, ed. Blochet, in Petrol. Orient., xiv. 445; van Berchem, J.F.A., 1897, p. 465, note 2).

Maṣyād presumably at first belonged to the "royal province of fortunate conquests" the capital of which was Hīṣn al-Akrād, then to ʿAṭābūlūs (after its capture in 688). It was later separated from this province and added to the niyāba of Dimashq to which it still belonged in the time of ʿAlāʾ al-Sulṭān ʿAbd Allāh, Cairo, iv. 113, 202, 235) about 814 (1412). Khālīl al-Zāhirī (Zublāt Kāshf al-Mamālik, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49) includes Maṣyād with Hāmā (about 850) Under Egyptian rule the position of the lands of the Iṣmāʿīlīs with Maṣyād as capital was to some extent exceptional (Chaudory-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'Époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 182, No. 3).

Abū ʿl-Fidāʾ (about 720 = 1320) described Maṣyād as an important town, with beautiful gardens through which streams flowed; it had a strong citadel and lay at the eastern base of the Djabal al-Lukkām (more accurately Djabal al-Siklīn) about a farashā north of ʿAṭān and a day's journey west of Hāmā (not Hīṣn, i.e. Strange, Palestine, p. 579 erroneously says: Abū ʿl-Fidāʾ, Geogr., ed Reinard, p. 229 sq.). As a result of its high situation, it has a more temperate climate than the low ground on the Nahr al-ʿAṣī; the young ʿUṣāma in 516 (1122–1123) brought to Maṣyād the wife and children of the emir of Shīzār, his uncle ʿĪzz al-Dīn Abū l-ʿĀṣikr Sulṭān, from the heat of Shīzār which was cauing the emir anxiety about their health (Derooeng, Vie d'Osumān, p. 43).

Ibn Ṣanūṣū passed through Maṣyād in 735 (1335) and al-Nābuluṣī in 1305–1306 (op. cit., p. 349). The latter mentions that the governor of the town then was a certain Sulaimān of the tribe of Tānīkh. An inscription of Maṣyād of Ramadān 870 (April–May 1466) contains a decree about taxes of the Sultan al-Malik al-Zāhirī Khshadhād (van Berchem-v. Oppenheim, Beitr. z. Assyri., vii., p. 20, No. 23: No. 22 is perhaps of the same Malik al-Zāhirī). Of a later date are two inscriptions of an emir Muḥāfiz b. ʿAbdī, one of the year 1203 (1788–1789) relating to the building of a well (tabīl) (op. cit., p. 21, No. 24), the other (No. 25) of 1208 (1793–1794) to the building of the house of the Iṣmāʿīlī emirs.

The Iṣmāʿīlīs lived constantly in open or secret enmity with the Naṣirs, although various tribes of the latter had offered their services to the Iṣmāʿīlī Masters, for example as early as 724 (1324) to Raḍjāb al-Dīn (Guizy, Une mission des Assassins au temps de Saladin, J.A., p. 1877, p. 165; Dussaud, Histoire et Religion des Noqairis, p. 86).

A number of Naṣirs of the tribe of Raḍān, whom the emir of Maṣyād had allowed to settle in the town under their Shaikh Mahmūd, in 1808 murdered the emir, his son and about 300 Iṣmāʿīlīs and seized the town. The other inhabitants, who had sought refuge in flight, applied for protection to Yūsuf Pāshā, the governor of Damascus. He sent a punitive expedition of 4,500 men against the Naṣirs; Maṣyād had to be surrendered by the Bani Raḍān after three months' stubborn resistance and the fugitive Iṣmāʿīlīs returned to Maṣyād in 1810 (Dussaud, op. cit., p. 32; Barckhardt, Reisen in Syrien, p. 258). In 1812 Barckhardt estimated the population of Maṣyād at 250 Iṣmāʿīlī and 30 Christian families. The population since then seems to have diminished still further. Barckhardt and Lammens found many houses in the towns in ruins and large gardens within its walls. According to Barckhardt, the land east of the town is a desert mor, while in the north at the foot of the hills the citadel stands on a high steep rock: on the west side is a valley, in which the inhabitants grow wheat and oats. The town, which lies on the slope of a hill is about half an hour's walk, in circumference. Three older gates have been incorporated in the present more modern walls. The mosque is in ruins. The citadel has an outer wall from which the inner defences are reached by a vaulted passage (G. L. Bell, Syria: The Desert and the Sown, p. 218). The old citadel is for the most part destroyed; only a few buildings have been roughly restored and in parts are still inhabited. (Bibliographie, Yahyā b. ʿAbd Allāh, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 556, (the 556, Saftā, ed. ʿAbd Allāh, iii. 390, according to Dussaud, Syria, iv. 3259, is based on a misspelling of Maṣyād): ʿAbd Allāh, Marājīd at-Tafṣīlī, ed. Juyhollah, iii. 111; Ibn al-Aṭār, Kāmil, ed. Torkhub, xi. 52; Abu ʿl-Fidāʾ, Tākām al-Rūḍān, ed. Reinard, p. 229 sq.: al-Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, p. 208; Ibn Ṣanūṣū, ed. Défrémery-Sanguinetti, i. 166; Khālīl al-Zāhirī, Zublāt Kāshf al-Mamālik, ed. Ravaisse, p. 49; Ibn al-Shāhna, al-Durr al-μuṣābāk fi Tārwīkh Mamlāk al-Halāb, Bâirūt 1909, p. 265; ʿUmar, 405

MATĀLÌ. See Matāla.

MATAMMĀ, a town in the Eastern Sudan (province of Kasala, district of Gallabat). Matamā is a remarkable importance as a market on the Sudanese-Ethiopian frontier near the route of the caravans between the Abyssinian region of Lake Tānā and Khartūm. Its economic value has greatly increased on account of the development of agriculture in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and the new survey of Lake Tānā as a possible reservoir of water to extend irrigation in the Sudan and Egypt and by this means to increase and intensify the culture of the cotton, which is the principal source of prosperity in these countries.

Matamā is famous in the recent history of Ethiopia, because the Emperor (Negus Nagač) Yohannes IV was defeated and killed in the neighbourhood of this town by the so-called Darāwīsh of the Sudanese Mahdi, March 10, 1889 a. D. (1st March, 1881 of the Abyssinian era). The Emperor was preparing an expedition against Shāwā to oblige Meniek, King of that country, to recognize definitely his vassallage to the Ethiopian Crown. But, when he was informed that a corps of Darāwīsh had advanced as far as the frontier and that the zone of Lake Tānā with the ancient capital, Gondar, was menaced by the fanatic followers of the Mahdi, he came back to the Northern regions with his army, and met the Darāwīsh at Matamā. After a strenuous fight the Emperor Yohannes IV himself was killed and the Abyssinians were defeated.

The Darāwīsh cut the head of Yohannes and sent it to the Mahdi as a sign of their victory.

The battle of Matamā however had no greater value for the Mahdi's followers than a successful razzia: they retreated to the Sudan after pillaging some neighbouring countries and did not occupy any territory of Ethiopia. On the contrary, Matamā caused the end of the Northern Abyssinian dynasties; and the southern region — the Shāwā kingdom — became the political centre of the Empire, when in the same year, 1889 A.D., King Menlek proclaimed himself Emperor (Negus Nagač) as a descendant of the Salomonic dynasty.

The death of the Emperor Yohannes as a martyr during the battle against the Muslims, hereditary enemies of the Christian Abyssinians, has been celebrated in many songs and poems. The following is a very interesting example of the Abyssinian poetry in recent times:

"The Emperor Yohannes was a fool, and we all despise him.

They said to him: "Reign in the middle of the country?"

He answered: "I will be the keeper of the frontier!"

The Emperor Yohannes was a liar!

He said: "I do not like drink."

And we have seen him drinking a drink which causes the head to turn around!"


(Enrico Cerulli)

MATHARAH, the name of a Berber tribe belonging to the great family of the Buti; they were related to the Zånīt and brothers of the Matmāta, Kümā, Lamāysa, Šaddāma, Matmāta, Matmāta, etc., with whom they form the tribal group of the Banū Fātūna. Like the other tribes belonging to this group, the Matghara originally came from Tripolitania: the most eastern members of the Matghara, however, known to al-Bakri and Ibn Khalīdān were those who lived in the mountainous regions along the Mediterranean from Mil- yānā and Tenes to the north of Ḫanīda (port of Tābāshīr); those of the western part of this zone were allied with the Kümā: their mountain rose not far from Nadmara and the fortress of Tāwun was on their territory.

Three sections had reached the western Maghrib as early as the eighth century and there formed an important bloc. These were:

1. The Matghara of Fās and the coulour of Tānū: al-Bakri observes that the source of the Wādi Fās was on their territory, in the region where Leo Africanus still mentions the Šāk al-ğāmīs of the Matghara "fifteen miles west of Fās".

2. The Matghara of the Middle Atlas in the Dżbāt Matghara which Ibn Khalīdān locates S.E. (ṭabīb) of Fās and which Leo Africanus says is five miles from Tānū (to the south?) The reference then is to the mountain region now occupied by the Ait Wārān: an important section of the latter, the Ait Djeelidāsian, represents the Banū Gallidāsān
whom al-Bakri gives as a section of the Matghara, settled near Tenes in Algeria. We still find among the Ait Wârûn several sections of the Imlâni who represent the Maghâla, brethren of the old Matghara.

In al-Bakri’s time (6th = xi-th century) these two sections of the Matghara had as neighbours in the west, the Zawâgha of Fârâz and of Tâlûla. 3. The Matghara of the oasis of the Sahara settled in the region of Sidjilmassa and in the town itself, in which they constitute the main element of the population, in the region of Fig; in Tum, Tamânît and as far away as Wallûn (Onelliers).

At the beginning of the Arab conquest, the Matghara are represented by Ibn Khaldûn as settled and living in huts built of branches of trees (khaïñûl); those of the Sahara lived in fortified villages (bâbûr) and devoted themselves to growing dates. In the time of Leo Africanus, the Matghara of the Central Atlas occupied about fifty large villages.

Like other peoples belonging to the group of the Banû Fattûn, the Matghara took an active part in the events at the beginning of the Arab conquest and weakened themselves considerably in the fighting. As soon as they had become converted to Islam, a number of bodies of Matghara went over to Spain and settled there. Later, like their brethren, the Matmâa, they adopted the principles of the Sunnî; one of their chieftains, Mâsûr, provoked the famous schismatic rising of 740, which was the beginning in Morocco of the Baraghîa heresy. In a list of the tribes which adopted this heretical teaching we find the Matmâa and Matghara of the Central Atlas, as well as the Banû Abî Nâṣîr, the modern Ait Bû-Âsîr, the eastern section of the Ait Wârûn.

With the rise of Idrîsî, the chief of the Maghara, Bahîlî, declared himself at first a supporter of the caliph of Baghdad, Hûrin al-Rashîd, then rallied to the new dynasty. Later and down to the xvii-th century, the Matghara of the Central Atlas do not seem to have played any part in politics; they retained their independence at least. From the xvii-th century, they seem to have been supplanted on their territory by invaders from the south. As to the Matghara of the shore, settled in the region of Nadrûnna, their alliance with the Kûmây gained them considerable political importance, when the latter became supporters of the Almohads. It was at this period that they built the fortress of Tawant. They then rallied to the Marinids but this brought upon them the wrath of the ruler of Tlemcen, the celebrated Vaghamurâsân, who finally crushed them.

Ibn Khaldûn uses the form Madghara instead of Matghara; in Moroccan texts of late date we also find Madghara.


MATHAL (A., pl. ââthâl) is originally by etymology, like the Eth. metl, messêlê, Aram. mathâl and Hebrew mishâl (see O. Eissfeldt, Der Maschil im Alten Testament, Bihkrê zur Z.A.T.W., xxiv., Giessen 1913), simile, comparison; as popular sayings commonly appear in this form, the term was applied to them in general and thus obtained the general sense of proverb and popular saying. The fondness for similes and allusions, which is common to all primitive cultures, survived among the Semites and especially among the Arabs with great tenacity and therefore plays an important part, even in the higher forms of literature. The simplest form of metaphor usually draws parallels between man and beast. Of a sleepless man, one says îâsû bî-lidâlî anâkâdâ (or anâkâd) ‘he spent the night like a hedgehog’ (Abû Hilâl al-Askarî, Madjma’ al-Amthîl, on the margin of Mâdînî, Cairo 1310, i. 109; 15; Li’ân al-Arîb, iv. 437) and with the downrightness beloved by the Arabs the good example and educative influence of a leader or father is described as bâbûr kimânî ba’îthâlî akirâmûn ba’îthâlî fâlîrânî ba’îthâlî dâjlînî (al-Mâdînî, Madjma’ al-Amthîl, Cairo 1310, i. 64, 65). The comparison to animals is also used to indicate veiled mockery of unpleasant social conditions as al-bâgîkhâmî fî arîdnî yastasîniru ‘here among us the sparrow plays the falcon’ (al-Askarî, i. 193, 26). Such proverbs are sometimes developed into regular fables (see Brockelmann, Fabel und Tiermachen in den alten arabischen Literatur, Islamica, ii. 96—128). Among them we find that much is common to all nations, which it is hardly ever possible to trace back to a single source (cf. the discussion on the ‘goat and knife’: Z. D. M. G., xlvii. 373 sqq.; xlviii. 86 sqq.), unless the origin is as well known as that of the two bulls from the Katsila wa-Dimma, which is given by al-Askarî, i. 47, 16 sqq. and therefore ‘All cannot have applied it to his relationship to Quthamîn.

But the circumstances of everyday life also provide material for similes which usually take the form of alîm men, as in those which al-Askarî and al-Mâdînî quote at the end of each chapter of their collections of proverbs arranged in alphabetical order. Even quite banal happenings may pass into proverbs (fâ-lidârît or dâhnîbat mathalân or darîba bhî ‘î-mathalîn, as so many Arabic stories end), like the story of Qalîs’î of whom we know no more than that his aunt once gave him as a surety and never redeemed him (al-Mufajjûl b. Si‘lûm, al-Fâkkîr, ed. Storey, p. 24, No. 54); or story of the poor woman selling butter of whom a vogue took advantage after inducing her to hold two skins of butter firmly together in her hands (al-Fâkkîr, p. 70, No. 147). But the memory of important historical events is also perpetuated in proverbial sayings, like that of the fratricidal war between the Bakr and Taghlib provoked by Basâsî (al-Fâkkîr, p. 76, No. 157); al-Mufajjûl in his al-Fâkkîr, p. 217—231, and al-Mâdînî, i. 38—47, therefore give the most notable battles of the Arabs in their lists of proverbs and proverbial allusions. Many incidents of the Muslim period have attained equal renown, like Mu‘âwiyâ’s exclamation of joy on hearing that al-Ashârî had been poisoned (see above, i. 504; al-Mâdînî, i. 38); or the memory of the fine voice of the two sons of the bôn vivant Calîph Yâzîd b. ‘Abd al-Malîk (al-Mâdînî, i. 137, 12). It is however not always epoch-making events that are handed down to posterity in this way, like the stormy night in the time of the Calîph al-Mahdi, which provoked him and his retinue to do such penance (al-Mâdînî, i. 176, 12); or the story of the defeat and fall of the Khâqân, apparently that chief of the Khuttal, whom Asâm b. ‘Abd Allâh conquered in the year 119 (737), which, according to Tàbârî, i. 1616, made a great sensation at the court of Hishâm, while Mufajjûl in al-Fâkkîr, p. 86, 14 sqq., refers to the fighting
against the Khazars, but the historians record no
event of the kind among them; or the story of
Ma‘āwiyah’s ambassador to the Emperor of Byzantium
(Ibn Katibah, ‘Cīyān, p. 238, and the proverb:
‘Askārī, i. 76, 11 sqq.; Maidānī, ii. 72, 4). Such
historical memories are frequently preserved in
the form of allusions like the famous ‘sifat al-
Ma‘āsyammas and the gawū Sinimūr. Many prob-
lems of this kind are of local origin, like the
allusion to the two equally poor asses of the man
from Hira (Maidānī, i. 72, 16) or to the Meccan
dandy (Maidānī, i. 127, 17); such proverbial allusions
are particularly common in Madīnā (ibid., i. 168,
6, 173, 20; 261, 19; 264, 12; 280, 25; 298, 7),
and so we have them from Basra (ibid., i. 145,
16 and 30); also from Kufa in Dīja, K. al-
ဟားရိုးဌာန, v. 153, 21). Kūfah (ibid., i. 192, 18
as a nest of ‘Shī‘a, Wāṣṣ (ibid., i. 97, 9) and Ḥimṣ
(‘ṣūd, i. 190, 22). Men celebrated for particular
qualities; as in other lands, are frequently
memorated among the Arabs in proverbial sayings,
but the popular imagination very often invests
the representative of such virtues; when Ḥūtūm
has to share the reputation for liberality with the
‘lāhir Kaff b. Mānā and Ḥarmī b. Sinān (‘Askārī,
i. 223 sqq.; Maidānī, i. 123 sqq.); this is due
to tribal rivalry. There are therefore various
typical representatives of fideity (‘Askārī, i. 251
sqq.; Maidānī, ii. 231 sqq.), of peculiarity (Mai-
dānī, i. 210 sqq.), and of stupidity (Dughlā:
al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 24, N. 58; Maidānī, i. 147; Shawlā:
al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 71, N. 108; Gothamites of Arabia,
The people of al-Hadjar: Maidānī, i. 178, 19; Abū
Ghālshān and others in Madīnā (ibid., i. 146, 195,
50 sqq.). the best known is Dīja, among whom have
attached the stories of a wandering rogue in the
Adab literature (E. S., Z D., M., G., lvi. 237 (1)).
We also have the Omayyad governor of the ‘Irāq,
Vissal b. ‘Omar al-Dhījah (Maidānī, i. 99, 31).
Memories of Penelope seem to have found their
way to Arabia in completely perverted form (“stup-
ider than the woman who continually undid the
weaving”, which is found as soon as Kūrān, xvi.
84: cf. ‘Askārī, i. 283, 7; Maidānī, i. 172, 8), and
apparently “guiddier than he who turned the rock”
(Maidānī, i. 207, 37), among the typical repre-
sentatives of stupidity and greed respectively.
But among Arabic proverbs there are not a few
the meaning and origin of which had already been
quite forgotten at the time they were put on
record, so that Arab writers invented all kinds of
explanations for them from pseudo-history, with a
particular fondness for the Amalekites; not in-
frequently a choice is given of several stories, as
for the “nailed warrior” (Maidānī, i. 217, 20), the
gatherer of acacia shoots of the tribe of ‘Anazā
(ibid., i. 49, 21; 288, 17), “the repenance of al-
Kūsā” (al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 74). We also find widely
disseminated motives, as in the story of Khurāzā
which the Prophet is said to have told his wives
(al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 137, N. 280). In many cases the learned
editors have gone so far as to invent
stories because they passed over the simplest
explanation as too easy. Thus the saying ḥuda, ḥudā,
‘arī ḥala (‘unūda probably only means “hawk,
hawk, the ball which was shot from the bow
before the invention of fire-arms” is behind you”,

1) The Varāḏī ‘Aṣūr (Al-Kubra, ed. Hikmet
Bek Şahrīf, Cairo 1346 (1928) are for the most
part from the Turkish Naṣṣūdān.
which Abū ‘Ubaida refers to a children’s game;
al-Kalbī and al-Shahrīkī however take ḥudā,
‘unūda as names of South Arabian tribes who
had fought with another (al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 38,
N. 93). Similarly the same writers invent stories
of the time of the Amalekites in which Ḥimār
is a proper name to explain ḥurakūs ḥuraz ‘uṣūda
hůmīr, which al-‘Aṣmā‘ī rightly takes literally (al-Fā‘ākhīr,
p. 12, N. 18).

The number of proverbs is naturally very large
in which maxims of life, often very trivial, are
laid down; they include some which owe their
origin to social conditions in Arabia, like “assist
thy brother whether he is right or wrong” (al-
Fā‘ākhīr, p. 119, N. 258). They also include much
that is the common property of all nations, the
origin of which can rarely be demonstrated, as
in the Arabic pendant to the definite Roman
Res vestit ad triarios in al-Aṣkārī, ii. 32, 16.
The subject can only be touched on here. To
the references given by the writer in Ostas. Zeitschrif,
vi. 66 sqq., we may add a few Arabic parallels to our
proverbs: “Walls have ears” (Maidānī, i. 57,
31); “Speak of an angel and you hear his wings”
(ibid., i. 57); “Hammer and anvil” (ibid., i. 58,
19); “A liar must have a good memory” (ibid., i. 49,
17); “Festina lente” (ibid., i. 87, 33); “Out of
frying-pan into the fire” (ibid., ii. 25, 9); “To fall
between two stools” (ibid., ii. 64, 7); “To be
on tenter-hooks” (ii. 74, 12); “Hoist with his own
petard” (ii. 168, 12); “A bird in the hand is worth
two in the bush” (‘aṣūra wa al-kaffi ‘uṣūda
min ‘uṣūda ‘uṣūda; al-Hamadānī, Resādl, Baitūr
1890, p. 44, 3).

Among sayings which are international in char-
acter those disseminated by religious communities
occupy a special position. It is of course not an
accident, but is quite in keeping with the importance,
which is becoming more and more evident, of
Christianity for the intellectual life of ancient
Arabia, that New Testament sayings are common
among Arabic proverbs, notably from the Sermon
on the Mount, like Mt. 7, 2 = Maidānī, ii, 67, 7;
Mt. 7, 15 = Maidānī, i. 192, 25; Mt. 7, 16 = Mai-
dānī, i. 34, 8, 336, 11; Mt. 18, 14 = Maidānī, i. 68;
Mt. 9, 24 = Maidānī, ii. 114, 23; Mt. 17, 3 = Mai-
dānī, ii. 67, 26; Mt. 23, 24 = Maidānī, ii. 259, 16;
Gal, 6, 7 = Maidānī, ii. 73, 12. On the other hand,
except for a few echoes of Proverbs and Eccles.
in which the origin is uncertain, the only one
from the Old Testament is Maidānī, i. 228, 99,
which looks like a quotation from Deut. 32, 15.
From Christian legend we have also the proverb
martyrdom of Euphrates (al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 256, N. 517)
and the story of the Seven Sleepers which appears
in various forms (al-Fā‘ākhīr, p. 109, 239; Maidānī,
196, l4; Kāfī, Amāli, i. 61; of ‘M.Z., N. v.,
288). On the other hand, of Old Testament figures
we find only Noah once in a later proverb, probably
native to Mūsul (Maidānī, ii. 250, 11). The Mandaean
Creator-deity Fiṭḥū must have gone into the proverb
Maidānī, ii. 62 sq., from the verse of Ru‘ha quoted
there, to whom it was welcome, like other foreign
matter, to give an appearance of learning (see
Ahkwadd, Dījaww rūb, xv). Later tradition also
associated with Buṭmān (q. v.), the wise hero
of Arab antiquity, sayings attributed to Āḥīkār
and common to many nations.

Although the proverb is from its nature ano-
nymous, learned tradition often tries to find authors.
Many proverbial sayings are therefore attributed
to the Prophet and his Companions. The Amīṭḥāl al-Nabī, which circulated outside the canonical collections of Tradition were collected by Ibn Khaldun al-Raḥmān (Fīriskt, p. 155) and Abū Hilāl al-Askarī; al-Mađānī accuses the latter of being uncritical and quoting in his preface as an example of genuine Ḥadīth the parable of the good and bad companion in Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ (ed. Kṛehl, ii. 17). This does not prevent him however from putting in his collection a series of sayings of the Prophet, as his predecessors had done, and at the end of his book compiling a special chapter of them, which also includes sayings of the first Caliphs. Special popularity was always enjoyed — not only among Shī'is — by sayings attributed to 'Ali. Ibn Kūtaiba in his Cīvīn al-Asbābīn, in the fifth book, K al-ʾilm wa ʾl-Bayān (ed. Köpr., fol. 155b), already uses a collection of this kind, such as was current in various recensions (anonymously in al-Tasfa al-bahība, Stambul 1302, p. 107—114) in the order of Saʿīd b. Abī Wahīd b. Muhammad al-Mađī, about 510 (1116), entitled Ghūr al-Ḥikam wa-Dirār al-Ḳalīm, lith. Bombay 1280 and also edited in Persian and Turkish (s. i. 299, and also W Yule, Apophthegms of Alte the son of Aboo Tālib (Maṭall kūl Tālīb) with an early Persian paraphrase and an English translation, Edinburgh 1812; Sad Kūlimi Ṭawūṣī Muttabbīyān Aмир al-Muʾminin. Teheran 1304; Naṭr al-Ṭallī, the second coll. in Fleischer, with Turk. paraphrase by Muṣallim Nādīd entitled Amīṭḥāl ʿĀlī, Stambul 1313, with Turk. comm. by Naṣīr entitled Rūṣṭān al-Dawārī, Stambul 1257).

Numerous also are the proverbs which have a metrical form, while it is impossible to say whether the poets, in whose poems they are, originated the idea or only gave it its form. Al-Sukkārī (Fīriskt, p. 78) and Ṭawīla b. al-Muḥī (ibid., p. 48) composed such abāb suʿūra. A fine collection has been made by al-Īṣāhābī in the Kitāb al-Muṣṭafī af, Cairo 1320, i. 27 sqq. Among such metrical sayings are some by the greatest poets of the pagan period like Tarafa (al-Fāqīrīr, p. 254, 509; al-Mađānī, i. 161), Imrāʿ al-Kāsī (ʿAskari, i. 255 = Mađānī, i. 133), Lelīb (ʿAskari, i. 37) and by later poets like al-Ḥarīṣ (al-Fāqīrīr, p. 250, N. 406; al-ʿAskari, i. 46) and Muṭṭī b. İyās, whose two palm of Huľūn (ʿAskari, i. 297, 452; Mađānī, i. 297) are famous. From a misunderstanding of a verse of Farazdāk in which the way to ʿUsulān is mentioned (Mađānī, i. 38; quoted by Yākūt, iii. 736), this verse became typical of taking the wrong way. Al-Mutanabī's verses that have in al-Maḥfūz he have been collected by Īsābī al-Talakānī, d. 385/995 (Yākūt, Irshād, vi. 501—518; Suyūtī, Rağbāt al-Walā, p. 35, in al-Amīṭḥāl al-ʿawra min Shīr al-Maṭunabī (Fīriskt, Cairo 2, iii. 23).

Proverbs excited the interest of the learned from the very beginning of Arabic literature; historians and philologists emulated one another in collecting and explaining them. Thus we find among the sources of the works that have survived to us the old historians and genealogists like al-Sharī ḵ b. al-Ḳūtāmī (Wustenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, N. 23) and ʿAwāna b. al-Hakam (ibid., N. 27) and Abū ʿIyāz (ibid., p. 36; al-Fāqīrīr, p. 253), the two former very often as authorities for Ḥadīth b. al-Kalbī, to whom with the great monographist Muhammad b. Ḥabīb (Wustenfeld, N. 50), Zuhair b. Bēkār (ibid., p. 61) and al-Mađīnī (ibid., p. 47), we owe most of the legendary and historical material. Almost all the philologists of note have devoted special works to the subject. To their interest in language is to be ascribed the fact that the limits of the scope of the subject are extended to include phrases and idioms which have really nothing to do with the proverb and, as for example laʿānaḥu ʿĪḥū (al-Fāqīrīr, p. 7), do not seem to require explanation; but we owe, for example, to al-Muḥadīl the interesting note that it had become a habit with some Syrian Arabs to use the Greek ปราก, "says he". The oldest work of the kind that has survived is the Kitāb al-Amīṭḥāl al-Muṣṭafī al-Dabbi († 170 = 785), pr. Stambul 1300. The next oldest, that of Abū Ṭubābī al-Kāsim b. Sollām al-Harawī (d. about 223 = 837), is preserved in a number of Stambul MSS. (s. Rescher, Z.D.M.G., lv. ixv., N. 43; M. S. O. S. A., xiv. 6; M. O., vii. 123), and in the Escorial (Derenbourg, Lévi-Provençal, N. 1757), also the commentary by Abī Alāl b. Bakrī (d. 487 = 1094), ibid., N. 526 and Lādeli, N. 1795; printed as N. 9 of the al-Tuḥfa al-ḥabbage, Stambul 1302, p. 2—16; on the other hand, the work dealt with by E. Bertheau in his Diss., Göttingen 1836 (s. Freytag, Arabun Verba, i., vii. — xi) is much more recent. The Kitāb al-Fāqīrīr of al-Muṣṭafī b. Salla, a pupil of Ibn al-Arābī (d. 231), has been edited by C. A. Storey for the "De Goege Foundation", I edyn 1915. The specially numerous proverbs of the form afzul min were collected by Ḥamza al-Isfahānī (d. between 450—460 = 960—970) in a work which only survives in a unique MS. in Munich (see Wittow, in M. S. O. S. A., 1909, p. 33 sqq.), which was much used by later writers, and copied word for word by al-Mađīnī for the corresponding section of his book. Abū Hilāl al-Askarī (q. after 395 = 1005) compiled the Dīmararat al-Amīṭḥāl, extant in several MSS, in Stambul (see Rescher, Z.D.M.G., lv. ixv. 513; M. F. O. B., v. 501; M. S. O. S. A., xiv. 36) and printed at Bombay in 1306—1307 as well as on the margin of Mađānī (Cairo 1310), in which an attempt was made for the first time to annotate each proverb from the philological and historical point of view, excluding all post-classical material, to which Ḥamza had allotted considerable space. Al-Mađānī [q. v.] collected the material compiled by his predecessors in their Madmū ḱ al-Amīṭḥāl and expanded each section by an appendix on modern proverbs. This has since then been regarded as the standard work on the subject and not even Zamakhšārī's Kitāb al-Muṣṭafī h the Amīṭḥāl, although also much read (to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. M., i. 202, xiv. 97, 102, 121; also Aghā, N. 991; Dāmāzade, N. 1557; Scutari, Z.D.M.G., ixvii. 58; Brussa, ibid., p. 50; Mōsul, Dāwil, al-Maṭunabīyān al-Mawīlyā, p. 329, 37; Cairo: Fīriskt, ii. 355), could according to Ḥājjī Khālīfa, N. 1142, permanently affect its popularity. Al-Mawīdī's [q. v.] book, like the different collections of sentiments made by al-Zamakhšārī, was from the first intended to deal rather with the literature than with the language of the people. It was not till the sixteenth century that interest in the east was again aroused in proverbs under the influence of European scholarship. Almost all works on modern Arabic dialects contain collections of proverbs (cf. the lists which could of
MATHAL — MATHNAWI


(C. Brockelmann)

VI-MATHĀṆI, a term of uncertain meaning which occurs twice in the Kūrān, namely in Sūrā xv. 87: "and we have brought thee seven of the mathanāt and the noble Kūrān," and Sūrā xxxix. 24: "Allāh sent down the most beautiful recital, a book which is in harmony with itself, mathāni, at which the skin of those who fear their Lord creeps." In the interpretation of the word is made more difficult by the fact that in the latter passage it seems to mean the Kūrān itself, in the former, on the other hand, something similar to the Kūrān.

In Tājūrī (Ṭadbirt, xiv. 39 sqq.; cf. xxix. 124 sqq.) we find the following opinions:

a. Māhsūs was given six out of the seven mathanāt; two were lost when he broke the tablets. The seven mathanāt are like seven long sūras, i.e. xxvii. and a seventh, on the identity of which there is a difference of opinion: it is either Sūrā x. or viii. and ix. combined.

b. The seven mathanāt mean the Fāṭiḥah which contains six verses. These with the hamalat in the beginning make seven. It is called the mathanāt, i.e. repetitions, because it is repeated in the qālid at each rafʾ. This explanation is supported by quoting the term mutaḥašbah (=in harmony with itself) which immediately precedes the word mathanāt in Sūrā xxxix. 24.

c. The mathanāt means the Kūrān in general.

Hadith hesitates among these interpretations a. (Ṭalmīdī, Tafsīr, Sūrā ix., trad. i; cf. Bkhārī, Aḥādīth, bāb 106) and b. (Bkhārī, Tafsīr, Sūrā ix., bāb 1; Sūrā xv., bāb 3; Fāṭiḥat al-Kūrān, bāb 9; Tirmīdī, Tafsīr, Sūrā xv., trad. 3: Naṣārī, Littāb, bāb 26).

Nor is there any unanimity in explaining the form mathanāt. Badawi on Sūrā xxxix. 24 gives as the singular mathanān, mathanān or mathanān, Zanakahīn gives mathanāt. The latter form is found in the Kūrān (Sūrā iv. 3: xxvii. 45: xxxv. 1) and in Hadith (Bkhārī, Sahīh, bāb 84; Witr, bāb 1. Tirmīdī, Sahīh, bāb 206 et al.) as a distributive, meaning "occurring in pairs." This meaning however would not be at all suitable for mathanāt.

Geiger (Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?, p. 57 sqq.) has already compared the Hebrew mathnāh (Arām: mathsitādā). According to him then mathanāt would mean the Kūrān itself as a whole. His suggestion is approved by Noldeke-Schwall (Geschichte der Quānāt, p. 114 sqq.). Attention might further be called to the fact that mathanāt means a single law as well as the whole code and from this could be derived the double meaning of mathanāt (separate verses and the whole Kūrān), a derivation which could be supported by the parallel double meaning of the word Kūrān (single revelation and all revelation as a whole).

Spranger (Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohamads, Berlin 1861, i. 463 sqq.) explains the word from the Hebrew śārār to repeat" and the conception from Sūrā xxxix. 24, from which it would appear that the mathanāt are part of the stories of punishment. This view has been adopted by D. H. Müller, Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form, i. 153; A. H. Grimes, Mohammed, ii. 77; N. Rhodokanakis, in W. Z. K. M., xxxv. 66 sqq.; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, p. 26 sqq. This would imply that, at least when Sūrā xv. 87 was revealed, there were seven of these legends of punishment.

Early evidence of the use of the word outside of the Kūrān is found in a poem of Abu ʿl-Aswad al-Duʿali (text and transl. by Noldeke, in Z. D. M. G., xiiii. 236 sqq.; cf. thereon Bēnān, in J. R. A. S., 1921, p. 584 sqq.; Horovitz, op. cit.). Here the mathanāt are mentioned along with the Mīlānā, "the seven verses" along with the "hundred verses" sūras of the Kūrān. The exact content of these groups is unknown.

In conclusion it may be mentioned that Goldziher (Z. D. M. G., lii. 866 sqq.) has called attention to a term mathānāt which occurs in non-canonical tradition and is obviously a new formation modelled on the Hebrew mathnāt.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article: Th. Noldeke, Neue Beiträge z. sem. Sprachwissenschaft, p. 26; Fakhruʾd-dīn al-Kāzī, Maṭāḥ al-Gshāb, iv. 110—112; Suʿyūnī, Ṭabaqāt, p. 124; Lišān al-Arab, xvii. 127 sqq.; Lane, Lexicon, s. v. mathanāt.

MATHNAWI, a form of poetry in which each bāḥt (verse) is normally a self-contained whole, grammatically complete and with the two miṣrāʾīs (hemistichs) rhyming with one another and not—except accidentally—with the verses that follow. In Persian, Turkish, Urdu and Urdu, poetic compositions of any length dealing with epic, romantic, ethical or didactic themes are of the mathnawī form, which probably originated in Persia. Dowlatshāh (ed. E. G. Browne, p. 29) relates a tradition that in the time of the Dalālamite ʿAṣād al-Dawla (d. 372 = 982) there was still to be found inscribed on the palace at Kāsr-i Shirān a bāḥt in "Old Persian" having the two hemistichs rhyming. There would appear to be no pre-Islamic Fāhāli verse of the kind extant, and the mathnawī form may be merely a development or expansion of the maṭāḥ of the ḥzdā or ghazal. However that may be, in the oldest fragments of Muslim Persian literature that have come down to us, there are examples of the mathnawī as of the other forms of verse. Of these fragments the oldest belong to the work of Abū Shukūr al-Balṭāni, who is said, probably on that account, to have invented the genre. They appear to be parts of a series of narrative mathnawī (cf. Asadi’s Lughat al-Furs, ed. P. Horn, p. 29 of the Persian, and also p. 22 sqq.). Alongside of them are to be found sufficient portions of the work of Rūḍār (a later contemporary of his), to indicate that he also used the same form
for a translation of the Kalila u-Dinna (Asadi, op. cit., p. 19 sqq. and Dawlatshah, p. 34). There is also a couplet-like hazaaj metre indicating an erotic mathnawi (Asadi, p. 48; cf. Eshiq, Kudaj, in N. G. W. pict., 1873, p. 755 sqq.).

The first complete poem that has survived of the genre is the Shab-nama, begun by Dakeji and completed by Firdawsi. Actually, apart from the arrangement of the rhyme, it is not of the regular mathnawi type. More characteristic is Firdawsi's Yasuf u-Zalikha, composed in the same metre (the muta'kāriib). It begins with a number of introductory sections of which the first is in praise of Allah and the rest are headed respectively: "In praise of the Prophet", "In description of the king of Islam", "On the cause of the revelation of the Qur’an of Joseph", "On the reason for setting down this narrative", etc. Then comes the story proper, commencing with the description of Jacob’s working for Rachel and pursuing its way through the various episodes of Joseph’s career until he becomes the vizier of the viceroy of the Pharaoh, whose wife Zalikha falls in love with the youth. When he refuses her advances she denounces him for wizardry to her husband. Here is introduced the often illustrated incident of the Egyptian ladies who, at a feast to which they had been invited by Zalikha, catch sight of Joseph and are so astounded by his beauty that, without being conscious of what they are doing, they peel the skin from their hands instead of keeping their knives for their oranges. Then comes the account of the imprisonment of Joseph, the events that lead to his release and exaltation, the confusion of the wicked brethren, the repentance of Zalikha, her rejuvencence and marriage to Joseph, and the death of Jacob.

A contemporary of Firdawsi’s, ‘Unsari, is credited with a mathnawi romance which has not survived: Wāmik u-Ashara. What purports to be a version of the story is given in a Turkish mathnawi by Lāmī (d. 940 = 1533), according to which, Wāmik, a priest in a fire-temple, is described as having fallen in love with Ashara, a maiden devoted to the cult. They are forced to part; Ashara going to the frozen regions of the North and Wāmik to the torrid lands of Ethiopia. They pine away in separation, and dying are turned into stars. The maiden becomes Virgo holding Spica in her hand, while Wāmik becomes Arcturus. The story bears marks of being of Pahlawi origin, the Arabic names being only translations.

Of mathnawis who have survived there follow chronologically two works of Nāṣir-i Khusraw, namely the Rawshān-i-nama and the Sa’di gasht, two romantic dialogues written in the hazaaj metre. After them in time is the romance of Wis u-Rāmin, ascribed by ‘Awfi to Fakhri al-Din Gurgānt (d. 440 = 1048), who is said to have derived it from the Pahlawi. In the version which has come down to us (ed. W. N. Lees, Calcutta 1865), we have a tale of passion unrestrained, which Pizzic (Poesia Persiana, ii. 88) characterizes as a vulgar product of India in Akbar’s time. In the tale, Wis or Wisa, the wife of Mōbad, king of Merw, has for her paramour her husband’s brother Rām or Rāmin, who proves unfaithful to her but in the end marries her after Mōbad has been killed. If the work is genuine, it marks a step in the differentiation of the romantic from the epic mathnawi, being composed in the hazaaj and not the muta’kāriib metre which had hitherto been common to both.

The true creator of the romantic mathnawi is Niẓāmi of Ganja, who, after beginning with the composition in that form entitled the Makhdun al-Arsarr — a collection of ethical and religious maxims interspersed with anecdotes, — wrote in succession the four other works which form his Khamsa or Pandj Gandj. This quintet provided the model for all subsequent mathnawi writers. Strictly speaking, only the second, third and fourth of them are romances; namely (a), the Khusrav u-Shirin, the story of the love of the Sasanian prince Khusrav Parwiz for the Christian princess Shirin, who is also loved by the mighty builder and engineer Parhad, and of the latter’s betrayal and tragic end; (b), the Laila u-Majnūn, the scene of which is laid in the desert and which shows the two lovers prevented from union by the hatred of their families for one another; and (c), the Haft Paikar, which has Bahram Gūr as its hero and consists of two sets of tales each told to the king by one of his seven favourite wives. The Sikandar-nama, which forms the fifth of the group, treats of the life of Alexander in epic style, but with a mystical touch in the later passages which makes him a prophet as well as a conqueror. Each of the five mathnawis is prefaced by introductory sections similar to those in Firdawsi’s Yasuf u-Zalikha, with the necessary changes for the names of patrons etc. and with a further section headed “On the mirāy of the Prophet” added in the works which follow the Khusrav u-Shirin. Every imitator of Niẓāmi’s mathnawi copies him in this respect as in others, so that even the eighteenth century Judeo-Persian Dandil-nama (by Khwāja Bahkhr, British Museum, MS. Or. 4743) has this introductory matter, though Moses is substituted for Muhammad in the section devoted to the Prophet.

The chief imitators of Niẓāmi are, in Persian, Djamān in Turkish, Shaikhī with his Khusrav u-Shirin and Fudullī with his Laila u-Majnūn; in Turki, Mīr Ṭāhir Nawāwī with his Khamsa; and in Urdu, Amin with a Yasuf u-Zalikha, Tadjalli with a Laila u-Majnūn, etc. (cf. G. de Tassy, Anteaux Hindustanès, Paris 1885, p. 30 sqq.).

The Mathnawi par excellence, i.e. the Mathnawi-i Ma’navi of Djalal al-Din Rumi, is in a class by itself, being a long medley of the doctrines of Sufism combined with parables, allegories, and pseudo-historical narratives. It is without the preliminary sections characteristic of the romantic mathnawi.

Arabic contains no poems of the mathnawi genre, but poems having the rhyme muta’kāriib of each line are known. The arrangement of the rhyme is known as muta’kāriib. Short specimens translated from Persian are quoted in Thālibī’s Yatīmat al-Dahr (iv. 23), and there are longer compositions, metrical grammars, by Hafti (Muḥāf al-Fu‘ād) and by Muhammad b. Mālik (Kitāb al-Alfaya) (for both of which see de Sacy, Anthologie Arabe, p. 134 sqq. and 145 sqq. of the Arabic text and p. 325, 356 of the notes).

The metres normally associated with the mathnawi form are those used by the masters in their compositions: i.e., in addition to those mentioned above, the sarf and khafrī used by Niẓāmi for Makhdun al-Arsar and the Haft Paikar respectively;
and the raman, used by Djalal al-Din Rumi in his Mathnawi and by Farid al-Din 'Aṭṭār in the Manṭik al-Tair.


(R. Levi)

MATURITY, name of a city, situated in 27° 31' N. latitude and 77° 43' E. longitude, and of a district of the same name in Northern India. The site of the city was of importance in the Buddhist period, as is proved by the numerous inscriptions and pieces of sculpture that have been found there. In later Hindu times it attained sanctity as the reputed birthplace of the god Kusenā and the temples erected there acquired great wealth and reputation. In 1617 Mahmod of Ghazna [q. v.] captured the city and levelled all the temples to the ground; there is no further record of the city until the reign of Sikandar Lodī, Sultan of Dihī (1488-1516), who destroyed all the temples that existed in Mathurā in his time. The city was practically refounded in the reign of Akbar, who visited the sacred site and gave permission for the erection of four temples, the ruins of which still exist. In 1669 Awrangzēb destroyed a vast temple that had been built in the reign of Līghangir and changed the name of Mathurā to Islāmābād, but like many other Muslim designations of towns in India it failed to displace the original name of the city. With the break-up of the Maghāl empire after the death of Awrangzēb, Mathurā suffered from the political confusion in which all the country between Dihī and Āgra was involved, and at one time or another passed into the hands of the Dżuj, the Marathas and finally the British.

In the centre of the modern city stands the mosque erected in 1661 by 'Abd al-Nabi Kān, who was appointed governor of Mathurā by Awrangzēb in 1659. The Muslims number 15,475 out of a total population of 56,666 in 1921.


vi-MATIN. [See Allāh.]

MAṬLA', MAṬTI', ascension. Two kinds of ascension are distinguished:

1. Ascension in the spherea recta R. — Modern astronomers use the expression right ascension for all points of the heavens; the older astronomers only for those of the ecliptic. The right ascension $R$ is found by drawing a circle of declination which is perpendicular to the equator through the corresponding points of the ecliptic. With us and as a rule with the Arabs the right ascension of the arc of the equator is between the beginning of Aries, the vernal equinox and the intersection of the circle of declination with the equator. Many Arab astronomers calculate the ascension $R'$ from the beginning of Capricorn; then $R' + 90^\circ$ gives the degree of the equator which rises at the time at which the corresponding degree of the ecliptic culminates. The ascertainment of this is, according to Suter, of importance for certain astrological purposes. If in fig. 1, the point $A$ or the star $S$ of the ecliptic rises above the horizon, the point $B$ of the equator, the pole of which are $P$ and $P'$, rises at the same time; $\gamma B$ is therefore the ascension of the arc $\gamma A$ of the ecliptic in the spherea recta.

One also talks of the ascension of a sign of the zodiac; it is the arc of the equator which rises contemporaneously with the 30° of this sign. The longitude of the ascension generally varies with the different signs, but from time to time is the same for those which are similarly situated at the beginning of Aries or of Libra, and for those which are at the beginning of Capricorn or of Cancer.

The maṭāli in the spherea recta are therefore so important (for astronomical purposes also) because in stereographic projection they give the curves corresponding to the degrees of the ecliptic, according to which the ecliptic, which is projected as a circle, is to be divided on the astrolabe.

Tables for the right ascensions have been prepared by numerous Muslim scholars, e. g. by Muḥ. al-Mūsawī, Muḥ. al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Iṣwā'ī, Muḥ. al-Kura al-mustaṣhām, Muḥ. al-Kura al-muṣṭaṣḥib, etc. ; al-Iṣwā'īyā and al-falakīyā.

If the point being observed does not lie on the ecliptic, the maṭāli are those of the degrees of the equator, which run at the same time as the star through the centre of the heavens i.e. the upper meridian (tattawarāt), quite in keeping with the modern definition.

The ascension in the spherea recta is called maṭāli (often with the addition of al-burūq = the sign of the zodiac); fi 'l-falak al-mustaṣhām (M. in the spherea recta); M. li 'l-burūq fi ḫaṣṣ al-Iṣwā'ī; M. al-Burūq bi-Ḫaṣṣ al-Iṣwā'ī; M. fi Muṣawī ḫaṣṣ al-Iṣwā'ī; M. al-Kura al-mustaṣhām; M. al-Kura al-muṣṭaṣḥib or fi 'l-Kura etc.; M. al-Iṣwā'īyā and al-falakīyā.

If one calculates from the degree of Capricorn, the right ascension is also called maṭāli al-khubb (i.e. ḫaṣṣ al-Araḍ, "M. of the dome", namely of the dome of the earth).
2. The ascension obliqua (fig. 2) of a point $A$ in the ecliptic at any point is the curve $\gamma B$ of the equator the poles of which are $P$ and $P'$, between the beginning of Aries and the horizon at the moment in which this point rises (for any particular star $S$ substitute “star” for “point of the ecliptic”); it is often also made to begin at Capricorn.

Tables for the ascension obliqua can only be given for particular places as they differ from place to place. The ascension obliqua however can easily be calculated from the ascension recta.

The ascension obliqua is called: $\text{Magâbât}$ al-Balad, $M. \text{al-Buldân}$, $M. \text{al-Ikhâm}$ (of the clime), $M. \text{fi} \ 'l-Balad$, $M. \text{fi} \ 'l-Ikhâm$, $M. \text{al-balâdiyâ}$, $M. \text{al-akhâkiyâ}$, $M. \text{fi} \ 'l-Ajlâk al-mâ'dâ', $M. \text{al-burîq} \ 'l-Kura al-mâ'dâ', M. al-Shurûq. We may also note the terms $M. \text{al-Ma'âsir}$ and $M. \text{al-Waâjît}$.

Ascension recta might perhaps be translated direct or spherical ascension and ascension obliqua by local ascension.

Arab astronomers, following Ptolemy, have proposed the following formulae for the ascension obliqua. If $e$ is the plane of the ecliptic, $\delta$ the declination of the point $A$ on the ecliptic, $a_1$ its right ascension and $r$ the number of parts (usually 60) into which the radius is divided (with the later Arabs and modern astronomers $r = 1$) then according to al-Khwârizmi and al-Battânî, we have:

$$\sin a_1 = \frac{\sin \delta}{\cos \phi} \sin \epsilon \cdot r = 1 \text{g cîg}.$$ 

The ascension obliqua $a_2$ is for the latitude $\phi$

$$a_2 = \text{ascension recta} (a_1) + \text{arc} \left( \sin \phi \sin \delta, \cos \phi \cos \delta \right) = a_1 \pm \text{arc sin} (\text{tg} \phi \pm \text{tg} \delta).$$

At the same time it is to be observed that al-Khwârizmi (d. about 850) and al-Battânî, who published his book before 900, give the formula with sine and cosine, while Habâb al-Hâsib, who made his observations between 825 and 835, uses tangents and cotangents.

To ascertain the ascension, the above formulae are used if tables are not available. But one can also use one of the many apparatus which are made for the mechanical solution of such problems. The simplest of these is the armillary sphere (see Nolte quoted in Kura) and the globe with thearm (see Schnell quoted in Kura) as in both cases the heavens can be used as the largest circles. There are also the monographic methods, in which projections of the sphere of heavens are used, as in the astrolabe (s. J. Frank, Die Verwendung des Astrolabium nach al-Khwârizmi, Abhandl. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaft, etc., Heft iii., 1922), the universal plane, the Zarkâl plane (see an article to be published later by Mittelberger), Werner's meteoroscope (Joannis Verneri de Meteoroscopii, publ. by J. Würschmidt, Abhandlungen zur Gesch. d. Mathematik, Heft xxviij, 1913) and the muqâfârâf quadrants. On the sine quadrants, the system of lines which enable the sine and cosine to be read off, the above formulae can be obtained with the help of the latter (see P. Schmalz, Zur Geschichte der Quadranten bei den Arabern, Munich 1929).

Along with the maţâlî, the magâbâbî also were ascertained. If one is observing, not the rising but the setting points, the corresponding curves are called magâhrib (a table for the latter is given by al-Birûnî in the Mas'ûdîc Canon).

Addendum. Among the Greeks and Arabs and European astronomers of the xiith-xvith century φαία means: 1. the globe or geometrical sphere; 2. the space between two surfaces of two concentric spheres, a shell of a sphere; 3. the circle which corresponds to the assumed path of a heavenly body, i.e. the ecliptic, the epicycle, the eccentric circles. — The Arabic kura has only the first meaning, the word faîak the second and third, the second in the theory of Ibn al-Halîfîm (see al-Kâarakî). The sphera recta, al-afâlak al-mâ'dâ is the sphere of the heavens, i.e. for the inhabitants of the equator; in the Latin translation of the tables of al-Khwârizmi (table 59) it is said of the ascension in the sphera recta “horoscopus secundum terram Arin” (Arin is a corruption of Azîn-Ud'înî = Ujajînî in Sanskrit, which was erroneously taken to be the kubbat al-arîd, dome of the earth, the centre of the equator and of the inhabited world). At all places which do not lie on the equator, there is a sphera obliqua so that these are innumerable.

Bibliography: Ptolemy, Almagest, ed. Heiberg, passim; al-Battânî Opus astronomiûm etc., ed. C. A. Nallino; H. Suter, Die astronomischen Tabellen des Muhâmmâd Ibn Mâsû al-Khwârizmi etc. [cf. also al-Khwârizmi] and numerous works on astronomy. — I am much indebted to Prof. Nallino for a number of suggestions. (E. Weidemann).

MATMÂTA, the name of a Berber tribe, belonging to the large family of the Butr, and brethren of the Maghâtî, Kûmûa, Lâmûa, Şadîna, Mâdyûa, Maghîla, etc. They formed with them the ethnic group of the Banû Fâtîn who, like all the other Butr, seem to have had their original home in Tripolitania.

Our chief source of information about the Matmâta are al-Bakît and Ibn Khâldûn. As with the majority of the Butr Berbers, three principal divisions can be distinguished:

1. Elements settled in the eastern Maghrib not far from their original home: these are the modern Matmâta in Southern Tunisia, some 30 miles S.W. of Gâbes.

2. Elements which have settled in the Central Maghrib: first in the plateau of the Serîl, in the N.E. of Mîdâs; then having been driven out of this territory by the Zanîa Banû Tûdjîn, they sought refuge in the mountainous massif of Wânscharî (the modern Ouarzânsî). One part of these elements has moved to the mountains of the Mediûn which are included within the borders of Morocco and the other part has moved to the upper valley of the Moulûa at 'Amuckûr. Ibn Khâldûn also mentions a little isolated group settled on the mountain...
which bears their name between Fās and Ṣaḥūf; there must also have been some of them in the coutour of Taza for a place between Fās and Taza still bears their name. Finally we owe to al-Idrisī the record of the most western body: the Maghmāt of Tamasna.

The Maghmāt played a fairly important part in the early centuries of Islam. Those of the central Maghmāt had adopted Abādī doctrines: being conquered by the Ṣanḥādja and Ṣanā, many of them migrated to Spain. The most famous member of this people was Sālīḥ b. Salāmān, the famous Berber genealogist, so frequently quoted by Ibn Khaldūn.


**MATN** (*v.*) a term with different meanings (cf. the lexica, s. v.), of which that of text, especially that of the text of a tradition, deserves to be mentioned here.

Main occurs in the sense of text already in pre-Islamic poetry and is used in this sense in Arabic literature up to the present day. It denotes especially the text of a book as distinguished from its oral explanation or its written or printed commentary.

In connection with traditions main denotes the contents as distinguished from the chain of traditions who handed it down (wannād).

**Bibliography:** Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, ii. 6 sqq. (A. J. Wensinck)

**MĀṬRAḤ, a town on the Gulf of ʿOman, two miles west of Masqat on the east coast of Arabia. The town, which has about 14,000 inhabitants, is the starting-point for caravan traffic into the interior of Arabia and next to Masqat, the most important commercial centre in Ṣanā. The town is beautifully situated in fertile surroundings, has a good harbour, easily entered but little sheltered, from which Masqat can be reached in an hour by boat. The inhabitants of Ṣanā used to have wharves for shipbuilding here and the textile industry was not unimportant (spinning and weaving). A fort built by the Portuguese still stands as a memorial of their rule in Ṣanā. According to Wellen, the town used to have 20,000 inhabitants.


**MĀṬURĪDI, ABU ʿMAYR Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Ḥanāfī al-Muṭakallim, al-Māṭurīdī al-Māṣmārī** is the titular head of the Māṭurīdī School of theology which, with the Ashārite School, formed orthodox Sunni Islam. The two Schools are equally orthodox, but there has always been a tendency to suppress the Māṭurīdī’s name and to put al-ʿAskārī forward as the champion of Islam against all heretics except in Transoxiana (Maṣūma al-Tabrī) where his school has been, and is, the dominant, representing the views of abī al- ṣanmaʾ wa l-ʿaṣmaʾ. Next to nothing is known of al-Māṭurīdī’s life, but he died at Samarkand in 333 (944), a contemporary of al-ʿAskārī who died a little earlier about 320 (931), while al-Ṭahāwī [q.v.], another contemporary, died in Egypt in 331. All three represented the movement, which must have been very widely spread, to defend orthodox Islam by the same weapons of logical argument with which the Muʿtazilites had attacked it. Mūtarrī or Māṭurīdī is a locality (maḥall, kury) in Samarkand. Its geographical reality and the identity of Abū Maṣmār al-Māṭurīdī are assured by the article Māṭurīdī in the *Aṣāb al-Samānī* (vol. 489, i. 4; cf. also Barhool, *Turkoistan down to the Mongol Invasion*, G.M.S., p. 90, notes 9 and 10; p. 267; note 5, and the Russian references there). The books of Hanafite Ṭabāḥārī give the names of his teachers, but to us they are names only (see Ibn Kuṭlūbghū [ed. Flugel, *N. 173*] and Flugel’s *Hanütem*, p. 274, 292, 295, 298, 313). The Saiyid Mūtarrī in his little treatise on Māṭurīdī, inverited in his commentary on the *Iṣbāʿ* (i. 5–14), complains that he has found only two biographies and that both are short (alī ‘l-ṭāghīt). Even Vākūr in his *Muʿjam al-nāmā* has no mention of him or of Mūtarrī. Ibn Khaldūn in his sketch of the origin and history of Kalām (Maḥaddima, transl. de Slane, ii. 55 sqq.; ed. Quatremère, iii. 38 sqq.) has no place for him and speaks only of Asḥāri and the Asḥārites. For Ibn Ḥanīfa (d. 456 = 1064; Fīqāl, ed. Cairo 1320, ii. 111) the orthodox opponent of Abī Ḥanīfa is Abū Hanīfa and he has no mention of Maṭurīdī. Similarly Shahrastānī (d. 548 = 1153, *Malal*, transl. Haarbrücker, i., p. 159; text on margin of Ibn Ḥanīfa, i. 188) gives the views of Abū Ḥanīfa but does not mention Maṭurīdī. Abū ʿAbd al-Ḥanīfa, he says, inclined to the Muṣṭafites and his followers were even called the Muṣṭafites of the Sunni, meaning, apparently, a form of Mūtājīrism consistent with orthodoxy. Similarly the Saiyid Mūtarrī (loc. cit., p. 13 foot) says that the Muṣṭafites claimed Abū Ḥanīfa for themselves and rejected his authorship of one book because it was too flatly against their positions. The truth evidently was that Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 = 767) was the first to adopt the methods of the Muṣṭafites and apply argument to the foundation of the Faith. Also, from the beginning, his standing was so high that it was simply impossible to call him a heretic. This status continued in the Māṭurīdī School.

All this goes back to the time before kalām had become a technical term and when fīqī meant both theology and canon law, with the difference that theology was called “the greater fīqī” (afki al-ḥikmat; see article KALAM above, vol. ii., p. 6726). That was the title of one of Abū Ḥanīfa’s books and we have a commentary on it ascribed to Māṭurīdī (Haidarābād 1321), the only writing ascribed to him, apparently in print. This does not occur in the two exactly similar lists which we have of his books (Saiyid Mūtarrī, p. 5; Ibn Kuṭlūbghū, p. 43): 1. Kitāb al-Taṣawwīḥ; 2. Kitāb al-Maḥāfīz; 3. Kitāb Rādī ʿAdwāl il-Dīn. l-ʿAṣmaʾ; 4. Kitāb Bayān Ḥākim al-Muṭakallim; 5. Kitāb Taṣawwīḥ al-Kurān. Of these only the last is given by Brockelmann, i., p. 195; 4; the biographers praise it highly. The others suggest only anti-Muṣṭafite polemic (for al-ʿAskārī see Horten, *Philosophische Systeme*, by index). As a matter of fact it is only in one MS. of the com-
MĀṬURĪDĪ — MĀ WĀRĀʾ AL-NĀḤR

How the theological school of Abū Ḥanifa came to be known as that of al-Māṭurīdī we do not know. The epithet al-muqaṭṭalīmīn, applied to al-Māṭurīdī, may mean that he was the theologian of the school of Abū Ḥanifa as opposed to those who were canon lawyers (fārāḥī). But the two tendencies to accept him and to suppress him still continue. The ʿAṣ[qī]dī of one of his followers, al-Nasafī, fortified with the commentary of al-Taṭfūzī, an Ashʿarite, is the theological text-book of the last two years of the Ashʿar course and is a final authority in Egypt. Yet when Muhammad ʿAbdūl, the late Chief Muftī of Egypt, a regenerator and reformer of Islam, put his views of the development of Muslim theology and of its final position into a course of lectures at Bairūt (Risālat al-nuṣūḥ: Exposé de la religion musulmane, traitee de l'Arabe... by B. Micheli and Moustaφhāʿ Abduh Kāzik, Paris 1925) he showed himself a Māṭurīdī with no mention of al-Māṭurīdī. The Māṭurīdīs in the two Schools are commonly reckoned as thirteen in number; six, a difference in idea (maʿnawī) and seven in expression (lafzi) (for them in detail see the Saiyid Murtada, p. 8 sqq. and Abū Ṭūṭhā al-Kawākib, Haidarālīdā 1904). They have been studied by Goldziher in his Forschungen, p. 110 sqq., and by Horten is His Philosophische System, p. 531 sqq. It is frequently said that these points of difference are slight, but that is not so. The moral position of Abū Ḥanifa is as plain in them as in his canon law. Al-Ashʿarī was concerned only to maintain the absoluteness of Allah's will; that he could do anything; and that a thing was "good" because he willed it. Future rewards and punishments, therefore, had no "moral" basis. But Abū Ḥanifa, and after him al-Māṭurīdī and his School, recognizes that man possesses free-will (khhāṭārī) actions for which he is rewarded and punished. No explanation is attempted of this fundamental antimony of predestination and free-will; they are stated side by side as equal, if contradictory, facts. Similarly, while Abū Ḥanifa admits that evil deeds are by the will (irḍa) of Allah — otherwise they could not happen — he cannot bring himself to say that they are by the "good pleasure" (riṣāqa) of Allah. Further, the Māṭurīdī School admits the doctrine of "assurance of salvation" and the Ashʿarite does not. A Māṭurīdī may say, "I am a believer, assuredly" (haḵaḵun), but an Ashʿarite must say, "I am a believer if Allah wills". Because, then, of this essential difference in human moral feeling the School of Al-Māṭurīdī has steadily penetrated the School of Al-Ashʿarī and even the professed Ashʿarīe at the present time is, to a greater or less extent, a Māṭurīdī.

Bibliography: has been given in the article. But cf. article KAI. in throughout.

(D. B. MacGonald)

Al-Māʿūn, title of Sûra cvii. taken from Vs. 7 where māʿūn denotes the zakāt.

Mawāliya, Mawwālī, means a kind of popular song. Tradition says that this genre of poetry was invented by the people of Wasit; but that it was the people of Baghdād who after improving it made it fashionable. It is said that when Hārūn al-Raṣīd had the most prominent Ermecides massacred, he forbade for lamentations them. One of the slaves of Dūʿār, so well-known from the Arabian Nights, composed in everyday language an elegy on her old master and at the end of each strophe she said wā maṣāliya "O my masters!" Whence the name of this kind of poetry.

From the view of metre, the mawwālī, a popular form from maṣāliya or maṣāliyā, is a song in the kisīr metre (first ʿarpaʿ) of which the last verse of each hemistich is ʾarbūn, ʾulān or ʾulān. In its primitive form, the mawwālī consisted of strophes, each of four hemistichs rhyming with one another. Later it was somewhat altered: the strophe contained five hemistichs in which the first, second, third and fifth, but not the fourth rhymed together or it contained seven hemistichs of which the first, second, third and seventh had the same rhyme and the fourth, fifth and sixth rhymed together.

The red mawwālī is used for war-songs while the green mawwālī is used for love-songs. In all cases the mawwālī must be in the popular dialect and make use of alliteration.


(Moh. Benchedine)

Mā Wārāʾ al-Nahr (Arab.) "that which (lies) beyond the river"; the name for the lands conquered by the Arabs and subjected to Islam north of the Amu-Dairī [q. v.]. These lands were called Mā wārāʾ al-Nahr on north and east were where the power of Islam ceased and depended on political conditions; cf. the statements of the Arab geographers on Mā wārāʾ al-Nahr in G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 453 sqq.: W. Barthold, Turkestān (G. M.S., 21. v., London 1928), p. 64 sqq. The phrase Mā wārāʾ al-Nahr passed from Arabic literature into Persian. As late as the ninth (xvth) century, Ḥāfiz Ābrāʾ [q. v.] devotes a special chapter (the last) to Mā wārāʾ al-Nahr in his geographical work. Under the influence of literary tradition, the phrase Mā wārāʾ al-Nahr was used down to quite recent times in Central Asia itself (Pāṣār, G.M.S., i., 1. The Ottom Muh. ʿāliī, Sprāv. Knīžka Samark. Oblastī, v, 240 et pass.)
although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river.

(W. BARTHOLD)

AL-MAWARDI, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. HABIB, a SHAH. Ik' al-Qašī, who, on the conclusion of his studies taught in Başra and Baghda and after holding the office of čāfand at 'Uṣūl near Nisabūr, settled permanently in Baghda. Here he often acted for the caliph al-Kālid (381–422 = 991–1031) in his negotiations with the Byzādids, who then ruled al-İraq; when the Bāyiid Dālāl al-Dawla in 429 (1037–1038) asked the caliph al-Muktafi to grant him the title of shāh (malik al-nāl), he expressed his objections in a fāṣah and thus earned the enmity of the Bāyiid. He died an 50th Rabī' I 450 (May 27, 1058) at the age of 86.

His works are said to have been collected and edited only after his death by one of his pupils. The following have survived: 1. Taṣfīr al-Kamīn or Ḳitāb al-Nabat wa l-Salīm; MSS. in Rampūr (s. Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, N.S., ii., xl.), Fez (Fīhāt al-Maṣūtiyān, N. 215) and Stambūl (Ḳilāb 'Aṣa, N. 90); 2. K. al-Mālik al-Kālid y l-Fāsid; MSS. in the Brit. Mus. Cat. 552; s. Ellis and Edwards, Deser.-List, p. 222; Cairo (Fīhāt, ii. 215) and Stambūl (Sulaimānīa, N. 436); 3. his most celebrated work, dealing with constitutional law in purely theoretical fashion, disregarding the political conditions of the time (s. A. v. Kremer, Cultuurgeschiede, i. 396; M. Hartmann, Unpolitische Briefe aus der Türkei, p. 242), entitled K. al-Akhān al-Sulṭāniyā, Constitutions politiques, ed. K. Enger, Bonn 1853; pr. Cairo 1298, 1324, 1327. Translations: Publik en administratief recht van den Islam met een invloed over de toepaslijkhed van dat recht in Nederlandse-Indië door S. Keizer, s. Groenhage 1852; Les constitutions politiques, trad. et commentées d'après les sources orientales par le comte L. Otrogo, Paris 1900–1906; Les statuts gouvernementaux en règle de droit public et administratif, trad. et comm. par F. Fagnan, Algiers 1915; cf. H. F. Amédro, Les Masal fields juridiction, J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 635–674; 4. K. Naṣīḥat al-Mu/liḥ, MS. in Paris, de Sane, N. 2447; 5. K. Talkāt al-Nasār wa-Talqīl al-Qādir, on politics and the art of government: MS. in Gotha, s. Pertsch, Vetus, N. 1572; 6. K. Kāmil al-Waṣāy, MS. in Vienna, Consularakademie, Kafft, p. 475, entitled Kāmil al-Waṣāy wa-Siyāsah al-Mulk; MS. formerly in Landberg's possession, s. Goldzimer, Arch. für philol. u. hist. p. 14 (the K. al-Waṣāy in Stambūl. Top Kapu 2495, 1 is however, according to Recher, R.O.S., iv. 710 perhaps only a part of N. 4); 7. K. dī'm al-Waṣāy; MS. in Berlin. Ahlwardt, N. 2557; Cairo (Fīhāt, i. 270); pr. Cairo 1310, 1330 (cf. Diet, Donbseridenten von Asien, ii. 582; Schreiner, in Köchel's Sammlungen, p. 503–513); 8. K. Ablād al-Kādī, MS. in Stambūl, Sulaimānīa, N. 581; 9. K. Ablād wa al-İraq, a collection of 500 traditions, 500 wise sayings; and 500 verses in 10 fat'āl to 30 proverbs, in Leyden, s. Catalogus, i., N. 382; 10. K. (al-Biyā′a al-qiṣāṣ wa l-Din, a work still much read; pr. Stambūl 1299, Cairo 1509, 1230. 1327, 1328, 1339: on the margin of al-Amuli's Kāfihan, Cairo 1316, in India 1315. Uways Waifa b. ʻAlaw al-Arzdānī Kāfihānd wrote a commentary entitled Manāhid al-Yawm, pr. Stambūl 1238. A synopsis was prepared by Ibn Liyūn a teacher of the vizier Liyūn al-Din b. al-Khašīb (d. 770 = 1370), Madrid, N. 427. An anonymous synopsis entitled K. Ablād al-Faṣād is in the Escorial, s. Arentenburg, ii. 748.


(C. BROCKELMANN)

MAWUDD, ABU 'L-FARID IBN AL-DÂNIL WA-QUB AL-MÂLLA, rûler de Ghāzna, was born about 1012—1022. In Muharram 432 (September 1040) he was appointed to the government of Balkh with Khwâja Abû Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad as vazir. A few months later, his father Sultan Masûd was deposed and Muhammad, son of Sultan Muhammad, was raised to the throne. On hearing news of this, Mawudd left Balkh, took possession of Ghazna, and spent the winter in making preparations for a struggle for the throne with Muhammad. At the end of the winter, Muhammad marched from India to take Ghazna and Mawudd advanced to meet him. A fierce battle took place on 3rd Rabî‘ I 432 (April 6, 1041) near Duppar or Dinawar (modern Pâṭhâbâd on the Peshawar-Kâbul route) in which Mawudd was victorious. Muhammad, all his sons except ʻAbd al-Rahîm, Sulaimân b. Yûsuf, and Nîshîgin of Balkh were taken prisoners and executed. Mawudd returned to Ghazna in triumph, but he was not yet the undisputed master of the kingdom. His brother Maḥmud, governor of Multan, was advancing on Ghazna by way of Lahore, but three days after his arrival at Lahore, he died mysteriously on the morning of 10th Dhu l-Ḥijâjah, 432 (August 11, 1041).

In 435 (1043–1044) ʻAbd al-Raḥîm, son of DJâ salts of the HindÝshîhîya dynasty of Waihând, formed a confederacy with some HindÝ Râjd-î and laid siege to Lahore. Sukhâpâl was killed in action, and after his death the Râjdîs quarreled among themselves, raised the siege and retired to their respective kingdoms. The Muslims followed them in pursuit and laid siege to the fort of Sonjîst where one of the confederates named ʻAlîpâl Haryānâ had taken refuge. The fort was captured and given up to plunder but ʻAlippâl managed to escape. About 5,000 Muslims who had been imprisoned in the fort were released. The victors next attacked another Râjdî called Tâlāt Bâlî, but ʻAlâ-al-Aṭīr, his master, took the fort and returned to Lahore with immense booty. These victors restored for some time the waning prestige of the Ghaznavids in Upper India.

It was the ambition of Mawudd to restore the greatness of his empire by conquering the provinces which his father had lost to the Saljuqs. In Muharram 435 (August 1043) he attacked Khurasân but was defeated by Alp ʻAlâsh b. Dâwûd. In the following month the Ghaznavid troops retrieved their reputation by inflicting a defeat on the Saljuq near Bist, but in spite of this reverse they became so powerful that Mawudd found it difficult to overcome them single-handed. After protracted negotiations, he secured the assistance of the ruler of Isfâhân and the Khân of Turkistan, and marched towards Balkh to join forces with the Khân of Turkistan, but he had not gone far
when he was taken ill with colic and was forced to return to Ghazna where he died on 20th Rajab, 441 (December 18, 1049), at the age of 29 years.

Mawdūd was a good ruler and was famous for his generosity. Padānī- Mawdūdī (the Arrow of Mawdūd) is called after him. It is stated that in his wars he used golden arrows so that if the victim was killed, the gold in the arrow would pay for his funeral, and if he was only wounded, it would defray the expenses of his treatment. He was a skilful general, and his premature death put an end to all hopes of crushing the power of the Saladujis.


(A. J. Wensinck)

MAWDŪD B. 'IMĀD AL-DĪN ZANGLI, KUTB AL-DĪN AL-RAHMĀNI, LORD OF AL-MAWIL. After the death at the end of 744 (Nov. 1149) of his elder brother Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī I [v.], Mawdūd was recognised as lord of al-Mawil through the influence of the powerful vizier al-Lujāwīd [v.] and of the commander-in-chief of the army Zain al-Dīn 'Ali. A number of emirs negotiated with the third brother, Nur al-Dīn Mahdī, who lived in Hādib, and seized the town of Sīnjarī, and according to the old chronicler, the vizier however, who feared not only Saladin but also the Franks, succeeded in persuading him, whereupon Nur al-Dīn handed over Sīnjarī to his brother and was given Hums and al-Kahba instead. On other questions also Mawdūd followed his vizier's advice; al-Lujāwīd however fell into disgrace and in 558 (1163) he was thrown into prison and replaced by Zain al-Dīn Kūkī. In the next year Mawdūd joined forces with his brother Nur al-Dīn in a war against the Franks, and in Ramādān (Sept. 1164) the latter defeated the Christian forces and stormed Kafrat Gārīn. According to the most usual statement, Mawdūd died on 22nd Dhu'l-Hijjah 565 (Sept. 6, 1170) aged about forty. He is described by the Oriental historians as a just and benevolent ruler. He was succeeded in al-Mawil by his son Saif al-Dīn Ghāzī II.


(K. V. Zettersetten)

MAWKIF (A.), noun loci from co-l-b to stand'. Of the technical meanings of the term two may be mentioned here:

a. the place where the mawalī [v.] is held during the pilgrimage, viz. 'Arafat and Muzdalīfa [v.] or Dāmā; in well known traditions, Muḥammad declares that all 'Arafat and that all Muzdalīfa is mawalī (Muslim, Ḥadīṣ, trad. 149; Abū Dāwūd, Musawīk, bāb 56th, 64th; cf. Hanbīkook of Early Moh. Tradition, s. v. 'Arafāt'). Snauk Hurgrone, (Hest mekkasneke fest, p. 150 = Verbreite Geschichten. i. 99) has conjectured that these traditions were intended to deprive the hills of 'Arafat and Muzdalīfa of their sacred character, which they doubtless possessed in pre-Islamic times.

b. the place where on the day of resurrection several scenes of the last judgment will take place; cf. al-Ghazālī, al-Durr al-Faṣīha, ed. Gautier, p. 577. 683; 68; 813; cf. Khwāja Aḥmad al-Kūkī, ed. W. Wolf, p. 65 sqq.

(A. J. Wensinck)

MAWLĀ (A.), a term with different meanings (cf. Lustān al-Arāb, xx. 289 sqq.) of which the following may be mentioned:

a. Fator, trustee, helper. In this sense the word is used in the Kūfān, Sūra xlvii. 12: "God is the mawālī of the faithful, the unbelievers have no mawālī" (cf. Sūra iii. 143; vi. 62; xvi. 41; xvi. 51; xxi. 72; lxv. 2). In the same sense mawla is used in the Shi'ite tradition, in which Muḥammad calls 'Ali the mawla of those whose mawla he is himself. According to the author of the Liṣān, mawla has the sense of wali in this tradition, which is connected with Ghadīr al-Khanām [v.] or C. van Arendonk, De oorkonde van het Zenditische imamsat, p. 18, 19). It may be observed that it occurs also in the Manusel of 'Abd al-Hādib B. Ḥanibal (i. 84, 116, 119, 152, 330 sqq.; iv. 281 et al.).

b. Lord. In the Kūfān it is in this sense (which is synonymous with that of sālyūd) applied to Alī (Sūra ii. 125 and Al-Hādi xix. 37), who is often called Mawalīd, "our Lord" in Arabic literature. Precisely for this reason in Tradition the slave is prohibited from calling his lord mawalī (Bukhārī, Qiyās, bāb 165; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, trad. 15, 16).

It is not in contradiction to this prohibition that Tradition frequently uses mawla in the sense of "lord of a slave" e.g. in the well known Ḥājīkh: "Three categories of people will receive twofold reward... and the slave who fulfills his duty in regard to Allāh as well as to his lord" (Bukhārī, al-Bukhārī, bāb 31; Muslim, Al-Nānī, trad. 45).

Compositions of mawla and suffixes are frequently used as titles in several parts of the Muslim world, e.g. mawla (mawlā), "my Lord" especially in North Africa and in connection with saints); mawla (mawla), "Lordship" (especially in India and in connection with scholars or saints).

The term mawla is also applied to the former lord (pant) in his relation to his freeman, e.g. in the tradition: "Who clings to a (new) panton without the permission of his (legal) mawla, on him rests the curse of Allāh" (Bukhārī, Dīya, bāb 17; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, trad. 18, 19).

c. Freed slave, e.g. in the tradition "the mawla counts as the people to whom he belongs" (Bukhārī, Fatawī, bāb 24, etc.). In this sense mawla, or rather the plural mawalī, is frequently used in Arabic literature. The evolution of the idea as well as the position and the aspirations of the mawalī have been expounded by von Kremer (Geschichte des Orients unter den Chaisen, ii. 154) and by Goldziher (Mier und Afrikanische Studien, i. 103 sqq.), by the latter especially in connection with the Ḥaʾībīn [v.]. On the position of the
mawālī in the law of inheritance law cf. the art. MIBAIL.

Bibliography: in the article; also Douâtet in R.H.A., xli, 30 sqq.; Littmann, in N.G.W., 1916, p. 102. (A. J. WENSINCK)

MAWLAVI. [See Mawlā]

MAWLAWIYA (Turkish pronunciation Mewlewîa), Order of Deirmishes called by Europeans Dancing or Whirling Deirmishes.

1. Origin of the Order. Its name is derived from mawâlînā ("our master"), a title given by excellence to Djalâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî (e.g. by the Turkish writers Sa'd al-Dîn and Pécévi, cited below), of which the Persian equivalent was according to the Munâdî al-Asrifîn (translated by Huarte in Les Huitante des Derviches Tourniers, Paris 1918-1922) bestowed on Djalâl al-Dîn [q.v.] by his father, with whom this hagiography commences. According to the same authority (i. 162), his adherents adopted the name Mawlawî, and indeed copies of the Međîhânî of the years 687 and 706 A.H. thus designate themselves (Nicholson's ed., i. 7 and ii. 11); yet Ibn Bââîî, who visited Konia after the latter date, asserts that they were styled Djalâliya, and the word Mawlawi seems to have been occasionally in the Munâdî in the sense of "scholar", which it ordinarily has in India. This work asserts that one Bââar al-Dîn Gûharî (a historical personage, since he is mentioned in Ibn Bibl's chronicle of the Seldûqs of Asia Minor) built a college at Konia for the children of Djalâl al-Dîn's father, which was inherited by Djalâl al-Dîn, The Munâdî (by Shams al-Dîn Ahmâd al-Alâîkî, 718-754 A.H.), however, so teems with anachronisms and extravagances that its statements must be used with great caution.

The European name is taken from the ritual of the dîkîr, in which the dervishes revolve, using the right foot as a pivot, to the tune of various instruments. Djalâl al-Dîn is said to have claimed that he had elevated the practice, but denied that it was an innovation (Munâdî, ii. 79). Certainly "dancing" (i'dâ) is mentioned as a Sufi practice in works earlier by some centuries than Djalâl al-Dîn's time, often with severe condemnation. The historian Sekhâni (al-Tîbi al-Munâdî, p. 220) in recording an event described in 852 against the background of the Cairene cures by one of the "earliest Sa'âdîs" in which the Sûfis who perform it are compared to apes and are bitterly reproached.

Dancing is indeed a natural accompaniment of music (Abyîhîn, x, 121) or poetry (Fîrâ'd al-Anbî, v, 131, 11), but the whirling of the dervishes would seem to have for its purpose the production of vertigo rather than the presentation of an idea in rhythm. Of the various reasons which have been assigned for it the most interesting is that recorded in the Munâdî (i. 190) as the excuse of Djalâl al-Dîn, viz. that it was a concession to the pleasure-loving inhabitants of Asia Minor, who might thereby be drawn to the true faith. The theory that the whirling was a reproduction of the motions of the celestial bodies is found in his Međîhânî (ed. Nicholson, iv. 734), and the same view is encountered in the much earlier ikhâdî of Ibn Tâfârî (Caioi 1072, p. 75), where its phallic effect is emphasized. The saints in the Munâdî are represented as able to maintain the exercise for many days and nights continuously, but the actual dîkîr lasts only about an hour, with some intermission.

2. Relations with other Orders. Although the earlier mystics, such as Djuânî, Bîstâmî and Hâlîdî are mentioned in the Munâdî with profound reverence, the treatment of founders of orders who came near Djalâl al-Dîn's time is very different. Alî al-Kâdirî of Djalâl is ignored, Ibn 'Arabi mentioned with contempt, and Kîfîn with severe condemnation. Hâdîdî Bektâshî is represented as having sent a messenger to inquire into the proceedings of Djalâl al-Dîn, and to have acknowledged the supremacy of the latter. At a later period the rivalry of the Mawlawi with the Bektâshi Order became acute.

It has been shown by F. W. Hasluck (Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929, ii. 370 sqq.) that the environment wherein the Mawlawi Order originated was favourable to Manichaeism, and that throughout its history it has shown itself tolerant and inclined to regard all religions as reconcilable on a philosophic basis. He suggests that the veneration of the Muslims of Konia for the supposed burial-place of Plato (in a mosque which was once the church of St. Amphelochius) may have been intentionally favoured by the Mawlawi dervishes, or possibly their founder, as providing a cult which Muslim and Christian might share on equal terms. In three other sanctuaries of Konia, one of them the mausoleum of Djalâl al-Dîn himself, he found evidence of a desire to provide an object of veneration to the adherents of both systems. It is not, however, easy to accept his inference that some sort of religious compromise on a philosophic basis was devised between the Seldûq sultan 'Alî al-Dîn, Djalâl al-Dîn, and the local Christian clergy. It appears from the Munâdî that the Order was frequently exposed to persecution from the fikakhâ in consequence of its music and dancing; and they found an analogy in Christian services to the employment of the former. They are credited in recent times with having impeded the massacres of Armenians.

3. Spread of the Order. The Munâdî attributes its propagation outside Konia to Djalâl al-Dîn's son and second successor, Sultan İbahâl al-Dîn Walâd, who "filled Asia Minor with his lieutenants" (ii. 262). It would however appear from Ibn Bââîî's narrative (ii. 282) that its following was not in his time extensive outside Konia, and was confined to Asia Minor. The story told after Sa'd al-Dîn by v. Hammer (G. O. K., i. 147) and others, that as early as 759 (1357) Sulaimân son of Orkhan received a cap from a Mawlawi dervish at Bulaq, has been shown by Hasluck (ii. 613) to be a fiction. The historians make no allusion to any importance attaching to the Mawlawi chief when Murâd I took Konia in 1386; but when the city was taken by Murâd II in 1435, peace was negotiated according to Sa'd al-Dîn (i. 358) by Mawâlînâ Hamza, but according to Neqî (quoted vâ'da) by a descendant of Mawâlînâ Djalâl al-Dîn al-Îmî, "Aîfî Celebi, "who united all the glories of worth and pedigree, and possessed mystic attainments"; the rebellious vassal supposed that a holy man of the family of the Mawlâ would inspire more confidence. The same person performed a similar service in 1442 (Sa'd al-Dîn, i. 371). According to V. Cunet (La Turquie d'Asie, i. 829) Selim I when passing through Konia in 1516 in pursuit of the Persians (i?) ordered the destruction
of the Mawlāwīyah, at the instance of the Shāikh al-Islām; and though this command was repealed, the moral and religious authority of the head of the Order was gravely compromised. That the saints of Konia were highly revered in the Ottoman Empire later in the sixteenth century appears from the list of graves visited by Sājid ʿAlī Kapūtān in 1554, which commences with those of Hayāt al-Din, his father and his son (Pelew's History, 1285, i. 371). In 1534 Mardīr IV assigned the khrāṣṭā of Konia to the Čelebi. Yet the first reference to “dancing dervishes” in Constantinople which Hasluck produces, is from the time of the Sultan Ibrāhīm (1640–1648). Cuinet mentions three Mawlāwīyah of the first rank and one Tekye of the second in Constantinople and the neighbourhood; he gives the names of the saints whose tombs they contain, without dates. He mentions seven other Mawlāwīyah of the first rank, at Konia, Manisā, Karālijăś, Bāghariya, Egypt (Cairo), Gallipoli and Bursa; and as the more celebrated of the second rank that of Shamsī Tabrīzī at Konia, and those in Medina, Damascus and Jerusalem. To these Hasluck adds Tekye at Canea (Crete), founded about 1850, Karaman, Ramlā Tatar (in Phœnice), and possibly Tempe (in Asia Minor). He omits the Tekye of Alexandria, founded for one in Salonica see the work of Garnett, and for one in Cyprus (that of Lukach cited below). It would seem then that the Order was confined to the limits of the Ottoman Empire, and indeed to its European and Asiatic territories.

By a decree of Sept. 4, 1925 all the Tekye in Turkey were closed, and the library of the Mawlāwīyah of Konia was transferred to the Museum of the city (Oriente Moderno, 1925, p. 455; 1926, p. 594).

4. Political importance of the Order. Reference may be made to Hasluck’s work (ii. 604 sq.) for refutation of the stories uncribrally reproduced by Cuinet and some less authoritative writers. In these “the Shāikh of the Mawlāwi becomes first the legitimate successor by blood of the Seldžūk dār-ʾal-šarḥ, and finally the real Caliph!” Hasluck supposed these tales to be based on the supposed “traditional right” of the Mawlāwi Shāikh to gird the new Sultan with a sword. This right cannot be traced earlier than 1648, and appears to have obtained recognition in the nineteenth century. It would seem that reforming Sultan used the Mawlāwi Order as a make-weight against the Bektāšis, who supported the Janissaries, and then against the ‘Ulama’, who supported the treatment of the Muslim community as a privileged community against the dāmmis. In recent times the Sultāns ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and Meḥmed Reşād were members of the Order.

5. The ritual of the Order has been described by numerous travellers, e.g. J. F. Brown, The Dervishes, 1868, p. 190–208; 1927, p. 250–258; W. Cuinet, loc. cit., p. 387; Garett and Lukach in the works cited; M. Hartmann, Der islamische Orient, 1910, iii. 12; S. Anderson, M. W., 1923. The attire consisted of a cap called sikba, a long sleeveless skirt called tennûre, a jacket with sleeves called destenû, a waistband called elif-lûm-end, and a cloak with sleeves called kherbe, thrown over the shoulders (in Lukach’s description [Cyprus] “a violet gown worn over a dark green cassock”). The instruments employed according to the last writer (dealing with Konia) are six: reed-flute, zither, rebek, drum, tambourine, and one other. Cuinet enumerates four, of which three agree with the above, the last being hatilî, vulgarily zi, a sort of small cymbal. Brown enumerates three, flute, violin, and kettle-drum. Those mentioned in the Manāṣir are rendered by Haïelt, flûte, violon and tambour de bagasse. The service in Konia according to Lukach was held twice a month after the Friday prayer; in Constantinople, where there were several tekės, they were held more frequently, to enable the members of different tekė to join in.

6. Administration of the Order. The head of the Order, resident at Konia, had the titles Mulla Khânjār, ʿIṣâḥet-i Pîr, Čelebî Mulla, and ʿAzīz Esken. A list of persons who have held the office is given by Hartmann (loc. cit., p. 193) after the Haṭîb-ʾi Ādâbî-sı Sanawîn, making 26 in all down to 1910; this list appears to be imperfect, and the Čelebî whom Lukach found in Konia was uncertain whether he was the 39th or the 40th. The head of the establishment at Manisa counted as second in authority. Cuinet enumerates seven officials subordinate to the Čelebî at Konia, but the names of several seem seriously mutilated. Others mention a secretary (awelîl). An account of the discipline which those who wished to enter the Order had to undergo is given by Haïelt (Konia, la ville des Derviches Touroueurs, Paris 1897). They had to perform menial service for 1001 days, divided into periods of 40; when this was over, they were clothed in the uniform of the tekė, assigned cells, and instructed in the exercises of the Order; and they had to remain thus occupied till they believed themselves able to enter into relation with the Deity by means of whirling, meditation, and music.


MAWLĪD (A.) or MAWLĪD (pl. mawālīd); time, place and celebration of the birth of any one, particularly of the Prophet Muhammad (Mawlaṭ al-Nabāū). From the moment when Islam in its attitude to Muhammad abandoned the line laid down in the Kūrānic view of him and began to bring his personality within the sphere of the supernatural, the scenes among which his earthly life had been passed naturally began to assume a higher sanctity in the eyes of his followers. Among these, the house in which he was born, the Mawlaḍ al-Nābul, in the modern Sīk al-Lāl in Mecca, the history of which is preserved principally in the chronicles of the town (ed. Wustenfeld, i. 422), does not seem at first to have played a part of any note. It was al-Khaṭţār (d. 173), the mother of Ḥāṭṭī al-Khaṭrī, who first transformed it from a humble dwelling-house to a place of prayer. As they did to the tomb of the Prophet in Medina, the pilgrims now made pilgrimages also to his mawlaḍ to show their reverence for it and to receive a share of its blessings (iʿtarab). In time also the reverence in which the house was held found expression in its development in a fitting architectural fashion (ibn Ḥujjāb, ed. Wright, p. 114, 163; on the present state of the house: Snouck Hurgronne, Mecca, i. 106; ii. 27).

Records of the observation of the birthday of
the Prophet as a holy day only begin at a later date; according to the generally accepted view, the day was Monday, the 12th Rabi' I. The story which Watenfeld originated, according to which the pious Shafi'i Karadji (d. 543) observed this day by breaking his fast upon it, which he only did on one other occasion, the 10th Dhul-Qa'da (Abk. G. W., ii., xxxv., No. 126), does not seem to find any confirmation in the sources and is in contradistinction to the general custom of fasting on Monday, as this day plays a special part in the life of Muhammad as the day of his birth, of his Hijra, and of his death (Ghazali, Ihot' [Biiik], i. 363 and pass. On the Jewish origin of fasting on Monday, see Wensineck, Mohammed ou le Jour, p. 126). But that on this day a special celebration was arranged, as distinct from private observation, one first learns for Mecca, where one would expect it earliest from the local traditions, from Ibn Jubair (d. 614; Travels, p. 113), who however is obviously referring to a custom which has already been a considerable time in existence. The essential feature of the celebration is however only a somewhat considerable increase in the number of visitors to the Ma'dhid house which was exceptionally open the whole day for this purpose. The visit and the ceremonies associated with it (mash etc.) are carried through entirely in forms which are characteristic of the older Muslim cult of saints.

But just as the later cult of the Prophet cannot be put on a level with the reverence shown to other holy men, so new and special forms developed for his birthday celebrations, which in spite of minor differences in time and place show the same general features everywhere and are comprised under the name Ladi al-Ma'dhid or briefly Ma'dhid al-Nabi. An anticipation of the Ma'dhid celebration is found in Egypt as early as the middle and later Fatimid period. During the period of office of the vizier al-Madjal (487-515), we hear that the 'four Ma'dhid' were abolished but a little later received in all their old glory (Makrizi, al-Ma'dhid, i. 466; for the description of the festival: i. 433 sqq.). The celebration still took place in broad daylight and participation was practically limited to the official and religious circles of the city. There were not yet any preliminary celebrations; but we already have a solemn procession of all the dignitaries to the palace of the caliph, in whose presence — he sits, covered with a veil on one of the balconies of the palace — the three Badshi of Cairo (cf. above, ii., p. 928) in succession deliver a religious address, during which a special ceremonial is observed. As to the matter of the discourses, we only know that they were like those delivered on the nights of the illumination so that they presumably dealt mainly with the occasion of the celebration. It is interesting to note that the ma'dhid ceremonies here are not confined to that of the Prophet but the ma'dhids of 'Ali, Fatima and even that of the reigning Caliph, the Imam al-Hadi, are similarly observed. As in the fundamental idea of these celebrations (Ma'dhid al-I'mam al-Hadi), Shi'a influence can also be traced in separate elements of it. It had not yet come to be a festival of the common people in the time of the Fatimid. This no doubt explains why — except in Makrizi and Kalkagandi, the great historians of Fatimid Cairo — there is hardly any reference to these celebrations in the literature emanating from Sunni circles, not even when writers like 'Ali Paşa Mubarak are dealing with features peculiar to Cairo and deal very fully with the history of the Ma'dhid festival.

The memory of these Fatimid ma'dhid seems to have almost completely disappeared before the festivals in which Muslim authors unanimously find the origin of the Ma'dhid, the Ma'dhid which we first find celebrated in Arbelia in 604 by al-Makhdum Sahib al-Din al-Kolturi, a brother-in-law of Saladin. The fullest account is given by a somewhat later contemporary, the great historian Ibn Khallikan (d. 681) on whom later writers continually base their statements (e.g. al-Suyuti, Ittad al-Ma'dhid [Broekelmann, G.A.L. ii., 157] and others). The personality of the ruler, his period so disturbed by the turmoil of the Crusades, and his milieu to which Ibn Khallikan calls special attention, lead us to suggest marked Christian influence in the development of this celebration; his close relations with the Sufi movement on the other hand suggest the possibility of influence of quite a different nature. This is clear from the description of the celebrations. Preparations are begun long before and people come in from remote districts. The prince takes special care that the visitors are housed in splendid wooden kubbahs specially built and they are entertained with music, singing and all kinds of amusements (mash, jugglers etc.). The streets of the town were for weeks as busy as on the occasion of an annual fair. On the eve of the Ma'dhid a torchlight procession took place from the citadel of the town to the khankah, led by the prince after the maghrib salat. Next morning the whole populace assembled in front of the khankah, where a wooden tower had been erected for the ruler and a pulpit for the hadj. From this tower the prince surveyed not only the crowd assembled to hear the address but also the troops summoned to be reviewed on the adjoining maidan. We are told nothing of the substance of the address. On its conclusion the prince summoned the distinguished guests up to the tower to give them robes of honour. The people were then feasted at the prince's expense in the maidan, while the notables were entertained in the khankah. The following night was spent by the prince like so many of the Sufis in samā ('Ibn Khallikan, Bllak 1299, ii., 550 sqq.).

In contrast to the Fatimid celebrations, what is specially striking here is the large share taken in the festival by the Sufis and the common people, a circumstance which is all the more notable, as it is probably in this association with Sufism that we have the reasons for the later great popularity of the Ma'dhid. At the same time the torchlight procession, really foreign to Muslim sentiment, and borrowed from contemporary Christian customs at festivals deserves our attention; it is not found at the celebration in Cairo which was purely a day ceremony, while the lavish entertainment of all present, especially with sweets, and the addresses are found in both cases. In this remarkable ceremonial, we seem really to have the foundation of all Ma'dhid celebrations. With the great political and religious movement, which we may call Saljuq reaction, the Ma'dhid reached Egypt in Saladin's time, where it is significant that Sufism very quickly took deep roots, thus preparing the way for an observance like the Ma'dhid, which is essentially kept up by popular religious sentiment.

The observance of the festival spread sooner
or later from here to Mecca where its old form was transformed. Its further progress was along the coast of North Africa to Ceuta, Tlemcen and Fès to Spain but it also went eastwards to India, so that ultimately the whole Muslim world is united on this day in a ceremonial, frequently of unprecedented splendour, but alike everywhere in its main features. We have innumerable descriptions of the festival from all parts of the Muslim world, most fully for Mecca (Chronik der, ed. Wustenfeld, iii. 438 sq.; Ibn Hadjar al-Haitami, Mawlid (Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 389); for modern times: Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 57 sqq.), where the celebrations have always been famous, for Egypt (Muh. Tawfiq al-Bakri, Bait al-Sidde, Cairo 1323, p. 404 sqq.; Lane, Manners and Customs (1871), ii. 166 sqq.) and the Indies (Snouck Hurgronje, Achehneyer, i. 207; do., Verspreide Geschichten, ii. 8 sqq.; Herklotz, Corte des saints (1860), p. 13; here it is frequently not the birth but the death of the Prophet that is commemorated). The Turkish element in Islam also has not resisted the advance of the celebration of the Mawlid (Turk.: Mevlid). Since Sulṭān Murād III introduced it in 996 into the Ottoman empire, it has enjoyed increasing popularity. Besides the lit has been celebrated like a national festival. Accurate descriptions of the festival as celebrated in the older period of the court of Constantinople (Mouradge d’Ohsson, Tablīq general, Paris 1787, i. 255 sqq.; G. O. R., viii. 441) clearly reveal its relationship with the festivals of a more popular nature in other lands of Islam.

One element in particular is very prominent, and that is the most characteristic one of the later celebrations, namely the recital of mawlid as i.e. panegyrical poems of a very legendary character, which start with the birth of Muḥammad and praise his life and virtues in the most extravagant fashion. The origin of these addresses is already to be found in the religious addresses in Fīhum Cairo and in Arbela and perhaps in part at least go back to the sermon usual at Christian festivals. The Kāl-Tawfiq fi Madīl al-Sirīfī, which Ibn Diyāh composed during his stay in Arbela at the suggestion of Kobkurt was already famous as a mawlid at this period (Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 310). It was not till later times however that mawlid became a predominant element in the celebration, along with torchlight processions, feasting and the fairs in the street, ever increasing in size. In Mecca, for example, at the present day they form the main feature of the celebration in the mosque; among the pious they are the most popular evening entertainment for days before the celebration and teachers interrupt their lectures in order to deliver mawlid to the students and the people on the streets and in the coffee houses find edification and entertainment in listening to them. The number of such mawlid is quite considerable. Beside the famous but not very popular Burād Sa’ad of Kaḥb, Zuhair of the older period, the Burda and the Hanziya of al-Buṣrī and their numerous imitations, there are a whole series of regular mawlid, some of which are intended to instruct like that of Ibn Hadjar al-Haitami, others purely edifying like a shorter version of it, and notably that of Ibn al-Dżawīl (G.A.L., i. 503) and al-Barzanjī (G.A.L., i. 384). In addition to those in Arabic, there are a great many mawlid in Turkish (Irmg. Engelke, Sulejmān Tschiblisch’s Lied gedicht, 1926). It is significant of the part played by these poems, that they have passed from the mawlid celebrations to other festivals, so that the word has actually become a name for “festival” and particularly “feast” (Cażima; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 147, 154 and pass.; Becker, in Isl., ii., 1911, p. 26 sqq.). Quite apart from any festivals, the recitation of mawlid is popular, in Palestine for example in fulfilment of a religious vow (T. Canaan, in Journal of the Palestine Or. Soc., viii., 1926, p. 55 sqq.; cf. also the introductory anecdote to the mawlid alleged to be by Ibn al-ʿArabī (G.A.L., i. 441)). Like the substance of these mawlid, the form is also very regular. Prose and poetry alternate, interrupted frequently by appeals to utter blessings on the Prophet. Dhikr are usually added at the end.

The Mawlid as the finest expression of reverence for Muḥammad has found almost general recognition in Islam, as fulfilling a religious need of the people and as a result of the strength of the Sūfī movement. This must not however blind us to the fact that at all times there has also been vigorous opposition to it. This is found as early as the festival of Arbela (al-Suyūtī, Ḥusn al-Maṣāḥif). The celebration is a bid’a, a religious innovation, which is in sharp contrast to the Sūfī doctrine. A large number of the Sūfī advocates of the festival confess this and the strictly orthodox, who adhere to the sunna, reject it most emphatically. But, as in so many other things, practice has here proved stronger than dogmatic theory. Once the festival had been thoroughly established in the religious life of the people, it was bound in time to find approval as an element of the ʿilm. Its supporters found it easy to get this bid’a legitimated, in theory at least, as a bid’a ḥasan. When the festival had been accepted by the consensus of the community, the essential thing had been done and legitimate ground for opposition had been removed. While the opposition thus finds itself reduced to combatting the outer forms of the festival and its developments, its supporters are never tired of calling attention to the merit that lies in feeding the poor, in the more frequent reading of the Kurān and mawlid, and in the joy of the leisure of the Prophet and all that the day brings with it. It is significant of the character of the opposition that the opponents object to those very forms which show the influence of Sūfīsm (dancing, samā’, ecstatic phenomena etc.) or Christianity (processions with lights etc.). The most interesting document of this feud is a fīrat al-Suyūtī (d. 911; Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 157: Ḥusn al-Maṣāḥif fi ‘Amal al-Mawlid) which gives a brief survey of the history of the festival, then discusses the pros and cons very fully and concludes that the festival deserves approval as a bid’a ḥasan, provided that all abuses are avoided. Ibn Ḥadżar al-Haṭṭāmi in his Mawlid and Kaḥb al-Dīn (Chronik der Stadt Mecca, iii. 439 sq.) take the same view, while Ibn al-Ṭāhilī (d. 737) in a more strict Mālikī condemns it most vehemently (K. al-Mawlid [1320], i. 153 sqq.).

Although the height of this struggle was apparently reached in the eighth—ninth century, it did not completely die down in later years; indeed it received new life with the coming of the Wahhabis. The cult of the Prophet is in such contradiction in their fundamental principle, the restoration of the ideal purified primitive Islam, that we can understand that they should completely
MAWLID—AL-MAYURKI

disapprove of this, the most popular and most splendid expression of it. In doing this, they are only putting into action the protests of the extreme Ḥanbalī Ibn Taimīyā (d. 728), the famous precursor of their movement, against innovations which are contrary to the sunna (Ibn Taimīyā against the holding of ḥatams in the Mawlid night: Fatwā[Cairo 1326], i. 312). Similar ideas are still found to-day even where Wahhābism is rejected, notably in the school which Goldziher calls “Kulturwahhābismus”, founded by the celebrated Muhammad ʿAbdul (d. 1905), who in connection with the worship of saints condemns the Mawlid also, in the periodical al-Manā (Goldziher, Richtungen des Islam, Koranauslegung, p. 369 sqq.).

In the reverence shown to other Muslim saints, the Mawlids also play a great part. Although the success of an appeal to a saint does not depend on particular days, yet certain days and bithdays in particular are regarded as particularly favourable. These celebrations are often connected with places, to which a certain sanctity has been attached from pre-Islamic times (the Mawlid of Shāhīn Asān al-Badawi in ʿAṣr: Goldziher, Muḥ. Stud., n. 318 sqq.). There are also other Mawlids of nameless saints. In the dervīsh orders, next to that of the Prophet, the Mawlid of the founder is held in particular popularity. “Alī Pasha Mustaṭb (Khīṭṭ Ḫudīda, i. 90; iii. 129 sqq.) mentions a large number of such festivities in modern Cairo, the characteristic features of which, he says, are the brilliant illumination of the town, the ceremonial procession (Muḥād: at the Mawlid al-Nabī: muwakī; cf. P. Kahle, in Ṭīl., vi., 1916, p. 155 sqq.) and the great feasts. One cannot now imagine the popular religion of Egypt without these festivities.


AL-MAWSIL. [See Mosul.]

MAWSIM. (fr. the root mws—“to stagnate”), market festival. In this sense the term is used in ʿĀṣī, especially in connection with the markets of early Arabia, such as those which were held in ʿUkā, Madīyān, Dūḥa ʿl-Mudājā, ʿAtāfa, etc. (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣh, b. 150: Tabārī, sūra 2, b. 34). At these markets the worst elements of Arabia gathered (al-mawsim yajmmara ṭawāʾ al-mārūn, Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣh, b. 31). Advantage was also taken of these assemblies to make public proclamations and inquiries, e. g. in order to regulate the affairs of deceased persons (Bukhārī, Ḫumr, b. 13: Muṣāfīk al-ʿAṯārī, b. 27). As the pilgrimage was at the same time one of the chief markets of early Arabia, the term mawsim is often combined with it (mawsim al-ḥajj, Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣh, b. 150: Tabārī, b. 1; Abū Dāwūd, Muḥ. b. 6).

Upon this basis the term mawsim has developed chiefly in two directions: it has acquired the general meaning of (religious) festival (Dozy, Supplement, s. v.) and that of season. In the Lebanon mawsim denotes the season of the preparation of silk (Bistānī, Muḥīṭ, s. v.).

In India and in European terminology referring to these parts of the world, it has acquired the meaning of season in connection with the weather-conditions special to these regions, such as the regularly returning winds and rainstorms. Monsoon, monsoon, monsoon, and other corruptions of the term are found in this literature.

Bibliography: apart from the works mentioned in the art. cf. Līḥūn al-ʿArab, xvi. 123 sqq.; Wellhausen, Rote arabischen Heidentums, Berlin 1897, p. 84 sqq. 246; Yule and Bernal, Hobson-Jobson, ed. Crooke, London 1903, s. v. monsoon. (A. J. Wensinck)

MAWWAL. [See Mawliya.]

MAWZŪNA, a small silver coin struck by the Sharifs of Mawjūd in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. It was the smallest silver piece and equivalent to 24 copper fulls or a quarter dirham. Another name for the mawzûna was ʿalīja. In 1911 (1330) copper coins of the value of 10, 5, 2 mawzûnas were issued, the mawzûna being now the equivalent of a centime. On recent issues the name mawzûna has disappeared and its place is taken by a new coin.

Bibliography: J. J. Marcel, Tableau général des Monnaies ayant cours en Algérie, Paris 1844, p. 9, 36—40. (J. A. ALLAN)

MAYURKĪ, a nisba of three Arabic authors, belonging to Mārijū (Mallorca), the largest of the Balearic Islands.

I. the poet Abu Ṭāhān ʿAlī b. ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿUza, d. in 475 (1082), according to others in 477 at Kazima near Baghdād; poems by him are preserved in the MS. of the Escorial in Dernigen, No. 467, 2; cf. al-Suyūṭī, Buḥaynī al-Waṣīl, 1327; Yaḥyā, Mirjam, iv. 722.


III. ʿAbd ʿAllāh b. ʿAbd Allah al-Tardjuānī, born in Majorca of Christian parents, studied in Lerida and Bologna, then went to Tunis on the advice of Bishop Nicolas Martell, who was himself a Muslim in secret, there adopted Islam and in 732 (1340) wrote a pamphlet against Christianity entitled ʿArūf al-ʿArīf (Aṭīb) bāʾl-ṣāʾīl al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbd Allah al-Ṣāḥib; MS. in the Brit. Museum Or. 5942; Ellis and Edwards, Descriptive List, p. 131; in Stambul, Ḫālīs, No. 5275 (with Turkish translation), Fāṭih, No. 2909, Asʿad, No. 1147—1148; pr. Cairo
MAZAGAN (old Arabic name: al-Buridja, "the little fortress"; modern Arabic name: al-Djedida "the new"), a town on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, 7 miles S.E. of the mouth of the Wadi Umm Rabī'. Its population in 1926 was 19,159, of whom 14,141 were Muslims and 3,385 Jews.

Some writers think that Mazagan was built on the site of the Pouzaiez or Pouzae ze of Ptolomy, or Portus Rubialis of Pliny. The texts however do not say that there was a town there, but only a roadstead frequented by ships. The situation seems to have remained unchanged throughout the middle ages. As to the name Mazagan, it seems to appear for the first time in al-Bakīt (eleventh century a.d.). This geographer, enumerating the ports of Morocco on the Atlantic coast, mentions a Marifen (de Slane's reading), which should undoubtedly be deemed to Masjīghan, a form attested by Idrisi (eleventh century). The same place-name is found in a manuscript collection of edifying anecdotes relating to the great saint of Azemmūr: Sidi Abū Sha'a'īr, who also lived in the twelfth century. Mazighan appears here as a fishing village between Azemmūr and the rivāt of Tī (q.v.). The proximity of these two fairly important towns prevented it from developing. The roadstead is marked on a folio of the Burj of Marrakesh and portolans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (publ. by Ch. de La Roncière, Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen-Age, 1925) which give the forms Messegan (1530 and 1573), Maseghen (1567), Mazagem, intermediate between Mazighan and the Mazagō of the Portuguese. The latter, from the end of the sixteenth century, used to come to the harbour of Mazagan for cargoes of the grain of Dukkāla to supply the capital. In 1502, a squadron commanded by a Portuguese gentleman, Jorge de Mello, caught by a storm in the Straits of Gibraltar was driven to Mazagan and landed there. The Portuguese installed themselves in a deserted tower there to defend themselves against a possible attack by the inhabitants. Jorge de Mello soon returned to Portugal and obtained the king's permission to build a fortress at Mazagan. Although the story of these events is only recorded by writers of the eighteenth century, it must be in keeping with the facts, for letters patent of king Dom Manuel dated May 21, 1505, give Jorge de Mello the captnacy of the castle which he is authorised to build at his own expense at Mazagan. He did not however make use of his privilege for, when on Aug. 27, 1513 the Portuguese army sent to take Azemmūr under the command of the Duke of Braganza landed at Mazagan, there was neither town nor fortress there except the old ruined tower (al-Buridja). The difficulty of entering the port of Azemmūr led the Portuguese to establish a more accessible base at Mazagan. During the summer of 1514 under the direction of the architects Diego and Francisco da Arruda, a square castle flanked by towers at each of the four corners was built. One of these bastions was formed by the old tower, al-Buridja, the name of which survived among the natives as that of the Portuguese town. This early castle still exists almost in its entirety. Particularly striking is a magnificent subterranean hall, the vaulting of which is supported by 25 pillars. It was probably, rather than a salle d'armes, a huge granary built to hold the contributions in grain paid by the tribes subjected to the Portuguese protectorate. It was at a later date used as a cistern to hold supplies of drinking-water for the garrison, when the place blockaded by rebellious tribes had no longer any taxes in grain to collect, which happened in 1541. For ten years before, the situation of the Portuguese stations on the coast, in view of the religious and anti-foreign movement stirred up by the coming and successes of the Sa'idian Shāhīd, had been so bad that the king of Portugal thought of abandoning several of his fortresses. The taking of the town of Sāfī and the capture of Guer (Agadir) by the shah (March 12, 1541) was a warning. John III decided to evacuate Sāfī and Azemmūr and to concentrate on Mazagan, a more favourable and more easily defended position, all the Portuguese forces he wanted to leave in the south of Morocco. The operation was carried through in the autumn (before Nov. 6). From the month of April onwards the work of putting the town in a state of defence had been going on. The work was actually pushed on during the last months of the year 1541 under the direction of the great architect João da Castilho, who used plans prepared by an Italian engineer, Benito di Ravenna. This was when the walls of Mazagan were built as they still stand to-day.

In retaining Mazagan the Portuguese wanted to keep a base along the coast to secure protection for the route to India. They also hoped that the fortress would serve them as a base for the conquest of Morocco, when a favourable conjuncture should arise, which however never happened. In fact for the more than two hundred years in which the Portuguese retained it, the possession of Mazagan only served them as a pretext to obtain from the Pope bulls of Crusades, which supplied the Papal Treasury with appreciable revenues. The tribes kept the town so closely blockaded that the inhabitants could not go outside its walls without military protection. The collection of wood and the cultivation of a few gardens, continually devastated by the natives, gave rise to continual skirmishes. The Muslims of the country around had built two little towns, a few miles from Mazagan, Fâby, across the Almimf and Fâby, Awlad Alwâyih, where they entrenched themselves to keep up the blockade and where the devout, desirous of acquiring merit from participation in the holy war, used to come to discharge a few shots at Mazagan. Badly supplied by sea, often a prey to famine and epidemics, the garrison and population however lived in sufficient security under their powerful walls, against which the tribes could do nothing. On several occasions however, they had to resist vigorous attacks. In April 1562 Muḥammad, son
of the Sa'dián Sultan, ‘Abd Allâh al-Ghâlib b’il-lâh, at the head of a vast horde of tribal warriors laid siege to Mazagan. Two assaults were repulsed and the besiegers lost heart. On Aug. 4, 1623, the place, attacked by 5,000 Muslims during the absence of the governor, who was led into an ambuscade, owed its safety to his wife who ordered the gates to be shut, organised the defence, distributed arms to the whole population, women as well as men, and sent them on to the walls. During the disorder which accompanied the decline of the Sa’dián dynasty, the governors of Mazagan seem to have succeeded in ratifying the blockade and resuming relations to some extent with the tribes. The mandâhar Sidi Muhammad al-Ayâshî, to put an end to this, attacked the Portuguese in 1639 and inflicted some losses on them. Mâlâwî Is’âmî, occupied with the siege of Ceuta, never seriously tried to take Mazagan. The honour of retaking it belonged to his grandson Sidi Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allâh. The Sultan came to besiege it in person at the end of Jan. 1769. The place held out successfully for five weeks, but, the order to abandon it having arrived from Lisbon, the governor surrendered on honourable terms. The garrison and civilian population returned to Portugal with their arms and baggage. Among the historical manuscripts on March 10, 1769 the Portuguese explored another town which did great damage; the sultan entered a ruined town which he repopulated in part but it remained in so miserable a state that it was called al-Mahdâmâ “the ruined”, until, in the reign of Sidi Muhammad b. Hîshâm, in 1240 (1824-25) it was restored by Sidi Muhammad b. al-‘Atîyah, kâdî of Dukkela and Tâma-na, who gave it the name of al-Qâdîâ through which it is generally known to Muslims.


MAZANDARÂN 

A province to the south of the Caspian Sea bounded on the west by Gilân, on the east by the province of Astârâbâd (q.v. formerly Gurgân).

The name of Gurgân to the Iranians was the “land of the Wolves” (voirkîn), the region to its west was peopled by “Mazanian dwâs” (Barbâoma, Alter. Wetterbuch, col. 1169 under mazâmeya dawâ). Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, ii. 375, note 32, thought that Mazandaran was a “comparative of direction” (“Mazana-tara” cf. Sîrîn and Shîrâstî) but Noldeke’s hypothesis is the more probable (Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., ii. 178) who thinks that Mazâr-dar = “the gate of Mazân” was a particular place, distinct from the part of the country known as Tâpurâstân. [A village of Mesdar (?) is marked on Stahl’s map 12. km. south of Firuzkôh.] In any case the name Mazandaran seems to have no connection with the “Mazandarán” which according to Ptolomy, vi., ch. v., was situated between Parthia and Ariëa (Hari-rûd) and was connected by Olsoschen (Mas- daran und Mazandaran, Monatsberichte Ab. Berlin, 1877, p. 775-783) with Mazâr-daran, a station 12 farsaks west of Sarakhs; cf. Ibn Khurâddîbîh, p. 24; Maqaddasi, p. 351 [ref. however the late source of 881 (1476) quoted by Dorn, Melanges asiat., vii. 42].

The Avestán and Pahlavi quotations given by Darmesteter, loc. cit., show to what degree the people of Mazandaran were regarded by the Persians as a foreign group and little assimilated. According to the Bûnâqânî, xv. 28, transl. West, p. 58, the “Mazandaran” were descended from a different pair of ancestors to those of the Iranians and Arabs. The Shâh-nâmâ reflects similar ideas (cf. the episode of Khal-kûs war in Mazandaran and esp. Vullers ed. i., p. 332, v. 290: the war is waged against Afrîman; p. 364, v. 792-795: Mazandaran is contrasted with Iran; p. 574, v. 955: the hestial appearance of the king of Mazandaran among the inhabitants of Iran; p. 432, d. b. 142: the “Shâh-nâmâ” was written by the king of Mazandaran, the king of the country, whom the people call “Shâh-nâm-a” (q.v. the “Shâh-nâmâ” to the west of Harâmân) and their place was taken by the Tâpyre (Tâpyre), who must have occupied the mountains (north of Simnân), and the Amdarâs (Amderas) to the region of Khwar (Khwar to the east of Harâmân) and their place was taken by the Tâpyre, whose name came to be applied to the whole province.

The Arabs only know the region as Tabâristân (q.v. the Pahlavi coins). The name Mazandaran only reappears in the Safîwî period in Ibn al-Athîr, v. 34, in speaking of the deaths of 8 farsaks by Alp Arslân (586) it says that Mazandaran was given to the emir Inandê Baigu. Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 14, and Yâkûn, iii. 502, 99, that Mazandaran was a name for Tabâristân only is of fairly modern origin (in Arabic?) but according to Zakariyâ Khâzîmin, p. 270, “the Persians call Tabâristân Mazandaran”. Hamdallâh Mustawfî distinguishes between Mazandaran and Tabâristân. In his time (1340) the 7 tumen of the “willayât of Mazandaran” were: Djûrdjûn, Mûrusîtûk (q.v.), Astârâbâd, Amôl and Kustâm-dûr, Dîhistân, Rûghad and Nishâr-rustûk (q.v.); on the other hand the diyar-i Kâmîs sea-Tabâristân included Sîmân, Dâmghân, Firuzkôh, a town of Damâvâd, Firerim etc. We find a similar distinction in Khwânîmâr, ed. Dorn, p. 83.

Geography: The actual breadth of Mazandaran (Rahûn) is 300 miles from east to west and 46 to 70 miles from north to south. Except for the strip along the coast — broader in the east than the west — Mazandaran is a very mountainous country. The main range of the Elburz forms barriers parallel to the south of the Caspian, while the ridges running down to the sea cut the country up into a multitude of valleys open on the north only. The principal of the latter ridges is the Mazâr-dûr, which separates Tabâristân from Tûn-kûn. The latter is bordered on the south by the chain of the Elburz in the strict sense, which
separates it from the valley of the Shāhrūd (formed by the waters of the Alamūt and Talakān and flowing westward into the Safid-rūd).

To the east of Māzār-e-Shāh, a number of ranges run out of the central massif of the Elburz: 1. to the east the chain of Nūr which cuts through the Harāz-vey and 2. to the S.E. the southern barrier which forms the watershed between the Caspian and the central plateau. Between the two, rises in isolation the great volcanic cone of Damavand (9,900 feet).

To the east of Damavand the southern barrier rejoins the continuation of the Nūr and the new line of the watershed of eastern Māzārdar is marked by the ranges of Band-i-vey, Sawād-kūh, Shāh-mirzād (to the south of Simnān), of Harāz- djarb (to the south of Dāmghān), of Shāh-kūh (to the south of Shāhrūd) etc.

The rivers of Māzārdar are of two kinds. A hundred short streams run straight down into the sea from the outer mountains of Māzārdar. Much more important are the rivers which rise in the interior and after draining many valleys form a single great river when they break through the last barrier. Such are (from west to east): the Sarūd; the Čalles; the Harāz-vey, which drains the region of mount Damavand and then runs past Amol; the Bābāl (the river of Bāfrūḏ); the Tālar (river of ʿAllābād); the Tidjin (river of Sāi) and the Nikā (or Aspeynāt) which flows from east to west, its valley forms a corner between the southern chain (cf. above) and the mountains which surround the Gulf of Artašābd on the north.

strip of lowland between the Gulf of Astarâbâd and the mountains; cf. Ibn Rusta (p. 149) who speaks of the brick wall (zūbūr) and of the Gate of ʿUmar through which travellers had to pass (cf. ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 303). To the west the town of Shâli (Câli) was situated on the frontier of Dailam (Ibn Rusta, p. 150: fi naqād 'aladwâr) but later the valley of the Sarâbâb-dûr (Kalâr-dûr) seems to have been annexed to Tabaristan. Farther west the coast of Tuṅkâbûn was governed sometimes with Mâzândarân and sometimes with Gilân.

The Arab geographers distinguished between the plain (al-sâliha) and the mountains (al-dâjâbiya) of Tabaristan (Iṣṭakhrī, p. 211, 271). The important towns of Tabaristan were in the lowlands: Amol, Nâtil, Shâli (Câli), Kâla (Kalâr), Mila, Târdji (Tûdi, Bardîji), ʿAin al-Humûn, Mâmûr (= Bârûfîrîsh), Sârî, Tâmishâ (cf. Iṣṭakhrī, p. 207; cf. Mûkaddasî, p. 353). The principal town (madîna) of Tabaristan in the time of Yaḥyâ, p. 276, still was Sârî (p. r.), but in the time of Masûd, Tâmûshî, p. 179, Iṣṭakhrī, p. 211, and Ibn Hawâkî, 271, the principal town (Jâpatâ) and the most nourishing one in Tabaristan was Amol (larger than Kâzin).

The mountain area was quite distinct and its connection with the plain is not very clear in the Arabic texts; cf. the confused summary in Iṣṭakhrī, p. 204. Tabârî, iii. 1295 under the year 224 (838) distinguishes three mountains in Tabaristan: 1. the mountain of Wandâd-Hurmuz in the centre (wasâf); 2. that of his brother Wandâsândjian (i.e) Bâlandâd b. Kâsin and 3. that of Shahrî b. Surkhbî b. Bâlî. Now according to Ibn Rusta, p. 151, (the Kârînî) Wandâd-Hurmuz lived near Dânbâwût. On the other hand, the same writer, p. 149, says that during the rule of Tabaristan by Dâjrî b. Yaîrîd, Wandâd-Hurmuz had bought 1,000 qair of domain lands (gâzâfî) outside the town of Sîrî. These off dijâb seem to correspond to the region round the sources of the rivers Tûdîn and Nîkâ which in Persian is called Haẓâr-dîjar. Later, the lands of Wandâd-Hurmuz included the greater part of eastern Mâzândarân. "Wandâsândjian seems to have ruled over the greater part of Mâzândarân for his capital Muz was the rallying point from which expeditions set out against Dâlbâwût. Finally the mountain of Shahrîn comprised the S.E. part of Mâzândarân, for according to Ibn al-Fakhrî, p. 305, it was close to Kûmî.

In the time of Iṣṭakhrî, the three divisions of the mountains specified are: the mountains of Rûbândî, of Fâdâbânî and of Kûrîn. "They are high mountains (dijâb) and each of them (gâzâfî) has a chief".

Rûbândî, according to Ibn Hawâkî, lay between Râî and Tabarîn. Barholtz, Oeter, p. 155 emends the name to Rûянî and identifies it with Rûянî. Ibn Rusta, p. 149 says that Rûянî, near the lands of Râî, did not form part of Tabaristan but formed a special kâra with the capital Kârdîja which was the headquarters of the Wall (cf. Kârdîstâkî in the buhûq of al-Umârî). According to this, Rûянî = Rûянî is to be situated in the S.W. part of Mâzândarân (north of Tabarîn). In the Mongol period, ʿâmidâlah Kâzinî, p. 160, is the first to mention Rûянî (on the Shâh-dûr). As Vasmîr, loc. cit., p. 122—125, has shown, Rûşandîr later included all western Mâzândarân between Sâkhtasr (Gilân) and Amol.
Rustamār therefore included Rūyān, without the two terms being completely synonymous.

Dībāl Kārin had only one town Shāhmār. a
day’s journey from Sāriya. The local chiefs of the
kārin lived in the stronghold of Firrum which must have stood on the western branch of
the river Tidjin, which later flows past Sāri. The
modern bālūk of Firrim is in the Hazār-Djarib
(more accurately in its western half which is called
Dudāniga). According to Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 95, the
possessions of the Kārnids included the mountains
of Wandūn-umid (ibid., p. 25; the water supply
of the mosque of Amol came from this mountain).
Amol, Lāfīr (on the eastern source of the river
Bābul which runs to Fārsūrūgh) and Firrim, "which
is called Kūh-i Kārin". According to Yāqūt, iii,
283, the lands of the Kārnids included Dībāl
Shawrin (cf. above) which Tīmāmd al-Saftāna, Khišīb
al-Tadwin, p. 42, identifies with Sawad-kūh i.e.
the sources of the Tālār (river of "Alībāb between
Amol and Fārsūrūgh"); the pass leading to Sawad-
kūh is still called Shafīn < Shawrin

The Dībāl Pādišān (ناوئرین) lay a day’s journey from Sāri.
The district had no cathedral mosque; the chief
lived in the village of Uran (Ibn Hāshāl, p. 268,17;
Uram-khūst, Aram). As Vasmer has shown, p. 127—
130, this must be sought on the middle course
of the rivers of Fārsūrūgh and Alībāb (to the
north of Lāfīr and near Shīrgāh).

Bibliography. R. G. A., s. v. Dailam, Tabārīstān,
Amol, Sāriya etc. Ibn al-Fakhīr, p. 301—314, in
particular gives very detailed information about
Tabārīstān. Mashīd, Murūd al-Dhakāb, index;
338 (of little originality); Zakarīya Šaftāna. Alīgar
al-Buštīn (clime iv.): Amol, p. 160: Bilād al-
Dailam, p. 221: Rūyān, p. 250: Tabārīstān; Yāqūt.
cf. Dorn, Auszuge, 1858, p. 2—45, where are
collected all the articles relating to Tabārīstān
[but the text of Wūstenfeld’s edition is preferable].
Hamdallah Šaftāna. Nawâl al-Khulūb. G. M. S.
p. 159 and 161: Dorn, Auszuge aus 14 morgen-
zeitlichen Schriften berücksichtigt, Kaspische Meer,
Mīlān, 1854, pp. 658—661, family and
family, and p. 52—92; cf. also the historical
bibliography. European works: Spiegel, Fran. alter-
orientalische, 1871, i. 64—74: Don. Castiglione, 1875
(a mass of rather undigested information); Geiger,
Ostasiatische Kultur, 1882, index; Brunnhof, Von
Pontus bis zum Indus, Leipzig 1890, p. 75—93:
Alburz and Mazandarān (the author seeks to explain
Indian geography from Sanskrit texts); Barthold,
Istor.-geogr. obzor Irana, St Petersburg 1903,
295; Le Strange, The Land of the Eastern Caliphate,
p. 368—376; Vasmer, Die Erhebung etc.

History. The local dynasties of Mazandarān
fall into three classes: 1. local families of pre-
Islamic origin, 2. the Allīd sayids and 3. local
families of secondary importance. 1. The
second name of the Sāsiānian dynasty, the
king of Tabārīstān and of Padāshvārgar (Marquart,
Erzähler, p. 130: "the district opposite the region of
Khāzār"); Farshūwagār is a misreading of the
name, which is also found in the Bundūdshīk, xii.
17) was Gushnaspa, whose ancestors had reigned
since the time of Alexander. In 529—536 Tabārīstān
was ruled by the Sāsiānian prince Kāyu, son of
Kawāt. Anāširwān put in his place Zāmhr, who

traced his descent from the famous smith Kāwa.
His dynasty ruled till 645 when Gil Gāburga (a
descendant of the Sāsiānian Djamasp, son of Perzūr
annexed Tabārīstān to Gīlān. These families, on
whom their coins might throw some light (cf.
below), had descendants ruling in the Muslim period.

The Bwāndids (who claimed descent from Kayvān), provided three lines: the first 45—597
(665—1007) was overthrown on the conquest of
Tabārīstān by the Ziyārid Kābūs b. "Ushāmir;
the second reigned from 566 (1073) to 606 (1210)
when Mazandarān was conquered by Muhammad
Kāvārizmshāh; the third ruled from 635 (1237)
to 750 (1349) as vassals of the Mongols. The
last representative of the Bwāndids was slain by
Ahrāsāyāb Cūlāwī.

The Kārinids (in the Kūh-i Kārin) claimed
descent from Kārin, brother of Zārhmūr (cf. above).
Their last representative Māyāzīr (9.v.) was put
to death in 224 (839).

The Pādíspānids (Rūyān and Rustamār), claimed
descend from the Dāhbyids of Gīlān (their
eponym was the son of Gil Gāburga; cf.
above). They came to the front about 40 (660)
and during the rule of the Alids were their vassals.
Later they were vassals of the Bwāndids and
Bwāndids, who depose them in 586 (1190). The dynasty,
restored in 606, survived till the time of Timūr;
one of its branches (that of Kārūn b. Kayvāmarth)
reigned till 975 (1567) and the other (that of
Iskandar b. Kayvāmarth) till 984 (1574).

II. Alongside of these native dynasties the
Alids were able to establish themselves, princi-
ually in Tabārīstān. In 250 the people of Rūyān,
rebellious against the governor, sent to Rayy for
the Zaidi Sayyid Ḥasan b. Zaid, a descendant of the
Caliph ʿAlī in the sixth generation. This (Hasanīd)
branch ruled in Tabārīstān till 316 (928). The
Hasanīd branch ruled from 304 to 537 (?). Another
dynasty of Marāgāsh sayyids ruled in Mazandarān
between 760 (1358) and 880 (1475). The founder
of this dynasty was Kīwām al-Dīn, a descendant
of ʿAlī in the twelfth generation. A third family
of Murtaḍāi sayyids is known in Hazār-Djarib
between 760 and 1000 A. D.

III. The noble families who enjoyed considerable
influence, mainly in their fiefs, are very numerous.
Rabino mentions the Kiyā of Čalāw (at Amol,
Tabālān and Rustamār) between 795 A. H. and
900 A. H.; the Kiyā Djalālī of Sāri in 750—
765; the house of Rūfa spān of Sawad-kūh between
897 and 923; the Dīw in the period of
Shāh Tahmāsp in certain parts of Mazandarān;
the Banū Kādūs between 857 and 957; the
Banū Iskandar between 857 and 1006 and the
different princes of Tamishā, of Miyānūrūd, of
Lārdījān, of Māmūr, of Lāfīr etc.

Besides this confusion of feudal dynasties, a
series of conquerors from outside has ruled in
Mazandarān: the Arabs (their expeditions began
in 22 = 644; the final conquest took place under
al-Mamūr in 145—144) (cf. the archaistic, rather
dates and facts given are very contradictory,
as Vasmer has shown), the Tāshirs, the Saffārīds,
the Samānids, the Ziyārids, the Ghaznawīs, the
Saljuqs, the Khvārizmshāhs, the Mongols, the
Sarbadārs. Timūr and his descendants, the Safawīs.
Shāh Ismāʿīl sent an expedition to Mazandarān
in 923 (1517) but it was under Shāh Abdās that
the land was definitely incorporated in Persia in
1005 (1596). This monarch claimed hereditary
rights there from the connection of his family with the Saiyid Kiwam al-Din Marashi (Mom-\u00e7er. Tcheran, p. 354). Farahabad was founded in 1020 (1612) and in the next year Ashraf was built with its famous palaces.

\u00e7eyzari; Joshi, Iranian Names and Customs, 1854, p. 430-431 in Indian and Jastini in Iran d. v. 6, 1861, p. 547; Marquart, Erdurk, p. 129-136.

For the Muslim period: Baladwiri, p. 334-349; Tabari, index; Yaqobi, Historian, ed. Houtsma, n 329-339, 355, 447, 461, 478, 514, 582: Kitab al-lami, ed. Jong and de Goeje, p. 392-405, 502-516, 520-523; Ibn al-Fakhri, op. cit.; Ibn al-Ashir, index; as well as the local histories given below [a-a mark it the works which seem to be les]: Abu l-Hassan 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Madini (d. 235 = 949). Kitab Futuhal Dibal al-Tabaristan: Marvan-nama (written for Shahriyar b. Kairia who reigned from 486-503 = 1092-1109); 'Abd al-Hassan Muhammad Vaziri; 'Abd al-Hadi Yazdi; Muhammad b. al-Hassan ibn Isfan-
\u00e7eyzari, Tabi\u00e7ik Tabaristan (written in 615-1216), abbr transl. by E. G. Browne, G. M. S., 1905; the manuscript mentioned by Dorn has been continued to 842 (1458); Badr al-Ma\u00e7li Awiya\u00e7 Al\u00e7am, 'Takriqi Tabaristan (written for Fakhr al-Dawla Shah Ghabār, 761-780 = 1359-1378); 'Ali b. Qasim al-Din, 'Ali b. Mahmud al-Naqdh b. Kairia. 'Takriqi Tabaristan (written for the Kairi\u00e7i Mirza 'Ali before 881 = 1476, used by Zahir al-Din); Sadiq Zahir al-Din (born in 815 = 1412) b. Naser al-Din al-Marashi. 'Takriqi Tabaristan von Kairi b. Mardazar, 821-831 (1476), ed. Dorn, St. Petersburg 1266 (1850); Dorn's German transl. was printed in 1885 but only a few copies are known; Ibn Abu Musallum, 'Takriqi Mardazar (late unknown): Kitab Gilan Von Mardazar, Von Astarabad Von Simnan Von Dunghin Von Ghasrb (Pers MS of 1275 = 1859), cf. Dorn, Bericht); Muhammad Hassan Khan Pindar al-Sultana, Kitab al-Tawarin fi Asariqhish Bibian, Teheran 1311 (geography and history of Sava\u00e7-kh, lists of the Hwangdists, Paghman etc.). Cf. also the local histories of Gilan: Zahir al-Din Marashi, 'Takriqi Gilan Von Pudon-
\u00e7ian (to 1489), ed. Dorn, Rasht 1300 (1912). (Annex p. 476-498, correspondence of Khan Abu Khusrau, Gilan al-Din, Tal\u00e7ik Sha\u00e7 (880-920), ed. Dorn, 1858; 'Abd al-Fattah Haman, 'Takriqi Gilan (1923-1935), ed. Dorn, 1858; and the local histories of Dvshih: Abu Sa'id al-Rahmani, 'Takriqi al-Rahmani b. Muhammad al-Idrisi (d. 659 = 1014). 'Takriqi Astarabad, continued by Ibn al-Kasim Hanbali, Yusuf al-Sa\u00e7al al-Dvshinab (d. 427 = 1036) the author of a 'Takriqi Dvshinab (perhaps = Kitab Marfat al-Umama, Abu Dvshinab, written by Abu l-Kasim Hamza al-Sa\u00e7al in 689 = 1290, cf. the Catalogue of the Bodleiana, Oxford 1787 (Uli), p. 165, Arabic MSS, N. 740; 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Dvshinab, 712-717 (date unknown). A large number of Muhammadan sources relating to Mardazar have been collected by Dorn, Die Geschichte Tabaristans und der Serbde nach Mardazar, Mdm. de l'Acad. de St. Petersburg, 1850, vol. viii.; and Annuaire aus Musum, Schriftstellern betreffend d. Gesch. und Geographie, St. Petersburg 1858 (extracts from 22 works). For Timur's campaigns: Zafarnama, i. 348, 358, 379, 570, ii. 577; Muneedjilm-

European works: d'Ossou, Hist. des Mongols, 1833, ii 2, 10, 44, 48, 106-109 (Cintumur governor in Mardazar, 120-122, 193, 414-418 (Abaq). J. IV. 44, 45 (Mardazar in the campaign of Ghazan), 103; Rosenberg (Abu Sa'id in M.), 613, 622 (revolt of Yasawur), 685 (Hasan b. Chidan in M.), 726, 730 (Tughla Timur, q.v.), 739 (the Bardadars, q.v.); Melgunov, op. cit. (lists of the dynasties and governors of Mardazar); Rehatsche, The Bino and Bawabiam sayeheh, J. Bombay branch R. A., 1876, xii., p. 410-445 (according to Zahir al-Din, Mirkhod and the Munkhtahab al-Ta'uriv). Howorth, History of the Mongols, index (publ. in 1927); Horn in the Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii. 503 (Alidis); Lane-
\u00e7poole, The Musulm. Dvstotn, cf. the additions by Barthold in the Russ. transl., 1899, p. 290-293; Casanova, Les Ischephodos de Timur, in A Volumes... presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, p. 117-126 (the identification of Firm with Firuzkhi is wrong); Hout, Les Ziyarides, Min de l'Ardak des Iner, xlii, Paris 1922, index; Barthold, La place des provinces caspiennes dans l'histoire du monde musulman (Russ.), Baku 1925, p. 90-100 (Timur in Mardazar); Rabino, Les dynasties alavides du Mardazar, J. A., 1927, exv. 253-277 (lists without references); Zambur, Manuel de genial. et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, ch. ix. and tables C and P; Vasmor, Die Erkennung Tabaristans durch die Araber z. Zeit des Chalifs al-Manur, Islamica, 1927, n. 86-150 (very important analysis of the Muhammadan sources); Rabino, Mardazar und Astar-
\u00e7abad, 133-149 (lists of dynasties and governors detailed but without references); Vasmor, Die Musam d. Ischephodos und all Statthalter von Tabaristan (in preparation). On the Russian expeditions to Mardazar see Dorn, Cypria; Kostomarow, Bint Sterki Razorin (1668-1669), in Sobrevre io neniini, St. Petersburg 1903, Kniga I, vol. ii. 407-505 (Persian sources call the Cossack chief Sterki Razorin "Istun Guraz"); Butkow, Sur les evenements qui couru lieu en 1787 lors de la fondation d'un etablissement russe sur le golfe d'Astarabad (Russ.), Ann. Mus. Vautr. del. xxiii. 1839, p. 9; Butkow, Materiali dlia morni istorii Karakara, St. Petersburg 1869, index (in the Persian sources the leader of the Russian expedition of 1781 Count Woszninicki is called "Karaffa = Ghiy Senatekhan"). Archaeology. Bode, On a recently opened tumulus in the nighnessward of Astarabad, Archologia. London 1844, xxx. 248-255 (on the circumstances of the find made at T"ring-tapf of Bode,
Anonymous coins were also struck. The issue of these coins with Sasanian types ended in the year 143 Tabaristan era (794, anonymous) but we have a coin of 161 (812) on the obverse of which in place of the king’s head — as earlier on the coins of the governor Sulaiman (136—137) — there is a rhombus with the initials, the Arabic letter, and on the margin al-Fadl b. Sahl Dhi-l-Kaysatun (in Arabic) is named; on the reverse, instead of the altar with its guardians are three parallel designs like firm brackets, between them an inscription in four lines giving the Muhammadan creed in Kufic and the date and mint in Pahlavi (Tisienhausen, Zap. vost. otd arch. obsh., ii. 224).

We know that coins of Tabaristan mint of the Caliphs of the years 102 (Lavoix), 147 (Brit. Mus. with the name of the governor Rawh), 190—192, copper coins of the years 145 and 157 (Zambur, Novum, Ztschr., xxvi, the latter with the name of Omar b. al-‘Ala). At a later date, coins were struck there by the ‘Alids (Amul, 253 Ar, 306 AV and Ar), the Bâyids and Ziyârids (Amul, Satia and Firrûm), the Bâvandids (Firrûm, 353, 357, 394), sometimes by the Samanids (Amul AV 241, AR 302, 353—357), still later by the Hâllâjids, Serberdâns, Timurids (Amul, Sâr) and Shâhs of Persia (Amul, Sâr, Tabaristan, Mazarandān). In Amul anonymous copper coins were struck from the xvith century onwards. On several pieces of this period the mint Tabaristan occurs. As these are all very rare, the issue must have been an occasional one. The dates are not pre-erred on any specimens. More common are copper pieces of the value of 4 kâbêkî (18—22 grammes = 280—340 grains) with the lion and sun and mint Mazarandān, which belong to the xvith century. During the Russian occupation of Gilan in 1723—1732, to meet the shortage of currency provoked by the financial crisis in Russia at this time, Persian copper coins were overstruck with a Russian double-ruble and cistre in the occupied provinces in place of Russian money.

These coins are often called Mazarandān pieces but this is not correct, as only Gilan and not Mazarandān was occupied.


MAZÂR-I SHARIF, a town in Afghânîstân, south of the Amû-Dirzû [q.v.]. In the middle ages it was the site of the village of Kheir, later called Khodja Khairân, 14 miles east of Balkh. On two different occasions, in the xvith (xvith) century after 530 (1135—1136) in the time of Sultan Sandîjâ [q.v.], and in 885 (1480—1481) in the reign of the Timûrid Sultan Husain, the tomb of the caliph ‘Alî was “discovered” here and its genuineness declared to have been proved. A place of pilgrimage (mâzûr) at once arose around the tomb with a considerable market: the second
tomb which is still standing (the first is said to have been destroyed by Čingiz-Khan), was built in 836 (1431—1432). The maqâr does not seem to have been of any particular importance during the time of the Özbeğs and is hardly mentioned although several Özbeğ Sultanlı were buried there. In the first half of the sixteenth century, the place is usually simply called maqâr by travellers, the name Maqâr-ı Şerif seems to have arisen within the last hundred years. 'Abd al-Karim Bûkûhâri (ed. Schefer, p. 4) does not mention Maqar at all among the towns of Afghanistan: in 1532 when A. Burnes passed through it, it was a little town with about eight hundred houses. In 1586, the Afghan governor Na'îb Alî Khan, a Shi'i, chose Maqâr-ı Şerif as his residence; since then Maqar-ı Şerif has become the capital of Afghan Turkistan. In 1878 it was described by the Russian general Matveyev as one of the best towns in Northern Afghanistan, with about 30,000 inhabitants (Costenko, Two Ke-stansky Krai, u. 157).


At-Maṣţî, a name borne by over twenty Abâdî writers or men celebrated for their piety, among whom may be mentioned Abu 'l-Kalîb Sulamân b. Yâghişî al-Maṣţî, a pupil of Abu 'Abîd Allah Muhammad b. Bakr. Celebrated for his learning and his virtues, he spent all his life in study and teaching and died in 474 (June 11, 1081—May 31, 1082) in a little town of the Banû Wisâlî, a clan of the tribe of Maṣţî, which in those days occupied the lands between Gâbes and the south of Tripoli. He wrote a book on the principles of law (mahfî) entitled al-Mahfî. Bibliography: Abu 'l-Abâb Ahmad b. Sa'îd al-Shâmîmashî, Kitâb al-Siyar, Cairo 1904, p. 412, 592. (Moh. BENCHEINE)

Maţdak, the apostle of a religion, which was founded two centuries before him by Zar'udî, son of Khurrâṡhân, but spread in Persia only after his propaganda; it had great political influence in the country in the time of Kâvâdî (488—531 A.D. with an interregnum). The latter adopted it and even made arrangements for putting its teaching into practice but after his restoration he put Maţdak and a large number of his followers to death. The best known feature of his teaching was the endeavour to remove every cause of covetousness and discord among men, and thus to purify religion, by making women and possessions common property.

It is not possible to reconstruct from the sources the Mazdak doctrine in detail nor to settle its relations with the other religions or sects of Persia. The main features will be indicated here.

The sources. Detailed narratives of the reign of Kâvâdî and some important references to Maţdak and his teaching will be found in the contemporary Syriac and Byzantine writers (Joshua Syllutes, Agathas, Procopius, Malala, Theophanes). In Pahlavi literature there are few references to Maţdak. The bulk of our information about Maţdak and his relations with Kâvâdî come to us from Arab and Persian writers and go back mainly to the Khwâdistânîmâgh or Royal Sâsânîan Chronicle, of which the best known Arabic version was that of Ibn al-Muqaffâ. Baron Rosen has shown that the other Arabic versions were not all independent on this one, some of them having been prepared directly from the original. Some compilers also inserted historical or legendary episodes taken from other Pahlavi works and others attempted to harmonize different narratives and did a certain amount of retouching in their reconstruction of the original. The Persian and Arab writers who had these different versions or computations at their disposal only very rarely mention their sources and endeavour in turn to reconcile the statements made. Noldeke has already distinguished two "Hauptquellen" for the various Arabic and Persian narratives (the first followed by Ibn Kûtaiba and Eutychius and a part of Tabâtî, the second by al-Ya'qûbî and another part of Tabâtî), Christensen in his fundamental study thinks he can distinguish four lines of the tradition of the Khwâdistânîmâgh found by the Arab and Persian writers in the different versions or editions of it. Noldeke's two "Hauptquellen" correspond to the first two; a third is represented by al-Dinawâri (Noldeke thinks his story is a harmonising of the two "Hauptquellen") and the Nihayat al-ṭarîb fi Aḥkâm al-Ṭarîb wa-l-Ṭarîb (J. R. A. S., 1900, p. 195 sq.), the fourth presents features of its own, some of which are legendary in character and are found again in the Siyasât-Nâma of Niẓâm al-Mulk, which is independent of the Khwâdistânîmâgh. The common source of all these legendary features would be, according to Christensen, the Book of Maţdak, a Pahlavi work of fiction (like the Kâlila wa-Dimna), which enjoyed great popularity and was translated into Arabic by Ibn al-Muqaffâ' and into Arabic verse by Abûn b. Abû al-Ḫâmid al-Lâhîkî. The elements of this fourth line of tradition are, according to Christensen, found in the Kitâb al-Ašrâmî, al-Lâhîkî, Firdawsi, al-Hira, Ibn al-Album and Abu l-Fadîl. Some references in al-Maṣţî and al-Khânînamî can also be traced to the book of Maţdak. Independent traditions would also be preserved elsewhere, for example by the Arabs of al-Hira. Al-Shâhrastânî's notes (to which some critics deny any historical value) might go back to books of the sect now lost. These are not found elsewhere and their immediate source was Muhammad b. Harûf Abû Ḫarîrî al-Wârāq, a Zoroastrian converted to Islam. The source of the notices in the Fihrist is not known (it calls the Mazdakists Zoroastrians); the Persian work of the sixteenth century called Lahnvâ-nâma Maţdákân, is probably a mere compilation of no value, from sources already mentioned and the pretended Maţdak book Dinwâdî, which it quotes, is quite unknown.

Doctrine. The fact that the majority of these sources emphasize the social aspect of the Mazdakī reforms and do not mention special doctrines or beliefs of the sect (some like the Fihrist and Ibn al-Vahir connect it with Mazdaism) has convinced the majority of Orientalists who have studied this subject (e.g. Noldeke, Nicholson, v. Wesendonk) that the reforms must be considered as a social movement which aimed at purifying the Mazdaean religion: a communist system of which the precepts regarding women and property and those of an ascetic nature (like the prohibition of slaughtering
animals and eating their flesh) had however a religious aim, and were clearly distinguished by this character from modern socialist communism.

Christensen, in his work already quoted, comes to the contrary conclusion that Mazdakism was above all a religious movement and that its social precepts were originally a very secondary feature: it was, he says, a reform of Manicheism, already preached by Zaradust, two centuries before Mazdak. Christensen supports his argument by two well-known passages in Malala, of which the first deals with the doctrines propounded at Rome under Diocletian by the Manichean Bundos in opposition to official Manicheism.

This Bundos is supposed to have afterwards gone to Persia and spread his doctrine there, which was called vah dast-o-dast (from the Pahlavi form deryt-darman = followers of the orthodox faith). The other passage calls king Kawaghi dast-o-dast (an inaccurate form for dast-o-dast, an epithet which contains an allusion to the Mazdaki faith. A popular form of dast-o-dast is said to be the origin of the very corrupt forms of this surname, which are found in the Arabic texts and are due to the similarity of certain Arabic letters (al-Tha‘allab translates it “may his beard fall” which presupposes a form داس-ن. دانتش). Christensen thinks these links sufficient to identify Zaradust with Bundos (Bundos would be an honorific title of the reformer, “the venerable”, from the Pahlavi bundaz, bundoq) and defines Mazdakism as a Manichean oyoogozia.

This theory is supported by al-Shahrastani’s resumé, which gives us, along with the general character of the religious history of Iran, the best argument for this thesis, and those who hold the other view are forced to deny any force to the evidence of this historian of sects. Christensen also concludes that it is with good reason that the Byzantine historians call the Mazdakis Manichaeans: but it must be added that their classification of a doctrine so little known in the west (where on the other hand Manicheism was well known and was, so to speak, the typical heresy of Persia) is not of much value.

According to al-Shahrastani’s exposition, Mazdak’s system consisted in that of Mani; except that he said that the dark spirits did not act of their own will and without restraint (bhod-kha’t va’l-khaiwar), but blindly and by chance (bi’l-khaht va’l-ittifak); that mixture is produced also by’l-khaht va’l-ittifak and liberation will be produced by’l-khaht va’l-ittifak. In this connection we must remember that the same author in his survey of the Manichaean tells us that the views of the Manichaean on the cause of mixture were divided and that some of them said that it was produced by’l-khaht va’l-ittifak the opposite of what was laid down in the original cosmogony. Other Muslims writers allude to this point in dispute among the dualist sects: al-Mu‘tahalib b. Tahir al-Makdisi says, for example, that mixture bi’l-khaht va’l-ittifak is taught by the Sabians, a name which is sometimes applied to the Manichaean. All this gives the impression that the mention of the Mazdaki teaching in this connection is quite in keeping with the conditions of polemic among dualists. Perhaps the practical teachings of Mazdakism should be connected with the doctrine of mixture bi’l-khaht va’l-ittifak.

Al-Shahrastani also gives from another source other details on Mazdaki cosmogony (the four forces, which surround the object of worship as court dignitaries surround the king of Persia; the seven viziers, the twelve spiritual beings, the three elements, the director of good and of evil), details which have their parallels in other gnostic and dualist cosmogonies, which should be studied with their names from the point of view of the latest studies on Iranian syncretism.

Al-Shahrastani finally alludes to certain cabalistic speculations on the letters of the supreme name and mentions Mazdaki sects (like the ‘Abul Musliya) still in existence in his time in Persia and as far away as Sogdiana.

We may conclude that it is at least premature to deny all connection between Manichaeanism and Mazdakism; it seems that rather than put the question in the form of a rigid alternative between Mazdaean or Manichean influence, it would be better to regard Mazdakism as a form of gnosticism upon which two powerful religious forces have exerted an equal influence, the official religion and the Manichaean heresy, and some other elements also (just as Manichaean gnosticism owes much to the national religion).

In any case, the feature which appears most clearly from the sources which struck contemporaries was the general body of Mazdaki precepts with communist and humanitarian tendency and especially those which relate to community of women and property and were actually put into practice for a short time. The ascetic prescriptions are quite in keeping with a gnostic character of the sect (the prohibition of slaughtering animals and eating their flesh) which with communist teachings would be the elements forming the path to gnostics and liberation.

The presence of an ascetic strain in Mazdakism, as in Manicheanism, is probable. The people naturally seized on these principles and eagerly attempted to put them into practice on a large scale. Thus excesses resulted which, at least in origin, were very far from the intentions of the reformer and the elite of his adherents. This explains also why the religious character of the sect was forgotten and memory of its social teachings retained. Whether the founder and his leaders also abandoned themselves to the excesses of which the sources accuse them, one cannot say; we know that very frequently the initial good faith of reformers is disturbed by contact with reality.

It was natural to give a more practical value to this body of teaching, if we regard Mazdakism as a Puritan reform remaining within the Mazdaean religion and not becoming an independent religion.

Contemporary sources also tell us of a bishop elected by the Mazdaks, named, according to Malala, Indarazar (which Noldeke connects with the Pahlavi word andazgar = to advise; cf. the inspagan or episksopos of the Manicheans) who was slain with the other Mazdaks on the day of the massacre; according to Christensen, it is possible to identify him with Mazdak.

During the persecution which followed the massacre, all the Mazdaki books were destroyed. The Persian work of the seventh century, Dabistan-i Madzakih quotes a book called Dismad which is usually regarded as a forgery: all the notices of the sect professing to come from this book are
taken from the text of al-Shahrastānī and other sources, like the rest of the book. The Book of Mazdak, which enjoyed a great popularity and was translated in Arabic by Ibn al-Muqaffa and into Arabic verse by Abūn b. 'Abd al-Hamid al-Lāhijī, was a work of entertainment and not of religious teaching (cf. above).

History of the Mazdak movement in the reign of Kawād—the Massacre. We know very little about the life of Mazdak (also written Mazdak). His father was called Bān-dādī (a Persian name like Mazdak) and according to Tabari, they came from a town which Christensen is inclined to identify with Māddhārāyā. Itspākhr and Tabriz are mentioned as the birthplace of the reformer. According to some sources, he had been a Zoroastrian priest (mōbadāh); al-Burūnī who sometimes follows a romantic tradition (cf. above), calls him mōbadāh mōbadāh! The details of his doctrine are not known but it is certain that he developed and spread the teaching of his precursor Zarādāšt of Pasā, who lived two centuries before him. It is evident that the disturbed condition of Persia after the victories of the Hephtalites facilitated the spread of revolutionary doctrines; but it is difficult to see why the king (who in the beginning of the sixth century became a convert of the new faith (and this is a question which also puzzled the ancients), and how he became connected with Mazdak.

The necessity of crushing the power of the nobility and higher clergy which he found annoying may have caused the king to use for his own ends a sect which aimed at destroying the privileges of these classes. Noldeke (who thinks Kawād was a man of strong will) credits him with this plan. Christensen (who had accepted this thesis) now sees in the allusions of some of the sources proof of the sincerity of Kawād (whom, as he says, the contemporary sources do not credit with a "Mazdakian character"). He thinks, was above all primarily by religious motives and was attracted by the religious element in the new teaching, while really to take advantage of any political advantages that the sect might be likely to gain for him. In any case it is evident that in his wars he was not restrained by any humanitarian prejudices, although one Arabic source with a hostile bias says that the king as a cantīf feared to spill blood. Christensen likes to compare his attitude with regard to Mazdak with that of Constantine with regard to Christian teaching. In any case it is difficult to give a verdict on Kawād, in view of the varying prejudices of the sources and the tradition of the time of Khusraw which in general tends to elevate the figure of Anūsharwān at the expense of the others. There were numerous conversions among the upper classes; proselytising among the common people was facilitated by the wretched conditions in which they lived and of course also by the nature of the teaching which in every age has seduced the masses. Mazdakism thus became a remarkable force and permeated all the machinery of government. The practical effect of the king's favour was seen in the measures alluded to in contemporary sources; but we do not know to what degree they realised the Mazdak ide. either as regards community of women (perhaps this was only an extension of regulations already existing in the Sasanian code?) or community of property (only taxes on the rich?). But what is certain is that Khusraw at the beginning of his reign had to take important steps to remedy the disastrous results to property and the organisation of the family; such abuses were however not the direct result of the legal measure adopted by Kawād but rather of the violent application of communism which was a later development.

The philo-Mazdak policy of the king and the growing power of the sect provoked a revolution in the palace and Kawād was dethroned and imprisoned. Djamān, his brother, was put on the throne in his stead. Kawād succeeded in escaping and took refuge with the Hephtalites and regained his kingdom with their assistance (498 or 499). In the meanwhile, in spite of the dethronement of the king, the sect had grown more and more and its power became disquieting. The people, urged on by their leaders and more alive to the practical advantages than to the religious elements of the reform, naturally abandoned themselves to all sorts of excesses and disorder broke out everywhere. The estates of the nobles were plundered, the women carried off, which, with a horror of communist principles, explains the violent language used by contemporary and Arabic and Persian sources against the sect. All this must have frightened the king on his return in 500 and became a convert of the new faith (and this is a question which also puzzled the ancients), and how he became connected with Mazdak.

The necessity of crushing the power of the nobility and higher clergy he had been attacking may have caused the king to use for his own ends a sect which aimed at destroying the privileges of these classes. Noldeke (who thinks Kawād was a man of strong will) credits him with this plan. Christensen (who had accepted this thesis) now sees in the allusions of some of the sources proof of the sincerity of Kawād (whom, as he says, the contemporary sources do not credit with a "Mazdakian character"). He thinks, was above all primarily by religious motives and was attracted by the religious element in the new teaching, while really to take advantage of any political advantages that the sect might be likely to gain for him. In any case it is evident that in his wars he was not restrained by any humanitarian prejudices, although one Arabic source with a hostile bias says that the king as a cantīf feared to spill blood. Christensen likes to compare his attitude with regard to Mazdak with that of Constantine with regard to Christian teaching. In any case it is difficult to give a verdict on Kawād, in view of the varying prejudices of the sources and the tradition of the time of Khusraw which in general tends to elevate the figure of Anūsharwān at the expense of the others. There were numerous conversions among the upper classes; proselytising among the common people was facilitated by the wretched conditions in which they lived and of course also by the nature of the teaching which in every age has seduced the masses. Mazdakism thus became a remarkable force and permeated all the machinery of government. The practical effect of the king's favour was seen in the measures alluded to in contemporary sources; but we do not know to what degree they realised the Mazdak ide. either as regards community of women (perhaps this was only an extension of regulations already existing in the Sasanian code?) or community of property (only taxes on the rich?). But what is certain is that Khusraw at the beginning of his reign had to take important steps to remedy the disastrous results to property and the organisation of the family; such abuses were however not the direct result of the legal measure adopted by Kawād but rather of the violent application of communism which was a later development.

The philo-Mazdak policy of the king and the growing power of the sect provoked a revolution in the palace and Kawād was dethroned and imprisoned. Djamān, his brother, was put on the throne in his stead. Kawād succeeded in escaping and took refuge with the Hephtalites and regained his kingdom with their assistance (498 or 499). In the meanwhile, in spite of the dethronement of the king, the sect had grown more and more and its power became disquieting. The people, urged on by their leaders and more alive to the practical advantages than to the religious elements of the reform, naturally abandoned themselves to all sorts of excesses and disorder broke out everywhere. The estates of the nobles were plundered, the women carried off, which, with a horror of communist principles, explains the violent language used by contemporary and Arabic and Persian sources against the sect. All this must have frightened the king on his return in 500 and became a convert of the new faith (and this is a question which also puzzled the ancients), and how he became connected with Mazdak.

The necessity of crushing the power of the nobility and higher clergy which he found annoying may have caused the king to use for his own ends a sect which aimed at destroying the privileges of these classes. Noldeke (who thinks Kawād was a man of strong will) credits him with this plan. Christensen (who had accepted this thesis) now sees in the allusions of some of the sources proof of the sincerity of Kawād (whom, as he says, the contemporary sources do not credit with a "Mazdakian character"). He thinks, was above all primarily by religious motives and was attracted by the religious element in the new teaching, while really to take advantage of any political advantages that the sect might be likely to gain for him. In any case it is evident that in his wars he was not restrained by any humanitarian prejudices, although one Arabic source with a hostile bias says that the king as a cantīf feared to spill blood. Christensen likes to compare his attitude with regard to Mazdak with that of Constantine with regard to Christian teaching. In any case it is difficult to give a verdict on Kawād, in view of the varying prejudices of the sources and the tradition of the time of Khusraw which in general tends to elevate the figure of Anūsharwān at the expense of the others. There were numerous conversions among the upper classes; proselytising among the common people was facilitated by the wretched conditions in which they lived and of course also by the nature of the teaching which in every age has seduced the masses. Mazdakism thus became a remarkable force and permeated all the machinery of government. The practical effect of the king's favour was seen in the measures alluded to in contemporary sources; but we do not know to what degree they realised the Mazdak ide. either as regards community of women (perhaps this was only an extension of regulations already existing in the Sasanian code?) or community of property (only taxes on the rich?). But what is certain is that Khusraw at the beginning of his reign had to take important steps to remedy the disastrous results to property and the organisation of the family; such abuses were however not the direct result of the legal measure adopted by Kawād but rather of the violent application of communism which was a later development.
orientalists Mazdaki elements can be discovered in Bətinism and Isma'iliism. But the whole question of the relations between these sects (of which very often insufficient is known) and the old Persian religious forms must be examined thoroughly with a knowledge of the progress made in the study of Irānian gnoses and syncretisms. It cannot be dealt with here; cf. the articles ISMA'ILIYA, KHURRAMIYA, MUBAYYIDA, MUHAMMARA, MUKANNA, RAVANDIYA, SINBAD etc.


**MAZHAIR, MIRZA DAEVAMIN AN A'UD PACHSAND AND CIVIL SERVICE SAINT**

His descent is traced back to the period 1699/1701. His biography, together with that of his father, was written by the name which the emperor had selected for him. He was received into the Naqshbandi order by Saiyid Mir Muhammad Badlaun and into the Kādiri order by Muhammad 'Abid Sumānt. He died in Dihili on the 10th of Muharram 1195 (January 6, 1780) from a pistol shot fired at him by some Shīa fanatic. His memoirs and some letters, called Ma'mār Khāshvar or Lu'ā'if Khāna, are edited by Muhammad Beg b. Rahim Beg, Dihili H. 1305, A.D. 1887. His biography, together with some of his disciples, has been written by Muhammad Na'im Allāh Bahādūd in Bishārat Mu'hammadiyya.


**MAZIN, THE NAME OF SEVERAL ARAB TRIBES WHO ARE REPRESENTED IN ALL THE GREAT ETHNIC GROUPINGS OF THE PENINSULA; THIS FINDS TYPICAL EXPRESSION IN THE ANCESTOR RECORDS IN AĞHĀNI, VIII. 141 (= YAKUT, IRJAD, ii. 382—383), ACCORDING TO WHICH THE CALIPH-AL-WALĪKH ASKED THE GRAMMARIAN ABDULLAH QUTHMUN AL-MAZIN, WHO HAD COME TO HIS ACCOUNT, TO WHICH MAZIN BELONGED: — IF TO THE MAZIN OF THE TALMUD, TO THOSE OF THE KAYS, TO THOSE OF THE BA'RA' OR TO THOSE OF THE YEMEN.

The first are the MAZIN B. MA'LĪK B. 'AMR B. TAMIM (Wustenfeld, Genes. Tabellen, 12) and the second, the MAZIN B. MAṢŪR (D. 10) or the MAZIN B. FAŻARA (H. 13); the third, the MAZIN B. SHABĪN B. DUGH (C. 19); the last, the MAZIN B. AL-NĀDIJĀR, A CLAN OF THE KHAZAJI ANSU (19, 24). But alongside of these, many other tribes and clans bore this name. The Djayharat al-Anāṣ of Ibn al-Kalbi gives no less than seventy, of whom the best known are the: MAZIN B. SA'D B. DĀ'BĀBA (Ibn Kūtaba, K. MAṢĀ'IR, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 56; more accurately according to the Dijamharra, MS. Br. Mus., Add. 23, 297, fol. 14r: MAZIN B. 'ĀBD MA'MĀT B. BAKR B. SA'D B. DĀ'BĀBA; not given in the Tabellen); MAZIN B. SH'Ā'RĀ B. MUṢĀ'IRiya B. BAKR B. AL-MAZIN (Ibn Kūtaba, p. 42; Tabellen, H. 14); MAZIN B. RA'Ī KHĀṢ'A FAN (H. 10); MAZIN B. RA'ĪKH B. ZUHĀR B. MAZIN MAṢĀ'I (7, 18); MAZIN B. AL-ĀZĪ (11, 11). The large number of tribes named MAZIN and their distribution over the whole of Araba makes the hypothesis that we have here a single tribe that had been broken up into small sections impossible and we are led to suppose that the name MAZIN, is a descriptive rather than a proper name; since the verb ma'sana means "to go away"; one might suppose that MAZIN originally meant "the emigrants" and was used in a general way of any ethnic group which became separated from its own tribe and was incorporated in a strange tribe. This etymology, like almost all those of the names of the Arab tribes, is most singular.

The sources give a certain number of geographical and historical references to different tribes called MAZIN; but they are generally very scanty, none of these tribes, having attained sufficient importance to make it independent of the larger body to which it was attached. We have a few details about the MAZIN B. AL-NĀDIJĀR, a fairly important group of Madinese KHAZAJI (on the part played by them at the beginning of Islam see CAETANI, Annali dell' Islam, Index to Vols. i.—ii.), as well as about the MAZIN B. FAŻARA WHO TOOK PART AS MEMBERS OF THE TRIBE OF THE DHUDYĀN, IN THE WAR OF DĀSĪKH AND AL-QA'BĪ (cf. DUDVĪN, and AĞHĀNI, xvi. 27). Ibn MawāṣIYA, himself a DHUDYĀN, directed a violent satire against them at the end of the first century A.H. (AĞHĀNI, ii. 90, 102). As for the B. MAṢĀ'IR, it is said that Abu B. 'AMR B. DUGH, to whom the grammarian ABDULLAH QUTHMUN belonged, we know from the anecdote above quoted that in their dialect, m (initial?) was pronounced like b (ba'smuka for ba'muqa, what is thy name?), a peculiarity which does not seem to be recorded of the dialect of other RA'BĪ. Lastly the MAZIN B. AL-ĀZĪ, whom tradition makes migrate to the north, changed their name to GHAṢĀN (q.v.) under which they became celebrated.

It is only of the MAZIN B. MA'LĪK B. 'AMR B. TAMIM that we have fairly full information. Legend, which has developed with unusual detail around the sons of Tamim (q.v.), gives MAZIN a part in the story of his uncle 'ABD SHAMS B. SA'D B. ZAID MA'MĀT B. TAMIM's fight against al-'ANBAR B. 'AMR B. TAMIM (cf. MAFJIDJAL B. SALAMA, al-FĀHIR, ed. Storey, p. 235 and the references given in the note). This tribe of MAZIN never left the great group of the 'AMR B. TAMIM to which it belonged and dwelled with them in the lands in the extreme N.W. of NADĪJ; their headquarters were around the well of SAFĀR near DHUD KĀR (NABA'ID, ed. Bevan, p. 48, note to line 17; YAKUT, iii. 95; BAKR, p. 724, l. 1: 787—788); their principal subdivisions were the BANĀṬ URRAKH, KHAZAJI, Kisson, Anmar, Zabīna, UTHAITHA and RA'LĀN. In the DJIHĀLIYA, the MAZIN followed their parent tribe and we find them sharing in the
wars of the latter; in rotation with the other Tamimi tribes they held the office of ḥākim at the fair of Ḫūṣqah (Khâtib, p. 438). At the coming of Islam, their chief was Muh'ammad b. Shāhāb, also known as a poet (cf. especially al-Dhābiq, Bayān, ii. 171; al-Kalī, Amārli, iii. 50; Ibn Ḥadjar, Ṭabāh, Cairo 1325, vi. 156). Without being particularly zealous partisans of the new religion, they did not take part in the riḍḍa with the other Tamim tribes (11 A.H.) and they even drove away the messengers sent them by the prophetess Sadīqah [q. v.] and made one of them prisoner, the Ṭaghlibi al-Ḥudhāfī b. Imrān; the latter waited for his revenge till the troubled period that followed the murder of the Caliph ʿAbd Allāh (35—656), of which he took advantage to ravage the district of ʿAlāfī; but the Māzin met him and slew him and threw him into the well (Ṭabarî, i. 1111, 1915; cf. Akhānī, xix. 145—146, transl. in Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, x. 552—555; in the last passage the expedition against the ʿAlāfī appears to be that of the second Māzin). At a later date, the Māzin settled in large numbers, like the rest of the Tamim, in Khuṣqah and took part in the conquest of Central Asia; among the Māzīnins who distinguished themselves there were Shāhāb b. Muh'ammad, son of the chief already mentioned (Ṭabarî, i. 2569, 2707); Ḥilāl b. al-ʿAbīwāz, who in 102 (720) slew the members of the family of Ya'qūb b. al-Muḥallab after the defeat of the latter (Ṭabarî, i. 1112—1113); ʿUmar b. Simān, who killed the Persian chief Rutbil (Ibn al-Kalībī, ʿAbu al-Khayl, p. 30, note to lines 3—4). We also find many of the Banū Māzin in the time of the Fāṭimid army in the time of the rising against the ʿUmayyads. But a no less number went to swell the ranks of the Khuṣqahīs; the celebrated chief of the ʿĀzārīns, Ka'bār b. al-Fadlābī [g. z.], belonged to the Māzin clan of Ka'bāy a b. Ḥurqis. Very few of the remarkable number of poets produced by the Tamim belonged to the Māzin. We may note however Ḥilāl b. As'ār of the Omayyad period (ʿAkhānī, ii. 186); Mālik b. al-Rabiʿ, poet and brigand, contemporary of al-Ḥadījād (ʿAkhānī, xix. 162—169; Ibn Kūtabī, al-Sīla wa ʿl-Sayrār, ed. de Goeje, p. 205—207 etc.); Zuhair b. ʿUrwa al-Sabī (ʿAkhānī, xix. 156: the few verses that we have by him, often quoted, are also attributed to his father, ʿUrwa b. Ḥajjāh, and even to ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ḥassān b. Ṭāḥibī: cf. Muṣafīd, ed. Lyall, p. 249, note y). Lastly it may be mentioned that the Māzin have given to ʿArabic philology two of its most illustrious masters: Abū Amr b. ʿAbī Allāh [g. z., d. 154] and Naṣr b. Sh̄uma whose genealogies are given in Wustenfeld, Tabellen (1). Bibliography: Wustenfeld, Register z. d. gehei Tabellen, p. 291; Ibn Kūtabī, K. al-ʿUmarī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 36—42; Ibn Durāid, K. al-ʿUmarī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 124—126, 171, 211, 258; Ibn al-Kalībī, Dinārī al-ʿAntīb, ms. Brit. Mus., Add. 23, 297, fol. 90 v—92 t, and passim. (G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

MAZYDĪS, a Muḥammadān dānast in al-Ḥilāl. The Banū Māzin, closely bound to the tribe of Assad and living west of the Tigris, from Kāfān to Hit. In the southeast, on the Kūzīstān frontier, the Banū Dubais had settled. When Abu ʿl-Ḥanāfī Muḥammad b. Māzin, who was related to the Banū Dubais, slew one of their chiefs with whom he had quarrelled, a war broke out between the two tribes (401 = 1010—1011). Abu ʿl-Ḥanāfī fell to his brother Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAllāh; the latter went out against the Banū Dubais with an army, but was defeated and Abu ʿl-Ḥanāfī fell in the battle. In 402 (1012—1013), ʿAllāh was recognized as emir by the Ḥāfiẓ Sūlfān al-Dawla. In Muḥarram 405 (July 1014), he undertook a campaign against the Banū Dubais, to revenge himself for the defeat he had suffered and slew Ḥāfīz Sūlfān and Nābāḥ, the sons of Duba, but in ʿAlamādā of the same year (Oct.—Nov. 1014) he was routed by their brother Muḥāfiz. After ʿAlī's death in Dhu ʿl-Ka'ba 405 (March—April 1018), his son Dubais succeeded him. The latter's brother al-Muṣṭafa, with the help of Turkish mercenaries in Baḡdād, endeavoured to seize the power for himself; but order was soon restored and al-Muṣṭafa went to al-Mawṣil and to the ʿUqulīs. In a few years Dubaize became involved in war with ʿAbū aṣ-Ṣūlān al-Muṣṭafa [q. v.] and he had also troubles within his own dominions. In 421 (1030) the Banū Kālidār and Djalal al-Dawla, the former was supported by Dubais and the latter by al-Muṣṭafa. After the defeat of Abū Kālidār in 421 (1030), al-Muṣṭafa with the help of the Banū Ḥaḍījā and the troops of Djalāl al-Dawla invaded his brother's territory. Dubais had to take to flight and the land was laid waste. Peace however was soon arranged. Dubais was allowed to retain his lands but had to pay Djalāl al-Dawla a considerable sum. The third brother ʿAbd al-Ṣūlān allied himself with Baḡdād, the military governor of Baḡdād, and in 426 (1032—1033) they advanced against Dubais. The latter sent an army to meet them; but his troops were routed and he himself had to take to flight. After receiving reinforcements he advanced against Djalāl; they met at Djarjarīyā and after a fierce battle, Dubais had to cede a part of his possessions while al-Baḡdādī, who arrived too late to take part in the battle, returned to Baḡdād. In Ḫurāb 446 (Oct.—Nov. 1054) the Banū Ḥaḍījā invaded the country but were soon driven out with the help of al-Baḡdādī. Two or three years later war broke out between al-Baḡdādī who was joined by Dubais, and the Sardjuk Sūlārī Toghrī Beg and his follower ʿAbū aṣ-Ṣūlān b. Badrān [q. v.]. Dubais died in Shawwāl 474 (March—April 1082) at the age of 80. His son ʿAbū Manṣūr succeeded him but died in Rabiʿ I, 479 (June—July 1086). In the reign of his son and successor ʿAbdāl [q. v.] the power of the Māzinīs spread over almost the whole of the ʿIrāq. At first he was a stout supporter of Baktiyarī [q. v.]; in 494 (1100—1101) he moreover turned to his brother. The towns of Hit, Wāṣit, Baḡra and Tarīt fell successively into his hands but, as the commander, ʿAbdāl in Baḡra did not prove fit for his task, Muḥāfiz seized the suzerainty of the town and installed a new governor. In ʿAbdāl's reign the capital al-Ḥilālī was extended and fortified, and given the name of al-Hilla (495 = 1101—1102). His steadily increasing power however aroused Muḥāfiz's misgivings and in spite of long negotiations, a rupture finally occurred between them. At the end of Ḫurāb 501 (Febr.—March 1108) Muḥāfiz himself set out from Baḡdād against ʿAbdāl. A section of the Arabs allied with him fled and ʿAbdāl fell in the battle. His son Dubais was taken prisoner but the latter's two brothers escaped and were only able to return home after Muḥāfiz's death
MAZYAR — MAZYAR

(511 = 1118). In 529 (1135) he was treacherously murdered [cf. the article DUBAIS] and succeeded by his son Şadaqa. In the war between Sultan Mas'ud and his nephew Dâvûd, Şadaqa declared for the former. After Mas'ûd's victory, the troops scattered to seek booty and several emirs including Şadaqa were surprised and captured by the enemy and at once put to death (532 = 1137–1138). Şadaqa's brother Muhammad was thereupon recognised as lord of al-Hilla. In 540 (1145–1146) however, the third brother 'Ali went to al-Hilla, because he was afraid of the Sultan and drove out Muhammad. After he had taken the town, he drove back the Sultan's troops and it was not till 542 (1147–1148) that Salâkerd, one of Mas'ûd's generals, was able to expel 'Ali but in the same year he was defeated by the latter and had to abandon the town. In 544 (1149–1150) 'Ali endeavoured to induce the caliph al-Mu'tâfi to abandon Mas'ûd but, as the caliph refused and summoned the Sultan to his help, 'Ali had to submit and the rebels who had joined him dispersed. 'Ali died in the following year and al-Hilla was given as a fief to Salâkerd by Mas'ûd. On Mas'ûd's death in 547 (1152), the town fell into the hands of Mas'ûd Bilâl, the commander of Baghdâd; the latter however was driven out by the caliph's troops who occupied al-Hilla. When in 551 (1157) Sultan Muhammad took the field against al-Mu'taft (q.v.), they had to withdraw and Muhammad and Mas'ûd gave a garrison in the town. The Mazyaids submitted to his deputy but in 558 (1162–1163) the caliph al-Mustانdjd sent an army against them which put an end to their power. 10,000 men were slain and the remainder outlawed so that they were scattered in all directions.


mad Dynasties, p. 119 sq.; de Zambur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie, p. 137.

(K. V. Zetterstêen)

MAZYAR, [Balâdûrî gives the form Mâyazîyâr (= Mâh-ýz-yâr), the last of the Kârinid rulers of Tabaristân, leader of the rising against the caliph al-Mu'tasim.

Origins. The Kârin-wand dynasty claimed descent from Kârin b. Sâkhra, whom Khusrâw Anûshirvân had established in Tabaristân and who was descended from the legendary smith Kâwâ, who saved Fâdîldûn. The hereditary fief of the dynasty was the "mountain of Kârin" [or of Windâd-Hurmuz], Tabari, iii. 1295. The capital of this region was probably Lapûrî (cf. Lâsûr on the eastern source of the river Bâbul which later runs through Bâwûrîsh). The Kârin-wand were subordinate to the Bâwandîd îspahbâds (capital Firîm). The genealogy of the Kârnîds given by Zâhir al-Dîn, p. 167 and 321 is fantastic. The first Kârinid known is Windâd-Hurmuz (138–190 = 755–805?) who raised a coalition of local chiefs against the Arabs (the Bâwandîd Sharwîn, [the] Mâshûgânî Walîsh of Mâyûndûrûd, the Pâdûspân Shahrîyâr b. Pâdûspân) and defeated the generals sent by the caliph al-Mahdi (= Sâlim Fârghânî, then Fârghânî; Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 128; Zâhir al-Dîn, p. 155–159). Windâd-Hurmuz had to submit to Hâdi, the son of the Caliph, and accompany him to Baghdâd. Soon he returned to his native mountains and resumed an independent attitude (ibid., p. 160).

According to Ibn al-Fakhî, p. 304, Windâd Hurmuz came to the court of Hârûn al-Rashîd, who appointed him îspahbâd of Khurâsân. He died in the reign of al-Ma'mûn. His son and successor was Kârin (a contemporary of the Bâwandîd Shahrîyâr). According to Ibn Isfandiyâr, p. 145, he accompanied al-Ma'mûn on his campaign against the Byzantines but this does not agree with the dates given for his successor.

According to Zâhir al-Dîn, p. 321, Mâyâyr b. Kârin ruled for 30 years (194–224 = 809–839) but on p. 167 the same writer says that his (tyrannical) government lasted 7 years (217–224). Tabari, iii. 1015, under the year 201, speaks of the conquests in Tabaristân of 'Abd Allâh b. Khuradâbîd (sic!) as a result of which the Bâwandîd Shahrîyâr b. Sharwîn had to leave the mountains and Mâyâyr b. Kârin was sent to al-Ma'mûn. According to late sources,
Shahrüyar b. Sharwin had deprived Māzyār of his possessions. Māzyār sought refuge with his cousin Windād Umud b. Windād-aspān, who handed him over to Shahrüyar. Māzyār however managed to escape, sought refuge with al-Ma‘mūn and became a Muslim, assuming the name Muḥammad. After the death of Shahrüyar (210 = 825; Tabarī, iii. 1093), Māzyār, returning to Tabaristān, slew Shahrūr b. Shahrūyr and seized the mountain (Tabarī, vi. 1093). (Ibn al-Fakhrī’s story, p. 305—306, about the “assassin of Sharwin b. Shahrūyr,” whom Māzyār assassinated treacherously seems to refer to Shahrūyr, the ally of the suqūm of his victims, Māzyār had built a mosque in Fīrūz.) Māzyār assisted the Arab governor Mūsā b. Ḥāfṣ b. ʿUmar b. al-ʿAṣār to subjugate the mountain of Sharwin and al-Ma‘mūn appointed him governor of Tabaristān, Kūyān and Dunbāwān with the rank of ʿiṣbahād (Balāḏūri, p. 229; Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 309). At this time (Yaḥyā, Historiae, ii. 582), Māzyār boasted the title of Qāṭil ʿiṣbahād, ʿiṣbahād Kūyān-ṭūbān (read Pātūbān-ṭūbān), Muḥammad b. Kūrān, muwālā (sic) amīr al-muʾāminin (i.e. “ally” instead of maqālī “client”). When Mūsā b. Ḥāfṣ died, Māzyār paid no heed to his son Muhammad b. Mūsā. Complaints against Māzyār were taken to Bāghādād by the Bāwandīds and by devout Muslims, but as al-Ma‘mūn was setting out against the Byzantines (expedition of 210—218) Māzyār felt himself free from any control. In his turn he charged Muhammad b. Mūsā with intriguing with the ‘Alids and on this imagiary pretext besieged Amūl. The town capitulated at the end of 8 months. Māzyār executed his enemies and imprisoned all the notables, including Muhammad b. Mūsā, first at Rūd-bast and then in his principal stronghold of Hurmuzābād. To judge from Tabarī, iii. 1289—1292, the place must have been in the valley of the Ṭālār, above ʿUram (Arum) at a distance of 8 farsākhs from Amūl and from Sāri [cf. the article MĀZANDĀRĀN].

In the sixth year of the reign of al-Mu‘tasim (218—227), Māzyār openly rebelled (Balāḏūri, p. 239; Kafarār ūw-zardārā). The Šāhīd Aḥmad Allāh, governor of Khūrāsān, had denounced to the Caliph the suspicions of the people and the apostasy of Māzyār. When al-Mu‘tasim’s ambassador arrived, Māzyār would not listen to him. Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 152, even accuses him of having conferred honours “on Bābak, Māzdak and other Maqāns who had ordered the destruction of the mosques and the obliteration of all traces of ‘Īslām”.

Māzyār’s schemes. It is difficult to reconstruct Māzyār’s programme from the sources, which are hostile to him, but the narratives of contemporaneous witnesses which Tabarī, iii. 1265—1303, gives under the year 224 contain a number of curious and important details.

The extension of Māzyār’s power (after the assassination of the Bāwandī Shajar b. Ḫosraw) had brought him into conflict with the Šāhīd to whom he refused to pay khārādy. It may be noted that Māzyār’s very title “iṣbahād of Khūrāsān” (this variant is given in Yaḥyā, B. G. A., ii. 276) must have been displeasing to the Šāhīd. On the other hand the celebrated Aḥṣīn, who after his victory over Bābak was at the height of his glory, coveted Khūrāsān. He therefore secretly encouraged Māzyār’s resistance to his rivals and according to Tabarī, iii. 1269, played upon his sentiments as a man of noble Iranian blood (ṣaṣṭ midārāhū bī ‘l-dāḥarānī).

From the national point of view, Māzyār could recall the precedent of his grandfather Windād-Hurmuz to whom late sources attribute the organisation of the massacre of the Arab garrisons. Māzyār, who came out of “the mountain” where he had only an almost unknown town (litsakhī, p. 206: al-Asāḥmār) must have looked askance at the urban elements of the great towns of the “plain” among whom Arabs and their clients (ʿābūn) predominated. The landowning class was certainly hostile to him, as in order to weaken and even extirpate them, he had relied on the support of the peasants. Māzyār’s actions were certainly very violent, for ten centuries later, Zahir al-Dīn, p. 167, quotes the proverb: “so and so has done an injustice such as not even Māzyār could have done”.

Coming out in open rebellion (probably before the year 224 under which Balāḏūri and Tabarī relate the denouement) Māzyār had homage paid to himself, took hostages and levied ḥarād at once. The doings of his governor Surkhastān in Sāri are characteristic. He transferred all the inhabitants of Sāri to Amūl, where he shut them up in a fort; as to the people of Amūl, he took 20,000 of them away into the mountains of Hurmuzābād (cf. above). The walls of Sāri, Amūl and Šāmīs were razed to the ground “to the sound of hoes and drums”.

Māzyār had given orders to the peasants to attack and plunder their masters (Tabarī, ii. 1269). The next passage (ii. 1270) seems to indicate that a cadastral survey was ordered (amara an yamsahu ʿl-balad) and the lands were let out, the rental being 30% (of the produce). As to Surkhastān, he collected 260 nobles (abnaʿ ʿl-farandū), the bravest he could find, and on a pretext “that the ʿabūn” were favourable to the Arabs and to the ‘Abbāsids, handed them over as dangerous individuals to the peasants, who slew them at his suggestion. He even tried to provoke a massacre of all the imprisoned landowners, saying to the peasants “I have already handed over to you the houses of the landowners and their wives”; but this time the peasants refrained from following his advice.

The later sources retain the usual accusation of apostasy against Māzyār (“he once more assumed the girdle of Zoroastrianism”, says Ibn Isfandiyār, p. 150 quoting the kādī of Amūl). Balāḏūri, p. 229 and Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 309 also say that Māzyār “renounced the faith and committed treason”, but this point is more obscure in Tabarī, where it only occurs in the list of charges made against Afṣīn, iii. 1311 (transl. in Browne, Lit. Hist of Persia, i. 334). The tone of the letter which Māzyār had addressed to his representatives, ibid., iii 1351, is respectful to the Caliph, in form at least. But there is no smoke without fire, if we may believe the authors who mention the existence in Tabaristān of a Māzyārī sect connected with the ‘Abbāsids [cf. Yaḥyā, B. G. A., ii. 276] or Muḥammārī [q. v.] (i.e. followers of Bābak). Cf. al-Baghdādī (d. in 429), Fārāk bain al-fārāk, p. 251—252; Tāhir al-Isfārā’īn (d. in 451), Tāhirī jīmān (quoted in Flugel, Bābak, Z. D. M. G., 1869, p. 533) and ʿAmānī, G. M. S., col. 501a.

Māzyār’s end. Aḥmad Allāh b. Tāhir sent against Māzyār his uncle Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn to operate from the direction of Djiurdjīq as well as
Hajiyan b. Djalala, who went with 4,000 horses via Khamis towards Djalal al-Sharwān (Sawadkhūh); cf. the article Māzdārān). At the same time the caliph al-Mu'tāsām sent considerable forces under the command of Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhim who entered Rūyān (western Tābaristān) by Shalmāb and Rūdghār (Tābari, iii. 1264). Manṣūr b. Ḥasan, "lord of Dībānāwānd," attacked from Raiy while Abu 'l-Sādāj advanced via Lāriz and Dībānāwānd.

The Arabs very skilfully exploited the rivalries and enmities in the entourage of Māzājr First of all his nephew ʿAfarīn b. Shāhryār (his representative in the mountain of Sharwān = Sawadkhūh) went over to Hatyan, who marched on Sārī and began to negotiate with Māzājr’s brother Kūhylir. In the meanwhile Surkhastān’s army which occupied the Tāmīḫa front dispersed and allowed Ḥasan b. Ḥasān to advance. Kūhylir, who had promised Māzājr’s place, submitted to Ḥasan Māzājr seems to have lost his courage when he found himself surrounded by the Arabs and betrayed by his follower. He trusted Kūhylir, who had promised him the āmān, and came with him to Ḥasan (Tābari, iii. 1288–1291, dramatic story by an eye-witness) but Ḥasan did not even acknowledge his greeting. Māzājr was handed over to Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhim and sent to Sāmarrā. Here he was confronted with Afsān and seems to have denounced the latter. The caliph ordered him to be given 400 lashes, under which he died and his body was exposed beside that of Šabak in 224 = 839.

Kūhylir’s treachery served him little. He was slain as a traitor by his cousin Shāhryār b. Māsin-muhinn who commanded the Dailamis in the service of Māzājr.

Surkhastān was betrayed by the soldiers after the defeat at Tāmīḫa and the other of Māzājr’s generals, al-Durra, who was fighting against Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhim on the Rūyān front, died while attempting to reach Dīlām (Tābari, iii. 1300).


MECCA.

On the eve of the Hīdhrā. It is with the birth of Muḥammad — between 570–580 A.D. — that Mecca suddenly emerges from the shadows of the past and thrusts itself upon the attention of the historian. The geographer Ptolemy seems to know it under the name Macoraba; but it must have been in existence long before his time. Mecca was probably one of the stations on the "incense route", the road by which the produce of the East especially valuable perfumes, came to the Mediterranean world. It owes its importance to its position at the.

Intersection of great commercial routes. The town that had grown up around the well of Zamzam and the sanctuary of the Ka'ba was advantageously placed at the extreme ends of the Asia of the whites and the Africa of the blacks, near a breach in the chain of the Sarat, close to a junction of roads leading from Babylonia and Syria to the plateaus of the Yemen, to the shores of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. By the latter it was in communication with the mysterious African continent. What advantages were offered by this situation at the boundary between civilisation and barbarism, at the point of contact of two societies, brought together by necessities more pressing than political ambitions or the quarrels of race and religion! This was the part played by the Palmyrans, situated between the Romans and the Parthians. It demanded an adaptability and diplomatic skill beyond the ordinary. The two societies were frequently at war; it required wits to deal tactfully with them. But if the position had its risks, it had the advantage of being able to fix the price for its services to the belligerents. In the delicate role of intermediary and broker between two world, the strength of will of the Ishmaelite and the tenacity that lay beneath his apparent compliance assured his success from the start. Civilisation and barbarism might conclude peace for a time or be at war; he was able to trade on their agreement or exploit their dissensions with equal satisfaction to himself. Ambiguous and ambivalent, the Meccan was able to have a foot in both camps without it being possible to discern where his sympathies really lay.

At an early date we see the Meccans opening negotiations with the states adjoining Arabia. They obtained from them safe conducts and capitulations, permitting the free passage of their caravans. This is what their chronicles call the “guarantee of Caesars and of Chosroes”. They also concluded agreements with the Negus of Abyssinia, with the principal shahs of Nadjd, the kātir of the Yemen, with the phylarchs of Ghassān and of Hira. In the negotiations with the Greeks and Persians the principal of the “open door” was not admitted. Commercial transactions were carried through at points on the frontier or in towns specially designated for the purpose. In Palestine these were the ports of Aila and Ghazza and perhaps also Jerusalem. In Syria, Bosrat was their principal outlet, their great market.

Sūrā c.vi. 2 mentions as a permanent institution "the double caravan of winter and summer". The nasābā, genealogists, record the names of the Kurash chiefs who had succeeded in obtaining by negotiation permits to trade. The countries open to commerce in this way were called wādīh, direction, maliqar, region of trade. There were innumerable restrictions, limiting the extension of the privilege. Eastern governments did not permit free trade. Distrustful of merchants even when their own subjects, Byzantium showed herself still more...
suspicious of foreigners, especially Bedouins, a slippery race which filled her with an unconquerable distrust. The latter had therefore to make heavy sacrifices, to pay onerous taxes, to pay continual customs-dues and tolls or to hand over hostages before negotiations could be begun. Mecca was not inspired by principles any more broadminded: she took care to recompense herself from foreign traders and to levy various charges upon them, tithes, charges for permits to stay in the country, to travel about and to trade. Tithes had to be paid before entering Mecca. There was also, as at Palmyra, a "departure" tax or tax on exportation. In short, foreign merchants were entangled in a very intricate fiscal system, whether they settled in Mecca or only passed through it, especially those who did not obtain the ḍiyār or guarantee of a local clan or notability.

The population. About the time of the Hijr, the people of Mecca claimed descent from a common ancestor. They called him Kuraish or Fāhr, sometimes also al-Naḍr named Kuraish. The origins of the Kuraish were humble and little is known of them. They formed one of the less wealthy branches of those who went back to the main stock of the Quraysh. At first they led a miserable existence in the wild mountains around the sacred territory of Mecca. A condottiere from the northern Hijr, Kuṣayy, is said to have installed them by force of arms in Mecca, which he took from the control of the tribe of Quraysh. Some ten main clans can be distinguished among them: Hāšim, Umayya, Nantif, Zuhra, Asad, Taim, Makhūm, 'Adi, Djumah and Sāhīm. These occupied mainly the centre of the town, the bottom of the valley, al-Baḥṣa, where the water of the well of Zamzam accumulated, the hollow where the Ka'ba stood. Their living in this neighbourhood earned them the epithet of al-Ṣaḥiḥ, al-Ṣayaḥ or Kuraish al-Ṣayḥ. This central quarter of the town was regarded as that of the aristocracy and of the oldest Kuraish families. Among these ten groups, some owe to Islam a renown hitherto denied them. Such were the Taim and the 'Adi, rendered illustrious by the caliphs 'Abdāl Bakr and 'Umar. Other clans more connected with the eponymous ancestor were thrust towards the outskirts of Mecca, on the lower slopes or in the gorges (ṣabiyah) of the hills which dominate the town. They were called the "Kuraish of the outskirts" (Kuraish al-zawāhir). Held in less consideration than their fellow-tribemen of the Baḥṣa, these suburbs had the advantage of being distinguished from them by their bravery. They supplied the Kuraish community with its best soldiers and never failed to cast this up to the Meccans "of the centre".

Government and Administration. It is not easy to discover definite indications of this. There must however have been a rudimentary system of archives in which to preserve treaties of alliance and commerce, and later the equivalent of an office to take charge of the collection of taxes on foreign traders. Nowhere do we find any explicit allusion to the working of such administrative organisations. A tradition records the existence of purely honorary offices with no jurisdiction. But it does not agree either upon the number (ten or six) nor upon the functions of these offices. I imagine it was invented to satisfy the vanity of the great families. The only allusion to it is in the verses of a Meccan poet, Ḥāsān b. Thābit.

The office of "pavilion and reins" has nothing to do — as has been supposed — with the art of war. This dignity, which was an ancient one and no longer understood, was a memory of the ritual processions held in pagan Arabia. The ḫubba was simply the pavilion or portable tabernacle, containing the fetish of the tribe and solemnly carried on the back of a camel. The chiefs and notables took turns at holding the reins of the animal bearing this precious burden. It is taking nothing from the glory of Khuṣayb b. al-Walid to say that he had not a monopoly of this privilege. Behind the legend of the Kuraish dignities, we perceive the intention of glorifying the cradle of the Prophet. In giving it administrative institutions, an attempt was made to conceal the modest beginnings of the Hāšim and no less those of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. The onerous office of ṣīhāb, which had to pay compensation for murder and injury, was far beyond the financial resources of the modest citizen called Abū Bakr. The entrusting to 'Umar of the safāra or diplomatic missions cannot be reconciled with his extreme youth and plebeian origin.

I have elsewhere, for lack of a better term, called Mecca "a merchant republic". If Abū Sufyān is called "Shaikh and chief of the Kuraish", several of his contemporaries are given equally high sounding titles. There is not the slightest reason to think that he was a kind of Kuraish doge. The manner in which the events of the first eight years of the Hijr are recorded produces the fallacious impression that he held the power in Mecca in his hands. In reality he was only the ablest and most intelligent of his peers, the chiefs of the Kuraish clans. As al-Fāṣi pertinently observes, all were equal: "no one exercised authority unless delegated or kindly permitted to do so by them". Did their chiefs constitute a regular official body? Yes, says tradition. Mecca is even said to have had a kind of Senate or Grand Council, the dār al-nadwa. It met only in extraordinary circumstances. Usually however, we find that it is in the madīlah, family groups or clubs, the Nādi Karam opening on the square of the Ka'ba — the forum and bourse of the town — that affairs of general interest were dealt with.

The Kur'ān cannot conceive of authority without a council of notables, without the maḥb. This institution is so frequently mentioned in the Kur'ān that the Prophet must have seen it working before his eyes. We think then that Mecca was ruled by the oligarchy of the maḥb, the equivalent in the town of the madīlah of the nomad tribe. This was an assembly of the chiefs of the wealthiest and most influential families. This is why Umayyads and Makhzsūmids are most usually mentioned as composing the maḥb. Neither election nor birth could necessarily open the way to a seat on it, but rather the fame of services rendered, the prestige of ability and wealth. Thus it welcomed to its counsels the very wealthy Ibn Dzuj'ān, a member of the humble clan of Taim. An assembly of elders or if you like of senators, in conformity with the principle of seniority among the Arabs: its authority, purely moral, was limited to advising, studying, looking ahead and giving to the merchant community the benefit of the experience of its conscript fathers. In the absence of any coercive
powers, persuasion was the only force it had to make its wishes obeyed. Hence the importance of eloquence in a milieu like this, where every family and every clan claimed autonomy. The cause of peace was in continual conflict with their claims. Without infringing their prerogatives, the Mala' was able to exert moral pressure when the general good required it. The system recalls, though remotely, the organisation of Palmyra and of Venice.

Site and climate. In the form of an elongated crescent with its points turned towards the flanks of the Kuʿaitīn, the town was hemmed in by a double range of bare and steep hills. The centre of this ill-ventilated couloir coincided with a depression in the soil. The early town occupied the bottom of this; this was the wādī, the valley, the ṣaʿī or Mecca, the hollow of Mecca. The centre, the lowest part of this depression, was called al-Raṭɑ' (cf. above). Some buildings in this quarter were so close to the Kaʿba that in the morning and in the evening their shadows were merged in that of the sacred edifice. Between these houses and the Kaʿba [q. v.] a narrow esplanade (fīnā) lay below the level of the surrounding soil. This open area formed the primitive masjīd, a sanctuary open to the heavens.

The pre-Islamic Raṭɑ' knew no other. The ends of the little streets opening on this open space were called the "gates of the ḥaram or of the masjīd". The so-called gates or openings took their names from the clans settled around the Kaʿba. Thus one regularly spoke of the "gate of the Bānī Džumāh". The walls of their houses served to mark the boundaries of the masjīd. It was on the ground floor of the buildings facing the sides of the Kaʿba that the maqṣīls or nādī of the chief families met, those that formed the Mala' (cf. above).

In the suburbs (qiwaḥi), and at a later date in the ravines (ṣābī), which had been dug by erosion out of the flanks of the hills, was a confusion of poor houses, low and ramshackle hovels. The unpleasant features of a town of this kind are obvious. The geographer Maḳdisī has summed these up strikingly: "suffocating heat, deadly winds, clouds of flies". The continual difficulty was the dearth of water. The population was dependent on the variable output of the Zamām. There were other wells, mainly outside the town. Those inside had a doubtful reputation. The scarcity of drinking-water is evident from the amount of precaution taken, when some thousands of pilgrims had to be supplied. In such deplorable conditions one can imagine what suffering the long days brought, ramīla Makka "the burning of Mecca"; why the great families preferred to send their children to be brought up in the desert; why the Sira only incidentally mentions the plague of Mekka (qiwaḥa Makka). Smallpox is mentioned only in connection with the enemies of the Prophet.

Rains are few and far between. Droughts sometimes last for four years. But when the winter season is wet, the rains may sometimes attain an unheard-of degree of violence. To the east of Mecca a rocky wall raises its steep barrier, a succession of strata and summits merging into the chain of the Sarāt. These jagged hills collect on their flanks the surplus rains of the monsoon which brings fertility to the Yemen. All along these slopes, where no shrub interrupts the fall — at the bottom of each a sail is formed — the cataracts augmented by all these tributaries fall into the hollow of Mecca, baṭn Makka, of which the Kaʿba occupies the bottom. The waters rush to this depression they force a passage through the "gates of the masjīd" and flow over the area around the sanctuary.

They fill it and rise to attack the Kaʿba. Before the Lidjarah, the Karashiṣyndicate seems to have paid no heed to the flooding or said they were powerless to prevent it. Efforts made by the caliphs yielded "only mediocre results".

This is why the misdeeds of the sail fill the annals of Mecca. On several occasions their violence has overthrown the Kaʿba and turned the court of the great mosque into a lake. As a result of the floods, epidemics broke out. The deposit of filth brought by the waters polluted the wells: bodies left unburied formed centres of epidemic infection. The analyses avoid dwelling on this, troubled by the Tradition which says that the plague never reaches Mecca. The absolute sterility of the soil brought another scourge, that of famine. The slightest irregularity in the conveyance of grain from Syria or the Sarāt was enough to cause it. It continues to figure along with the ravages of flood and plague in the monotonous annals of the town.

Economic life and finance. On examining closely the picturesque literature of the Sira and Hadīth, one sees the impression of business, of intense activity bursting out of the narrow and sterile valley of Mecca. The Qurʾān only strengthens this impression. All his life the Prophet retained the impress of his Qurashi education and training. This fundamentally mercantile character is revealed at every turn.

Writing and arithmetic. One is amazed at their importance in the economic life of the town. Relying on the Qurʾānic epithet ummut, i.e. pagan, gentle, and on biased writers like al-Baladhuri, it has been held that, except for some fifteen individuals mentioned by name, all the pre-Hdjran Karashi were illiterate. Alongside of the "book" of accounts, the scales always figure in the Meccan shops; not so much to weigh goods as to verify and check payments of all kinds including cash. Now, coins were not plentiful on the Meccan market; they were supplemented by the precious metals, ingots of gold and silver, by tibr, gold dust. Only the scales could determine the value. In the more delicate cases, recourse was had to the services of a wasāṣan or professional weigher.

It would be difficult to imagine a society in which capital enjoyed a more active circulation. The ṭājir, business man, was not engaged in hoarding, in gathering wealth into his strong boxes. He had a blind faith in the unlimited productivity of capital, in the virtue of credit. Brokers and agents, the bulk of the population lived on credit. The sleeping partnership was much in favour (muḏārâ), especially the "partnership for the half", which supposes 50% participation in the profits by the sleeping partners. Thanks to the development of the institutions the humblest sums could be invested, down to a gold dinar or even a masūd or half dinar. Such a flexible organisation stimulated even the humblest to take his share in commercial enterprises.

The coins brought to Mecca were of very different kinds: the denarius aureus of the Byzantines
and the silver drachm of the Sasanids and Himyars. These pieces were often worn, rudely engraved, very unequal in weight, and enormous, came from the most varied mints. Only the money-changer had the requisite flair, the eye sufficiently trained to deal with the confusion of currencies, to determine accurately the standards, values, and the kinds in circulation. In addition there were the complications caused by the difference of standard and the oscillations of exchange. The Byzantine provinces, Syria and Egypt, were among the abī al-dhahab or countries with a gold standard. Babylonia was abī al-warī, a land with a silver, the Sasanian, standard. On the eve of the departure of the caravans for Syria, there were regular battles in search of dinārs. The Meccan tādir was not distinct from the financier. His first article of trade was money. When occasion arose, he invested his capital in business, in the organization of large caravans. To the leaders of the caravan, to the traders and to the factors, he advanced the funds necessary for their operations.

Primarily a clearing house, a banking town, Mecca had customs and institutions peculiar to this kind of transaction and to finance. Sometimes it is ribā, usury, in all its ugliness: dinar for dinār, diham for diham, i.e. 100% interest. To the condemnation of ribā in the Kūr'ān, the Kuraish objected that they saw in it only “a kind of sale” (Kūr'ān ii. 275), of letting out capital for a rent. Speculation too was rampant, on the rates of exchange, the load of a caravan which one tried to buy up, the yield of the harvests and of the flocks and lastly the provisioning of the town. Fictitious associations were formed, bonds and ivory sets were made, which loans were borrowed. “Every Arab”, says Strabo, “is either a trader or a broker”. In Mecca, says the ḥadīth “he who was not a merchant, counted for nothing”. In setting out on a military expedition the citizens always took merchandise along with them. This is what they did when going to relieve the Bādār caravan. The first thing the Meccan murājī harām did on arriving in Medina was to ask the way to the market-place. The women shared these commercial instincts: Abū Dā'ī's mother ran a perfumery business. The activities of the tādira Khaḍīja are celebrated. Hind [q.v.], the wife of Abū Sufyān, sold her merchandise among the Kalbīs of Syria. Like their husbands the Meccan women had financial interests in the caravans. On the return of the convoys they gathered round Abū Sufyān to know what their money and their contributions had earned and to get their share of the profits.

The caravans. The organization of a caravan was the subject of interminable palavers in the nāḍi around the Ka'ba. Its departure and return were events of public interest. The whole population was associated with it. En route it remained in continual communication with the metropolis through Beduins met on the journey or special couriers. Abū Sufyān sent one of these messengers to describe the critical position of the Bādār caravan. It cost him 20 dinārs, an enormous sum, but one proportionate to the value of the convoy in which Mecca had 50,000 dinārs invested. The Meccan caravans were of considerable size. Neither horses nor mules appeared in them. The number of camels on occasion rose to 2,500. The men (merchants, guards [dā'il] and guards) varied from 100 to 300. The escort was strengthened on approaching areas infested by bandits (qā'īd) or when traversing the territory of hostile tribes. The Bādār caravan may be taken as typical. We do not now of another in which the capital invested attained such an amount. The greater part was supplied by the important Umayyad firm of Abū Uṣayba, i.e. the family of Sa'id b. al-Ṭāṣ. This firm had formed a company of the family, adding to their own considerable reserves the contributions of their sleeping partners. To their 30,000 dinārs the other Umayyad houses added 10,000. Four-fifths of the capital of the Bādār caravan was therefore of Umayyad origin. We can understand why the direction and supreme control of the convoy was entrusted to Abū Sufyān, who was personally interested in the enterprise.

In the first place a caravan from Mecca carried skins and leather, sometimes also the saḥib of Tā' if, a kind of currant; then ingots of gold and silver partly from the mines of the Banū Sulaim and tīrū, gold dust from Africa. The texts frequently call it latīma, i.e. convoy laden with perfume and rare spices. Of the perfumes, the most esteemed came not from the Ḥijāţ, but from southern Arabia, the “land of frankincense”, or even from India and Africa. To these might be added aromatic gums and medicinal drugs, like the senna of Mecca, all objects of small bulk and purchased at higher prices by the luxury of the civilized countries.

From the Yemen the Meccan caravans brought back the products of India, the silks of China, the rich 'adān cloths, so called from 'Aden. Besides gold dust, the main exports of Africa were slaves and ivory. In 629 Mecca recruited her labourers and her mercenary soldiers, the Ḥafīẓ or Abyssinian. In Egypt and in Syria, the Kuraish traders bought luxury articles, products of the industry of the Mediterranean, mainly cotton, linen or silk stuffs and cloths dyed in vivid purple. From Borsa and the Ṣa'ar (Syria) came arms, cereals and oil, much appreciated by the Beduins. The pace of the caravan was slow but the articles transported, leather, metals, scented woods, feared neither damage nor the delays of long journeys. The expenses were confined to the hire of the animals, the payment of the escort, the tolls and presents to the chiefs of the tribes. With such an economical organisation, the profits of 100% attested by our authors were quite usual. This was the case with the caravan of Bādār “each dinār having brought back a dinār”. Two years after this brilliant affair, the Companions of the Prophet who had sought refuge in Medina were able to carry out as profitable a transaction in the same field “since each of their dirhams gained a second dinār”, that is to say a profit of 100% again.

Fortunes in Mecca. We can now imagine how money had gradually accumulated in the chests of the Meccan financiers, who were naturally of a saving disposition. This explains Pliny the Elder's ill-humour when he recalls “the millions of sestercii which the Arabs take annually from the Roman Empire giving nothing in return, nisi insidiam sedimentibus” (Hist. Nat., vi. 28). This last statement is an exaggeration, but it should be remembered that the Meccan caravan carried only articles of high value, and that with regard to the Empire the Arabs were mainly importers, so that the trade balance was always very much
in their favour. The 30,000 dinārs invested by the one house of Abū Umarīah in the Badr caravan suggests that H. Winckler is quite right when he tells us to think of the Palmyra of Zenobia if you wish to get an idea of the financial capacity of Mecca. The fortunes of the Makhlūmis were no less than those of their Umaiyyid rivals. The Taimī 'Abd Allāh b. Djiḍdān must have been a millionaire if the poet thought of comparing him to Caesar. The principal organisers of the Badr caravan were also millionaires. The thousands of dinārs subscribed by them did not even represent all their fortune. Other portions of their capital were out at interest or put in other speculations. Among other millionaires we may mention the Makhlūmis Walīd b. al-Mughira and 'Abd Allāh, father of the poet 'Umar b. Abī Raisā.

Next to these representatives of high finance come the well-to-do Meccans, like 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf who had a capital of 8,000 dinārs and al-Harīrī b. 'Amir and Umaiya b. Khalāf. Of the latter two, the first had 1,000 and the second 3,000 dinārs in the day. In the class of the small traders, there were the small traders, brokers and shopkeepers who formed the petite bourgeoisie of the town. To their commerce a number added the supervision of some industry like ironwork or carpentry. The most typical representative of this class is given us by the future caliph Abū Bakr, a basās, retailer of cloth. He belonged like Abū Djiḍḍān to the plebeian clan of Taim, rich in men and women of initiative, like 'Ašīṣa, daughter of Abū Bakr. He seems to have had a capital of 40,000 dirhams. 'Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet, is also mentioned among the rich bankers of Mecca, but we have no details about him. The other Makhlūmis lived in circumstances bordering on poverty. Those Meccans most certainly must have been wealthy who paid without a murmure the enormous ransoms demanded for their relatives after the defeat of Badr. After this sacrifice — it cost them not less than 200,000 dirhams — the Meccan chiefs gave up their share of the profits in the Badr enterprise — some 25,000 dinārs — to prepare for the revenge. They did this with a good heart", with the easy grace of opulent financiers, used to running the risks of speculations on a large scale. One touching detail is recorded. They refused to touch the modest shares of the small contributors. This example shows how at Mecca, "the strong", abī al-fawās (Wāqīdī), i.e. the patricians, were able in critical circumstances to realise a spirit of solidarity and of sound democracy.

Mecca before the Hijra had neither ships nor a port. It was only exceptionally that foreign ships cast anchor in the little bay of Shu'āiba off a desert shore. It was here that the Byzantine ship was wrecked, the wood of which went to build the terrace of the Ka'ba. It was to Shu'āiba that the first Muslim emigrants for Abyssinia went, no doubt on hearing that two merchant ships had touched there. More rarely sailings took place from the desolate shore of Djīdā, which was nearer Mecca. From the time of 'Uthmān, Djīdā took the place of Shu'āiba and became the port of the Kurāsh metropolis. When Muhammad settled in Medina and cut their communications with Syria, the Meccan leaders never thought of taking to the sea but resigned themselves to the enormous detour through al-Najd. The creation of an Arab navy was the work of the caliph Mu'āwiya.

2. Aftér the Hijra. We need not rehearse the events of the first eight years of the Hijra. They are summed up in the struggle with the Prophet. This struggle and the ridda, the surrender of Mecca, were fatal to its economic prosperity. One after the other, the great families migrated to Medina, now the capital of Islam. This tendency increased under the first three caliphs, who made their headquarters among the Ansār. 'Ali definitely left Arabia to settle in Kufa. Richly endowed by the state, the leading Kūraishi, becoming generals and governors of provinces, lost interest in commerce. No more is heard about caravans or fairs in the Hijāz. It was only at the period of the pilgrimage that Mecca became alive again and saw the caliphs reappear at the head of the pilgrims. The conquest of the ḍirāq dealt the last blow to the economic decline of western Arabia. The Indian trade resumed its old route by the Persian Gulf and the valley of the Euphrates. The second commerce was established by land with the markets of the middle east.

Umaiya period. The situation improved with the coming of the Umaiya dynasty. Mu'āwiya took an active interest in his native town. He erected buildings there and developed agriculture in the environs, dug wells and built dams to store water in the spring. Under his successors, especially the Marwānids, Mecca became a city of pleasure and ease, the rendezvous of poets and musicians, attracted by the brilliant society formed by the sons of the Companions of the Prophet. Many people returned to live in Mecca after making their fortunes in the government of conquered provinces. Contact with foreign civilisations had made them refined and fastidious. They had become accustomed to baths, a luxury which presupposes an abundant water-supply. Water had to be procured from the hills of the Sarā'. Khalid al-Kasrī's [q. v.] name is associated with this undertaking which changed the aspect of the town. To meet the scourge of flood, the caliphs 'Umar and 'Uthmān had called in the aid of Christian engineers, who built barrages in the high-lying quarters. They also secured the area round the Ka'ba by making dykes and embankments. The Umaiya caliphs continued and completed these works. They dug a new bed along the course of the sail and endeavoured to break its violence by barriers built at different levels. Their great anxiety was to protect the depression of the Baṭḥah where the Ka'ba stood. The skill of the engineers of the period did not succeed in overcoming the topographical difficulties nor in averting the ravages of the winter rains, regular phenomena. They were frustrated by the steep slopes of the ground, still further aggravated by the unusual shape of the Baṭḥah, a basin with no outlet. The houses on the bank of the sail were taken down and the alleys adjoining the Ka'ba removed. Each modification of the old plan meant the sacrifice of more buildings. These clearances in time changed the traditional aspect of Mecca, where the sail continued to sow destruction.

Along with these precautions against flooding an endeavour was made to enlarge the exiguous court around the Ka'ba. Islam aspired to possess a temple in keeping with its worldwide claims. Successful expriations begun by 'Umar and finished
by Walid I prepared an esplanade. The plan of the great mosque [cf. Al-Maṣfīd al-Ḥakām] with its galleries, a vast courtyard with the Ḳa‘ba in the centre, is the work of the Umayyad caliph. He had the assistance of Christian architects from Syria and Egypt to carry it out. The important governorship of the Ḥijāz with its three cities, Medīna, Mecca and Ta‘if, could in principle be given only to a member of the ruling family. Among the most celebrated of these Umayyads may be mentioned Sa‘d b. al-‘Azīz and the two future caliphs, Marwān b. al-Ḥakam and ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. When no Umayyad was available the choice fell upon an officer of tried capacity like Ḥādżjādī and Khālid al-Ḳasrī. At first they were given Ta‘if and then transferred to Mecca. It was only after this probation that the three towns were entrusted to them. But even then the centre of government remained in Medīna, which under the Umayyads eclipsed Mecca by its political importance and by the fact that it was the home of the new Muslim aristocracy.

Under Ya‘qūb I, the rising of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] brought Syrian troops to Mecca. The rebel had made his headquarters in the court of the great mosque. A scaffold of wood, covered with straw, protected the Ka‘ba. The carelessness of a Meccan soldier set it on fire. Ibn al-Zubayr rebuilt the edifice and included the Ḥijār within it [see Ka‘ba]. When Ḥādżjādī had overthrown the Zubayrid anti-caliph, he restored the Ka‘ba to its former dimensions which have since remained unaltered. In 747 a Ḥārūnī rebel from the Ye‘men seized Mecca without meeting opposition. He was soon defeated and slain by the troops of the caliph Marwān II. In 750, Mecca passed with the rest of the caliphate under the rule of the ‘Abbāsids.


II

Mecca under the ‘Abbāsids down to the foundation of the Sharifate (750–961).

Although the political centre of gravity in Islām now lay in Baghda‘d, this period at first presents the same picture as under Umayyad rule. The Ħaramān are as a rule governed by ‘Abbāsīd princes or individuals closely connected with them (Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, ed. Wustenfeld, i., 151 sqq.). Sometimes Mecca and Ta‘if were under one ruler, who was at the same time leader of the Ḥādżjī, while Medīna had a separate governor of its own.

Arabia had however from the first century A.H. contained a number of ‘Alīd groups, who, as was their wont, fished in troubled waters, lay in wait as brigands to plunder the Ḥādżjī caravans and from time to time hoisted their flags when they were not restrained either by the superior strength or by the bribes of the caliphs. We find al-Mansūr (136–156 = 754–774) already having trouble in Western Arabia. Towards the end of the reign of al-Mahdi (156–160 = 774–785) a Ḥasanī, Ḥusain b. ‘Ali, led a raid on Medīna, which he ravaged; at Fakīkh near Mecca, he was cut down with many of his followers by the ‘Abbāsīd leader of the Ḥādżjī. The place where he was buried is now called al-Shu‘hādā‘ī. It is significant that it is regarded as the “martyr of Fakīkh” (Tabari, ii. 551 sqq.; Chron. Mecca, i. 435; 501 sqq.).

Ḥārūn al-Rashīd on his nine pilgrimages expended vast sums in Mecca. He was not the only ‘Abbāsīd to scatter wealth in the holy land. This had a bad effect on the character of the Meccans. There were hardly any descendants left of the old distinguished families and the population grew accustomed to living at the expense of others and were ready to give vent to any dissatisfaction in rioting. This attitude was all too frequently stimulated by political conditions.

In the reign of al-Ma‘mūn (198–218 = 817–833) it was again ‘Alīds, Ḥusain al-‘Alīs and Ḥibrīm b. Mūsā, who extended their rule over Medīna, Mecca and the Yemen (Tabari, ii. 981 sqq.; Chron. Mecca, ii. 238), ravaged Western Arabia and plundered the treasures of the Ka‘ba. How strong ‘Alīd influence already was at this time is evident from the fact that Ma‘mūn appointed two ‘Alīds as governors of Mecca (Tabari, iii. 1039; Chron. Mecca, ii. 191 sqq.).

With the decline of the ‘Abbāsīd caliphate after the death of Ma‘mūn, a period of anarchy began in the holy land of Islām, which was frequently accompanied by scarcity of famine. It became the
regular custom for a number of rulers to be represented at the Ḥadjijj in the plain of ʿArafāt and to have their flags unfurled; the holy city was rarely spared fighting on these occasions. The safety of the pilgrim caravans was considerably affected; it was very often ʿAlids who distinguished themselves in plundering the pilgrims.

The ʿAlid cause received an important reinforcement at this time by the foundation of a Ḥasanid dynasty in Tabaristan (Tabari, iii, 1523–1533, 1583 sq., 1682–1685, 1693 sq., 1640, 1880, 1884 sq., 1940). In Mecca the repercussions of this event were felt in the appearance of two Ḥasanids (Chron. Mekka, i. 343; ii. 10, 195, 239 sq.), Ismāʿīl b. Yūsuf and his brother Muhammad, who also ravaged Medina and Diḍjāda in the way that had now become usual (451 = 865–866).

The appearance of the Karamatians [q.v.] brought still further misery to the country in the last fifty years before the foundation of the sharifate (Tabari, iii. 2124–2130). Hard pressed themselves at the heart of the empire, the caliphs were hardly able even to think of giving active support to the holy land, and, besides, their representatives had not the necessary forces at their disposal. From 916 onwards the Karamatians barred the way to the pilgrim caravans. In 930, 1,500 Karamatian warriors raided Mecca, massacred the inhabitants by the thousand and carried off the Black Stone to Baghdad. It was only when they realised that such deeds were bringing them no nearer their goal — the destruction of official Islam — that their zeal began to relax and in 950 they even brought the Sr. over to their side. Mecca was relieved of serious danger from the Karamatians. The following years bear witness to the increasing influence of the ʿAlids in western Arabia in connection with the advance of Fāṭimid rule to the east and with the Ḥajj rule in Baghdad. From this time the Meccan ʿAlids are called by the title of Sharif which they have retained ever since.

2. From the foundation of the Sharifate to Kātāda (c. 350–498 = 960–1200).

a. The Mūsāwīs. The sources do not agree as to the year in which Ḥajjār took Mecca. 966, 967, 968 and the period between 951 and 961 are mentioned (Chron. Mekka, ii. 205 sqq.). ʿAlids had already ruled before him in the holy land. It is with him however that the reign of the Ḥasanids in Mecca begins, who are known collectively as sharifs, while in Medina this title is given to the reigning Husainids.

The rise and continuance of the Sharifate indicates the relative independence of Western Arabia in face of the rest of the Islamic world from a political and religious point of view. Since the foundation of the Sharifate, Mecca takes the precedence possessed by Medina hitherto.

How strongly the Meccan sharifate endeavoured to assert its independence, is evident in this period from two facts. In 976 Mecca refused homage to the Fāṭimid caliph. Soon afterwards the Caliph began to besiege the town and cut off all imports from Egypt. The Meccans were soon forced to give in, for the Hijāz was dependent on Egypt for its back supplies (Ibn al-ʿAthr, Kāmil, viii. 491; Chron. Mekka, ii. 246).

The second sign of the Sharifs' feeling of independence is Abu 'l-Futūḥ's (384–432 = 994–1039) setting himself up as caliph in 1011 (Chron. Mekka, ii. 207; Ibn al-ʿAthr, Kāmil, ix. 233, 217). He was probably induced to do this by al-Ḥākim's heretical innovations in Egypt. The latter however was soon able to reduce the new caliph's sphere of influence so much that he had hurriedly to return to Mecca where in the meanwhile one of his relatives had usurped the power. He was forced to make terms with al-Ḥākim in order to be able to expel his relative.

With his son Shukr (432–453 = 1030–1061) the dynasty of the Mūsāwīs, i.e. the descendants of Mūsā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Mūsā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Hasan b. Hasan b. ʿAli b. Abī Ṭalib came to an end. He died without leaving male heirs, which caused a struggle within the family of the Husainids with the usual evil results for Mecca. When the family of the Banū Shaiba (q.v.; the Ṣōkhā) went so far as to confiscate for their private use all precious metals in the house of Allāh, the ruler of Yemen, al-Sulaiḥi (Chron. Mekka, ii. 208, 210 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿAthr, Kāmil, ix. 422; x. 19, 38) intervened and restored order and security in the town. This intervention by an outsider appeared more intolerable to the Ḥasanids than fighting among themselves. They therefore proposed to al-Sulaiḥī that he should instal one of their number as ruler and leave the town.

He therefore appointed Abū Hāshim Muḥammad (455–487 = 1063–1094) as Grand Sharif. With him begins the dynasty of the b. Ḥāshimiyyah (455–598 = 1063–1200), which takes its name from Abū Hāshim Muhammad, a brother of the first Sharif ʿAbdīr, the two brothers were descendants in the fourth generation from Muḥammad, the ancestor of the Mūsāwīs.

During the early years of his reign, Abū Hāshim had to wage a continual struggle with the Sulaimānī branch, who thought themselves humiliated by his appointment. These Sulaimānīs were descendants from Sulaimān, a brother of the Mūsī II above mentioned.

The reign of Abū Hāshim is further noteworthy for the shameless way in which he offered the suzerainty, i.e. the mention in the khutba as well as the change of official rite which is indicated by the wording of the asḥān, to the highest bidder i.e. the Fāṭimid caliph or the Sāljuḵ sultan (Chron. Mekka, ii. 253; Ibn al-ʿAthr, x. 67). It was very unwelcome to the Meccans that imports from Egypt stopped as soon as the official mention of the Fāṭimid in the khutba gave way to that of the caliph. The change was repeated several times with the result that the Saljuḵ, tired of this comedy, sent several bodies of Turkmans to Mecca.

The ill-feeling between Sulṭān and Sharif also inflicted great misery on pilgrims coming from the Irāk. As the leadership of the pilgrim caravans from this country had gradually been transferred from the ʿAlids to Turkish officials and soldiers, Abū Hāshim did not hesitate occasionally to fall upon the pilgrims and plunder them (Chron. Mekka, ii. 254; Ibn al-ʿAthr, x. 153).

The reign of his successor is also marked by covetousness and plundering. The Spanish pilgrim Ibn Duhaylī, who visited Mecca in 1183 and 1185, gives hair-raising examples of this. Even then however the Harūn were no longer absolutely free of their own masters, as over ten years before, the Ayyūbī dynasty had not only succeeded to the Fāṭimid in Egypt but was trying to get the whole of near Asia into their power.
Saladin's brother, who passed through Mecca on his way to South Arabia, abandoned his intention of abolishing the sharifs but the place of honour on the Ḥajjī belonged to the Aiyūbids and their names were mentioned in the khutba after those of the ʿAbbasid caliph and the sharif ( Ibn Djuubair, p. 75, 95). The same Aiyūbid in 1186 also did away with the Shīf (here Zaidī, for the Sharifs had hitherto been Zaidīs) form of the adḥām ( Chron. Meḳka, ii. 214), had coins struck in Saladin's name and put the fear of the law into the hearts of the sharif's bodyguard, who had not shrunk from crimes of robbery and murder, by severely punishing their misdeeds. — A further result of Aiyūbid suzerainty was that the ʿShīfī rite became the predominant one. But even the mighty Saladin could only make improvements in Mecca. He could abolish or check the worst abuses but the general state of affairs remained as before.

3. The rule of ʿKatāda and his descendants down to the Wahhābi period (c. 1200—1788).

In the meanwhile a revolution was being prepared which was destined to have more far-reaching consequences than any of its predecessors. ʿKatāda, a descendant of the same Mūsā (see above) from whom the Mūsāwīs and the Ḥawāqih were descended, had gradually extended his estates as well as his influence from Yaqūb to Mecca and had gathered a considerable following in the town. According to some sources, his son Ḥanẓala made all preparations for the decisive blow on the holy city, according to others, ʿKatāda seized the town on the 27th Ṣaʿdīb when the whole population was away performing a less ʿumra in memory of the completion of the building of the Kaʿba by ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubair, which was celebrated on this day along with the festival of Muharram's ascension to heaven. However it came about, ʿKatāda's seizure of the town meant the coming of an able and strongwilled ruler, the ancestor of all later sharifs. He steadfastly followed his one ambition to make his territory an independent principality. Everything was in his favour; that he did not achieve his aim was a result of the fact that the Ḥīdżaz was once again at the intersection of many rival lines of political interest.

Katāda began by ruining his chances with the great powers; he ill-treated the son of the Aiyūbīd al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (540—615 = 1145—1218) in brutal fashion ( Chron. Meḳka, ii. 265). He roused the ire of the caliph by his attitude to pilgrims from the ʿIrāk. He was able however to appease the latter and the embassy he sent to Baghdad returned with gifts from the caliph. The caliph also invited him to visit Baghdad. According to some historians, however, the sharif turned home again before he actually reached Baghdad. On this occasion, he is said to have expressed his policy of the "splendid isolation" of the Ḥīdżaz in verse, as he did in his will in prose (see Snouck Hurgronje, Qudāddah's Policy of Splendid Isolation etc. in Bibli.).

On the other hand, Katāda is said to have vigorously supported both the Imām of Hāsānī descent in founding a kingdom in the Yemen. After the reconquest of this region by a grandson of al-ʿĀdil, the Aiyūbīs of Egypt, Syria, and South Arabia were mentioned in the khutba in Mecca along with the Caliph and Sharif.

Katāda's life ended in a massacre which his son ʿHāsān carried out in his family to rid himself of possible rivals ( Chron. Meḳka, ii. 215, 263 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿAṭṭīr, Kāmil, xii. 262 sqq.). The Aiyūbid prince Manusīd however soon put a limit to his ambition and had Mecca governed by his generals. On his death however power again passed into the hands of the sharifs, whose territory was allowed a certain degree of independence by the rulers of the Yemen as a bulwark against Egypt.

About the middle of the xiiiith century the world of Islam assumes a new aspect as the result of the advent of persons and happenings of great importance. In 1258 the taking of Baghdād by Hāsānī put an end to the caliphate. The pilgrimage caravan from the ʿIrāk was no longer of any political significance. In Egypt power passed from the Aiyūbīs (the Mamluks; Sulṭān Baḥārī (658—676 = 1260—1277) was soon the most powerful ruler in the lands of Islam. He was able to leave the government of Mecca in the hands of the sharif, because the latter, Abl Nūmaī, was an energetic individual who ruled with firmness during the second half of the xiiiith century (1254—1301). His long reign firmly established the power of the descendants of Katāda.

Nevertheless the first half of his reign was almost entirely filled with fighting between different claimants to the throne. Aḍjlūn's reign also (1340—1375) was filled with political unrest, so much so that the Mamluk Sulṭān is said on one occasion to have sworn to exterminate all the sharifs. Aḍjlūn introduced a political innovation by appointing his son and future successor Aḥmād co-regent in 1361 by which step he hoped to avoid a fratricidal struggle before or after his death.

A second measure of Aḍjlūn's also deserves mention, namely the harsh treatment of the Muʿāthīdhīn and Imām of the Zaidīs: this shows that the reigning sharifs had gone over to the predominant rite of al-ʿShīfī and forsaken the Zaidī creed of their forefathers.

Among the sons and successors of Aḍjlūn special mention may be made of ʿHāsān special mention because he endeavoured to extend his sway over the whole of the Ḥīdżaz and to guard his own financial interests carefully, at the same time being able to avoid giving his Egyptian suzerain cause to interfere.

But from 1425 he and his successors had to submit to a regular system of control as regards the allotment of the customs.

From the time of Ḥāsān, in addition to the bodyguard of personal servants and freedmen, we find a regular army of mercenaries nominated which was passed from one ruler to another. But the mode of life of the sharifs, unlike that of other Oriental rulers, remained simple and in harmony with their Arabian surroundings. As a vassal of the Egyptian Sulṭān the sharif received from him every year his ʿawāfī [q.v.] and a robe of honour. On the ceremonies associated with the accession of the sharifs see Snouck Hurgronje, Meḳka, i. 97 sq.

Of the three sons of Ḥāsān who disputed the position in their father's lifetime, Barakāt (1) was chosen by the sulṭān as co-regent; twenty years later, he succeeded his father and was able with slight interruptions to hold sway till his death in 1455. He had to submit to the sulṭān sending a permanent garrison of 50 Turkish horsemen under an emir
to Mecca. This emir may be regarded as the pre-
cursor of the later governors, who sometimes at-
tained positions of considerable influence under
Turkish suzerainty.

Mecca enjoyed a period of prosperity under
Barakat's son Muham mad (Chron. Mekka, ii.
341 sqq.; iii. 230 sqq.), whose reign (1455—1497)
coincided with that of Kâtîbey [q.v.] in Egypt.
The latter has left a fine memorial in the many
buildings he erected in Mecca.

Under Muhammad's son Barakat II (1497—
1525) who displayed great ability and bravery in
the usual struggle with his relatives, without getting
the support he desired from Egypt (Chron. Mekka,
ii. 342 sqq.; iii. 244 sqq.), the political situation
in Islam was fundamentally altered by the Ottoman
Sultan Selim's conquest of Egypt in 1517.

Although henceforth Constantinople had the im-
portance for Mecca that Bagdad once had and there
was little real understanding between Turks and
Arabs, Mecca at first experienced a period of
peace under the sharifs Muhammad Abû Nu-
maiyy (1525—1566) and Hassan (1566—1601).

Under Ottoman protection the territory of the
sharifs was extended as far as Khaibar in the north,
and Hadd in the south and in the east into
Nadîd. Dependence on Egypt still existed at the
same time; when the government in Constantinople
was a strong one, it was less perceptible, and
vice versa. This dependence was not only political
but had also a material and religious side. The
Hijaz was dependent for its food supply on corn
from Egypt. The foundations of a religious and
educational nature now found powerful patrons in
the Sultans of Turkey.

A darker side of the Ottoman suzerainty was its
intervention in the administration of justice. Since
the sharifs had adopted the Shafi'i madhab, the
Shi'i Kâdi was the chief judge; this office had
also remained for centuries in one family. Now
the highest bidder for the office was sent every
year from Constantinople to Mecca; the Meccans
of course had to pay the price with interest.

With Hasan's death a new period of confusion
and civil war began for Mecca. In the language
of the historians, this circumstance makes itself
apparent in the increasing use of the term Dhawî...-
for different groups of the descendants of Abû
Numayti who dispute the supremacy, often having
their own territory, sometimes asserting a certain
degree of independence from the Grand Sharif,
while preserving a system of reciprocal protection
which saved the whole family from disaster (Snouck
Hurgeonje, Mekka, i 112 sqq.).

The struggle for supremacy, interspersed with
disputes with the officials of the suzerain, centred
in the xviiith century mainly around the 'Abadîla,
the Dhawî Zaid and the Dhawî Barakat.

Zaid (1631—1666) was an energetic individual
who would not tolerate everything the Turkish
officials did. But he was unable to oppose success-
fully a measure which deserves mention on account
of its general importance. The ill-feeling between
the Sunni Turks and the Shi'i Persians had been
extended to Mecca as a result of an order by
Sultân Murâd to expel all Persians from the holy
city and not to permit them to make the pilgrim-
age in future. Neither the Sharifs nor the upper
classes in Mecca had any reason to be pleased
with this measure; it only served the mob as a
pretext to plunder well-to-do Persians. As soon
as the Turkish governor had ordered them to go,
the Sharifs however gave permission as before to
the Shi'i to take part in the pilgrimage and to
remain in the town. The Sharifs likewise favoured
the Zaidis, who had also been frequently forbidden
Mecca by the Turks.

The further history of Mecca down to the coming
of the Wahhâbîs is a rather monotonous struggle
of the Shi'i families among themselves (Dhawî
Zaid, Dhawî Barakât, Dhawî Mas'ûd) and with the
Ottoman officials in the town itself or in
Djidda.

4. The Sharifs from the Wahhâbî
period to its end. The Kingdom.

Although the Wahhâbîs [q.v.] had already
made their influence perceptible under his prede-
cessors, it was Ghâlib (1788—1813) who was
the first to see the movement sweeping towards
his territory like a flood; but he left no stone
untorned to avert the danger. He sent his armies
north, east and south; his brothers and brothers-
inar in law all took the field; the leaders of the Syrian
and Egyptian pilgrim caravans were appealed to at
every pilgrimage for help, but without success. In
1799 Ghâlib made a treaty with the emir of Darîya,
by which the boundaries of their territories, were
laid down, with the stipulation that the Wahhâbîs
should be allowed access to the holy territory.
Misunderstandings proved inevitable however and
in 1803 the army of the emir Sa'ûd approached
the holy city. After Ghâlib had withdrawn to
Djidda, in April Sa'ûd entered Mecca, the inhab-
habitants of which had announced their conversion.
All kubbahs were destroyed, all tobacco pipes and
musical instruments burned, and the adhân purged
of praises of the Prophet.

In July, Ghâlib returned to Mecca but gradu-
ally he became shut in there by enemies as with a
wall. In August the actual siege began and with
it a period of famine and plague. In February of
the following year, Ghâlib had to submit to acknowl-
ding Wahhâbî suzerainty while retaining his
own position.

The Sublime Porte had during all these hap-
penings displayed no sign of life. It was only
after the Wahhâbîs had in 1807 sent back the
pilgrim caravans from Syria and Egypt with their
mahmals, that Muhammadd 'Ali was given in-
structions to deal with the Hijaz as soon as he
was finished with Egypt. It was not till 1813 that
he took Mecca and there met Ghâlib who made
cautious advances to him. Ghâlib however soon
fell into the trap set for him by Muhammadd 'Ali
and his son Tunân. He was sent to Salonika,
where he lived till his death in 1816.

In the meanwhile Muhammad 'Ali had installed
Ghâlib's nephew Yâhîyâ b. Sarîr (1813—1827)
as sharif. Thus ended the first period of Wahhâbî
rule over Mecca, and the Hijaz once more became
dependent on Egypt. In Mecca, Muhammad 'Ali
was honourably remembered because he restored
the pious foundations which had fallen into ruins,
revived the consignments of corn, and allotted
stipends to those who had distinguished themselves
in sacred lore or in other ways.

In 1827 Muhammadd 'Ali had again to interfere
in the domestic affairs of the sharifs. When Yâhîyâ,
had made his position untenable by the vengeance
he took on one of his relatives, the viceroy deposèd the
Dhawî Zaid and installed one of the 'Abâdîla,
Muḥammad, usually called Muḥammad b. ʿAwn (1827—1851). He had first of all to go through the traditional struggle with his relatives. Trouble between him and Muḥammad ʿAli’s deputy resulted in both being removed to Cairo in 1836.

Here the sharif remained till 1840 when by the treaty between Muḥammad ʿAli and the Porte the Hijāz was again placed directly under the Porte. Muḥammad b. ʿAwn returned to his home and rank: Ottoman suzerainty was now incorporated in the person of the wāli of Jidda. Friction was inevitable between him and Muḥammad b. ʿAwn; the latter’s friendship with Muḥammad ʿAli now proved of use to him. He earned the gratitude of the Turks for his expeditions against the Wahhābī chief Faisal in al-Riyadh and against the ʿAsir tribes. His raids on the territory of Yemen also prepared the way for Ottoman rule over it.

In the meanwhile the head of the Dhawi Zaid, ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib (1851—1859), had made good use of his friendship with the grand vizier and brought about the deposition of the ʿAbadīa in favour of the Dhawi Zaid. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib however did not succeed in keeping on good terms with one of the two pashas with whom he had successively to deal. In 1855 it was decided in Constantinople to cancel his appointment and to recall Muḥammad b. ʿAwn. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib at first refused to recognise the genuineness of the order; and he was supported by the Turkophobe feeling just provoked by the prohibition of slavery. Finally however, he had to give way to Muḥammad b. ʿAwn, who in 1856 entered upon the Sharifate for the second time; this reign lasted barely two years. Between his death in March 1858 and the arrival of his successor ʿAbd Allāh in October of the same year took place the murder of the Christians in Jidda (June 15) and the atonement for it (cf. Ḫidda, and Snouck Hurgronje, Een rector der meekanschke universiteit, in Bydragen t. i. Taal-, Land- en Volkenkund en van Ned.-Indië, 5° volg., deel ii, p. 381 sqq., 399 sqq.):

The rule of ʿAbd Allāh (1858—1877) who was much liked by his subjects, was marked by peace at home and events of far-reaching importance abroad. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) meant on the one hand the liberation of the Hijāz from Egypt, on the other however more direct connection with Constantinople. The installation of telegraphic connections between the Hijāz and the rest of the world had a similar importance. The reconquest of Yemen by the Turks was calculated to strengthen the impression that Arabia was now Turkish territory for ever.

The brief reign of his popular elder brother Husayn (1877—1880) ended with the assassination of the latter by an Afgān. The fact that the aged ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib (see above) was sent by the Dhawi Zaid from Constantinople as his successor (1880—1882) gave rise to an obvious supposition.

Although the plebs saw something of a saint in this old man, his rule was soon felt to be so oppressive that the notables petitioned for his deposition (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, i. 204 sqq.). As a result in 1881, the energetic ʿΩlīmān Nūrī Pāsha was sent with troops to the Hijāz as commander of the garrison with the task of preparing for the restoration of the ʿAbadīa. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib was outwitted and taken prisoner; he was kept under guard in one of his own houses in Mecca till his death in 1886.

ʿΩlīmān Pāsha, who was appointed wāli in July 1882, hoped to see his friend ʿAbdīlāh, one of the ʿAbadīa, installed as Grand Sharīf alongside of him. ʿAwn al-Kafīl (1882—1905) was however appointed (portrait in Snouck Hurgronje, Bilder aus Mecca, p. ). As the wāli was an individual of great energy, who had ever done much for the public good and ʿAwn, although very retiring, was by no means insignificant, nay even tyrannical, trouble between them was inevitable, especially as they had the same powers on many points, e.g. the administration of justice and supervision of the safety of the pilgrim routes. After a good deal of friction ʿΩlīmān was dismissed in 1886. His successor was Djiāmil Pāsha, who only held office for a short period and was succeeded by Sāwāt Pāsha. Only ʿAbdīlāh could keep his place alongside of ʿAwn and that by shutting his eyes to many things and being satisfied with certain material advantages. After ʿAwn’s death ʿAbdīlāh was chosen as his successor. He died however before he could start on the journey from Constantinople to Mecca. ʿAwn’s actual successor was therefore his nephew ʿAli (1905—1908). In 1908 he and ʿAbdīlāh both lost their positions with the Turkish Revolt situation.

With ʿHusayn (1908—1916—1924), also a nephew of ʿAwn’s, the last sharīf came to power. But for the Great War his sharīfate would probably have run the usual course. The fact that Turkey was now completely involved in the war induced him to declare himself independent in 1916. He endeavoured to extend his power as far as possible, first as liberator (muḥājir) of the Arabs, then (June 22, 1916) as king of the Hijāz or king of Arabia and finally as caliph. Very soon however, it became apparent that the Sultan of Nadj, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Saʿūd, like his Wahhābī forefathers, was destined to have a powerful say in the affairs of Arabia. In Sept. 1924 his troops took Taif and in October Mecca. King ʿHusayn fled first to Egypt and then to Mecca. His son ʿAli retired to Jidda. Ibn Saʿūd besieged this town and Medina for a year, avoiding bloodshed and complications with European powers. Both towns surrendered in December 1925.

Since January 1926, Ibn Saʿūd has been king of the Hijāz; the official title of his kingdom now is Hijāz, Nadj and dependencies. A political unit has thus been formed which covers a larger area than the sharīf ever ruled and possesses greater internal strength than has ever been seen in Arabia since the end of ʿAbbāsīd power.

By the organisation of the Nadj warriors (iššāwīn) as agriculturists also, by the maintenance of a strict discipline among the Beduins, by the creation of a military police, which is held in awe, a security has been created such as Arabia has perhaps never known and secure foundations laid for traffic, especially of the pilgrims.

With the representatives of foreign governments in Jidda the king maintains friendly relations. Recently several states have raised their consulates there to the rank of an embassy. Treaties have been concluded with a number of states.

By making use of modern technical skill, the king is endeavouring to counteract the natural poverty of the land. The automobile has become of importance for the pilgrim traffic, agricultural machinery is being imported and cisterns built to hold the rain water. A project for examining the
ground to prospect for minerals has been drawn up as well as a plan for a quay in the harbour of Djidda.

Wahhábism — or as they prefer to call it in Arabia: Ḩaḍrami according to the Ḥanbalite rite — is the state religion. But it has advanced cautiously in comparison with its attitude at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The external symbols of veneration for saints and the dead have been removed; Muhammad’s tomb in Medina has however been spared. The māḥmūl [q. v.] no longer comes to the ḥadāj; the new covering for the Ka’bah is made every year in Mecca. The pilgrim traffic again shows high figures and even Shi’is are admitted again to the pilgrimage.

The religious and economic life of the city has from the earliest times centred round the pilgrimage (cf. the article Ḥaḍīj) and the Mosque (cf. Al-Masjid al-Ḥaram). The character of Mecca as the metropolis of Islam is reflected in the great variety of its population. Besides the original Meccan nucleus we have numerous Arab elements — among which the Ḥadrami are particularly prominent on account of their energy — and colonies of foreigners from all parts of the Muslim world who have out of worldly or religious motives taken up residence in Mecca permanently in the capital. Among these, special mention must be made of those from the Malay Archipelago who are known collectively as Dža’; with them it is exclusively religious motives that have caused them to take up permanent residence in Mecca.

Even at the present day, slaves mainly African, form an important element in Meccan society. Abyssinian slave girls have always been highly esteemed as concubines. The slave-market however no longer carries the importance it once was. Freedmen rise from the slave caste and their dwellings, huts put together of every conceivable material, are on the outskirts of the city.

Artisans are, or at least down to the end of the sixteenth century, organized in guilds. Among these guilds of the pilgrim guides (mu’tawakkilīyya, q. v.), who have agents in Djidda and outside Arabia, is the most important; it lives entirely on the pilgrim traffic.

This is true in a way of the whole population, which has arranged to let houses to the pilgrims for a considerable portion of the year. By the eight month, tens of thousands of these visitors are in the town. Their number increases till the twelfth. In Muḥarram, Mecca resumes its usual appearance.

During the last few hundred years — except for the first Wahhabī period — the cult of saints in Mecca has steadily increased. Numerous places have sacred memories of Muḥammad and his family, the most prominent muṭābiqūn and later saints; numerous ḥawls were built over their graves and ḥawls and māls were celebrated in their honour. The Wahhabīs have done away with a great deal of this, how much is not exactly known.

Mecca is the seat of the government, although the king’s residence is in Riyyād. The official gazette Umm al-Kurā appears weekly. There are also printing presses, which mainly print Wahhabī or Ḥanbalite literature.

List of the Sharifs of Mecca (ca. 961–1916).

a. Muḥāṣṣib (ca. 961–1061)

Djīf’ar ca. 961–980
‘Isa. ca. 980–994
Abū ʾl-Futiḥ 994–1039
Shukr 1039–1061
b. Sulaimān or Banû Abî ʾl-Ta’īyib, from 1061, at constant feud with the

c. Ḥawāshım (1063–1200)

d. Ḥāṭāda and his descendants (1200–1916)

Katāda 1200–1221
His sons. till 1254
Abū Numayr I. 1254–1301
His sons. till 1346
ʿAdjlān 1346–1375
His sons. till 1396
Ḥasan I. 1396–1426
Barakāt I. 1426–1455
Muḥammad 1455–1497
Barakāt II. 1497–1525
Abū Numayr II. 1525–1566
Ḥasan II. 1566–1601
His sons. till 1631
Ẓād 1631–1666
Ṣad I. 1666–1672
Ṭāwq Barakāt 1672–1684
Ṣad II. 1684–1704
Ṭawq Barakāt. 1704–1711
Ṭawq Zād. 1711–1770
Ṣāḥib 1773–1788
Ghālib 1788–1813
Yahyā b. Ṣāḥib. 1813–1827
Muḥammad 1827–1851
ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. 1851–1856
Muḥammad 1856–1858
ʿAbd Allāḥ 1858–1877
Ḥusain I. 1877–1880
ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. 1880–1882
ʿAwīn al-Raḥīf. 1882–1905
ʿAbdullāh 1905
ʿAlī. 1906–1908
Ḥusain II. 1908–1916

As Sharif till 1914 as King.

al-Arab; Oriente Moderna, passim (especially v. 143 sqq., 302 sqq., 413 sqq., 660 sqq.; vi. 219 sqg., etc. s.v. Arabia; treaties: vi. 14 sqq., 42 sqq.; vii. 6 sqq., 474—479; x. 105 sqq., 122; constitution: vi. 530 sqq.; assumption of regal title: vi. 101 sqq.; cf. vii. 172 sqq.).

MEDEA, a town in Algeria (depaement of Algiers), 60 miles S. of Algiers, in 36° 15' 50" N. Lat. and 2° 45' E. Long. (Greenwich). Medea lies on an altitude of 3,070 feet on the northern border of the mountainous massif which divides the high plateaus from the Mitidja. Down to the French occupation, it could only be reached by a bridle-path over the Muzania pass (3,270 feet). The building of a road through the gorges of the Chiffa, alongside of which a railway now runs, has made access to it easier. The town itself is built at the foot of slopes covered with vineyards which yield wines of superior quality and orchards in a district and as a result of the temperate climate, fruit trees grow very well. In the neighbourhood a number of European villages have grown up in which the cultivation of cereals is combined with that of the vine. There is also a fairly busy market but it is losing in importance since the railway has been extended to Djelfa at the southern end of the high plateaus. The population (census of 1926) is 13,816 of whom 2,225 are Europeans, almost all French and 11,591 natives.

Medea occupies the site of the Roman settlement of Lambida, on the ruins of which Boluggin b. Zivi in the ninth century built the modern town. The site was burned in 1069, according to Ibn Khalidun (Barberis, transl. de Selimur, S. 181) inhabited by the Sanhadjia tribe of Lembida, whence no doubt the name Lembani taken by natives of Medea. Of the history of the town itself we know hardly anything. Leo Africanus (Bk. iv., ed. Schefer, iii. 66) and following him Marmol (Africa, ii. 394) only tell us that after having belonged to the sultans of Tlemcen who kept a garrison there, it passed into the hands of the sultans of Tenes, and then of the Turks when the Barbarossa established themselves in Algiers. Under Hasan Kha'ir al-Din, Medea became the capital of one of the three provinces (beliklik) of the Regency, the beylik of the south or of Tiltiri, to which a later date was added the lower valley of the Sebou in Kabylia. Down to about 1770 we therefore find the bey of this province living alternately at Medea and Bordj-Sebou. It was not till this date that the region of Sebou having been incorporated in the Dār al-Sultan governed by the bey, the bey of Tiltiri settled permanently at Medea where he was in a better position to control the nomadic tribes of the plateaus. He had however no authority over the inhabitants of the town itself, who were under the authority of a ḥākim appointed by the agha of Algiers. The population, which did not exceed 1,000—2,000 among whom were many Kalgghiis and Turks retired from service, became wealthy through its trade with the south. Caravans brought thither the produce of the Sahara and also negro slaves who were sold to the citizens of Algiers.

During the years which followed the capture of Algiers, the French on several occasions (Nov. 1830—May 1831—April 1836) occupied Medea, without taking permanent possession. 'Abd al-Kādir however placed a bey in it and had his ownership of it recognised by the treaty of the Tafna [cf. 'Abd al-Kādir]. The outbreak of hostilities again between the Emir and the French led to the final occupation of Medea by the latter on May 17, 1840.


(G. YVER)

MEDINA. The Arabic word madina "town" [cf. al-Madinah] has survived in Spain in a number of place-names. The principal are Medina de las Torres in the province of Badajoz, Medina del Campo and Medina de Rioseco, in the province of Valladolid, Medina de Pomar, in the province of Burgos, Medina del Campo, in the province of Soria and Medina-Sidonia, in the province of Cadiz. The Arabic place-names Madinat al-Walid and Madinat al-Paradj correspond to Valladolid [q. v.], and to Guadalajara respectively (from the second Arabic name of this town: Wadi l-Hidjarah) [cf. above li. 177, and it may be added that the town took its name from a known individual, Mālik b. 'Abd al-Rahmān Ibn al-Paradj, according to Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Iḥāta, MS. in the Escorial, i. 189].

(E. LÉVI-PROVENCE)

MEDINACELI, a little town in the N. E. of Spain on the railway from Madrid to Saragossa, about halfway between these two towns, some 3500 feet above sea-level on the left bank of the Jalón. In the Muslim period it was called Madinat-Salim, which is not to be confused with Madinat Ibn al-Salane, or Ibn Salane in the Seville district (Idrisi, Descr. de l'Espagne, 174/208 and note 5, 177/215), the modern Grazalema in the province of Cadiz.

The Arab geographers give brief descriptions of Medinaceli. According to Idrisi, it was a large town built in a hollow with many large buildings, gardens and orchards. Abu 'l-Fidā' says that this town was the capital of the Middle March (wādghar al-await); Yākūt adds that Tārik [q. v.] found the town in ruins at the conquest of Spain but it was repopulated under Ibulm and became a prosperous town.

Through its geographical position, Madinat-Salim was of considerable strategic importance for the Umayyads from the fourth century onwards. It was on many occasions, as the last stronghold on Muslim territory, the point from which forces assembled at Córdova finally started for expeditions against the Christians of the N. E. of the Peninsula and to which they retired. Though somewhat decayed down to the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān III al-Nāṣir, it was rebuilt, if we may believe the detailed evidence of a chronicler quoted by Ibn Ṭāhir, in 335 (949): this ruler put the work in charge of his client, the general Qālib, and all the governors of the country lent their aid in the work. This Qālib remained governor of Medinaceli and all the Middle March until the power was seized by al-Muṣārāf Ibn Abi ʿAmar [q. v.]. It was in Medinaceli that this famous hāḏiḥī died on 27th Ramadan 392 (Aug. 10, 1002) on returning from his last expedition against Castile. In the following century Medinaceli was frequently taken by the Christians and retaken by the Muslims, before being finally incorporated in the Kingdom of Castile.

Bibliography: Idrisi, Iḥāta al-Anṭāla, ed.
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ZATW = Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZDPV = Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinenvereins
ZMGS = Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Vorderasiatische Kunst in Berlin
ZL = Zeitschrift für Indo-iranistik
ZK = Zeitschrift für Kolonialwissenschaften

MEDINA-SIDONIA, a little town in the S.W. of Spain, in the province of Cádiz, almost equidistant from Algeciras and Jerez de la Frontera. Under the name of Shadhîna it was in the Muslim period the capital of the district of this name; its territory formed part of the province of Seville and adjoined that of Moron.


MEDJELLE (a. meqalla). Under this name the Civil Law Code of Turkey; is generally known it is an abbreviation of Medjelle-i âhkâm-i 'adîsî. The elaboration of this Civil Code took place between 1869 and 1876 and was a part of the legislative programme of the Tanzimat (q.v.). It had been preceded by a Penal Code (1858) and a Commercial Code (1861), but while these two codifications had been based in a large measure on the laws of European countries, the Medjelle was a codification of that part of Hanâfit fiqh, which treats of obligations (mi'âma'ât). The codification was done by a commission of seven members, having as pre-sident Ahmed 'Ijwadet Pasha (q.v.). In a preliminary report (fadl-bu'a), dated 18 Dhù 'l-Ḥijjâ 1285 (April 1, 1869), this commission explained the reasons why a codification of this matter had become necessary. The previous, scattered secular tribunals (nişâmîye) had often to deal with matters of common civil law, but the judges did not know much, as a rule, about fiqh; it had, therefore, been thought wise to appoint the president of the so-called religious tribunal at the same time president of the secular tribunal. This, however, did not prove satisfactory and it was necessary to put the main points of the law of obligations into a code that could be more easily consulted than the voluminous fiqh-books. Among the previous, endeavours to bring Hanâfit law into this form the commission mentions expressly Ibn Nujjâm (q.v.); the biography of this jurist is to be found at the end of the first part of the Cairo edition of 1334 of his al-Bahr al-râîf [communication of Dr. C. van Arendonk]). The editors have followed as a rule those opinions of Hanâfit doctors, which are most in harmony with the exigencies of modern life and business. It is, however, expressly stated that the Introduction (muḥaddîme) and the first Book have been approved by the Shahâk al-Islâm and other prominent jurists.

Though the different parts were successively sanctioned by Imperial khatt (with the formula muqaddîme 'amel ilâm), the Medjelle cannot be said to have had an exclusive authority in the matter regulated. The jurist were perfectly free to form their own opinion as regards the study of the Hanâfit law books and this liberty was really used.

The muḥaddîme of the Medjelle contains in 100 articles a number of principles (kuwâ'id) as already elaborated by Ibn Nujjâm and his school; then follow sixteen books (kîthâb), beginning with the Kitâb al-Bayân; the last four books deal with process matters. The whole has 1,801 articles. The first part of each book gives definitions of the technical law terms used, and most of the articles are followed by examples taken from the collections of fećâצûn. The Introduction and the first book obtained the imperial sanction on the 8th Muharram 1286 (April 20, 1869) and the last two books on the 26th of Sha'bân 1293 (September 16, 1876).

The text of the Medjelle is to be found in the big code collection Davûtûr (the introduction and books 1.-viii. in vol. i. ; books ix.-xiv. in vol. iii. ; and books xv. and xvi. in vol. vi.). It has been published several times with a commentary, as the Medjelle-i âhkâm-i 'adîsî şarî'î by H. M. Diya'd al-Dîn (Der-i Se'âdet 1311) and a work under the same title by the in his time famous jurist 'Aţif Bey (Der-i Se'âdet, in different parts from 1328 to 1339; most parts had a second and the first part a third edition); the latter commentary, however, does not go beyond art. 1448. A full French translation is found in G. Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, vol. viii., Oxford 1906, p. 170-446.

Since the Great National Assembly has adopted, on February 17, 1926, a new civil code (Kânûn-i mideât; cf. Ortrutte Moderne, vi. 134 sq.), which is substantially the Swiss civil code, the authority of the Medjelle has disappeared.

(J. II. Kramers)

MEDJIDIYE. In February 1814 (Muharram 1260) in the reign of 'Abd al-Medjul the Turkish coinage was entirely re-organised on European models and this currency is known as the Medjidiye. The name Medjidiye was also given to the largest silver piece in the new coinage: the 20 piastre piece of this new issue; it weighed 372 grains (24.68 grammes). (J. Allan)

MEHEDJA [See M. I. Mâhîyâ].

MEHEMET, MEMHED, MEHEMED. [See Muhammed].

MEHEMED PASJA. [See Karâmî Mehemed Pasha].

MEHRI 1), the language of the Mahra country in Southern Arabia, which with Shâwî (spoke in the mountains northeast of Za'far) and the dialect of the island of Sokotra forms a separate branch of South Semitic; the relation of this branch to the now extinct languages found in the inscriptions of the Sabaean, Minaean and Hadhramawtans has not yet been accurately defined. Mehri itself as a spoken language in South Arabia is seriously threatened by the steady advance of northern Arabic. The Mahra people are already almost all bilingual and their native idiom is very much influenced, especially in vocabulary, by northern Arabic; for example, of its old numerals it has preserved only the first ten; all higher numbers have been replaced by the northern Arabic forms. It is therefore not always easy to distinguish with certainty old words which are also found in northern Arabic from later borrowings.

As regards phonetics, the Mehri consonants are in general agreement with Arabic and Ethiopic. Of the laryngeal loss of 'ain, which still sur-

---

1) In this article the author's system of transliteration is retained for philological reasons.
vives in Shihwari, is characteristic of Mehrī. The uvalar plosive \( \ddot{a} \) seems always to be voiceless; of the palatals the \( s \) which still survives in Shihwari, is always voiceless, as in northern Arabic, to \( \ddot{a} \).

The case of the sibilants is particularly characteristic. The original Semitic \( s \) seems to have been replaced by \( h \) in genuine Mehrī words, initially for example in \( hima \) (he) "heard" (compare mi'ma "ear-muscle") and mediavly in \( neh\dot{a} \) "forgotten"; in the final position it may be dropped, as in \( t\dot{a} \) "a goat", \( h\dot{a} \) "head". But when we find alongside of \( hated \) "to obstruct" \( sa\dot{a} \) "to carry over, to come to an agreement", which is connected with the Arabic \( su\dot{d} \) "straight, correct", the latter can only be regarded as borrowed from the Arabic. This however is also found in words like \( n\dot{a} \) (he) "put on" and in the pronoun of the third pers. fem. \( s\dot{u} \), etc., in which any such borrowing is highly improbable; these must therefore belong to a dialect for which the phonetic law \( \ddot{s}h\dot{h} \)--\( h \) did not hold. The primitive Semitic \( \ddot{s}h \) has also survived where a following \( t \) was assimilated to it, even when the consequent doubling was dropped, as in the prefix to the causative reflexive \( \ddot{u} \).

A primitive Semitic sound seems also to have survived in the \( sh \), to which Jahn has given the name "lateral", and which is transliterated in the Vienna texts by \( s \); it corresponds etymologically to the Arabic \( sh \), and therefore to the \( s\dot{h} \) in Canaanite and Old Aramaic. Whether the position of articulation was exactly the same cannot of course be decided; but the description of the sound as "lateral" probably means the same as the pronunciation with flattened tongue which is assumed for Canaanite and Aramaic. Among the dentals we find alongside of \( d \) and \( t \) also the fricatives \( \ddot{d}h \) and \( \ddot{d} \) in native as well as loanwords; but in both groups the fricative pronunciation has frequently been dropped, e.g. in the case of \( \ddot{d}h \) regularly in the demonstratives alongside of \( th\dot{a}l\dot{a} \) "this" 300. we have \( \ddot{t}h\dot{a}n \) 30. In \( s\dot{h} \) "behind" \( \ddot{s}h \) appears instead of the \( \ddot{t}h \) in the Arabic \( \ddot{s}h\dot{a}r \) "track", probably under the influence of \( r \), like \( \ddot{d}h \) in the Ethiopic \( \ddot{s}h\dot{a} \) instead of the \( \ddot{t} \) which we should expect. So also in the case of \( z \), the fricative has in many cases become a plosive \( \ddot{z} \) under conditions still to be explained, as in \( \ddot{p}\dot{z\dot{a}}r \) "moon", \( \ddot{z}\dot{a}m \) "great" = Arabic \( \ddot{z}\dot{a}m \), \( \ddot{z}\dot{a}n \).

The voiced \( \ddot{d}h \) has a lateral articulation differing from the Arabic. In the labials, as in Arabic, the voiceless fricative \( \ddot{d}h \) corresponds to the voiced explosive \( b \). The liquids, \( m \), when in proximity to vowels and palatals, is frequently more nasal than in Arabic, \( d \) and \( r \) before consonants frequently lose their own sound and merge in the preceding vowel, as \( m\dot{a}\dot{m} \) "slain" from \( l\dot{a}k \) 24 = \( \dot{a}k \); \( y\dot{u} \) "he carries" from \( \ddot{k}\dot{h}l \) (by dissimilation in \( h\dot{a} \) "night", \( k\ddot{l}\dot{a} \) "every night"), \( k\dot{a}n \) "horn", \( k\ddot{a}n \) > \( \ddot{k}\dot{a}n \) "belly".

The vowels are frequently prefixed with the laryngeal fricative instead of the laryngeal plosive, i.e. we often have \( k\dot{a}r \) for \( k\ddot{a}r \). As in Ethiopic and probably also in primitive Semitic, only two short vowel sounds, \( a \) and \( i \), are distinguishable, while of long vowels we have \( a \), \( \ddot{a} \) and \( i \). The old diphthongs are contracted to \( e \) and \( e \). These basic vowels are however more strongly affected than in Arabic by the predominant articulation of consonants. The distinction between \( a \) and \( e \) is thus frequently obliterated. Stress brings about the disappearance of short vowels in unaccented syllables and lengthens them in accented ones, whereas \( a \), if not retained by laryngal-
genders as in Arabic, m. dāl, f. dāl, in plur. comm. dāl; they are further combined with (neither to m. wālī, f. dīna, pl. lā'ī, with k to m. dākī, dīqī, pl. lāqī, or with both elements to m. dākān, f. ḍīmān, pl. ḍīmān; in the basic form both genders when unstressed sometimes coincide in dī, in the combined form in ḍīmān. The basic form ḍīmān is used without the addition of gender, pl. lā, lā, lā, serves also as a relative. In the interrogative besides the personal pronoun "who?", we have the neuter hē <u>at what" of the numerals, as already mentioned, only the first ten have survived. "One" in the basic form hād is only used as an indefinite "any one": otherwise it has been driven out by the relative phrase dād; talk; the fem. talk, the ending of the nomina unumītis (see below), which by analogy has been transferred to 2 and the other numerals—except 4 and 5, perhaps under the influence of mānī, which follows the regular phonetic law; from *pawīt we get by haplography *pawīl. The numeral 2 agrees in its stem with the Aram. ḍām; hē ḍām; hē ḍār; hē ḍām, ḍār, ḍān, ḍār, ḍān from ḍān is the old dual ending of the feminine. In 3 the initial letter, as in Saharian and Ethnopic, is dissimilated (from the final tā) to and the final nā becomes a phonetic: ḍātī; the feminine form after dropping the l (see above) has dissimilated the final ṭ of the stem to f, becoming ḍāītā. 4 and 5 lose in the feminine the unaccented first syllable: ḍāī; 5 loses the last radical, weakened to h; in the masculine the basic form hāmān, hāmān has through vowel assimilation become hāmān through hāmān, the feminine shows the feminine ending ē, to which the vowel of the stem is assimilated: hāmān, 6 and 7 change the initial ṭ to h, while the final ṭ of 6 as in Arabic by mutual synthesis becomes ṭ; ṭ; 7 following phonetic laws: m. ḍābān, f. hēkē,t 9 loses its initial sound, which had already lost its vowel in the unaccented syllable: sē, f. sāt, 8 and 10 show, following regular phonetic laws, m. hēnumā, f. hēnumītī; m. hār, f. hārī.

Among the nouns, the most noteworthy for their form are those which were originally monosyllabic: they are found throughout with the prefix as (hot) as in īmābīl alongside of kār (see above) "son," a new formation (frequently Bittner, i. 28, g), following hērī alongside of hērī "daughter," hāmān "water," hēmān, hēmān, hēmān "day," "sun," alongside of māhī "to-day," hāmān alongside of hēmān (hot, hāfīl see above) "night," hērī "father" and hērī "hand" are therefore not to be equated directly with ah and ṭ with h for h instead of hāmān, as it is found in ūmān "mother," but we must recognize in them as well the prefixed syllable which is found also before some nouns which are tential in the other Semitic languages, like hērī "head" = ṭālīk, hāmān "soul," which Bittner explained by metathesis, hērī "vowell" = Ar. mād, ḍādī, pl. ḍaṭādīn, "great, elders = Āt, mād, pl. aswādīn, "old she-camel, head of a family," hāmān "water, skin" = Hebr. hāmān, Accad. hāman. To hēmān "in a valley" (Müller, ii. 24, s) this syllable (here assimilated only to the beginning of the next word) serves as an indeclinable article, which has lost its significance in the above word. The feminization of the masculine stem, as in modern Arabic and in Hebrew and Ethiopic only in adverbs. The suffixal syllable is the plural ending of the masculine in unaccented syllables (Gramm., 1. 442), just as the fem. sī it takes the masc.
ending -a (as above), or it may be, as Rhodokanakis (of cit., p. 8) suggests, the other plural ending -an, as in Accad. *kullitum "all." In the formation and use of the broken plural, Mehri adopts a mean between Arabic and Ethiopic. Characteristic are the number of formations from plurals of the plural, such as are found also in Arabic, e.g. *šurq "a piece of wood," plur. -šurq, then *šurqayt and on that basis širayq (Rhodokanakis, p. 7.) Double plurals also arise through the addition of the masc. pl. ending in in in *řenāt "wind," ḥamītun "tails," ṣemin "bows," to which the original plurals širq, ḍerob, ḍîmûn are then taken as singulaires (Rhodokanakis, p. 9) and again with vowel reduction after the accented syllable in kūltûn "hitches," ḍāhātun "daughters," in which however Rhodokanakis (p. 15) sees the ending -an.

The case inflections, except for a few remain from the accusative in some adverbs, have completely disappeared. The genitive is expressed by the simple juxtaposition of two nouns, more frequently by the relative, sometimes with a demonstrative suffix, as in gēldēt de gēgelīs ḥēbē dī bagri "the skin of the steer, the young of the cow," Hein, p. 15, 16, alongside of  тебē ṭīvec "the young of the ox," ibid., p. 37.

Determinatives and indetermination are never indicated. Nomination only survives in some adverbs, like fenāmēn in "in front," alīven "behind," nyfèren "later."

The prepositions of Mehri are for the most part new formations, some of uncertain origin. Of the old Semitic prepositions, only bi (ba, b), bēn, ṣad "after," fi ẓūlan and ilā, and min have survived; ḫa, ḫe has come to mean "with". The place of li has been taken by ḫa, ḫe, which Bittner traces to the 1st syllable of ẓūlā, but this is not very probable. The other prepositions have been replaced by words indicating place, like fenāmēn, fenī "before", sār (properly "track") "behind", tawwīl, ṭawwīl "at" (properly a T-nomen connected with Arabic ṭawwīl "to be neat", rather than with Syriac ṭawālād, as Bittner considers), ḫaqāl "below" (properly "depression"), but Sukūfl, ḥēt, Müller, nii. 54 infra), or parts of the body, like ḥrēk "in" (lit. "in the bosom"; Christian) and ṣār, ṣār "upon" (properly "back") which receives distinctive forms from the simple form, is found in the active as ḫantīr "wrote" and as ḫantīs "was clothed", an intensive which has however dropped the doubling and thus coincides with the purpose, and a causative with the prefix ḫa, which in the imperfect also sometimes has the same form as the intensive (e.g. ḫwiirmīd "to tend a sick person", impf. ind yihrīmīn, subj. yiḥramāt, but ḫajalāt "to remedy", impf. ind yiḥajalīn, subj., yiḥajalāt). The causative has very often a passive sense, like the simple intrasitive verb, with which it often coincides as an inner causative. To each of these stems there is a reflexive with inserted t: to the simple verb in double form as ḫatīt, or kattīt, or with assimilation to the vocal of the simple verb kattīt, to the intensive kattīt, to the causative from the simple form ḫakāfīr "to beg pardon", to the purposive stem ḫāñkēm "to go to law", ḫagāśīd "to quarrel."

In contrast to the perfect (quoted above as the normal form), which expresses a fact as such, there is an imperative in the active ḫāł "break", in the passive ḫālūs "put on", in the intensive ḫālsīr "travel", in the causative ḫakītēb "cause to write", in the reflexive kītītēb, kītōtēb, kītīb, in the caus. refl. ḫagāśīfī and ḫāñkēm. From these imperatives is formed the affective mood (Bittner's subjunctive), like yiḫbēk "that he crushes" yīḥbēk, "that he put on", yīṣāfīr "that he travel", yīḥakītēb "that he write", yīkītītēb, yīkītōtēb, yīkītībīfīr, yīkāñkēm. Next there is expressed the progressive aspect, which presents the action as in process, often with limitation to the present and future, a form which doubles the second radical in the simple verb but, as in the intensive, has replaced the reduplication by lengthening the vowel as in yīṭōbīr "he crushes", so also in the causative yīḥakītēb, but in the intensive and sometimes in the reflexive shows an ending corresponding to the Arabic energetic, as in yīṣāfīn "the travels", refl. yīkītētēn and yīkāñkēten, caus. refl. yīkāñkēm. In the intransitive simple verb, the affective mood serves also to indicate that an event is happening at the present time (as a so called indicative); on account of the relations of the intransitive, to the caus. and refl. already referred to this formation, but now for the indicative only, is transferred to these forms in yīḥakōkēb (alongside of yīḥakītēb), yīḥāgōfīr and yīkītētēb (from kātōb).

In the so called perfect in active verbs, the stress remains on the second syllable of the stem, except in the exception of the 3rd fem. sg., the ending of which ẓā, as in the noun, attracts the emphasis to itself (ṭeḇērōt). The 3rd pl. has lost the endings and replaces them only in the masc. by em, which comes from the pronoun. The consonantal terminations have lost their vowels, but the double consonant at the end of a word is separated by the insertion of an epenthetic vowel only before the sonant n of the 1st pers. plur. (ṭeḇēron); before other terminations the vowel ḫa, ḫi, ḥa remains short. As in Ethiopic the initial of the 2nd pers. is assimilated to that of the 1st (ṣ-); as in the suffix, the 2nd fem. sg. appears in the palatalised form ḫ. The intransitives with the exception of the 3rd fem. sing. retain the stress on the first syllable of the stem, the vowel of which is assimilated to that of the second (ṭiḥō). In the intensive the lengthening of the a to ḡ is found only in the forms which do not add a termination.

In the imperative in the transitve simple verb and as well as in the causative there is no distinction of gender in the singular. In the intransitive form however, the vowel of the second accented syllable of the stem was assimilated to the feminine ending i, so that even after it was dropped the distinction between m. teborah and f. tevir was retained, similarly in the reflexive fīḥōmīn, fīḥīmīn.

Accordingly, in the intensive and its reflexive and in the causative reflexive the distinction of gender is expressed also by changing the accent of the vowel: m. ṣūfar, f. ṣūfar, m. ṣūbāb, f. ṣūbāb, m. ḫāñkēfī, f. ḫāñkēfī. In the plural the genders are distinguished by the endings in -em, f. -en. In the intransitive simple form however, the vowel change is transferred from the singular to the plural, m. teḥōrem, f. teḥōrem and in the reflexive of the scheme kētēb, with peculiar change of function m. kētēbēm (assimilation to the indec. imp. yīkítētēm, pl. yīkítētēm, f. kētōbēm. The same change of function is also found in the perf. of the causal: 3 m. pl. hākāñkēm, f. hākētēb. Out of the imperative arises the so-called subj. 1
of the imp.f. by means of the same personal prefixes as in all Semitic languages and with the endings i for the 2nd sg. f. and m. -em, f. -en for the plural of the 2nd and 3rd pers. In the corresponding indicative the distinction of gender is expressed in the second person by internal vowel change, m. te‘eb, f. te‘eter and on the addition of the plural endings the short vowel (yitberem etc.) is restored. In the intransitive simple verb the moods are not distinguished, the genders of the 2nd pers sg. are distinguished by tawaqit ‘to be as in the imperative; this vowel change is also transferred to the plural (m. tathorem, f. tathoren) and with exchange of functions also to the 3rd pers. (m. yittharem, f. tathoren). In the intensive, distinction of gender in the second person is expressed only in the singular (subj. tinfer, f. tefer, indic. m. teferen, f. teferen); before the endings, the vowels are short and the mood endings give way to the plural endings so that the 3rd pers. f. sg. and pl. are the same: teferen.

Participles are in the simple form active tebrone, f. tebrite (see above), pass. net Ahmed; in the derivative stems as in e.g. intensive mekhtab, f. mekhtatite, cause, mekhakte, f. mekhaktite; in the passive they follow the model of the simple verb, makhads ‘despatched’ (in the intensive only when borrowed from the Arabic like meqaddim ‘chief’). The infinitives are in the simple verb of the form tiher (more rarely like qebel ‘to carry’, ninie ‘to be ill’) or qitiher ‘to take’ (frequently with med. lar), with prefix like muntal ‘work’, or with ending like qubos ‘to forgive’; in the intensive wawd ‘to cool down’, in the causative and reflexive with the ending i; taw (taw) as in Eth. hakhteb, keteteb, shaqshafer.

In the verbs with laryngal as second radical, the perfect is e.g. dykelm ‘he went’; it is therefore, as in Ethiopic, the intransitive scheme with the type of the transitive making itself felt; the imperfect is therefore inferred as in the intransitives without distinction of mood. As a first radical, a laryngal frequently produces intrusive syllables, as subj. yibebem ‘let him judge’. Hamza, arising out of ain as first radical, acts in the same way, e.g. ya’anas ‘let him become hard’ (cf. Arabic ansafa, not Hebrew annas as Bittner suggested), while an original hamza disappears, as in yameb ‘let him say’. As a second radical ain disappears, but keeps a in the perfect of the simple verb unchanged, as faan ‘trust (past tense) with the lange’. In the verbs with third an unlike Ethiopic, trans. and intrans. formation is distinguished in the simple verb, whereby the perf. of the trans. coincides with the intensive (date ‘he paid’ like dama ‘he collected’): the intransitives distinguish the moods of the imper. exactly like the intransitives.

In the verbs with first waw, the primitive Semitic formation of the blunter stem is lying out. It is true we still find the imperative ain ‘give’ with the subj. yizen and ay ‘come in’ with the subj. yikhe, but yikhe is already limited to the feminine and the masc. wakhab formed from it; we have besides the reduplicated imperative zim, kekkib, as well as dhabak and dhabak ‘to load’, and with vowel lengthening bakk ‘to calm’ and dyer ‘to be necessary’. In secondary formations the 2 disappears from the root in some forms of the reflexive, like watlab ‘to go in the afternoon’, imp. ind. yickhab, subj. yitkhab, inf. yakhab and wakhab ‘he awakened’, imp. ind. yetkab, subj. yetkab, inf. teltefin. For the rest the first-waw verbs inflect regularly, and the few first-y verbs follow them.

The third-hamza verbs very often coincide with the third-waw and third-y. In the intransitives in the simple form we have m. taw, and in the intransitive z, which in the perfect in the forms with consonant endings merges with the stem, e.g. kew ‘he found’, but 2.m. and f. kask and lini ‘he saw’, but linc. In the 3rd plur. m. besides the original kiten, we have alitken with secondary vowel differentiation, and with a new formation on the model of forms like kuskem also kusem. In the imper. and subj. the form of the third-y, like kes, yikhe has predominated; in the indic. the unaccented final vowels disappear except in the 2. f. sg. (lekhyi). The denominative biru ‘to bear’ from ber ‘son’ follows completely the strong paradigm tiher, only the 2. of the 2. sg. f. is also found in the 3rd sg. f. (tibit) and 2. pl. (tibir). The strong stems only the 3rd m. sg. of the perf. in the caus. (hekihi) and its refl. (hekihi) is formed after the trans. simple verb, in all other forms the paradigm of the third-y is followed (keto, ketsi, katsi etc.). But the final vowel is lost in the imperative always and in the subj. of the reflexive sometimes (katir ‘hide thyself’, subj. jikatir, but qatir ‘speak’, subj. qehtin); and both forms lose it regularly in the causative and its reflexive (hede, yikhe, sometimes with lengthening: heyder ‘get up’, ehye, yeye, zulb (Zah, p. 113, 25) ‘give heed’, yigish).

The medial a and i verbs are, as in Ethiopic, to a great extent assimilated to the plan of the strong verbs, ya and waw being treated as consonants. Only in the simple form of the med. a is the old Semitic inflexion retained in principle. But the old form dimit (frequently dimit) has become indicative, and a new subj. has been formed with vowel change, yimait, followed by the imperative yimait. As in the intransitives, the ending of the 2nd sg. f. reacts on the stem in the indicative: temit, whence also the fem. plur. temiten to the m. temiten and the 3rd pers with these reversed: temiten, temiten. In the perf. meit < mata is retained but abbreviated before consonant suffixes, as met; the participle from it is meten. But the pass. part. is quite strong in formation as makhe ‘feared’. Some verbs, probably formed from nouns, follow the strong paradigm throughout the simple form, like tanit ‘to be finished’, haiaret ‘to be mad’. This is always the case in the blunter stem of the base. e.g. liwak ‘to long for home’ and in the causative, as haiteb ‘turned’ and its reflexive, e.g. sbakub ‘warned himself’, as well as in the med. ya verbs e.g. sey ‘travelled’.

The intensive stem shows a peculiar formation, e.g. avoq ‘returned’, imp. i. ind. avoqied, subj. yavoqid, imp. avoqit, part. maavoqide, inf. avod (from the simple verb, elsewhere however like taavit) and avit ‘called aloud’ following the formation of the doubled verbs.

The biliteral roots with short waw (the so-called med. gem. or doubled verbs) have retained the primitive Semitic inflection with doubling of the second radical only in the perfect of the simple form; in addition the consonantal endings take some epithetic vowel: 3rd m. temm ‘was at an end’;
f. termo, 2d m. tennem etc. But the vowel of the stem changes without regard for the meaning; he-s "thought of", riis "creep" (spider), hadd "stopped", zil "lost the way", guff "covered", döö "creep". The imper. and subj. follow the pattern of the strong verb, e.g. wäoni, yatim. The indicative however is yätim (yätim). This is a new formation on the analogy of the med. 6, like yömîd : yöntö. The simple form yätimna had avoided the threefold repetition of the same sound just as the intensive has done, but forms in the perf. termun, imper. yätim, subj. yätim (with assimilation to the vowels of the inf. termun).

The causative of the simple form follows in the perf. kisäni and imper. the strong paradigm e.g. yämäni, while in the subj. the succession of similar consonants is avoided, as in Aramica, by doubling the final radical: wätiini, and in the perf. kätten and part. mahattanö. The causative of the intensive however follows its formation, e.g. yämäni, etc. The reflexive of the simple form replaces in the perf. (after the model of bätät) the repetition of the second radical by doubling it: döööni. Other respects follows the pattern of the strong verb e.g. ind. yätäni, subj. yätäni, imp. yätät, part. yäsätäni, inf. yätäntä. The causative reflexive follows the same pattern but with doubling of the 2nd radical in the subj and part.: yömäntä, "the attained", ind. yämäntäni, subj. yämäntäni, part. yämäntäni.

The suffixes are added to the 3rd pers. sg. m. of the perf. with the "doubling vowel" i, which as in the similarly constructed forms of the Syr. imperf. (e.g. nedelâ) may have been an originally independent particle, which in Arabic is expanded to yät, cf. e.g. zaabi "he met her" with zaabit. Only before the 2nd pers. sg. m. suffix, it appears instead for unknown reasons. This i may also appear in association with the element t found in North Semitic (Hebrew 3th, 3rd etc.) probably abbreviated from the verb at mitto "come", which with the 2nd pers. sg. m. take also shows t/y. These independent suffixes however may also appear after all the other verbal forms, which otherwise take the suffixes direct or with an enclitic vowel.

The vocabulary shows the closest affinity, apart from later borrowings, to northern Arabic, but possesses, in addition to many characteristic new formations like i'si "mouth" (cf. Arabic ishâri ket "air-hole"), many old words which otherwise survive only in outcry regions, like fam "foot" as in Arabic, instead of the phonetically inconvenient rcf. so: lô edit, eit. Sok. taten, i.e. Müller, iv. 170. 22, 1. 2., "sheep" = Fg Aram. and M. and ihtâ (see Lardzsists, Ep. ii. 44). 176: Yâhâm, i.e. 215 notes: fástâ, "together", cf. occurs in the "to resemble" the language of the Berbers and that of poetry in addition many special features, particularly in its vocabulary.

The colonists, most of whom have come from Algeria, cultivate mainly wheat, of which they are obtaining increasing yields. The cultivation of the vine is increasing each year. The region of Mawâlîn Idrîs is one of the principal centres of olive-growing in Morocco (400,000 trees); 330 farms are laid out in the district, covering 85,000 hectares. Official colonisation which has now disposed of almost all the reserved lands has been outdistanced since 1927 by private colonisation. The native farms (137,000 hectares) tend to disappear from the plain and to confine themselves to mixed farming in the mountains. Prospecting for minerals has only been done piecemeal; traces of petroleum have been found beside Petit Jean and of lead in the Central Atlas.

The government of Meknes, which is a makhzûna town, is in the hands of a bâbî. He is also bâbî of the Bâbkhers, who have retained a relic of their past greatness in a special statute and a high title. He has under his command, and is independent of that of the bâbî. The Inhabitants of the town, many of whom have built their houses here, because of the advantages of the site, have now built houses around the old town. The place has become a centre of trade and industry, and the bâbî has become the head of the gnawa, the inhabitants of the town.

The government of Meknes consists of two distinct elements: the bâbî, Bâbkhers, Berbers and Jews. The bâbî bâbî, who have played their part in the history of the town, and retain privileges of the numerous descendants of Mawâlîn Idrîs, only the families residing in Fas and Meknes are allowed to share in the income of the zîâyan of Fâs and the bâbî bâbî, who have many privileges of their own, form a kind of aristocracy, generally prosperous. The Bâbkhers- descendants of the 'abd of Mawâlîn Idrîs, up until 1912 formed an unreliable element, which was always a nucleus of trouble. Since that date they have become the leaders of the tribes of the Bâbîb and Baqiq, who live close to the town of old bâbîs and gardens which belong to the Meknes, and in the old kashî of Mawâlîn Idrîs in the bâbî Makhzan quarter. Their houses, roofed with thatch, look like African encampments. But it is the Berber (Bâbîb) element which predominates at Meknes and gives it its desire for independence, a feature of which has for centuries been a headache of Fâs. It is the Berbers of the mountains, who give it its tone; when they come down to the town, their women give colour to the streets of the bâbî with their short skirts, their leather gaiters, and their wide-brimmed hats. The Berber elements of the plain are much more mixed, having undergone many vicissitudes since the day when Mawâlî Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh inaugurated the policy, considerably practised by his successors, of transferring tribes. A considerable part of the population of Meknes consists of floating elements who come, usually between harvests, to work as artisans. These immigrants almost all come from the south, from Tâdbîl in particular (potters, tanners and porters),
from Sīs (grocers), from Tūṭṭ (oil-makers), from Figg and Dāʻa (masons). The Rifans and Jbāla supply most of the agricultural labourers. A small number of Fāsīs, who have in recent years merged into the population of the town, are cloth-merchants, old-clothes-dealers and shoemakers.

Jews form a quarter of the native population. Foucauld estimated the miṣīrīd of Meknes to be half that of Fās. Chénier remarked on its prosperity. It has increased since his day as elsewhere and the position of the Jews is greatly improved since the establishment of the French Protectorate.

Religious life. From the presence of the Idrissids and Ḥasanids of the Ḥārūn, the proximity of the sanctuary of Mawlāū Īdrīs and the religious event of the celebrations of his miṣām (class. maṣūmīn, q.v.) every year, Meknes is one of the most important centres of šariʿīs. At the same time for the Berber population it is a centre of markab rites of the most elementary kind. All the brotherhoods that have zawiyas in Morocco are represented in Meknes. The most important are those of the Kādirīya, Tāqīnīya, and especially Ḥamādhā and the largest, the Ḥāwa, to which half the population is attached. Meknes, whose patron saint is Sīdī Muhammad b. Ṣūd and which contains his tomb under the khubba erected by Mawlāū Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, is the capital of the order. This saint came here at the end of the 7th century. His teaching at first met with a vigorous resistance, which he overcame so completely that, when the governor of the town sought to take steps against him, the people protected him. Before his death he acquired an estate, constituted it khubba and set it aside as a cemetery. It is still used and many men of religion are buried there. The celebration of his miṣām on the first day of the miḥrīd (mawlid) festival is the great event of the year. The preparations for it begin forty days before and include all-absorbing ten days before the festival. On the day before or the preceding day delegations flock in from all parts of Morocco, following the traditional routes. The most generous hospitality is given to the pilgrims by the descendants of Shakh āl-Kāmil, who have the miḥrīd (Brunel). The excesses committed on the occasion of this pilgrimage have been frequently described. Many other special cults are observed in Meknes. Bū Ṣekrī is the patron of the graziers, and Mawlāū Īdrīs of the Zarihīn is the patron of the tanners, weavers and butchers (Mawṣiqna). There is even a cult of a living holy man, Mawlāū Aḥmad Wazzānī. As it was his custom to sit in the public way in a very simple costume, he was in 1917 granted clothes and a khubba at the request of Mawlāū Yūsūf. The khubba is at the entrance to a dispensary and the admirers of the saint come there daily to keep him company.

History. We know nothing certain about the history of the region in the Roman period nor in the centuries which followed. The most advanced Roman stations were on the slopes of the Zarihīn guarding the plain, out of which the warriors of the Central Atlas might descend, and perhaps throwing out a screen as far as the plateau of el-Hājīb.

We do not know at what date the people here had their first contact with Islam, nor even if it was not till the Hilālī invasion that Islam became securely established here. The Berber tribes of the Saiṭās and Sebū made the most of the fertility of their country. A tradition records that a fire destroyed the gardens there in 917. It was at this period that the country was covered, from Tāzā to Meknes, by the migration of a Zanīta tribe, the Mīkās, a section of whom, who received the name of Mīkās āl-Zatīn to distinguish them from the Mīkās Tāzā, who lived farther to the east, established themselves securely in the plain. The Idrissids met with a vigorous resistance from the Mīkās. They always found in them opponents whom they could not overcome in spite of several campaigns, and who were the medium of Umayyad intervention.

The Kīrihī records that a governor of the district, al-Mahdī b. Yūsuf al-Kezānī, having joined Yūsūf b. Ṭāshfīn, was assassinated by the tribesmen, but the terrified citizens hastened to disown the murder. At this date a few villages stood on the site of Meknes. One cannot say at what date, perhaps in the tenth century, they were grouped together to form the Tuqatīd mentioned by Idrīsī (Taqrīr, according to the Kīrāb al-Idābīrī). The population seems to have been more numerous in the 8th century than later, and prosperous. Enclosed by a wall, Meknes looked like a pleasure resort, with its gardens, cultivated fields, its mosques, its baths and water channels.

The Mīkāsīs vigorously opposed the Almohad onslaught. When passing through this region in 1120—21, Ibn Ṭūmāt preached here but he was not well received. Twenty years later, ʿAbd al-Maʾūnīn laid siege to Meknes but it was not he who took it. He left it to enter Fās, leaving the conduct of siege in the hands of Yāḥyā b. Yaghūmur. The Kīrīhī says the siege lasted seven years. The town fell in 1150. It was plundered, the defences dismantled, a part of its wealth confiscated, and all its garrison put to death, except the governor Yāḥyā b. Uqūf, who was said to have gone over to the Almohads before the surrender in order to save his head. On the site, or beside the ruins, Meknes rapidly rose again under the shelter of the fortifications built by the Almohads. At the end of the century, it had regained some importance and the mosque of al-Najdīrīn was finished. This is the oldest monument in Meknes: in 1756—757 Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh had it restored and built the present minaret. The Almohads brought water hither from Tādījena, five miles away. In 1182 the khubba was said in five different places in Meknes and there were six gates in the wall which surrounded the town.

In the course of the following century, the intrigues of the Banū Marīn (q.v.) disturbed the country, where the fighting that accompanied the fall of the Almohads was particularly lively. In 1231—1232, al-Maʾūnīn had to intervene against the Banū Fāzāz and Meklāta, who were ravaging Meknes. In 1236—1237, as a result of the Marinid success in the battle in which al-Saʿīd's son was slain, ʿAbd Bakr entered the town. This occupation was only temporary but the Almohad restoration was not secure. In 1245—1246, the governor left there by al-Saʿīd was slain in a rising in the town in favour of ʿAbū Zakariyyāʾ the Ḥafṣīd. Al-Saʿīd again returned victorious, causing Yāḥyā b. ʿAbd al-Hakīk to fly to Tāzā. The Marinids had only two years to wait: after the death of the Almohad governor, he returned to Meknes to occupy it definitely.

The first period of greatness for Meknes dates from the Marinids. They set out to make it beautiful
like Rabat and Fás. Abū Yūsuf moved from Fás to Meknes, which owed to him a kāsha and a mosque (1276). Abū ʿl-Ḥasan improved its water-supply, built bridges on the road to Fás and began the Madrassa ʿal-Dīdīla which Abū ʿl-Ḥasan was to finish. It bears the latter’s name and is still the most notable building in Meknes, in spite of the indiscreet restorations carried out in 1917–1922. Other madrasas, ʿAṭṭārīn and ʿIlāla, were built by the Marinids.

During this period the political organisation of the country was developing in quite a different direction. The ʿIdrīsī shūrā, having assisted the Marinids to gain power, prepared to take advantage of the organisation which the latter had given them. Thus the foundations were laid for the movement which was to end in the partition of Morocco in the last years of the xvi th century into practically independent divisions. The shūrā were numerous in Meknes. When the weakening of the Marinids and the decline of their prestige made it possible, they supplied leaders. History has preserved the name of Mawālī ʿAzīzīn. The Waṣṣīns—only once intervened, it appears, when at the beginning of the xvi th century Mansūr b. Abū-ʿl-Ḥasan, having rebelled against Muhammad al-Borjūgī, found an asylum at Meknes. The Sultan besieged the town and took it, then installed his brother al-Ḥasan al-Kaddul there, who however did not prove faithful to him. The few years of independence enjoyed by Meknes were not particularly glorious. They mark, however, an epoch in the history of the town destined at other periods to be the prey of anarchy or the plaything of a tyrant.

The rise of the brotherhoods of the xvi th century found a favourable soil among the Mknāsīs. The Zāwīya Dżazūlā was established there, as in other places in Morocco. A few years later, Muhammad b. ʿIsā was teaching there.

Meknes was thus well prepared to welcome the Saʿdīns. When Muhammad al-Ṣaʿīd al-Shaikh approached in 1548 he entered the town without much trouble. The Marinid al-Naṣīr al-Ṣaḥrī was said to have agreed to hand over the town in return for the liberty of his father Ahmad Bū Zekrī, and the marabouts to have demanded the conclusion of such an agreement. Muhammad al-Ṣaʿīd, however, took a sufficiently sure method to establish his authority; when the Khāṭīb Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAli b. Ḥarṣūz began to preach against him, he had him scoured to death. When he returned two years later, he was welcomed with gifts. The estimates of travellers of this time put the population of the town at 6—8,000 hearths. It was the only town in the region. The Saʿdīns took little interest in Meknes which never attracted their attention. The country was well in hand and the Berber tribes peaceful to such a degree that the road from Marrākush by the Tâlīla was regularly used. It was the practice to make Meknes the residence of one of the sons of the Sultan. There was however no important command attached to it. Leo Africanus credits it with a revenue equal to half that of the viceroyalty of Fás, which is astonishing. Under Ahmad al-Mansūr, Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAli lived there and then after the second partition, Zūlān and, lastly Mawālī al-Ṣaʿīd, but as a prisoner in the last years of his father’s life.

The civil war which broke out on the death of al-Manṣūr placed Meknes at the mercy of the Berber risings and marabout intrigues. Mawālī ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Ṣaʿīd lived by brigandage and often found a refuge in al-Ḳasr al-Ḳabīr. In 1619, his brother Muhammad defeated him near Meknes. Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿIraqī mentions for the next year the rising of an individual who called himself the Sharif Amghār. In the midst of this disorder an authority gradually made itself felt, that of the Zāwīyas, and especially that of the Zāwīya of Dīla. In 1640—1641, Muhammad al-Ḥāḍīj was even able to seize the sovereign power and get himself recognised by Fás and Meknes after his victory over Mawālī Muhammad al-Ṣaʿīd b. Zūlān. He gamed over the Berber tribes, and Mawālī al-Ruṣūlī, in 1666 found the Bani Mṭr against him, allied with the Dīla’s Abū ʿAbd Allāh, and he had to fight them again in 1668.

Mawālī al-Ruṣūlī seems to have been interested in Meknes, the Kāsha of which he restored. In burying him in the mausoleum of al-Ḥāḍīj, Mawālī Ismāʿīl said he was fulfilling the last wishes of the deceased. But the most important event was that al-Ruṣūlī sent Mawālī Ismāʿīl to Meknes. The latter lived before his accession in the Almohad Kāsha, as a landed proprietor managing his estates. In his choice of a capital, we see the attraction of a rich district like this. He wished to build on his own image and real-ised his desires. For fifty years Meknes was simply the framework for his splendour, the scene of his extravagances. He at once decided to build himself a palace and at once a grandiose scheme was projected. He began by clearing a space. The houses adjoining the Almohad wall east of the town were destroyed and their owners forced to carry the debris off to a site which has retained the name of Hedum, then to rebuild on a site which the sharif enclosed by a wall to the N.W. of the mādīna. The site which he chose for himself was also separate from the town. His palace was built, and one even more splendid for his women. This first edifice, Dar Khirā, was finished in 1679. It was a series without intelligible plan, of tiyāds embellished with fountains, paved with marble, surrounded by galleries which were supported by columns of marble; the apartments opened on to three galleries. The sovereign’s palace was in two suites, that of his ladies in four and larger than his. His four wives and his favourites were equally splendidly housed. The other concubines, of whom he had 500 of all nations, were housed in rooms along the passage. At the end was a common hall, on a higher level, which gave a view over the gardens through iron grilles. The reception pavilions were planned on the same scale; one of them had forty rooms. The palace contained in all 45 pavilions and twenty kūbāb. The whole was surrounded by a crenellated wall pierced by twenty gates. It was triple in the N.E. with a road round it and it could be defended equally well against the interior of the kasāla. The bastions supported walls of guns and mortars. The women being subject to rigorous confinement and Mawālī Ismāʿīl being very meticulous in the performance of the duties of religion, a mosque was set aside for them. Another had begun in 1672, communicating with the town by the Bāḥi ʿIsī. Lastly the palace with its dependencies contained four mosques; two are still in use, the Dīmān b. al-ʿĀkhdar and in the quarter of the mews, very broken down, the Dīmān al-Ruṣūlī. To the south was a garden, the area of which is equal to that of the present mādīna, an
orchard in which olive trees predominated. Farther on were the stables to which the Sultan admitted only picked horses, to the number of 1,200; two parallel rows of arcades about 100 feet apart. In the centre ran running water. Each animal had its stall and a shelter for its equipment. Opposite was a stables, the āri, which supported a supplementary palace with twenty pavilions. Between the palace and the stables was the granary, forty feet high and big enough it was said, to contain the whole harvest of Morocco. At the sole was a pond for irrigation purposes and also subterranean reservoirs of water in case of a siege.

The buildings did not stop here. To the south-west of the town lay a city of pleasure, Ḍāmil al-Kuṭb, where the officials had palaces, where Mawāli ʿIsāfīl himself had his mosque, his madrasa, his hamam, his fondāl and the offices of the ministry of the Treasury, with the shops of the Shāfīs traders. In 1732–1733 Mawāli ʿAbd Allāh, on returning from an unsuccessful expedition into the saḥ, had the Madin al-Kuṭb destroyed by Christian slaves. There is nothing left of it today except the Bāb al-Khamsī, dated 1667, one of the finest and best preserved gate in the city.

Lastly a site was reserved for the troops. To the west of Meknes a large āra was settled with ṣabīs and their families. To the east of the Dār al-Mahbūn, five kābās for the 150,000 men of the ghīb were gradually incorporated in the great kāba.

After fifty years of unorganised but superhuman effort, the buildings were not yet completed. It was in 1731–1732 that Mawāli ʿAbd Allāh finished the surrounding wall and the Bāb Manṣūr, the most finished example of the Ismāʿīlī gate, pandentives, of proportions by no means perfect but imposing, of which the Bāb al-Bahrīn and the Bāb al-Xān are the other two finest examples at Meknes at the present day. This name of a renegade, Manṣūr al-Kuṭbī, was no doubt that of a keeper of the gate. Mawāli ʿIsāfīl directed all the operations himself. During the last twenty-four years of his reign he never spent twelve months on end at Meknes. But he returned there after each expedition; in proportion as his ambition and his power increased, his despotism and the needs of his government, his army and his family grew. His scheme became more and more grandiose: the work done was found unsatisfactory, modifications were made, buildings taken down and the work begun all over again. The result certainly was magnificent and imposing but also odd and varied.

All the country helped in the work. Mawāli ʿIsāfīl collected materials wherever he could. Volutes, chafas, marquetry were plundered. If he destroyed al-Badi, it was perhaps out of jealousy of Šāhān work or perhaps simply to get material. Like Ahmad al-Manṣūr, he procured marble from Fustat. One day when a caravan ship had stranded near Tangier he ordered the Gunyahī to bring the coffin from it by unused manual labour. When he died the columns of marble which were still on their way were left at the roadside.

Labour was remunerated by similar means. The Sultan imposed days of labour on the tribes, forced labour as he pleased, sent his ministers to the workshops, but relied mainly on renegades and Christian slaves who were his permanent workers. From 1680 the work was pushed on frenantically. All the Christians in Morocco were collected there. The Trinitarians of Fás joined them. The slaves were at first housed in sheds near the building-yards, then they were moved to the Dār al-Mahbūn, then to the stables, under the arches of a bridge, where their lot was particularly miserable, finally to the interior of a ruined bābījī, east of the town along the north wall of the Dār al-Mahbūn. They were able to organise themselves a little there, to build themselves a church, to have chapels, a convent and infirmaries. A pharmacist monk made up a medicine, the “Christian decoction”; this was the means by which humane relations were established with the natives, even with the dwellers in the palace. Their last historian has reduced the number of Christian prisoners in the service of Mawāli ʿIsāfīl to its real figure: they did not as a rule reach a thousand and the Sultan, in the course of over fifty years, himself killed only one hundred and nine (Koehler).

The emperor revealed in his palaces his extravagance and his cupidity; he accumulated wealth as he did buildings, but only to hide it. The consuls and ambas-sadors who came to negotiate the ransom of captives he received with a mixture of baronial courtliness and splendour. We often mention the madly of the cruelty and the terror which this ruler inspired; he loved to torture his women and cut off heads to show his skill. His amusements were of a similar character; he liked to shoot with his hārd at the deer in his menageries then to finish them off with spear-thrusts. “Let us avert our eyes from all these horrors which make nature shudder”, says Chénier. Following his example his household inspired terror in the town. He had six hundred children, a nursery of slaves, *who might have had a happier lot if he had loved them as much as his horses*. On the approach of any of them, “every one hid all that he might take a fancy to”, and the ʿābd in their turn, negroes robed in bright cloths, went about bullying, in the name of their master at first and then in their own.

All his work was to collapse at his death, but he was able to keep it up in his lifetime. From the troubles that broke out when he disappeared from the scene, one can judge of the energy of this man of eighty who maintained order among his horde of negroes and in this country desolated by an epidemic of plague, outbreak of the ʿābd were simply given orders to kill anyone who came from Fās.

Mawāli ʿIsāfīl was buried like his brother in the mausoleum of Šāh ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Majidī, a moralist saint of the eight century. He was the rebel Mawāli Muljamīn, killed at Tāru in 1706, and Mawāli Ẓāīn in 1707, had already joined Mawāli ʿAbd al-Rahmān. In 1859 the ashes of Mawāli ʿAbd al-Rahmān were also deposited there.

On the death of Mawāli ʿIsāfīl, the Ḥakīka and the soldiers of the āri stirred up a palace war which lasted twenty years. Mawāli ʿAbd Allāh lost and regained his throne six times. But however great this danger was, the other threat was still more disturbing; having got rid of the garrisons of the Ismāʿīlī kābas, the Berbers, armed, came down from the mountains. The problem for the sultāns was to choose the lesser evil; they
declined to disband the 'ghibl' and in the struggle which naturally arose between these and the Berbers relied more on the former. The civil war extended to the tribes of the plain and the garrisons of Fès, especially the Ciswa; pretenders stirred up the flames, readily giving the signal to plunder and, in the rivalry of races and tribes, easily finding a party to support them. Gradually the Bu'abders sank in misfortune. It was in vain that Mawāli 'Abd Allah and his sons expended the treasure of Mawāli Ismā'il for them. The worst of all was that every one ended or began by plundering it.

Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah almost re-established order and restored to the town its past glory. He did a great deal for it; his palace of Dār al-Da'āḥiq, the severe architecture of which, not without charm, can still be seen in a part of the olive-grove of al-Hammām; in the ka'bah, he built the Ḫamā'ī al-Anwar and in the Ḫamā', the maqṣūra of the Ḫamā'ī al-Muhājirīn, the kubah of Sulīm Muhammad b. Salām and several mosques (al-Aṣār, al-Baṣṣārīn, Bāb al-Maḥāl, Berutīn and Sitt Bū Ṭūlim). It was he who made the 12,000 books of the library of Mawāli Ismā'il hāfiẓ for the benefit of all the mosques of Meknès. As regards the tribes his policy was to break them up. He transplanted many of them and took several repressive measures. The end of his reign was marked by the success of the Berbers whose attacks had been resumed about 1775.

Doing nothing was to be left of the work of Mawāli Ismā'il. The Christian community lost its Franciscan mission in the reign of Mawāli Yāqūt and did not survive the persecution of this sharif. The earthquake of 1755 had destroyed their church, convent and hospice. The renegades, who had gathered together at Ka'bah Agūrīn, were gradually absorbed.

The Berber crisis was again acute from 1811. Communication with Fès was continually being cut and it was something to boast of for the sulṭān to go out of Meknès. Mawāli Shāhān (Ṣuḥmān), who had an interest in restoring the kahf and rebuilding the bridges on the road to Fès and who would have liked to get rid of the Bu'abders, decided to settle in Fès. His walls were his only defence at Meknès, which was beseiged by the tribes. Mawāli 'Abd al-Raḥmān, whom Delacroix saw there and who built a kubah in Ḥamān b. Ḥalīm, left the Berbers in semi-independence and even disbanded the 'ghibl' without even granting those who remained in Meknès the character of Malagzi troops. His son carefully avoided all quarrels.

Mawāli al-Ḥaṣan revived the tradition of the great sulṭān and made his authority felt. He was able to enter Meknès after his accession only by crushing the power of the tribes. In 1857 he conducted a campaign against the Beni Mūjr. In 1857 he forced his way through the country of the Beni Mūjr in his campaign against the Nūn. On his death the Berbers regained their independence. If they retained their ka'bah, it was because the latter cast out their allegiance to the Malagzi. After the fall of Mawāli 'Abd al-'Arīf, Meknès recognised all the competitors in succession. It was Mawāli that proclaimed 'Abd al-Ḥafṣ, who had come via the Berbers of Tarfī in 1908, in 1909 it summoned the sharif al-Ḥaṭṭānī and in 1911 rallied to Mawāli Zāin. It was in this year that General Moïnier entered Meknès and two years later Colonel Henrys under the direction of General Lyautey pacified the Beni Mūjr country.


b. European sources: Marmol Caravaigal, Descripción general de Fes, 1723; Monette, Relation de la captivité du sieur Monette, 1683; Mission historique de Moutons, etc., by Fr. de San Juan de el Puerto, 1708; Windus, A journey to Morocco, 1725; Busnet, Histoire de l'empire maure, 1731; Birthingman, Tagebuch einer Reise nach Marokko, 1805; Custardis and Cavanilles, Pianta del Marocco, in course of public.: Champion, Tanger, Fès, Meknès, 1924 (gives the French translation of the passage of Windus relating to the caliph of Meknès); Poquelin, Au Maroc, CetAhmail, Kabīb, Meknès, 1910; al-Sulīm, La mission franciscaine du Maroc, 1927; Scholle, La pénétration chrétienne au Maroc. La mission franciscaine, 1912; etc., Brief account on some traits in history having to do with captives of Maroc, in Rec. de géogr. maroc., 1921; etc., (part) point d'histoire sur les captifs chétiques de Meknès, in Haerpie, 1928; Marqās, Manuel d'art musulman, 1926–1927: Sardou, Les ports de Meknès d'après les documents envoyés par M. le Capitaine Faureau, and La grande mosquée de Meknès... in Bull. archéol. du Com. des Travaux Hist., 1916 and 1917; Ricard, Pour comprendre l'art musulman en Afrique du Nord et en Espagne, 1924 (gave a plan of the Pu al-Makhyen); Fournald, Reconnaissance maroc., 1887; Segourez, Voyage au Maroc, 1903; Ma-Signor, Le Maroc dans les premières années du XXe siècle, Tableau d'après un d'Alger, 1906; etc., François sur les corporations musulmanes d'armée et de commerçants au Maroc, 1925; Le Chatelier, Notes sur les villes et tribus du Maroc en 1879, 1902; Brune, Essai sur la conscience religieuse des Musulmans au Maroc, 1926; Bel. Historien d'un aiment musulman vivant actuellement à Meknès, in Rev. hst. des reis, 1917; Van Pirenne, Les moyens en armes, 1922; etc., Posticipes de grandes musulman, 1925; Arnaud, La monarchie de Meknès, 1911; Beige and Ioleaud, Étude technique de la signature de Meknès, in Bull. soc. de France, 1922; Mémorial du Service coopératif de l'Armée, Proposition géométrique en Meknès, Fès et al. Maroc, 1926.

(C. TUCK-BRENNANO)

MELLĀH, the name given to the quarter in Moroccan towns which the Jews are compelled to inhabit. Being all d'el-dummā, the Jews have a right to the special protection of the government which allows them a particular quarter to live in, situated very often close to the citadel (qāṣbah) where the governor of the town resides. Moreover, the sovereigns and governors used to have at hand "their" Jews who were frequently of use, to them as clever diplomatic
agents and often gave them valuable financial support. All the towns of Morocco, even the large ones, did not necessarily have a mellah. Thus at Tangier there are certain quarters particularly inhabited by Jews but they are not set aside for them and we also find Muslims there. As to Rabat, its present mellah was established only in 1808 by Sultan Moulay Suliman; formerly the Jews lived together in the Al-Ɓahira quarter (el-Ɓeira) where there were also Muslims. When he founded Fas in 805, Idris II compelled the Jewish refugees who flooded into the capital to reside in the northern part of the ‘Adwat al-Karawiyin (Agilan quarter as far as the gate called lih II-a Suliman); this was undoubtedly the first Moroccan ghetto; and the present Fondak el-lândi (“the Jew’s warehouse”) apparently preserves its memory. But at the end of the xiiith century, the Marinid dynasty, wishing to create a new capital, founded alongside of “Old Fas” (Fas al-Bāli) “New Fas” (Fas al-Ijālid) or “White City” (al-Malānat al-Daifâ). In the first half of the xivth century, the town of Ims was built close beside Fas and at first occupied by the Ghuzz archers who formed a part of the regular Marinid army: after the suppression of this force in 1320, Ims became the quarters of the Christian mercenaries, whom we find there in 1361. Later, probably at the beginning of the xivth century, and no doubt as the result of massacres, the Jews of Old Fas were ordered to settle in Ims; this town was built on a site known as al-Mellah, the “salt spring”, or “salt marsh”, and the new ghetto became known by this name. From a proper, this became a common noun, and passed from Fas to the other towns of Morocco as the name for the quarter assigned to the Jews. The etymology proposed by Dozy in his Supplement (al-mellah < al-naḥallā “quarter”) is therefore to be rejected, as are the explanations as “salted, accursed land”, or “quarter of the Jews who were forced to salt the heads of decapitated rebels”. In Morocco instead of al-mellah, in speaking, the expression el-meniss (class. al-manis) is often used by anti-Semites as “not-salted”.

The mellah of Fas is therefore the oldest in Morocco in every way. For a long time it was also the most important; in the middle of the xith century, al-Bakri says that Fas is the town with most Jews in the Maghrib, which has given rise to the proverbial saying: Fas balad bi-lā nās. “Fas, a town where there are no people (worth mentioning)”.

But the constitution of Marakush in 1063 resulted in the foundation in southern Morocco of a new Jewish centre which was to attract to it the Jewish and pseudo-Jewish peoples of the Atlas. The term el-mellah however appears for Marakush only in the second half of the xivth century (cf. E. Fagnan, Extraits inédits relatifs aux Maqreke, p. 409). At the present day the mellah of Marrakesh and the Jewish town of Mogador form the most important Jewish centres of Morocco.

The name al-mellah is peculiar to Morocco; there, however, it is applied not only to the Jewish quarter in a town but also to little mountain villages exclusively inhabited by Jews. At Tlemcen the term dar el-stūd (class. dar el-saṭūd) is used; at Constantine esh-šādr and in Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli: el-hārā.

On the interior organisation of the present day Moroccan mellah see E. Aubin, Le Maroc d’aujourd’


(Georges S. Colin)

MELILLA (in modern Arabic: Milīya, Berber Tamlilt, “the white”; in the Arab geographers: Milīta), a seaport on the east coast of Morocco on a promontory on the peninsula of Gelfiya at the end of which is the Cape Tres Forcas or the Three Forcas (Fas-Hurk of the Arab geographers, now Dibb el-Hurk). Melilla probably corresponds to the Rassadar of the ancients (cf. Rhysiodor ap. pipium et portus Pliny, v. 18), Rassadar Colonia of the Antoninian itinerary. Leo Africanus says that it had belonged for a time to the Goths and that the Arabs took it from them, but in reality we know nothing of the ancient history of the town.

It is only at the beginning of the tenth century that Melilla appears in the Muslim history of Morocco. In 930, the Umayyad Caliph of Spain, Abd al-Rahmān al-Naṣir li-Dīn Allāh succeeded in detaching from the Fāṭimids the famous Miknās chief Mūsā b. Abī ‘l-‘Afyā, who had established his authority over the basin of the Muluya and the district of Tāzz; having seized Melilla, al-Naṣir built ramparts around it and gave it to his new ally, who thus had at his command a base of defence against the Fāṭimids and a port which made communication with Spain easy. Later on, the descendants of his son, al-Brī b. Mūsā, rebuilt the town, which remained one of the strongholds of the Miknās in Morocco down to the time of the decline of the power of the tribe, who were definitely defeated and scattered by the Almoravid Yūsūf b. Tashfin in 1070.

But the Miknās must have abandoned it before their dynasty was crushed by the Almoravids; for al-Bakri shows us that by 1067 a descendant of the Hammūdī Idrīsīds of Spain had been summoned to Melilla and recognised as ruler by the people of the district.

At the period when al-Bakri wrote (1067), Melilla was a town surrounded by a wall of stone; inside was a very strong citadel, a great mosque, a bazaar and markets. The inhabitants belonged to the tribe of the Banū Wartadi (or B. Wartadi), a branch of the Ṣanḥājya group of the Batliya. Melilla had a harbour which was accessible only in summer. It was the terminus of a trade route which connected Sidjilmassa with the Mediterranean through the valley of the Muluya and Agarsiff (French: Guerif). The trade must have been considerable; the principal exports were no doubt those mentioned by Leo Africanus: iron from the mines of the mountains of the Banū Sfīd and honey from the Kabdāna country; we may also add pearls which were taken from oysters found in the harbour itself. Al-Bakri notes that the inhabitants made money by granting protection to merchants. The environs of the town were occupied by the Banū Wartadi (who also occupied the stronghold called Kuliū Garei), the Maṭmā, the Ahl Kabdān, the Marnisa of the “White Hill” (al-Kudriyat al-bahidī) and the Ghassāsa of the massif which ends in Cape Tres Forcas (Dibb el-Hurk). All this region was then independent and had no political
link with the kingdom of Fás or that of Naksūr. But in 1680 the Almoravid sovereign Yūsuf b. Tāshītīn took Melilla and added its territory to the Almoravid empire. In 1441–1442, in the course of the Almoravid pursuit of the Almohads, a body of the latter set out from Tantsimān to lay siege to Melilla, which was taken and plundered. In 1272, the Marinid Sultan Ya'qūb took Melilla from the Almohads and Ibn Khaldūn simply mentions it as a fortified place. It seems in fact that these three captures of the town had destroyed its commercial importance to the advantage of another town on the west coast of the peninsula of the Gellāta: Ghassās (also called al-Kudayt al-ba'ādī), the Aţuda of the Portolans; in the thirteenth century it is this latter town that appears as the Mediterranean port of Fás and Tāzāt, and it was through it that political and commercial relations with eastern Spain and Italy (Genoa and Venice) were carried on.

Leo Africanus says that in 1490, hearing that an attack on it was planned by the Spaniards, the inhabitants abandoned the town and fled to the mountains of the Gellāta; to punish them for this the Waṭṭāsdūl Sahān had the town burned down; when in Sept. 1497 the Spaniards arrived they were thus able to disembark without resistance and occupied the town, abandoned and half destroyed. The occupation of Melilla enabled the Spaniards to attack the port of Ghassās by land and it was taken in April 1506. The Moroccans recaptured it in 1533 but the dangerous proximity of Melilla henceforth deprived it of its importance. The commercial activity of this region was moved farther west to the port of Mazīmīn (Spanish: Almucézar, Fr.: Alhoubene). And the centre of Muslim resi-tance in this part of Morocco was henceforth the strong-hold of Tāzāt, which after having been the capital of the Marinid Tafsīn the Banū Waṭṭās became that of a practically independent leader of a holy war. After passing into the hands of the Spaniards, Melilla was continuously besieged by the Muslims, mainly by the forces of the leaders of holy war established at Tāzāt and at Mūjān (the Meggea of Leo Africanus). Occupied by the Christians, the town naturally became one of the places in Morocco in which Muslim pretenders and rebels found asylum and support against the central power, especially at the beginning of the Sa'dian dynasty. In 1549, it sheltered the dispossessed Waṭṭāsdūl Abū Ḥassūn, "king" of Bādīs; in 1550 it welcomed with his family the Mawlāy 'Āmar, "king" of Debdū. It was from Melilla that in 1595, the pretender al-Naṣir b. al-Qāhir b'ilāḥ set out against his uncle Sulṭān Ahmad al-Mansūr.

Later Melilla only appears in history in connection with sieges which it had to suffer: sieges by Mawlāy Ismā'īl in 1657 and 1658, siege in 1774 by Mawlāy Muhammad b. Abū Allah; Spanish-Moroccan war of 1893 (Sābit Waryāsh affair). From 1903 to 1908 the region of Melilla was the scene of struggles between the pretender al-Djibrīl al-Rūgī, established in the Qašba of Selwān, and the troops of the Sulṭān Abū Al-Azīz; defeated and receiving no support, the latter had to take refuge in Spanish territory and be repatriated. Still more recently in 1921, the same district witnessed the sanguinary battles between the Spaniards and the Rifans under Abū Al-Durar, an infidel. Melilla is for Spain a "place of sovereignty" like Alhucemas, Peñón de Velez and Ceuta. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, Melilla, constituted a free port, was the landing-place for all the European merchandise (cotton, sugar, tea) intended not only for eastern Morocco but also for the Saharan regions of Morocco and Tunisia. It has now lost much of its commercial importance.


(M. G. Colin, Geogr. S. Colon)

MENDEZ, the name of two rivers in western Anatolia:
1. Buyuk Menderes (called by al-'Umarī Menderes, by Piri Reis, Mendarız or Mendaro), the ancient Maeander, the Mandra of the Crusaders. It rises in the district of Germiyan in a little lake, the Huweiran Golu (Sarı) above Diner (according to Abū Bakr b. Bahām in a spring called Buiār bashī, a day's journey from Homa), flows past Homa at some distance off, then through the plain of Şākhīl and the kaşat of Bāhān and Cāl. In the kaşat of Cāhāna (capital Bolām) it is joined by the Banāz Ĉaī (called Murad Dagh Suyu in Abū Bakr b. Bahām whose statement that it flows past Şākhīl is wrong), which rises in the Muṣād Dagh and flows past Banāz. Farther down its course, in the plain of Denizli, it receives the Čuk Šu, the ancient Lycus Fl. Further on a ruined bridge called Demirsahi Köprüsü marks the frontier between the two old livās of Germiyan and Ašíl; according to Abū Bakr a warm spring rising in its foundations had contributed to the destruction of this bridge. In the territory of Nisbīn the Buyuk Menderes flows past at a distance the villages of Ortoçı, Nazlılı, Sulţānişār, Koşāk and Güzeliş-har Aşi. In 1549, it sheltered the dispossessed Waṭṭāsdūl Abū Ḥassūn, "king" of Bādīs; in 1550 it welcomed with his family the Mawlāy 'Āmar, "king" of Debdū. It was from Melilla that in 1595, the pretender al-Naṣir b. al-Qāhir b'ilāḥ set out against his uncle Sulṭān Ahmad al-Mansūr.

Later Melilla only appears in history in connection with sieges which it had to suffer: sieges by Mawlāy Ismā'īl in 1657 and 1658, siege in 1774 by Mawlāy Muhammad b. Abū Allah; Spanish-Moroccan war of 1893 (Sābit Waryāsh affair). From 1903 to 1908 the region of Melilla was the scene of struggles between the pretender al-Djibrīl al-Rūgī, established in the Qašba of Selwān, and the troops of the Sulṭān Abū Al-Azīz; defeated and receiving no support, the latter had to take refuge in Spanish territory and be repatriated. Still more recently in 1921, the same district witnessed the sanguinary battles between the Spaniards and the Rifans under Abū Al-Durar, an infidel. Melilla is for Spain a "place of sovereignty" like Alhucemas, Peñón de Velez and Ceuta. Before the establishment of the French protectorate, Melilla, constituted a free port, was the landing-place for all the European merchandise (cotton, sugar, tea) intended not only for eastern Morocco but also for the Saharan regions of Morocco and Tunisia. It has now lost much of its commercial importance.


(M. G. Colin, Geogr. S. Colon)
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(M. G. Colin, Geogr. S. Colon)
came down the river valleys opening on the Aegean thus ended in Smyrna, just as at the present-day the railways which utilize these valleys start from Smyrna.


MENF. [See MANEF.]

MENGÜÇEK (HANDGÜL), a Turkish emir, who after the capture of Komnatu Djeçen in 1071 A.D. seized various places in the northeast of Asia Minor and transmitted his power to his descendants. We find them in Erzindjan, Koghboa (Colonna, Kara-Ilyar Sharji) and Durgi (cf. the genealogical table in von Zamburr, *Manuel de Genealogie etc.*, p. 146). Little is known of their history. It is incidentally mentioned in Michael Syros (cf. Chabot, in 205) that Ibn Mengüçek, being represented at the Portukal Bajaz, made an alliance with Theodore Galuzis, the Byzantine commander of Trebizond, but was taken prisoner in battle along with the latter (1118). He was, how again released by the Danishmand Urı̄n Châri, whose daughter he had married, while the Greek had to pay a heavy ransom. His name is not mentioned but, from the genealogical statements in the inscriptions of his descendants, he was called I-ḥâk. The same story is given elsewhere but not so fully. Better known is his grand-on Fâhär al-Din Bahramshâh, who ruled for many years in Erzindjan and died in 622 (1225). To him the celebrated poet Najmuddin dedicated his poem *Malḵūn al-Iṣrâʾīl*, which was composed in 1198 or 1199. He was on the best of terms with the Seljuks of Konya, with whom he was connected by marriage, but when these relations were altered under his son ʿAlā al-Din Ibadštâh, the rule of the Mandjuks was ended. At the end of 625 (1228) he was forced to cede Erzindjan to Kaikhschâh, and his brother Muṣtafar al-Din Muḥammad who ruled in Koghboa met a similar fate. A collateral line established in Dzwin and ruling there in the name of the Seljuks held out for a few more years, perhaps till the coming of the Mongols into the region in 675: only a few scraps of information about this line have been obtained from inscriptions and coins.


(M. Th. Houttm.)

Menteshe-eli, a little principality in Anatolia. The boundaries of the territory of the Menteshe-eli's [q. v.] are given by MüSN-DAJ-MAH (cf. Fr. Babinger, *G.O.W.*, p. 234 sqq.) on his *Sūrah al-Abīr* (Stuttgart 1285) as marked by Muğbâ, Halâl, Boz-lyuk, Münts, Lâgman, Manife, Čine, Tâvas, Bornâz, Mackri, Dogânja, Foca and Mermere. They thus correspond approximately to those of the ancient Caria. The origin of the name is uncertain, but it can confidently be asserted that the opinion, presumably first put forward by F. Meninski (Lezoum, iv. 737) and till quite recently upheld, that the district takes its name from the Munûds (Mûdzêq in Strabo) of the ancients is not worthy of credence. Several of the places above mentioned played a not unimportant part as centres of scholarship and literature in the earlier period of Ottoman intellectual life. Thus in the time of the Menteshe-eli's Mehmedm (757-777) a certain Muḥammad b. Mehemmed of Bâdjin composed a *Fâlkuš*, which was published by J. v. Hammar-Purgstall under the title *Falkwinkel* (Pest 1840) from the Milan MS. and rightly described as one of the earliest documents of the Ottoman language. In many of these places there were academies where an active intellectual life flourished, so that the share of the district of Menteshe in Ottoman literature is strikingly large.

(En. Barb.)

Menteshe-oghluari, a petty dynasty in Anatolia. The princes of Menteshe first appear in history after the break up of the Seljuks empire. The founder of the family is said to have been a certain Hâbîb Bey Bâdjin al-Din Karsh. He had his court at Milas (Mylasa) in the ancient Caria, and not far from it his stronghold Pağini (Petona). His descendants also lived in Milas until they moved their court to Mileus. The son of the Menteshe was Urkhan Bey, who is known from an inscription on a building in Milas and from Ibn Balşâh who visited him in 1334 in Milas (cf. Ibn Balşâh, *Inschriften*, ed. Dehremy, Paris 1854, ii. 278 sqq.) Urkhan's successor was his son Ibrahim, who built a mosque in Milasa in 745 (1344) and left two sons, Ahmed Châri and Mehmedm. The second succeeded him in 755 (1354), but succumbed in the struggle for the throne to his brother Ahmed, who took the throne in 755 (1354). In 777 (1375) founded an academy at Bâdjin and at the end of Lûmâsâ II, 780 (Oct. 1378) completed the *Ulu Lâmi* in Milas. Ahmed Châri died in Şahîn 793 (July 1391) and was succeeded by his nephew Ilaysia. The Ottomans had in their reign already taken possession of several principalities in the neighborhood of Menteshe-eli, such as that of the Germân-eli [q. v.] and of the Hamel-eli [q. v.], and now seriously threatened the existence of the Menteshe. Immediately after the accession of Ilaysia Bey, Lâyazid I, who had just become Şârîn, deprived the lords of Menteshe of the last vestige of their independence. The sudden and unexpected death of the ruler of Sûrûn, Bâzîrî and Kûma, and later with the conquest of the Ottomans, Timur-Lenk, Ilyas Bey, who built a mosque in Mileus, regained possession of Menteshe-eli in 1402. On 24 July 1403, he concluded a treaty with the Count of Crete, Marco Falieri (publ. by M. Attie, at the end of his essay, *Commence d'Epître et de Milet moyen âge* in the *Bibli. de l'E. O.* xi. 6, 1884, xvi. 3, 1884, xvi. 3, 1884, v. Vol. vi. Paris 1864, p. 226 sqq.) and with
the admiral Ser Pietro Civrano on 17th Oct. 1414 (cf. Diplomatarium Venet-Locarnianum, ii. 305, 293 and W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii. 553 sq.). The reign of Ilyas beg filled with fighting and difficulties of all kinds ended in 824 (1421) when his lands passed to the Ottomans. Mehmed I had struck coins as early as 818 (1415) on which he calls himself lord of Menteshė. Among the children of Ilyas beg, mention is made of Latih beg, but the shadowy part he played is quite uncertain. The year 829 (1426) saw the end of the princes of Menteshė. A certain Bahman was appointed as Ottoman governor of Menteshė-el and henceforward the district formed a part of the Ottoman empire. The chronology of the dynasties of Menteshė is still uncertain and essential points have still to be cleared up, which will require a systematic study of the many monuments in Menteshė-el with their important inscriptions, especially in Milas, Miletus, Bardjum, Mugla, etc.

The following genealogical table shows how the relationship of the various princes and is based on coins and inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han®bî li-bîn Kursî</th>
<th>Government of Nîmar under the Nêljîrâc-Menteshê</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shudîbî bîn Utkhân</td>
<td>[c. 730 = 1350]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoûshîm</td>
<td>[c. 745 = 1344]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tâdî bîn Ahmed Ghaûzî</td>
<td>Mehmed 777 (1375), d. 793 (1391) 755 (1354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muçafîr bîn Ilyas</td>
<td>I. 793 (1391) II. 805—24 (1402—21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latîh Wîwîs Ahmed</td>
<td>Fâîmîn 824 (1421) d. 825 (1420)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bibliography: The Arabic historians of
MERIDA — MERÍNIDS


(E. LÉVY-PROVENÇAL)

MERÍNIDS (Barūn Marin), a Berber dynasty, which ruled over the extreme Maghrib (Morocco) from the middle of the xith to the middle of the xith century.

The first references we have to the Banū Marin show them living a nomadic life in the Sahara between Fugqīg [q.v.] and Tafṣīlt [q.v.]. Like the other groups who claimed to be Zenātā, they must have been driven to the west by the nomad Arabs Banū Hilāl in the second half of the xith century. Like their brethren, the Banū 'Abd al-Walī, whose lands adjoined theirs, they had attempted in 1145 to revict the conquest of the Central Maghrib by the Almohads and had been defeated. While the Banū 'Abd al-Walī entered the service of the conquerors, the Banū Marin took refuge in the desert. The weakening of the Almohad empire gave them a chance to take their revenge. In the course of their periodic movements in the valley of the Muluya, they learned of the weakness of the defences of the extreme Maghrib, the best forces of which were engaged in Spain, and the Benū Marin therefore made a formidable razzia northwards in 615 (1216). This was the first stage of the war, which went on year by year, for 53 years. It was continued next year by the razzia of the Banū Risayl Arabs, who lived in the plains of the west, and by a first fiscal exploitation of the country. The Almohads, paralysed by dynastic feuds, made no serious thrust in return until 27 years later, when the Banū Marin were defeated by the troops of the caliph al-Sa'id (642 = 1244). After a forced check, the conquest was resumed with more method by the amīr Abū Yahyā b. 'Abd al-Haqq. He endeavoured to increase his military forces by granting lands to groups of his kinsmen and taking into his service foreign mercenaries and esteems, every effort to capture towns. To achieve this end and to gain a moral support which he lacked, the amīr claimed to be the mandatary of the Haṣfīdīs [q.v.], the Almohads of Ifriqiya. He further declared himself the protector of the holy men, who were venerated by the people. It was thus that he took possession of Meknes, Fas, Tāzā, Rabat and Sāla. Finally the help he gave the Almohad pretender Abū Dabīhū enabled the amīr Abū Yūsuf Ya'llūb, Abu Yahyā's successor, to annexe Marrakesh, which marked the completion of the Marinid conquest (669 = 1269).

Inheriting this area of the western Muslim world, which had been the very heart of the great Almohad empire, the Merīnids also inherited the traditions of those they had dispossessed and their dreams of hegemonv in Spain and Barbary.

As in the time of the Almoravids and Almohads, Spain was for the Merīnids the land of martyrs for the faith. Not only did the dynasty send there its troublesome sons, princes whose presence in the Maghrib might be inconvenience and who formed the corps of volunteers of the faith, but several sultans fought there in person: Abū Yūsuf, whose re-occupation of the holy war was his one great scheme, his successor Abū Ya'llūb, and Abu l-Hasan, who saw the failure of these overseas expeditions.

In crossing the Strait, Abū Yūsuf fulfilled his dearest vow but he was also answering the reiterated appeals of the Banū l-Ḥamr of Granada, who were tired of enduring the exactings and insults of the King of Castile. He was received there as a saviour and at once undertook a plundering expedition. Don Nuño de Lara, endeavouring to capture the loot taken from the Christians, sustained a heavy defeat near Écija and was himself slain (674 = 1275). Very few other pitched battles are mentioned in these wars of the Merīnids in Spain, but almost daily razzias into Christian territory. The Muslims destroyed or carried off the crops and stocks and they took prisoners who were sold as slaves in the Maghrib. The relations between the Sulṭāns of Fāṣ and of Granada, by no means warm at the time of the landing in Spain, became decidedly hostile when Abū Yūsuf claimed the ownership of the town of Ceuta as a base for his future operations in the Peninsula. Ibn al-Ḥamr appealed to the King of Castile for help against the encroachments of his rescuer. A league was formed between Christians and Muslims of Spain which Yaghammadun, sulṭān of Tlemcen, soon joined. The latter undertook to prevent or impede any further crossings of the Moroccan ruler into Andalusia.

The entente with the Christians did not however prevent the latter from continuing the task of the reconquest. In 709 (1309) they took Gibraltar, an island which was afterwards re-occupied, again to the Maghribi Sulṭān. Abu l-Hasan sent his son 'Abd al-Malik who recaptured Gibraltar (733 = 1333). 'Abd al-Malik having been killed, Abu l-Hasan sent a large army on ships supplied by the ports of Ifriqiya and himself landed near Tarifa. This town was in the hands of the Christians. He tried to take it but was routed by the combined forces of Alfonso XI of Castile and Alfonso IV of Portugal. This disaster of 1340 and the taking of Algeciras by the King of Castile finally discouraged the Merīnids sultāns. Neither he nor his successors again made attempts in Spain.

If cunning was the foundation of the Merīnids from reviving against Christianity the glories of the wars of the Almohads, they were able to devote themselves to regaining the great African empire of their predecessors and they succeeded in doing so for a comparatively short time. That empire, as is well known, covered in addition to the kingdom of the Merīnids, that of the 'Abd al-Wādīds of Tlemcen and that of the Haṣfīds of Tunis [q.v.]. The Kingdom of Tlemcen was that most directly threatened by the ambitions of the sultāns of Fāṣ. Causes of quarrel were numerous between these neighbouring and related dynasties. To old rivalries dating from the days when the two clans were nomads, had been added the competition of two adjoining states each seeking to extend their frontiers.
The ‘Abd al-Wādids very soon lost hope of annexing territory in the west. If, as we have seen, they were a thorn in the side of the Merinids who desired to cross into Spain, this policy was of brief duration. Very soon they had to confine themselves strictly to the defensive. On many occasions, the kingdom of Tlemcen was invaded and the Tlemcenians shut up within their walls. For example for eight years and three months, from 698 (1299), they were blockaded, during which period the Merinids established a permanent camp which became the town of al-Mansūra [q.v.] in addition to numerous other works of circumvallation; Tlemcen however did not fall till later. In 737 (1337) Abu l-Hasan took it; he and his son Abū ‘l-Hassan were to hold it for 22 years. For these two princes, whose reigns mark the apogee of the dynasty, Tlemcen was only a first stage towards Ifriqiya. The dream of recreating the empire of the Almohads was to be realised by annexing the Ḥafsid kingdom.

Constant relations, in which each hoped to gain some advantage, united the two states of east and west, Baṣṭar Ḥafs and Baṣṭar Marin. To a contemporary observer like the Egyptian al-Umari, the Baṣṭar Marin alone counted as a military power, but the Baṣṭar Ḥafs, descendants of the Almohad caliphs, had a prestige which the Baṣṭar Marin could not claim in spite of the title of Amir al-Muʾminin which Abu Inān arrogantly assumed. This explains why, from the very first, the Baṣṭar Marin in annexing the towns of the Maghrib declared themselves mandatories of the sovereigns of Tunis and why they married Ḥafsid princesses. On their side, the Baṣṭar Ḥafs did not think it wise to refuse their daughters; they dealt tactfully with the Moroccan sultans, who might be useful in protecting them against the sultans of Tlemcen. In a word, they hoped to see the Merinids attack central Maghrib but not to become complete masters of it, which would directly expose Ifriqiya to the attacks of the conquerors.

This is what actually happened in 747. Taking advantage of the usurpation of the throne of Tunis and of the troubles which followed it, Abu l-Hasan invaded Ifriqiya and sought to impose his authority there as in his own kingdom. The situation here however was very different from what he was familiar with in the Maghrib. In Ifriqiya, the Arabs were still very strong. Abu l-Hasan came to grief against the Arab tribes united against a foreign master and near Kairawan they inflicted a disastrous defeat on him in Muharram 749 (April 1345). This disaster even endangered the position of the Marinids in the Maghrib itself. An attempt by Abu Inān, son of Abu l-Hasan, to reconquer Ifriqiya proved fruitless.

In spite of the collapse of Marinid aims, the period of these two last sultans was nevertheless one of the greatest in the history of Muslim Barbary, one of those which has left us most memorials of its magnificence.

The Merinids were vigorous builders. In 726, Abu Yūsuf had founded New Fās, west of the old town, to make it his official capital; but it was during the first half of the xivth century that the greatest building activity was displayed. The majority of those that have come down to us dates from this period. Works of considerable artistic value, they are at the same time evidence of the military activity and religious ardour of the Baṣṭar Marin, like the ramparts and the mosque of al-Mansūra, the walls and necropolis of Chella, the medersas of Fās and Sale, the different buildings erected near Tlemcen around the tomb of the great ascetic Sidi Bū Madyan. Piety in the form of mysticism was the dominating note in the intellectual life of the Maghrib. We must however not forget that the court of Fās was frequented by men like ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Khaldūn, Ibn al-Khaṭīb and Ibn Batūṭa, who have left a name in the field of literature and profane learning.

The failure of the attempts upon Ifriqiya and the disaster at Kairawan may be taken as the beginning of the decline of the Merinids. As a result of these military failures, the troops stationed in some parts of the Maghrib had to be withdrawn. The passes of the Atlas being no longer guarded, the Arabs of Sūs and Tafṣīlīt, excited by the rumours from Ifriqiya, began to display their turbulent spirit. The tribes who paid taxes now paid only at longer and longer intervals under the threat of expeditionary forces sent against them. There was still a graver cause of decline: the power of the viziers vastly increased. An aristocracy of high officials related to the royal family handed down offices from father to son, backed by powerful clans, and ended by acquiring the power to nominate the new sovereigns. To keep them in subjection, we have to choose for the throne a minor or a weakling. When the Sultan displayed some desire to rule in person, they did not hesitate to dethrone or assassinate him. Thus in 762 (1361) Abū Sālim was decapitated by a soldier of the Christian militia; his successor Taṣfīn, an idiot, was deposed and replaced by Abū Zayīn, who was found strangled and drowned in a reservoir.

In the midst of these palace revolutions the unity of the kingdom was destroyed. We find the prince who governs Sijilmāsa fighting with the sultan reigning at Fās. The vizier who has control of the legitimate sovereign had pretenders against him, who end by dividing up the country among them. Marrakshī fights against Fās. At one time, the traditional enemies of the dynasty, the ‘Abd al-Wādids of Tlemcen, endeavoured to profit by the occasion to resume the aggressive policy of Yaghmorān. But Tlemcen was itself too weakened to attain success. Besides, it was attacked in the rear by the Arabs of the Central Maghrib, instigated from Fās. One of the shahīgs of the Swwāt Arabs is called the ‘friend and patron of the Marinid dynasty’. The Baṣṭar Marin had another means of neutralizing Tlemcen; this was to support pretenders of the ‘Abd al-Wādīd family. To sum up, in spite of the weakness of the Baṣṭar Marin, the Baṣṭar ‘Abd al-Wādī, whose lands had for the most part passed into the hands of the Arabs, cut a still sadder figure and could not resist when attacks from the west were resumed. From 1389 all the sultans of Tlemcen ruled under the suzerainty of Fās.

But grave events were to turn the attention of the Merinids from the affairs of the Central Maghrib. In 1401, King Henry III of Castile landed in Barbary to take vengeance for outrages of the Muslim corsairs and destroyed Tetwān. This attack, which produced considerable commotion in the Maghrib, and the taking of Cartagena by the Portuguese in 818 (1415), provoked a vigorous campaign by the religious element. The threat from abroad, combined with its weakness in meeting this critical
situation, brought about a series of troubles under which the dynasty succumbed. In 823 (1429) after the assassination of the Sultan Abü Said, the Merindës gave place to the Bântë Wagga.


**MERKEZ, Muṣliḥ al-Dîn Mūsá, an Ottoman Shaikh of an Order and Saint.** Merkez Muṣliḥ al-Dîn Mūsá b. Muṣṭafā b. Ḥalîf. b. Ḥajjâr belonged to the village of Ẓarî Mahâfolî in the Anatolian district of Lâjûlikîa. He was at first a pupil of the Mollâ Ahmad Paşa, son of Khâliq Mâk [q.v.], later of the famous Khlâwî Shâtî, Sunûlîn Sunûlîn Efendi, founder of the Sanûsîya, a branch of the Khâlîwîya, head of the monastery of Khoja Muṣliḥî Paşa in Stambol (cf. on him: Drûsal Mehemmed Tâhir, *Othmanî Mûsidîddî, i. 78 sqq.). When the latter died in 936 (1529), Merkez Efendi succeeded him in the dignity of Ẓir. He held the office of head of a monastery for 23 years and died in the 6th zâhîr of 959 (1552), aged nearly 90. He was buried in Stambol in the mosque which bears his name (cf. Ḥâṣîṣît al-Mâliwî, i. 230 sq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., iv. 95, N. 495) before the Vekt Kapû. At the tomb of Merkez Efendi there is a much visited holy well, an *awza*, to which one descends by steps. Its reddish water is said to have the miraculous power of healing those sick of a fever (cf. Ewîlya Ẓahlî, i. 372; J. v. Hammer, Constantinopolis, i. 503; do., G. O. K., ix. 95, N. 495, following the Ḥâṣîṣît al-Mâliwî, loc. cit.). Beside it is the cell (*zâwîya*) of Merkez Efendi, of which wonderful stories still circulate among the people. He had many pupils, including his son Ahmad, famous as the translator of the ‘Arâmf, his son-in-law Muṣliḥ al-Dîn (cf. Ewîlya, i. 372), the poet Râmâdân Efendi, called Bîshikî and many others.


**MERSİNA, an Anatolian sea-port on the south coast of Asia Minor.** Mersîna, the port and capital of the former sandjak of the same name (with an area of 1,780 sq. m.) in the vilayet of Adana (*q.v.*), on the south coast of Anatolia, is 40 miles from Adana, to which a railway runs. The name Mersîna comes from the Greek *myrsini*, *myrtos*, myrtle, because this tree grows in large numbers in this region. The regularly built town, founded only in 1832, with about 21,171 inhabitants (1927) is only of importance as a port for the export of silk, corn and cotton. The climate is very unhealthy in summer. The old name of Mersîna was Zephyrium; in the vicinity (8 miles S.W.) lie the ruins of Soloi or Pompeipolis. The town which is quite modern is of no Muslim historical interest.

**Bibliography:** V. Cuinet, *La Turquie d’Asie*, ii. 50 sq. (Fr. Bâbinger)

**MERTOLA, or Martafla and Mirafila, a little town in the south of Portugal on the Gua- diana, 35 miles above and north of the mouth of this river, at its junction with the Guadiana. This place, the *Murtallas* of the Romans, was of some importance in the Roman period. It was the district of Beja and according to Vâhk was the best defended stronghold in the whole of the west of the Peninsula. At the end of the ninth century it was the headquarters of an independent chief, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abî ‘l-Djarâwî, who was in alliance with the lords of Badajoz and Oesonoba and held his own against the Cordovan emir ‘Abd Allah.


**MÉRWAHA, a British district in Râjidputana, lying between 25° 24′ and 26° 11′ N. and 73° 45′ and 74° 29′ E., has an area of 641 sq. miles and a population (1901) of 109,459. The local name of the district is Mâra, or "hills". Beyond the fact that between 1138 and 1232 (1725 and 1816), several unsuccessful attempts were made by Râjidpûts and Marâthas to subdue the country, the history of Mérwa is a blank up to 1234 (1818), when the British appeared on the scene. The District was at one time an impenetrable jungle, inhabited by outlaws and fugitives from other states. The population known under the name of Mâra originally comprised a mixture of castes, Cândâla Gujîrars, Bâtî, Râjidpûts, Brah- mans and Mînas. It is said that Nisâlîdë, the
Čauhán King of Adžmir, subdued the inhabitants and made them drawners of water in the streets of Adžmir. The country has made much progress under the British rule.

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer of India, xvii. 309—311; Kaypantan District Gazetteers, vol. i. (Ajmer 1904).

(M. Hiadayet Hosain)

**MERZIFÜN,** also called **Mǎrshīwān,** a town in the **Anatólian wilāyēt of Siwās** [q.v.], and in the **sandjak of Amasia** [q.v.] at the beginning of the fertile plain of Sultan Owa, with 11,334 inhabitants, plays a notable part in the history of Ottoman culture as the birthplace and scene of the activities of learned men and authors (cf. A. D. Mordtmann, Anatolien, ed. F. Babinger, Hanover 1925, p. 88). In Merzifun there used to be a number of deriwh monasteries (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Sīyāšetnīma, ii. 396 infra, where several are mentioned). Of special interest are the mosques, mainly converted from Byzantine churches, including the so-called Eski Džami, on the walls of which Christian paintings could until recently be seen (cf. V. Cucin, *La Turquie d'Asie*, L. 761) and the mosque of Murad II, both on the market-place. The saint locally revered was Pir Dede Sultan, said to be a pupil of Hāḍjdži Bektaş (Ewliya, *op. cit.*, ii. 396). In A. D. Mordtmann's time (1852) the "whole Turkish population" consisted of šarīfīs, i.e. descendants of the Prophet.

**Bibliography:** Ewliya Celebi, *Siāshetnīma,* ii. 396 sqq.; Eng. transl. by J. V. Hammer, ii. 212 sqq.; *Le Voyage de Monseigneur d'Arnaum...* (ed. J. C. Schefer, Paris 1887, ii. 681); F. Monis, *Kurzere Reisen,* (1829); and the mosque of Murad II, both on the market-place. The saint locally revered was Pir Dede Sultan, said to be a pupil of Hāḍjdži Bektaş (Ewliya, *op. cit.*, ii. 396). In A. D. Mordtmann's time (1852) the "whole Turkish population" consisted of šarīfīs, i.e. descendants of the Prophet.

**Bibliography:** Ewliya Celebi, *Siāshetnīma,* ii. 396 sqq.; Eng. transl. by J. V. Hammer, ii. 212 sqq.; *Le Voyage de Monseigneur d'Arnaum...* (ed. J. C. Schefer, Paris 1887, ii. 681); F. Monis, *Kurzere Reisen,* (1829); and the mosque of Murad II, both on the market-place. The saint locally revered was Pir Dede Sultan, said to be a pupil of Hāḍjdži Bektaş (Ewliya, *op. cit.*, ii. 396). In A. D. Mordtmann's time (1852) the "whole Turkish population" consisted of šarīfīs, i.e. descendants of the Prophet.

**Mesheh** (al-Mashhad), capital of the Persian province of Khūrsān [q.v.], ii, p. 966, the greatest place of pilgrimage for the Shi'ites in Persia. It lies 3,000 feet above sea level in 59° 35' E. Long. (Greenw.) and 16° 17' N. Lat. in the valley from 10 to 25 miles broad of the Khesf-Rud, which runs from N. W. to S. E. This river, also called Ab-i Mesheh ("the River of Mesheh"), rises about 12 miles W. of the ruins of Tūs [q.v.] in the little lake of Češme-i Gilās (cf. Fraser, *op. cit.*, p. 350; Khatīkoff, *op. cit.*, p. 110; Vate, *op. cit.*, p. 315) and joins the Heri (Hari)-Rūd (q.v., and cf. Le Strange, *op. cit.*, p. 407 sq.) about 100 miles S. E. of Mesheh on the Russo-Persian frontier. Mesheh lies about 4 miles south of the bank of the Khesf-Rūd. The hills which run along the valley rise to 8,000 or 9,000 feet at Mesheh.

In consequence of its high situation and proximity to the mountains, the climate of Mesheh is in the winter rather severe, in the summer, however, often tropically hot; it is regarded as healthy.

Mesheh may in a way be regarded as the successor of the older pre-Muhammadan Ṭūs [q.v.], and it has not infrequently been erroneously confused with it.

The fact that Ṭūs is the name of both a town and a district, together with the fact that two places are always mentioned as the principal towns of this district, has given rise among the later Arab geographers to the erroneous opinion that the capital Ṭūs is a double town consisting of Ṭabārān and Nīkān; e.g. Yākūt, iii. 560, 1 (correct at iv. 824, 21) and in the Liḥāb of Ibn al-Ąджir [q.v.] quoted by Abu 'l-Fida' (*op. cit.*, p. 453). Kašwī (*Abār al-Buldān, ed. Westenfeld, p. 275, 1) next made the two towns thought to be jointed together into two quarters (*māḥālis*). This quite erroneous idea of a double town Ṭūs found its way into European literature generally. Sykes (*J.R.A.S.*, 1910, p. 115—116) and following him Diez (*Charakteristik der blondeen*, Berlin 1918, i. 53 sq.) have rightly challenged this untenable idea. The older Arab geographers quite correctly distinguish between Ṭabārān and Nīkān as two quite separate towns. Nīkān, according to the express testimony of the Arabic sources, was only ⅓ Parasang (farrāḵād) or one Arabic mile from the tomb of Hādrān al-Kashīd and 'Ali al-Ridā (see below) and must therefore have been very close to the modern Meshed. The ruins of Tūs and Meshed are about 15 miles apart.

As to Nīkān (often wrongly vocalised Nawkān) it is sometimes called more precisely (e.g. Yākūt, iii. 153, 21) Nīkān Ṭūs, and occasionally (e.g. Ṣīkārī = B. G. A., i. 257, 1; Ḥamd Allah al-Mustawfī, *op. cit.*, p. 151, 2—3) included with Sanābād. The distance between these two towns is put at an Arabic mile (Yākūt, iii. 153, 21) or what is practically the same, ⅓ farrāḵād (e.g. Ṣīkārī, *op. cit.*; Ibn Ḥawkal in Abu 'l-Fida', *op. cit.*, p. 451). Nīkān must have lain to the east and north-east of the modern Mesheh and a small part of it is the northeastern quarter of the latter town.

In Nīkān or in the village of Sanābād belonging to it two distinguished figures in Muslim history...
were buried within one decade: the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd and the ‘Alid ʿAli al-Ridā b. Mūsā.

When Hārūn al-Rashīd was preparing to take the field in Khurāsān, he was stricken mortally ill in a country house at Sanābād, where he had stopped and died in a few days (193 = 809). The caliph, we are told (Ṭabarī, op. cit., iii. 737; 13–17), realising he was about to die, had his grave dug in the garden of this country mansion and consecrated by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Malik.

The three available accounts differ at first sight as to the house in which Hārūn spent his last hours. Two of them are given by Ṭabarī: according to the first (iii. 736; 17–18; 737'), it was on the estate of Dujnāid b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān that the caliph stopped; the second story (iii. 735; 15–16; 738'; 14–15') says that Hārūn lived in the mansion of Humād b. Abī Ghannām. A third story in Yākūt (ix. 560) says that the tombs of Hārūn and of ʿAlī al-Ridā were in one of the gardens of the house of Humād b. Kaḥṭāba. Now there is not the slightest doubt that the references to the house (dari) of Humād b. Kaḥṭāba and to that of Humād b. Abī Ghannām are to the same place. Humād b. Kaḥṭāba must be the same person as Humād b. Abī Ghannām; they are both described as of the tribe of Taʾy. As to Ṭabarī’s second story, which substitutes a ḍar b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān for a ḍar Humād, it may be observed that Dujnāid b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān had the office of governor of Khurāsān under the Omayyads (caliphate of Hishām) from 111 to 116 (729–734) (in him cf. above i. 1109 sq.; ii. 357b; Weil, op. cit., i. 629–631; E. v. Zambur, op. cit., p. 47). Dujnāid probably resided as a rule not in Nishāpūr or Tūs but in the palace at Sanābād which he had probably built. One of his successors, Humād, also chose to live here and seems to have enlarged the place. This would explain how our sources call the same house the house of Humād and of Dujnāid. Perhaps the estate became the property of the ʿAbbāsid family on the death of Humād.

100 years after the death of Hārūn, the caliph al-Maʾmūn on his way from Merv spent a few days in this palace. Along with him was his son-in-law ʿAlī al-Ridā b. Mūsā, the caliph designate, the eighth imām of the Twelvers. The latter died suddenly here in 203 (818); the actual day is uncertain (cf. Strothmann, Die Zwölfer-Shia, Leipzig 1926, p. 171). On ʿAlī al-Ridā and his death cf. above i. 296, 2968; iii. 2224; Weil, op. cit., p. ii. 225b; Fraser, Narrative of a Journey into Khurasan (London 1825), p. 449–451 (gives the story current in Mešḥed of the imām’s death); Yate, op. cit., p. 340–342; Sykes, The Story of the Shahi World, London 1916, p. 235–236; W. Jack, ibid., p. 265–266.

It was not the tomb of the caliph but that of a highly venerated imām which made Sanābād (Nūkshan) celebrated throughout the Shi’a world, and the great town which grew up in course of time out of the little village actually became called al-Maʾmūn al-Mašḥad (Mešḥed) which means "sepulchral chapel" (primarily of a martyr belonging to the family of the Prophet). Cf. on the conception of Mašḥad, iii. 325 and v. Berchem in Diez, Churassiana, 2. Diezenerkte, i. (Berlin 1918), p. 89–90. Ibn Hawkāl (p. 313) calls our sanctuary simply Mešḥad, Yākūt (ix. 153) more accurately al-Mašḥad al-Ridāwī = the tomb-chapel of al-Ridā; we also find the Persian name Mešḥed-i muḥaddas = "the sanctified chapel" (e.g. in Ḥamd Allāh al-Muṣawwi, p. 157). As a place-name Mešḥed first appears in al-Muṣawwi (p. 352), i.e. in the last third of the tenth century. About the middle of the eleventh century the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṣa (iii. 77) uses the expression "town of Mešḥad al-Ridā." Towards the end of the middle ages the name Nūkshan, which is still found on coins in the first half of the eleventh century under the Ilkhanids (cf. Codrington, A Manual of Muslim Numismatics, London 1904, p. 189), seems to have been gradually ousted by al-Mašḥad or Mešḥed. At the present day Mešḥed is often more precisely known as Mešḥed-i Rīdā, Mešḥed-i muḥaddas, Mešḥed-i ʿUṣū (so already in Ibn Baṭṭūṣa, iii. 66). Not infrequently in literature, especially in poetry, we find only ʿUṣū mentioned, i.e. New ʿUṣū in contrast to Old ʿUṣū or the proper town of this name; e.g. Muḥammad Mahdī al-Aʿlāwī, Taʾrīkh ʿUṣū aw al-Mašḥad al-Ridāwī, Baghderd 1927, p. 3.


The importance of Sanābād–Mešḥed continually increased with the growing fame of its sanctuary and the decline of ʿUṣū. ʿUṣū received its death blow in 791 (1389) from Mirānshāh, a son of Timūr. When the Mongol noble who governed the place rebelled and attempted to make himself independent, Mirānshāh was sent against him by his father. ʿUṣū was stormed after a siege of several months, sacked and left a heap of ruins; 19,000 inhabitants were massacred (cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 316; Sykes, in F.R.A.S., 1910, p. 1118 and Browne, op. cit., iii., p. 190). Those who escaped the holocaust settled in the shelter of the ʿAlid sanctuary. ʿUṣū was henceforth abandoned and Mešḥed took its place as the capital of the district.

As to the political history of Mešḥed it coincides in its main lines with that of the province of Khurāsān [q. v.]. Here we shall only briefly mention a few of the more important events in the past of the town. Like all the larger towns of Persia, Mešḥed frequently saw risings and the horrors of war within its walls. To protect the mausoleum of ʿAlī al-Ridā in the reign of the Ghaznawid Muʿāwī [q. v.], the then governor of Khurāsān erected defences in 1037. In 1121 a wall was built round the whole town which afforded protection from attack for some time. In 1161 however, the Ghuzz [q. v.] succeeded in taking the place, but they spared the sacred area in their pillaging. We hear of a further visitation by Mongol hordes in 1296 in the time of Sulaiman Ghāzin [q. v.]. Probably the greatest benefactors of the town and especially of its sanctuary were the first Timūrid Shāh Rukh (809–850 = 1406–1466; see vol. iv. 265 sq.) and his pious wife Džawhar-S̄adūq.
With the rise of the national Safawid dynasty [q.v.], a new era of prosperity began for Meshed. The very first Shaikh of this family, Isma'il I (907–930 = 1501–1524; q.v.), established Shifism as the state religion and, in keeping with this, care for the sacred cities within the Persian frontier, especially Meshed and Kumm, became an important feature in his programme as in those of his successors. Pilgrimage to the holy tombs at these places experienced a considerable revival. In Meshed the royal court displayed a great deal of building activity. In this respect Tahmasp I, Isma'il I's successor (930–984 = 1524–1576; q.v.), and the great Shaikh ʿAbbās I (995–1037 = 1587–1627; q.v.) were especially distinguished.

In the eighteenth century the town suffered considerably from the repeated raids of the Ozbekhs (Uzbek). In 1507 it was taken by the troops of the Shahbânt Khân [cf. Shahbânt Xāvārī]; it was not till 1528 that Shah Tahmasp I succeeded in repelling the enemy from the town again. Stronger walls and fortifications were then built and another attack by the same Ozbekh chief was repulsed. But in 1544 the Ozbekhs again succeeded in entering the town and plundering and murdering there. The year 1589 was a disastrous one for Meshed. The Shahbânt ʿAbd al-Muʿīmin after a four months' siege forced the town to surrender. The streets of the town ran with blood and the thoroughness of the pillaging did not stop at the gates of the sacred area. Shaikh ʿAbbâs I who lived in Meshed from 1555 till his official ascent of the throne in Kashan in 1567 was not able to retake Meshed from the Ozbekhs till 1598.

At the beginning of the reign of Tahmasp II [q.v.] in 1722 the Afghān tribe of Abâli [q.v.], invaded Khurāsān. Meshed fell before them, but in 1726 the Persians succeeded in retaking it after a two months' siege. Nādir Shaikh [q.v.] (1736–1747) had a mausoleum built for himself in Meshed.

After the death of Nādir Shaikh civil war broke out among the claimants to the throne, in the course of which the unity of the Persian empire was broken. The whole eastern part of the kingdom of Nādir Shaikh, particularly Khurāsān (except the district of Nishāpūr), passed in this period of Persian impotence under the rule of the vigorous Afghān Shaikh Ahmad Durrānī. An attempt by Karim Khan Zand to reunite Khurāsān to the rest of Persia failed. Ahmad defended the Persians and took Meshed after an eight months' siege in 1167 (1753); cf. above i., p. 164., 202b, 203b. Ahmad Shaikh and his successor Timūr Shaikh left Shaikh Rukh in possession of Khurāsān as their vassal, making Khurāsān a kind of buffer state between them and Persia. As the real rulers however, both these Afghān rulers struck coins in Meshed (cf. above i., p. 202b).

Otherwise the reign of the blind Shaikh Rukh, which with repeated short interruptions lasted for nearly half a century, passed without any events of special note. It was only after the death of Timūr Shāh (1207–1792) that Agha Muhammad Khan, the founder of the Kâjîr dynasty, succeeded in taking Shaikh Rukh's domains to death in 1210 (1796) and thus ending the separation of Khurāsān from the rest of Persia (cf. above, i., p. 204b). The death soon afterwards of Agha Muhammad (1211 = 1796) enabled Nâdir, who had escaped to Herât, to return to Meshed and take up the reins of government again. A siege of his capital by a Kâjîr army remained without success; but in 1803 Fath 'Ali Shāh was able to take it after a siege of several months when Nâdir's funds were exhausted.

From 1225 Khurāsān suffered greatly from the raids of Turko-Turkoman hordes and the continual feuds of the tribal leaders (cf. Conolly, op. cit., i. 288 and Yate, op. cit., p. 53). To restore order the crown prince ʿAbbâs Mirza entered Khurāsān with an army and made Meshed his headquarters. He died there in 1249 (1833). The most important political event of the sixteenth century for Meshed was the rebellion of Hasan Khan Sâlîr, the prince-governor of Khurāsān, a cousin of the reigning Shaikh Muhammad-ʿAbbâs. For two years (1847–1849) he held out against the government troops sent against him. At the time of the accession of Nâdir al-Din (1848) Khurāsān was actually independent. It was only when the people of Meshed, under pressure of famine, rebelled against Sālîr that Ḥusnān al-Saltāna's army succeeded in taking the town. In 1851 a certain Vice-Admiral of Herât declared himself independent in Meshed under the name of Muhammad ʿAli Shāh and for a period disturbed Khurāsān considerably with the help of a body of reactionaries who gathered round him. This gave the Russians a pretext for armed intervention, and on March 29, 1912, they bombarded Meshed in gross violation of Persia's suzerain rights and many innocent people, citizens and pilgrims, were slain. This bombardment of the national sanctuary of Persia made a most painful impression in the whole Muslim world. Yūsuf Khan was later captured by the Persians and put to death (cf. E. G. Browne, The Persians and Persia, Cambridge, 1914, p. 124, 127, 156; Sykes, History of Persia, London 1917, ii. 426–447).

Meshed is now the centre of eastern Persia, the capital of the province of Khurāsān which, since its eastern part was taken by the Afghāns in the eighteenth century, is barely half its former size (cf. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 383 sq.; ibid., xi., 198 sq. and above, ii. 966). In the middle ages it was not Ṭūs, Meshed's predecessor, but Našābūr (modern Per-i Našābūr) that was the capital of this extensive and important province. A royal prince has usually been governor since the fall of the Nādīrids. Since 1845 the lucrative and influential post of Mutawallī-šāh, the controller or treasurer of the sanctuary of the Imām, has usually been combined with the governorship (cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 322).

The only plan — not very accurate — of Meshed known to me is that of Colonel Dolmage (cf. Curzon, op. cit., i. 151, note 2; 160) and was made about 1870. It is published in MacGregor, op. cit., i. 284. The plan of the town is an irregular oblong with its longer axis running from N.W. to S.E. Its circumference is according to the most reliable calculations about 6 miles, the greatest breadth about a mile, and the length not quite two miles measured along the main street Khvāshān which runs right through the town.

Like most Persian towns Meshed is enclosed by a great girdle of walls, which gives it a very picturesque appearance. The lines built to strengthen the defences, namely a small moat with escarpment before the main wall and a broad ditch running outside, are now in ruins and in places have completely disappeared.
The citadel (ark) in the southwest part of the town is directly connected with the system of defence. It is in the form of a rectangle with four great towers at the corners and smaller bastions. The palace begun by Abbās Mirzā but finished only in the 17th century by the Safawī Shahs, is connected with the fortress proper, now fallen into disrepair (cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 327). It is used as the governor's residence. The whole quarter of government buildings which, according to MacGregor, occupies an area of 1,200 yards, is separated from the town by an open space, the Maidān-i Tāp (Cannon Place) which is used for military parades.

There are six gates in the city walls.

The town is divided into six great and ten smaller quarters (mahalīs) (see Yate, op. cit., p. 328). The six larger bear the names of their gates; see al-Mahdī al-`Ālawni, op. cit.

The principal street which divides the whole town into two roughly equal halves, the Khīyābān, is a creation of Shāh Abbās I who did a great deal for Meshhed (1587-1627); see Yate, op. cit., p. 192; cf. of the Sūks. The Glory of the Shia World, p. 231). This street, a fine promenade, is, being the main thoroughfare, filled all day with a throng of all classes and nationalities, including numerous pilgrims, and caravans of camels and asses; the bustle is tremendous, especially in the middle of the day.

The canal, which flows through the Khīyābān in a bed about 9 feet broad and 5 feet deep is fed, not from the Keshf Rūd (see above) which runs quite close to Meshed, as it has too little water, but from the Čeher-e Gīlās already mentioned, which used to provide Tūs with water. When this town had been almost completely abandoned, Šīr Allāh, the viceroy of Sūltān Husain b. Maḥmūd b. Bahārī (1468-1506; on him see above, i. 933-1. 594), at the beginning of the sixteenth century had the water brought from this source to Meshed by a canal 45 miles long, thus sealing the ruin of Tūs; cf. Yate, op. cit., p. 315; al-Mahdī al-`Ālawni, op. cit., p. 13.

The making of this canal (see Yate, op. cit., p. 315; Mahdī al-`Ālawni, p. 13) contributed essentially to the rise of Meshed; for the greater part of its inhabitants rely on it for water, although after entering the town, the canal becomes muddy and marshy (which was often a subject of satire; cf. Abd al-Karrām, op. cit., p. 74), and used for drinking, washing, and religious ablutions, without hesitation. There are also large and deep reservoirs before the main gate. The water is saline and sulphurous and therefore has an unpleasant taste (cf. Conolly, i. 333-334; Khanikh, p. 105; Curzon, i. 153).

The sacred area divides the principal street into two parts: the Bālā (Upper) Khīyābān in the N.W. and the As in (Lower) Khīyābān in the S.E., of which the former is about 3 times as long as the latter. The sacred area covered by the sanctuary of the Imām al-Ridā is usually called Bālā (cf. above, i. 709). The name Ḥaram-e Shīrvān or Ḥaram-e Muḥammad or ʿArāmī al-Khīyābān (al-Ridā’s Haram), is often also applied to it: frequently it is called simply “Imām” in Persia as in the Irāk this title is applied also to a holy relic or piece of ground sacred to the Bālā. The rectangle 1,000 yards × 700 feet in area, is in the lower half of the Khīyābān. With its courthouses, sanctuaries, madrasas, caravanserais, bazaars, dwellinghouses etc. it forms a town by itself; a wall around it cuts it off completely from the rest of Meshed. The main entrances from the Khīyābān are two great doors on north and south, but they are barred by chains so that no vehicle or person can enter; for the ground of the Bālā is holy and may only be trodden on foot. Animals which get in by accident become the property of the administration of the Imām. The Bālā also has the right of asylum (whence the name Bālā). Debtors who take refuge in it are safe from their creditors; criminals can only be handed over by order of the Mutawalli-Bashī, which is now usually done after three days. In the whole of the sacred area strict discipline is maintained by its own police; there is a special prison for thieves (see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 75; cf. also Conolly, i. 263; Khanikh, p. 98; Keswas, op. cit., p. 224; Curzon, i. 153-154; Massy, op. cit., p. 1006; Yate, p. 334)

Entrance to the Bālā is strictly forbidden to all non-Muslims. In earlier times the rule does not seem to have been so strict. In 1591, Molla Afsari in 1404 was able to visit the sepulchral chapel of the Imām al-Ridā. In the sixth century Fraser (1822, 1833), Conolly (1830), Burns (1832), Ferrier (1845), Eastwick (1862), Vāmberi (1863), Colonel DOLMAGE (in the sixties) and Massy (1893) visited the sacred area. Only Fraser, Conolly, DOLMAGE and Massy actually entered the sepulchral chapel itself. Vāmberi and Massy were dressed as Muslims while the others retained their European dress. Except DOLMAGE, all these travellers have given more or less full descriptions of the sacred area. The full and accurate description given by Sykes in the J. R. AS., 1910, p. 1130-1148 and in the Glory of the Shia World, p. 240 and in the Glory of the Shia World, p. 1128 and in the Glory of the Shia World, p. 100. The latter differs in details not inconsiderably from Šārī al-Panah’s plan which is right we have not the means of telling.

The history of the sanctuary of ʿAlī al-Ridā is pretty well known from inscriptions and literary sources (cf. especially the references in Yate, op. cit., p. 317 sq.; Sykes, J. R. AS., 1910, p. 1130 sq.; and Mahdī al-ʿĀlawni, p. 14 sq.). According to local legend, Alexander the Great built a wall around the site as he foresaw in a dream that it was destined to be the tomb of a saint (cf. Fraser, Narrative, p. 449; Sykes, op. cit., p. 1130). As early as the second half of the tenth century, as Ibn Hawšāl tells us (P. S. A., ii. 313), the ʿAid sanctuary had a strong wall built around it, within which devout men who wished to lead an ascetic life (ritikāf, q.v.) took up their abode. The almost contemporary account of al-Mukhallābī in Abu Tāfīd, p. 452 is similar. A few decades later, Sūltān Mahmūd of Ghazna (988-1030) as a result of a dream enlarged the
buildings of the tomb and provided a new wall around them (see Sykes, p. 1130). The sanctuary at a later date seems to have fallen somewhat into disuse; for about a century later it was restored by the Sadjak Sulthan Sandijq (q.v.) out of gratitude, local tradition says, for the miraculous cure effected on his sick son there (see Fraser, *cf. etc.*, p. 451; Napier, *J. R. G. S.*, xlii. [1869], p. 80). Sykes, *cf. etc.*, p. 1141—1142 and in *Glory of the Skin World*, p. 238 *et seq.*). It is to this event that an inscription of *512* (1118) inside the chamber of the tomb refers (see it in Sykes, p. 1140—1141 and cf. Mahdi al-Alawi, p. 15). There is also a second inscription (in Sykes, p. 1142—1143) which records a restoration undertaken in 612 (1215). The existence of these two inscriptions, the oldest in Meshhed, shows that the Mongols of Mongol-Khan when they swept over Khurasan in 1220, if they may have plundered the sanctuary, spared the buildings. We hear of another restoration of the buildings in the reign of Sulthan 'Uljiaji Khudzbanda (1304—1316; cf. Sykes, *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 1132; Mahdi al-Alawi, p. 18). From the middle of the sixteenth century we have the somewhat fuller description of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Kijja by Ibn Battuta (ii. 77—79). Timur's son Shah Rukh (1406—1446) and his wife Iqwar Shuddi did a great deal for the Haram. The latter built the splendid mosque to the south of the tomb which still bears her name. The Dar al-Suytija, the fine hall within the tomb, and the adjoining chamber of the Dar al-Hujra, are also due to the queen. Under Timur's grandson Sulthan Husain Bakhsh (1469—1506) the famous Shri 'Ali erected the southern part of the Shah-i Kuhna, "the old court", with the imposing portal; see the inscription reproduced in Sykes, p. 1133.

With the coming to power of the Safawids a new and brilliant era dawned in Meshhed. The rules of this dynasty vied with one another in the development and adornment of the sanctuary of 'Ali al-Kijja, which they raised to the religious centre of their kingdom. In the re-pect of the Tahmasp I (1524—1576) and Solomon I (1576—1581) devotes his attention mainly to the further decoration of the Shah-i Kuhna. The inscription published in part by Sykes, p. 1133 (cf. also Khanikoff, p. 1912) was written by the master hand of Muhammad Raja Aibash (on him cf. Sarre and Mitwach, *Zeichnungen aus dem Islam*, Munich 1914, p. 15—16). Solomon I (1566—1604) devoted special attention to the restoration of the dome of the Imam's tomb: see Mahdi al-Alawi, p. 19 (cf. also Yate, p. 345; Sykes, p. 1137). Foreign potentates also gave great gifts to the 'Aliid sanctuary in the Safavid period, such as the Emperor Akbar of India who made the pilgrimage to Meshhed in 1595 (cf. Yate, p. 319) and in 1512 the Raja of Bikaner, the Raja of Deccan. It was Nadi ar Shuh (1735—1747) who did most for the town of Meshhed in the eighteenth century. Although a very strict Sunni, he devoted a considerable part of the enormous wealth which he had brought back from his Indian campaign to the embellishment of the great Shuh's place of pilgrimage. He restored thoroughly the southern half of the Shah-i Kuhna built in the reign of Sulthan Husain Bakhsh. He decorated the portico richly and covered it with sheets of gold so that it is still called 'Nadir's Golden Gate' after him. In 1750, before his accession to the throne, Nadi ar erected a minaret covered with gold in the upper part of the Shah, as a counterpart to that erected by Tahmasp I on the north side of the 'old court'. Cf. on Nadi ar's activities at the sanctuary of al-Kijja. Muhammad 'Ali Hazan *Turk' Akbar Shaikh Hazan* (Memoirs, ed. Balfour, London 1851, p. 272).

The rulers of the Khujjar dynasty of the sixteenth century, Fath 'Ali (1797—1834), Muhammad Shah (1833—1848) and Nasir al-Din (1848—1896), faithfully followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, as regards attention to the Imam's sanctuary.

In spite of the number of times which the Shahi sanctuary has been plundered in course of time, it still has countless treasures within its buildings and courts, in the shrine, as regards the wealth and the extent of its buildings and courts, all the other great Muhammadan sanctuaries, except perhaps Mecca, but including the much-admired Nadyf and Kerbela.

A detailed and accurate description of the Haram and an account of its architectural history detailed in its present state cannot be given because the strict prohibition of admission to members of other faiths has prevented non-Muslim scholars from examining thoroughly and reproducing the buildings. Relying on descriptions of the sacred area prepared by Europeans and Orientals and on the valuable data contained in inscriptions (the latter were first noted by Khanikoff, p. 103—104; the more important were published by Sykes assisted by Khan Bihahar Ahmad Din, in *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 1151 *et seq.* we can assume with considerable probability that, except the tomb proper, which in its present form (excluding the later dome) according to the inscription (512 = 1118), dates from the beginning of the sixteenth century, only insignificant remains of the earlier mediæval period have survived. The Haram in its present form is the main a creation of the last 500 years, as is briefly outlined in the above short historical sketch of the sanctuary.

The dome of the tomb with its various annexes rises in the centre of the sacred area and is bounded on the north and east by two great rectangular courts, the Shah-i Kuhna and the Shah-i Naw, while in the south it is bounded by the extensive buildings of the Iqwar Shuddi mosque.

The most popular entrance to the last and the one preferred by pilgrims is the gateway in the Bāl-Khāyān barāda by a chain. The road runs for 250 yards through this street till it meets at the end a great gateway through which the Shah-i Kuhna, the 'old court' is entered. Its northern part dates from the time of Shuh Aibash I, while the southern is as old as the second half of the fourteenth century, reign of Sulshan Husain Bakhsh, but was completely altered by Shah. Four great towers with niche-like halls called *aqwāl* admit to the court. The simplest are the west and east towers built by Aibash I; the former has the clock tower, while the platform of the latter is used as *nikšār-khānez* i.e. *music-
house", where, according to an old Persian custom, found in other royal cities, sunrise and sunset are greeted with music. From the east gate one reaches the eastern exit of the Bost through the Bazar of the Pā'īn-Khiyābān. Much more impressive from the architectural point of view are the northern gateway built by 'Abbās II and especially the southern gateway of the court, “Nādir’s Golden Gate.” Nādir Shāh’s most splendid achievement and the most imposing building of the whole Haram. At each of the two great gates stands a minaret 100 feet high, the upper part of which is covered with gold; the builder of the northern gate was Tāhmasp I and of the southern Nādir Shāh. Nādir built in the centre the famous octagon of “Nādir’s Well” covered by a gilt baldachin (Saḥāla-Khān-e Nādirī = Nādir’s water-carrier-house”); it was hewn out of a huge block of white marble which the Shāh had brought at great expense from Herāt. The walls of the court are pierced by two rows of alcoves, the lower of which is occupied by artisans, schools and dwellings of the servants of the mosque, while the higher officials of the Imam occupy the upper storey. The whole courtyard which has a length of about 100 yards and a breadth of 70, is paved with dark Mešhērī stones (cf. below) which are also to some extent tombstones. For pictures of the Šāhni Kuhna with clock tower and Nādir’s Well see above, iii. 354, pl. 15; Yate, p. 340, 345; Sykes, Glory of the Shīr World, p. 241; picture of Nādir’s Golden Gate in Yate, p. 326 and Sykes, 19, cf. cit., p. 245.

Nādir’s golden gateway leads southwards into the area of the holy tomb, the sepulchral chamber with the halls and rooms surrounding it. Strictly speaking, it is only this nucleus of the whole sacred area that should be called Haram or Hāram-ī Muḥaddas or Hāram-ī Mūbārak, terms often extended to the whole Bast. The names al-Ra’i’sa al-Maʾshahara and Asīrān = (the holy) threshold, are also used. After passing through the Golden Gate one enters the Dār al-Siyādah, built by Dājwār Shāhī, the finest hall in the sacred quarter. Hung on a wall here is a round disk said to be that on which the poisoned grapes were offered to ʿAbbās the Great. The pilgrim can see into the sepulchral chamber through a silver grille from the Dār al-Siyādah. Turning to the southeast one enters a smaller, more simply decorated chamber, the Dār al-Huṣayn.

Adjoining the Dār al-Huṣayn in the north is the dome of the Mausoleum of the Imām. The interior of the sepulchral chamber (see the picture in Sykes, cf. cit., p. 251), an almost square area, 30 x 27 feet, is, as there are no proper windows, lit by the dim light from golden lamps and candlesticks and furnished with the greatest splendour. The tomb itself is in the N. E. corner and surrounded by three beautiful grilles, one of which, dated 1747, is said to come from the mausoleum of Nādir Shāh now destroyed. ʿAbbās I gave the top of the tomb with its gold covering. In a projection at the foot of the tomb, Fath ʿAlī Shāh placed a false door of gold inlaid with jewels (picture in Sykes, cf. cit., p. 253). In niches in the wall behind glass are kept very valuable votive offerings (jewelled arms, etc., mainly gifts of the ruling house). On the wall are the two inscriptions already mentioned of 512 (1118) and 612 (1215) of which the first is the earliest known example of the so-called round hand (thulth) in Arabic epigraphy (cf. v. Berchem in Diez, Churaran. Beaufändler, i. 97, note 8). These enable us to place the building of the present chamber in the beginning of the xivth century, while the dome 65 feet high covered with sheets of gilt copper was built only in 1607 by ʿAbbās I and renovated in 1675 by Sulaimān I, according to inscriptions on its outside. As the thread of tradition regarding the site of the Imām’s grave can hardly have been broken, it may be assumed practically with certainty that the present dome is built on the true site. There is no longer any trace of Ḥārūn’s grave; it probably was in the centre of the mausoleum, whence the tomb of the ʿAlid who died later was put in a corner of the same place.

Of the other chambers and isolated buildings belonging to the system of the Haram proper, we shall only mention here the Qanbaq (domed tomb) of ʿAbbās Wardi Khān, which lies to the N.E. and takes its name from its builder, a famous general of ʿAbbās I (cf. Conolly, i. 271; Sykes, The Glory of the Shīr World, p. 266; see also the picture in Diez, Persien: Islam. Baukunst in Churaran, p. 54).

Leaving the sacred chamber by the eastern door one reaches, after traversing two adjoining rooms, the “Golden Gate” of Naṣīr al-Dīn, which leads into the New Court (Ṣahni-ī Nāvo); its northside is bounded by the Pā’īn Khiyābān. Fath ʿAlī Shāh began this court in 1818. His two successors continued the building, which was completed in 1854.

If one turns southwards from the Dār al-Siyādah already mentioned, one enters the area of the charming mosque endowed by Sūlāna Dājwār Shāhī and bearing her name. Like the Šāhni Kuhna this other court, an oblong running N. to S. about 100 yards long and 90 broad, is broken in the middle of each of its four sides by an arched hall (awān), while the unbroken parts of the walls have rows of alcoves fitted up as dwellings. The largest and finest of these four awāns of the mosque, the Awān-ī Maḵṣūra in the south (for Maḵṣūra = stall, cf. iii., p. 336), is used for prayers; in it is a wooden pulpit in which the Māḥbī will one day show himself to the faithful. The entrance hall is covered by a blue dome which surpasses that on the tomb of the Imām in height and width, and is flanked by two high minarets covered with blue glass tiles. The centre of the court is occupied by the Masqīlijī Pir-i Zind = “Mosque of the Old Woman”, a square unroofed area surrounded by a wooden balustrade around which runs water in a deep stone channel.

The Dājwār Shāhī mosque is the noblest and finest building in the sacred area; cf. the opinions of Fraser, Narrative, p. 467; Vāmbrī, Meine Wanderungen etc., p. 322 and Sykes, J.R.A.S., 1010, p. 1145. — Pictures of the mosque in Sykes, The Glory of the Shīr World, p. 265; Yate, p. 344 (Awān-ī Maḵṣūra and Awān-ī Pir-i Zind); Diez, Persien: Islam. Baukunst, p. 45-48.

Of the various small sanctuaries which the pilgrim visit in the Haram, only two need be mentioned here, the Ziyārat Kadam-i Mūbārak or Shārif = “the place of pilgrimage of the blessed or excellent foot” also called Dājī-ī Sing-i Cuḥār-pā = “place of the foot-stone” (see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 16), a circular space covered by a dome (east of the north awān of the Dājw-
hath Shâh mosque), in which reverence is paid to a dark grey oval-shaped stone said to contain an impression of 'Ali al-Ridâ's foot (cf. Massy, op. cit., p. 1003—1004). The second noteworthy feature of the Bâst is a tall stone pillar, out of which a water basin has been roughly hewn. It is said to have fallen into the Bâst as a shapeless block from heaven (see Massy, op. cit., p. 1002).

Inside of the sacred area are the richest and busiest bazaars of the town, the most richly endowed madrasas, the most profitable caravanserais and the most popular baths. These are all, like the dwelling houses here, the absolute property of the Imâm, the 'Alîid buried here, i.e. of the ecclesiastical authorities who administer the sanctuary on his behalf. The whole Bâst belongs exclusively to them. This dead hand however has still more possessions in land, buildings, canals (jâdâl, q.v.), in all the provinces of Persia, especially in the immediate and more distant vicinity of Meshed.

To the vast sums which these properties yield in produce and rents, are to be added the considerable payments for funerals and tombs, the gifts of pilgrims etc. There is also considerable expenditure, the payment of a considerable number of higher officials and of a large number of lower officials and servants, the maintenance of many pilgrims, the cost of repairs, lighting, decoration of the sanctuaries etc. The income of the Haram in course of time has naturally varied. Towards the end of the Safawid period it is said to have been about £15,000 while at the time of Fraser's first visit (1822), as a result of the troubled times, it had sunk to £2,000—2,500 (Fraser, Narrative, p. 455). Later travellers, like Basset (1878) and Curzon (1889), estimated the annual revenues of the Imâm at £20,000 to £17,000 (without revenues in kind); for the last decade of the sixth century Massy (p. 1106) and Yate (p. 344) give £20,000. Ibrahim Beg's estimate (op. cit., p. 43) of £50,000 is certainly much too high.

At the head of the administration of the Haram there has been from early times a Mutawalli-Bâshi, who must be a layman. In view of the very influential position which this official occupies in his capacity as head of the greatest Persian sanctuary and treasurer of a very considerable estate, it is only natural that an appointment to such a position of trust is regarded as a very special honour. As it was not uncommon for disputes about the limits of their respective spheres of authority or other matters to arise between the holder of this office, the representative of ecclesiastical power, and the governor of Khurâsân, the clerical element has since the middle of the sixth century been subordinated to the civil power by giving the office of Mutawalli-Bâshi to the governor of the time (see Yate, p. 322, 344).

This very lucrative double office — the Mutawalli-Bâshi gets 10% of the revenues of the Haram — is as a rule only held for a few years by the same individual.

The Mutawalli-Bâshi is assisted by a staff of higher officials (mutawalls). He has further at his command the varied hierarchy of the sacred area, among whom the muftis [q.v.] who have a thorough knowledge of religious law and are men of great prestige and influence, occupy the first place. Next comes a regular army of lower clerics (malâls) who conduct the services, teach in the schools and guide the rites of the pilgrims; not a few of them make a living by supplying official documents sealed with the seal of the Imâm (see the picture in Sykes, Glory of the Shia World, p. 278) which deal among other matters with the answering of petitions made by the pilgrims at the sacred tomb (cf. Khanikoff, p. 99). On the administration of the sanctuary of Meshed cf. Fraser, op. cit., p. 455—456; Curzon, i. 162—164; Massy, p. 1006 and especially Yate, p. 344—345.

As we know from mediaeval Arabic sources, pilgrimage to the tomb of 'Ali al-Ridâ began at an early date. We occasionally hear also of royal visits from the sixth century onwards.

As to the number of pilgrims who visit Meshed annually we have different estimates for the sixth century but as exact figures can hardly be kept and the numbers vary greatly, they can only claim reliability to a very limited extent. While Yate (p. 334) gives the annual number for the last decade of the sixth century at 30,000, earlier travellers, except Marsh (1872: 20—30,000) give much higher figures, e.g. Bellieu (1872): 40—50,000; Forster (1845): 50,000; Khanikoff (1858) and Eastwick (1862): over 50,000; Curzon 1889 even gives 100,000, but this is certainly too high. The numbers go up considerably when special religious ceremonials are going on, e.g. at the anniversary of 'Ali al-Ridâ's death (cf. the pictures in Diez, Persien etc., p. 46) and during the first third of the month of Muharram at the Ta'âsya [q.v.] in memory of the tragedy of Kerbelâ. We have a full description of the Muharram festival (see his Journey etc., i. 267—284, 335—336) and a shorter one of 1894 by Yate (op. cit., p. 144—148); cf. also the illustrations in Yate, p. 146 and the drawing by the painter 'Ali Ridâ 'Abâd of a Meshed pilgrim at the time of the Muharram festival in Sarre and Mutwoch, Zeichnungen des Kisa Abbasi (Munich 1914), Plate 1 (thereon p. 23, 49 and Iis., i. 216 sq.).

Every pilgrim who arrives has a right to free maintenance for three (according to Vâmbéry: six) days. In the sacred quarter, south of the Bâst Khiyâbân (see the plan in Yate, p. 322), there is a special kitchen used exclusively for pilgrims, which gives out 5—600 free meals every day (cf. Vâmbéry, op. cit., p. 322; Goldsmith, Eastern Persia, i. 304 and Curzon, i. 162).

On the ceremonies which the pilgrims have to perform at their visit to the tomb of 'Ali al-Ridâ, we have accounts by Massy, op. cit., and the notes supplied by Khân Bahâdur Ahmed al-Din Khân in Sykes, J.R.A.S., 1910, p. 144—145 and in the Glory of the Shia World, p. 240 sq. Special mention may be made of the three circumambulations (proid [q.v.] of the tomb and the cursing of all enemies of the imâm three times, especially the Caliphs Harûn and Ma'mûn.

Every pilgrim who has performed the pilgrimage to 'Ali al-Ridâ's grave in the prescribed fashion is entitled to call himself Meshkedi. Meshed occupies first place among all the places of pilgrimage in Persia. Among the great sanctuaries of the Muslim world, Meshid stands seventh in the view of Shi'a theologians, coming after, not only Mecca and Mekâh, but also the four specifically Shi'a sanctuaries of the 'Irâq, Nejdjef, Kerbelâ, Sâmarra and Kûttâmân, in this order (cf. Sykes, The Glory of the Shia World, p. viii). According to a version current in Shi'a
circles which Curzon (i. 150) gives, Meshed is entitled to the sixth place, coming between Kā'imānī as fifth and Sāmāntrī which is put seventh.

The longing of every Shī'ī to find a last resting place in the shadow of any of the beloved Imāms caused extensive cemeteries to be laid out at an early date at the great centres of pilgrimage. Thousands of corpses are brought every year to Meshed, mainly of course from Persia, but also from all the Shī'ī lands, particularly India, also Afghanistan and Turkestan. Nowhere in the whole of Persia are there so many tombs as at Meshed. As the ground of the cemeteries must be used over and over again, the graves change their occupants every few years. Fine solid tombstones are not used, but simply rough blocks of granite or soapstone from the quarries of the neighbourhood (cf. also Conolly, i. 243–4 and Khanikoff, p. 105). Graves within the sacred quarter itself are naturally most desired. Every available space there is used for the purpose; the pavingstones in the courtyards are often tombstones for the dead below. The fees for graves within the Bast, which vary with the distance from the Mausoleum of 'Alī al-Ridā, bring a not inconsiderable revenue to the authorities.

Of the large cemeteries (mağbaras) outside the Bast the most important is the Mābarra Kātī Gāh ("place of the killing") lying north of the sacred area. East of it is that of Saiyid Aḥmad in which three children of the seventh Imām, Muṣṭaṣr al-Kāẓim, are buried (cf. Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, p. 8). In the Pāčī Khiyābān quarter is the Mābarra Pirt-i Fālāndās. S. E. of the citadel is the cemetery of Gumbad-i Said ("green dome") which takes its name from a half ruined mausoleum there, now inhabited by dervishes (cf. Yate, p. 328; Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, p. 9).

In the Naḵūn quarter is the Mābarra Shāh-za'de Muḥammad (see Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, p. 8). We may also mention that outside the Naḵūn gate on the site of the old town of Naḵūn (see above), are visible the remains of a gigantic cemetery on which, according to Sykes (J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 1116), there may be found stone sarcophagi with inscriptions carved upon them dating from 760 to 1099 (1359–1685).

Outside of Meshed a good half hour's journey to the south, on rocky ground, is the cemetery of Miḥrāb-ʿAbd al-Rāfiʿi (see Mahdī, op. cit., p. 8) and still farther from the town, 5 miles north of it, that of Khabūrārā Rāfiʿ (cf. Sykes, op. cit., p. 1124 and Ibn Saʿd, vi. 127 sq.). According to the popular view, he was a Sunni in spite of his relations with 'Ali and is therefore in a way regarded as the patron of the Sunnis in Kūh-i-Rās, of whom those who live in Meshed are usually buried near his tomb. Rābiʿ's mausoleum is one of the most interesting in the whole of Kūh-i-Rās: it is a large octagonal building crowned by a dome but now it is in a half ruined condition.

Meshed is the centre of Muslim theological and legal studies in Persia. A number of colleges (madrasas) there are devoted to teaching these subjects. Lists of them with dates are given by Fraser (p. 456–460) who mentions 14 of the present 16 madrasas, also by Khanikoff (p. 107) who gives 13, and by Mahdī al-ʿAlawi (p. 9–10). The latter observes that there were 20 older colleges, of which he gives 15, and a number of more modern ones. Fraser also gives brief notes on the possessions of the various madrasas and the clerics (muallās) attached to them. Yate (p. 329–330) simply mentions six of the best known. From these lists, which supplement one another in welcome fashion, we get the names of 20 colleges. From the dates of foundation we find that the oldest of the madrasas still standing in Meshed is the Madrasa Dūdār, which was built in 823 (1420) by the Timūrid Sultan Shāh Rakh and restored by Sulaimān I. Under the same ruler was built the Pāčī Khiyābān Madrasa which was completely remodelled by Sulaimān I. From the time of 'Abbās II date the two almost contemporary colleges Khatīr Kān (1058 = 1649) and Mirāz Dīfār (1059 = 1650). The majority of the older colleges, no fewer than nine in number, date from the time of Sulaimān I, who also restored some buildings (1666–1694). As to the Kāẓamī, one was founded in the reign of Fath 'Abd al-Shāh and two in that of Nāṣir al-Dīn, who also restored two that had fallen into ruins.

From the artistic point of view, the finest is the Madrasa of Mirāz Dīfār which was built and richly endowed in 1059 (1650) by a Persian of this name who had made a fortune in India. It is generally regarded as the third finest building in Meshed, next to the Mausoleum of 'Alī al-Ridā and the Dījāvar Shāhī Mosque. In its plan, with vaulted halls and courtyard with niches, and its rich decoration, it follows the style of the courts and mosques of the sacred area above described, typical of the ecclesiastical architecture of Persia (cf. above, iii. 439, 447 sq., and also Fraser, p. 466–467). Not only the Madrasa of Mirāz Dīfār but also other richly endowed colleges, like that of Fath Sīn (both of the time of Sulaimān I) owe their origin to Persians who had made fortunes in India (cf. on the foundation of the two last named colleges: Fraser, p. 457–459; Sykes, The Glory etc., p. 267–269). The most esteemed colleges are in the Bast, namely the three already mentioned as the oldest, Dūdār, Pārīzād and Khatīr-Kān, also Fathār and Ālī Nāṣir Mirāz. Others, like the above mentioned Mirāz Dīfār Madrasa and the Mustaṣḥār Madrasa have doors communicating with the Shāh-i Kūhān of the Haram quarter.

Students also live in the madrasas, their maintenance being provided for by pious endowments. While in Khanikoff's time (1852) there were no outstanding teachers there and the number of students was small, the reputation of the Meshed colleges went up again in the second half of the sixteenth century so that Sykes (The Glory etc., p. 267 sq.) in 1910 puts the attendance at 1,200 students, who came from Persia, India and other Shī'ī regions. The student who wishes to take a higher theological training after the nine years' course at Meshed must go to Meshed 'Alī (Nedjef, q.v.) and attend the lectures of the teachers there, who are the first authorities on Shī'a theology.

We have no details of the libraries of the Meshed colleges. Of the rich Fāṭimah Kān Madrasa, Fraser only says (p. 457) that it has a valuable library. The administration of the Haram also has a large and valuable collection of books (on its location see the plan in Yate, p. 332, No. 65 and cf. No. 29), founded in the first half of the sixteenth century by Sultan Shāh Rakh. The treasures accumulated under him and his successors were for the most part lost when Meshed was sacked by
the Ozbegs under Abul-Mu'āmin Khān (1589; cf. Yate, p. 318; Sykes, The Glory etc., p. 239; cf. also Herfeldt, in Ephemerides Orientales, 1926, N. S. 28, p. 7—8). A thorough examination of the manuscripts here might give valuable results.

In this connection we may mention the activity of the Meshed printing presses. Newspapers etc. which began with the last decade of the 19th century; see thereon Browne, The Press and Poerty of Modern Persia (Cambridge 1914), p. 348 (Index s. v. Meshed); Browne, Literary History of Persia, iv., Cambridge 1928, p. 223, 489; Mahdī al-ʿAlawi, p. 12.

Meshed is remarkably rich in mosques which are built in the sacred area, at cemeteries and at separate tombs, and are connected with madrasas and other buildings of a religious character.

Here we may also mention the Musaʿīlī which stands outside the town, 1/2 mile from the Fārīn Khīyābān gate on the Haḍrāt road. It is a hall (ārdābār) about 50 feet high which opens into a great hall about 60 feet high.

However picturesque Meshed may look from outside, the impression one gets on entering is quite different from pleasing, except for the Saṭrā which forms a separate enclosure. Except for the already described broad main street (Khīyābān), there are only narrow dark alleys the level of which is almost always considerably above that of the inner courts of the houses of brick, so that they can be entered by long gloomy passages (cf. Khanikoff, p. 304; Yate, p. 328).

As to the population of Meshed, the permanent residents, excluding the many pilgrims, is said to be greatest in the reign of Nādir Shāh, who frequently held his court there and every way contributed to the prosperity of the town. At that date Meshed had not less than 60,000 inhabitants. But the half century of turmoil which followed the reign of Nādir Shāh brought about a great decline in the town so that only 3,000 houses were reckoned there in 1769 (cf. Yate, p. 330). In the 18th century began a slow but steady rise. Trüllhier in 1807 estimated the number of houses at 4,000; Fraser in 1822 at 7,700 with 25—30,000 inhabitants. Conolly (1850) and Burnes (1839) estimate 40,000 inhabitants; Ferrier (1843) and Khanikoff in 1844 at 60,000. In 1874 Khrasānī suffered a terrible famine and 24,000 in Meshed alone died of starvation (see Goldsmid, i. 361). Baker is too high in putting the figure at 80,000 in 1873 and Curzon too low at 45,000 for 1889. Meshed at the present day is said to have 100,000 inhabitants (see Mahdi al-ʿAlawi, p. 4); it is in any case the third largest town in Persia.

The permanent population of Meshed is a rather mixed one; in consequence of the great influx of pilgrims and the commerce which was very great at least in an earlier period, many foreigners (Turkmans, Afghans, Indians etc.) settled in Meshed. Except for a very small section, all the Muslims of the town are Shīʿa. The small number of Sunnis are mainly Afghans and Turkomans. We have already mentioned that the Masjd-i Shāh and the Makbara Khwāja Kābīr are used by the Sunnis. The number of Christians is infinitesimal and is confined to a few Armenian traders and the personnel of English and Russian consulates established in 1889.

Nādir Shāh settled 100 Jewish families in Meshed whom he had transplanted from Każwin. After his death their position became a miserable one, especially after the catastrophe which overwhelmed them in 1839. When in this year, during the celebration of the Muslim Kurbān festival, a Jewess on medical advice placed her hand, which was suffering from an eruption, in the bosom of a dog, the Muhammadans took this for an insult to their religious observances. The excited mob, seizing the excuse, fell upon the Jewish quarter, plundering and murdering as they pleased and destroyed the synagogue. The surviving Jews had to adopt Islam. The Jews were called Ljudid, more fully Ljudid al-Islām = "new comers to Islam", because their forced conversion is of recent date. The change of faith was only an external one; it is true that these Ljudid to avoid suspicion regularly attend the mosque, but not a few of them are said to observe their old rites in secret. The number of Judeo-Muslims in Meshed at the present day who are small traders, physicians, etc., was put by Bassett (1878) at 300 families, by Yate at 200 On the Jews of Meshed and their persecution in 1839 cf. Trüllhier, p. 273; Conolly, i. p. 304—308; J. Wolff, Narrative, p. 177, 394—396; Ferrier, p. 122—123; J. J. Benjamin (see Fisk), p. 189—190; Vamiery, Wanderungen, p. 324—325; Bassett, p. 235—233; Yate, p. 322.

The clerical element is strong in the Muslim population; everywhere one sees mulās, jolmas (students) and dervishes. The town swarms with saiyāls (alleged descendants of the Alim amid who the Rāis has, who claim descent from ʿAlī al-Khātā, enoy special privileges Meshed is not only one of the most fantastic cities in the whole Muslim world but also one of the most immoral in Asia. Prostitution, the so-called pilgrim marriage (Paschtsch; cf. muta'a and iv., p. 353, 355), sanctified by the Imāmī group of the Shīʿa, flourishes here. Most pilgrims take advantage of this institute of temporary marriage (cf. Khanikoff, p. 98; Currzon, i. 164—165; Ibrahim Beg, p. 45; Yate, p. 419; Allemagne, iii. 86—87).

The people of Meshed are described as very superstitious; see especially Bassett, p. 228 sq. and the Meshed Storie in Conolly, i. 316—318. Many stories are told of miracles wrought in the ʿAṣl sanctuaries: see Fraser, p. 451—452; Bassett, p. 426—427; Massy, p. 992—993, 1002; Yate, p. 325, 337.

The population of the town lives partly by catering for pilgrims and partly on local industries and commerce.

The industries, once so flourishing, have now declined. The famous manufacture of sword-blades, introduced by a colony of sword-makers transplanted by Timur from Samarkand, has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Trüllhier, p. 275; Fraser, p. 124; Ferrier, p. 468; Curzon, i. 166).

A specialty of Meshed is the manufacture of decorated vessels (howesh-ul utensils, like jugs, pots, dishes etc.) out of serpentine and dark grey soapstone (Meshed stone), from the quarries 1½ hours south of Meshed. This stone industry is old and the Arab sources of the middle ages mention it as native to the district of Tīs and especially to the town of Nāmūnī, the predecessor of Meshed; cf. B. G. I., i, 258; ii. 311; iii. 321, 326; al-Muhallab in Alī al-Fidāʾī, p. 452; Alī Ḥumāmid al-Gharnānī, in J.A., 1925, p. 203; Yāḵūt, iv. 824 and cf. G. Le Strange, Op. cit.
For the sixth century cf. Truhl'ier, p. 274–275; Fraser, p. 409; Ferrier, p. 124; Bellew, p. 366–367; Baker, p. 184; MacGregor, i. 291–292; Basset, p. 234; Curzon, i. 167.

When the construction of the important line of communication between Ashkhabad and Meshhed was begun, the centre of the tuquoise trade was located in Meshhed. The tuquoise came to Meshhed by camel and was transported to the market town of Nishapur (about 1½ days journey distant). The same route was used by the camel trains from the Caspian to Khurasan.

The trade of Meshhed is still very extensive. The city is a centre of the turquoises trade. The tuquoise is obtained from the mines in the neighbourhood of Meshhed and is sent by camel to the Gulf. The trade of Meshhed is still very extensive. The city is a centre of the turquoises trade. The tuquoise is obtained from the mines in the neighbourhood of Meshhed and is sent by camel to the Gulf.

Weaving is an important industry in Meshhed. The carpets produced here were at one time of immense greater value than those of the present day, which are produced in factory fashion. The modern shawls of Kashmir style are especially prized and known as Meshhdari, as are the veils, which in Fraser’s time were regarded as the best in Persia. On weaving in Meshhed cf. Fraser, p. 468; Ferrier, p. 124; Goldsmith, i. 365; Baker, p. 184–185; Curzon, i. 167; Ibrahim Beg, p. 47; Schweinitz, p. 27–28; Allemagne, iii. 116.

Until the second half of the sixteenth century, Meshhed was one of the first emporia of Eastern Iran. At the intersection of important caravan routes, it was the centre of the trade of Central Asia and especially of Afghanistán. Since however Russia has established itself in Turkestan and built the Transcaucasian railway, Meshhed’s trade has declined. Nevertheless the town must still be described as an important centre of trade, not least on account of the numerous pilgrimage routes that lead to it. Meshhed is 150 miles from the Russian railway station of Ashkhabad (q. v.), the capital of the Transcaucasian area; there is a good road between the two towns.

For the housing of the numerous pilgrims and other strangers who come to Meshhed, a considerable number of caravanserais are available. In Fraser’s time (1822), there were at least 25–30 such places in u. e. apart from some that had been abandoned and allowed to fall into ruins (see Fraser, Narrative, p. 460). Khankhoi (p. 107–108) gives 16, four of which, intended for pilgrims only, were inside the i. a.; of these the latter are the old is the Šabja; Caravanserais, built by Tāhmasb I; others date from Sulaymān I.


**MESHED-ALI.** [See NEJAFI.]

**MESHED HUSAIN (Kerbela),** a place of pilgrimage west of the Euphrates about 60 miles S.S.W. of Bagdad on the edge of the desert (Yākūt, *Mu'jam*, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 249). It lay opposite Kār on Ibn Hubair (al-Iṣkāhri, B.G.A., i. 85; cf. al-Balāghrī, *Fatār*, ed. de Goeje, p. 287; al-Makdisī, B.G.A., i. 121). The same Kerbelā is probably connected with Aherār Kerbelā (Daniel, 3, 3) and the Kerbelāk (a kind of head-dress) (G. Jacob, *Turkische Bibliothek*, xi. 3, note 2). It is not mentioned in the pre-Arab period.

After the taking of al-Ḥira, Khālid b. al-Walid is said to have encamped in Kerbelā (Yākūt, iv. 250). On the 18th day (19th Muharram) 61 (Oct. 10, 680) the Imam Husain b. 'Ali (cf. ii., p. 339) on the march from Mecca to the Iraq, where he intended to enforce his claims to the caliphate, fell in the plains of Kerbelā in the district of Ninawa (al-Tabari, iii. 2190; Yākūt, iv. 870; now according to Massignon: Khaymat Kā'a; according to Musili: Iṣhan Nainwa) in a battle with the troops of the governor of al-Kufa and was buried in al-Hira (Yākūt, ii. 188 sq.; al-Tabari, iii. 752; E. Herzfeld, cf. above, ii., p. 221.

The place where the decapitated body of the Prophet's grandson was interred (on the fate of the head which was cut off and sent to Damascus to Yazid I, cf. van Berchem, *Festskriften*, Ed. Sahau geworden., Berlin 1915, p. 298–310), called Kahr al-Husain, soon became a celebrated place of pilgrimage for the Shiites (cf. art. MA)'s.

As early as 63 (684–685) we find Sulaimān b. Ṣulaymān b. Ṣāḥib (cf. above) with his followers to Husain's grave where he spent the day and a night (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii. 545 sq.). Ibn al-Athir (Ta'rikh, ed. Tornberg, v. 184; ix. 358) mentions further pilgrimages in the years 122 (739–740) and 436 (1044–1045). The priests of Meshed Husain at quite an early date were endowed by the pious benefactions of Ṣumma Mīsā, mother of the Caliph al-Mahdi (al-Tabari, iii. 752).

The Caliph al-Mutawakkil in 236 (850–851) destroyed the tomb and its annexes and had the ground levelled and sown; he prohibited under threat of heavy penalties visiting the holy places (al-Tabari, ii. 1407; Ṣamī̄d Allah al-Mustawfī, *Nihayat al-Kalb*, ed. Le Strange, p. 32; Ibn Hawkal (ed. de Goeje, p. 160), however, mentions about 977 a.d. a large mosque with a domed chamber, entered by a door on each side, over the tomb of Husain, which in his time was already much visited by pilgrims. Dābīb b. Muḥammad al-Asadi of 'Ain al-Tamr, supreme chief of a number of tribes, devastated Meshed al-Hira (Kerbela) along with other sanctuaries, for which a punitive expedition was sent against 'Ain al-Tamr in 369 (979–980) before which he fled into the desert (Ibn Mansuwar, *Tāhir al-Umm*, ed. Amadrous, in *The Eclipse of the Abhārid Calipha*, ii. 338, 414). In the same year, the Shi'ī Bāyūd 'Aīdād al-Dawla (cf. above, i. 143) took the two sanctuaries of Meshed 'Ali (al-Majdāʿ) and Meshed al-Husain (M. Harī) under his special protection (Ibn al-Athir, v. 518; Ṣamī̄d Allah al-Mustawfī, loc. cit.).


In Rabi‘ al-awwal 407 (Aug./Sept. 1016), a great conflagration broke out caused by the upsetting of two wax candles, which reduced the main building (al-Kubbah) and the open halls (al-Arwiga) to ashes (Ibn al-Athir, ix. 209).

When the Sultān Sultan Malik Shāh came to Bagdad in 479 (1086–1087) he did not neglect to visit the two Meccahs of 'Ali and al-Husain (Ibn al-Athir, x. 103). The two sanctuaries at this time were known as al-Maghāhadān (al-Hurādī al-Isfahānī, *Tawārikh al-Salāf*, ed. Houssain, in *Revue des textes*, ii. 77) on the analogy of the dual al-Iṣkān, al-Baṣra, al-Hirān, al-Misrān.
(al-šāri'iyā) in which the pilgrims are entertained. Admission to the tomb could only be obtained by permission of the gate-keeper. The pilgrims kiss the silver sarcophagus, above which hang gold and silver lamps. The doors are hung with silk curtains. The inhabitants are divided into the Awdāl Raḥīk and Awdāl Fāyiz, whose continual feuds are detrimental to the town, although they are all Shīʿa.

About the same date, Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfī (op. cit.) gives the circumference of the town as 2,400 paces; he mentions there also the tomb of Ḥurr Raʾīṣ (b. Ṭāʾīḍ), who was the first to fall fighting for Husain at Kerbela'. Šāḥ Ismaʿīl I (d. 930 = 1524) made a pilgrimage to al-Najaf and Meshhed Husain.

Ṣulfān Sulaimān the Magnificent visited the two sanctuaries in 941 (1534–1535), repaired the canal at Meshhed al-Husain (al-Husainyā) and transformed the fields which had been buried in sand into gardens again. The Māmar al-ʿAbd (see below), formerly called Enguşṭā Yār, was built in 982 (1574–1575). Murād III in 991 (1583) ordered the Wālī of Baghdād, ʿAli Pasha b. Alwān, to build or more correctly restore a sanctuary over the grave of Husain. Soon after the capture of Baghdād in 1623, ʿAbbās the Great won the Meshhed for the Persian empire. Nādir ʿShāh visited Kerbela' in 1743; while he is credited with guiding the dome in Meshhed ʿAlī, he is also said to have confiscated endowments intended for the priests of Kerbela'.

The great prosperity of the place of pilgrimage and its large number of inhabitants is emphasised on the occasion of the pilgrimage of ʿAbd al-Karim, a favourite of Nādir ʿShāh. Radya Sulṭān Bēgum, a daughter of ʿAdī ʿHusain (1694–1722), presented 20,000 nādīris for improvements at the mosque of ʿHusain.

The founder of the Kādjar dynasty, Aḵta Muḥammad Kājān, towards the end of the eighteenth century, presented the gold covering for the dome and the maqām of the sanctuary of ʿHusain (Jacob in A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 65; note 4).

In April 1801, in the absence of the pilgrims who had gone to al-Najaf, 12,000 Wahhābis under Ṣaḥīḥ Saʿād entered Kerbela', slew over 3,000 inhabitants there and looted the houses and bazaars. In particular they carried off the gilt copper plates and other treasures of the sanctuary and destroyed the shrine. But after this catastrophe contributions poured in for the sanctuary from the whole ʿArabī world.

After a temporary occupation of Kerbela' by the Persians, Najīb Pasha in 1843 succeeded by force of arms in enforcing the recognition of Turkish suzerainty over the town; the walls of the present old town were now for the most part destroyed. The governor Mīḥāṣ Pasha in 1871 began the building of government offices, which remained incomplete, and extended the adjoining market place (references for the history of Meshhed ʿHusain are given in A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 35–50).

At the present day with over 50,000 inhabitants, Kerbela' is the second largest and perhaps the richest town of the ʿIraq. It owes its prosperity not only to the great number of pilgrims who visit the tomb of Husain, but also to the fact that it is the most important starting point for the Persian pilgrim caravans to al-Najaf and Mecca, and through its situation on the edge of the alluvial plain it is an important "desert port" for trade with the interior of Arabia.

The old town with its tortuous streets is surrounded by modern suburbs. About half to three quarters of the citizens are Persians, the remainder Shīʿa Arabs. The most important tribes among them are the Bani Saʿād, Salāhe, al-Wuṣūm, al-Tahmāz and al-Nāṣiriyye. The ʿDede family is the richest: for constructing the ʿNahr al-Ḥusainiya it was rewarded with extensive estates by Sulṭān Selim.

The name Kerbela' strictly speaking only applies to the eastern part of the palm gardens which surround the town in a semi-circle on its east side (Mussīl, The Middle Empires, p. 41). The town itself is called al-Meshhed or Meshhed al-Ḥusain.

The sanctuary of the third Imām lies in a court yard (sahra) 354 × 270 ft in area, which is surrounded by liwāns and cells. Its walls are decorated with a continuous ornamental band which is said to contain the whole ʿKurʾān written in white on a blue ground. The building itself is 156 × 138 ft in area. The rectangular main building entered by the "golden outer hall" (picture in Grothe, Georg. Charakterbilder, pl. Ixxviii., fig. 136) is surrounded by a vaulted corridor (now called qāmān; A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 20, 3) in which the pilgrims go round the sanctuary (pāwaf) (Wellhausen, Reise arab., Heidelberga, p. 100–112). In the middle of the central domed chamber is the shrine (ṣanaʾiḥa) of ʿHusain about 6 ft high and 12 long surrounded by silver mazharīya work, at the foot of which stands a second smaller shrine, that of his son and companion-in-arms ʿAli Akbar (Masʿūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbih, ed. de Goeje, B. G. A., vii. 303).

"The general impression made by the interior must be called fairy like, when in the dusk — even in the daytime it is dim inside — the light of innumerable lamps and candles around the silver shrine, reflected a thousand and again a thousand times from the innumerable small crystal facets, produces a charm beyond the dreams of imagination. In the roof of the dome the light loses its strength; only here and there a few crystal surfaces gleam like the stars in the sky" (A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 25 sq.).

The sanctuary is adorned on the Kibla face with magnificent and costly ornamentation. Two manāras flank the entrance. A third, the Manāṭir al-ʿAbd, rises before the buildings on the east side of the ʿSābah; south of it the face of the buildings, surrounding the court recedes about 50 feet; on this spot is a Sunnī mosque. Adjoining the ʿSābah on the north side is a large medrese the court yard of which measures about 85 feet square with a mosque of its own and several miḥrābs (on the present condition of the sanctuary: cf. A. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 5–26, on its history p. 35–50 and on its architectural history, p. 51–66).

About 600 yards N.E. of the sanctuary of ʿHusain is the mausoleum of his half-brother ʿAbbās. On the road which runs westward out of the town is the site of the tent of ʿHusain (Khaılmah). The building erected there (plan in Noldeke, pl. viii.; photograph in Grothe, pl. Ixxxiv., fig. 445) has the plan of a tent and on both sides of the entrance there are stone copies of camel saddles.

On the desert plateau (hamāmah) west of the town stretch the graves of the devout Shīʿa. North of the gardens of Kerbela' lie the suburbs, gardens
and fields of al-Bkārē, N.W. those of Kurra, S. those of al-Qadhbāriyya (Yākūt, iii. 768). Among places in the vicinity, Yākūt mentions al-ʿAkr (iii. 695) and al-Naʿwāyi (iv. 816).

A branch line diverging north of al-Ḥilla connects Kerbāli with the Baghdād–al-Baṣra railway. Caravan roads lead to al-Ḥilla and Najaf. The sanctuary of Ḥusain still has the reputation of securing entrance to Paradise for those buried there, wherefore many aged pilgrims and those in failing health come and stay on the holy spot.


**(E. H. HOMMANN)**

**MESHED-I MĪSRIYĀN, a ruined site in Transcaspia (Turkménistan).** N.W. of the confluence of the Atrak and its right bank tributary the Sumbar, or more exactly, on the road which runs from Čat a right angle to the road connecting Cikīghtar with the railway station of Aydūn.

The ruins are surrounded by a wall of brick and a ditch and have an area of 320 acres. The old town, situated in the steeples which are now peopleed by Turkomans, received its water from a canal led from the Atrak about 40 miles above Čat. Near the latter place the canal diverged northwards from the river, crossed the Sumbar by a bridge and finally followed an embankment 6 feet high on which the bed of the canal was 12 feet broad.

The ruins of a fine mosque can still be seen, the gateway of which, decorated with faience, has an inscription according to which this ṭābī was built by Ḍirār al-Danāy wa l-Dīn ʿAlīyāt al-ʿĀṣimi wa l-Mūṣlimin zill Allāh fi l-ʿAlāmin Sūlān Muḥammad b. Sūlān Tākī b. Burān Amīr al-Muʿāminīn. The Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad in question reigned 1200–1220. On one of the two towers (minarets) is written: bismillāh.... barakātun min Allāh nimāmā amara bīhī Abī Ḥāfīz Abī Ḥāmid b. Abī ū-Aqār ṣāḥib al-ribāb, d'aṣṣu ṭūlūk. Āmar Ḥāli R....(f). The identity of this Ḥāmid is unknown but the title of the ribāb which he gives himself, confirms the fact that M.-Mīsriyān was a frontier fortress (ribāb). Near the east gate stood another white mosque.

Tradition (Conolly) ascribes the destruction of Mīsriyān to the "Kalmaṭ Tatars." The appearance of the Kalmaṭs in these regions may be dated about 1600.

The name Meshed-i Mīsriyān (variants: Mestorian, Meshedebian, Meshedovran, Mastian) is obscure, unless Mestorian is to be explained as "Nestorian "Nestorian Christians"; it may be recalled that during his campaign in the Col (*Cuylu*), to the east of the Caspian, Yazguludū persecuted the Christians (Hoffmann, p. 50; Labouret, Le christianisme dans l'Empire d'Erse, 1904, p. 126).

The site of the ruins (to the north of Dājrūnā) is given the name Dihistan in Muslim sources, which recalls the name of the old Scythian people Daha who led a nomadic life on the Atrak (Greek Δαχος and ἄφος; cf. Tomasek in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encycl., iv., col 1945). From the Dahan clan of the Parāvān was descended the Arghakhi dynasty which imposed its authority on the Pārthians (cf. Minorski, Transcassarides, J.A., 1930, July–Sept., p. 56).

The basin of the Atrak (the ancient Ἐξήγαι) is at the extreme limit of the lands described in the classical and Muḥammadan geographers. The sources mention several settlements in Dihistan but in a somewhat confusing fashion. As the analysis by Hoffmann and by Barthold has shown, a distinction must be made between: 1. the settlement on the seashore, 2. the town of Dihīstān and 3. the ribāb Dihīstān.

1. The first of these was built on a promontory (daňgha) behind which ships could shelter. Marquart, Erdmahr, p. 130, reads the name concealed in the variants in ʿāṯāk, p. 219, note b, as "Dihīstān Bayāsīn" which he connects with the district of Bayāšān mentioned (in Dājrūnā) by Ṭabāri, ii. 1330; Balāzī, p. 337 and Ibn Khur- ḏāḫīshūbī, p. 35. The Ḥādīd al-ʿĀsīr mentions a peninsula of Dihīstān-Sur on the coast of Dihīstān.

This may be an echo of the name of the Turkish (♂) princes ʿOmar (Hoffmann, p. 281) who attacked Dājrūnā from the north (ibn al-ʿĀṣīr, ii. 22). Lastly Ṭabāri, ii. 1325, locates an island of Buḥairā 5 farsākh from Dihīstān. Barthold identifies all these names with the cape of Ḥasan Kūl which shelters the bay into which the Atrak flows. (Cf. also the article TOḴĀN, on the Dīz-i Aḵān mentioned in the Diḵūnāma).
A difficulty is raised by Ištákhrî (p. 219) who puts at 50 farsaks and p. 226 at 6 nûrâfala (each of 80/9 farsâkhs) the distance between Abâs-kân (at the mouth of the river Dîjîdân, now Gümüş-tapa?) and the cape of Dîjîstân in question. If we follow this double indication literally, we ought (with Hoffmann, p. 279, who reads the name Dîjîstân—Tabâhirî) to move the cape of Dîjîstân considerably to the north, in the bay of Krasnowodsk, which is certainly a very important place. In this case the cape would be a different one from Buhaiya = Hasan Kuli (Hoffmann, p. 278).

2. The town of Dîjîstân, according to the middle Persian list of the towns of Erân, was founded by a certain Narsâkh-e Arshaâkîlî (Marquart, Erânîakhr, p. 73) and according to the Nuchât-âl-Kûlû, p. 166, by the Sâsânîd Kûbâd b. Firuz. According to Mughaddasî, the town of Dîjîstân was called Akhûr. Tabâri locates the town of Dîjîstân 25 farsaks from (the river of) Dîjîdân and, as we have seen, 5 farsaks from Buhaiya. This latter distance is by the way less than the actual distance between Hasan-Kûlî and Mâshîd-i-Mîsîrân.

3. The ruins of Mâshîd-i Mîsîrân (as the inscriptions on the mosque suggest) must correspond to the rîbât of Dîjîstân which Mughaddasî, p. 358 (cf. also p. 312, 367, 372) mentions distinct from Akhûr. This rîbât situated on the borders of the steppes had fine mosques and rich markets. Relying on Yâlû, i. 39, Barthold thinks that in the sixteenth century the rîbât (and not Akhûr to the east of the Dîjîdân-rîbât road) was the capital of the district of Dîjîstân.


(V. Minorsky)

MESÎH (originally Tâsî), an important Otu-mân poet of the time of Bâyâzîd II. Born in Fârshâtna (northern Albania), he came as a youth to Constantinople where he became a softa (theological student) and distinguished himself as a calligrapher. In the end he won the favour of the grand vizier Khâzîn-Allâh Pasha [q.v.] and became his divân-secretary. But his irregular life and carelessness in the performance of his duties frequently irritated his patron (Allâh Pasha called him Shâhr âghânî). He held his post, however, till the death of Allâh Pasha in 917 (1511) in battle against the Şîfî rebels under Şâh Kûlî. Mesîh wrote an elegy on his death, full of the deepest emotion.

His attempts to find a new patron failed. He had to be content with a miserable fief in Bosnia where he soon died in 918 (1512), poor and forgotten and still quite young.

According to Ahmad Pasha [q.v.] and Nidjîtâ (d. 914 = 1509), Mesîh was regarded as the third great Ottoman poet and the greatest lyric poet before Bahâî. He is a most artistic and original figure. His output was not extensive, but of lasting importance. His Divân has not yet been printed, a fate common to nearly all important Turkish poets. In his lyric poems he is above the average of contemporary poets. In addition to the grace and delicacy of his diction, there is a certain novelty in his style. New images and pictures are introduced with great boldness, perhaps a result of his Albanian blood. The best known of his poems, in Europe is his Ode to Spring (Murcebâvi) which Sir William Jones published with a Latin translation: Poëtas Asiaticae commentariorum libri sex, Leipzig 1774 and has been repeatedly reprinted (by Toderini, by Wieland in the Deutsche Merkur, by J. von Hammer etc.). His Divân is also of importance linguistically, for it bears the stamp of the original Gothic dialect.

Mesîh's most original work is his Methwâvi, Shâhr-ëngîz (the "Thriller of the Town"), which is also the most original work in Turkish literature down to Mesîh's time. It is original in subject also, as it did not have a Persian model. It introduced quite a new style of poems, which was frequently imitated. Shâhr-ëngîz represents the first attempt at humorous verse in Turkey, and its language is very close to the spoken speech. Here Mesîh could write Turkish to his heart's content, while in other forms he had to use the learned jargon. He laments in one passage that without Persian and Arabic there would be no room for him as a poet, even if he had come down from heaven.

Shâhr-ëngîz is a burlesque catalogue of the beautiful "boys" of Adrianople — it is interesting to note that they are all Muhammadan — and became popular on account of its unadulterated language.

As a product of his activity as a secretary, we have also a collection of inâhâ', elegant specimens of epistolary style, not without historical interest, entitled Gâlî 'Sâîl Berg (the hundred-leaved rose). I have a manuscript of this work, which seems to be rather rare, of 991 (1583) entitled Inâhâ'-î Mesîh.

Bibliography: Sehti, Hecht Bikhût, Constantinople 1325, p. 109; Lauff, Teêkère, Constantinople 1314, p. 309—311; Thureyia, Sîâjîlî-î 'othâmî, Constantinople 1311, iv. 369; Sâmî, Kûma, Constantinople 1316, vi. 4286; Ahmad Kifâtî, Lûghâtîî tâ'irîhîy, Constantinople 1300, v. 50; H. Husâm al-Dîn, Amaštîa Târîhî, Constantinople 1207, iii. 260; Nidjîth 'Açîmî, Mesîhî Divânî, T.O.E.M., i. 300—308 (Notices historiques-sociologiques tirées du divan de Mesîhî); Mehmed Tâhir, 'Othâmîî Mülâkkîfî, Constantinople 1313, vi. 410 (the Divân in the Hamidiya Library is numbered Nª 483 [not 471]); I could not find the copy of the Inâhâ' in the Cat. of the Nîr-i 'othâmîyé); Hammer, G.O.D., i. 297—302: G. O. K. 2, i. 679; Smirnov, Oterk istori, St. Petersburg 1891, iv. 477 (Kors); Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, London 1902, ii. 226—256; the Catalogues by Fertsch (Berlin, Götha), Rieu a.o. (Th. Menzel)
METAWILA. [See MUTAWILÎ.] MELWALA HUKDIR, a title of the head of the Mawlavi Order [see Mawlavia]. The second word is the Turkish form of the Persian khudawand, the equivalent of maslalâ, which, according to Alâ'î (Sauces des Derviches Tonnneurs, i. 59) was bestowed on Djalâl al-Dîn by his father. Sâmi in his Turkish Lexicon states that the word, besides being used for “Sultan,” “King,” is applied to certain saintly personages, in such combinations as fir hukdir or mulâ hukdir. The underlying idea of such a title is probably that the saint has committed to him the government of the world, if he choose to undertake it, an idea elaborated by Ibn-Arabi (Futûhât Makhîya, i. 262; ii. 407), who regards such a saint as the true khâla. The title elâh is more generally recognized as that belonging to the head of the Mawlavi Order (Sâmi, loc. cit., p. 5108). (D. S. MARGOLIUTH.)

MEZZOMORTO, an Ottoman Grand Admiral whose real name was ḤUSAYN ḤUSAYN PAŠA. Hadžiđi Husein Paša, known as Mezzomorto, i.e. “half-dead” because he was severely wounded in a naval battle, came from the Barbaric Islands, if A. de la Montraye’s statement (Voyage, The Hague 1727, i. 206) that he was born in Mallová is right. He probably spent his youth sailing with corsairs on the seas off the North African coast. He first appears as a desperate pirate in the summer of 1682 in the Barbary States. When France was preparing to deal a decisive blow at the pirates of Algiers, whose arrogance had passed all bounds, he was handed over as a hostage to the French after the bombardment of Algiers, but managed to return there, to strike down with his own hand, in a mutiny of the mercenaries which he had stirred up, the Bey of Algiers Baha Hasam, who was ready to make peace and to fight his way to the head of the state (summer of 1683; cf. Zinkesien, G.O.R., v. 51 sq.). Husein Reis in the following year condensed with Louis XIV of France a truce for a hundred years, which however was only of brief duration. His own rule over Algiers was not long either (till 1688; cf. A. Bernard, L’Algérie, Paris 1929, p. 159). Ten years later, in Maharram 1107 (Aug. 1695), Husein Reis, who had already distinguished himself as commander of a galonne (kabun keşfûlân), was appointed Grand Admiral of the Ottoman fleet (kaptan-i derya) in succession to Amârîrâde Husein Paša, who was appointed governor of Adana after the taking of Chios. He owed his promotion to his skilful seamanship at the capture of Chios where he distinguished himself in the battle with the Venetian fleet (spring of 1695). In 1697 Husein Paša inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Venetian Captain General Alessandro Molino off the island of Lemnos, and in the following year, in a naval fight on July 6 with Molino’s successor, Giacomo Cornaro, near Mytilene it was very doubtful whether the Cresecnt on the Lion of St. Mark gained the victory (cf. Zinkesien, G.O.R., v. 183, from the account by the inquisitore Garzoni in his Istoria della Repubblica di Venezia. Venice 1705, p. 644 sqq. 691 sqq. 748 sqq. and 775 sqq.) Ottoman authorities and the historian Rashid (fol. 231: cf. J. v. Hammer. G.O.R., v. 635) credit the victory to the Ottomans. In 1113, Mezzomorto was dismissed from his rank and re-

placed by ‘Abd al-Fattâh Paša. He retired to Chios, where his adventurous life came to an end in the same year on the 13th Safar 1113 (July 20, 1701, according to Safvet, op. cit.), on the 14th Safar 1114 (t.e. July 9, 1702) according to others. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 766 and vii. 624, gives the date as 15th Rabî’ 1113 (Aug. 20, 1701). One of these dates is probably that of his dismissal.


MIDHANA. [See MANAW.] MIDHAT PAŠA, Ottoman statesman, twice grand vizier. Midhat Paša was born in Stambul in Safar 1238 (beg. Oct. 18, 1822), the son of Hâdji Ali Efendi-Zade Hâdji Hâzim Mehmed Esh of Efendi, a native of Rûchîuk. The family seem to have been professing Bektashis and Midhat Paša also had a leaning towards them. His earliest youth was spent in his parents’ home at Wdlin, Loška (Bulgaria) and later in Stambul, where his father held judicial offices. In 1836 he was working in the secretariat of the grand vizier and later he filled confidential posts in various governorships (including two years in Damascus), in 1844 he came to Konya and in 1849 became second, in 1851 first secretary to the Council (muhterem valide). In 1854 the grand vizier Kâzî Mehmed Pasha gave him the difficult task of pacifying the provinces of Adrianople and the Balkans and cleaning them of robber bands. Here he displayed for the first time his special talents for administration, which were not unnoticed by the Porte and soon afterwards brought him the appointment of governor of the Danube districts (Wdlin, Silistra). In 1858 he spent six months travelling for study in western Europe, including Vienna, Paris, Brussels and London. In 1861 he was appointed governor of Niş and Prizren with the rank of vizier, where he earned distinction by his pacification of the country, so that, when the new organisation of wilayets was carried out in 1864, he was given the model province, Danube-Bulgaria (Thraki Wilayet). During his four years’ governorship, he raised the province to a level rate in Turkey, although it was only under his successor that the people learned to thank him for it. He built schools and educational institutes everywhere, created funds to make advances and to support useful undertakings, built hospitals, granaries, roads (2,000 miles) and bridges (400) and improved communications in every way. As he required money for all these progressive undertakings, which the government could not give him and he would not raise by abuse of taxation, he raised the necessary funds by “voluntary contributions” from the people. The Bulgars, with whom for nationalist reasons he had no sympathy, suffered not a little from the enterprising spirit and unrestrained love of work of the young governor who, of unyielding will and inexorable severity, was of a nature not attractive, but rather arrogant and conceited. At the same time he was quite modern in his views and had no scruples about
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introducing absolute equality between Christians and Muslims in his province. He proceeded ruthlessly against agrarian rebels, dismissed incompetent officials and brought exhortations to book. His most rigorous steps were directed against the Russian Pan-Slav intrigues, the leaders of which he ruthlessly hanged. Although in a few years he made the Eunube province the richest in Turkey without it costing the state a pastré, in 1869 Midhat Paşa, who had incurred the hostility of the Russians, was deprived of his office and sent to remote Bagdad as governor and commander of the 17th Army Corps. Midhat Paşa was not dismayed, but went to work with renewed energy to develop his new governorship. He laid roads, started horse-tramways, built a technical school, founded a savings bank, instituted regular steamship traffic on the Tigris between Bagdad and several harbours on the Persian Gulf and urged the building of a “Euphrates railway”. Under the pretext that he had taken part in a conspiracy against the Sultan, Midhat Paşa, who had already earned the gratitude of the Bagdad province and also won Nedjî for the Ottoman empire, was summoned to Stamboul where his enemy, the grand vizier Mahmûd Nêdim Paşa, had chosen him for the office of wâli of Adrianople Instead of this, on the fall of his rival, Midhat Paşa was appointed grand vizier on Aug. 1, 1872, only to be dismissed on October 19. It was clearly shown that his real strength lay in provincial administration. All possible elements combined to bring about his fall: Sultan Abd al-Azîz could not endure him because he opposed his mad whims; the Old Turks regarded him as an infidel because he planned his measures regardless of dogmatic objections; he was most unpopular with the Russians because he had taken sharp measures to deal with the Slav Bulgarian intrigues. Midhat Paşa retired into private life as persona non grata. In the grand vizierate of Eşâd Paşa, he became minister of justice on March 15, 1873 and held this office still under his successor Shêrîmân-zâde Mehemmed Rûshdî Paşa till Sept. 29, 1873. In the following October, the governorship of Adrianople was given him, which he accepted with reluctance and held for barely three months. On Feb. 17, 1874 he was again dismissed and retired once more to private life. He used the leisure thus forced upon him to work out the schemes which he later unfolded and which meant a decisive change in the orientation of the Ottoman empire. In August 1875 his old enemy Mahmûd Nêdim Paşa, who had again received the imperial seals, appointed him minister of justice but by November he had handed in his resignation, which was accepted. The empire was then in a state of complete confusion rising, famine, an empty treasury, and half rebelled. Midhat Paşa then composed his famous memorandum of March 9, 1876, which was to have such momentous results. On May 20, 1876 he entered the cabinet of the grand vizier Murad-jîd Mehemmed Rûshîd Paşa as minister without portfolio. In the night of May 30, Sultan Abd al-Azîz was deposed and Murad V raised to the throne of his fathers. On July 15, a proclamation issued in the name of the new sovereign used for the first time the word “constitution”. Midhat Paşa was the soul of the new movement and he worked ardently with a few kindred spirits to give Turkey a constitution. Sultan Murad V became insane and was replaced by his brother Abd al-Hasîm; on December 18, 1876 Midhat Paşa became grand vizier for the second time, and five days later, the constitution was solemnly proclaimed. The reactionary party and a powerful camarilla never ceased its endeavours to bring about the fall of Midhat Paşa and to bring his progressive schemes to nought. Under the pretext of high treason he was dismissed on Feb. 5, 1877 and banished to Europe. He was put upon a steamer and went via Rome and Paris to England. He was only permitted to return in 1878 and then only to Cetie. In November 1878 under pressure from England, he was appointed governor-general of Syria. In 1880 he was transferred to Smyrna as governor. Here Abd al-Hasîm’s wrath overwhelmed him. In May 1881 he was arrested and brought to Stamboul. The ludicrous charge of having caused the assassination of Sultan Abd al-Azîz was brought against him. Midhat Paşa was condemned to death but the sentence was not carried out. He was banished for life to Tâif in Arabia. After repeated attempts to poison him, he was strangled on April 10, 1883 (Râdzâh 29, 1301) in prison. In this tragic fashion ended the life of one of the most notable and best statesmen of Turkey, perhaps the most important administrator that the Ottoman empire has produced in modern times. Midhat Paşa had a son, Ali Hüdâr Midhat Bey, who after his death conducted a campaign to clear his memory and wrote a very full life of his father.

Leipzig 1878, p. 82 sqq.; [Gg. Dempwolff], Seraif und Hohe Pforte, Vienna 1879, p. 237 sqq.; Carl, Geschichte der Machtverfall des Trieck, Vienna 1908, p. 372 sqq. But the western sources have mainly been used to have caution, as the very varying statements about his origin, date and place of birth show.

(FR. BARINGER)

MIDILLI, Turkish form for Mytilene, name of the island of Lesbos, which in the middle ages had already taken the name of its capital. The island is about 650 sq. m. in area and has two large gulls, the Gulf of Kaloni (Kalafka) and that of Jeros (Kelemia). When Venetian rule had become acquainted with the island, it belonged to the Byzantine empire. Its conquest in the reign of the emperors Alexios Comnenos in 1184 (1091) by the Emir of Smyrna, Tzachas, father-in-law of the Seljuk Kılıç Arslan I ib Sulaimān, was only temporary. After the conquest of Constantineople by the Latins (1204), the island passed for a time to the Venetians. In 1355, the emperor John Palaeologos, on the marriage of his sister with the Genoese Francesco Gattiluso, granted the island to the latter as a fief. It belonged to this family until Mehmed II the Conqueror took Constantinople in 1454. The Sultan paid to pay tribute to the Turks, to which the Gattiluso in the hope of retaining their position readily agreed; and when the grand vizier Hamza Pasha in 1456 anchored off Lesbos on the voyage to Rhodes, the prince Doino Gattiluso sent rich gifts to the Turkish commander through the historian Ducas. After the death of Dornoa, his son and successor Domenico sent an embassy under the same Ducas to try to gain the good graces of the Sultan, but the Turks imposed rather harsh conditions. In 1458 Domenico was slain by his brother Nicholas who had escaped from Lemnos and the latter seized the island. On the pretext that he had given shelter to the pirates who harassed the Asia Minor coast and had committed other acts hostile to the Sultan, Mehmed in 1462 set out against Lesbos. The grand vizier Mihamd Pasha conducted the siege of the capital. It was taken after 27 days' bombardment and the Sultan received the surrender of the island in person (Aşık Pasha Zade, ed. Giese, Leipzig 1909, p. 269 sqq.; Hājjī Khālīfa, Tāhli al-Mālik; Īmm al-Adīd fī Edrā al-Rūḥānī. Constantinople 1141 [1728-1729], fol. 66; Hammer, ii. 15, 67; Zinkelmann, ii. 226, 239 sqq.). A mosque in the citadel of Midilli was built by Fāthī; cf. Newton, i. 117; Köldewe, p. 11.

Attempts of the Venetians under Orsato Giustiano (1464) to take the island from the Turks failed (v. Hammer, ii. 81 sq.). An expedition against the island in 1500 of the allied French and Venetian fleets was thwarted by the Turkish forces (v. Hammer, ii. 327; Hājjī Khālīfa, op. cit., fol. 109). Since that date the island had been in undisputed possession of the Turks until during the Balkan War it was handed over to the Greeks on Nov. 24, 1912 and finally conceded to them by the Peace of London of May 30, 1913, although with certain reservations by Turkey.

The island, the largest in the Archipelago, belonged to the wilāya of the Archipelago (Dżeier-i Bahri-i sefiū) and formed in it the sandjak of Midilli with 5 kazas: Miilīa (with the capital, in the east of the island), Plemart (= Plomari, in the south), Mōlōva (= Molivos, the ancient Methymna, in the north), Sīghri in the west of the island; and lastly the Janda Islands (Moskonisi) of Midilli; cf. Sami, Kāmās dʾAm, vol. 1894, 4425; Ćinet, La Turquie dʼAsie, i. 449, 472; cf. also: Suleimān Fātīk, Ṭubād Dervis, i. (Stambul 1299), p. 55–59. — According to Baedeker 1914, the island had had 140,000 inhabitants of whom 6/7th were Greeks and 1/7th Muhammadans.

Bibliography: On the island in ancient times and most of the questions connected with it, see the very full article by Burchner on Lesbos in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, xii. (1923), col. 2107–2153.

A full description for the earlier Turkish period is given by the Turk Piri Reis in his Bahriye written in 1521; this section has been translated by Maximilian Bittner in Paul Kretschmer, Der heutige Lesbische Dialekt (= Schriften der Balkankommission, iii,1), Vienna 1905, col. 579–584 and in my ed. of the Bahriye of Piri Reis (Berlin and Leipzig 1925), chap. ix.: Midilla, text p. 21–26. transl. p. 32–42. — The most important later description is those of Foscoche, Description of the East, i,1, London 1745; Newton, Travels and Discoveries in the Levant, London 1864, i. 17 sqq.; A. Conze, Reisen auf der Insel Lesbos (1855) and R. Köldewe, Die antiken Bauwerke der Insel Lesbos. Im Auftrage des Kaiserlich-Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts unterrichtet und aufgenommen, Berlin 1890. This book gives details of early explorations of the island and accurate maps on a larger scale of sections of it.

(P. KAHLE)

MIDJARA, the center, from jara, "slowing coal", the Arabic name for the constellation of the Ather which bears south of the Scorpion (τηρίζων in Aratus, are in Cicero, Midjara etc.) or center (μεσοτόρας in Ptolemy, τιρνίων in Geminos).


MIDRĀR BANĀ. [See SIGJAMAČA]

MIHNA (Anc.), noun derived from the root m-n-h, appearing in the Arabic verbs maḥnus, "to smooth", and in some Archaic derivations, trial (e.g. the trials to which the prophets and e-specially the family of Muhammad, the Ālids, are exposed in this world, cf. Goldhauer, Vorlesung, n. p. 212–213, 261). Inquisition. In the latter sense it is usually applied to the Muftilite inquisition and persecution extending from 215–234 (813–838). On the use of the verb, "inquisitor", "to inquise", cf. e-specially Q. Iliad, "inquisitor de pluribus mundi ab", i.4, p. 81, note 10.

The first Muftilite inquisition was instituted towards the end of his reign by the ibn al-Maḥmūd al-Masān (9 v. 1195–1218 = 813–833), who was a Muftilite by conviction, e-specially with regard to the creation of the Kuran (cf. the articles A-KURĀN and MIHNAZIL). He sent a letter to the governor of Baghdād, ʿAbbās b. Ibrahim, ordering him to cite before him the kāfīs under his jurisdiction in order to test them 1865 in regard to their opinion on the Kuran (Tabari, in. 1112 sqq., transl. by Paton, ed. cit., p. 57–61; Kāfīs dūd, p. 338 sqq.; cf. Abu l-Maḥbūs, i. 636
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sqq.: Fragmenta Hist. Arab., p. 465). Those who declared their opinion in conformity with that of the caliph, should cite the legal witnesses under their jurisdiction and institute a similar inquisition.

This letter was sent to the provinces. In Egypt little was done At Kufa the general feeling was against yielding to the order of the caliph. In Damascus, the latter, probably on his way to Asia Minor, personally conducted the testing of the doctors of the town.

In a second letter he ordered Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm to send him several of the leading theological authorities of Baghdād, that he might test them himself. The name of the chief champion of the orthodox view, Aḥmad b. Mūhammad b. Ḥanbal [q. v.], which was at first in the list, was cancelled at the instance of the chief kālī Aḥmad b. Abū Dūād [q. v.], the most vigorous advocate of the mīḥāna under al-Maʿmūn and his successors. Among the seven who were summoned to the court was Mūhammad b. Saʿd [q. v.], the secretary of al-Waḥīdī [q. v.], and author of the Kitāb al-Ṭabaḥī. All of them gave way to the pressure, assented to the view forced upon them, and were sent back to Baghdād, where Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm had them repeat their confession before the theologians (Ṭabarī, iii. 1116 sqq.; Kitāb Baghdādi, p. 343 sqq.). The success of the caliph moved him to cling to the method inaugurated by him. In a third letter which is interwoven with theological arguments (Ṭabarī, iii. 1117 sqq.; Paton, op. cit., p. 65 sqq.) he enjoined Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm to test all the kādīs under his jurisdiction, who in turn should test all witnesses and assistants in matters of law. Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm cited before him a number of the most notable doctors of Baghdād (Ṭabarī, iii. 1121 sqq.; Paton, op. cit., p. 69 sqq.), among them Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. The result of the test was that some of them yielded and others remained steadfast; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal belonged to the group of the latter.

In a fourth letter to Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm (Ṭabarī, iii. 1125 sqq.; Paton, op. cit., p. 74 sqq.), the caliph discussed the attitude of each of the doctors in connection with his character and way of life, and ordered those who had given unsatisfactory answers to be sent to his camp in Ṭarsūs. After a further examination by Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm two of them only remained steadfast, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Mūhammad b. Nūḥ. They were sent to Ṭarsūs as prisoners. On the way thither the report of the caliph’s death reached them. They were sent back to Baghdād, Mūhammad b. Nūḥ died before he had reached the capital.

Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal remained in prison. Although he was urged to make use of ġahīra [q. v.] others had done, he stuck to his attitude. Cited before al-Maʿmūn’s brother and successor al-Muʿtaṣim (218—227 = 833—842), there originated lively debate on the nature of the Kurān and other theological subjects between him, the caliph, Aḥmad b. Abī Dūād and others, which lasted three days. No change, however, being brought about in Aḥmad’s attitude, he was scourged at the order of the caliph, and afterwards, from fear of an insurrection (for Aḥmad was very popular), set free. Little more is heard of the mīḥāna under al-Muʿtaṣim (Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, i. 649; Paton, p. 115), who had neither the interest nor the training of his predecessor in theological matters.

His son al-Waṭāḥī b. Ibrāhīm (227—232 = 842—847) who succeeded him, returned to the methods of al-Maʿmūn (Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, i. 683; Paton, p. 115 sqq.), although it is said that he had restrained his father from prosecuting the miḥāna any farther. He ordered the governors of the provinces to test the notables under their jurisdiction. Little is known of the consequences of this order. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal in the meanwhile had become a favourite teacher; when, however, he heard of the renewed activity of Aḥmad b. Abī Dūād he refrained of his own will from teaching, and was henceforth left alone.

Al-Waṭāḥī personally interested in the trial of one person of note, the theologian Aḥmad b. Naṣr b. Mālik al-Khuṣaynī who had moreover taken part in a conspiracy (Weil, ii. 341; Paton, p. 116 sqq.; cf. Taḥāri, i. 1343 sqq.; de Goeje, Fragmenta hist. arab., p. 529 sqq.). Questioned about the Kurān, al-Khuṣaynī replied that he believed it to be the word of God. The trial had not proceeded much farther, when the caliph put an end to it and personally made an attempt to beseech his victim, in which he did not succeed without the assistance of one more skilled than himself (Shaʿbān 231 = 846).

Other persons of note who remained steadfast under al-Waṭāḥī were Naʿāmān b. Hammād and the well known Naṣr b. Yahya al-Buwaytī, the pupil of the Shāfiʿī and editor of some of his works (Paton, p. 110). Both died in prison. As an instance of the fanaticism of Aḥmad b. Abī Dūād it is related that, when in 231 (846) it was proposed to ransom 4,600 Muslim prisoners from the Byzantines, he proposed to abandon those who would not admit the creation of the Kurān; this was actually done (Ṭabarī, iii. 1351 sqq.; Fragmenta hist. arab., i. 532; Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, i. 684; Paton, p. 120). It is said that al-Waṭāḥī gave up his Muʿtazilite views before his death. The mīḥāna continued to exist during the first years of the reign of his successor al-Mutawakkil (232—247 = 847—861), but in 234 this caliph stopped its application and forbade the profession of the creation of the Kurān on pain of death.

MIHRĀB, the seventh month of the Persian solar year which runs from Sept. 17 to Oct. 16 and therefore begins the autumn. Mihrāb is also the name of the 16th day of each month. To distinguish between the month Mihrāb and the day, the former is called Mihrāb Māh and the latter Mihrāb Kūz. On the 16th Mihrāb, the day when Mihrāb Māh and Mihrāb Kūz coincide, called Mihrāgān, one of the great feast days begins, which is also called Mihrāgan and lasts till the 21st of the month. The first day of the feast is called Mihrāb-i Şinna, the general Mihrāb, the last Mihrāb-i Ḥisgū, the special, proper Mihrāb. The associations of this feast partly relate to the beginning of autumn, partly to the sun, whose name the month indeed bears, and partly to heroic legend: Mihrāgān is the feast of Ferdīnān's accession after his victory over Daḥsh. On the rites observed at the sources mentioned below.

**Bibliography:** Ginzel, Handbuch d. math. n. tech. Chronologie, 1, 56 993; al-Birānī, ʿAḥār, ed. Sachau, p. 45, 43, 70, 222 993; Vuillers, Lexicon persico-latinum, s.v. محراب, al-Kawzī, ʿAḏīb al-Mubāḥhāt, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 81 sq. (M. Plesner)

MIHRI MĀH SULTĀN, daughter of Suleīmān the Magnificent. Mihrā Māh (sometimes also written Mihrā-u-māh: cf. Karāčebīzilī, Karvāf al-Ebārī, p. 458) was the only daughter of Suleīmān the Magnificent [q.v.] as well as F. Babiner, in Meister der Poeti, 67, Berlin 1915, p. 39—63]. While still quite young she was married to the grand vizier Rustem Pasha (cf. F. Babiner, G. O. W., p. 81 sq.) in the beginning of December 1539 (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, in J. S. O., Year xxxii., Part 2, p. 37), but the marriage does not seem to have been a happy one. She used her enormous wealth — St. Gerlach in 1576 estimated her daily income at not less than 2,000 ducats (cf. Taageper, Frankfurt 1674, p. 266) — for many pious endowments. Among these the most important were the two mosques built by her, one in Constantinople at the Adrian Gate and the other in Ewliya, Seyyid İmam-ı Evliya, p. 165: Hüfif Hüseyn, Hadīkat al-Dīnāmī, i. 24 and J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 59, i) and the other (Mihrābā Māh Sultān Dīmā) of Ewliya, op. cit., i. 472 71; Hüfif Hüseyn, op. cit., i. 186 and ib. G. O. R., ix. 128. No. 741) near the landing-stage in Scutari. The second was the work of the great architect Sūnān [q.v.] who built it in 1553 (1547) and also erected a palace for Mihrāb Māh in Scutari near this mosque. After her husband's death (July 8, 1566) Mihrāb Māh Sultan intervened on several occasions; for example she continually urged upon her father that the conquest of Malta should be one of the main undertakings of the Holy War and offered to equip 400 galleys for this campaign at her own expense. She was still alive at the reconciliation with her brother Selim and his accession. The correct date of her death, Jan. 25, 1578 is given only by Gerlach. Taageper, p. 447: the date in Karāčebīzilī, op. cit., p. 458, namely Olu-1-Ka’dā 984 (Jan. 20—Feb. 18, 1577), is a whole year out. She was buried beside her father in his tomb (tombeau de Mihrāb) in Stambul. From her marriage with Rustem Pasha two sons and a daughter ʿAṣīha Khanum were born; the latter married the grand vizier ʿAḥmed Pasha.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text, cf. Mehemmed Thuriyā, Sīqūl-i ʿotmānīi, i. 53; J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 393, 425 and pass.: a description of the circumcision festivals of her sons Daḥshār and Bāyazīd is given in the Turkish MS., No. 34, fol. 433 sqq. in the Pruss. State Library (cf. W. Pertsch, Zeitschrift, 66).

(FR. BABINGER)

MIHRAZ (see also MASHID I, D. C). Derivation of the niche. The mihrāb niche has been given a two-fold origin by Orientalists and historians of art: from the Christian apsis and the Buddhist niche. "Tout ce qui reste de la basilique dans le sanctuaire de la mosquée c'est la qibla, sorte d'abside atrophie" says M. v. Berchem in his Notes d'archéologie arabe (J. A., vol. xvii., 1891, p. 427). The introduction of the niche mihrāb into the mosque is no doubt rightly ascribed to the Omayyads, who were the first to build mosques of any size, under the influence of the Christian architecture of their lands. The simple Arabian and Persian village mosques have no niches even at the present day. According to tradition, As-'Abd 1, when he visited the mosque built for him with the help of Byzantine masons in Medina, was reproached with having built the mosque in the style of Christian churches (Wustenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina, Abh G. W. Goett, ix., 1861). When ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in his Syrian buildings had the qibla made in the form of a niche, he provoked the opposition and anger of the zealots on account of the similarity which was thus produced between the mosques and churches. H. Lamennis has collected a number of references, in which the mihrāb is roundly asserted to be copied from the Christians and to have become naturalised only with difficulty and not till the second century (Zeydil, p. 94, note 1 quoted by C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultur, Islam studien, p. 493). Perhaps the custom of placing several niches in the qibla wall of large mosques was also a gesture against the appearance of imitating the Christian custom. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that the semicircular niche was one of the most widely disseminated forms in Mediterranean architecture and its adoption was much more natural than an imitation of the much Christian apsis. The derivation of the mihrāb from the Buddhist or Hindu niche for idols has as much or as little in its favour as the other. For it was only exceptionally that the Indian idol stood in a niche, but regularly it was in a separate quadrangular cell. The separate phenomenon of the eastern polygonal mihrāb developed by the Turkic peoples, which was brought by the Seljuqs and other Turkic peoples to Asia Minor and is found in Mesopotamia from the end of the 13th century can only be explained satisfactorily as a deliberate creation of its makers. As the heart of the house of worship, the mihrāb forms the culminating point in the equipment of the mosque, and as the carrier of the varied forms of decoration and continually changing systems of Muslim decorative art through the centuries is of considerable importance in the history of art. As a metrical instrument of the art of the mihrāb, if properly read, shows the prevailing tendency of art and its changes as a result of social changes. The writing of its history is a task for the future and it can only be outlined here.

**History.** The qibla was originally indicated not by a niche but by some mark such as a strip of paint or a flat stone marked in some way. Ac-
According to Abū Hurairā, it was introduced into the first mosque of the Prophet in Medina: “In stead of a mihrāb or prayer niche a block of stone directed the congregation; at first it was placed against the southern wall of the mosque, and it was removed to the southern when Mecca became the Kiblah.” (R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina*, 1874, ii. 72.) The oldest mosque of ʿAmr in Fustāṭ of 21 (642) had no niche, but the ʿibāda, accurately calculated, was marked (Corbett, *J.R.A.S.*, 1890, p. 757–800). The Arabic use of slabs to indicate the ʿibāda instead of a niche survived, alongside of the mihrāb and in spite of it, for several centuries within and without Arabia. The mosques in Arabia proper are still unknown and only a few buildings on the borders enable us to draw some conclusions. The ruins of the xith–xiith century on Baqī‘ (Diez, *Eine mittelalterliche Moschee auf der Insel Bahrein*, Jahrb. d. asiat. Kaut., 1925, II. Halsband) and the mosque of Kishmaki on Ṣirṭah (S. H. A., 1922, pl. iii.) show nothing of a type later well known. Such slabs of stone or stucco were frequently built into the front pillars of the ʿarḍān down to the xiith century to indicate the ʿibāda. They are to be found in Māz (Herzfeld, *Arch. Reis.*, ii. 277, 280) and they would certainly have been found in Bagdād for example had the old mosques survived there. They gave the caliph and his representatives the opportunity, so limited in Islam, of perpetuating their names and boasting themselves helpers of Islam by erecting such flat mihrābs. Examples are the richly ornamented stucco slab presented by the vizier al-Afṣal in the name of the caliph al-Mu’tasir (485 = 1092) to the mosque of Ibn Ῥūf in its counterpart ordered by Sulṭān Lūdūn (696–698 = 1296–1298) (illus. in F. Flury, *Die Orientamente der Moscheen und Afshar-Moschee*, 1912, pl. xvi.). When Muslim architecture is deliberately developed on a grand scale however we find the mihrāb in the xiith century as a semi-circular shell-shaped niche flanked by pillars, and this is the form that has survived essentially with local variations to the present day.

**Mesopotamia.** The oldest example here is the mihrāb of the Dāmī al-Khāṣṣātī in Bagdad. It consists of a single marble block 5’ 4” inches high and 3’ 1” broad with a semi-circular niche in it 12” deep. The columns have spiral grooves in them and Corinthian-like capitals upon which the hollow-shell-shaped shell is directly placed without any alabes. The niche, otherwise smooth, has in the central axis a perpendicular strip of ornament as its sole decoration, which is quite devoid of any structural function and is quite in the textile-like style of later Islamic decoration. Herzfeld supposes that this mihrāb was brought by water about 145 A.D. for the newly founded Baghdad from Nāth Syria or Dīyār Bakr and suggests for this and similar mihrābs of Northern Mesopotamia, the similar niches in Christian churches as models (ibid., 1. 35 sqq.). The Khāṣṣātī type of mihrāb is found again in the walls of Aμd, which were built in 297 (910) by al-Muqtadir (M. v. Berchem, *Inscr. Arab. der Safarzeit* coll. by Frh. von Oppenheim: Be Beyh., Prome et Samarra, fig. 43; v. Berchem-Strejowski, *Ameda*, fig. 12, 292, pl. 111 sq.) The change to the pointed arch however took place here probably by the tenth century, certainly in the xiith A.D. Instead of the semicircular we find also flat niches cut out in the form of a rectangle e.g. in the tomb of a holy man in Abū Hurairā (Sarre-Herzfeld, *Arch. Zeit.*, i. 133 sqq.). The use of stucco, which formed the development of the form of the niche in the xiiith century. In the mausoleum of the Forty Faithful (al-ʿAbaṣṣā) in Ṣirṭah there is a stucco mihrāb of 660 (1261–62) with a stepped arch in profile. The tomb of Zainal in Sindjār of about 657 (1258) contains a richly decorated stucco mihrāb completely covered with ornaments and scrolls (*Arch. Reis.*, p. 308 sqq., pl. iv.). This wealth of decoration may in turn have reacted on the niches of stone, as the rich mihrāb of the great mosque of 543 (1148) and other niches in Māzul show (*Arch. K.*, pl. v. xci. xcliii.). In contrast to Persia, stone remained the usual material here. We now find twisted little pillars with vase bases and vase capitals, zigzag arches and richly fluted bands with paneled decorations (mihrāb of Bād- al-Dīn in Māzul). The Muslims otherwise lost their naturalism by turning the spindles-like structure into ornament. The rectangular frame of the arch of the niche completed the adaptation of an originally Hellenistic type to the oriental spirit of architecture. In the vacant field below the arch we here frequently have a musel shell carved in relief. We find variations like the flat rectangular niches with the base of the couch protruding as in the Dāmī al-Omariya (*Arch. K.*, pl. cxxv.). When however we find in Pandjāh ’Ali in Māzul in 868 (1267) i.e. under the Ilkhan Arghu, a polygonal mihrāb with stalactite canopy, we have apparently eastern, ʿṢalṭān influence, which produced the abstract stereometric crystallisation of the details and general form. Their seeming structural function is taken from the flanking pillars by direct continuation around the arch. Finally we may mention the occurrence of corner mihrābs in Mesopotamia when the ʿibāda demanded it and it was not possible to orient the whole building properly. Such exceptions were confined to sepulchral domes (Masḥhad Imām ʿAwān al-Dīn in Māzul; cf. Herzfeld, *Arch. K.*, pl. cxxxi.)

**Syria.** The Mosque of the Omajyads in Damascus has twelve mihrābs in all (cf. the plan by A. Dücke, supplemented by C. Watzinger and K. Wulzinger, *Damasak, Die islamische Stadt*). If systematically studied, they would probably give a conspectus of the development of the mihrāb in Syria. Only the principal mihrāb appears, at least in its architectonic development, if not in its embellishment to go back to the time of the foundation of the mosque. The other niches were put up mainly in the xiiith century and later (*J. A.*, 1890, ser. viii, p. 185). The two favourite styles of decorating the walls in use among Byzantine workmen under Walī were *opus reticulatum* and glass mosaic. They must have been used almost exclusively for the early mosques along with carved mouldings. The description by Ibn Dībārī, who visited the mosque in 580 (1184) i.e. not till after the first great fire of 461 (1069), gives us an idea of the mihrāb as it then was, probably still predominantly Omajyad. The mihrāb wall was covered with marble slabs: the arch of the niche had inscriptions in gilt letters on a blue ground, probably in mosaic, and had a quadrate frame. The wedges between arch and frame were decorated with the famous “vineyard of Wāḥd”, as we may safely assume, in mosaic. The vaulting of the niche was probably adorned in the same way. The frame
of the mihrāb was crowned by a miniature arcading, a motive which with others was taken to Spain (see below) and above this the wall was adorned with views of celebrated towns and trees in mosaic, the Ka'ba in the centre. Remains of these mosaics still survive and the mosaics discovered a few years ago in the mosque by the French give us an idea of the splendour of their decorating. The mihrāb destroyed in the fire of 1863 had a miniature arcading (illustr. in Saladin, Manuel, fig. 35); it had also an arch encircling it above, which also suggests an Omayyad origin. (According to M. Qasri, La mosquée d’el-Walid à Damas et son influence sur l’architecture musulmane d’Occident, R. A., L., where the dependence of the mosque of Cordova on that of Damascus is discussed, in Damascus all arches were originally horseshoe-shaped — and as in the rebuilding — arranged in two stories as we see from old descriptions). Of the mihrāb of the Liyāmi al-Asūr we know that it was covered with marble in 882 (1187) by order of Saladin. It has a wide niche formed of segments, with a pointed arch. The two sets of pillars with acanthus capitals are earlier than Saladin (Saladin, op. cit., fig. 28). Le Bon mentions two peculiar mihrāb niches in the transept of the mosque (La civilisation arabe, p. 148 and fig. 68). Under the Ayyūbid this use of interlacing patterns in stone was popular in Northern Syrian architecture. They are sometimes textile, sometimes rounded interlacings of textile origin which were used on the fronts of doors and prayer niches either in profile or as bands of stone in alternating colours. The decoration of the mihrāb thus received a remarkable stimulus, as the prayer niches of the Madrasa al-Sultāniyya and the Dāmās and Madrasa al-Firdaws of 633 (1235), both in Aleppo, and the mihrāb re-destroyed by Barbars of the Kubbat al-Salisī in Jerusalem shew (picture in Creswell, The Works of Sultan Baibars, B. I. F. A. O., pl. xxvi, pl. 28, 29). Another peculiarity of the Syrian mihrāb is the occasionally found adornment of the vaulting of the niche with it is true very rounded arcs inopus sectile, as an example of which we may take the mihṭāb of the great mosque of Tripoli founded in 693 (1294) (in J. M. F. A. O., vol. xxv. 1909, pl. 5). The later Syrian mihrābs continued the traditional enserating with different coloured marbles to which Turkish influence added the stationalcic conch.

Egypt. The principal mihrāb of the oldest mosque that has survived in Cairo, the mosque of Ahmad b. Tūlūn, is thought to be the original one in its general structure. The mosaic frieze with inscription at the level of the capitals and the marble covering below belong either to the restoration by Kālāb or more probably to that of Lājin. Thus a type was created in Cairo in the middle of the third century which is characterised by the double stepping of the niche with two pillars on each side, in this case taken from old Christian buildings and by the skilful pointed arch and rectangular frame; this form became the Egyptian model. In place of the Neoroman, a niche of the niche was smooth and probably, as in Karawān, painted. The narrow top continued through the Fatimid period while the double recess of the niche with pillars gives all later Cairene mihrābs their character. A stucco mihrāb of the fourth (tenth) century, only the upper third of which has survived in its original form, of which there is a copy in the Arab Museum, had the same structure with two pairs of pillars. The conch was imposed later (Flury, Ein Stockmihrāb des IV. (X.) Jahrhunderts, S. R. P., 1925, fig. 21, ar. K). The stucco mihrāb of the sepulchral mosque of Dārwāza on the Muqattam in Cairo, a century later (478 = 1085) and particularly richly decorated, has a similar niche with a high pointed top (pict. in Flury, Ornamente loc. cit., pl. xvii., Springer, Halbch. d. Ky., vi., fig. 400). It is to be assumed that the original mihrābs of the Fatimid mosques of Hākin and al-Azhar also belonged to this group. The al-Akmar mosque, completed in 519 (1125) introduced a new motif in its façade, which was much imitated in Cairo, the placing of a row of ribs like the corrugation of a shell along the top of the niche. The stucco mihrāb already mentioned, a copy of which is in the Arab Museum, must have been embelished about this time by a musell shell. The mihrāb in the sepulchral chapel of Shadjarat al-Durr [q. v.] the widow of Sultan Sallāh Nadjīm al-Dīn Aṣyūl of c. 648 = 1250 (fig. in R. I. D., Some Cairo Mosques, London 1921, p. 32) shows this fashion in a much more decided and more advanced mugharnasised stage. Such variations were however the exception. On the other hand the stucco mihrāb survived down to the Mamluk period Cresswell, for example, ascribes the stucco mihrāb on the outside of the north wall of the mosque of Aṯm, rebuilt by Sultan Bābars, to the time of Bābars on grounds of style (658—766 = 1260—1277) (The Work of Sultan Baibars, B. I. F. A. O., 1901, 1926). The splendour of the exceedingly thick stucco ornamentation in relief is here increased by the mugharnas in the miniature arcading of the upper part of the niche. Stucco decoration thus reached its last effective possibilities. With the Mongol invasion of Syria, Syrian influence on Egyptian art was renewed (Cairo also benefited by the taking of Miṣr by the Mongols in 653 = 1255 and the resultant migration of the celebrated copper-smiths of Miṣr to Cairo, who had been left behind by the advance of the metal-worker flourished, cf. Creswell, op. cit., p. 182). Syrian influence also brought the Syrian mihrāb overlaid with marble slabs and stone mosaic to Egypt, where it drove out the other types and became predominant. The oldest prayer niches of this new kind appear in the buildings of Kālāb at the end of the viith (ixth) century. The flanking double pillars give them their Gothic grace and elevation. The arches are usually composed of alternating coloured wedge-shaped stones serrated in various ways. The wails of the niches are decorated with mosaic in geometric patterns between miniature arcading and the conch vaulting overlaid with light and dark strips of colour alternating (often zigzag). Exceptionally we also find glass mosaic, as in the masjid of the Maṣrijāt of Kālāb. Under the late rulers of the Cemal-Shahs, the decoration of the niche reached its height. The inlaying was done with all kinds of costly materials such as mother-of-pearl, turquoise, agates, ivory (Madrasa of Al-Abī Bakr b. Muḥṣir and al-Chāri; cf. Briggs, Muh. Arch., fig. 110 and 127).

A small group by itself is formed by the three portable mihrābs of the viith (ixth) century from al-Azhar, Saiyida Kuṣayya and Saiyida Naṣīsa which are now preserved in the Arab Museum. Maqbiḥ. The history of the mihrāb in the
western lands of Islam begins with the prayer niche in the great mosque of Kairawân. It was not the direct model for the later mihrâb—this was reserved for the portal of the library of the mosque—but with its wide semi-circular niche and the slightly rounded but still pointed arch it forms the transition to the western form of the niche. The pillars of motled red and yellow stone rest on late antique bases and support pseudo-byzantine porphyry capitals the abaciues of which are decorated with Kufic inscriptions. The wall of the niche is covered with marble slabs, some perforated, some carved in relief, the frames of which also bear inscriptions. Belund is a recess. The vaulting of the niche still shows traces of having been painted with vine tendrils arranged in curicular patterns, which remind one of Mshatta (pictures in G. Marqâs, *Coudeil et plaisons de la Grande Mosquée de Kairouan*, 1925, pl. viii.). The frieze separating the recess and the vaulting of the niche, and the surrounding walls are covered with the famous lustre tiles made, some in Bagdad and some by a Bagdad artist in Tunis, and presented in 284 (854) by Ishaq b. Aghlab. This remarkable mihrâb of the early period, when Islam was still in search of a style, thus contains all that the empire could prove in decoration, sculpture, painting, both richly brightened by gold and shining tiles. The fully developed western style is found a century later in the mihrâb of the Mosque in Cordoba. This mihrâb, built by Hâkim II about 970, consists of an isolated heptagonal space 12 feet broad and 23 to 26 feet high. One side is formed by the wall containing the door. The floor and walls are covered with rectangular pieces of white marble, above are a frieze of inscriptions and the cornice, on which a richly carved niche wall with clover leaf arch on marble pillars with gilt capitals forms the upper part, which again terminates in a richly decorated frieze and is covered by a single piece of marble in the shape of a mussel shell. In the inscription on the outer wall the artist is mentioned "the work of Badr b. al-Khiyâl." The historically important part here is the entrance wall to this chamber, which consists of a horseshoe-arch gateway with rectangular frames and miniature arcading at the top. This form of wall, which now becomes typical for mihrâb andportal walls in most lands of the Maghreb and shows its own course of development, has been traced to the portal wall of the library of the great mosque in Kairawân as the earliest model, or both go back to a common Syrio-Sasan original (cf. Marqâs, *Manuel*, i. 264 sq.). In Cordoba we meet with a special shape of the mihrâb recess, the origin of which is doubtless different from that of the niche and goes back to an original with special functions connected with the cult of relics and of the dead. According to tradition, a relic of the Prophet was actually preserved in this space and the believers used to pay reverence to it in a sevenfold circumambulation. A quite singular, similar, isolated mihrâb is found in the madrasa in Khargird, Khurasân (cf. Mahâjir and below Persia). (Whether here we have the influence of the *pradakshina* of the Indian cult of relics cannot be settled. The circumambulation of altars, tombs of saints, and other sacred objects was of course a widespread custom in northern lands also) Horseshoe-arches, multiple rectangular border and miniature arcade are the typical elements of the henceforth canonical mihrâb wall. The wedge-shaped stones of the horse-shoe arch are not serrated in complicated fashion, as in Egypt and Syria, but usually alternate in colour and are all smooth, as in Cordoba, or alternately smooth and carved in relief. In Cordoba the spandrels are still filled with palmbranches and acanthus-like tendrils in relief and the two borders decorated with Kufic inscriptions (cf. R. Amador de los Ríos, *Inscriptio arabes de Cordoba*, Madrid 1894). The niches of the miniature arcading with clover-leaf arches are covered with mosaic (pict. in E. Kühnel, *Maurische Kunst*, K. ii., O., pl. 13, 14). The wall of the pentagonal mihrâb niche in the great mosque of Tlemes of about 1125 A.D. is similarly formed (pict. in Kühnel, *op. cit.*, pl. 24). But we already find here in the spandrels the isolated rosettes which first appear on the mihrâb of the Aljaferia in Saragossa of the second half of the eleventh century (pict. in Marqâs, *Manuel*, fig. 215). The mihrâb wall of the Almohad mosque in Tin-mal in the Atlas (1153 A.D. shows, instead of the tendrils, a woven pattern such as is often found on carpets (pict. in Marqâs, *op. cit.*, fig. 216); and in place of the miniature arcading we find windows alternating with flat niches. A divergence from the canonical type is found in the mihrâb of the mosque in Tozeur built in 590 (1194) in the oasis of Djerid (pict. in Marqâs, *op. cit.*, fig. 218). It has a double arch and profuse ornamentation, on the wall of the niche also. Marqâs explains the divergence by saying that the mosque was built by a conqueror of Almoravid descent in the Almohad period by workmen from Andalus. The niche bears the stamp of hurried improvisation. The mihrâb here reproduced, in the Sidi Oghâ mosque in the Sibân oasis at Biskra which is considered the oldest mosque in Algeria, may be regarded as an example more in the popular tradition, therefore particularly interesting. The date is unknown. The decoration belongs to the field of Khânqâh-i. Under the dynasties which succeeded the Almohads from the xii.—xvth century the Cordoba type remains the model in principle. Only the proportions are more slender, the horseshoe arches more elegant and, instead of the miniature arcading, windows with coloured glass in a stucco framework have become naturalised. The isolated mihrâb chambers have given place to semicircular or polygonal niches. Examples are the maḥrâb of the mosques in Taza, Sidi el Yazid and al-Ulâd in and near Tlemes, in Fas and the Hamra of Granada. The latter covered with mosaic (pict. in Marqâs, *op. cit.*, fig. 336—338 and P. Ricard, pl. xiii.). In Tunis of the xv.—xvith century also the mihrâb with flat round niche and horseshoe-arch of alternately coloured and ornamented stones and rectangular frame continued to predominate. The plinths are usually covered with marble tiles, while the niche vaulings are slatted like a mussel shell.

Persia, Turkestan, Afghanistan. The two earliest prayer niches in Persia, so far as is known, are at the mosque at Noyin, east of Isfahân, of the x.—xii. century A.D. (Viollet and Flury, in *Syria*, 1921, pl. xxx. and S. Flury, in *Syria*, 1923) and in the *Zâbah* at Khargird, Khurasân, of the x.—xvith century (Diez, *Chrsanatische Baudenk-mär*, pl. 30).

In spite of their different ornamentation, these
Fig. 1 Mihrab of a Mosque in Tahsin.

Fig. 2 Mihrab of the Sidi 'Ukba Mosque in Kairawan.

Fig. 3 Mihrab of the Mosque in Sidi 'Ukba
(Ziban oasis, Algeria).
Fig. 4. Mihrab of the Ahmed ib. Talun Mosque in Cairo.

Fig. 5. Mihrab of the Mu'aiyad Mosque in Cairo.

Fig. 6. Wooden mihrab from the Saijida Naffa Mosque in Cairo (Arab Museum).

Fig. 7. Mihrab from Bidjapur (1636 A.D.).
Fig. 8. Mihrāb of the Djawhār Shād Mosque in Meshhed.

Fig. 9. Mihrāb of the Ulujalut Khudābanda Mosque in Iṣfahān (1310 A. D.).

Fig. 11. Mihrāb of a Mosque in Iṣfahān (xviith century A. D.).
Fig. 10. Persian frieze with lustre decoration.
two stucco mihrābs are very similar. Both are rectangular niches flanked by inset 3/4 pillars with leaf capitals, with pointed arches diagonally set and thickly decorated with tendrils in a rectangular frame. The back wall under the arch presents a repetition of the architecture of the niche so that we have a niche in a niche. In Persia therefore, if Flury is right in his early dating, perhaps as early as the third (nineth) century, a rich double framed style of mihrāb had been developed, which lasted down to the xivth century, as is shown by the next surviving monument of this group, the stucco mihrāb in the Masjīd-i Djam'a in Isfahān of 710 (1310) (Diez, K. d. isl. Volker, p. 109, 2nd ed., p. 85). In the interval however the decoration, as yet purely floral, had become mainly epigraphic, a transition that can be followed step by step from the xivth century. The stucco mihrāb of the mosque of Dijārāš in the Mukaţjam in Cairo of 478 (1085) is also of importance for this sequence of development (pict. in Flury, Ornamenta etc., pl. xvii).

But in Persia a second type developed alongside of the stucco mihrāb, the mihrāb decorated with lustre faience, with which this part of the decoration of the mosque and with it Persian faience reached its zenith. The lustre mihrāb of Kāshān of 624 (1226) in Berlin (pict. in Springer's Kunstgeschichte, v. 438) and a similar niche from Warāmin in the possession of the firm of Kelekian (Cat. of the Exhib. of Persian Art, London 1931) may be quoted as examples. These mihrābs show the same double niches as their stucco counterparts but are flatter, more framework than niche. In place of the curved arch, the canopy is a rectilinear gable, a change in shape probably mainly due to the material. The colours are predominantly a light blue ground with letters in dark blue relief and decorations in brown lustre. By the combined effect of the colours and the profuse ornamentation, these mihrābs have a truly fairlike suggestion and reach the highest ideal of Islamic decorative art. The mihrāb assumed a new form in the Timūrid period. Instead of the semi-circular or flat rectangular niche we now find under Turkish influence the polygonal 'pentagon constructed out of an octagon - of larger dimensions than previously, broader and deeper. The ornamentation proceeds parallel with the usual Timūrid wall decoration. In the same way the plinth is covered breast-high with polygonal tiles and the walls above usually with flat miniature arcing, which pass into vaulted mahārāna painted or covered with tiles. Finally the frames and the scrolls of inscription filling them are frequently inlaid with that finely executed tile-mosaic which forms the glory of Timūrid architectural ornament. As examples may be mentioned the mihrābs in the praying chambers of the madrasa in Khargīrd (Diez, Chir. Bandkämmer, pl. 33, 1), the mihrāb of Žiyād Abī Walīd near Herāt (Niedermeyer-Diez, Afghānistan, fig. 174), the splendid prayer niche in the mosque of Djiwarādāne in Mashhad (Diez, K. d. isl. Volker, v. fig. 146 and 108) all of the xivth (xvith) century. The mihrāb in the splendid medrese in Herāt, now destroyed, must have been similar to that in Meshhed, here reproduced, having been founded by the same princess and probably built by the same architect (cf. above ill. p. 387b). In the Safawīd period, we find alongside of mihrābs with mosaic and mahārāna also painted niches, which show intertwining tendrils standing out in white from a brick red ground. Mihrābs like this are to be seen in the ruins of the Musalla outside Isfahān and in Reshāh, Khurāsān (fig. Diez, Chir. Bandkämmer, pl. 22, 3). They seem to have been very widely disseminated. It may be mentioned in conclusion that in place of a prayer niche in the Kišī-iwān of the Timūrid madrasa in Khargīrd, there is a rectangular windowless niche, accessible by a doorway through the iwan. The similarity with the mihrāb chambers frequently found in the Magḥrib is remarkable and is discussed under Spain.

In India. No mosques earlier than the xivth century have survived in India. In the mosques of the xivth-xvith centuries the prayer niche is in Indian fashion, that is to say flanked by decorated Indian pillars and adorned with Indian ornamentation. The gable-shaped panels over the niches are particularly ornamental. The wall of the niche is usually adorned in relief with a lotus rosette and a pendant vase out of which grow tendrils. Numerous niches of this kind are to be found in mosques of Gudjārat and Ahmadābād of the xivth-xvith centuries. An Indian peculiarity is the placing of three to five, sometimes even seven mihrābs in the kišīa wall in keeping with the architectonic units of the main building, each marked by a dome (Djumī Masjīd in Bhoresh, and Champaner, Gudjārat etc.). There are also mosques with mihrāb chambers, which we can assume with Havelot to be adaptations of the former cells for idol- (Dhokla, Gudjārat, Khāns Masjīd and Ahmadābād). It is therefore not impossible that isolated mihrāb chambers outside of India, as in Khargīrd, Persia, or even in the Magḥrib, should be traced to Indian influence, although this feature is not found in the earliest mosques in Adjmūr and Delhi. In Gudjārat however these chambers might have been used as mihrābs in the oldest mosque and provinces with a sea coast and international trade may have had influence abroad (cf. Arch. Survey of India, Western India, vol. vii, viii, Gudjārat, Ahmadābād). When Persian influence began to be felt under the Mughal emperors, the Indian elements gradually disappeared from the mihrābs and their place was taken by the polygonal niche in the wall incruste with coloured marble. Under Akbār Indian detail still survived. The back of the mihrāb of the great mosque in Fathpur Sikri, for example, are edged with a lacemwork of carved palmette friezes; the material is stone but the inlay work imitates the Persian tiled mihrāb (pict. in V. A. Smith, A History of Fine Art in India and Diez, K. d. isl. Volker, p. 229 and p. 141). In the court mosques of Agra and Delhi we find dazzling white marble mihrābs with coloured intarsia of flowers. The most splendid mihrāb in India and indeed in all the lands of Islam is the niche of the Friday mosque in Bhoresh, the former capital of the Ādī Shāhs in the Dehkan. The only rival that it can ever have had is Walī's mihrāb in Damascus. Framed by a gigantic arch resting on double pillars, the pentagonal niche recess constructed out of an octagon goes deep into the wall on whose surfaces the motif of the niche is three times repeated. The central of the three niche areas is mysteriously marked by a gilt eight-pointed star as the real kišīa. In gigantic letters of gold the two sacred names Allah and Muhammad in the spandrels of the arch impress themselves on the hearts of the worshipper, and chime in
afresh in the drumshaped flanking pillars, which, in Bijdâpûr decoration are frequently used as conventional ornament but are here of structural importance. Manâras and sepulchral domes crown the structure and their principal motive is again a niche in the centre. This imposing decoration is carried out in shallow relief and is painted with red, blue and black colours heightened with gold. In the rectangular fields on both sides and in the arches are inscriptions on bands and in medallions of which we give Cousens translation of one because it sums up Muslim philosophy in a nutshell: *Place no trust in life: it is but brief*. *There is no rest in this transitory world*. *The world is very pleasing to the senses*. *Life is the best of all gifts but it is not lasting*. *Malik Yağûb, a servant of the mosque and the slave of Sultan Muhammad, completed the mosque*. *This gilding and ornamental work was done by order of the Sultan Muhammad 'Abîd Shâh, 1045* (1636 A.D.).

Asia Minor, Armenia and Turkey. The mihrâb took a development quite of its own among the Seldûiks of Rûm. Instead of the descendant of the high, Hellenistic round niche, we find here a prayer niche which rather resembles a hearth and is probably to be explained as an adaptation of the prayer carpet to this form of building. The appearance of these niches, which are thus of no structural significance, is however made up for by their stereochemically crystal-lined cone-shaped vaulting formed of cells. The Turkish art of the Seldûiks brought as its dowry to the art of the Muslim world the Muğharat, the suggestion of which, it in turn owed to Buddhist art, for the Seldûiks came from Central Asia where Buddhist art had long prevailed. During the short period of Seldûik architecture in Asia Minor, the xiiith century, the form of the niches remained unaltered. They are low rectangular shallow niches with pillars built in without bases, which bear rhombohedral crystal bodies as capitals and come to a point with the conical cells of the vaulting. The spandrils and frames are inlaid with the usual Seldûik white, blue and black tile mosaic (pict. in Löytved, Sarre, Springer-Kuhnle and Dicz, *op. cit.*). The most important change undergone by this early Turkish mihrâb in Ottoman architecture was the raising of the supporting niche to its full height. The niche assumed polygonal form, i.e., it has three or five surfaces constructed out of the octagon, such as we find in India and Persia from the xvith century; it was however raised higher and was, more slender and regularly ends in a mugharat cone. The decoration consists mainly of marble and Turkish tiles. A moulded tinfoil frieze formed the usual framework for the whole. The combination of Byzantine and early Turkish elements, the hard forms and a certain rationalism in execution give these mihrâbs that cold appearance which is peculiar to Ottoman art.

Worthy of mention is the splendid mihrâb of the Ulû Djami in Wân in the Persian style with mosaics of glazed brick terracotta reliefs and inscriptions; a niche with a mugharat (xiiith—xixith centuries, pict. in Bachmann, *Kirden und Moschtes in Armenia*, pl. 62).


(E. Diez)

**MIHRBAN,** the name given by Muslim writers to the Indus (Sanskrit Sindha), called by the Greeks Sindâs and *Sindos*, by the Romans *Sindus* and *Indus*, and by early Muslim writers *Ab-i Sind* (the Water of Sind). The name is more particularly applied to the lower reaches of the river, after it enters Sind. Flury writes of "Indus, incolis Sindus appellatus". The Indus rises in 32° N. and 81° E., receives the Kâbul river almost opposite to Atak, and the Pandjâb, the accumulated waters of the five rivers of the Pandjâb, just above Mîhanhatk. Near Kash- mor, in 28° 20' N. and 69° 47' E., the river enters Sind, and below Bakkar is locally known as Daryâ, "the Sea". It falls into the Arabian Sea in 23° 58' N. and 67° 30' E. Its drainage basin is estimated at 372,700 square miles and its length at a little over 1,800 miles.

The courses of the Indus and its tributaries have undergone, even in historical times, extensive changes of which it is impossible to give details in this article, and which have misled historians who have disregarded them. They have been minutely and elaborately described in *J. A. S. P.*, vol. Ixi. (1892) by the late Major H. G. Raverty, who has illustrated his scholarly monograph by a series of admirable maps.

(T. W. Hâig)

**MIHRGÂN.** [See MIHR.]

**MIHR KHATUN** (originally Mihr-i Mîh), an important Turkish poetess of the end of the xvith and beginning of the xixith centuries. She belonged to Amâsia, which produced a number of poets, and spent her whole life there. She was one of the family of Pir Ilyâs. Her father was a kâdji and wrote poetry under the makûlîs of Belâî. She inherited from him her poetic gifts and also
received from him the poetic and theological training ascribed to her by Ewliyya.

Not much is known of her life. This is in part to be explained by the reticence of the East regarding women. That in the East boys rather than girls are sung of in love songs is due not so much to a preponderance of paederasty as to a disinclination to talk of women at all. She died in 912 (1506). Her tomb in Amasia is a place of pilgrimage. She belonged to the literary circle of prince Ahmad, the second son of Sulthan Bayazid, who was governor of Amasia in 886–918 (1481–1512). Of a circumcision festival in the konak of the prince in 914 (1505), it is recorded that Mihrī was the chief of the poets present.

In spite of the love affairs credited to her and sung by her (with Iskender, son of Sinan Paşa, with Mu'inayyid-zade [born 850 = 1456] and others), the Turkish biographers emphasize besides her beauty her virgin life, in spite of the glowing fervour with which she described her nights of love. Her nature was evidently not quite clearly understood by the tekkeredd. Contrary to the Oriental custom, Mihrī remained unmarried in spite of many wooers. It is not improbable that the experiences described by her are not quite inventions but evidence of her passionate nature which drove her to unfeathered love. Mihrī's great merit is that she did not suppress her femininity, so that in her poems she reveals a truly womanly soul. In this respect, she is the most personal among Turkish poets.

As a woman she found it doubly difficult, in view of the restrictions on her sex at the time, to win a place as a poet, as the study of the Persian poets was absolutely necessary for this. The energy with which she managed to achieve her aim is remarkable. Her chief model was Nadjattî (d. 914 = 1509), the most important poet of the period, with whom she tried to compete. Most of her pieces are written in Nadjattî's manner. She is not very original, but very few Turkish poets are. In language and in images she is conventional. But her freshness, directness and passionate feeling, in which no other poetess equals her, are remarkable. Her eloquence and brilliant style were proverbial.

She left a Divan (edition in preparation by Martinovitch) and several treatises in rhyme. A number of her poems have been made accessible to us by Smirnov. According to Ewliyya's statement (in MSS, not in the printed text), she also composed risâla's on fik and farâ'id.


(TH. MENZEL)

MIKAL, the archangel Michael [cf. Mal'k'i], whose name occurs once in the Kur'an, viz. in sûra ii. 92: "Whosoever is an enemy to Allah, or his angels, or his apostles, or to Gabriel, and verily Allah is an enemy to the unbelievers."

In explanation of this verse two stories are told. According to the first, the Jews, wishing to test the veracity of the mission of Muhammad, asked him several questions, on all of which he gave the true answer. Finally they asked him who transmitted the revelations to him. When he answered, Gabriel, the Jews declared that this angel was their enemy and the angel of destruction and penury, in opposition to Michael whom they said to be their protector and the angel of fertility and salvation (Tabari, Tafsir, i. 324 sqq.). — According to the second story, 'Umar once entered the synagogue (miyârâ) of Madina and asked the Jews questions concerning Gabriel. They gave of that angel as well as of Michael an account similar to the one mentioned above, whereupon 'Umar asked: What is the position of those two angels with Allah? They replied: Gabriel is to His right and Michael to His left hand, and there is enmity between the two. Whereupon 'Umar answered: If they have that position with Allah, there can be no enmity between them. But you are unbelievers more than asses are, and whosoever is an enemy to one of the two, is an enemy to Allah Thereupon 'Umar went to meet Muhammad, who received him with the words: Gabriel has anticipated you by the revelation of: "Whosoever is an enemy" etc. (sûra ii. 92; Tabari, Tafsîr, iii. 327; Zamakhshari, p. 92; Badawi ad sûra n. 91).

We do not know of any Jewish traditions which ascribe to Gabriel a hostile attitude towards the Jews. For the statements regarding Michael as confirmed above, there is sufficient literary evidence. In Daniel x. 1 Michael is called the great prince, the protector of the people of Israel; cf. Targum Conti- cutum, viii. 9: "Michael, the lord of Israel"; Daniel x. 13, 21 where Michael is said to have protected the Jews against the kings of Persia and Greece; further 1 Enoch xx. 5 where he is called the protector of the best part of mankind; Testamentum Levi, xv. 6; Test. Dan., vi. 2.

In Vita Adae et Evae, chap. xii. 294, it is Michael who orders Satan and the other angels to worship Adam. Although the story is mentioned several times in the Kur'an [cf. 113.1], there is no trace in Muslim literature of the role ascribed to Michael in Vita Adae et Evae; the only mention of Michael in the Muslim legend is that he and Gabriel were the first to worship Adam, in opposition to Iblis who refused to do so (al-Kisa'), p. 27).

Neither does Muslim literature seem to have preserved other features ascribed to Michael in Jewish Apocrypha (mediator between God and mankind, 1 Enoch xli. 9; Test. Dan., vii. vii. 2: 3 Baruch, xli. 2), or in the New Testament (Eph. Jude, vs. 9: Michael disputing with the devil about the body of Moses; Revelation xii. 7 sqq.). Michael and his angels
flying against the dragon and the final discomfiture of the latter). Perhaps a faint recollection of Michael as the protector of mankind (the Jews, the Christians) may be found in the tradition according to which Michael has never laughed since the creation of Hell (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 224). Further, however, Michael is rarely mentioned in hadith (Tukhrî, Bad' al-Kalâb, b. 7, where he, together with Malik, the guardian of Hell, and Gabriel, appears to Muhammad in a dream; Nasâ'i, Isritžâh, b. 37 where Michael incites Gabriel to urge Muhammad to recite the Kur'ân according to seven āhruf). "Ya'kubî mentions a story of which we have no counterpart in Jewish or Christian literature either, which is not amusing, the story bearing an outspoken Shi'ite tendency. One day Allâh announced to Gabriel and Michael that one of them must die. Neither however was willing to sacrifice himself in behalf of his partner, whereupon Allâh said to them: Take 'Ali as an example, who was willing to give his life on behalf of Muhammad (the night before the hijrata; Ya'kubî, ii. 39).

Michael is further mentioned by name as one of the angels who opened the breast of Muhammad before his night journey (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i, 1157-59; Ibn al-Ajurî, ed. Tornberg, ii. 36 sq.), and as one of those who came to the aid of the Muslims in the battle of Badr ( Ibn Sa'd, ii, 9-19).

In the text of the Kur'ân as well as in a verse cited by Tabari (ed. de Goeje, i. 320), the form of the name is Mikl as if it were a mîf'al form from wakal (Horovitz). A direct reminiscence of the Greek, probably also of the Hebrew and Aramaic, forms of the name is to be found in the tradition preserved by al-Kisa'i (p. 12), which calls Miklî the attendant of the second heaven, in contradistinction to Miklî, who is the guardian of the sea in the seventh heaven (p. 15). Other forms of the name are Miklî, Miklîl, Miklîl, Miklîn and Miklîl. It is hardly necessary to say that in the magical use of the names of the archangels that of Miklî is on the same level as that of his companions (e.g. Zwemer, The Influence of Animism on Islam, p. 193, 197).


MIKÂT (mîf'al form from wk-l-t, plural ma/wâkit) appointed or exact time. In this sense the term occurs several times in the Kur'ân (sura ii. 185; vi. 138, 139, 154; xxvi. 37; xlv. 40; lxi. 50; lxxviii. 17). In hadith and 'îqâm the term is applied to the times of prayer and to the places where those who enter the haram are bound to put on the thürâm. For the latter meaning of the term cf. hirâm, 1.

Although some general indications for the times at which some âlaqas are to be performed occur in the Kur'ân (cf. sura ii. 239; xi. 116; xvii. 80; xxiv. 29), it may be considered above doubt that during Muhammad's lifetime neither the number of the daily âlaqas nor their exact times had been fixed and that this happened in the first decades after his death.

A reminiscence of that period of uncertainty may be preserved in those traditions which apply a deviating nomenclature to some of the âlaqas. The âlaqat al-ṣuhr e.g. is called al-hadîd al-ṣuhr; the âlaqat al-maghrib, 'îsha'; the âlaqat al-išrâ, 'atama; the 'alaqat al-fajr, ghadî'at (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit al-Šâlat, bâb 13, 19). In other traditions the term al-ʿatama as applied to the âlaqat al-išrâ is ascribed to the Beduins and prohibited (Muslim, Masâ'idj, trad. 228, 229; Abû Dâwûd, Ṣaḥîh, bâb 78; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Masâ'idj, ii. 10 etc.); cf. on the other hand Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, bâb 20; Muslim, Šâlat, trad. 129 etc., where the term ʿatama is used without censure.

From some traditions so much may be gathered, that the — or at least some of the — Unayjads showed a predilection for postponing the times of the âlaqat (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 7; Muslim, Masâ'idj, trad. 166, 167; al-Nasâ'i, Imâma, b. 18, 55; Zaid b. 'Ali, Maḏmûn al-Fishâ, No. 113).

In opposition to this a âlaqat in due time is declared the best of works (Bukhârî, Ṣaḥîh, b. 1; Mawwâkit, b. 5; Muslim, Imâma, trad. 138, 139; Tirmidhî, Šâlat, b. 15; Birr, b. 2). In other traditions this is said of a âlaqat at its earliest time (Tirmidhî, Šâlat, b. 13).

This early state of things is reflected in several respects in a tradition according to which Umâr b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz once postponed one of the âlaqas and was rebuked for this by ʿUrwa b. al-Zubair, who related to him that al-Mughîra b. Shu'ba had once been rebuked for the same reason by Abû Masâd al-Ansârî, on account of the fact that Gabriel himself had descended five times in order to perform the five âlaqas at their exact times in the presence of Muhammad. Thereupon Umâr admonished ʿUrwa to be careful in his statements (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 1; Muslim, Masâ'idj, trad. 160, 167; al-Nasâ'i, Mawwâkit, b. 10).

Some early groups of traditions affect to reproduce reminiscences of the practice in Medina in Muhammad's time.

a. The âlaqat al-ṣuhr was performed at noon, when the sun was beginning to decline (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 11).

b. the âlaqat al-ʿāshr when the sun was shining into ʿÎsha's room, no shadows being yet cast there (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 13; Muslim, Masâ'idj, trad. 168). After this âlaqat people had still time to visit the remotest parts of the town, while the sun was still "alive" or "pure" (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 1, 13, 14, 18, 21).

c. the âlaqat al-maghrib was performed at a time when people could still perceive the places where their arrows fell down (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 21).

d. the âlaqat al-išrâ was sometimes postponed till a late hour, sometimes till the first third of the night had passed (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 11, 20, 21, 24).

e. the âlaqat al-fajr was performed by Muhammad at a time when a man could discern his neighbour (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 13); but the women on their way home could not yet be recognised (Bukhârî, Mawwâkit, b. 27).

In a second layer of traditions these general indications are specified by the mention of the first and the last limits allowed for the different
prayers (cf. e.g. Muslim, *Masūqīd*, trad. 176, 177). On one day Muḥammad performed:

a. the *ṣalāt al-ṣuhr* when the sun began to decline;

b. the *ṣalāt al-‘aṣr* when the sun was still high, white and pure;

c. the *ṣalāt al-maghrib* immediately after sunset;

d. the *ṣalāt al-‘idā* when the twilight had disappeared;

e. the *ṣuhr* at daybreak. On the following day Muḥammad performed:

a. the *ṣuhr* later than the day before;

b. the *‘aṣr* later than the day before, the sun being still high up;

c. the *maghrib* before the twilight had disappeared;

d. the *‘idā* when the first third of the night had passed;

e. the *fajr* when sunrise was near (asfara bikhā).

In a tradition communicated by al-Shāhī (Kitāb al-Cmm, i. 62) the fixing of the mawākiṭ just mentioned is ascribed to the example of Gabriel (cf. Zaid b. ‘Ali, *Maghārīr al-Fīlqh*, No. 109). These mawākiṭ have for the most part passed into the books of *fīḥh*. We cannot reproduce all details here. The following scheme may suffice:

a. *ṣuhr*: from the time the sun begins to decline till the time when shadows are of equal length with the objects by which they are cast, apart from their shadows at noon. The Ḥanafites alone deviate in one of their branches in so far as they place the ultimate term by the time when the shadows are twice as large as their objects. In times of great heat it is recommended to postpone the *ṣuhr* as late as possible;

b. *‘aṣr*: from the last time allowed for *ṣuhr* till sunset. According to Mālik the first term begins somewhat later;

c. *maghrib*: from the time after sunset till the time when the red twilight has disappeared. Small deviations only, in connection with a predilection for the first term;

d. *‘idā*: from the last term mentioned for the *ṣalāt al-maghrib* till when a third, or half of the night has passed, or: till daybreak;

e. *fajr*: from daybreak till before sunrise.

Side by side with these mawākiṭ we find in the books of *Ṭabīʿah* and *Law* the times on which it is not allowed to perform prayer, viz. sunrise, noon, and sunset (Bukhārī, *Mawākīt*, b. 30–32; Muslim, *Ṣalāt al-Musāfīrīn*, trad. 285–294; cf. al-Nawawī's commentary for controversies regarding this point, and further Wensiack, A *Handbuch* of Early Mkh. Trad., p. 192a). According to *Aḥṣa* it is only forbidden to await sunrise and sunset for prayer (Muslim, *Musāfīrīn*, trad. 296). In Makkah prayer is allowed at all times (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṯi, b. 73; Tirmīḏi, Ḥadīṯi, b. 42).


**MĪKĀṬ AL-SABBĀʾ, an Arabic author**

born of Catholic parents in Akko in 1784, was educated in Damascus and then came to Egypt. Here he joined the French expedition, had to leave the country with them and came to Paris. The State printing works employed him as a proof-reader and the Bibliothèque Nationale as a copyist of Oriental manuscripts; his irregular habits prevented him leading a comfortable or settled existence, although de Sacy and his pupils appreciated his thorough knowledge of his mother tongue. He himself only used it to compose ḥaṣīdas in the old style in praise of great men of the period and to make some money thereby. For example in 1805 he addressed a poem to the Grand Juge when he visited the printing works, in 1805 to Pope Pius VII, in 1810 to Napoleon on his marriage, in 1811 to the Pope of Rome, in 1814 to Louis XVIII. These poems were printed at the government press, those to Pius VII with a Latin translation by de Sacy, that to Louis XVIII with a French one by Granget de Lagrange. He also published a work on carrier pigeons entitled Kitāb Maʿṣūhabat al-Sīkāw wa ʿl-Ghamām fī Ṣalāt al-Hamām. La colonne messagère, plus rapide que l'éclair, plus prompte que la nue, par M. S. traduit de l'Arabe en français par Silv. de Sacy, Paris 1805; based on the preceding: Die blitzgeschwinden Brießpfosten, oder sinnvolle Kunst des Orients, Tauben zum Bestellen der Briefe abzurücken, nach dem Arab. des M. S. Herborn 1806; Beschreibung der Kunst der Tauben post, welche seit der Zeit der Erleuchtung gebrächt wird, aus dem Arab. von Dr. Th. J. K. Arnold, Frankfurt 1817; La colonne messagère role più del lampo, trad. di S. A. Catanese, Milano 1822; Die Briefbrust schneller als die Blitze, aus dem Arab. von C. Lepre, Strassburg 1879. — He lived in manuscript a history of the Arab desert tribes of Syria, a history of Syria and Egypt and, important for its lexicographical information: al-Kiṭāb al-fāmāma wa Ḥalām al-ʿAmma wa ʿl-Maṣūhabat fī al-Wāḥīl al-Kulām al-dāriḍ, M S. Grammatik der arab. Umgangssprache in Syrien und Agypten, nach der Munchener Hs. heraus. von II. Thorbecke, Strassburg 1886.

**Bibliography:** Hunter, Anthology Arabic, p. 291 sqq; *Biographie Universelle*, xxxix. 427. (C. Brockelmann)

**MĪKĀṬ-OL-GHUL, an old Ottoman noble family.** This family traces its descent to the feudual lord Köse Mīkāṭ 'Abd Allāh, originally a Greek (cf. F. A. Geoffroy in Ch. Schefer, *Petit traité de l'origine des Turcs par Th. Spankow Cuca- casien*, Paris 1666, p. 267; L'oriz dedisce Grece etat nommé Michalian... Du: Michalos sont descen- dancs les Michalezis), who appears in the reign of ʿOthmān I as lord of Chirmenika (Khirmandjik) at the foot of Olympus near Edrensos, and later as an ally of the first Ottoman ruler earned great merit for his share in the latter's expansion (cf. J. v. Hammer, in G.O.R. ii. 48, 57, following Idris Bitlis and Nešić). Converted to Islam, Köse Mīkāṭ appears again in the reign of ʿOthmān's son Erkan. The rank of the family of the kümmīs [q.v.] became hereditary in the family of Köse Mīkāṭ,
which is even said to have been related to the royal house of Savoy and of France (cf. Paolo Giovio: *Michaloghi di sangue Turchesco e per via di doni si fa parente del Duca di Savoia e del Re di Francia*; in this case Mikhāl [Maksā] alias Kose Mkhāl must have been descended from the Palaeologi; cf. J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.* i. 584), and along with the Malkoč-Oghlu (properly Malković, i.e. Marković), the Ewrenos-Oghlu [q. v.], Timurtash-Oghlu [q. v.] and Turašan-Oghlu [q. v.] was among the most celebrated of the noble families of the early Ottoman empire. Kose Mkhāl, called ʿAbd Allāh, died in Adrianople and was buried in the mosque founded there by him in the western Yildırım quarter. As Adrianople was certainly not conquered till 1361, see F. Babinger, in *M.O.C.* ii. 311) he must therefore have lived into the reign of Murād I. What J. H. Mordtmann has said in the article ʿEwrenos [q. v.] would therefore be true about his remarkably long life. Kose Mkhāl had two sons, namely Mehemmed Beg and Yakhshī (Bakhshī?) of whom only the former acquired some renown. He was vizier under Māsā Celebi and a close friend of Sheik Bedr al-Dīn of Siwa (q. v.). Under Māsā he was Beglerbeg of Rūmeli, and died in 825 (1422) at Isığk at the hand of the judge Tādż al-Din-Oghlu and is said to have been buried at Feleva in Bulgaria (cf. Euliya Celebi, *Siyāḥat-

The following genealogical table shows the order of succession of the Mkhāl-Oghlus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʿAbd Allāh, called Kose Mkhāl, son of &quot;Axız&quot;, d. at Adrianople, buried in his own mosque there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi Mehemmed-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 826 at Isığk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi Yakhshī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 816 at Buğar-Ḥiṣār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi Khidr-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 870 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buried in Adrianople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi &quot;Ali-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fell at Vilcab 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi Iskender-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi Half-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghāzi ʿAli-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleiman-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥmed Čelebi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khādīr-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurkūṭ-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinān-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barak-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāsim-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khādīr-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleiman-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muştafa-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikender-Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemmed-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khādīr-Pasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlī-Beg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the genealogy published by Ismāʿīl Ḥakki, *Kiλbeler* (Stambul 1345 = 1927), p. 25 which is based on a *Sīlātenāme* in the Ewāfī- of *Waṣīfīye Deyṣerī*, NR. 247, in Siwa, the genealogy of the Mkhāl-Oghlus is as follows:

| Ghāzi Mkhāl-Beg |
| ʿAlī-Beg |
| Mehemmed-Beg |
| Yahyā-Beg |
| Khādīr-Pasha |
| Mehemmed-Pasha |
| Yurkūṭ-Pasha |
| Sinān-Beg |
| Barak-Beg |
| Kāsim-Beg |
| Mehemmed-Pasha |
| Khādīr-Beg |
| Suleiman-Pasha |
| ʿAlī-Beg |
| Mehemmed-Pasha |
| Muştafa-Beg |
| Ikender-Beg |
| Mehemmed-Pasha |
| Khādīr-Pasha |
| ʿAlī-Beg |

If we compare the article *Yurkūṭ Pasha* in 1, where the descendants of this general are given, *Mehemmed Suraiya*, *Sīlāte-i ʾosmāni*, iv. 652, 1, we get a different picture of the genealogy.

---

1) According to Mehemmed Thuraiya, *Sīlāte-i ʾethmāni*, iv. 101, Iskender-Beg had four sons, ʿAlī, Mehemmed, Khādīr and Suleiman. This must be wrong and the genealogy is as above.
name, iii. 305), after being previously (1816 = 1413) detained as a state prisoner in the castle of Bedestân Cardak near Tokat. His son was Khiýr-Beg who distinguished himself in the wars of Murad II's reign. He died in 870 (1465) and was buried at Adrianople beside his ancestor Kose Mîkhâl. Khiýr Beg seems to have had three sons, namely Ghiyâsh 'Ali Beg, Ghiyâsh Iskender Beg and Ghiyâsh Bâli Beg, of whom only the first two are of any historical importance. Ghiyâsh 'Ali Beg in 1461 distinguished himself in the battle against Vlad (see J. v. Hammer, ii. 64), in 1473 ravaged the lands of Uzun Hasan [ibid., ii. 115], invaded Hungary in 1475 [ibid., ii. 144] with his brother Iskender Beg, in 1476 [ibid., ii. 156] was in command of the ašûtûn before Scutari in Albania and appears once again in Transylvania [ibid., ii. 172]; in the next 13 years nothing is heard of him. In 1492 he seems to have met his death at Villach in Carinthia, defeated by Count Khevenhüller, although other sources mention him at a still later date. According to them, he died in Plevna. His brother Iskender Beg in 1476 commanded the light cavalry at the siege of Scutari, as sandjakbey of Bosnia (880, 885 and 890) [J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 156]; in 895 (1490) in the Karamanîn campaign, in which he lost his son, the governor of Kağıriya Mîkhâl Beg (see J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 293), who was taken prisoner and sent to Egypt. He seems to have lived till 903 (1498). The military exploits of Ghiyâsh 'Ali Beg were celebrated by Sûrî Celebi (d. 930 = 1530 at Prizen; cf. F. Bahinger, G. O. W., p. 34 sq.) in a long epic, (said to have been 15,000 couplets) fragments of which have recently been discovered (one in Berlin, MS. Or., No. 1468 containing 1,700 baits and the other in Agram, South Slav Academy of Sciences, Coll. Bahinger, No. 554, l. with 212 baits). In some sources a Mehemmed Beg, who was distinguishing himself at that time, is described as a fourth son of Ghiyâsh Khiýr Beg; in others however, he appears as the son of Ghiyâsh 'Ali Beg, which is improbable as he probably was twice governor of Bosnia, namely as early as 897 (1492) and again in 949 (1542) and did not die till 950 (1543). The family of the Mîkhâl-oghlu now begins to fall into the background. About the middle of the xvîth century an Ahmed Beg is again mentioned, perhaps as the last of the Mîkhâl-oghlu holding the hereditary office in the family of leader of a body of ašûtûn (see J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 293), and lastly a Khiýr Pâshâ is mentioned in history as a descendant of Kose Mîkhâl (see J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 512). The family had, at a later date had estates in Bulgaria (around Ihtiman) [cf. Ewliya Celebi, iii. 390 and Ç. Jiricek, Das Fürstenthum Bulgarien, Vienna 1891, p. 138 and Philippopolis, ibid., p. 379 sqq.] and survived down to modern times. As we learn, however, from the Sâlnâmé of Adrianople for 1309, p. 82 sqq., the Mîkhâl-oghlu had already at an early date large estates around Adrianople. They had the country round Buñar-Hisar, Tarnovo, Kîrk Kilise and Wiza as a hereditary fief. The Anatolian district of Mîkhâl-oghlu (Mîkhâl-oghlu, Mîkhâl-oghlu in Chalkondyles, p. 225; cf. Ewliya Celebi, 293 sqq.; W. Tomasek, Zur geschichtlichen Topographie von Kikianiou im Mittelalter, in S. H. W., Philhist. Kl., xxviii. 1925, p. 93 and J. H. Mordtmann, in Z. d. d. M. C., vol. lxxv., 1911, p. 101) seems to be connected with the family of the Mîkhâl-oghlu.

**Bibliography:** The well-known histories of J. v. Hammer, Zinkleisen, Jorga. Under the title Ašûtûn Ghiyâsh Mîkhâl (pr. Stambul 1315; cf. F. Bahinger, G. O. W., p. 35, note 1) Nuzhet Mehmed Pasha published a work glorifying a Köse Mîkhâl and his descendants. — Al. A. Olesnîckj in Agram is preparing an edition of the work of Sûrî Celebi and at the same time a history of the Mîkhâl-oghlu. (Fr. Bahinger)

**Mîynâs.** [See Merkez.]

**Mîkyâas,** any simple instrument for measuring, e.g. the pointer on a sundial; in Egypt the name of the Nilometer, i.e. the gauge on which the regular rise and fall of the river can be read. To get an undisturbed surface, the water was led into a basin; in the centre of this stood the water gauge, a column on which cills and fengers were carefully measured off. The level of the water was ascertained by an official daily and proclaimed by criers.

Originally the rising of the Nile was measured by the gauge (al-rukab). According to Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakâm, al-Ḳâfâ'î, and others, Joseph, the son of Jacob, built the first Nilometer at Memphis; at a later date, the “aged Dalûkî” built Nilometers in Aḥnim and Arṣûn (Antinoe). These were the Nilometers in use throughout the Greek period till the conquest of Egypt by 'Amr b. al-Āṣî. The latter erected a Nilometer at Assuan and a second at Dendera. Others were built in the reigns of Muṣwîyiwa and 'Abd al-Ḳâfâ. Finally the Caliph al-Muṭawakkîl had a large Nilometer built and instead of the Christian officials appointed Abu l-Raddâd to look after it, and the office remained hereditary in his family down to the time of al-Mâkzen (d. 1442).

The ancient Egyptians are said to have drowned a virgin in the Nile at the beginning of its rise as a sacrifice. 'Amr compelled the Nile to rise and fall at God’s command by means of a writing which he threw into the water.


**Mîlād (A.).** According to some Arabic lexicographers the meaning of this term is time of birth in contra-distinction to mawlid which may denote also “place of birth.” The latter is the usual term for birthday, especially in connection with the birthday of Muhammad and Muslim saints [cf. the art. Mawlid]; milâd denotes also Christmas. For other special meanings, cf. Dozy, Supplement aux dictionnaires arabes, ré. [v.]

**Bibliography:** the Arabic lexicons.

(A. J. Wensink)

**Mîlas.** The ancient Mylasa, capital of Caria and famous in antiquity for its sanctuaries of the Carian Zeus (in mediaeval and modern western sources: Milaso, Milaxo, Melaso, Melaxo), a town in S. W. Anatolia, 15 miles from its seaport, Kulluk (on the Gulf of Mendelia). It is the capital of the kaza of the same name in the Wilayet of Mugla (formerly the sandjak of Men...
TESHE) and has 7,346 inhabitants (census of 1928) compared with 7,261 (of whom 3,206 were Greeks who were removed by the exchange of 1922, 739 Jews, who still flourish, and 71 foreigners) in 1908 (Szlámü Acsia, of 1326 A.D.).

Milaš lies on a low eastern spur of the Sodra Dağh (Gr. St. Elias) in the centre of a very fertile plain surrounded on all sides by hills, and watered by the Sari Çay which flows round the Sodra Dağh on north and west. The road to the sea however does not follow this marshy water-course but crosses the hills south of the Sodra Dağh, here commanded by the once powerful mediaeval fortress of Pećin (three miles S. of Milaš).

The bay itself was in the middle ages defended by the island citadel of Asf Kafesi (Judieh, Kasos; Atien. Miletii, iv. 139) and later by a castle at the harbour built by Mehemed II (Piri Keşbs, Bâkırî, ed. P. Kahle, chap. 21). At Milaš met the old and, although difficult, only roads to the west to the important mediaeval port of Balat (Miletos), to the north into the fertile plain of Karpuzlu Ovası and Cine and into the Maeander valley, and eastward to Mughla, the other important town of the district. This and its protected situation near the sea within a broad fertile plain destined the town to be once more a capital when the region again attained political independence under the Turkish dynasty of the Mentešhe [q. v.].

The region first passed temporarily under Turkish rule when, after the victory of the Selbdsïs at Manzikert in 1071 the western Anatolian coast with Nicaea, Smyrna and Ephesus and even islands like Samos and Rhodes were occupied by the Turks. Although we have no definite information about Milaš itself we know that the monks of the neighbouring Latmos had to leave their monasteries on account of the Turks (in 1079; cf. Th. Wiegand, Milet, i, 185). But Byzantine rule was soon restored. It was only when the centre of the imperial government was withdrawn to Constantinople after the victory over the Latins in 1261 that this region finally passed into Turkish hands. When and how the final conquest took place we do not exactly know. Melanudion, which with Milaš formed a theme from the period of the Comneni (W. Tomascher, Zeit. Topographie Kleinasiens im M.A., Vienna 1891, Abb. d. Ak. d. Ws., p. 38), and is therefore to be located in the neighbourhood of Milaš and was Byzantine till 1273 at least, was again taken for a time from the Turks of Mentešhe in 1296, so that it must have been occupied by them a few years before (Wiegand, op. cit.). That Mentešhe is called Xélauxis (= Sahîl ilâhi, Emir al-Sawaîlî) in Pachymeres (i. 472; ii. 211, Bonn ed.), in Sanudo (Hopf, Chronografia Romanica, p. 145) Turquenomadar (read: Turquenomadar = ÒTurkoman of the seaÓ) suggests a conquest from the sea. There is no longer any record at this period of the bishopric of Milaš, which as a church of the eparchy of Caria (see G. Parthey, Hierosolyma Sancutum et nothing gracae episcopatum, p. 32, 112 etc.) was under the metropolis of Stavropolis, which still existed in the 14th century (A. Wächter, Diet Verfall des Græchentums in Kleinasiien am 14. Jh. U.P., p. 34 sqq.) (Stavropolis, the ancient Aphrodisias at the village of Gerî, twenty miles west of Denizli).

Milaš appears as the capital of the principality of Mentešhe about 1330 in al-Umarî (ed. Taeschner, p. 21) and Milaš (Fākeh = Fâquēa which appears as a capital in the Genoese report, ibid., p. 47 is probably an error of the writer and is not to be corrected to Mughla) and in Ibn Battûta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 278 sqq.) also, who here enjoyed the hospitality of the Akhi gild (on a Fotisîcune of written in Milas at the end of the 14th century see Taeschner, in Islamica, iv. 40) and admires the wealth of the town in gardens and orchards and gives the name of the lord of the country as Shuja al-Din Urkhan b. Mentešhe, whom he visited in his capital Pećin, not far Away. The Mentešhe built very little in Milaš as they were engaged in embellishing their residence. It is noteworthy that the two mosques of this period lie outside the old town, still largely enclosed in its old walls; one to the south, in the Hâdjî Dhîs quarter, the little Sâlah al-Dîn Djâmî with outer court and stepped minaret, built under Urkhan Bey in 1330; the other just outside the walls to the east, the mosque of Ahmed Ghaïû built in 1378, which with its entrance in the narrow side (without an outer court) and the stepped minaret built above it (Ismîlî Hâckî, Kitâbeler, Istanbul 1929, fig. 47) looks as if it had once been a church (cf. Wulzinger, Die Perzisch-Mongolische Milas, in Festscr. d. Techn. Hochschule in Karlsruhe, 1925, p. 10 of the reprint). The minbar of this mosque also dated 1378 (1378) is now in the Çini Kiosk in Constantinople. From the position of these mosques, it may be deduced that the old town remained in the occupation of the Christians, who still held the most of it in quittance in recent times. The only mosque in the old town, just in its centre, and in the highest part of it, the Bulel Djâmî, seems also to have been a church and was probably used by the garrison, if it is old. The medrese of Khoja Berî al-Din, which dates from the period of the Mentešhe, unfortunately cannot be exactly dated (Rev. Hist., v. 58).

Milaš received its first important building from the first Ottoman governor Firuz, whom Bâyâzid I appointed over Mentešhe-ili (Dusturname-i Euweri, ed. Meşrûm Hâlî, Istanbul 1928, p. 88) after the conquest (792 = 1390) (the date given by most Turkish sources is probably Bâyâzid’s confirmation of the Venetian privileges for Balat of May 21, 1390, Diplomaturium Veneto-Levantinum, Venice 1899, ii. N. 134). The Mentešhe who fled to Egypt (Dusturname, i. c.) was probably the prince of the house ruling in Balat, while the senior Ahmed Ghaïû may have held out in Milaš and Pećin till July 1391 (according to his tombstone he died in Pećin in Şabân 793 as shahîl). In 1394 Firûz built to the north of the old town and outside of it a splendid mosque in the style of the Brusa private mosques (cf. Wulzinger’s monograph). Ottoman rule was interrupted by Timûr who passed through Milaš on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Ángora (1402) (Ducars, p. 76, Böam ed.), for about twenty years by the restoration of the former dynasty. This last period of the Mentešhe-oglu has left no memorials in Milaš or Pećin. The Bâyâzidian Ottoman commanders then made their headquarters in Pećin after which this kind of the Mentešhe sandjik was long called (Ahî Bakr b. Bahrîm in Hâdîh al Khalfi, Djâkân-nâmâ, p. 638, i.e. the second half of the 16th century) and only moved
to Milas at a later date, when a magnificent official residence was erected, with defensive towers, and is still partly inhabited.

From the second half of the xviith century we have Ewliya's description of the town (in the unprinted vol. ix. of his Sīyāḥet-nāme, Ms. Beşhişt Agha, No. 452, fol. 51) He says the town had 4 mosques, 3 madras and two large khāns. At this time the garrison was still in Pećin. He praises the gardens of the town but rightly describes the climate as unhealthy. Among the products he mentions tobacco, with which Milas supplied the whole of Anatolia. Among the holy places mentioned by him, we may note that of Shaikh Shuhreti because it probably belongs to the Baba al-Shuhreti met here by Ibn Batūta. Ewliya's description of the old ruins is much exaggerated, although he saw a good deal more than now exists. Pococke (Travels, ii. 2, ch. 6) at the end of the eighteenth century was still able to sketch a temple of Augustus and Roma here. All that now survives in addition to the town walls is the Balta Kapu (a Carinthian gateway with the Carian double-axe) and a mausoleum called Guvmarğa (filigree-worker) (Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage dans l'Empire Ottoman, i. 234 sqq., pl. 84—92). In the adjacent village of Shuhreti köy is the turbe of Shaikh Bedr al-Din b. Shaikh Kasım, who died at Brusa in 884 (1479) and is buried here, a khalīfa of Saiyid Muhammad al-Bukhari (see Rev. Hist., v. 311 sqq.), on the site of a church of St. Xene, who died here (Bulit. de Corr. Hell., xiv. 616 sqq.).

The capital of the Mentege, already mentioned several times, Pećin (Gr. Petsoa) consists of an imposing citadel built over ancient foundations and Byzantine masonry and an extensive town lying south of it. The citadel with its walls and towers crowns a steep rock that rises out of the southern end of the plain of Milas (Ismā'īl Hakki, fig. 40) and is accessible only at the south side by a great door flanked by a tower adorned with lions' heads. Inside the fortress, where there now is a miserable little village, the only architectural remains are the foundations of a church. Opposite to the entrance to the citadel, on a plateau surrounded by walls, some of which still stand, lie the palace and its annexes, now mostly in ruins. All that survives is the charming medrese built, stone of Ahmed Ghażi of 777 = 1375 (Ismā'īl Hakki, fig. 51—54). In the İdwān, the arch of which is flanked in the spandrels by reliefs of lions holding flags, the founder is buried (see above); opposite the medrese stands a mosque built by Urkhan Bey in 752 (1352), in ruins except for the gateway of Byzantine doorm_frames and fragments of mosaics (the inscription is given in Ewliya's), probably the one that Ibn Batūta saw being built on his visit to Pećin (Bardżin). There is also a mosque and medrese, a bath and a palatial serai, all in ruins. Exceptionally finely carved tombstones give the names of important people who lived here down to the xvth century. Ewliya, who still found about one hundred houses here, thought there must once have been a great town here. Pećin is mentioned by Kaṣğābāna, Şāh-al-Ďayhā, viii. 18, as the possession of a certain Emir Mūsā, lord of Balaš and Bardžin (şēş) who is known from a coin in the collection of J. H. Mordtmann. A native of Bardžin was Mahmūd b. Meḥmūd, who about the middle of the xviith century dedicated his "Book of the Falconer" (Bāsāmīn) written in Turkish to a Mentege-oglu (v. Hammer, Folk overweight, Vienna 1840, Thury, Türkîk nylevemlekâ x. i., p. 29). On October 17, 144 in Pećina the Mentege-oglu Ilâs Bey concluded a treaty with the Venetians (Diplomatium Veneto-Levantinum, ii, No. 166).

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text: V. Caimet, Turquie d'Asie, iii. 666 sqq. Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, Paris 1872, p. 648; Heyd, Gesch. de Levantehande im M.A., i. 584 (Fr. ed., i. 553). I was unable to consult the work mentioned by Hasluck, Christianity and Islam, ii. 596 entitled I. Koukoulis, Ta Nêa Mivarz, in Ezhحار, iii. 448 sqq. For the Muslim inscriptions see A. Tewyld, in Rev. Hist. (Constantinople), ii. 761; iii. 1146, also Haš Ės Url (ibid., v. 57, 308) and Isma'il Hakki, Kitâbeler, Istanbul 1929, p. 155 sqq.

(P. WITTERN)

MILK (.), possession, property. The word is not found in the Kurān, but is in regular use in legal terminology. The double meaning of the word shows that the usual distinction in our legal language between the conceptions of possession and property are not found in the fikr. There is, it is true, a special term for the actual power over a thing, what we call possession in the narrower sense, namely yâd, lit. "hand", but the distinction between a judicial ownership and the actual control is not found in Muslim jurisprudence and there is not a word for property which takes into account the actual ownership, either from the positive or the negative point of view. As a result we find, for example, that the ownership of a thing passes directly by agreement if this was intended, even if the thing in question is not at once handed over. On the other hand, not only things but also rights can be owned.

The following are excluded from the possibility of being property and subject to legal regulations: 1. useless things (e.g. wild animals); 2. things the use of which is prohibited by religion (e.g. wine-grapes); 3. things which are ritually impure or have become polluted to such an extent that they cannot be purified (e.g. swine, dung et. seq). As long as they are not essential parts of a pure or permitted thing. If such things, however, are acquired, one talks not of milh but of tâzı̇ba, a special claim upon them; legal transactions relating to such things have a special vocabulary of their own.

Kumāl al-milk is a necessary preliminary for the property of an owner being liable to zakāt (q.v.).

Bibliography: The articles "BAR, BAT, MĀL, SHIRKA, TâGARA and the literature there given; Juynholl, Handbuching (1939), 560 and the references there given; al-Ghazzali, al-Wāfas, i. 85 sqq.

MILQA (.), religion, rite. However obvious it may be to connect this word with the Hebrew and Jewish and Christian-Aramaic milā, melā, "utterance, word", it has not been satisfactorily proved how and where it received the meaning which it is taken for granted in the Kurān or not. It is known whether it is a purely Arabic word or a loanword adopted by Muḥammad or others before him (Noldke, Z. D. M. G., iiv. 413 seems to hold that it is Arabic for he refers to the 4th form amīla or amāli to dictate""). In the Kurān it always means (even in
the somewhat obscure passage, Sūra xxxviii. 6) "religion" and it is used of the heathen religions (vii. 86 sq.; xiv. 16; xviii. 19) as well as of those of the Jews and Christians (ii. 114), and of the true religion of the fathers (xii. 38). The word acquired a special significance in the Medina sections where the Prophet in his polemic against the Jews speaks of "Abraham's minā", by which he means the original revelation in its purity, which it was his duty to restore (ii. 124; iii. 89; xvi. 124; xxii. 77 sq.; cf. iv. 124; vi. 162; xii. 37). Muslim literature follows this ḫurānic usage but the word is not in frequent use. With the article, al-minā means the true religion revealed by Muḥammad and is occasionally used elliptically for al-il al-minā, the followers of the Muḥammadan religion (Ṭabarī, iii. 843, 19, 853, 4), just as its opposite al-djinna is an abbreviation for al-il al-djinna, the non-Muḥammadans who are under the protection of Islām; e.g., Ibn Sa'd, iii.1, 235, 2; cf. also the derivative milli opposed to djinna, client (Bahākī, ed. Schwally, p. 121 infra).

Bibliography: Noldke, Orientalische Skizzen, p. 40; Z. D. M. G., lvi. 413; Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, Glossar, s. v.; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mekkaansche Feest, p. 30 sqq. (F. Buhl)

MiM, 24th letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of forty. On different forms of the letter cf. Arābī, plate 1. In some dialects of Southern Arabia and of tribes coming from that region, mim is and was used as the article of determination, side by side with f. A well known tradition is put into the mouth of a man from Southern Arabia in the following form: Layn ana kābīrī am-ṣiyāni fi 'aš-ṣaf'īn. Ibn Ya'ish, ed. Jahn, ii. 1331; Landberg, Etudes sur les dialectes de l'Arabe méridionale, 1, 1910. 281—290.

(A. J. WensincK)

MiNā, later often pronounced Munā, a place in the hills east of Mecca on the road from it to 'Arafá [q. v.]. The distance between the two is given by Muḥaddasi as one parasang, while Wavell calls it five miles and says the continuation to 'Arafá is nine miles. Minā lies in a narrow valley running from west to east, 1,500 paces long according to Burckhardt, surrounded by steep barren granite cliffs. On the north side rises a hill called Ṭhābir. Travellers from Mecca come down into the valley by a hill path with steps in it; this is the Ḧakāba [q. v.] which became famous in connection with Muḥammad's negotiations with the Madinians. The town consists of stone houses of fair size which form two long streets. Close beside the Ḧakāba is a rudely hewn short pillar leaning against a wall: this is the "great djamra" or the "Ḫāba djamra", at which the pilgrims cast stones [cf. DJAMRA]. A little to the east in the middle of the street is the "middle djamra" also marked by a pillar and lastly at a similar distance the third (the so-called "first djamra"). As one approaches the east end of the valley, there is on the right of the road a square mosque surrounded by a wall, the Ḥadji al-Khāfīr, which was rebuilt by Saladin and in 874 (1467) reconstructed by the Mamlūk Sultan Kā'īr Bey. Along the west side of the surrounding wall is a colonnade with three rows of pillars, but there is none on the other sides. It was different earlier, for Ibn Rusta (c. 300 A.H.) tells us that the mosque had 168 pillars of which only seventy-eight supported the west wing. The north side of the wall is pierced by several doors. In the centre of the court of the mosque is a little domed building with a minaret built over a fountain. There is another dome over the colonnade on the west side (see the illustrations, ii. 256).

The most striking feature of Minā is the very great difference, noted already by Muḥaddasi, between the quiet and empty streets of the greater part of the year and the tremendous throng and bustle of the pilgrimage month when, as Wavell says, half a million people with heavily laden beasts of burden hope to cover nine miles in the period between sunrise and 10 a.m. Every spot in the valley is then covered with tents in which the pilgrims spend the night. Muḥaddasi talks of fine houses built of brick and stone (among them was a frequently mentioned Ḍār al-Imāra), and large stone buildings are still to be found in Minā; but these are usually empty and are only let at the pilgrimage to the more wealthy pilgrims and even among these many prefer to live in tents. This depopulation of the city has been a subject for discussion among the geologists, for some held that this circumstance enables MiNā and Mecca to be regarded as one city (mīyār), a view which others reject. But another circumstance must have contributed to prevent a permanent settlement of the town, which is also true of other places on the pilgrims' route, namely the incredible filth and dreadful stench which is caused by such masses of humanity at the Ḥadji. Complaints are made even of the uncleanness of the Ḥadji al-Khāfīr and at Minā there are further the decomposing remains of the countless animals sacrificed. The Ḥadji djamra symbols in Minā date back to the old pagan period [cf. ḤADJĪ], for Muḥammad, as usual in taking over old customs, contented himself with cutting out the too obviously pagan elements, the result being that we can no longer reconstruct the old forms with certainty. The old poets make only passing references to them [cf. DJAMRA]; that they were similar to the Muslim practices is evident, for example, from an interesting passage in the Medina poet Kāb. Khatim (ed. Kowalski, No. 4, p. 1 sqq.) where there is a reference to the "three days in Minā" and where we further learn that the festival held there offered an occasion for entering into and carrying on love-affairs. The stone throwing is certainly very ancient; its significance is quite unintelligible in Islam, although it is difficult if there were already three heaps of stones in the pre-Islamic period [cf. DJAMRA]. It is also clear that the ceremonies in MiNā formed the conclusion of the Ḥadji even in ancient times. Muḥammad however made some serious alterations here, for he inserted a visit to Mecca before the stay in Minā, whereby the ceremony first received its legitimate Muḥammadan character; but the old elements remained the important factors, for the Ḥadji ends not in Mecca but, as before, in MiNā, to which the pilgrims return after the digression to Mecca. A survival of the pagan period probably exists in the slaughtering place preferred by the majority on the southern slopes of Ṭhābir "the place of sacrifice of the ram" (cf. Sūra xxviii. 101 sqq.), as its association with the story of Abraham probably enabled an old pagan sacred spot to be adopted into Islām. From Burton's description it is a square rocky platform reached by a few steps. Muḥammad himself did not directly forbid the use
MINÄ — MINBAR

MINBAR (A.), pulpit [cf. Masjid]. On the origin of the form of the minbar the reader may be referred to C. H. Becker's exhaustive study, Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam (Noldeke-Festschrift und Islamstudien). Becker refers to the earliest historical statement which says that the Prophet in the year 7 A.H. made his minbar on which he used to preach to the people; it had two steps and a seat (maṣṣa’d). The minbar was therefore originally a raised seat or throne. On the morning after the death of the Prophet, after stormy disputes, Abū Bakr took his seat on the Prophet's minbar in a solemn assembly and received the general homage here. The later caliphs followed this tradition, as did the governors, who ascended the pulpit on their accession to office and on their resignation. The minbar in the early period was therefore not at all specially associated with worship but was the seat of the ruler in the council. The pulpit only gradually grew out of it with the development of public worship. According to Becker, the date of the change from the ruler's or judge's seat to the simple pulpit coincides with the end of the Omayyad dynasty. In 132 A.H. all the mosques in the provinces of Egypt were provided with minbars, about the same time period probably in the other lands of Islam also. At the beginning of the Abbāsid period the minbar was already a pulpit exclusively. The first tendency to its use as a pulpit is seen by Becker in the introduction of the minbar into the divine service at the Muṣallā in Medina, which is ascribed to Mu‘āwiyah or to his governor. The Prophet did not have a minbar at the Muṣallā and nothing but divine service could have been held there.

The typical form of the minbar as a pulpit, which is placed to the right of the mihrāb and of the spectator, is an erection on steps with a portal or without a door at the entrance to the steps and a ciborium-like canopy to the platform. This form is peculiar to the minbar of wood, which is the most usual. The variants in stone and brick are more simple and frequently are only a bare platform reached by three to five steps. The fine series of minbars of wood begins with that most famous of all in the history of art, the minbar in the great mosque in Kairawān. On the occasion of the extension of the mosque by Ibrāhīm II Ibn Aghlab (261–289 = 874–902) it is said to have been bought with the lustre tiles of the mihrāb wall from Baghdad and set up. It is made of plane-tree wood and is in the canonical minbar shape with a staircase here of 17 steps — to the preacher's platform. The pulpit, however, has not yet the stylized structure of the later wooden minbars. It has not the portal nor the canopy at the top. Its composition of about 200 carved panels and narrow strips of unequal size, is simply a primitive agglomeration of profuse ornamentation, still very nomadic in feeling, such as would hardly ever have been found in Baghdad, and even in Kairawān can scarcely be regarded as original. Saladin has pointed out that the pulpit must have been restored after Kairawān had been sacked by the troops of the Fātimid Mustanjīr Abū Tamim in 441 (1054). In any case it has several times suffered damage and undergone restoration so that its present general appearance cannot be dealt with critically until we have a thorough monograph based on exact investigation on the spot. The ornamentation, as Kühnel observes, be regarded as Omayyad (Springer's Kunstgeschichte, vi. 385).

The vine branches of the frame-strips and the panels filled with floral patterns and leaves resemble the decoration at Maḥātī (q.v.) and some of the geometrical patterns, which are of all imaginable combinations, are already found on the shafts of
pre-Islamic columns in Diyarbakr (cf. van Berchem-Strygowski, *Amide*). The archaic combination of designs on the minbar has no connection with the decoration which since Sāmarrā we call ‘Abdāsid. We have here a phenomenon comparable to Ṭaḥtā′ since here also ornamentations from different sources are combined to form a general scheme whose common denominator is formed by the formal quality of the chiaroscuro common to them all. We do not even know how long the nucleus of these carved strips and latticed panels may have previously existed in Bagdad and they may have there belonged to an Omayyad minbar before the pieces were brought to Kairawān and supplemented by copies and additions of local workmanship.

The few pulpits that have survived from the Fāṭimid period follow the Syro-Egyptian style of woodwork of the period with their system of frames filled with foliage. The tendrils were prevented from over-running the whole surface by being placed within small polygonal areas which were grouped together in cassettes (Kühnel, Springer’s *Kunstgeschichte*, vi. 406). The wooden mīhrāb of the xith century from Cairo illustrated in the article mīhrāb illustrates this style, which is also represented by the minbar made in 1091 A.D. for the mosque in ‘Askālan and now in Hebron, and by the pulpit of 1155 A.D. in the mosque of ‘Amr in Kūt on the upper Nile.

During the Fāṭimid period the pulpit developed its canonical form as represented in the minbar of the Masjīd al-Aqṣā in Jerusalem, which was gifted in 1168 A.D. by Nūr al-Dīn to Aleppo and later taken by Saladin to Jerusalem (Saladin, Murād, 228). It henceforward took up the way and the domed canopy. The main decorative motives are 8-pointed stars and the polygonal and star-shaped subsidiary panels show carving in relief inlaid with ivory and mother-of-pearl. Of the minbar of Suṭlān Lādin in the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn of the year 1269 A.D. little more is left than the framework, while the panels are preserved in the Arab Museum in Cairo and in the South Kensington Museum (cf. Descriptive Catalogue of the Arab Museum, Cairo). That wooden pulpits were sometimes copied in stone is shown by the stone pulpit in the mosque-madrassa of Suṭlān Ḥassān (757—764 = 1356—1363). The mukarnas on the door case and soon after found on the dome also, here as in the mīhrāb goes back to Turkish influence transmitted through Syria. Like the mīhrāb, the minbar also attained its finest workmanship in Cairo under the second Mamlūk dynasty in the xviith century and later. No essential alteration was later made in its canonical form and its embellishment remained standardised and varied only in details. A fine example of this fully developed Cairo type is in the South Kensington Museum. According to the inscription, it was presented by Ka’īt Bey (1468—1495) and has finely carved ivory panels and traces of painting on the wooden parts. The usual star pattern is replaced by a smooth surface. The gilt onion-shaped dome with its finial and crescent on the stalactite cornices are, as Briggs observes, characteristic of the period (Briggs, Mukam. Archit. in Egypt and Palestine, p. 217).

After the Turkish conquest, the general deterioration in craftsmanship in Cairo affected the minbar also, but exceptions, like the finely-worked pulpit of the mosque of al-Burdaein, however show that the good old tradition still survived. Hakam II’s minbar in Cordoba has not survived but from the descriptions of the Arab writers it must have been a peculiarly valuable piece of work, for according to al-Maḳkātī it cost 35,705 dinars. It could be moved on wheels and contained the caliph ‘Omar’s Kurān. In the mosque of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn in Konya is a minbar of hazelwood, according to an inscription on the posts supporting the upper part, the work of an artist of Aḵīlāt of the year 550 (1155). Two inscriptions on the pulpit mention Suṭlān Mas’ūd I (510—551 = 1116—1156) and Ǧūḏlī Jārslān II (551—584 = 1156—1188) (cf. J. H. Laytved, Konia and F. Sarre, Seldschusische Kleinkunst, p. 27 sq., pl. vi.—viii.). Inscriptions from the Kurān decorate the frames of the balustrades of the steps. The pulpit is of the traditional Syro-Egyptian form, but is, however, distinguished from them by its vigorous structure. Polygons and star-shaped panels fill the sideframes, together with the same tendril patterns symmetrically interwoven, as we find naturalised in all the eastern lands of Islam from the beginning of the eleventh century (detailed illustration in Sarre, op. cit., fig. 24).

In Persia and Afganistan all the old minbars seem to have been destroyed during the Mongol invasion. On the other hand, the minbar illustrated here in the mosque of Djiwar Shāh Agha in the sanctuary of the Imam Riḍā in Meşhādeh which was built about 840—850 (1436—1446) is original in ornamentation and an example of the Timūrid minbar. The structural motive is thrust into the background by the profuse covering of small pentagonal and star-shaped wooden panels with tendrils carved in relief after the style of its contemporary tiles; the effect is that of a carpet. Nothing is known of old minbars in Turkestan. In India, pulpits were built almost exclusively of stone. Many, some of them richly carved, still exist in the Muslim provinces and towns of India. The pavilion on four pillars, common and popular in India, which gives a charm to buildings for Muslim worship as a decorative finish to the roof, was also used here for the stone minbar. Indeed one might even wonder whether this originally Indian structure was carried by the Eastern Turks to Central Asian lands and adopted by them for the minbar. Minbars with such canopies are frequently found in the mosques of the province of Gujrat and in Aḥmādābād (cf. these volumes in the Arch. Survey of India, Western India). The mosque of Hīlāl Khān Kādī of 1333 A.D. in Dholka, for example, has a stone minbar with seven steps and a canopy on pillars on the roof, but no entrance gate. The triangular side walls are divided into square areas which are carved in relief (Arch. Survey of India, Western India, vol. viii., Gujrat, pl. xxviii., xxx.). In Haidarābād, the Muslim state of the south, on the other hand, the minbars are more simple and heavier, and have no canopy (cf. illustration from Osmania).


(E. Diez)
Fig. 1. Minbar in the Sidi Īkba Mosque in Kairawān.

Fig. 3. Minbar in the Sulṭān Hasan Mosque in Cairo.
Fig. 2. Minbar in the Farenda Mosque in 'Uthmanabad.
MIN TA KA

MIN TA KA or MIN TA KA al-BURUJ also MIN TA KA Falak al-BURUJ or (more rarely) NITA K al-BURUJ means, like the technical term FALAK al-BURUJ most frequently used in scientific literature, the circle (min t a k a) of the twelve signs of the zodiac ("towers", Greek πύργοι), then the zone of the ecliptic formed of the twelve signs each covering 30°.

The KU R A N contains references to min t a k a in three different passages, viz:

Surat xv. 16: "We have placed towers (bura Tj) in the heavens and adorned them for the spectators'.

Surat xxv. 61: "Blessed be he that placed towers (bura Tj) in the heavens and who placed a lamp in them and a light-giving moon'.

Surat Ixxxi is entitled al-Bura Tj and verse 1: "By the heavens with its towers (bura Tj)'.

Babylonian may with great probability be assumed to be the original home of the zodiacal circle. The period of its origin cannot be fixed with certainty: the first attempts at a grouping of the constellations on the path of the sun and the planets, however, date from before the period of Hammurabi and in any case into the third millennium B.C. Almost all the names familiar to us are already found in Sumerian inscriptions. The Bogaz-Kalil list of about 1300 B.C. gives all the signs of the zodiac with the exception of Leo and Libra.

The only pictorial representation of the zodiac constellations is the zodiacal map of the early Muslim period, the fresco on the dome of Qasir Amra shows the ecliptic as a broad band, along which are arranged the twelve bura Tj; it also shows the poles of the ecliptic and the 12 (ecliptical) degrees of longitude, as well as the equator and a series of parallel circles. The peculiarity of the arrangement of the constellations with considerable southern latitudes shown beyond the equator on the hemispherical inner surface of the dome results in the equator and ecliptic not being shown as the largest circles. The method of representing the separate constellations on the fresco, especially the min ta k a, is, broadly speaking, the same as that on the Al-Assas Papyrus. (N.B. It should be noted that the fresco of Qasir Amra represents the heavens reflected as in a mirror.)

The twelve Buruj. Preliminary Note:

The names of the bura Tj are given in Arabic literature with many variations: those quoted below are the most usual. With the fixed stars a distinction is made between those which form the outline of a constellation (Kawakib min al-bura Tj), i.e. the essential stars and such as "go beyond the constellation" (bura Tj al-wa l'), and are regarded as only being loosely connected with it, i.e. the unessential stars.

The account given is based on its main features on the statements in the first part of al-Kazwini's Cosmography.

1. al-Hamal or al-Ka'b, the Ram (Aries). It consists of 13 essential stars, 5 unessential lie in its immediate vicinity; its fore-part is turned to the west and its hind-part to the east. It has its face on its back. The two bright stars on the horn (β and γ) are called al-Sharafani or al-Na'ib ("the butler"); they form at the same time the first of the 28 stations ("mansions") of the moon (masili). According to another reading the name al-Na'ib is given to the unessential star. Aries is situated above the figure of the Ram. The three stars ε, δ and ρ Aries form the second station of the moon and are called al-huqaiq ("little paunch").

2. al-Thaur, the Bull (Taurus). 32 essential and 12 unessential stars; its forepart faces the east. The bright star at the point of the northern horn (presumably β Tauri) is also included in the Waggoner (Auriga) as well as in the Bull. α is called al-Dabarun, 'Am al-Thaur, Tal' u Na'igim, Ḥadi 'l-Naqdim and al-Fanik ("large camel"); while the Hyades which surround it are called al-Kisr (the "young camels"). The Pleiades are called al-Thura riyya, x and u together al-Kalbani ("the two dogs") of al-Dabarun. The Pleiades form the third, al-Dabarun and the Hyades together the fourth station of the moon.

3. al-Tawamun or al-Quwar, the Twins (Gemini). 18 essential and 7 unessential stars. The Twins are in the form of two men whose heads are turned to the northeast and feet to the southwest. Castor and Pollux (α and β) are called al-Dhari al-munabiya; they form the seventh station of the moon. γ and ζ are called al-Han'a; together with three other stars of the Twins they form the sixth station of the moon. The name of γ and μ Geminorum is al-Bakhtiti.

4. al-Sarafan, the Crab (Cancer). 9 essential and 4 unessential stars. ε Cancri with γ and δ form the eighth station of the moon and have the peculiarly Arabic name of al-Nathra ("the cartilage of the nose") or in keeping with the Almagest, al-M'laf (= precept). The star β on the south hind-foot is called al-Tawaf ("the extremity"). ζ Cancri and λ Leonis form the ninth station of the moon, al-Tawf (= the glance).

5. al-Asad, the Lion (Leo). 27 essential and 8 unessential stars; he is conceived of as looking to the west. α (Regulus), γ, ζ and κ are called al-Djasha ("Forehead of the Lion") and form the tenth station of the moon; ζ and δ are the eleventh station of the moon, al-Zubra ("back-hair" or "mane of the Lion") or Khallil al-Asad. β Leonis is called Kunb al-Asad or as the twelfth station of the moon al-Sarfa. According to another reading, the name Kunb al-Asad is given to small stars in the vicinity of al-Sarfa.

6. al-Adhra (only in the catalogue of fixed stars taken from the Almagest), the Virgin (Virgo) or al-Sunduqa, the ear of corn. 26 essential and 6 unessential stars; the head of the Virgin lies south of β Leonis, her feet west of α and β Librae. The five stars in the shoulders β, γ, δ and ε Virgo, form the thirteenth station of the moon of al-Orwa; α Virgo forms the fourteenth station of the moon, al-Sinaak al-azal or al-Sunduqa (cf. Spica) which name is applied to the whole constellation of the Virgin. (N.B. The name Fahr al-Takr or α Virginis is not quoted as a name of the fourteenth station of the moon.) The fifteenth station of the moon consists of the stars δ1, γ, α and λ on the left foot; it is called al-Qahf.

7. al-Mizan, the Scales (Libra). 8 essential and 9 unessential stars. α and β Librae on the pans of the balance form the sixteenth station of the moon which is called al-Zubhun or Za baniya al-θ-skrab ("claws of the Scorpion") (cf. Sumerian ZILLA AN.NA., Akkadian Zibanita as the name of the constellation Libra).

8. al-θ-skrab, the Scorpion. 21 essential and 3 unessential stars; it has its head to the west and its tail to the east. β, γ and α Scorpii mark the seventeenth station of the moon al-
Ikthi, the eighteenth station of the moon in 1 Kelb al-Äkrab, and v the nineteenth station of the moon in 1 Kelb al-Shawala ("Sting of the Scorpion"). The stars ρ and τ to the right and left of 1 Kelb al-Äkrab, are called al-Niyât.

9. al-Rími, the Archer (Sagittarius) or al-Kawa, the Bow or al-Sabn, the Arrow. 31 essential and no unessential stars; the face with bow and arrow is turned to the west, the hind-part of the horse’s body to the east. (The fresco on the dome at Kásr 1 Amra on the other hand shows the upper part of the body of the archer turned towards the hind-part of the horse’s body, and aiming with the bow over this to the west. The stars σ (on the point of the arrow), δ (on the bow-grip) θ (at the south end of the bow), γ (on the right foot) are called al-Nā‘am al-warid, σ (on the left shoulder), φ (on the notch of the arrow), τ (on the shoulder blade) and ζ (under the shoulder) αl-Nā‘am al-sâdir. Both constellations together form the twentieth station of the moon, in al-Na‘īm. μ and λ Sagittarii on the northern bend of the bow are called al-Zalimáni, α (on the knee), and β1, β2 (on the shin-bone) are together called al-Suradáni. The space almost void of stars at π Sagittarii marks the twenty-first station of the moon, in al-Balad or Baidat al-Thaláb.

10. al-Díyad, the Goat (Capricornus). 28 essential, no unessential stars: the figure is conceived of as looking to the west. α and β on the eastern horn form the twenty-second station of the moon 1 Sád al-Dhâbîh γ and δ on the tail are called al-muhâbiáni.

11. Sâbîb al-Maw or al-Sâbît, the water-carrier (Aquarius) or al-Daw, the pail. 42 essential and 3 unessential stars; the head of Aquarius points to the N. W., the feet S. E. α and ν on the right shoulder are called Sâd al-Ma‘lih or Sâd al-Ma‘lik. The two (or three) stars on the left hand (μ, ν or μ, ν, σ) form the twenty-third station of the moon. Sâd al-Bula, ρ and ζ υ in the left shoulder together with ρ, and κ Capricorni form the twenty-fourth station of the moon Sâd al-Sâ’âd. The four stars γ, ζ, π and ν on the right-forearm and the right hand are called Sâd al-Akhâiya and form the twenty-fifth station of the moon.

12. al-Samaka‘âni, the two Fishes (Piscis) or al-Hatt, the Fish. 34 essential and 4 unessential stars; the figure is conceived as two fishes, the western in the south of the back of Pegasus, the eastern in the south of Andromeda. The two fishes are connected by a band of stars. al-Kawáni does not mention any outstanding stars.

It is evident, then, that by far the greater part of the 28 manâsil fall into the area of the 12 Burúdî and form part of them. Only the following four do not belong to them: N° 5 al-Hok’â (α, φ, μ, η Orionis), N° 26 al-Farb al-abual (α Pegasi), N° 27 al-Farb al-thâln (γ Pegasi, α Andromae). N° 28 Bâr al-îl Há or al-Râshîb (a large number of stars forming a fish in the neighbourhood of β Andromae). The zodiacal figures N° 1, al-Hamal, N° 4, al-Sarafân, N° 7, al-Misân and N° 10, al-Díyad are known together as Burúdî manâkib, Greek Καθα μονακία; N° 2, al-Thawr, N° 5, al-Asad, N° 8, al-Äkrab and N° 11, al-Daw under Burúdî dhâbîh, Κάθα στηθ; N° 3, al-Djawa’, N° 6, al-Ädrâ’, N° 9, al-Rími and N° 12, al-Sama- kâni under Burúdî Dhawât al-Djasadâin, Κάθα διαμ (i.e. "Signa bicornis", "Double figures": Twins, Virgin and Ear of corn, Archer with Horse’s body and the two Fishes).

al-Kawáni gives from Ptolemy the extent of the Minâkâ as 486.259.7211/3 Mil, the length of each Burúdî as 39.388.3101/3 Mil, and the breadth as 1.322.9431/3 Mil.

**Minâkâ in Astrology.**

**Muthallathât.**

By al-muthallathât (sg. al-muthallathâ) are meant in Arab astrology the Greek τρίγωνα, Lat. trigona or tripeta, which in the middle ages were usually translated by tripilcides.

The twelve signs of the zodiac are here arranged in threes at the angles of four intersecting equilateral triangles of which one is allotted to each of the four elements. Each triangle is given two of the seven planets as its rulers (rabī, pl. arbah, Greek ἀριστεράτον or τριγυνάκτορας, one for the day and another for the night; a third is associated with the two others as "companions").

The arrangement is as follows:

1. **Muthallathât — Element: Fire.**

   **Zodiacal sign:** al-Hamal, al-Asad and al-Rími (N° 1, 5 and 9).
   **Ruler:** by day al-Djams (Sun), by night Muhšâri (Jupiter).
   **Companion:** Zu’kal (Saturn).

2. **Muthallathât — Element: Earth.**

   **Zodiacal sign:** al-Thawr, al-Ädrâ’ and al-Díyad (N° 2, 6 and 10).
   **Ruler:** by day Zuhara (Venus), by night al-Kamor (Moon).
   **Companion:** Minribh (Mars).

3. **Muthallathât — Element: Air.**

   **Zodiacal sign:** al-Djawa’, al-Misân and al-Daw (N° 3, 7 and 11).
   **Ruler:** by day Zu’kal (Saturn), by night ‘Ufarîa (Mercury).
   **Companion:** Muhšâri (Jupiter).

4. **Muthallathât — Element: Water.**

   **Zodiacal sign:** al-Sarafân, al-Äkrab and al-Sama- kâni (N° 4, 8 and 12).
   **Ruler:** by day Zuhara (Venus), by night Minribh (Mars).
   **Companion:** al-Kamor (Moon).

The distribution of the Muthallathât has been settled since the time of Ptolemy (τρίγωνα). Wuğûh or Suar. By dividing each Burúdî into three we get 36 decans each of 10°, which in Arabic are called wuğûh (sing. wağûh), Suar (sing. šâr), or darâkân (from the Indian dreykâna, a loanword from the Greek or dakâd (Pers.), in Greek δακάδ or πυρώρα), in mediaeval Latin facies, more rarely decani. The astrological significance is the same as with the Greeks, who in their turn go back to Egyptian models. The decans are not mentioned in Ptolemy. al-Suar means properly the paranatellonta of the Babylonian Teukros, the constellations which rise at the same time as the separate decans according to his list, Abu Ma’shar and other Arab authors took over the list of the paranatellonta from Teukros un-
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altered, but not the astrological interpretations associated with them.

Buyut. The Greek διάωρος or τόπος, Lat. domicilia or (mediaeval) dominus, are called in Arabic buyūt (sg. būt) according to one sign of the zodiac; each of the other five planets rules over two signs at the same time, according to the following scheme, also already laid down in the ṕerāḥibālāq:

- Lion — Sun
- Crab — Moon
- Bull
- Scorpion
- Ram

Scales { Venus
Goat
Water-carrier
Virgin
Twins

Archer { Jupiter
Fishes
Saturn
Mercury
The burūdı from the Lion to the Goat are day-houses, the rest night-houses. If a planet is in its day-house during the hours of day or in its night-house at night, it is credited with particularly powerful astrological influence.

Sharaf and Ḥubīt. By sharaf (pl. ašwar) we understand the ūnoum of the Greeks, sublimitas of Pliny, altitudo of Firmicus Maternus, exaltatio in mediaeval Latin; Ḥubīt is the Greek ταυτίωσις, ταυτίωμα, more rarely κωλίμα, class. Lat. directio, med. Lat. causas.

A planet attains its maximum astrological influence in its sharaf; its influence is least in the Ḥubīt, i.e. the point in the heavens diametrically opposite the sharaf on the circle of the ecliptic.

**Planet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharaf</th>
<th>Ḥubīt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Ram 10°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Bull 3°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn</td>
<td>Scales 21° (20°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Crab 15°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>Goat 28°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>Fishes 27°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Virgin 15°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only inaccuracy in the list of exaltations, already fixed in ancient times, is giving 20° instead of 21° to the Scales for Saturn, which however goes back to a very old error; it is also found in Pliny, Firmicus and in the Hindu astronomer Varaha-Mihira.

-al-Balʿami assumed that at the time of the creation of the world the planets were in their ašwar.

Various Arab writers since Abū Maʿṣhar also ascribe exaltations and dejections to the nodes of the moon (ḥabītuni or ḥuklatānī, scil. al-kamar): ascending node (raʾa) as sharaf the Twins 3°, and as Ḥubīt, the Archer 3°; vice versa to the descending node (ḏamāb) as sharaf the Archer 3°; as Ḥubīt the Twins 3°. This allocation is not known to the Greek astrologers.

Ḥudūd. Each of the five planets (excluding the sun and moon) possesses in each of the 12 burūdı a sphere of influence covering several degrees (Arab. ḥudd, pl. ḥudūd, Greek ὅψων, Lat. fines, med. Latin terminus) which has the same astrological significance as the planet itself and can represent it at any time in horoscopes. On the distribution of these spheres of influence within the zodiacal circle opinions differed widely and unanimity could never be attained. Ptolomy added one more to the Egyptian and Chaldaean divisions already in existence. (The various systems are fully expanded in the ṕerāḥibālāq, i. 20, fol. 43.) Boll has studied this question very fully in Neues zur babylonischen Planetenordnung, Z. A., xxxviii. [1913], p. 340 sqq.). The Arab astrologers used almost exclusively the Egyptian system, which makes the different spheres of very unequal sizes.

**MINTCHA in Astronomy.**

The Minṭakā is, as in the Greek astronomy, the fundamental basis for all calculations. It is divided into 360° degrees (ḏiʿa, pl. adʿa or dāraḏa, coll. daraḏ, pl. daraḏāt) each degree into 60 minutes (ḏakāk, pl. dākāt), each minute into 60 seconds (ṯamin, pl. ṣawān), each second into 60 thirds (ṯābita, pl. ṣawāt) and so on. The points of intersection of the ecliptic with the equator (ḏaʿira or falab muʿaddil al-nakhar) define the two equinoxes (al-ʿīšālām), the points of the greatest northerly and southerly declination the two solstices (al-īnḥātām). The position of a fixed star or planet with respect to the Minṭakā is defined by its longitude (fāl, pl. aṭfurūl or in al-Battānī al-ʿaṣab allāḏā išā išī al-kaṣab) and latitude (ʿard, pl. aʿrāh). The longitudes are numbered from the vernal point (al-ʿwāṣīt al-rajīla). The axis erected perpendicular to the plane of the ecliptic meets the sphere of the fixed stars in the two poles of the ecliptic (ḥubīt dīʿarat al-burūḏ). On Arab star-maps and -gloves, we frequently find a mixed ecliptical and equatorial system of coordinates used (cf. the remarks above on the fresco on the dome at Kusair 'Amra), which consists of equatorial circles of longitude in the poles of the ecliptic and equatorial parallel circles.

**Precession** (in al-Battānī Ḥarakat al-kawākib al-ṭabīha, in later authors more precisely Muḥad-darat muʿaddil al-ṭīlāt). Among the Arab astronomers supporters were found for the theory of Ptolemy, who explained the precession as a continual revolution of the whole heavens around the pole of the ecliptic with a period of 26,000 years, as well as for that handed down by Theon of Alexandria (Thawun al-Iskandarānī) from older sources, according to which the process of the precessions consisted of an oscillation to and from around the "nodes of the path of the sun". The greatest amount of the precession, according to this theory is 8° west or east of the nodes; the retrogression amounts to 1° in 80 years so that the whole phenomenon repeats itself after 2,560 years. The latter theory found particular approval in India and was further developed there. Thabit b. Kura gave an explanation for it which at the same time took into account the (more suspected than observed) diminution in the obliquity of the ecliptic and calculated the length of the period at 4171/2 years. al-Battānī attacked and refuted this oscillation hypothesis of Theon and of the Ḥabīb al-ṭīlāmāt (Abū al-walid), on a basis of new and comparative observations he found that the precession amounted to 1° in 66 years, which corresponds to a period of 23,760 years, which is roughly 10% too small. The very accurate estimate of 1° in 70 years is also occasionally, if rarely, given in Arabic literature, according to E. Zinner, Geschichte der Sternkunde, p. 289.

**Obliquity** (Maʿlul faṭāb al-burūḏ, very frequently al-mail kulkhu or al-kullu in contrast to al-mail al-ḏiʿa, "declaration of the separate points in the Minṭakā"; cf. al-Qhālīwī, p. 21). The pro-
blem of estimating the obliquity of the ecliptic was during the classical period a centre of interest for the Muslim astronomers. As a first attempt at an exact estimate in the Muslim period, Ibn Yūnus (ch. ix., p. 222 of the Leyden Codex or of the Paris Codex, No. 4247) mentions an observation of the period between 778 and 786 which gave the value $\varepsilon = 23^\circ 30'$. We have an unusually large number of observations of later dates. (For details see Nallino’s notes on al-Battānī’s *Opus Astronomicum*, i. 157 sqq.).

al-Battānī in his observations used a parallactic ruler (triqurum, iṣṭāda ṣawwāl) as well as a finely divided wall quadrant (ilīma). He ascended with these instruments in al-Raḥṣa the smallest zenith distance of the sun at 12° 26', the greatest at 59° 36'; this gave $\varepsilon = \frac{470^0}{2} = 23^\circ 35'$. This value is at the basis of all al-Battānī’s calculations and tables and has been adopted by many other Arab astronomers.

The question whether the amount of obliquity remains constant at all times or is subject to a secular diminution was answered in different ways by different students. As a matter of fact the degree of accuracy of observation was not sufficient to settle this point and the old Hindu value of $\varepsilon = 24^\circ$, on which these investigations were often based, was based not on observations but only on a statement of Euclid’s according to which astrologers of his time used to estimate the obliquity as a fifteenth part of the circumference of the circle.

The following table gives a survey of the Arab values for the obliquity of the ecliptic (cf. Nallino, *al-Battānī, Opus Astronomicum*, loc. cit.). The column “average obliquity” gives by Bessel’s formula:

\[
\varepsilon = 23^\circ 28' 18''.0 - 0''.48 368.8 t - \\
0''.000 002 722 95. t^2 (t = years after 1750)
\]

the true values calculated for the periods in question. The years given in brackets are only approximate, i.e. not given by the authors themselves.

**Comparative table of the Arab values for the Obliquity of the Ecliptic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Obliquity observed</th>
<th>Average obliquity</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eratosthenes</td>
<td>Alexandria (230 B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23° 43' 45''</td>
<td>35° 41''</td>
<td>+ 7° 35''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipparchus</td>
<td>Rhodes (130 B.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42° 57''</td>
<td>41° 10''</td>
<td>+ 1° 40''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>Alexandria (140 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35° 17''</td>
<td>35° 0''</td>
<td>+ 1° 17''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulœs Probatae (al-Zīj al-\textit{muntakaθ})</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>33°</td>
<td>35° 41''</td>
<td>- 2° 41''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other observers under al-Māmūn</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33° 52''</td>
<td>35° 26''</td>
<td>- 1° 48''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Mūsā</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35° 26''</td>
<td>- 0° 26''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Battānī</td>
<td>al-Raḥṣa</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35° 17''</td>
<td>- 1° 17''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banū Amājdūr</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>35° 0''</td>
<td>- o° 0''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Abd al-Ḥaθmān al-Ṣūfī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>33° 45''</td>
<td>34° 35''</td>
<td>- 0° 50''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu 'l-Wafa</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>34° 25''</td>
<td>+ 0° 35''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widjān b. Rustam al-Kūhī</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>51° 1''</td>
<td>34° 25''</td>
<td>+ 16° 36''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Yūnus</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>34° 52''</td>
<td>34° 19''</td>
<td>+ 0° 33''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bīrām</td>
<td>Ghaznī</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>35°</td>
<td>34° 16''</td>
<td>+ 0° 50''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphansonian Tables</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>32° 29''</td>
<td>32° 19''</td>
<td>+ 0° 10''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn al-Shāṭīr</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>31°</td>
<td>31° 25''</td>
<td>- 0° 25''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg</td>
<td>Samarqand</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>30° 17''</td>
<td>30° 49''</td>
<td>- 0° 32''</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Willy Hartner)

**MINICOY**, a coral island in the Arabian Sea midway between the Laccadive and the Maldives islands; it belongs like the former to the Ali Rājā of Cannanore but ethnographically and geographically has more claim to be attached to the Maldives group. It is six miles long but very narrow, being only 12/4 square miles in area. The population is about 3,000. The people, who are probably of Singhalese origin, have been Muslims since the sixteenth century. The language is Malh but the Arabic character is used. They are strictly monogamous. A girl’s consent is required for her marriage and she brings no dowry, but receives presents from the bridegroom. The women go unveiled. There are three castes in the island. The inhabitants all live in one village which is divided into ten quarters in each of which the men and women are separately organised with their own headmen and headwomen. All work on land is done by women. The men are sailors and fishermen. Most of the island’s food supply has to be imported. The chief exports are cocoanuts, coir, cowries and dried fish. The important position held by women in Minicoy has suggested its identification with Marco Polo’s “Female Island” (ed. Yule, ii. 404).
MINICOY — MĪRĀDJ


MĪNŪCHRĪ, ABU L-NAJDĪ AHMĀD B. YĀKŪB, Persian poet, nicknamed Šash-i-gala = "sixty-herds", because of the wealth he accumulated in horses and cattle; but some say the name should be read Šash-kul or Šash-kul i.e. "crooked-thumb". He was a native of Dāmghān, calling himself "Dāmghānī" in his verse although Dāwlatshāh says he came from Balkh. He was a younger contemporary and imitator of Ūnsūrī [q. v.], but he is considered to have excelled his model in poetic power. After completing his studies under Abu l-Farajī of Sīstān (d. circa 902) he enrolled himself in the service of the Amir Minūchrī b. Khābūs b. Washghnīr, ruler of Dīrūdān and vassal of Maḥmūd of Ghāzna, and from the name of this first patron he took his takhallūs. Presumably through the influence of Ūnsūrī he later became attached to Maḥmūd's entourage of literary men at Ghāzna, and wrote kashidas in praise of his new patron and of his sons Maḥmūd (who reigned for less than a year) and Masūd who succeeded to the Ghāznawī throne. The latter was assassinated in 432 (1041), and Minūchrī did not long survive him (Kīz-kūl Khān, Maḥmūs al-Faṣfaṣī, i. 543, says he died in the same year and quotes 'Abbās as having called him "short-lived"'). In his work Minūchrī shows himself to be a skilled versifier, displaying a clever felicity of rhyme and very often a refreshing simplicity and straightforwardness of language. Also he did not hesitate to use new forms for his verse, and he is the earliest Persian writer we know of to have used the strophic form of the masnammat, which, as used by him, consists of a series of mirā's or stichoi, in groups of six. All six may rhyme together, or only five; in the latter case the last line rhymes with the last line of the other strophes. In spite of his qualities as a versifier, Minūchrī cannot be regarded as a great poet of his day for his themes, — wine, love, springtime and the virtue of patrons — are of the stock pattern, and his kashidas are deliberately moulded on the Arabic form, with all its artificialities. In flattery of his patrons he is as servile as any in the whole range of Persian panegyrist and his conceit of himself as it appears in his work is sometimes ludicrous in its effect (cf. No. 48 in Biberstein-Kazimirski's edition, Paris 1886).

Bibliography: works quoted above and Ethē, in Grundriss d. iran. Philologie, A Tihrān ed. of the Divān was published in 1399 A. H. (R. Levy)

MĪR, a Persian title abbreviated from the Arabic amīr and approximating in meaning both to it and to the title mirā [q. v.]. (For the dropping of the initial aīf, cf. Bū Sahl for Abū Sahl etc.). Like amīr the title is applied to princes (Minūchrī, ed. Biberstein-Kazimirski, 1886, p. 96, speaks of Mašīd, Sultan of Ghāzna, as "Mīr"), but it is also borne by poets and other men of letters (e.g. Mīr 'Alī Shīr, Mīr Khwādān, Mīr Muḥṣīn; cf. the following art.). In India, Saiyids sometimes call themselves by the title. As a common noun, it is used as an equivalent of ẓāḥib, e.g. mir pandār.

mir ʿākwār. In Turkish there was derived from it the colloquial adjective mirā ("belonging to the government"), which gave rise to al-mirā ("the government") in the colloquial Arabic of Trāk. (R. Levy)

MĪR, the poetical designation of Mīr Muḥammad Taḵī b. Mīr ʿAbd Allāh, was a native of Akbarābād. After the death of his father he went to Dhiḥi during the reign of Shāh ʿAlam (1173-1221 = 1759-1806) and became a pupil of Sirāḏī al-Dīn Āli Khān Ārzū. In 1190 (1776) he left Dhiḥi for Lucknow, where he spent the remaining portion of his life. He is recognised to be the most eminent poet of the Urdu language. He died at Lucknow in 1225 (1809) when he was nearly 100 years old. He is the author of six dīrāms which have been repeatedly printed in India, and a biography of Urdu poets, entitled Nūkāt al-Shurārā. (R. Levy)


MĪR AMMĀN, [See Ammān.]

MĪR DJUMLA, [See Muhammad Saʿīd.]

MĪRĀDJ (a.), originally lādār, later "ascent", especially Muḥammad's ascension to heaven. In the Kurʾān, Sūra lxxxi. 19-25 and liii. 1-12, a vision is described in which a heavenly messenger appears to Muhammad and Sūra liii. 12-18 deals with a second message of a similar kind. In both cases the Prophet sees a heavenly figure approach him from the distance but there is no suggestion that he himself was carried off. It is otherwise with the experience alluded to in Sūra xvii. 1: "Praise him, who travelled in one night with his servant from the Masjīd al-Ḥaram to the Masjīd al-ʿAṣqā, whose surroundings we blessed, in order to show him our signs". That Muḥammad is meant by the "servant" is generally assumed and there is no reason to doubt it (Schrieke, Islam, vi, 13, note 6; Beveridge, Z. A. T. W., xvii. 53 n.); that the Masjīd al-Ḥaram is the Meccan sanctuary is certain from Kurʾānic usage (Horovitz, Korān. Unterr., p. 140); but what is the Masjīd al-ʿAṣqā? According to the traditional explanation, but not the only one recognised in Ḥadīth (see Schrieke, op. cit., p. 12, 14 and above, s. v. ISRĀ) it would mean Jerusalem, but how could Muḥammad, who in Sūra xxx. 1 speaks of Palestine as adnā l-aʿrāf, call a sanctuary situated in Jerusalem al-masjīd al-ʿaṣqā? The age of this explanation is not quite certain; perhaps it was already known to ʿAbd Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Raḥmān (ed. Schwarz, xxi.) and Abū Saḥkr (Lieder der Hadsch-bitten, ed. Wellhausen, cxxiv. 24); but even these belong only to the Umayyad period (contrary to Lamsæn, Sanctuaires, p. 72, this is true also of Abū Saḥkr, who according to Aghānī, xxi. 94 was a partisan of the Bahri Marwānī and panegyrist of ʿAbd al-Malīk). Muḥammad probably meant by al-Masjīd al-ʿAṣqā a place in heaven, such as the place in the highest of the seven heavens in which the angels sing praises of Allāh and we would then have in Sūra xvii. 1, evidence from the Prophet himself about his nocturnal ascension into the heavenly spheres (Schrieke, op. cit., p. 13 sqq.; Horovitz, Isl., ix. 161 sqq.), testimony which is however content with the mention of the experience itself and says nothing about its course. The question
of the possibility of an ascent to heaven is several times touched on in the Kur'ān. In Sūra xl. 38 Fir'awn gives Hāmān orders to build a palace so that he can reach the cords of heaven and climb up to the god of Mūsā (cf. also Sūra xxviii. 3). In Sūra lii. 38, the calumniators are asked whether they had perchance a ladder (zulam) so that they could hear the heavenly voice and in Sūra vi. 35 the consequences are considered which the signs brought by the Prophet with the help of a ladder to heaven might have on his hearers. The old poets also talk of ascending to heaven by a ladder, as a means of escaping something one wants to avoid (Zuhahir, Malālahā, p. 54; Aʿshā, xv. 32).

Hadīth gives further details of the Prophet's ascension. Here the ascension is usually associated with the nocturnal journey to Jerusalem, so that the ascent to heaven takes place from this sanctuary. We also have accounts preserved which make the ascension start from Mecca and make no mention of the journey to Jerusalem. In one of these the ascension takes place immediately after the "purification of the heart" (see Bukhārī, Sahīh, bāb 1; Ḥadīth, bāb 76; Manākīb, bāb 42; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iv. 207; v. 143; Tābari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1157 sq.) In the last mentioned passage we read: "When the Prophet had received his revelation and was sleeping at the Ka'ba, as the Kurāsīḥ used to do, the angels Gabriel and Michael came to him and said: With regard to whom have we received the order? Whereupon they themselves answered: With regard to their lord. Thereupon they went away but came back the next night, three of them. When they found him sleeping they laid him on his back, opened his body, brought water from the Zamzam well and washed away all that they found within his body of doubt, idolatry, paganism and error. They then brought a golden vessel which was filled with wisdom and belief and then his body was filled with wisdom and belief. Thereupon he was taken up to the lowest heaven": The other versions of the same story show many additions and variants; according to one, for example, Gabriel came to Muhammad through the roof of his house which opened to receive him; according to another, it was Gabriel alone who appeared to him and there are many similar variants. All these versions however put Muhammad's ascension at an early period and make it a kind of dedication of him as a Prophet, for which the purification of the heart had paved the way. Ethnographical parallels (Schrieke, op. cit., p. 2–4) show other instances of a purification being preliminary to an ascension. Similar stories are found in pagan Arabia (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 171 sqq.) and also in Christian legends (op. cit., p. 170 sqq.). Another story (Ibn Sa'd, vi. 143) says that the ascension took place from Mecca although it does not associate it with "the purification of the heart" which it puts back to the childhood of the Prophet [cf. ḤALIMA].

There is something about this, obviously the earlier, tradition of Mecca as the starting point of the ascension was ousted by the other which made it take place from Jerusalem? The localisation of the Kurānīc Masjid al-ʿAlṣṣa in Jerusalem is by some connected with the efforts of ʿAbd al-Malik to raise Jerusalem to a place of special esteem in the eyes of believers (Schrieke, op. cit., p. 13; Horovitz, op. cit., p. 165 sqq.; do., in Islamic Culture, ii. 35 sqq.) and in any case it cannot be proved that this identification is older than the time of ʿAbd al-Malik. It might all the easier obtain currency as Jerusalem to the Christians was the starting point of Christ's ascension and from the fourth century Jesus's footprint had been shown to pilgrims in the Basilica of the Ascension; as now, perhaps as early as the time of ʿAbd al-Malik, that of their Prophet was shown to Muslim pilgrims (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 167 sqq.). The idea of the "heavenly Jerusalem" may have had some influence on the development of the isrā' legends; when Muhammad meets Ibrāhīm, Mūsā and ʿĪsā in Jerusalem, the presence of these prophets in the earthly Jerusalem is not at once intelligible, but it loses any remarkable features if Bait al-Makdīs (Ibn Hishām, p. 267) from the first meant the "Heavenly Jerusalem" (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 168, another explanation cf. ii. 604). Perhaps also the phrase allādhī bārakāna halālahu was taken to support the reference to Jerusalem; when these words occur elsewhere in the Kurān they refer to sites in the holy land (Lammens, op. cit., p. 72, note). While the stories quoted above only say that Gabriel took the Prophet up to the heights of heaven, but are silent as to how, others add that a ladder (mīrādī) was used for the ascent (see Ibn Hishām, p. 268; Tābari, Tāfsīr, xv. 10; Ibn Sād, vi. 143); this ladder was of splendid appearance; it is the one to which the dying turn their eyes and with the help of which the souls of men ascend to heaven. The ladder is probably identical with Jacob's ladder in Genesis, xxviii. 12; the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees, xxvii. 21 calls this mēʻāreg and Sūra lxx. 3, 4 calls Allāh Dhu' l-Ma'ārīfīrī "to whom the angels and the spirit ascend" (tārādī). According to Sūra xxi. 4, the anvr rises to Allāh; according to Sūra liiv. 4 and xxxiv. 2, Allāh knows "what descends from heaven and what ascends to it", and in Sūra xliii. 32 there is a reference to steps (maʻārīfīrī) in the houses of men. Muhammad therefore already knew the word, which is presumably taken from Ethiopic (Horovitz, op. cit., p. 174 sqq.). Among the Mandaens also the ladder (sumhitē) is the means of ascending to heaven (Ginsa, transl. Lidzbarski, p. 49, 208, 490) and there are parallels to the ladder of the dead in the mysteries of Mithras (see Anderson, Cults of the Far West, 185; Wauters, Pba., p. 114, note 2); the Manichaean amūd al-sābb (Fkrīst, p. 335, 30) by means of which the dead man is taken to the sphere of the moon is a more distant parallel (Bevan, op. cit., p. 59).

Just as the mīrādī is associated with the ascension, so Burāk is originally connected with the night journey to Jerusalem; it found its way however at an early date into the legend of the ascension (see Bukhārī, Manākīb, bāb 42; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iv. 207; v. 387; Tābari, Tāfsīr, xv. 12). The prophets earlier than Muhammad had used Burāk as their steed (Ibn Hishām, p. 263; Dīyārīkīt, Tarīkh al-Khdīsī, i. 349); in particular, it is included under the "dajjał" in the mystical traditions (Ibn Ḥaqqānī, tarīkh, xv. 48–52; Ṭabarī, Tāfsīr, x. 5; Ṭalḥābī, drā'iś, p. 63; Ḥabīb, i. 369). This idea of one animal used by the different prophets is borrowed; according to the Midrashic statement, late it is true (Yaḥṣūb on Zachariah, ix., No. 875; Pirḳe de R. Elīceez, xii.), the ass which Abraham rode (Genesis xxii. 3) is the same as that used by Zipporah and her sons (Exodus, iv. 20) and is that on which
That Muhammad appeared before Allah's throne in the seventh heaven and that the conversation about the obligatory prayers took place there, is already recorded in the oldest stories (see above) but only rarely do they extend the conversation between Allah and the Prophet to other subjects (Tabari, xxvii. 26; Munsud, iv. 66 as a dream; Andrae, p. 70). But objection was raised to the assertion that Muhammad on this occasion saw Allah face to face (Andrae, p. 71 sqq.), and the question was also raised at an early date whether the ascension was a dream or a reality, whether only the soul of the Prophet was carried up or also his body (Caetani, Annali, Instr. § 320; Andrae, p. 72; Bevan, p. 60; Schrieke, p. 13, note 1).

The Hadith contains, besides these, other details which Asin (Escatology, Madrid 1919, p. 7—52; do., Dante e il Islam, Madrid 1927, p. 25—71) has discussed. In developing the story of the Prophet's ascension Muhammad writers have used models afforded them by the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. A few features may also come from the Pseudepigrapha. (cf. the works already mentioned by Andrae, Bevan, Schrieke, Horovitz and W. Bouisset, in A.R.W., iv. 136—169.)

Later accounts (Chauvin, Bibliographie, xi. 207 sqq.; Asin, Escatology, p. 53 sqq.; do., Dante etc., p. 72 sqq.; Nallino, in R. S. O., vii. 802) collect and systematise the material scattered in the older sources; they only increase the matter without however increasing the depth of its thought.

Among the Mirādī-books which have become popular in modern times that of al-Ghātīṣī may be mentioned (this is the correct form, see Nallino, op. cit., p. 813) on which Dardir (d. 1201) wrote a ṣāḥīḥīya; also that of Barzanjī (d. 1179). In the non-Arab lands of Islam, Persian, Turkish, Hindustān and Malay versions of the legend have contributed to its dispersion (see Chauvin, loc. cit.).

The ascension of the Prophet later served as a model for the description of the journey of the soul of the deceased to the throne of the divine judge (Asin, Escatology, p. 59 sqq.); for the Sūfis, however, it is a symbol of the rise of the soul from the bonds of sensuality to the heights of mystic knowledge. Ibn al-'Arabī thus expounds it in his work inrār al-irrā' ilā Ma‘ām al-irrā‘ (Asin, p. 61 sqq.; Andrae, p. 81 sq.) and in his Fisalātī, ii. 356—375 he makes a believer and a philosopher make the journey together but the philosopher only reaches the seventh heaven, while no secret remains hidden from the pious Muslim (Asin, p. 63 sqq.). Abu l-'Alā al-Ma‘arī’s Risālāt al-Ghāfṣīfān is a parody on the traditional accounts of the Mīrādī (Asin, p. 71 sqq.). Asin in his two books quotes has dealt with the knowledge of Muslim legends of the ascension possessed by the Christian middle ages and their influence on Dante. In a separate work (La escatologia musulmana en la divina comedia, Madrid 1924) he has collected and discussed the literature produced by his Escatology down to 1923.

According to Ibn Sa‘d, i. 1. 147 the irrā‘ took place on the 17th Rabī‘ I, the ascension on the 17th Ramadan. For centuries however, the night before the 27th Rabī‘I — a date also significant in the history of Mecca (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 71) — has been regarded by the pious as the Lailat al-Mirādī, and the eve is like the Mawlid al-Nabī devoted to reading the legend of the feast.

the Messiah will make his entrance (cf. also Ibn Sa‘d, i. ii. 176). The recollection that this steed was an ass survives in Muslim tradition so that Burāq is described as “smaller than a mule and larger than an ass” (Bukhārī, Ma‘nākī, bāb 43; similarly Ibn Highm, p. 264; Ibn Sa‘d, i. 143). Ibn Sa‘d already describes Burāq as a female beast and, as early as a story attributed by Ibn Isha‘q to al-Ḥasan al-Basri, Burāq is given wings (Ibn Highm, loc. cit.) and he seems to be the first who speaks of Burāq’s human face (in Ḥalābī, i. 370); in the miniatures that are illustrated by C. Arnold, Painting in Islam, p. 118 sqq., al-Burāq usually has a woman’s head.

At the gate of each of the seven heavens through which he wanders with the Prophet, Gabriel is asked for his own name and that of his companion (Bukhārī, Sahīh, bāb 1, Tabari, Taṣfīr, xv. 4; Annāles, ed. de Goeje, i. 1157). After he gives these he is next asked if Muhammad has already been sent as a prophet (awwad ba‘itha ilākhī, correction for the original awwad ba‘ithu found in Tabari, Annāles, i. 1158; see Snouck Hurgronje, Isl., vi. 5, note 4); this also indicates that the ascension originally belonged to the period immediately after his call (Schrieke, op. cit., p. 6). In each heaven they meet one of the earlier messengers of God, usually Adam in the first, Yahyā and ‘Īsā in the second, Yūsuf in the third, Idrīs in the fourth, Hārūn in the fifth, Mūsā in the sixth and Ibrāhīm in the seventh heaven; there are also variations and Adam appears as judge over the spirits of the dead (Andrae, p. 44 sqq.; Schrieke, p. 17; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Munsud, vi. 145; cf. Apoc. Mosi, p. 37). Of the other messengers of God we are only told that they have a description of their personal appearance — that they greeted Muḥammad; Mūsā is an exception who explicitly says that Muḥammad is higher in the esteem of Allah than himself and that the number of his followers surpasses his own (Tabari, Taṣfīr, xv. 11). On another occasion, Muḥammad engages in a conversation with Mūsā after Allah had imposed upon him 50 ṣalāts a day as obligatory prayers for the faithful. On Muḥammad’s advice, Muḥammad asks several times for an alleviation and each time Allah grants it; but when Mūsā says 5 ṣalāts are still too many, the Prophet refuses to ask for less (on Genesis, xviii. 23 sqq. as the prototype of this episode; cf. Goldziher, Studien, i. 36; Schrieke, p. 19; Andrae, p. 82). According to some versions, Mūsā dwells in the seventh heaven and the conversation seems to be more natural there. To the ascension belong the visits to paradise and to hell. Paradise according to many versions is the seventh heaven, according to others in the first; in some it is not mentioned at all. The statements about its rivers are contradictory (Schrieke, p. 19; cf. above Kawkabār), the Sidrāt al-Muntahā is usually placed in the seventh heaven (Bevan, p. 59; Schrieke, p. 18). In one description hell is put below the first heaven (Ibn Highm, p. 269; Tabari, Taṣfīr, iv. 10). According to another, the place of punishment of the damned is on the way between heaven and earth and Muḥammad sees it on his journey to the Bait al-Ma‘kdis (Tabari, xv. 101, also Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Munsud, i. 257; ii. 353; iii. 120, 180, 224, 231, 239). On the punishment in hell cf. Schrieke, p. 17; Andrae, p. 44; Horovitz, p. 173; Reitzenstein, Das mandäische Buch der Großen, p. 81 sqq.; Litzbarski, Johannismut, p. 98 sqq.; Ginza, p. 183.
(see al-‘Abdari, Muddhakhl, i. 143 sqq.; Herklotz, Qanoun e Islam², p. 165; Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1806, 474 sq.; Snouck Hurgronje, The Achekhete, i. 219; Asin, Estatologia, p. 97).


(J. Horovitz)

MIRANDJI, whose full name was Mir Muḥammad b. ʻAbd-Allāh b.'Abd-Kalantar, commonly Mīrzā Mir or Mīrāndji, born 928 (1523) in Siwās, Sīstān. He traced his origin to the caliph 'Umar and spent the last 60 years of his life in great sanctity at Lāhīj. He died in 1045 (1635). But according to the Šadšah-Nāma of 'Abd al-Ḥamid, i. 330, his death took place in 1044 (1634). Shāh Dījāwī repeatedly visited the saint and Prince Dārū Shīkūh erected a splendid dome over his tomb. The Prince also wrote a work called Sofmatat al-ʻAwliyya in which he described fully the lives of this Indian saint and his disciples.

Bibliography: Sofmatat al-ʻAwliyya, p. 70; Khasmat al-ʻAtīyya, p. 154; 'Abd al-Ḥamid, Badshah-Nāma, i. 329; Rieu, Cat. Persian MSS. British Museum, i. 538.

(M. Hidayat Hosain)

MIRĀN MUHAMMAD SHAḤ I, son of Khāndes, was the eleventh prince of the Fārūḵī dynasty. He belonged to the younger branch of that line, which had taken refuge in Gudjārat, and his ancestors had lived in that kingdom and had married princesses of the Muḥfazzār family until Maḥmūd I of Gudjārat had, on the extinction of the elder branch of the Fārūḵīs, placed ʻAdīn Khān III, Muḥammad’s father, on the throne of Khāndes. Muhammad, who was, through his mother, the great-grandson of Maḥmūd, and the grandson of his son, Muḥfazzār II, succeeded his father in Khāndes in 1520, and in 1527 incastiously intervened in the cause of ʻAla’ al-Dīn Ṣiyāḥ Shāh of Bārār by aiding him against his enemy, Burūhān Niẓām Shāh I of Ahmādanag. He was defeated and driven back into Khāndes, but succeeded in persuading his uncle, Bahādur of Gudjārat, to intervene, and with him invaded the kingdom of Ahmādanag. The campaign was only partially successful, but Muḥammad was indemnified by Burūhān I for his losses. He accompanied his uncle in the campaign which ended, in 1531, in the capture of Māndū and the annexation of Malwa to Gudjārat, and on Bahādur’s death in 1537, was summoned, in his mother’s right, to the throne of Gudjārat, but died on his way to Ahmādanagāb.

Bibliography: Muḥammad Kāsim Fīrūḥt, Gulghan-i Ibrāhīmī, Bombay 1852; An Arabic History of Gudjārat, ed. E. Denison Ross (Indian Texts Series); T. W. Haig, The Fārūkī Dynasty of Khāndes (The Indian Antiquary, 1918).

(T. W. Haig)

MIRĀTH (m.), inheritance (pl. mawārīth), mawārīth legator, wāṣīth heir.

1. The law of inheritance (ilm al-farā’īd, the science of dispositions), i.e. of the quotas laid down in accordance with Sūra iv. 16, which is called after its most important and most difficult part) is one of the branches of Muḥammadan law in which Muḥammad more deeply modified earlier practice by legislation. Although the Korānic regulations are fairly detailed, the task of deducing all necessary conclusions from them, to which lawyers turned with particular enthusiasm, gave rise to a great mass of traditions and considerable divergences of opinion on questions not expressly decided in the Korān. In the law of inheritance we can also still trace fundamental old Arabian pre-Islamic features.

2. In the period before the rise of Ḳūṣān, in keeping with the patriarchal system prevailing among the Arabs, the estate of a deceased tribesman went, if he died intestate, to the nearest male relative(s); the order of succession in which these relatives, the so-called ‘aqāba (corresponding to agnati), were called upon to inherit survives systematized in its order in the Muslim law of inheritance (cf. below). Minoros were, as incapable of bearing arms, excluded from the succession as were female relatives; widows also were not entitled to inherit, and originally no doubt themselves formed a part of the estate, a view which survived in the levirate marriage usual among the Arabs, to which Sūra iv. 23 (cf. below) refers in forbidding it. There is no evidence of any preferential treatment of the first-born, which we find elsewhere in Semitic law. This, the original legal position, had by Muḥammad’s time most certainly altered somewhat in favour of women; in cases where the deceased left no male relatives his daughters seem frequently to have obtained the estate: but woman had by no means equal treatment with man, as is clear from Muḥammad’s regulations. In addition to these principal heirs the pre-Islamic Arabs had also secondary heirs who correspond to the later so-called quota-heirs (dhawu ḫarāḍ) and received a part of the estate, the bulk of which went to the ‘aqāba. From Ḳūṣān ii. 176 and iv. 37 which confirm this arrangement, we can see that these included the parents, the “relatives” apparently so far as they were not ‘aqāba — and the so-called confederates (ḥalif, plur. ḥalafā) : the settlement of the portions falling to them was done in accordance with Sūra ii. 176 — at least in part according to the last will of the testator.

3. Muḥammad modified this system considerably in details, the main point being the improvement in the treatment of women as in his innovations with regard to the laws of family life generally (cf. Ṭaḷāk); at the same time there is a clear endeavour to fix in legal form the practice which had varied considerably in heathen times. The main lines of the system and the general conceptions as above briefly outlined were retained by the Prophet. One provision which had been made under special circumstances he was not able later to keep in force; immediately after the Ḥijrā, he had ordered that those who migrated with him (the mukhāfīrīn) and the believers in Medina (the anṣār) should regard themselves as brethren and therefore able to inherit from one another, while all bonds of relationship between the mukhāfīrīn and their relatives left in Mecca, even if they were believers, were to be regarded as broken (Sūra viii. 73, with the limitation imposed in viii. 75); but this was expressly revoked by Sūra xxxiii. 6. Tradition regards this fraternalization as a special case of confederacy (ḥalif/dom; cf. above, section 2). For the rest, Muḥammad in his first Medina period confirmed the system of secondary heirs and the whole general practice in regard to inheritance (cf. tāḥ; Sūra ii. 176 is probably to be dated in Ṣaḥiḥ of the year 2, and iv. 37, of which the first view in
al-Baidawi is undoubtedly the right one, cannot
be much later); that in ii. 176 he expressly makes
the fair treatment of the secondary heirs a duty,
already reveals the direction which later ordinances
were to take. Connected with this is the probably
contemporary ii. 241 sqq. which secures the wife, if
she survives her husband, a legacy of maintenance
for a year. Not much later, about the year 3, is
Sura iv. 23: "Ye, who are believers, are not per-
mitted to inherit women against their will"; this is
a prohibition against the *azaba forcing the
widow of the deceased into a levirate marriage
and generally assuming the position of *walî over
her which belongs only to her male relatives; this
is not meant as a regular legal ordinance but is part
of Muhammad’s endeavour to improve the position
of women [cf. Tal.]. Very soon after the battle of
Uçud, when numerous Muslims had fallen, we
have — as a result of it — the final Qur’anic
ordinance of Sûra iv. 8—18: “To the men belongs
a share of what their parents and relatives leave,
and to the women a share of what their parents
and relatives leave — whether it be much or little
— as a definite share. 9. If the relatives
(not entitled to inherit), the orphans and the poor
are present at the division, give them some of it
and speak kindly to them (verses 10 sqq. go on to
deal with the treatment of orphans). 12. Allâh
commands you, as regards your children, as follows:
to the boy belongs as much as the share of two
girls; if however there are (only) girls (and) more
than two, two-thirds of the estate belongs to them
and if there is one (girl) to her belongs the half.
And the parents shall each have a sixth if (the
legator) had children, and if he had no children
and (only) his parents inherit from him, his mother
shall have a third. If however he has brothers, his
mother shall have a sixth. (All this) after deducting
any bequests he may have made or a debt. Ye
know not whether your parents or your children
be of greater use to you. (This is) an ordinance of
Allâh and Allâh is all-knowing and wise. 13. To
you belongs the half of the estate of your wives,
if they have no children; but if they have children
you shall receive a fourth of their estate — after
deducting any bequest that they may have made
or any debt. 14. To them belongs a fourth of
your estate, if you have no children; but if you
have children an eighth of your estate belongs to
them — after deducting any bequest that you may
have made or any debt. 15. If distant relatives
inherit from a legator, male or female, and he has
a brother or a sister, each shall have a sixth; but
if there are more, they shall have a third among
them after deducting any bequest which he may have
made or debt. 16. Without prejudice (this is) an
ordinance of Allâh. Allâh is all-knowing and gracious”
(Verse 17 sqq. contain promises and threats). As the
settlement of the succession in indirect lines left
questions undecided, Sûra iv. 175 supplemented
the above: "They ask thee for a decision. Say:
Allâh gives you the following decision for remoter
kindred: if a man die childless and have a sister,
half of what he has is hers and if she die childless,
he is her heir; if there be two sisters, two-thirds
of the estate belongs to them; but if there be
both brothers and sisters, the brother shall have
as much as two sisters...”. The object of these regu-
lations is simply to supplement the law regarding
the rights of the *azaba; they are not a reorganisa-
tion of the whole law. Each of the persons named is
therefore only allotted a definite portion. The
remainer, and this as a rule the major portion,
of the estate falls as before to the *azaba. There
is a distinct tendency to give female relatives half
the share of male relatives of the same degree;
even in the case when there are daughters but no
sons (and correspondingly sisters but no brothers),
they do not receive all that would belong to the
sons or brothers; but as regards a few smaller
portions the two sexes rank equally. The quotas
here given abolished the testamentary settlement
of the portions usual in the heathen period, which
was still approved by Sûra ii. 176; this is the
historical starting point for the tradition — early
interpreted in another sense — that a legacy in
favour of the heirs is not valid. Sûra ii. 241 sqq.
(cf. above) is probably rightly regarded as abrogated
by the settling of the widow’s portion in tradition.
There is a slight difficulty in interpretation only
in iv. 15; but there can be no doubt that this verse
refers to half-sisters on the mother’s side, as indeed
it has always been interpreted; the text of Ubâi
even inserts an addition to this effect (cf. Noldeke-
Bergstrasser, Gesch. des Qorâns, ii. 85, 93,
note 5). The verse iv. 175 on the other hand
refers to full sisters; how the Qur’ân wished half-
sisters on the father’s side to be dealt with, is
difficult to say. In iv. 12 "more than two" (girls)
is to be interpreted, as the sense requires, as "two
and more"; similarly, in the case in which the mother
is allotted a third of the estate, it is presumed
that the father gets the other two-thirds.
4. The full details which tradition is able to
give regarding the causes of the revelation of the
regulation of the law of inheritance are not
historical; on internal grounds all we can say is
that it took place soon after the battle of Uhud
(cf. above, section 3). The numerous hadiths which
simply repeat the Kur’ânic regulations may be
neglected here. Tradition can only record very
few actual divergences from the prescriptions of
the Qur’ân: one of these is that a woman received
back as her inheritance a slave whom she had
presented to her mother and who repented to the
latter’s whole estate (in a parallel case it is a
man who has given his mother a garden; by this
alteration the divergence is disposed of). According
to another story, the Prophet is said
to have laid it down that the wives of the muhâajirûn
should inherit the houses of their husbands;
according to the wording, it cannot have been a
temporary arrangement which was abolished by
the final settlement. While nothing can be quoted
in favour of the first hadith, the second, which
does not seem to be intended as a foundation for
any legal clause, may have a grain of historical
truth in it.
5. As the prescriptions of the Qur’ân are supple-
mented and developed in countless traditions
among which a comparatively large number relate
not decisions of the Prophet himself, but of his
Companions (we may cite Ibn Hanabî, iv. 279 sqq.,
as a typical mixed form); in reality they must
not for a moment be regarded as fact, but
only as anonymous evidence of the first develop-
ments of the Qur’ânic law of inheritance. At this
stage of development it is already firmly established
that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim;
the right of a Muslim to inherit from an un-
believer is finally also denied, although there is
some opposition to this view; on the question
of inheritance of a murādād, unity was not attained. Excluded from the right of inheritance is also one who has killed the legator; according to one view always, according to another only if the slaying was deliberate (with 'āmid; cf. article KATL). That a slave has no right of inheritance is taken for granted. Legal relationship is necessary for the right of inheritance; thus illegitimate children or those whose paternity has been disputed by īśān [q.v.] have no legal claim on the estates of their father and his relations. The patron (mawāla, q.v.) is included among the 'ażaba, who are placed in the order which had been handed down from the pre-Islamic period and continued to hold good: the patron and the mansumitted slave inherit from one another and according to one view, the same right is granted to the mawāla, meaning the man before whom the person concerned has adopted Islam. After the mawāla come — although some oppose this — the dhauw l-arbām, i.e. persons related to the legator in the female line, whose representative is usually the kādī or maternal uncle. In case all these heirs should not exist, the fellow-tribesmen are named. The law in Sūra iv. 14 is also extended to the widow whose husband dies before the consummation of the marriage; on the question what should be the share of two daughters, we have the answer two-thirds, doubless in keeping with the sense of Sūra iv. 12, but also that based on the literal interpretation (the half); finally half-brothers on the father's side, about whom the Qur'ān lays down nothing definitely, are excluded from inheriting by full brothers. With certain modifications which occur again in the later teaching, a son's daughters are treated like daughters and grandparents like parents, but this regulation only won recognition after opposition and varying practice in details. Here arises the problem of the different shares of the grandfather along with the brothers when he appears with them as 'ażaba, which goes back to his varying position in the series (cf. below sect 65); along with other views we find quoted also the one that later prevailed but it does not seem to be the earliest. The Qur'ān lays it down that before dividing the estate the amount of any legacies and debts should be deducted, and there is no doubt that in early times, probably in literal interpretation of the Qur'ānic passages the legacies often were given preference to debts; after some opposition the opposite teaching prevailed. The diya [q.v.] to be paid for a slain man was in itself subject to the usual laws as part of his estate; but in early times the wife was not allowed a share in the diya of her slain husband, which goes back to old Arab conceptions of the family; the other view ultimately prevailed. In addition there are numerous, often contradictory, views on separate points which show the eager interest taken in the matter. The interest taken in early Islam in the law of inheritance is reflected in Ḥadīth; there are traditions in which the Prophet orders the law of inheritance to be taught and learned, calling it "the half of knowledge" on account of its difficulty and expressing the fear that this subject, so difficult to remember, might in time disappear from the memory of his community.

6. The law of inheritance attained its full development in the system of fikh; the following are its principles according to the Shāfiʿī teaching (for the most important divergences in the other schools cf. below sect. 7).

a. The law of intestacy in general. According to Muslim law, there is no fusion between the property of the legator and that of the heir. The creditors of the estate can therefore only assert their claims against the estate; on the other hand, the heirs have no claim on the estate until all debts are paid. The fikh has therefore no special teaching on the rejection of legacies, the different ways of succeeding to an inheritance, etc. In addition to pledges entered into by the deceased, the debts of the estate include the funeral expenses and the religious duties omitted by the deceased so far as they consist of concrete things (e.g. unpaid zakāt) or can be atoned for by payment (e.g. neglected fasts [ṣawm]) or can be carried through at the expense of the amīn or a deputy after the death of the owner (e.g. the ṣafādād omitted without good reason); in the opinion of a minority of Shāfiʿī legists, omitted salāts may also be included in these. After the debts any legacies have to be paid (cf. WASĪYA); the remainder passes to the heirs. A necessary condition for inheriting is that the heir has survived the testator; in doubtful cases, when persons who would inherit from one another have died without its being certain which died first, as a rule no inheritance passes between them (this decision is already found in Tradition; there was a very old difference of opinion on the point). The heir must also have existed when the testator died; only in the case where a man leaves a pregnant widow or umm al-waṣīla, is a child's share reserved for the unborn child (Tradition is not agreed on this point). If a man is missing long enough to be considered dead, the kādī can declare him "presumably dead" at the request of the heirs after investigating the circumstances; the heirs thus receive the right to take possession of the estate for the time. Excluded from succession are the following: one who has caused the death of the deceased, the murādād, an unbeliever from the succession to a Muslim and vice versa, the karbī (the unbelieving member of a state with which the Muslim stands in no treaty relation) and the slave. As in old Arab law the succession of the 'ażaba is the basis of the law of inheritance in the case of an intestate; the 'ażaba are the usual heirs, inheritance by others is only an exception from the general rule; on the other hand, the succession among the 'ażaba cf. under b. If there are no 'ażaba, receive the whole estate and deduction of the portions set aside for the quota-heirs by the Qur'ān (cf. under c). If there are no 'ażaba, that portion of the estate which remains after the deduction of the portions of the quota-heirs goes to the state treasury (bait al-māl); a notable change from the view found in traditions — cf. section 5 —; even 'Omar II is said to have decided otherwise, cf. al-Dārīmī, Farāwīd, bab 56), it being presumed that this is administered according to law for the benefit of the Muslims; otherwise the Qur'ānic quota-heirs receive the remainder of the estate in proportion to their quota by the so-called law of reversion, with the exception of the widow or window if they are not also at the same time kin relations of the deceased (here also as in the case of the exclusion of the widow from sharing in the diya of her slain husband, the basis is the old Arab family law). Only if there are neither 'ażaba nor quota-heirs and the state treasury is not being administered in accordance with the law are the dhauw l-arbām — i.e. persons related to the deceased in the female line as well as those
female relatives who cannot be quota-heirs—called upon to inherit (there are two theories regarding their order of succession). If there are none of these relatives, any Muslim may take possession of the estate, if he is capable and ready to administer it for the general good of Muslims.

b. Rights of the 'āqāba. The 'āqāba are called upon to inherit in the following order which in essentials already existed in the pre-Muḥammadan period: 1. The male descendants of the legator in the male line, a nearer excluding the more distant relatives from the succession. 2. The nearest male relative in the ascending male line with the provision that the father, but not the grandfather (and remoter ascendant), of the deceased inherits before his brothers; the grandfather shares with the brothers (cf. below). 3. The nearest male relative in the male line in the descendants of the father: first the full brother, then the half-brother on the father's side, then the descendants of the full brother, then those of the half-brother on the father's side. 4. The nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the grandfather (as under 3) etc.; 5. lastly the mawāli, i.e. the patron (or patroness), if the deceased was a freed man, and then his 'āqāba. — The brothers of the deceased inherit only with the grandfather as 'āqāba in equal shares with him, but if there are more than two brothers there, the grandfather receives one-third of what is to be divided between him and the brothers. If there are also quota-heirs, the grandfather is allowed in addition at least a sixth of the estate (which he would inherit as a quota-heir; cf. below c). He can then choose the most favourable of the three arrangements. This rule seems to be a compromise between the two earlier contradictory views that the grandfather excluded the brothers or vice versa was excluded by them (cf. above section 5). — Female 'āqāba. If the deceased left sons as well as daughters they inherit jointly, the share of a son being twice as large as that of a daughter (according to Sūra iv. 12) while the quota allotted to the daughters (ibid.) is dropped, as is intended by the spirit of the Kur'ānic law. The daughter inherits along with a son is therefore also called 'āqāba, and in order to distinguish her from the male 'āqāba, the 'āqāba binafṣātī ("'āqāba by themselves"); she is called 'āqāba bi 'l-ghairī ("become 'āqāba through another"). The daughter of a son of the legator is similarly treated, inheriting along with the son of a son; and the full sister who inherits along with a full brother (by Sūra iv. 175); finally it applies also to the half-sister on the father's side who inherits with a half-brother on the father's side (the grandfather makes the full sister as well as the half-sister on the mother's side 'āqāba bi 'l-ghairī). — If the full sister and the half-sister on the father's side inherit along with a daughter of the deceased or of a son, they do not receive their Kur'ānic quota (Sūra iv. 175) which in this case goes to the rest of the estate after deduction of all quotas that have to be paid; they are in this case therefore called 'āqāba ma'a 'l-ghairī ("inheriting with one another as 'āqāba").

c. Rights of the quota-heirs (iḥāram 'l-farādī; cf. the article FARĀDĪ). The regulations in this connection are in general based on literal interpretation of the Kur'ānic regulations. It is true that here only the daughters, parents, husband and wife, and brothers and sisters are allotted a quota but (with some limitations) the rules holding for the daughters have been extended to the daughters of the son and those for the parents to the grandparents; in addition, a distinction has been made among the sisters between the full sister, the half-sister on the father's side and the half-sister on the mother's side. The total number of quota-heirs has thus been raised to twelve: 1. The daughter is entitled to half the estate, two or more daughters get two-thirds, but if daughters inherit along with sons, their claim to the quota drops and sons and daughters receive the whole after deduction of the quotas to be paid; in this case the daughter's share is half a son's. 2. The daughter of a son is subject to the same rules as a daughter; inheriting along with the son of a son she receives half as much as he as 'āqāba bi 'l-ghairī. As the son's daughter is related to the son through him, she is excluded from participation when a son of the legator inherits. A daughter on the other hand does not exclude a son's daughter from the succession; as however daughters and son's daughters together have only two-thirds of the estate as their quota, a son's daughter has only a sixth if there is one daughter, and nothing if there are two or more, unless she inherits in these cases along with a son's son as 'āqāba bi 'l-ghairī. 3. The father's quota is always a sixth of the estate; in addition he appears as 'āqāba and receives as his quota also any residuum of the estate after deducting all quotas, unless male descendants of the legator inherit jointly with him. 4. The paternal grandfather (in default of him, the remoter ascendants) also receives one sixth of the estate as his quota but is excluded by the father; he also appears as 'āqāba (like the father) if there are no male descendants nor father of the deceased. But if in addition to him there are also brothers of the legator, he appears with them as 'āqāba (on the share which falls to the grandfather in this case and in the case where there are also quota-heirs, cf. above b). 5. The mother by Sūra iv. 12, receives one-sixth of the estate if there are children, son's children or two or more brothers or sisters of the legator; otherwise a third (on the meaning of the Kur'ānic rule cf. above; in practice the father in this case as a rule receives two-thirds, i.e. according to the scheme, one sixth as quota-heir and the rest as 'āqāba; on the exceptions cf. below under 6). 6. The quota of the grandmother is always a sixth; from this the mother's mother is excluded by the mother, and the father's mother by the father and mother; all other female ascendants of the legator rank equally with the grandmothers on both sides if there is no father and mother, so far as they are not related to the deceased by a male descendant; not entitled to inherit (therefore for example the mother of the maternal grandfather inherits nothing). 7. A full sister receives half, two or more such sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate (Sūra iv. 175). Along with a full brother or grandfather she becomes 'āqāba bi 'l-ghairī and receives the half of the brother's share (Sūra iv. 175). Along with the daughter or son's daughter she becomes 'āqāba ma'a 'l-ghairī (cf. above b); sons, sons' sons and the father exclude her from succession. She has a claim to the quota only when the legator has died without leaving de-
scendants or male descendants. 8. The treatment of the half-sister on the father's side in general corresponds to that of the full sister; along with a half-brother on the father's side or the grandfather, she becomes 'aṣaba bī 'l-ğhairi, with the daughter or son's daughter 'aṣaba ma'ā 'l-ğhairi (cf. above 3); sons, sons' sons, father and full brothers exclude her from the succession. Full sisters exclude her only in so far as two or more full sisters receive together two-thirds of the estate, so that nothing is left for the half-sisters; if however, half-sister inherits along with one full sister they receive together two-thirds, the full sister getting a half and the half-sister a sixth; unless she in these cases inherits along with a half-brother on the father's side as 'aṣaba bī 'l-ğhairi (i.e. the same rule as with daughters and sons' daughters; cf. above). 9 and 10. The rights of the half-brother on the mother's side and of the half-sister on the mother's side are based on Sūra iv. 15: each of them receives a sixth, two or more together share a third among them; they are excluded from the succession by descendants and female descendants. 11. By Sūra iv. 13 the widower receives half of the estate, but only a quarter if there is a son or son's child; it is indifferent whether these are his wife's or his own descendants. 12. The widow, by Sūra iv. 14, receives the half of what a widower would receive under the same circumstances; if the deceased leaves more than one widow they share equally the quota allotted to the widow. During the 'idda (period of waiting; q.v.) after a revocable tālāk a man and woman are still regarded as man and wife for purposes of inheritance.

d. Exceptions from the general rules.

Although the quota-heirs can never all inherit together and in particular the collateral relations are excluded from their quotas by those in the direct line, the number of qualified quota-heirs may sometimes be so large that the sum of their shares is larger than the whole estate; in this case their shares are proportionately reduced (cf. 'AWL). Otherwise, the occurrence of a number of heirs makes no change from the main rules necessary, except in a few particular cases which have special names; these are cases in which, if the main rules were strictly carried through, the inheritances would be in a proportion to one another which would be contrary to the law; e.g. in the case of the so-called ḍharrīṭāna: if some one dies leaving a husband or wife and both parents, the mother would receive in this case a third, the father's share however, which is usually two-thirds (cf. above c 5), would be here reduced by the quota either of the widow i.e. a quarter or of the widower, i.e. the half; and thus reduced to five-twelfths or a sixth; according to tradition, it was 'Omār who decided in this case that father and mother should share, in the proportion of two to one, what remains after deducting the portion of the widow or widower, an arrangement which is doubtless in the spirit of the Kur'ānic rule. Another case, the so-called ṣaḥarīta: that is in which a wife leaves her husband, her mother, two or more half-brothers on the mother's side and also one or more full brothers; as the quotas in this case make up the whole estate, nothing would be left for the full brothers as 'aṣaba, and they are more closely related to the legator than the half-brothers; in this case, which is also said to have been decided by 'Omār, the law lays down that the full brothers have the same rights as the half-brothers so that all inherit in equal shares the third originally set aside for the half-brothers. On a third case of this kind cf. AKBĀRIYA.

7. The most important points of difference among the madhhabīs, including the early legists, are the following. It is unanimously agreed that an unbeliever cannot inherit from a Muslim nor a Muslim from an unbeliever; but Sa'īd b. Mūsāyib and Ibrāhīm al-Nakḥāt recognized the right to inherit in the latter case. Unbelievers who belong to different religions cannot inherit from one another according to Mālik and Ibn Ḥanbal, but they can according to Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Ṣāḥīfī. There are three views regarding ability to inherit from the murtaḍī according to Mālik, al-Ṣāḥīfī and Ibn Ḥanbal his whole estate goes to the state treasury; according to Abū Yūsuf and al-Shābizī it goes to his Muslim heirs; according to Abū Ḥanīfa what he has made while a Muslim goes to his Muslim heirs, but what he made after his apostacy goes to the treasury. If a legator has been deliberately (with 'aman) and illegally slain, his slave, it is unanimously agreed, is excluded from inheriting. Abū Ḥanīfa, al-Ṣāḥīfī and Ibn Ḥanbal, but not Mālik, also exclude one who has killed him without design (with ḥaṭa; q.v.). One who is a slave to some degree can, according to Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik and al-Ṣāḥīfī, neither inherit nor bequeath; according to Ibn Ḥanbal, Abū Yūsuf, al-Shābizī and al-Muẓānī he can inherit or bequeath in the proportion he is free. According to Abū Ḥanīfa and Ibn Ḥanbal, if there are no 'aṣaba and quota-heirs, the dhār wa 'l-ṭarāḥām inherit; according to Mālik and al-Ṣāḥīfī (cf. above 6 a) as well as Zuhri, al-ʿAzaīṭ and Dāwūd al-Zāhirī, in this case the treasury steps in. If there are only quota-heirs, according to Mālik and al-Ṣāḥīfī the remainder goes to the treasury, according to Abū Ḥanīfa and Ibn Ḥanbal however also to the quota-heirs; according to Sa'īd b. Mūsāyib the quota-heirs along with the daughters. The relationship of muṣāba, which is produced by some one attaching himself to the tribe (usually on the adoption of Jaʿān by a non-Arab; cf. above, sect. 5) and which results in the patron becoming surety for the diya (q.v.) of the client, does not, according to the usual view, give any right to inherit. Ibrāhīm al-Nakḥāt and Abū Ḥanīfa take the opposite view but hold but it may be dissolved at any time by either side so long as the patron has not paid a diya for his client. The paternal grandmother is not excluded from the succession by the father, according to Ibn Ḥanbal only; in his view, in this case she inherits a sixth either alone or shared equally with the mother. Among female ascendants, according to Mālik, only the mothers of the two grandmothers inherit, likewise their mothers and so on, but according to Abū Ḥanīfa also the mothers of all male ascendants and their mothers again, and so on; both views are quoted by al-Ṣāḥīfī, but the latter is best known and has established itself in the madhhab. According to Mālik and al-Ṣāḥīfī, the female ascendants on the father's and mother's side share in equal portions the sixth allotted to the grandmothers who is nearer of the two to the legator. According to Abū Ḥanīfa, however, the nearer female ascendant on the father's side excludes the remoter on the
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mother's side from the succession. Whichever of the two sides is entitled to inherit a quota inherits, according to Malik and al-Shafi'i, only on ground of "stronger" relationship, according to Abū Ḥanifa and Ibn Ḥanbal on ground of blood respects (this case, particularly frequent if the marriages of the Parsees, has been decided in various ways in Tradition; cf. al-Dārīmī, Farā'īd, bab 42); in the case of two cousins on the father's side, of which one is also the brother on the mother's side, the latter, it is unanimously agreed, receives a sixth and the remainder falls to the two as 'asaba in equal portions, while Abū Thawr and al-Islām of Baṣra make him inherit the whole. The estate of a child, whose paternity has been disputed by ḥumūr, as well as that of an illegitimate child, passes in default of other heirs, according to Abū Ḥanifa, entirely to the mother (a third as Kūrānic quota and the remainder as quasi-'asaba); according to Malik and al-Shafi'i the mother receives a third as Kūrānic quota and the remainder goes to the treasury; according to one view transmitted from Ibn Ḥanbal the 'asaba of his mother are regarded as his 'asaba, and receive the remainder; the other view corresponds to that of Abū Ḥanifa. In the special case of the son and another grandson (son's grandson), which agrees with that of al-Shafi'i (cf. above 62); this is also the opinion of al-Zuhri and of Sa'd b. al-Musayyib and others; according to Abū Ḥanifa and his fellows, Ibn Ḥanbal and Dāwūd al-Zāhirī, the full brothers actually receive nothing.

8 a. The law of the Imāmīs (Twelver-Shī'is) as regards inheritance is based on the same principles as that of the Sunnis but in its practice shows a number of features of its own, which already can form the most part be traced in the tradition, i.e. in the earliest post-Kūrānic development. Among the divergences — apart from differences in terminology and presentation — are the classifying of the 'asaba and the dhawr 'ar-hām together into one group of relatives, which is divided into three classes: 1. the ascendants in the first degree and the descendants; 2. the other ascendants and the descendants of the ascendants of the first degree; 3. the maternal and paternal uncles and aunts. Each of these classes excludes the fraction only from the succession, and within the two categories of the two first classes the relative of the nearest degree excludes all others of a remoter degree of relationship, i.e. for example the daughter excludes the son's son; within the third class a distinction is made between the uncles and aunts of the legator and their ascendants, the uncles and aunts of his parents, and their descendants etc., and here also the member of a nearer degree excludes those of a remoter degree. Within the same grade all (male or females) exclude all relatives on the father's (not the mother's) side, i.e. full sisters exclude half-brothers; the relatives on the mother's side are excluded only from a share in the residuary estate by all other relatives of the same degree. If relatives whose relationships with the legator is traced through several persons inherit jointly, the proportion of their shares is settled by the (hypothetical) shares of the persons through whom they are related to the deceased. If, for example, paternal and maternal uncles inherit together, the former divide two-thirds of the estate (i.e. the father's hypothetical share), the latter a third (i.e. the mother's hypothetical share); correspondingly, son's children and daughters children, children of brothers and children of sisters, and ascendants on the mother's and father's side. The rules applying to the brothers and sisters of a legator are also applied to his father's brothers and sisters and so on, in the order of their willingness to inherit; if, for example, father's full brothers and sisters (uncles and aunts), and father's brothers and sisters on the mother's side exist together, the latter are not excluded by the former but receive a third (if there is only one, a sixth) which is divided equally among them (Surah iv. 15), and the former receive the remaining two-thirds (or five-sixths as the case may be) of which each uncle gets twice the share of an aunt; the process is to nilar when their children take the place of uncles and aunts; the grandfather (and if the case arises the remote ascendants) also inherits equally with the brothers of the legator. Within similar groups the male inherits double as much as the female, so far as there are no special regulations to the contrary (cf. above); for the rest the male relative on the father's side is not specially privileged before the others, as among the Sunnis. Besides these heirs by blood, there are "heirs for special reasons", i.e. the husband and the patron (marzā), namely

1. a patron who has released the legator from slavery;
2. a patron before whom the legator has become a Muslim, or who has pledged himself to pay the diva for him;
3. the imāmī, who here takes the place of the state treasury, and who, as the general protector of all Muslims, is entitled to inherit in the last resort. — In both main groups there are simple heirs and such as have a claim to a Kūrānic quota. If the estate does not suffice to satisfy all the quotas, the shares are correspondingly reduced to the paternal relatives only, never to the maternal. What is left over after satisfying the quotas is given to relatives by blood according to the above rule; but if there are no blood relatives entitled to inherit, the quota-heirs, with the exception of the husband or wife, receive the residuum also by the residuary law (cf. however above); if there are no heirs by blood the patrons come in, in the order given, so that the imāmī, i.e. the treasury, inherits only in the last resort. — These general rules are sufficient to cause the distribution of an estate to look very different among the Shi'is from among the Sunnis. But there are in addition differences in detail, of which the most important are the following: The Muslim can inherit from the unbeliever (and apostate); even the remotest Muslim heir of an unbeliever has a preference over all non-Muslim heirs; unbelievers of all sects inherit from one another; the succession of the heirs to the estate of an apostate who was born a Muslim begins from his apostasy. The accidental killing of a legator does not exclude the slayer from inheriting. If the sole existing heir is a slave, he is purchased at the expense of the estate (his owner cannot refuse to sell him), thus becomes free and inherits what is left, if the parents of the legator are slaves, they must in all cases be purchased at the expense of the estate, according to some the children also (this is disputed) and according to others every heir (this has not been accepted). The part-slave inherits to the degree in which he is free. One who has a claim to an inheritance from two sides inherits on both grounds. Of the estate of a child whose paternity has been disputed by ḥumūr, the mother receives a third as the Kūrānic quota.
and the remainder as quasi-‘ṣaba, according to the more usual view; according to the other the remainder goes to the imām. There are no legal relationships between an illegitimate child and his ascendants (including his mother and her relatives), only between him and his descendants; if there are none, the estate goes to the imām. In the special case of the so-called gharbātān (cf. above 6 d), there is no divergence from the general principles. — On the whole then the Shī‘a law of inheritance represents an independent systematisation of the common principles found in the Kur‘ān and Tradition but diverging further from the old Arab pre-Islamic principles; whether and how far it the Sunni system already presupposes (as has been proved for the Zaidis; cf. Bergstrasser, O. L.Z., vol. xxv., p. 124) has not yet been investigated.


c. The most important peculiarities of the law of inheritance among the Khārijī Ḩudairis are the following: the paternal grandfather inherits as qua‘a-heir a sixth of the estate if there are descendants of the legator; otherwise he inherits as ṣaba, thus excluding the brothers, just as he himself is excluded by the father. The grandmother is only excluded by the mother. Female descendants, like husband or wife, have no right to the residuum. Manumission confers no rights of inheritance; freedmen, negroes, Indians, Abyssinians or Nubians can inherit from another if there are no other heirs (cf. above, sect. 5). If there are no heirs at all, the estate is given away in charity. The special case of the so-called mu‘āwarah is settled as among the Šāfī‘is (cf. above 6 d). — The dependence of this system on the Sunni is apparent.

d. The law of inheritance, as a branch of family law and as possessing a peculiar religious character from its very full regulation in the Kur‘ān, has always been one of the chapters of Muslim law most carefully observed in practice [cf. ‘Inā‘ and šarī‘a]. As in the long run it must lead inevitably to the splitting up of even the largest estates, various endeavours have been made to avoid this result, which was considered undesirable. A plan, frequently adopted, was to constitute considerable portions of the estate religious endowments [cf. waṣf]; the proceeds of which could be disposed of by the grantor as he pleased; but most endowments in course of time became much broken up. Another way adopted in the Dutch Indies is, in keeping with the local ‘udai, to admit only a portion of the actual estate to division among the heirs; we also frequently find an estate divided already in a lifetime by gift or friendly arrangement, and not infrequently some member of the family, according to circumstances, simply takes over the estate and obligations of the deceased; lands here are taken out of the control of Muslim law. So far only a very few Indian modernists (notably Khdūr Būkhd) have dared to criticise the Muslim law of inheritance and demand its abolition. It is the general practice of Muslim lands and is used in the šarī‘a tribunals, which also undertake the distribution of the estate, a thing too difficult for a layman to attempt. The Muslim law of inheritance is also applied to members of other creeds, when they come with problems to be settled to the šarī‘a tribunals, which often happens in Muslim countries.


MIRDAS B. UDAIYA, Khārijī leader in Baṣra, killed in 61 (680–681). He belonged to the Rab‘ī‘a b. Ḥanā‘al b. Mālik b. Zaidamān (called Rab‘ī‘a al-Wusāṣ, Naṣā‘id, ed. Bevan, p. 185, 5 = 699, 11; Mufaddalīyāt, ed. Lyall, p. 123, 12, 772, 9), a branch of the tribe of Tamim which supplied so many leaders to the Khārijī movement. His father was called Ḥudair b. Ḥamr b. ‘Abd b. Ka‘b and Udaya was his mother’s or grandmother’s name; she belonged to the tribe of Muḥārid b. Ḥāṣāfa (Ibn Dura‘id, Kitāb al-Ihtī‘āk, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 134; Ibn Ḥutaiba, Kitāb al-Mawāris, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 209; Ţabari, Muḥarrad, Baladhurī, cf. Bībī). He is often called by his kunya Abī Bīlāl.

His brother ‘Urwa b. Udaya had been one of the instigators of the Khārijī movement of secession at the battle of Siffin; he himself had taken part in the movement and had fought against the Caliph ‘Ali at al-Nahrawān (38 a. h.); after this defeat he gave up all political activity although, like his brother, he remained faithful to his old opinions; but he declared himself against armed insurrection, political assassination (istīrāḍ) and the participation of women in the Khārijī movement. These moderate views, which Miridās retained till the end of the caliphate of Maw‘īyā and which caused the extremists to class him among the ḫadā‘a (quietists) of the Khārijīs, made it all the more remarkable when he came out openly and actively against the excesses of the governor of Baṣra, ‘Ubaydallāh b. Ziyād, in his repression of Khārijīsm. A woman named al-Balid‘a or al-Balid‘a (the latter form, given by Ibn al-Athir from al-Balid‘hurst, seems to be wrong) had been cruelly martyred by the governor. Miridās’s indignation was so aroused that he left Baṣra with 40 of his followers and went to al-Ahwāz on the Fārs frontier, where he held out for a long time without committing any of those acts of fanaticism usual among the Khārijīs and confined himself to imposing a levying equal in the village to the pension
MIRJAM. [See Maryam]

MIR KHAWAND, historian, author of the Rewa'at al-Saf'ā" ("Garden of Purity"). He was son of Burhān-ud-Dīn Khwānd Shāh, native of Transoxiana, and, apparently, of Bukhārā. He lived much in Herāt and died there on June 22, 1498, aged 66. His work is a universal history in seven volumes, beginning with the Creation and ending at the death of Sulṭān Husain of Herāt in 1505. The last volume, however, is really the work of his grandson, Kḥānandāmīr [q. v.]. His work is not so interesting as his grandson's Ḥātif al-Sūr, for it is a compilation and wants the personal note. The style too is bombastic, and there is little historical criticism. But it is a work of great industry and has a high reputation in the East. It was lithographed in Bombay 1848, in Thirān 1852; a Turkish translation appeared at Constantinople in 1842; partial translations were made by Jenisch, Mitscharlik, Wilken, Vullers, Shea (O. T. F. series), Rehatsek (T. F. serie-), Jourdain and Silvestre de Sacy (Journal des Savants, 1837).


(HER. BEVERIDGE)

AMIRRIKH, the planet Mars. The etymology of the name is unknown. The sphere of Mars is the fifth in the order of the planets and on the outer side of the sphere of Jupiter, and its breadth is according to Ptolemy (xx. 376) 998 miles. Its period of revolution is estimated at 1 year, 10 months and 22 days. In about 17 years, after 9 revolutions, Mars comes back to the same spot in the heavens; it spends about 40 days in each sign of the zodiac and covers about 40
minutes each day. It is said to be one and half times the size of the earth.

Astrologers call Mars al-Naks al-aghar, the minor misfortune. It is the planet, which next to Saturn is credited with the most ominous omens and effects, war, revolutions, death, confusion etc. The character of those born under Mars is in keeping with this.

Bibliography: al-Kazwini, 'Adiib al-Makhbūbat, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 26; A. Hauber, Plante, kinderbilder und Sterbildber, Strassburg 1916, passim; Razi’l Hikayat al-Safī‘a, Section iii., iv. (J. RUSKA)

MIRZA or MIRZÄ, a Persian title, from Mir-sāda or Amīr-sāda, and originally meaning “born of a prince” (cf. Malik-sāda and Farhang-sāda, which occur in Sa’di etc.). The title, in addition to bearing its original significance, was also given to noblemen and others of good birth, thus corresponding to the Turkish Âğhâ. Since the time of Nâdir Shâh’s conquest of India it has been further applied to educated men outside of the class of mullah or ‘ulamâ’. In modern times the title is placed after the name of a prince and before the name of other persons bearing it: e.g. ‘Huṣain Mîrzâ “Prince ‘Huṣain”, whereas Mîrzâ ‘Huṣain is practically equivalent to “Mr. ‘Huṣain” (R. LEVY)

MIRZAPUR, a district and town in India in the Benares division of the Central Provinces: area 5,240 square miles. The population is nearly 1,100,000 of whom barely 79% are Muhammadans. The latter show a tendency to increase in proportion to the Hindus, owing to their greater vitality, containing as they do a smaller proportion of the very poor. The district is however a stronghold of Hinduism, and Islam makes little progress by conversion. Nothing is known of the early history of the district. It was occupied by Râjputs in the eleventh century a.d. and in the next century passed into the power of the Muslim rulers of Djasnâpur. Down to the Moghul conquest, the district played an important part in the military history of India, as it contained the great stronghold of Cunâr which guarded the gateway of the east.

At Râwa, near Abara, is a tomb of a Muslim merchant called Saiyid Aghrâ ‘Ali which is a place of pilgrimage. Near the gateway of the fort of Bijaiaghar is shown the tomb of Saiyid Zain al-Âbidin, the saint who miraculously took the stronghold for Sher Shâh. The town of Cunâr contains two mosques at one of which are preserved garments said to have belonged to Hasan and Huṣain. The tomb of the Afghan saint Shâh Kâsim Sulaimâni (1545-1606) with those of his family forms a group of buildings of architectural interest. His festival is celebrated on the 17th—21st Djam âdâ I.

Mirzapur city is the capital of the district of the same name. It has a population of 80,000 of whom six are Muslims. It is a Moghul foundation dating from late in the xviiith century: in the xviiith and early xixth centuries it attained great prosperity as a trading centre, being at the junction of important roads and at the highest point on the Ganges reached by the larger ships. In 1864 the opening of the East India Railway left the town isolated; since then it has declined, as the railway now carries the trade with which it used to deal.

Among the mosques is one founded in the middle of the xixth century by a Muslim lady named Ganga Banu who also left funds to build a sarai. The town contains the celebrated Hindu shrine of Vindeshwar, much visited by pilgrims and formerly held in special veneration by Thugs.

Bibliography: D. L. Drake-Brockman, District Gazetteer of Mirzapur, Allahabad 1911. (J. ALLAN)

MIRZA TAKI KHAN, Amir-i Niqâm or Amir-i Kâbir, was born at Farâhân of humble parents, his father having been first the cook and then the steward of the Kâtim Mâfâm, Mirza Abu ‘l-Kâsim, who ended his life as the first minister of Muhammad Shâh Kâdîr (1834-1848). In 1829, as a young menial, Taki Khan accompanied the Persian Commander-in-Chief on the Mission which was sent to St. Petersburg after the murder at Tirhân of the Russian ambassador Gershadoff. On his return to Persia after this visit to Europe, he was promoted to be a mîrzâ or writer, and subsequently was advanced to the rank of khan. By the time his master and patron died the young official had achieved distinction enough to be made wazir responsible for the army in Aḏharbâijdân. Still further honours came, when, during the negotiations at Erzerûm for the settling of outstanding disputes between Persia and Turkey, he was sent to represent his own country in place of the Mughûl al-Dawla, who had fallen ill after his appointment as plenipotentiary. On the conclusion of the Treaty of Erzerûm, Mirza Taki returned to Tirhân and was then commissioned to accompany the Young ‘Abd Allâh Mirzâ, to Tabriz, to which the latter was sent as governor of Aḏharbâijdân. In 1848, Taki Khan’s master became Shâh, and on the way back to Tirhân he appointed his lieutenant to the post of Prime Minister. It is said that either modesty or prudence caused him to refuse the title of Šad-i Aḏâm which is bestowed on the holders of the office, but, in any event, he contented himself with the less imposing one of Amir-i Niqâm, which he had held in Aḏharbâijdân as Commander-in-Chief. As a mark of the royal favour he was given the sister of the Shâh in marriage, and found in her a wife who displayed the devotion to him for the sake of his life.

In office he had the rare distinction in Persia of being inamenable to bribery, and he had a regard for his country which led him to resist interference from foreign powers in its affairs. Moreover, recognizing the reactionary influence of the ulamâ’, he attempted in such ways as were open to him to counteract their activities. He reorganised the army in spite of attempts by his enemies to rouse certain sections of the troops into revolt against him, he made efforts to improve the fiscal system of the country and he had some success in making the provincial treasuries self-supporting. Trade, both internal and external, was encouraged by him, and it was he that equipped Tîrbân with the fine bazars which it now has. As has been indicated, his period of office was not a peaceful one. In 1850 occurred the execution of the “Bâb” [9, v.] at Tabriz, the revolts of the Bâbis at Yazd and Zîndîân and the execution of the “Seven (Bâb) Martyrs” at Tîrbân. The risings were put down with great cruelty, and in consequence an attempt was made by the Bâbis on the life of the Amir-i Niqâm, whom they regarded as responsible. Almost from the begin-
ning of his period of office he had aroused by his influence over the Shāh the jealousy of the latter’s mother and of possible rivals, and their secret attacks were helped by his overbearing character. In November 1851 his enemies succeeded in securing his dismissal, after which the ill-judged attempt of the Russian ambassador to give the fallen minister his protection roused the anger of the Shāh who ordered him to retire in disgrace to Kāshān. There, on January 9, 1852, he met his death at the hands of the sovereign’s fārāsh-bāshī.


MISĀḤA (science of measurement, plane and solid geometry) is the name given by the Arabs to the science of comparing magnitudes and its methods. In the wider sense it covers the measurement of all things which can or need be measured, mainly lengths, areas, volumes, weights and numbers; in particular however, the ʿilm al-misāḥa deals with geometry, with definitions of solids and geometrical figures as well as the laying down of rules for the calculation of lengths, areas and volumes of the different figures in elementary plane and solid geometry. The conception misāḥa therefore includes only a portion of what we call measurement in the wider sense, or practical or technical geometry (i.e. the measurement of things having length, breadth and volume); in particular it excludes mensuration in the narrow sense, geodesy. The Arabs possessed special treatises dealing with the problems of geodesy. They therefore make the same distinction between theoretical and applied measurement, which had developed among the Greeks from the time of Aristotle and is most clearly expressed by Hero in his Metrica and Dioptra.

The definitions given by the Arabs themselves of the conception misāḥa are very varied. Some authors give a very wide one (e.g. al-ʿUmarī: “Measurement consists in ascertaining an unknown quantity by means of a known one. The result gives the amount of the unknown quantity in units of the quantity used for measurement”); most of them mean by it the measurement of length, area and volume. Al-Shinshawī makes a clear distinction between direct measurement, “the test of coincidence” (taḵṣīḥ), and indirect measurement by calculating from certain formulae.

We find treatises on geometry throughout the whole period in which the Arabs acted as the transmitters of the ancient culture with which they had become acquainted, from the earliest beginnings of their literary activity at the beginning of the ninth century A.D. to the decline of Arab mathematics about 1600. The purpose of such works was to give the future surveyor, architect or soldier the necessary equipment, the theoretical foundation for his profession. Three groups of these treatises can be distinguished according to their method of treatment:

(a) those which contain examples, completely worked out, illustrating the process of calculation (e.g. that of al-Baghdādī);
(b) those which only contain a series of fully worked out problems, and are a kind of exercise book (e.g. that of Abū Bakr).

On the method of exposition in these works it should be noted that we cannot of course speak of mathematical formulae in our sense of the word among the Arabs. They, especially the eastern Arabs, had no language of mathematical formulae; it was only late among the western Arabs and probably only in the field of algebra that a technical language was developed. The rules for measuring were always written out fully in words, sometimes even the figures occurring in the text.

The matter of the works on misāḥa, especially the larger ones, as a rule comprises introductory remarks, rules for calculating areas and volumes and the most important lengths found on them, and occasionally also practical exercises.

A. Introductory remarks. These are as a rule

1. Definition of the term misāḥa.
2. Explanation, description and systematic classification of the geometrical figures to be discussed.
3. Definition and list of the most common units of measurement.

B. Rules for calculation.

1. Plane surfaces (and the lengths occurring on them).
2. Triangles (equalateral, isosceles, scalene, right angled, acute-angled and obtuse-angled).
3. Polygons (regular, irregular, “drumshaped figure” (minṭābba), “hollow figure” (muṣṭawffe) “stepshaped figure” (μυδραράδ). “Drumshaped” and “hollow” figures are formed by the combination of two congruent trapeziums in such a way that in the former the shorter, in the latter, the longer parallel sides coincide; a number of varieties are distinguished. The stepshaped figure is formed by placing together a number of rectangles of the same length but different breadth, in which the proportions of the breadths form an arithmetical progression.
4. Circle, segments of a circle (semi-circle, segment, sector, circumference) and related areas (horseshoe or crescent (kiflījī), egg-shape, bean-or lentil-shaped, or oval figures).

The crescent is formed by the subtraction of two segments of circles of different radius with a common chord. egg-shape and bean-shape by the addition of two congruous segments which in the egg-shape are less, in the bean-shape greater than the semi-circle. The area of the oval (ellipse) is given by Savasorda as \(\frac{a+b}{2} \pi\).

II. Solids (and the areas, especially superficies, and lengths that occur on them).

1. Prism (ordinary straight and oblique prism, square column, rectangular column, dice, triangular prism, obliquely cut prism, corpus simile domui in Abū Bakr as translated by Gerard of Cremona).
2. Cylinder.
3. Pyramids (straight and oblique pyramids, sections of pyramids).

4. Cones (straight and oblique cone, section of cone).

5. Sphere and section of a sphere, hemisphere, segment, sector and zone.

6. Regular and semi-regular bodies (the five Platonic and two Archimedean are treated at any length only in al-Kāshī).

7. Other bodies [cylindrical vault (arzūjī and ṣīḵānī; the only difference between them is the length) hollow dome (ḫubba), roof-shape (corpus singuli cabrīr in Abū Bakr), wreaths and discus (hollow cylinder), terrace-shaped figures].

C. Practical exercises.

These are generally speaking rare in works on misāḥa. We frequently find exercises in dividing fields modelled on Hero and Euclid. Savasorda has a number of exercises on fields on slopes, in hollows and on summits and on the calculation of the heights of hills; al-Ḥanbalī has some on the measurement of inaccessible pieces of ground, the depth of wells and breadth of rivers. Of other problems may be mentioned, for example, the calculation of the number of pieces of stone or bricks required to build a house or a roof, the ascertainment of the height of a wall.

It must not however be supposed that the subject matter as above described is fully contained in any work on misāḥa. The individual works differ in subject matter according to the inclinations and abilities of their authors, just as our text-books of geometry do at the present day. We find works planned on a very comprehensive scale (by al-Ḥanbalī and al-Kāshī), alongside of very brief ones, often dealing only with portions of the subject (e.g. the anonymous Berlin MS. No. 5954 which contains only formulae for calculating plane surfaces), or even only a single problem (like the treatise by al-Shīnawī). We therefore often find expositions which are only put into works on geometry in order to show the author's special knowledge or results of his research in a particular field. The most remarkable examples of this kind are the insertion by Dīmashqī al-Kāshī in a work on misāḥa of a treatment of regular and some semi-regular bodies (the calculation worked out by him in sexagesimal fractions to the fifths is so accurate that it only begins to differ from the correct figure in the tenth decimal place); the formulae for the area of a surface given by al-Ṭūmāwī $F = \sqrt{a \cdot b \cdot c \cdot d}$ for trapezoids with a right angle and his improvement of Hero's formulae for the segments of a circle; the formula for an arc given by al-Karkhī; the formula $a^2 = \frac{1}{9} [n(n - 1) + 6] a^2$ where $d$ is the diameter of the circle around a regular polygon of $n$ sides of length $a$ given by the same author and al-Baghdādī (the same formula is found in Nemerārus and Regiomontanus and attributed by the latter to the Hindus; it is however, so far as we know, not found in any Hindu mathematical work yet published); also the application of algebra to geometry by Abū Bakr and Ibn al-Banna. The former uses the algebraic solution for problems of areas in order to show the application of equations of the first and second degree to the six cases distinguished by al-Khwārizmī; the latter uses combinatorial analysis to investigate the different possibilities of stating the problem.

The methods of calculating the volume are the same as we find among the Greeks and Egyptians. When it is not a question of matter that has been taken over from them, in which case the formulae are directly adopted, the obtaining of results is purely inductive and empirical. Al-Karkhī for example for the volume of a sphere gives, in addition to the formulae $a^3 (\frac{1}{3}a^3)$, on the method of obtaining which he says nothing, also $a^3 (\frac{28}{45})$ which he gets by comparing the weight of a cube of wax with the weight of a sphere, which is made out of the cube of wax and whose diameter is equal to the edge of the cube. al-Baghdādī deals with a method of ascertaining the volume from the weight and specific gravity. al-Kāshī knows the method of immersion of Archimedes mentioned by Hero. The direct method of measuring the length of areas by laying a thread along them is still recommended as the most reliable by al-Karkhī and Bahā al-Dīn. It is evident that such methods must lead to approximative results and formulae of approximation, the typical feature of practical geometry, continue to be used by the Arabs in measuring long after they obviously knew of their inaccuracy. Ibn Mammātī criticizes the usual formulae for the area of a triangle $\frac{1}{2} (a + b) \cdot h$, and $\frac{1}{2} (a + b) \cdot 2a_s \cdot 4a$, al-Baghdādī the formula for a quadrilateral $\frac{1}{2}(a + c) \cdot (b + d)$ which comes from the Egyptians.

The reasons for the long survival of such rules are partly that the formulae gave in practice quite useful results and partly that the practical men who were concerned with measurement in the exercise of their trade wanted values easy to calculate rather than great mathematical accuracy and took no note of slight errors, especially if they thereby avoided calculations with roots. For similar reasons and in keeping with the traditional practice, almost all works of misāḥa give no scientific geometrical proofs of the accuracy of the formulae they quote. Only the book of the Jew Abraham Savasorda, who may be reckoned among the western Arabs, gives logically worked out proofs in any number; we occasionally find references to early mathematicians (especially Euclid) in Ibn al-Banna and Ibn al-Hanbalī. Probably inspection was quite sufficient ('Abd al-Azīz for example draws plane figures in a network of squares each of one unit and counts the squares and their parts within this area) or a simple demonstration in some form or a calculation to prove the correctness of the procedure, which was frequently illustrated also by examples completely worked out.

A further peculiarity of Arabic authors was to give formulae which agree completely in substance in different algebraic forms. The Berlin MS. No. 5954 gives for example for the calculation of the section of the hypotenuse $q$ in the right angled triangle the following formulae: $q = \frac{1}{2} a + (c^2 - b^2) \cdot a = \frac{1}{2} a + (c + b) \cdot (b - a) \cdot a = \frac{1}{2} a + (c + b) : \sqrt{2a^2 + (c^2 - b^2)}$. This differentiation was probably only intended to give as many forms as possible of the relations between the known and unknown magnitudes so as to afford the practical man a choice of different correct formulae of which one might suit the special case better than another.

The sources of Arab geometry are to be sought among the Greeks and Hindus. The form and
substance of the rules are almost entirely Greek, especially in the older authors. Hero's "elaborations" in particular, which in turn go back to Egypt, seem to have been the model for Arab works on geometry. To Egypt may be traced the prefiguring of a metrological section (found in many books on misāḥa, the works on dividing fields, the formula for the trapezoid, the special name for the upper side of a quadrilateral (ra¿ al-ā']aru]) in the works of Khañzīm, the formula \( V = \frac{1}{2} a \cdot b \cdot d \), for the quadrilateral inscribed in a circle, the terms are, perpendicularly from the summit of an arc and chord, the marking of lengths in Hindu figures, the use of algebra to solve geometrical problems (equations, method of double error, combinatorial analysis). The chief teachers were however the Greeks, whose achievements the Arabs generally speaking never surpassed; the requirements of practical mensuration gave them no new problems and practical geometry remained down to quite modern times elementary, the majority of the problems of which had been finally settled long ago by the Greeks.

The services of the Arabs to geometry lie less in the extension of the field by ascertaining new, hitherto unknown facts, although in the misāḥa works we do find a series of new and novel rules, than in their enrichment of this science by new methods of calculation and teaching and especially in their preserving the inheritance of the ancients and handing it down to the western world. Although Hero's geometry first became known in northwestern Europe through Roman surveyors, it was mainly the Arab sources which gave new life to that subject which had become stagnant in its old form. Arabic original works were made accessible to the west in Latin translations. Leonardo of Pisa in his Practica geometriae, which remained a standard work for three centuries, depended closely on Savasorda, who most probably owed a great deal to Abū Bakr as there are striking similarities between the Liber embadorum and the Liber mensurationis; down to late in the xvith century we continually come across writings on practical geometry, which in form and content show what to what originals they go back.

I. Manuscripts: Arabic authors translated into Latin:

II. Arabic works (the titles are given as translated by E. Wiedemann and J. Ruskab)
1. Ibn al-Dījā (c. 1150) "Records of the measurement of surfaces", *Excerptum. old. N. 924*, fol. 1a—70b; 2. Imād al-Dīn al-Baghdādī (*1345*; Suter, N. 495), "Work on the science of measurement and the sharing of difficulties", Berlin 5976, fol. 7a—26b; 3. Ibn al-Banān (*1399*; Suter, N. 399), "Treatise on the doctrine of measurement", Berlin 5945, fol. 70b—73a;
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MISAR B. MUHULHIL

Ahm al-Dulaf al-Khazānī al-Yanāqī, an Arabic poet who lived at the court of the Samānids Nasr II b. Ahmad (301—331 = 913—943) and in 331 was sent by his master, the Chinese empress, to bring back to her land and on his return visited India. He later gained the favour of the Buyid vizier al-Sāḥib al-Tūlānī (so al-Samānī, *Anṣāb*, fol. 365b) and lived in Baghdad (d. 585 = 995). To him he devoted a long kashda on the thieves' dialect of the Banū Sā'?ān, a work which he himself wrote a commentary upon it (extracts in Thā'labī, *Yatima*, iii. 176—194). The dates of his birth and death are nowhere exactly given. To his long journeys he alludes in his verses quoted by Thā'labī, *op. cit.*, iii. 174. The only authentic information has been preserved by the author of the *Filist*: on p. 340, 50 sqq. (where wa-kānā gawasalān is of course not to be translated as Fligel does [note 182] "there was a rumour current" but "he was a great traveller") he gives his account of a temple in Mukran said to be of gold, and on p. 350, 51 sqq. a description of the capital of China. A comparison of these with the corresponding account of his journey attributed to Ahmad Dulaf in Vāxšī, *Majām*, iii. 457, 451, 51 sqq. shows that at least a translation (cf. Marquart in the *Festschrift* for Sachau, p. 292). This is confirmed by an internal criticism of his statements. The first country to be entered after leaving Muslim territory is, he
says (Yaḥūt, iii. 449, 7), al-Kharga, i.e. as Marquart, S. B. B. A., 1912, p. 492 has recognised, the Persian translation of the Turkish name for Kāhgar, Ordunkad. Of this kingdom of the Boghrā-khāns however, this author (p. 447 sqq.) talks as if it belonged to the tribe of Boghrā, whose ruler was a descendant of ʿAli, as the East Turkish legend of Satok Boghrā Khān says of his grandson. The story is therefore compiled from various sources. Marquart (Sachau, Festschrift, p. 271—272) has also recognised that the alleged ruler of Sadjistān whom the author claims (cf. cit., p. 458, 4) to have met, ʿAbū Dāvjār Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. Laiḥ, son of Bānū, a sister of Yaḥūb b. Laiḥ, is identical with Khaļaf b. Ahmad son of Bānū, a granddaughter of ʿAmr b. Laiḥ, who was taken prisoner by Muḥammad al-Ghazni in 1002—1003 and died in 1008. The geographical information given by the compiler is therefore quite unreliable in detail. His story is also preserved in the second version of Kazwinī’s Cosmography in the Gotha Mss. 1506 (Möller, Nr. 2316) and has been edited from it by Schlozer.


(C. Brockelmann)

**MISBAḤA.** [See SUBH.]**

**MISKĪN, poor,** a loan word which has shown remarkable vitality. It goes back to the Assyrian miskinu, “poor” (in the Laws of Hammurabi it is a name for a class between those enjoying full citizenship and slaves; according to L. W. King: freemen who do not belong to the ruling race). In the meaning “poor” it has passed into Aramaic (miskín), Hebrew (miskín), North Arabic (miskín or, against analogy, misku), into Southern Arabic and Ethipic (miskín). It has passed from Arabic into Italian as mecenä and into French as misquin. In Arabic, on the analogy of the form ništ, it is usually of common gender but the feminine form miskina is also found with plural miskindū. Muhammad often uses the word in the Kurʾān in the list of persons whom it was a duty for believers to support. As in Sūra ix. 60 it is found alongside of fūkārā, commentators and jurists have felt that some distinction must be made between the two. They usually explain miskin as needy, but not absolutely without possessions like the fūkārā, and refer to Sūra xviii. 78, where there is a reference to poor people who possess a ship among them. How uncertain this is, is however evident from the fact that the Mālikis in opposition to the Shāfiʿīs to the other view to regard the miskinu as the most needy; cf. also the various definitions collected by Lane. Ḍhā Ṣṭārah in Sūra xc. 16 does not help us. From the meaning “poor” gradually developed that of “base, miserable”, also in the moral sense, e.g. Ibn Saʿd, iii/6 ut. where Abū Sufyān’s wife is called al-Misikīna. On the other hand, the word can mean “humble” as in the words attributed to Muhammad: “Let me live as a miskin and die as a miskīn and include me among the miskinu.”

**Bibliography:** On the Assyrian of the references in Gesenius, Hebräisches Worterbuch, 10, and King, History of Babylon, p. 164; for Arabic: Lane, i. 1305; Abū Isḥāq al-Shirāzī, Tanbih, ed. Juyouni, i. 879, 9 sqq.; Th. W. Juyouni, Handbook des islamischen Gesetzes, p. 106. (Fr. Buhl)

**MIṣR, a. a proper name denoting the eponym of Egypt, the ancestor of the Berbers and the Copts. In accordance with the Biblical genealogy (Genesis x. 1 sqq.) Miṣr is called the son of ʿHām, the son of ʿNāḥī. The Biblical origin of the pedigree appears clearly in the form Miṣrāʾim or Miṣrān (cf. Hebrew Miṣrayim) which is found side by side with Miṣr. In some genealogies between ʿHām and Miṣr there is inserted Bakṣar, a name of which the origin is unknown to me.

There exists, however, also quite a different genealogy, according to which Miṣrān is a son of Tablīn, one of the early heroes (qatāhīra), who ruled Egypt after the Deluge.

**Bibliography:** al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīḵ, ed. de Goeje, i. 217; al-Yaḥṣib, Taʾrīḵ, ed. Houssaini, i. 210; al-Maṣʿūdī, Murūḏ al-Dabāh, Paris ed., ii. 394; Ibn Khurḍāḏbih, B.G.A., vi. 86; Ibn al-Aṯīr, al-Kamīl, ed. Tornberg, i. 58; al-Suyūṭī, Ṣīr al-Maḥādārā, Bālāq, p. 15; Maḥfūz, ʿAbd al-Muʿīn al-Maḥfūz, Kitāb Akhbar al-Duwal, Cairo 1311, p. 5.**

b. a proper name denoting Egypt as a country. It may be supposed that Miṣr was already the name of Egypt among the Arabs in pre-Islamic times as it is used in the Kurʾān (e.g. Sūra x. 87; xii. 21, 100; xiiii. 50), where the Biblical form Miṣrān does not occur. It has remained the Arabic name of Egypt [q.v.] up to the present day.

c. a proper name denoting the capital of Egypt, i.e. at present and since its foundation Cairo, which with its full name is called Miṣr al-Kāhirah [cf. CAIRO]. Miṣr occurs, however, already as the name of the city or the cities situated southwest of later Cairo; when the name had been transferred to this city, the name Miṣr al-Kādira (Old Arabic) clung to the old settlement situated between the mosque of ‘Amr and the right bank of the Nile (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, p. 16).

In the period between the Arab conquest and the foundation of Cairo the name Miṣr is regularly applied to the settlement just mentioned (Ibn Khurḍāḏbih, B.G.A., vii. 247, 251; Ibn Roshteh, B.G.A., viii. 115 sqq.; al-Bukhārī, Fārs al-Kāhir, bāb 13: Abū Dāwjūd, Ṣṭārah, bāb 74). We are, however, not able to decide which of its parts (Babylon, Fuṣṭāṭ or the Tūlūnī capital) is especially denoted by it. It may be supposed that the combination of Fustat Miṣr “Fuṣṭāṭ in Egypt” (cf. e.g. Maṣʿūdī, Tanbih, B.G.A., viii. 358; Maḥfūz, Kāhir, i. 288) opposes Miṣr Fuṣṭāṭ to and Miṣr forms the link between the appellation of the name Miṣr to the country and to the capital. After the conquest of Egypt by the Muslims there were two settlements only on the right bank of the Nile where it divides, viz. Babylon and Fuṣṭāṭ. The papyri never mention Miṣr as the name of either of these settlements. Yet in the latter part of the seventh century A.D. the application of the name Miṣr to one or to the other or to both
must have begun, as is attested by John of Nikiu who at least once uses Mesr as the name of a city, where he speaks of "the gates of Mesr" (p. 25). In other passages Mesr appears as the name of the country (p. 201, 209).

The statement that the name Misr as the name of a town arose after the Muslim conquest only, is in opposition to Butler, who maintains that at least since the age of Diodorean there existed on the right bank of the Nile, to the South of the later Babylon, a city called Misr (cf. Butler, Babylon of Egypt, p. 15; do., The Arab Conquest, p. 221 note). Caetani (Annali, A. H. 19, § 47) already pointed to the fact, that the traditions concerning the Arab conquest of Egypt do not give the slightest credit to the existence of a city bearing the name of Misr. Butler's reference to the Synaxary proves nothing, as this work was composed many centuries after the conquest. — The Coptic name of Babylon was Kemæ.


d. a common noun, denoting a town; it is used especially in connection with the capitals of the provinces in the times of the conquests, e.g. in the tradition: "The amār will be conquered at your hands" (Abū Dawūd, Dhiklah, bāb 28). Baṣra and Kūfa are often called "the two miṣr" (Buḫkhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 13; Yaḵūt, Maḏqar, iv. 454). Further any town may be called misr (e.g. Buḫkhārī, Dhābbah, bāb 2; Aḵbār, bāb 15; Tawīm, bāb 25; Tirmidī, Nikūz, bāb 32 etc.). This miṣr is a genuine Semitic word, cf. Lišān al-ʿArab, s. v. and the Jewish-Aramaic miṣr, meyṭīm, which have the same meaning, viz. that of a house or a field as an exactly delineated and demarcated territory (cf. I. Levy, Chaldäisches Worterbuch; do., Neuherzüchtet-Talmudisches Worterbuch).

It may be supposed that the geographical name Miṣr (cf. above, a.—c.) comes from the same root and has originally a meaning akin to that of the common noun. (A. J. Wensinck)

MUŚRA, a term in Arabic prosody applied to a hemistich or half line (haft); the first hemistich is called ṣudr and the second "adīq. Each has two, three or four feet, taʿṣīra or ḥjūs. The last foot of the first hemistich is called araḍ and the last of the second ḥarb. As a general rule, and in the first verse of a poem, the araḍ foot should have the same measure (ṭajrī) and rhyme (taḫṣīs) as the ḥarb foot.

(Moh. Ben Cheyeh)

MUŚRĪ, [See NIVZEL.]

MUŠŠISH, arab. Al-Maṣṣaṣa, a town in Cilicia on the Dājjān.

In antiquity it was called Mæsalis or a name, which (like that of Mæsalis in the Cilician passes) is derived from the cult of the legendary seer Mopsos (cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert., viii, 2, § 483). In ancient times, the town was chiefly famous for its bishop Theodorus (d. 428), the teacher of Nestorius and friend of the suffragan bishop and inventor of the Armenian alphabet, Maĝh-ṭoc (Peeters, Reine des Etudes Armèn., ix., Paris 1929, p. 210; on him cf. e.g. Al-Maṣṣaṣa, Tānūkh, ed. de Goeje, p. 152; Mich. Syr., transl. Chabot, ii. 3; Barhebræus, Chron. ecclesi., ed. Abu-l-Mamālī, i. 133; Theophanes, Chron., ed. de Boor, i. 77, 96). In the year 1452 a synod was held in Mopsuessa in June 550 to see that his name was removed from the diplomas of the bishops (Mansi, Acta Concil., ix., col. 275—280; Hefele, Konzilengeschichte, ii, 2, 832—834). At a later date the name of the town was usually called Mopsuṣṭissa (pronounced: Mopsuṣheista?; cf. Appendix ad Petri Siculi hist. Manic., ed. Gieseler, p. 53, r; Wilh. Schultze, Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforsh., xxiii., new series, xii., 1895, p. 372; references in Geiger zu Georg, Kypr. 819; Syr. Mopsuṣheista: Noldeke, W. Z. K. M., iii, 1889, p. 356; Severus Antioch., Epist. v, 6, ed. Hoekoa, p. 338; Arab. Mopsuṣheiba in Ibn Khaldūnī, ed. de Goeje, p. 99). As early as the end of classical times we already find the popular forms Mopsuṣṭa (Tab. Peut.), Byzant. Maṣṣaṣa (Michael Glykas, Annali, Bonn. Corpus, p. 570; Anna Komnēna, ed. Reifferscheid, i, 140, 51; in Al-līrīs, ed. Gildemeister in Z. D. P. F. I., vii, 24: Monestra; the Byzantine work on "Towns with later altered names", ed. Burkhardt, Iter ICONIUM, Leipzig 1693, p. 62, Appendix I, No. 29, wrongly says: Kastāla Kaliusia ἢ vivi Maṣṣaṣa; the former is rather the modern Burdur Kafe, Masista (Theodorius, De situ terrae sanctæ, c. 32, ed. Geyer in Corp. Scriptorum, Lat., xxxix, 150, 6). In the reign of Justinian I the city was probably again called Kastāla Kaliusia (Novell. Antiochenæ, ed. Rahmän, I. Fasti della chiesa patriarcale Antiochenæ, Rome 1920, p. v.; Byzant. Zeitchr., xxxv. 74, 81), from which the Arabic al-Maṣṣaṣa. Armen. Miṣrīs and Turk. Miṣrā is Misāris have arisen.

The emperor Heraclius is said to have removed the inhabitants and laid waste the district between Antioch and Mopsuessa on the advance of the Arabs; in order to create a desert zone between them (al-Tabari, i. 2396; al-Baladūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 165; between al-Iskandarān and Tharsus), and under the Omaiyads all the towns taken by the Arabs from al-Maṣṣaṣa to the fourth Aramaen (Tell Malaya) are said to have been left unfortified and uninhabited as a result of the inroads of the Mardaites (Theoph., ed. de Boor, i. 363, 17). According to Abu l-Khaṭṭāb al-Azdi (in al-Baladūrī, p. 164), the Arabs conquered al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tharsus under Abu l-ʿUbdā, according to others under Masṣar b. Masrūk, who was sent by him and who thereafter advanced as far as Zangī (in 16 = 637: Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, i. 805, § 511). Muʾawiya on his campaign against Ammūriya in 25 a. h. found all the fortresses abandoned between Anāṭkīya and Tharsus (see above). According to the Māḏṣi Malawī he himself destroyed all the Byzantine fortresses up to Anāṭkīya in 31 (651—652) on his return from Darawīya (Dynast., in Phenicia) (al-Baladūrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 164). After the Syrian rebellion against Abū al-Malik, the emperor Constantine IV Pogonatos in 65 (684—685 A. D.) advanced against the town and regained it (al-Yaḵūbī, ed. Houtsdra, ii. 321). Yaḥyā b. al-Khakam in 77 marched against Marj al-Shām between Malaya and al-Maṣṣaṣa (al-Yaḵūbī, ii. 337). It was only in 64 (703) that Abū al-Malik's son Abū ʿAlī al-Malika retook the town and had the citadel rebuilt on its old foundations (Baladūrī, p. 165; Yaḵūbī, ii. 466; Wāṣḵū in Tabari, ii.)
Ibn al-Atligh, ed. Tornberg, iv. 398; Theophan., Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 372, 41; Mich. Syr., transl. Chatot, f. 477; Elias Nisibeni, Opus chronologiae, ed. Brydges, p. 155; transl., p. 75; Seeck., Syr. chronica nitens, ed. Guidi, p. 232. transl., p. 176, under 1015 Sel. year: Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, i. 472). In the following year, he installed a garrison in the fortress, including 300 specially paid soldiers, and built a mosque on the citadel hill (Tell al-Hisn); a Christian church was turned into a granary (kourun, harvi = horreum, horrea); al-Baladhum, p. 165; Ibn al-Shihna, ed. Baflit, p. 179). To the same event no doubt refers the wrongly dated reference in the Chronicles of the Armenian Samuel of Ani of the year 602 A.D. to the fortification with strong walls of the town of "Mestia, i.e. Misia" by the Muslims under 'Abd al-Malik (Rafito temporum nosque ad suas actum pristivit Samuelem Antiochenus, in Euseb. Pamphil., Chron., ed. A. Mai and I. Zotra, Mediolani 1813, App., p. 57; Alisjahb, Sittenau, p. 256). Every year from 1,500 to 2,000 men of the corps (tawālid) of Anṭiliya used to winter in the town. According to Michael Syrus (transl. Chatot, iii. 478), 'Abd al-Malik died in 1017 Sel. (705 A.D.) in al-Massāja. 'Umār II is said to have intended to destroy the town and all the fortifications between it and Antioch and to have been either prevented by his own death (Baladhum, p. 167) or dissuaded by his advisers; according to this version, he then had a large mosque built in the suburb of Kafar baiya in which there was a cistern with his inscription. It was called the "Citadel Mosque" and kept up till the time of al-Mu'tasim (al-Baladhum, p. 165); but Kafar baiya was probably not real before the time of al-Mahdi or Hārūn al-Rashid; [see below], Yazid b. Djiabār (Wassī, i, τοῦ Χασέλ) in 704 A.D. attacked Sīs (π Σίσον κατον) in al-Tabar and Ibn al-Atligh; Sūsana in the Nāhiya of al-Massāja but was driven off by Heracleius, the emperor's brother (Theophan., ed. de Boor, p. 372, 23; A.M. 6196; according to al-Tabar, ii. 1185, and Ibn al-Atligh, iv. 419, wrongly not till 87 A.H.). Hārūn built the suburb (al-Khairat), Marwān II the quarter of al-Khuṣṣa east of the Djāhīn, which he surrounded with a wall with a wooden door and a ditch. The bridge of Djīsr al-Walid between al-Massāja and Adhâna, 9 mil from the former, was built in 125 (742-743 A.D.) and restored in 225 (840) by al-Mu'tasim (al-Baladhum, p. 168; Yūsūf, Mu'ākum, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 82; Saff al-Dīn, Marāfīj, ed. Juynboll, i. 255). In the first half of the viith century the caliphs al-Walid II and Yazid III brought the gipsy tribe of the Zaut, who had been deported to Basra by Mu'āwiyah in 670 A.D., and settled them with great heaps of buffalos in the region of al-Massāja in order to fight the plague of lions in the district of the Djalab al-Lukkam (al-Baladhum, p. 168; De Goeje, Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Eigenaren, 1875, p. 17-22). The first 'Abbāsid, Abu 'l-Abbas al-Saffār, on his accession strengthened the garrison by 400 men, to whom he gave lands; the same estates were later allotted to them by al-Mansūr. The latter in 139 (756-757) restored the wall, which had been damaged by an earthquake in the preceding year, and increased with 8,000 settlers the much diminished population of the town, which he called al-Ma'mura (al-Baladhum, p. 166; Ibn al-Atligh, v. 382; Yūsūf iv 579, s.v. al-Ma'mūriya; Ibn Shihna, p. 179). On the site of a heathen temple he built a large mosque which far surpassed the mosque of 'Umar in size. When 'Abd Allah b. Tāhir was governor of Ma'arrat (see above), he was enlarged by al-Ma'mūr. Al-Mansūr increased the garrison to 1,000 men and settled in the town the inhabitants of al-Khuṣṣa, Persians, Slavs and Christian Arabs (Nabataeans), whom Marwān had transplanted thither (see above), and gave them allotments of land. It is probably that to the same event the story refers that Sālih b. 'Ali, when in the 'Abbadid period the inhabitants of al-Massāja, harassed by the Byzantines, resolved to migrate, sent Djiabār b. Yahya al-Baḍjali al-Khuraṣāni in 140 (757-758) to rebuild the town and settle it with Muslim inhabitants (al-Baladhum, p. 166; according to al-Tabar, ii. 135 in the year 141). Under al-Mahdi the garrison was increased to 2,000; in addition there was the Anṭiliya corps of almost the same size which wintered here regularly until Sulim of Burdur left here in 1082 and increased the garrison by 500 men instead. There is a brief reference in the Syriac inscription of 'Enesel to a raid by al-Mahdi to the Djāhīn (Syr. Giḥūn) in 780 A.D. (1091 Sel.: Chatot, in J.F., ser. ix., xvi., 1900, p. 287; Pognon, Insér. sémile de la Syrie et de la Mesop., p. 148-150, N°. 84). Hārūn al-Rashid built Kafar baiya or according to another story, altered the plans for this suburb prepared by al-Mahdi and fortified it with a ditch; he also built walls which were only completed after his death by al-Mu'tasim. In 187 (803) an earthquake laid waste the town (al-Tabar, iii. 688). In the following year, the Byzantines invaded and pillaged the region of al-Massāja and 'Ain Zarba and carried off the inhabitants of Tarsus into captivity, whereupon Hārūn al-Rashid attacked and defeated them (Mich. Syr., iii. 16). According to al-Tabar (iii. 709) and Ibn al-Atligh (vi. 135), the Byzantines in 190 (806) invaded 'Ain Zarba and Kanisat al-Sawad and took prisoners there; but the people of al-Massāja regained all their loot from them. If, as it seems, the curious story in the Byzantine chronicles (Theoph., Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 446, 13; Georg. Kedren, Bonn. Corpus, ii. 17) that in 777-778 (A.M. 6624) 'Abd al-Walid Badaūn, i.e. the Fadl b. Dinār, who had 500 Byzantine prisoners with him, lost 1,000 men and all hisbooty through a sortie of the Melleumestis refers to the same events, the latter would appear to be wrongly reported and wrongly dated.

On the 13th Haziran 1122 Sel. (811 A.D.) the walls and many houses in the town and three adjoining villages fell in a great earthquake; near al-Massāja the course of the Djāhīn was dammed for so long that the boats lay on the dry bed (Mich. Syr., iii. 17). In 198 (813-814) Thābit b. Nasr al-Khuṣṣā'ī was fighting in the Syrian marches of al-Massāja and Adhāna, Yaqūbī, ii. 541. On his campaign into Bilād al-Rim, al-Ma'mūn passed through al-Massāja and Tarsus in Muḥarram 215 (March 830): al-Tabar, iii. 1103; Ibn al-Atligh, vi. 294; Ibn 'l-Fidā, 'Anfās Muslim, ed. Reiske, ii. 152; Weil, Gesch. d. Chal., ii. 239). In revenge the emperor Theophilos in 216 (831) raided the lands around these two towns and slew or took prisoner 2,000 men (al-Tabar, iii. 1104; Ibn al-Atligh, vi. 295).

After the emperor's campaign against Zibatra (837 A.D.) in which he also defeated the Melleumestis (Const. Porphyrog., De castr., ed. ...
Bonn, p. 503; Vasilev, Visantiya i Arabi, in Zapiski iz-filol. fak. imp. S.-Pbgh. Univ., cast lvi, 1900, p. 85 sq., note 4), al-Mu'asim bi 'llah in the following year attacked 'Ammūriya; his general Bashir commanded a part of the army which included the Maṣṣaṣa contingents (Mich. Syr., iii. 96). In 245 (859) the town was again visited by an earthquake which destroyed many places in Syria, Mesopotamia and Cilicia (al-Ya'kubi, iii. 1440). The Caliph al-Mu'ādīd after restoring order in the Thughur al-Shamiyya (287 = 900) returned from al-Maṣṣaṣa via Funduk al-Hussain, al-Iskandariyya and Baghraw to Anṭākiyya, Halab and al-Kaṣṣa (al-Tabari, iii. 2198–2200; al-Funduk, a place in the Thughur near al-Maṣṣaṣa: Yākūt, iii. 918; Şafi al-Din, Marāṣīd, ii. 365).

When in 292 (904–905) the Byzantine Andronicus invaded the district of Mar'ash, the people of al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tarṣus met him but were defeated and lost their leader Abu 'l-Ridāj b. Abi Bakr (al-Tabari, iii. 2251); Ibn al-Ąţār, vii. 371; Vasilev, Zap. ist.-fil. fak. imp. S.-Pbgh. Univ., cast lvi, 1902, p. 154, note 2).


In 352 the emperor Nicephorus took Adana, the inhabitants of which fled to al-Maṣṣaṣa, and sent the Domesticus John Taimises (Yānīs b. al-Shimīshkī al-Dumistikī) against this town. The latter besieged it for several days but had to withdraw as his supplies were running short, and after laying waste the country round burned the adjoining al-Mallūn (Mālaqā) at the mouth of the Dijlā (Yahyā b. Sa'īd, op. cit., p. 791 sq.). The emperor himself came again in Dhu 'l-Kāda 353 (Nov. 694) to the marches (al-Thughr) and besieged al-Maṣṣaṣa for over 50 days but had again to abandon the siege owing to shortage of supplies and retired to winter in Kaṣirāyī. Finally the town was stormed by John Taimises (Arm. Kuči Čan) on Thursday the 11th Radjab 354 (July 13, 965). The inhabitants set it on fire and fled to Kafar brazil. After a desperate struggle on the bridge between the two towns the Greeks took this suburb also and carried off all the inhabitants into captivity (Yahyā b. Sa'īd, op. cit., p. 795; Ibn al-Ąţār, viii. 408–411; Abu 'l-Fidā', Ann. Musil., ed. Reiske, ii. 872 sq.; Mich. Syr., iii. 128; Elias Nisibeni, ed. Brooks, p. 218; transl. p. 106; Georg. Cedren., ed. Bonn, i. 362; Leon Diakon., ed. Bonn, p. 52 sq.; Mattēuēs Utshayect, ed. Dulaurier in Rec. hist. croat., Docum. Arm., i., 5; Step'an Anošik of Taron, Armen. Gesch., transl. H. Gelzer and A. Burchhardt, Leipzig 1907, p. 134, 24). They were, to the number of 200,000, it is said, led past the gates of Tarṣus, which at that time was being besieged by the emperor’s brother Leo, to terrify the people of the town (Ibn Shihna, Kavbād al-Manṣūṭ, in Freytag, Z. D. M. G., Elias Nisibeni, op. cit.). The gates of Tarṣus and of al-Maṣṣaṣa were gilded and taken as trophies to Constantinople, where one set was put in the citadel and the others on the wall of the Golden Gate (Georg. Cedren., ii. 253).

The town remained for over a century in the hands of the Byzantines; the Emperor Basil II Bolgaroktonos stayed for six months in the region of al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tarṣus before going to Armenia after the death (March 31, 1000 A.D.) of the Kouroplates Davīd of Tadjī to take possession of his lands by inheritance (Yahyā b. Sa'īd, Tarīqī, ed. Rosen, p. 39, in Zap. Imp. Akad. Nauk., xiv., St. Petersburg 1883). In 1042 the Armenian prince Ap'lagār, son of Hasan and grandson of Khaṭīk of the house of the Accruntans, was sent by his emperor Constantine Monomachus as governor to Cilicia (St. Martin, Min. sur l'Arm., i. 199). In 1055 A.D. Philelotos Ikrhoumos, who was appointed in Constantinople perhaps Sebastos (Mich. Syr., iii. 173) or at least Kouroplates (Mich. Atal., Bonn ed., p. 301) and whose ephemeral kingdom comprised the land from Tarṣus to Malatya, Urfa and Anṭākiyya, held al-Maṣṣaṣa (Mich. Syr., loc. cit.: Laurent, Byzance et Antioche sous le kouroplate Philiacite, Rev. des Est. Arm., ix., 1929, p. 61–72). Shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders, the Seldjūk Turks took Tarṣus, al-Maṣṣaṣa, ‘Ain Zarba and the other towns of Cilicia (Mich. Syr., iii. 179). About the end of Sept. 1097 the Franks under Tancred, who had been invited thither from Lombardy by Oshin III, took the town which was stormed on a day’s siege: the inhabitants were slain and rich booty fell into the hands of the victor (Albert. Aquens., iii. 15 sq., in Migne, Patrol. Lat., clxvi., pp. 446 sq.; Radulf. Cadom., Gesta Tancredii, c. 39 sq.). William of Tyre describes al-Maṣṣaṣa on this occasion (iii. 21, in Migne, Patrol. Lat., cci., p. 295): "Erat autem Manliistra una de nobilioribus eiusdem provinciae civitatis, muro et multorum incultu insignis, sedet optimo agro et gebe aerae et amo- nitate principi commendabilis.”

Count Baldwin, who had quarrelled with Tancred, followed him along with the admiral Winimer of Boulogne and encamped in a meadow near the Dijlān bridge; Winimer left him there and went with his fleet to Lādģijīia, while the two rivals had a desperate fight, after which Baldwin withdrew to the east (Albert. Aquens., iii., iii. 15, 59, in Migne, op. cit., pp. 446, 472). Tancred followed him, after he had improved on the city “plus paternas quam principis leges” (Radulf. Cadom., c. 44). The Byzantine general Tatikios, who had joined the Crusaders to take over their conquests in name of the emperor, left them in the lurch in the beginning of Feb. 1098 at the siege of Anṭākiyya and ceded to Bohemond the town of Tarṣol (Tarṣus), Maniistra and Anṭākiyya (Adana) (Raymond of Aguiles, in Borgongs, Gesta Del per Frances. Hanover 1611, p. 146, 2). Bohemond only took possession of the towns of Tarṣus, ‘Ain Zarba and al-Maṣṣaṣa in August (Will. of Tyre, vii. 2). After the town had again fallen to the Greeks for a period. Tancred again took it in 1101 (Rad. Cad., c. 143). But he had to hand it over to Tarṣus, Adana and ‘Ain Zarba to Bohemond on his return from captivity in 1103 (Will. of Tyre, vii. 2, in Migne, op. cit., p. 377). The following year however, Longinias, Tarṣus, Adana and MāΤšηε were regained for Byzantium by the campaign of the general Monasras (Anna Comnena, Αλεξις, ed. Reifferscheid, ii. 140, 5), who apparently did not recognise the identity of MāΤšηε with MāΤηου

Thoros II, the son of Levon who had escaped home from his confinement in Constantinople, was again able to cast off the Byzantine yoke. When in 1151 he took Msiis and T'lij (Tall Hamdan) from the Byzanines (Smbat, in Doc. arm., i. 619) and made their general Thomas prisoner, the emperor Manuel in the following year sent against him with 12,000 cavalry Andronicus Comnenos, whom he had appointed governor of Tarus and al-Maṣṣaṣa (Gregor. presb., in Doc. arm., i. 217 = Matth. Edess, transl. Daurulier, p. 334; Smbat, Chron., in Doc. arm., i. 619). Andronicus, who did not recognize Thoros as ruler of Asia Minor, advanced against al-Maṣṣaṣa but was surprised by the Armenians and put to an ignominious flight with his 12,000 men. Thus not only the town, which was very well supplied with provisions and military material of all kinds, fell into his hands, but also a great part of Cilicia (Gregor. presb., transl. Daurulier, p. 334-336 = Doc. arm., i. 217 sqq.; Smbat, op. cit.). The emperor, himself too weak to avenge the insult, twice induced by gifts the Sulṭān Kīlidj Arslān II (Gregor. strongly: Mas'ud) of Kūshīa to attack Thoros. The Sulṭān, who on the first occasion (1153 A.H.) did not content with the defeat of the Armenians and the return of the lands taken from the Greeks, again attacked al-Maṣṣaṣa, 'Ain Zarba and Tāl Ḥamdun (Arm. Tāl Hamtuny) in 1156 but could do nothing against them and had finally to retire after heavy losses (Gregor. op. cit., p. 338 = Doc. arm., i. 171).

The emperor Manuel himself passed through Cilicia in 1159 with a large army to the assistance of the Crusaders. Thoros had already retired to Vahka in the desolate mountains (Armen. Rhyme Chvorn., in Doc. arm., i. 505) when the emperor entered al-Maṣṣaṣa at the beginning of November, but he did no injury to any one there (Gregor. transl. Daurulier, p. 333 sq. = Doc. arm., i. 187). The Frankish kings led by Baldwin came to pay homage to him in the town or on the adjoining pratum pallium (as Will. of Tyre, xiii. 27 translates Mardj al-Dibâdî) where his court was held in camp for 7 months (Gregor. transl. Daurulier, p. 358; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 298). Thoros was also able with great tact to become reconciled with him, and on acknowledging Byzantine suzerainty and ceding several towns in Cilicia, was recognised as "Sebastos" of Msiis, Azarbars and Vahka (Doc. arm., i. 186; Smbat, ibid., p. 622). His brother Miel, who attempted his life while out hunting between al-Maṣṣaṣa and
Adana, was banished by Thores and given by Nur al-Din the town of Kürüs (Kyrhos; Smbat, loc. cit.). After the death of Thores of Mısır (1168-1169; Smbat, p. 623), Mleh (Arab. Malîh b. Liwun al-Armani) succeeded him and at first ruled only over the district of the passes (Büldəd dər-ůrub). In 1171 he surprised Count Stephen of Blois at Mamistra and plundered him (Will of Tyre, xx. 25-28). In 1178 (1172-1173), supported by troops of his ally Nur al-Din, he took from the Greeks Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and Tarsus (Ibn al-Athir, xi. 255; Kamal al-Din, transl. in Röhrich, in Beitritte zu Gesch. d. Kreuzzüge, i. Berlin 1874, p. 336).

When Mleh’s successor Rüpen III fell through treachery into the hands of Bohemund of Antioch, his brother Levon (I) obtained his release in 1184 by ceding al-Maṣṣaṣa, Adana and Tall Hamdun (Titlun) and paying 3,000 dinars; immediately afterwards, Rüpen retook these strongholds from the Franks (Mich. Syr., iii. 397; Doc. arm., i. 394).

Het’um, the nephew of the Catholicoi Grigor IV and son of Cortvan N Taron, who came to Cilicia in 1189 with his brother Shahinshah, received from Levon II (1185-1211) his niece Alice, daughter of Rüpen III, in marriage and the town of Mısı̇s, but died in the same year (Smbat, in Doc. arm., i. 629; Marquart, Sündernemien and die Türkenreisen, Vienna 1930, p. 481 sqq.). The Emperor Frederick II (1190) was about to go to Syria via Tarsus and al-Maṣṣaṣa when he met his tragic end in the Kalkyados (alleged?) letter of the Armenian Catholics in Ibn Shaddad, in Rec. Hist. Orient. des Crois., iii. 162): a portion of his army thereupon went to Antioch via Tarsus, Mamistrissa and Thoje (Hişn al-Muthakka; not Portella, the Syrian passes, with which Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Fertuna, p. 530, identifies it).

Wilbrand of Oldenburg who visited the East in the train of Duke Leopold VII of Austria and the Teutonic Grandmaster Hermann von Selen, came to Cilicia in 1212 to Mamistrissa which he describes as follows: (Wilbr., c. 18, ed. Laurent, Peregrinatus, Leipzig 1864, p. 175): "Hac est civitas bona, super humen sita, satius amoen, hummus habens circa se territum, sed antiquitate coronatus, paucos in quodam respecto habens inhabitationes, quibus omnibus rex illius terrae imperat et dominatur." In the vicinity lay "quodam castrum quo erat de patri-mono beati Pauli, sed nunc tempore possidetur a Graecis." "In hac civitate [Mamistrisse] habituer sepulchrum beati Pantalonic, lupa vero dicit a Canetilla (cf. Tomaschek, S. R. Ak. Wien, 1891, p. iv, p. 71) magnam dictam". Levon II granted the republics of Genoa and Venice the privilege of having their own trading centres in al-Maṣṣaṣa, which could be reached by the sea from the shore of the mouth of the Djahn became silted up (Alishan, Sisewan ou l’Armeeno-Cilicie, p. 287). The attempt of Raymund Rüpen of Antioch to seize the throne of Armenia after Levon’s death in 1219 failed; he was, it is true, able to take Tarsus and attack al-Maṣṣaṣa but he was taken prisoner by Constantine of Bartheb and died in prison in 1222 (Doc. arm., i. 514; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Fertuna, p. 741 sqq.).

For a century the Rupenhids ruled almost unsettled in the town. Their glory reached its height under the splendid-loving Het’um I (1219-1270). Here were held the annual festivals of the Church at which numerous princes and nobles used to gather down to the last and difficult years of the king. Here was held the brilliant ceremony at which his 20-year old son Levon was dubbed knight. Hither the king brought the seat of government after the destruction of Sis (Alishan, Sisewan, p. 287 sqq.).

Baibars sent a punitive expedition against Het’um in 664 (1266) under al-Malik al-Manṣūr of Hama, who advanced as far as Kafr al-Anmūdān and into the district of Sis, while Saif al-Dīn Kīlibān took al-Maṣṣaṣa, Adana, Ayās and Tarsus (al-Maṣṭr, Hist. d. Sult. Mam., transl. Quatremeré, i. 34 sqq.; Abu ‘l-Fida‘ī, Annal. Musul., ed. Reiske, p. 158; al-Nuwayri, in Welsh, Gesch. d. Chal., iv. 56). Three years later (1269) the district of al-Maṣṣaṣa was visited by an earthquake (al-Suyūṭī, in Doc. arm., i. 1906, p. 772, note l). Baibars (Arm. Panitkhtar = Arab. Būnudūdār) himself in 673 (spring of 1275) took the field against Levon III, son of Het’um, laid waste the whole of Cilicia as far as Korikos and stormed al-Maṣṣaṣa and Sis, the former on 26th March. The inhabitants were massacred, almost all the houses burned and the great bridge destroyed (Armen. Kandarayn Masay, i.e. Kandarayn al-Maṣṣaṣa; cf. al-Maṣṭr, ii. 123 sqq. with note 154; Muḥammad b. Abu ‘l-Fadā‘ī, Gesch. d. Maṣṭranens, ed. Blochert, in Petrol. Orient., xv. 129; Barbeh, in Petrol. Orient., ii. 531; Smbat, Chronic, in Doc. arm., i. 653; Röhrich, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 967; van Berchem, C. J. A., i. 168, note 2). When in 697 (1297-1298) an army under the emirs Saif al-Dīn Kīlibān, the Nāʾib of Dimashq, Fāris al-Dīn Ilbeke al działalności of the Nāʾib of Saff, Saif al-Dīn Bizār al-Manṣūr and Saif al-Dīn ‘Azāz al-Sāliḥi invaded the land of Sis, al-Maṣṣaṣa is not specially mentioned among the unimportant places taken like Tall Hamdun, Hammūs (Humamīs), Kafr Nadjima, al-Maṣṣaṣa, Siftandak, Ḥadžar Shuglān, al-Nakṣar and Zandīdra (al-Maṣṭr, ii. 60-65; al-Muʿtaṣṣid, op. cit., p. 607; al-Nuwayri, in Blochert, ibid.). In 1322, the Egyptians crossed the Djahn by a bridge of boats, got behind the Armenians who had retired to Mısı̇s and inflicted a severe defeat upon them; among those who fell are mentioned the barons Het’um of Dīlkoc, his brother Constantine, Waḥram Lotik, ‘Oṣhīn, the son of the marshal, along with 21 knights and many men (Smbat’s Continuator, in Doc. arm., i. 668). This authority also mentions a raid by an Egyptian force against al-Maṣṣaṣa (Masuesta), Adana, al-Mallūn (Mlun) and Tarsus in 1334 (Doc. arm., i. 67; Tomaschek, S. R. Ak. Wien, 1891, part viii, p. 68). The last Egyptian invasion took place in 823 (1373-1374). Among the towns destroyed were Sis, Adana, al-Maṣṣaṣa and ‘Ain Zarba, and Levon had to surrender in 1375 after a siege of nine months in Ghaban (Doc. arm., i. 686, note 3). The town thus passed nominally into the Fūṭūḥa al-Djahnīya of the Mamlūk empire; but it had, it is true, by now sunk into insignificance and it is not mentioned, for example, among the towns taken by Shahuwar in 1467 (Alishan, Sisewan, p. 290).

Armenian sources mention 8 archbishops of the town from 1175 to 1170 (1175-1260 David, 1215 Johannes, 1266 Sion, 1306 Constantine 1316 John, 1332 Stephen, 1342 Basil, 1362-1370 unnamed; cf. Alishan, op. cit., p. 290). Michael Syrus knows only Job of about 800 A. D. (Chron., transl,
Chabot, iii. 23 sq., 451, Nö. 27) and the Frankish writers from 1100 onwards Bartholomaeus, before 1234 Radulphus and in the years from 1162–1238 three or four more unnamed bishops (Albert Aquensis, ix. 16; Will of Tyre, cit. from the Quinm, Oriens Christianus, iii. 1198–1200; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusal., p. 42, 202). On account of the many Egyptian invasions the Latin archbishopric was removed to Ayas by Pope John XXII in 1320 (Alişan, Sizosan, p. 290).

After the fall of the kingdom of Little Armenia, the power of the Karmash-oghlu and Dhu 'l-Kadr-oghlu gradually spread in Cilicia. Selim I on his campaign against Egypt in 922 (1516) and on his return also preferred to keep to the east of their land (Taschner, Anatol. Wegzüge, ii. 32). Missis had been Ottoman since that year, in which the decisive battle was fought on Mardj al-Dibâdî. In Kafaraya a khan was built for caravans passing through in 1542 and restored in 1830 by Hasan Paşa. The Djalâh bridge became useless in 1736 when the central arch collapsed; in 1766 this was repaired but it was blown up in 1832 on the retreat of the Turkish troops from the fighting at Baïlân in order to hold up the advance of Ibrahim Paşa's pursuing army. As late as the middle of the xixth century it could only be crossed by an improvised wooden footbridge.

In modern times Missis is mentioned only by eastern pilgrims and travellers who as a rule only spent a short time there. Thus it was visited in 1432 by the Burgundian Bertrand de la Brocquière ("bîne-sur-Téban"), in the xviith century by P. Belon, 1682 the Mecca pilgrim Mehemedd Edib, 1695 the Armenian Patriarch of Antiochios Marakos, 1704 Paul Lucas, 1736 Chevalier Otter, 1766 the Dane Carsten Egebhr, in 1783 Mac. Kennir, 1834 Acher Ebal, 1856 Colonel Chesney, 1840 Ainsworth, 1853 Victor Langlois, whose works are exhaustively used by Carl Ritter (Erkundige, i. 66–115). The "Merges Galles" visited by Ludwig von Rauter on July 8, 1568, is not (as in Rohricht-Meisner, Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem hl. Lande, 1880, p. 434, note 43) al-Maqṣūṣa, but Merkez Kal'esi on the Báb Iskandarûn (Cilic.-Syr. passes). Somewhat fuller descriptions of the modern Missis and its ancient and mediæval ruins were given in the xixth century by Langlois, Alişan and at the beginning of the xxth by Cousin (see Bibliographie).

The stretch of the Baghdad railway from Doruk south of the Taurus via Adana and Missis to Maľmur at the foot of the Amanos was opened on April 27, 1912. As a station on the railway (the station is actually 1½ miles N.W. of the place) the town gained a certain strategic importance in the Cilician campaign of the French in 1919–1920 (1919: settlement of about 1,2–1,500 Armenians; May 27–28, 1920: futile Turkish blockade of the town,xiv. 10; Le Quien, Oriensstrong; end of July: withdrawal of the troops to Adana; cf. E. Brémond, La Cilicie en 1919–1920, in Rev. Étud. Arm., Paris 1920, i, p. 311, 360, 363, 365). After the Turkish occupation the newly settled Armenians were probably exterminated in the usual way. The importance of the town has now passed to the neighbouring Dihânân.

According to the Arab geographers, al-Maqṣūṣa lay on the Djalân (Tiganoes, sometimes confused by the Byzantine authors with the Zepes, Arab. Salihân, with which it seems to have had at one time a common mouth: George Cedren., ii. 362; Anna Comm., ii. 147), 1–2 days' journey from Baïlân and one from 'Ain Zarba and Aţha, 12 li. from the Quinm, Oriens Christianus, iii. 1198–1200; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusal., p. 42, 202). From the Friday mosque in the town; in front of the town lay a beautiful fertile plain (the ancient 'Aravw. mûsâ). Al-Maqṣūṣa lying on the right bank was connected with Kafaraya by an ancient stone bridge built by Constantius and restored by Justinian. The country round was rich in gardens and cornfields, watered by the Djalât. According to Yâkût, the town originally had a wall with 5 gates and Kafaraya, one with 4 gates. A peculiarity of the town were the valuable fur-cloks exported all over the world. Ten miles from al-Maqṣūṣa, which is somewhat inaccurately placed by Ibn Khurdâd-Bih, Yâkût and others on the Djabal al-Lükkân (Amanos), was the plain of Mardj al-Dibâdî, which is often mentioned in the records of the fighting between the Mamluks and Little Armenia (probably the "ager Mosquettiae" on which Cicero encamped: ad fami., iii. 8). In it, N. E. of the town on the road to Sis, was the fort of al-Amûdîn (al-Makrîzî, ed. Quatremère, ii/ii. 61; cf. Ka'fî al-Amûdîn in Abu 'l-Fida, Ann. Musil., ed. Reiske, v. 18, located by Alişan, Sizosan, p. 225 sq. too far east in "Hemétêre-Kalési"). A field near Mardj al-Arâkhân is also mentioned near al-Maqṣūṣa (Yâkût, iv. 487; Saîf al-Dîn, Marâdîdî, ii. 74). Tall Hâmid, a strong fortress of the Thuhîr al-Maqṣūṣa, corresponds to the modern Hâmîdîye, now called Dijân (Z.D.M.G., xi. 191, 200; Yâkût, i. 866; Saîf al-Dîn, Marâdîdî, i. 211; Ibn al-Shînâ, Bâiritt, ed., p. 339). There also was Tall Hâm Yâkût, i. 867; Marâdîdî, i. 211; Ibn al-Shînâ, Ibid., exact site unknown). Al-'Ain at the foot of the Djabal al-Lükkân, over which went the Darb al-'Ain pass, was also one of the forts of al-Maqṣūṣa (Yâkût, iii. 756; Marâdîdî, ii. 293); on the frontier against Halab lay Bïka (q.; cf. van Berchem, Voyage en Syrie, i. p. 257, 5; Hisn Sînân (al-Balâdherî, p. 165; Yâkût, iii. 155) is probably also to be sought near al-Maqṣûsu. A pass called Thandiat al-'Ukhâbî, to be distinguished from that of the same name near Damascus, was in the region of al-Maqṣûsu (Yâkût, i. 936; Marâdîdî, i. 230). Even the remote fortress of Samâlû (on its site cf. Tomacheck, Festschrift f. H. Kipert, p. 144) was sometimes reckoned in the Syrian Thuhûr and located near al-Maqṣûsu and al-Tarsîs (Balâdherî, p. 170). Dhamâlû, Yâkût, iii. 416; Marâdîdî, i. 167; Byzantinâ to kôrûnê Sîmûlîbê) and al-Safaşî on the present Sugudîyû (Z.D.M.G., xi. 180; Reiske on Abu 'l-Fida, Annal. ii. 649, note 76 according to Hâdâyîd Khâlâfa: "Heîs Safashî, that is Sugud") is also reckoned by Yâkût (iii. 401) to the marches of al-Maqṣûsu. Not far from the town was a Syrian monastery, Gaûkâth (mentioned about 1200 a. d. Barhebr., Chron. eccles., ed. Abbélou-Lamy, i. 624; in Alişan, Sizosan, p. 295; Gaûkôth, probably identical with 'Aqshubâ). The neighbouring fortress of Amadômâ (now Thalûn-Kal'e) and Cambethfort ("in territorio Melonii", i.e. of Mûn, Arabic: al-Mallûnî) were according to Wilbrand of Oldenburg (op. cit.) about 1212 in the possession of the Teutonic Order (Allemann). The Venetians had a church in al-Maqṣûsu (Gestes des Chirops, in Doc. arm., ii. 831). Armenian authors mention there the churches of St. Sarkis, Thoros and Stephan (Alişan, p. 288 sq.).

The present Mississ, (frequently also written Misiss)
cf. Taeschner, Türk. Bibl., xxii, pl. 16 and 17), is an insignificant village lying on almost exactly 37° N. Lat. (pict. in Alishan, p. 283), which is stretches along the heights of the right bank of the Dijihan-cai. A stone bridge with nine arches (in Bae- deker, Konstantinopol, 1914, p. 303 wrongly: “five arched”) the foundations of which are in part ancient (pict. in Alishan, Sissawan, p. 289; Lohmann, In Kloster zu Si, p. 15), leads to the left bank where piers of walls and inscriptions mark the site of the ancient Mopsuestia. Here lay the medieval Kafarbaiya; while this form is in general use in Arabic texts and in modern authors, al-Idrisi (transl. Jaubert, ii. 153) and Haddi Khalfa (Dijihan-numa, Constantineople 1145 [1732], p. 602) have Kafarbaiya (Taeschner, Türk. Bibl., xxii, p. 145), as Langlois (Voyage, p. 402) and others apparently heard on the spot. The name is unknown there now (Heberdey-Willhelm, Denkschr. Ak. Wien, xiv. part vii, p. 11 sq.; the Turkish General Staff map in the German version of July 1918, Sheet Adana, calls the two halves of the town “Misis Nahjesi” and “Huranjie”). According to Ibn al-Shiha (Bairdt ed., p. 179), Kafarbaiya was also called Lih Le Baggidit.

Misis lines where the river emerges from a gorge with walls of yellow loess at which the last foothills of the highlands between the Sahin (now Saihun) and Dijihan (now Dijihan-cai) in the N.W. and the Djabal Naur (Nur Dagh, 2,200 feet; pict. in Alishan, p. 284), a part of the Djabal Misis (Stadiasmus mar. mag.; Nevs sqv.), in the southeast most. This ridge, which takes its name from the town, lying in the centre of the Cilician plain on the left bank of the lower Dijihan and linked up with the Amanos in the east, is celebrated, particularly in the Djabal Naur, for its rich flora, which was studied by the Austrian Theodor Kotschya on 24th-26th April 1859. On account of its medicinal herbs, Ibn al-Rumayn in his commentary on the book of Dioscorides says that many writers took al-Masiga to be the city of the wise Hippocrates (Ibuqraj) who, however, according to others, belonged to Himis (Mufadjal b. Abi ‘I-Fadali), in Patrol. Orient., xiv. 393; Ibn al-Shiha, Bairdt, p. 180).

Near the mouth of the Dijihan, which at one time was navigable for small ships up to al-Masiga, lay al-Mallin, the site of which is not known (Malla; now rather Bebelit than Karatash; cf. R. Kiepert, Form. orb. antiqui, viii, text p. 190). The Frankish writers also speak of a “portus de Malimastra” (Raimundus of Aiguelers, Historia Francorum, qui eburnum Jerusaleu, c. xii, cf. Doc. arm., i. p. xvi, note 1), probably of the “fauces fluminis Malimnstrae”, where al-Idrisi mentions the place al-Busah (Z. D. P. V., vii. 141; Tomasechek, S. B. Ak. Wien, xcviii, 1891, fig. viii, p. 69 writes al-Basah).


E. (HONIGMANN)

MISWAK (A.), a term denoting the toothbrush as well as the tooth-pick. The more usual term is siwak (plural swāwak) which means also the act of cleansing the teeth. Neither of the two terms occurs in the Kur‘ān. In Ḥadīth miswāk is not used, siwāk, on the other hand, frequently. In order to understand its use, it is necessary to know that the instrument consists of a piece of smooth wood, the end of which is incised so as to make it similar to a brush to some extent. The piece of wood used as a tooth-pick must have been smaller and thinner.
MISRÁK — MÍZAF

as appears e.g. from the tradition in which it is related that Muhammad one day received a visitor and kept the tooth-pick "at the end of his tongue" (Mír, Žákhrá, trad. 45).

Concerning Zaid b. Khálid it is related that he used to sit in the mosque keeping the tooth-pick behind his ear, "just as a writer will keep his pen" (Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 25; al-Tímírdít, Žákhrá, báb 18). When Muhammd was in his last hours, there entered a man with a piece of wood fit for a sívwák; Êíshá took and chewed it, so as to make it smooth (Bukhráí, Mágížá, báb 83).

In general Hádíth emphasises the.value attached by Muhammad to the sívwák. When he entered his house, his first movement was towards it (Muslim, Žákhrá, trad. 43; Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 27). His servant, Abú Aláílh b. Músáíd has received the epithet of žákhrá al-sívwák "the one who used to take care of Muhammad's sívwák" (Bukhráí, Físííb al-Sáhíhá, báb 20). When Muhammad awoke at night, he cleansed his mouth by means of the sívwák before he washed himself and performed night-prayer (Bukhráí, Adúhám, báb 8; Weríd, báb 73; Táhádídýud, báb 9; Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 30; Muslim, Žákhrá, trad. 46. 47). When fasting, Muhammad also used the sívwák (Ahdám b. Ḥambal, iii. 445, 446).

The miswák is chiefly used before warídí as a preparation before the šáliút. It is said that this was the practice of Muhammad (Muslim, Žákhrá, trad. 48) who attached so great a value to it, that he would have declared it obligatory before every šáliút, were it not that he feared thereby to overburden his community (Bukhráí, Adúhám, báb 8; Muslim, Žákhrá, trad. 42; Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 27; Tímírdít, Žákhrá, báb 18). In one tradition it is said, as a matter of fact, that the obligatory use of the sívwák before every šáliút was introduced by Muhammad as a compensation for the abolition of the obligatory warídí before every šáliút (Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 25). In another tradition (Naṣõí, Qíjumá, báb 66) the use of the sívwák is called obligatory before Friday-service.

The appreciation of the miswák which appears from all these traditions culminates in the fact that it belongs to the customs of the "natural religion" (fíra: Abú Dáwíd, Žákhrá, báb 29) or to the ordinances of the Apostles (Tímírdít, Niśák, báb 1).

Nevertheless Fíkh does not declare the use of the miswák obligatory in any case. There is general agreement on this point. According to some traditions, however, the Záhirítes did declare the use of the miswák obligatory before the šáliút, but these traditions are not generally accepted. According to Fíkh the use of the miswák is recommended at all times, especially in 5 cases: in connection with the šáliút, under all circumstances; in connection with the warídí; with the recitation of the Kurán; after sleep; and as often as the mouth has lost its freshness, e.g. after long silence.

According to the school of Šáhí the use of the miswák is bálàmabále (makrúkh) between noon and sunset at the time of fasting; for the nasty smell (khúla) of the faster's breath is beloved by Allâh (cf. Naṣõí, Žákhrá, báb 6).

It is recommended to use a miswák of ará, wood of medium hardness, neither too dry nor too moist; to cleanse the palate as well as all sides of the teeth, beginning from the right side of the mouth, moving the miswák upwards and downwards in order not to hurt the alveoles.

Bibliography: References to Hádíth in Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muh. Tradition, s.v. Tooth-brush; the juridical points of view in al-Nawawí's commentary on the Šáhí of Muslim, Bulák 1290, i. 325; Wellhausen, Rest arab. Heidentumus, 2nd ed., p. 172; Goldziher in R. H. K., xliii. 15 sq.; Buhl, Das Leben Muhámmads, p. 354, note 94 (A. J. Wensinck) Míta. [See Muţa.] MÝTHKÁL (A.), the weight of a thing; this is the meaning of the word in the Kurán; a particular weight for weighing precious metals, jewels, drugs, etc., probably the oldest unit in the Arab Troy system. The mithkál corresponds to the Roman solidus of the Constantinian system which the Arabs adopted in Syria. Abú d-Málík took it over for his unit of gold when he reformed the currency in 77 (696). His dinár weighed a mithkál of 65.5 grains (4.25 grammes), hence mithkál is used as a synonym for dinár. The silver dirham weighed 1/40 of a mithkál and the mithkál contains 24 kíra. Slight variations in weight are found in the different parts of the Muhámmadan world. Bibliography: See the bibliographies to the articles DÝNÁK and ḤÁBBÁ. (J. Allan) MÝWÁDÍ. [See Ḥámár.] MÝZÁF, MÝZÁFA (A., plur. MÝází). Among the various classes of musical instruments dealt with by Arabic, Persian and Turkish writers on music is one which embraces those with "open strings" (awyr múnlka) such as the lyre or cithara, harp, psaltery and dulcimer. Among them are instruments grouped as mýází. Nówadays, this term refers to all stringed and wind instruments (M. F. O. E., vi. 28) but in the Middle Ages it had a more restricted meaning and stood for "instruments of open strings", Al-Djáwáhid (d. ca. 1003) and al-Sáfíhání (d. 1261) define them as "musical instruments which you beat upon as in the "ud" (lute), ţunbár (pandore) and the like", meaning by this that mýází were played with the fingers or plectrum in the same way as the "ud" and ţunbár were. The Žàidí al-Árás includes the tambourine among the mýází, but it is an erroneous deduction from the saying of 'Umár, margin b. ťábītí du'úfí ("he passed by the sound of the drum"), which has misled many writers (cf. Sachs, Reallexikon der Musikinstrumenten, s.v.). The author of Múlrín al-CLUmí (9th cent.) states that the mísáfa was "a stringed instrument belonging to the people of al-Írak" (p. 237), whilst al-Mútárisí (14th cent.) says that the mísáfa was "made by the people of al-Yaman", a provenance which Ibn Khúdrúžhib (d. 912) also gives the instrument (al-Máṣáíh, viii. 93). A more precise classification is allowed by al-Shállí, which includes the mísáfa among barbitons (barábít) and lyres (lárán), which agrees with our oldest authority, al-Ìilábí b. al-Múzafar (11th cent.), who says that both mísáfa and mísáfí were terms given to "an instrument of many strings", whilst al-Farábí (d. 950) specifically denominates mádásí as instruments of "open strings" (Kosegarten, Lib. cent., p. 77, 110). In the Kíláb al-Ághámí the mísáfa is rarely placed in the hands of the minstrels, probably because it was of inartistic merit. One performer on the instrument, Muhammad b. al-Háríb b. Bàshkír (16th cent.), was asked sarcastically if it was a rat-trap (Adhámá, x. 153).

Tradition avers that mázísí were "invented" by Dílát the daughter of Lamák, who was of the
seventh generation from Adam (al-Mas'udi, viii. 89). Since there was a hadith condemning maqāsīf as signs of the end of the world (al-Tirmidhi, ii. 33) it is quite likely that the stūkahā thought it consistent with policy to make Dīlāl or Dīlāl ("error, destruction") the originator of these ma-lāhi or "forbidden pleasures". On the other hand, we read that "David the Prophet had a mi'zafa on which he used to play when he recited the psalms" (Ibl al-Fāri'd, iii. 189), which was an echo of the Jewish tradition that he was an adept on the kinnōr (I Samuel, xvi. 19, 23). The name may be a survival from the days of belief in sympathetic magic. The voice of the djinn was termed the 'azf, and the spiritual world could be conjured by the sounds of the mi'zafa. In Islamic times musicians claimed that their music was inspired by the djinn. The Greek μαγάς was an instrument of the same class as the mi'zafa. It was of Lydian origin and the name is suspiciously like the Semitic one.

Lyre and cithara. Although we see these instruments in the hands of the ancient Semites on the monuments they do not appear to have had acceptance among the musicians of I-lāmic times except with the fallāḥīn, unless the seven-stringed wandāf (= sandj) of Khurāsān was such an instrument (al-Mas'udi, viii. 90). Both words are of Greek origin and they appear in Arabic as lūr and šīṭara generally. In Palestine and Egypt to-day, a primitive type of lyre is known under the name of ṣūnūra barbāriya or šīṭara (kissara) barbāriya. Villoteau (Descr. de l'Egypte, état mod., i. 918) and Saint-Saëns (Lavignac, Encyc. de la musique, i. 528) have shown how much of the ancient Greek method of lyre-playing still obtains in the modern Egyptian šīṭara-playing. It is worthy of notice that the Arabic word for striking the šīṭara strings is ḫarraba, and this is practically identical with the Greek χέρω.

Harps. Whilst we possess an actual example of a Sumerian harp with the sound-chest below the strings, this type does not seem to have had any vogue with the Arabs or Persians in artistic music, and is only found among the peasantry. In Palestine and Upper Egypt to-day it is called the ṣūnūra sunudāni and nanga. The harp with the sound-chest above the strings has been a far more important instrument with the Semites and is to be found in the Assyrian sculptures (cf. the Assy. word sanāš and the Ethiopic sanē); That extremely chatty Turkish writer Ewliyya'īn Celebi says that this instrument, which the Persians called the lang, was "invented" by Pythagoras to solace Solomon (Travel, ii. 227), and even al-Shalāji says that it was of Byzantine (Kūni) origin (fol. 15). Yet Ibn Khuradīdhab and al-Djawhari show that it was peculiar to the Persians and, indeed, the type may be found on the Sāsānian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travel, ii. 175).

The Arabs called it the djanq and/or sandj (cf. al-Djawalikī, ed. Sachau, p. 97). It may be that the djanq and sandj were different types of harp, the Persian and Arabian. There were certainly two types, the straight sound-chest and the crooked. In the Maṣūfīh al-'Ulām the Byzantine salūk (ṣawmōn) and fihr (ṣapi) are likened to the djanq and sandj respectively. Among the Arabs the djanq is mentioned as early as al-Ash'ā Malmūn (d. ca. 629). Al-Fārābī devotes a section in his Kitāb al-Maṣūfīh to maqāsīf, djanq and/or sandj, and other instruments "in which there is made to every note, according to its state, a solitary string", and he shows them strung with both fifteen (diatonic) and twenty-five (chromatic) strings (Kosegarten, l. c.). Both Ibn Sinā (d. 1037) and Ibn Zaila (d. 1048) deal with the sandj, whilst in the Kanz al-Tuḥaf (xivth century) and the works of Ibn Ghāibī (d. 1435) the lang is fully described. The oblique sound-chest was 109 cm. long, and the handle (dashū) 81 cm. long. From the sound-chest to the horizontal bar below twenty-five strings of gourd hair were stretched, being fastened to metal pegs (muṣālū). Some players even used thirty-five strings so as to embrace the scale of the Systematists. The face of the sound-chest was of skin, but the remainder of the framework was of vine or plum tree wood. The handle was placed under the left arm (cf. the pictures in MSS.) and the fingers of both hands were used in performance, plectra (zaḵmīn) being fastened to the finger tips. Nowadays the harp has fallen into complete desuetude among the Arabs and Turks. Even among the Persians it has become rare, and in its modern form it was little different from the occidental instrument (Advieu, La musique chez les Persans, p. 13), whilst the instrument shown by Kaempfer (xvith century), under this name was a zither. In 1638 Ewliyya'īn Celebi found only twelve players of the lang in Constantinople because, he said, it was a difficult instrument to play (Travel, i. 234). At this time the Turkish lang had forty strings, and a very large instrument of the xvith (not xvith) century is given by Engel (Mus. instr. in the South Kensington Museum, p. 59).

Although the "humped back" of the lang or djanq became a favourite theme for poets, and it was certainly the best known type, yet an instrument with a "straight back" was also to be found. A more pronounced "hump" existed in a type mentioned by Ibn Ghāibī and called, probably on account of this feature, the agē. It was strong similarly to the lang but had a wooden instead of a skin face on the sound-chest, and its tuning pegs were also of wood.

A Byzantine harp called the salūk (erroneously written sabaḵ, chaṣkaḵ [cf. the art. SHAHK], which clashes with the opinion of the present writer, Red.), or salbān in most dictionaries and MSS.) was also known to the Arabs. It was actually a survival of the old Greek κασῳδων and is described in the Maṣūfīh al-'Ulām as "an instrument of the Greeks (Vānnanīs) and Byzantines (Kūni) resembling the djanq" (p. 236).

According to Ibn Khuradīdhab it had twenty-four strings (al-Mas'udi, viii. 91: cf. Farmer, Byzantine musical instruments in the ninth century, p. 4 sq.). Ibn Sinā classes it with the sandj among the instruments with "open strings" stretched across a space.

Psalters. In describing those instruments with "open strings" stretched across a surface, both Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila mention a particular type named the 'anqā. Whilst the name suggests a "long necked" instrument, the details given of strings of different lengths but identically situated bridges (hamīlit), compel one to recognize in it a trapezoidal psaltery, one species of which was known later as the kānān. The word 'anqā also stood for "phoenix", and we know that the Greeks of old had an instrument called the θηνάξ. This

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, III.
may account for both the instrument and the name among the Arabs. It is not mentioned however, after the 6th century.

The ܚܢܝܢ [q.v.], the present-day psaltery of the Arabs and Turks, is said by Ibn Ghālibī to have been invented by Plato, although the instrument as known in the 6th century is attributed to Abu-Farābī (Ibn Khallīkān, Biog. Dict., ii. 309). The word itself is derived from the Greek खαδάτι. Although the instrument is delineated in the various MSS. of the Syriac lexicon of Bar Bahlīl (vth century) sub “ख指望”, yet the name ܚܢܝܢ is not given. It is mentioned in the Thaumaturg and One Nights (ed. Macnaghten, 49th and 149th nights), and in one place is designated the ܚܢܝܢ ܡܪܝ ("Egyptian psaltery"). In Spain it was particularly favoured and al-Shākundi (d. 1231) includes it among the Andalusian instruments manufactured at Seville (al-Makki, Arab. Historia, ii. 143—144).

In the Persian Kanz al-Tawḥīf and in Ibn Ghālibī it is described in detail. The shallow, flat, trapezoidal sound-chest, 9 cm. deep, was made of vine or plum tree wood. The lengths of the bass and treble sides were 81 and 40.5 cm. respectively, whilst the oblique side was 74.25 cm. It was mounted with sixty-four strings (seventy-two in Ibn Ghālibī), arranged trichordially. Although the ܚܢܝܢ has fallen into disuse in Persia, it is still a great favourite in the Maghrib, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, where it is to be found strung trichordially with from sixty-one to seventy-five strings.

A rectangular type of psaltery of greater compass was the ܒܫܒܡ. It was invented by Ṣafī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (d. 1294) and a design is sometimes to be found in his Kitāb al-ʿArūs (see Farmer, Arab. musical ms. in the Bodleian Library, frontispiece). Its features are also fully discussed in the Kanz al-Tawḥīf and by Ibn Ghālibī. Its dimensions were 74.25 × 54 cm., whilst the depth of the sound-chest was 27 cm., 178 strings were mounted on the instrument.

Dulcimer. Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila describe an instrument with "open strings" played on with beating rods (mazāfīr) which is called the ܒܫܒܡ (*"Chinese ܚܫܫ") is clearly the dulcimer, later to be generally known as the 穰.BorderFactory (also written 穰(Borderly)), a word derived immediately from the Arabic, and probably finally traceable to the Greek 穰(Borderly). Indeed, it is invariably found in the hands of Jews and Greeks. It is of similar structure to the ܚܢܝܢ, but with two of its sides oblique instead of one. The strings, which are mounted dichordally in Egypt, are of metal and are beaten with sticks (mazāfīr) instead of plectra as in the ܚܢܝܢ. We find it mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406) and al-Ḥaṭḥāmī (d. 1563), but its popularity was but slight among the Arabs. In the 6th century it is doubtfully acknowledged by Russell (i. 152) and Niebuhr (tympanum.) In Egypt, both Villeteau and Lane show that it was only to be found in the hands of Jews, Greeks and other foreign residents, whilst native writers like Musharka and Darwish Muhammad make no mention of it. To-day it is practically unknown in Syria and Egypt. In the Maghrib it is unnoticed by Host, Christianowitsch and Salvador-Daniel, and although it is dealt with by Delphin and Guin, it is scarcely known to-day. In Persia however, it obtained greater recognition. In the 6th century it is mentioned by Chardin, but not by Kaempfer, whilst Advielle in the 6th century gives both a design and a description. In Turkey, whilst the word is registered in the 6th century by Meninski, it is not mentioned by Ḥadījī Khālīfā nor described by Ewyīyaʾ Āṣifī, in their lists of Turkish musical instruments. In the next century however, it is recognised by Toderini, and to-day the 穰(Borderly) is one of the most esteemed instruments in the country, where it may be seen in two forms: the 穰(Borderly) and the 穰(Borderly) ܡܪܝ. The former, exclusively used by the Jews, has 160 strings, grouped in fives, giving thirty-two notes, a two octave chromatic scale. The latter, which is confined to the Turks, was introduced from the West about the middle of the last century by a certain Ḥilmi Bey. It is mounted with 105 strings, also grouped in fives, which are placed on the sound-chest in the Occidental way.


(4. O. Farmer)

AL-MIZĀN, the balance, is the nomen instrumenti from wannana "to weigh," which means to weigh in the ordinary sense and also to test the level of, like the Latin libra. Here we shall discuss:

1. The various instruments used for weighing in the ordinary sense; brief notes are added on the ascertainment of specific gravities. 2. Levelling instruments.

1. Balances.

The steelyard (al-karasfīf, q.v.) has already been dealt with; the general principles of the balance are also discussed in that article. — The usual balance with two arms of equal length had the same shape among the Muslims as in ancient times and at all periods of the west; this we know from extant specimens and illustrations in various works, notably in al-Khāzīnī, in a manuscript of al-Kāzmīn with reference to the constellation Libra (fig. 1), in a manuscript of Hartrī, in the ʿĀrīn ʿAlīhī of Abu l-Fadl (fig. 2). In the beautiful manuscript from which Ch. Schefer published the Sefar Nāmeh of Naṣīrī Khusrav,
on p. 88 in the illustration of the Masjid al-Aqṣā there is a balance labelled terasu (Sefer Naméh, Relation du voyage de Nassiri Khorau, ed. Ch.) and is contrasted by the ḥāhān al-ṣafū to the ḥabhān (steelyard), also taris from the Persian terūsū, then miḥmar for scales and ḥabba for beam and tongue. Mīḏjam means the tongs and also the beam. According to J. Ruska, ḥabba seems to be used for scales (for gold). On the expressions connected with karastān, see that article. Al-Maḳḍīsī mentions Ḥarrān as a place where balances were made, in his work Aḥṣan al-Taḥāṣim fi Maʿrifat al-ʿAqṣām, p. 141; in this town many very skilful mechanisms were engaged in making astronomical instruments. The accuracy of the balances made in Ḥarrān was proverbial.

The Arabs devoted special attention to the construction of balances used to identify metals and jewels from their specific gravity, to distinguish false from genuine and pure and to ascertain the composition of alloys of two metals by the use of the principle of Archimedes. They called these balances mīḏān al-māʾ, “water” (hydrostatic) balances. Of makers of these, al-Khāzīnī (c. 1100, q. v.) mentions: Sanad (Sīnd) b. ʿAlī (c. 250 = 864), Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī († 320 = 932—933), Ibn al-ʾAmīd († 359 = 969—970), Yuḥannā b. Yūsuf (perhaps al-Kaṣṣ, d. c. 370 = 980—981), Ibn Sīnā († 428 = 1037), Aḥmad al-Faḍl al-Maṣṣāḥ (the “measurer”, also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī without the “Massāḥ”), Abū Ḥaṣṣ ʿOmar al-Khaṭībī (as the celebrated mathematician is never called Abū Ḥaṣṣ, it is doubtful whether he is the individual mentioned by al-Khāzīnī). The balances made by these men are still fairly simple as only two, or at most three, scales were used in them. A contemporary of al-Khāzīnī, namely Abū Ḥaḳīm al-Muẓaffar Ibn Ismāʿīl al-ʾAṣḥārī (d before 515 = 1121) added two more scales; these and other improvements made the scales much more convenient to use. Of him al-Baiḥaḵī says (E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xx., Einige Biographien nach al-Baihaḵī, in S. B. P. M. S. Erls., xlii, 1910, p. 17): “He constructed the balance of Archimedes with which one ascertains forgeries. The treasurer of the great sultan feared that his frauds would thus be discovered. He therefore broke the balance and destroyed its parts. Al-Muẓaffar died of grief as a result”. Al-Khāzīnī then took up al-Muẓaffar’s work and made the balance a
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Schefer, Publications de l’école des langues orientales vivantes, ii. ser., i., Paris 1881). The common balance is called mīḏān but in the Kūrān we also find ḥūṣfās, which, according to al-Thaʿlabī, is a loanword. Other names are ṣḥākin, which does not only mean the beam and tongue of the balance
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most accurate means of measuring; he called it the universal balance, al-mizān al-wājīmi. But, no doubt in memory of his predecessor, he called his book Kitāb Mīzān al-Iḥkām.

Here we shall describe somewhat more fully the "balance of wisdom" 1) of al-Khāzīnī.

A l-Khāzīnī gives the beam $A$ of the balance (fig. 5) a thickness of six cm. and a length of

---

1) H. Bauerreiss (Zur Geschichte des spez. Gewichtes im Altertum und Mittelalter, Dissertation, Erlangen 1913) has reconstructed the "balance of wisdom", as nearly as possible following the data of the original. Reproductions are in Erlangen and the German Museum in Munich. The illustration is taken from a photograph. In the original right and left are reversed.
two m. In the centre it is strengthened by an additional piece C, obviously intended to avoid any bending at this point. A cross-piece H ('arida) is let in here. Corresponding to it is a similar cross-piece F on the lower part of the tongis, in which moves the tongue D, itself about 50 cm long. The upper cross-piece E is hung by rings to a rod which is fastened somewhere. Pegs or small holes are placed at exactly opposite places of the cross-pieces B and F to which threads are tied or drawn through. The friction at an axis is thus avoided, which, in view of the great weight of the beam, is quite considerable. The knob visible below the beam under its centre is used to secure the tongue to the beam or to take it out in order to adjust it evenly. The tongue has for this purpose a peg at the foot which goes through a hole in the beam. Al-Khāzīnī also observes that one could also take shorter beams but then all the other dimensions must be proportionately smaller. The beam is divided not on one side only, as in the illustration, but on both. The scales are hung on very delicate rings of steel (ṣawāb) "ravens", the points of which fit into little niches on the upper surface of the beam. Five scales are used in ascertaining specific gravities, i.e. in investigating alloys and examining precious stones. Of these the scale H (fig. 5a) is called the cone-shaped or al-hākim, the judge, as it is used to distinguish false from true. It goes into the water and in order to meet with less resistance in sinking is cone-shaped and pointed below. The scale f is called the winged (muqannab, fig. 5b and 5c, side and top view). It has indented sides so that it can be brought very close to the adjoining scales. It is also called the movable (munakkal). There is also a movable running weight K (al-rumnāna al-sāyāra) which serves, if necessary, to adjust the weight of the lighter beam; it is therefore also called the rumnāna of the adjustment (al-sāyāra). The other scales are used to hold weights. Al-Khāzīnī attained an extraordinary degree of accuracy with his balance. This was the result of the length of the beam, the peculiar method of suspension, the fact that the centre of gravity and axis of oscillation were very close to each other, and of the obviously very accurate construction of the whole. Al-Khāzīnī himself says that when the instrument was weighing 1,000 mithkāls, it could show a difference of 1 haba = \(1/100\) mithkāl, i.e. about 75 centigrammes in 4.5 kilogrammes. We thus have accuracy to 1/100,000.

Al-Khāzīnī used his scales for the most varied purposes. Firstly for ordinary weighing, then for all purposes connected with the taking of specific gravities, distinguishing of genuine (ṣamīm) and false metals, examining the composition of alloys, changing of dhirams to dinārs and countless other business transactions. In all these purposes the scales are moved about until equilibrium is obtained and the desired magnitudes in many cases can at once be read on the divisions on the beam.

False balances. That as early as the time of Muḥammad balances showing false weights were used for fraudulent purposes is shown by various passages in the Kurān (Sūra xxvi. 182; vii. 13; xxi. 37). We read for example: "Weigh with the just (or upright, mustaṣṭām) balance", Al-Ḍawhari (middle of the xiiith century; cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, iv., Uber Wagen bei den Arabern, in S. B. P. M. S. Erfg., vol xxxvii., 1905, p. 388) describes two such arrangements. In the one the beam of the balance consisted of a hollow reed closed at the ends in which there was some quicksilver; by a slight inclination of the beam this could be made to flow as desired to the side of the weights or of the articles and thus make the one or other appear heavier. A balance like this was used in Cairo in the time of E. W. Lane by a dishonest police inspector (muḥtasib). In the second pair of scales the tongue was of iron and the merchant had a ring with a magnetic stone. By bringing the ring close to it the balance went down to right or left.

The balance or the principles applying to it were used for many purposes besides weighing. Contrivances turning on an axis in which sometimes one and sometimes the other side becomes lighter or heavier, especially by the admission or release of water, were used to produce automatic movements; they are often called mīzān (cf. e.g. the writings of the Banū Mūsā and of al-Djazari; e.g. in F. Hauser, Über die Kulturgebiete der Mūsā’schen Schule, Abt. 2, Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften und Med., Heft II, 1922; E. Wiedemann and F. Hauser, Über die Uhren im Bereich der islamischen Kultur, in Nova Acta der Kais. Leop.-Carol. Akademie, vol. c., 1915, No. 5 and other passages). In the hour balance used to measure time, a container filled with sand or water is hung at one end of a lever poised with arms equal and has a hole in the bottom. The equilibrium disturbed by the gradual loss of sand or water is compensated by weights which move along the other arm. From their weight and position one can calculate the time that has passed (E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, xxxvii.: Über die Stundenwaage, in S. B. P. M. S. Erfg., xlvi., 1914, p. 27; a full description is given by Prof. F. Hauser in E. von Bassermann-Jordan, Die Geschichte der Zeitmessung und der Uhren).

Most artisans also describe as "scales" al-misāra, i.e. ruler, al-barkas, the compasses, al-khāniyā, set square and level, as they serve to show lapses from the straight etc. — Miṣqā’il, ell. chākin, kubān are "scales" with which one measures whether things are correct or over measure in business transactions (Ra‘īṣil lughāt al-Safā, Bombay 1305, i/ii. 128).

For a few further meanings of al-miṣāra see Dozy, Supplement, s. v.毽”室。— In mathematics the balance is used to elucidate certain mathematical processes. The steelyard is used to illustrate the inverse relation: the weights are in inverse proportion to the length of the arms (cf. e.g. Th. Ibel, Die Wäge im Altertum und Mittelalter, in Programm Forchheim, 1905—1906, p. 93; Ra‘īṣil
with the water displaced weighed \( P'_{3} \), so that from \( P'_{3} - P_{2} \) we get the volume of water corresponding to the mass \( P_{1} \), which is then calculated by al-Bīrūnī for a weight of 100 mithkāls. As almost always, in ascertaining the specific gravity the Arabs rely on the ancients, particularly on the work of Menelaus “on the artifice by which one ascertains the quantity of each of a number of mixed bodies”, Fi Ḥila ṣaltī yu'raṣu bi-hā Miktār kult māḥkīd min ʿIdā Adjīmā mukhātāli (from the Escorial MSS.) and Maṭrīsī Fāmīyāt ʿimārāt al-Adjīmā al-mukhātāli (according to Ibn al-Ḳifṭī, p. 321; Professor Dr. Würschmidt is giving an edition of this work in Philologie). In al-Bīrūnī’s work, Archimedes himself is mentioned and a certain Manāṭyūs (according to Noldeke, probably Maxwīlaq). The Muslims however did not slavishly take over the statements of the ancients. Al-Bīrūnī, for example, emphasizes that one can ascertained the composition of an alloy of two components but not of one of three, as Menelaus says. Among the Muslims it was certainly al-Bīrūnī who did most in this field, in his work “on the relations which exist between metals and jewels in volume” (Makāla fi ʿl-Nisāb ṣaltī bah al-Fīlīzāṣ wa ʿl-Dawāwīr wa ʿl-Ḥāṣaf, cf. also al-Bīrūnī, Chronology, text, p. xxxiv), which still exists, and also in another work, which only survives in fragments quoted by al-Khāzīnī. Al-Bīrūnī was induced to compose the first named by the difficulties encountered by goldsmiths in ascertaining the quantities of metals necessary to copy a given article. As predecessors he mentions Sand b. Ṣafī, Yūḥānā b. Yūsuf, Aḥmad al-Ṭaṣār al-Buḥārī. So far as we know he was followed and his results were used by: Abū Ḥafs ʿOmar al-Khayyāmī (see above), al-Ashīzarī (see above), al-Khāzīnī (see above), Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad Ibn ʿOmar al-Rāzī († 1210, Suter, Nö. 328), and Abu ʿl-Fazl Allāmī, Elyāh Misraḵī, a work ascribed to Plato which was composed in the time of ʿAbd al-Salāt al-Saʿūdī by a slave of a son of Sinān, a Turkish work by Ḥaḍafārī, and a Persian by Muḥammad b. Maṣūr (on these works, as on mineralogical literature in general, see E. Wiedemann, Beitr., xxx.: Zur Mineralogie des Islam, in S.P.M.S. Erł., xli., 1912, p. 205). We must also mention the study by Abū Maṣūr al-Nairṣī who is not to be confused with the commentator on Euclid, and the work on the measurement of bodies which are compounded of

---

1) It is to be noted that expressions like specific gravity and specific volume, which refer to the unit of weight and the unit of volume are not found among the Arabs. Al-Bīrūnī, for example, gives the amount of water displaced by 100 mithkāls of various substances corresponding to their volume and the weights of the metals which have the same volume as 100 mithkāls of gold and in the case of other substances the same volume as 100 mithkāls of blue ṣafīt.

The statements on specific gravities refer to: A. Metals: gold, mercury, bronze (zjur), copper, brass (ṣiyāṭ), iron, tin (raḥiṣ), lead (nurrūf and urṣūb). B. Precious stones: blue yāḥūt, red yāḥūt, ruby, emerald, lapis lazuli, pearl, coral, cornelian, onyx and rock crystal. C. Other substances: Pharaonic glass, clay from Siminān, pure salt, salt earth (ṣābāḥ), sandarach, enamel (mīnā), amber, pitch, wax, ivory, bakkam wood, willow wood.

The weights of equal volumes of liquids and the volumes of equal weights of liquid are sometimes found directly, sometimes ascertained with the areometer of Pappus. The former magnitude plays an important part in the liquids used in every day life like oil and wine. The second was of more scientific interest. It is especially interesting that the Arabs found that hot water and hot urine had a larger volume than equal weights cold. They also knew that ice had a larger volume than the same weight of water.

The facts ascertained with the areometer of Pappus for fluids refer to cold fresh water, hot water, ice (does not properly belong to this connection), sea water, wine, gar, wine, sesame oil, olive oil, cow's milk, hen's egg, blood of a healthy man, warm and cold urine.

Fig. 7 shows the areometer reconstructed by H. Bauerreiss from al-Khazinī. *X* is a massive cone used to make the instrument heavy. There are inscriptions corresponding to the Roman numerals. For details the reader may be referred to H. Bauerreiss's article. — The principle that floating bodies of the same weight sink in water to the same depth finds application in a juristic trick cited in the Kitāb al-Hīsāf fi 'l-Fīkḥ of Abī Hātim al-Kazwīnī. The weight of a camel is ascertained by putting it in a boat and noting how deep the boat sinks. The camel is then replaced by iron weights until the boat sinks to the same level (cf. J. Schacht in G. Bergstrasser, Beitr. zur german. Philologie und Linguistik). In medical works and treatises on weights and measures, figures are given for the weights of equal volumes of wine, oil and honey (cf. Bauerreiss, op. cit.).

So far as it is a question of particular bodies, the values as ascertained by the Arabs agree very well with those obtained by modern science and even surpass in accuracy those obtained by it up till the beginning of the last century.

**Bibliography:** This is given in the article AL-KARĀȘTĪN.

2. Leveling (waṣama, to weigh, corresponding to the Latin librare).

The Arabs certainly adopted a large number of methods of levelling and testing levels from other peoples, either the Byzantines or the Persians. The statements in Ibn Wālshīya (see below) about the making of canals etc. agree with those of Vitruvius, who in turn drew on Greek sources. The Arabs learned partly from Greek works; for example, we are told that according to Philoemen (according to M. Steinschneider: Philon), the inclined in canals must be at least $5:1,000$; but they also utilized data gained from the practical experience of land owners, canal builders etc. Whether the Arabs were acquainted with the standard works of Hero on this subject, the *Metrika* and the “On the Diorpra” (Hero, *Opera omnia*, ed. H. Schöne, iii., Leipzig 1903), is not known, for no corresponding title is found in the biographical or bibliographical works. But the writing mentioned in the *Fihrist* “On the use of the astrolabe” may have dealt with geometric problems. Many problems in the Arabic sources are very similar to those dealt with in the work “On the Diorpra”; only the Arabs use the astrolabe or quadrant instead of the dioptra.

Whether one or other of the methods described below was discovered independently by the Arabs and by whom, cannot be established from the authors on the subject, who were mainly practical men. They are described in the most different places.

In levelling, one is faced with two problems: firstly to make a surface exactly level and horizontal or to place a rod or a surface exactly perpendicular, and secondly to ascertain the point on the same level as a given one, or to ascertain the difference in height between two points.

1. A surface is made level and horizontal in the following way:

- A ruler with a straight edge is moved over the surface and one sees whether it touches it everywhere so perfectly that light penetrates nowhere between ruler and surface; in this case the surface is perfectly smooth (al-Shirāzī, see below).

That the ruler itself is straight is ascertained by seeing if a thread stretched along it and fastened to it at one end can be lifted the same height from the ruler along its whole length. Whether three rulers are straight is tested by putting them side by side and exchanging their sides (Ibn Yūnūs, in K. Schoy, see below).

To examine if a surface was perfectly horizontal, the following tests were adopted:

1. Water is poured over the surface and it is observed whether this flows equally in all directions; this is one of the most usual methods. The same plan is given by Proclus in his *Hypotyposis* (ed. K. Manitius, Leipzig 1909, p. 50, 51). According to him, one pushes supports in under a level surface on all sides till it shows no slope anywhere; this is the case when water poured on it remains standing without running to one side.

2. An object which can roll is placed on one side; if it does not roll off but only oscillates, the surface is horizontal (al-Shirāzī, see below).

3. Water is poured into a plate or dish (djaṣma, fig. 8) with an edge which is parallel to the surface and of the same height all the way round, and it is observed whether the water comes exactly up to the edges on all sides (Ibn Luyūn, see...
An exactly straight ruler is laid on the plate and one looks over this.

Ibn Sinā (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1061) in order to test whether the upper surface of the base of a theodolite is horizontal, makes a cavity in it with exactly perpendicular walls, pours water in and proceeds as in the case of the plate. To test whether a large ring is absolutely smooth, al-'Urdī used a process which he called al-asfādāin. This is not a ready made instrument but an apparatus to be put together from case to case. The ring to be tested is first of all placed exactly horizontal with the ground by means of the level (Fig. 9). Inside the ring on its concave side a circular gutter of potter's clay is built. Its outer edge comes up to the level of the surface of the ring while its inner edge is a little higher. The gutter is filled with water and some light ashes are scattered on it. If the water flows over the ring the depressions in the ring are filled with it, while the ashes remain on the raised parts of it. The inequalities in the surface of the ring are thus brought out (Fig. 10). Al-'Urdī emphasised that the test must be made in absolute calm.

Al-'Urdī also used the same method in order to see that the outlets for water in a distribution system at Damascus were all of the same level. In the centre of the reservoir he put a gutter like this and deepened or raised the bottoms of the channels running out of it until the water from the gutter spread equally over the channels which revealed any inequalities (Fig. 11). Cf. H. J. Seemann, in S. B. P. M. S. Erlg., Ix., 1928, p. 49, 81 and J. Frank, in Zeitschr. f. Instrumentenkunde, xlviii., 1929.

Fig. 9.

In the original the rod is at e, the rope at a, b, c mudjimatī, it is a triangle of wood, at d thread, at f ṭuṭkāla, weight.

4. A plumb-line (ṣāḥēl, baqal, balad [from ṭurq], ṭuṭkāl) is dropped from the apex (Fig. 12) of an isosceles triangle, made for example of wood, with its perpendicular marked; a piece is sometimes left open in the centre of the under side for the weight of the plumb-line. If the plumb-line coincides with the perpendicular, the surface is horizontal (the figures go back to al-Shirāzi and al-Khalkhālī). Such drawings have led to the erroneous idea that Muslim students were already acquainted with the pendulum (cf. E. Wiedemann, in Verhäl. d. d. phys. Ges., 1919, p. 663: the apparatus is called al-fādīn [e.g. in al-Shirāzi, al-'Urdī, see below], Dozy, op. cit., also al-fādīn).
In the architect's balance (fig. 13), according to Ibn Luyūn or al-Tūhānī (see below), a quadrangular piece of wood is placed on the beam a a to be examined; in the middle of it, a perpendicular line b a is drawn before which a plumb-line is hung; according to the original figure, it seems to be two parallel lines between which the plumb-line hangs.

Al-Marrākushi (see below) has described a more perfect form (fig. 14). In the figure a b, a c and d e are rods, and a b = a c and a d e is an equilateral triangle; d e is pierced in the centre. A plumb-line is hung from a through the hole. If the surface on which b and c are put is horizontal, the thread of the plumb-line goes through the centre of the hole.

Whether the levels and other similar instruments are themselves correct, whether for example the plumb-line from the apex to the base is perpendicular, is tested in this way: After the plumb-line comes to rest in one position of the level, the latter is put in various positions on some horizontal surface, particularly in one perpendicular to the first, and in one in which left and right have places exchanged. If the plumb-line always comes to rest the level is correct but if it only does so in the former case the error can be corrected by adjusting the position of the surface and that of the level.

The level here described is usually called kūnīya (γυνία); the word, however, is also used for the wooden set square, as used by carpenters (s. Maclauchlan, A History of the Sciences, 3rd ed., Vol. II, p. 255) and land surveyors like Abu 'l-Wafā (s. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und Medizin, Heft iv., 1922, p. 98). A synonym is according to al-Shirāzī (Nihāyat al-Idrāk fi Dīvān al-Afāk, Mak. 2, chap. 13): afadān. From the same root we have in Ibn Wahshiyya (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1279, p. 527) fāwād, in Dozy (Supplément, ii., p. 246) fāsin and fādīn. Connected with this is fāwīd, dual of fāwād.

Sometimes one finds it stated that levelling is done with the šākūl; e.g. in al-Battānī (ed. Nallino, text, 1903, p. 137): mawsīn bi 'l-šākūl, and an exactly similar statement is made by Ibn Sīnā (Cod. Leidensis, No. 1279). A set square is either brought up to the plumb-line and a perpendicular dropped on the surface from it, or the šākūl is used for the level, the essential part of which is the plummet.

On larger surfaces, such as roofs, etc., a long rod (šākūl = cubitale) is first of all laid down and on it the apparatus for testing the level is placed; this is called mūsān al-tasīr (s. al-bunādīn of the architects; cf. Ibn Luyūn, see below).

5. At the apex of a three-sided pyramid, built on a surface by 3 rods of equal length, a plumb-line with a sharp point in the plummet is hung. This ought to hang over the centre of the surface (al-Khāzīnī, see below).

6. On the apexes A and B (fig. 15) of two sharp pointed tetrahedra of equal height A IH K, and B LM N; a rod of some length AB is laid on which is fixed a triangle with a plumb-line hanging from it or an arrangement such as is already described for the scale-beam, if the plumb-line or the tongue comes to rest, the rod and therefore the surface is horizontal (al-Marrākushi, see below).

The necessity of making surfaces exactly level continually crops up in building, and also in putting up astronomical instruments, and in constructing the Indian circle with which the meridian and then the direction of the kihi is a certain. In this case the level surface is usually not prepared on the ground but on a firm foundation, perhaps of stone. The construction for the Indian circle is already described in the Hypotyposis of Proclus (loc. cit.) in the same way as by the Arabs.

We now deal with the testis used to see if a thing is perpendicular:

1. The simplest method is to hang a plumb-line beside it. In the case of level perpendicular surfaces, this must touch it all the way down if its point of suspension is on it. This method is always recommended in working with the quadrant (s. also below).

2. If the point of suspension is a little in front of the surface the thread must be equidistant from it all the way down.

3. In the side of the gnomon, a perpendicular rod, often with a cone-shaped top, Ibn Yūnus (see below) cut a groove which ended in a hemispherical cavity. In the groove a thread is hung from the top of the gnomon with a ball shaped weight. If this comes to rest in the hollow, the gnomon is perpendicular.
4. The gnomon is moved backwards and forwards (turned about on its foot: *mubbell* or *naabdhir*); its shadow must only move so far on the level surface, on which it stands, as is in keeping with the movement of the sun during the turning (Ibn Yūnus, see below).

5. A circle is described at the foot of the rod and a pair of compasses used to test whether the distance of the top of the gnomon is the same from all points of the circle.

6. Ibn Sīnāア drills a small hole through the gnomon parallel to its base, puts it in a vessel with a horizontal bottom which is filled with muddy water and examines whether the surface exactly coincides with the level of the hole.

7. In order to examine whether a level surface is standing exactly perpendicular, two exactly equal parallelepiped blocks of wood (fig. 16) are placed on it, $L_1$ and $L_2$, one above the other. From the upper edge of $L_1$ a plumb-line is hung; one watches whether its thread exactly touches $L_2$; the best plan is to place a very thin ruler between $L_1$ and the plummets and test the position of the thread with respect to $L_2$ (al-Marākūsh, see below).

8. In order to ascertain the difference in height between two points $x_1$ and $x_2$ which are at a distance $a$ from one another, as is necessary in making a canal for example, one looks horizontally from $x_1$ with an apparatus which is at a height $h$ from the ground to a vertical rod at $x_2$ and ascertains the height $h_1$ at which the point observed is above the ground. A mark can be made on it (in modern mensuration, the rod at $x_2$ has divisions marked on it). The difference in height is $h_1 - h$. According to fig. 19, the Arabs, like Hero, seem to have used something similar. Ibn al-'Awwām (see below) uses a square board on which are marked a number of circles touching one another, which are distinguished by different colours or have different centres. In order to place the rods absolutely perpendicular, plumb-lines are hung beside them (fig. 17).

The horizontal line of vision is obtained in various ways:

1. A rod (e.g. an ell long) with square sides is put up in such a way that the upper surface appears horizontal to the eye and one looks along this surface.

2. The rod (*tubīfūl*) is put on the above mentioned dish or plate (fig. 8) and one looks along it.

3. At the end of the rod nails are fastened at the same height and their heads are pierced and one looks through the holes.

4. For a rough examination, one can put, at the two places, two tube-shaped bricks which for convenience may be made each out of two half-pipes (Ibn al-'Awwām, see below).

5. An astrolabe is put in a horizontal place such as the edge of a well or on its cover and one looks through the eyepiece.

Other methods of ascertaining differences of level are as follows:

1. An assistant is sent from the higher position to the lower holding a rod of a known length $l$ vertically until one sees just the end of it; if $h$ then is the level of the eye, $l - h$ is the difference in height. If the distance is too great for the top of the rod to be distinguished, a light is put on it, for example a lighted candle and the observation is made by night.

2. If it is a question of ascertaining whether a place outside a well is lower than the level of water in the well, the distance of the latter from the surface of the ground or from the edge is ascertained by letting a rod and thread down with a shining heavy object at the end and used in calculation.

Two apparatuses, closely connected with each other, are the following:

3. To a rod (fig. 17) the triangle with the plumb-line is attached. To its two ends two threads with weights at the ends are attached, $a$ and $b$.

Two posts $r$ and $z$ are erected at the points, the difference in level of which is to be ascertained. The one thread is fastened to the end of the lower post $r$ and the other hung along and over the post $z$ until its weight comes to rest. The amount of shifting of the thread measures the difference in height (al-Khāzīnī, see below).

4. The *murджīkāl* (the bat, fig. 18) consists of an equilateral triangle with a plumb-line which hangs from the middle of one side. The triangle is suspended by this side. Two rods, each an ell in length, are erected 10 ells apart; a rope is passed from the top of one to the top of the other and by two threads $a$ the *murджīkāl* is suspended in its centre. If the plumb-line goes through the apex of the triangle, both places are on the same level, if not, one is raised by putting stones below it for example; but the end of the rope can, as in 3, be moved along (Ibn Lu'yūn, see below).

5. In the Paris manuscript 2468, an unknown author describes 3 apparatuses for levelling (fig. 19a–c). In the first (al-murjẖārī, the known) a rod of wood an ell in length is bored through its entire length and tongs with a tongue suspended from its centre (fig. 19a). Through the hole a rope some 15 ells long is drawn which is fastened to the two vertical rods already mentioned. The second apparatus (fig. 19b; al-zabība, the similar) corresponds to the *murджīkāl*: only the two threads $a$, $b$
and Bahāʾ al-Dīn but not described; it probably corresponds to our canal-level, a communicating pipe filled with water, such as is very fully described by Hero (Dieoptra, p. 197 and loc. cit.); but he gives it no particular name, probably because it is associated with a dioptra. On the plum-line of the figure is written ख्याल (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, xxxiv, see below).

Ṭihgnārī mentions another instrument called میسان al-کاف̣, Ibn Wahshiyā (see below) one of brass called کافار or کاف. Neither are described however. Arabic authors who give full descriptions of Arab instruments are the following:


3. Ibn al-ʿAwāmān (c. 1350) in Kitāb al-Falāḥa (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, x., see below).

4. Abū ʿOthmān b. Lūyūn (c. 1048) in Kādārā ḵāl al-Falāḥa, deals with levelling ground etc., and gives notes on al-Ṭihgnārī and others (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, x. 317 and Đozai, Supplemente, i. 302 and 579).

5. Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī, Ezess der Rechenkunst, ed. F. Nesselmann (1547-1622, s. E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, x., 319).

Full details of levelling are given in the astronomical books in discussing the ascertainment of the meridian, e.g. in Kūṭb al-Dīn al-Ṣhirāzī (d. 1311; cf. E. Wiedemann, in Zeitschr. für Physik, vol. x., 1932, p. 267), al-Khalīghī etc. Many books on the astrolabe give information on the subject in discussing surveying problems, e.g. al-Bīrūnī (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beitrag, xviii. 59 sqq.).

I give once again the names of the levelling instruments:

میسان, میسان al-حمن, میسان al-کاف, میسان al-یسر, کافار, کیییا, فاسین, کادین, افادان, دیفنا, مرگیکح, کاف.

I know of no comprehensive treatise on levelling in connection with canal building etc. in the early Muslim period. For the literature see my Beitrag, iii. 229; xviii. 26 and H. Schmeller, loc. cit., p. 41. — For knowledge of these matters in ancient times see C. Merkel, Die Inventur-technik im Altertum and H. Diesl, Antike Technik, Leipzig 1920.


** Mizmār means literally *an instrument of piping*. In the generic sense it refers to any instrument of the "wood-wind" family, i.e. a reed-pipe or a flute. In the specific sense it refers to a reed-pipe (i.e. a pipe played with a reed) as distinct from a flute, as we know from Ibn Sinā (d. a.d. 1037) who describes the mīzmār — a reed-pipe — as an instrument "which you blow into from its end which you swallow", as distinct from an instrument like the yarrā — a flute — "which you blow into from a hole". Ibn Zaila (d. 1048) writes similarly but substitutes the Persian word ньā for the Arabic word mizmār.

In Ibn Sinā's Arabic treatise al-Nadāǧūt we read of the mīzmār, but in the identical passage in his Persian Dānjīn-nāma the word is ньā. Further, the Maṣṭāth al-ʿUlūm says, "the mīzmār is the ньā" (p. 236). For the present purpose, "wood-wind" instruments (nāṣim) may be divided into: i. reed-blown types; and ii. pipe-blown types. Among the former we have single reed-pipes of the clarionet, oboe, and saxophone types, as well as double reed-pipes, the bagpipe, and the чéřèng. Among the latter we have the flute and recorder, as well as the panpipes.

a. **Reed-blown types.** Single reed-pipes occur in ancient Semitic art and literary remains (Lavinac, i. 55 sqq.). Hoary gossip attributes the "invention" to the Persians (al-Masūdī, Mūrūdī, viii. 90), whilst Djamshid himself is claimed to have been the actual "inventor" (Ew-liyā Ǧelebi, i. 641). With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes are found with a conical or cylindrical tube (nāṣāb) pierced with finger-holes (ṭhūbāb), and played with a single or double beating reed (kā-ṭaba, kāṭāha). Among the Arabs of the 7th century, the mīzmār finds a place at convivial
parties (Mufid al'iyat, xvii.), and in the viith century it is one of the martial instruments of the Jewish tribes of al-Hijáz (Aghani, ii. 172). When Islam came, an anathema was placed on reed-pipes mainly, it would seem, on account of the female reed-pipe player (summârî) who, as was common in the East, was looked upon as a courtesan, and, indeed, the terms summârâ and zuhira became almost synonymous. It is improbable that the Prophet Muhammad could have referred to a reed-pipe (mîzmûr) in the well-known hadîth in praise of the chanting (kir'a) of Abû Mûsâ al-Asghâri. The reference was rather to a mismâr (Hebr. mismâr “psalm”) from the msâmâr of the House of David” (cf. my Hist. of Arabian music, p. 33). In early days, what the Arabs called the mismâr, the Persians called the nār, and the latter distinguished the flute by the name nār narm (soft nār). Later they called the reed-pipe the nār sâfîd (white nār) and the flute the nār safîd (white nār) because of the colour of the instrument. About the beginning of the viih century, a musician at the 'Abbâsid court named Zunnâm invented a reed-pipe which was named after him the nār zuhnâm or zuhnâm (Tâdî al-Ârâs). What the invention was we can only conjecture. It may have been the cylinder used for altering the pitch of the instrument, or perhaps it was the introduction of a conical tube (see my Studiis, p. 79, 82). At this period we have no information whether the various reed-pipes had cylindrical or conical tubes or whether they were played with single or double beating reeds. The word zuhnâm was accorded little recognition in the East, whatever favour the invention itself found. In the West, where the name eventually became vulgarized into zuhnâm, it became the most important reed-pipe not only in Spain as we know from al-Shakundi (d. 1231; al-Mâkârî, Mak. Dyn., i. 59), but also in the Maghrib (Ibn Khaldûn, ii. 353). It became the zumân of the Spaniards (see also Schiaparelli, s. v.).

The mîzmûr (mismâr wa'dhîk) is described and delineated by al-Fârâbi (d. 950). It had eight holes for fingering, giving a complete octave. He also describes a smaller reed-pipe called the suryânâ (Kosepârt. p. 95; Land, p. 122; D'Erleranger, p. 262). One special feature of this instrument was called the shâtrâ. In the Mâsâ'îl al-Chânî (p. 237) we read: “The shâtrâ of the mîzmûr is its head, and it is by which it is made narrow and wide [in compass]”. It was actually the cylinder inserted into the head of the instrument which lowered the pitch when required (see my Studies, p. 82), a device called later the tâfik (Kans al-Tuhaf) or fašt (Villotet). It was called the shâtrâ perhaps on account of the button at the top of the cylinder which was turned round. The word suryânâ came to be modified into surnây and then surnâ. Popular etymology opined that the word was derived from sâr “fête” and nây “reed”, but this form only appears in the lexicons (Surhâni, shâri). Some modern even write surnây. The surnây found its way into martial music as early as the beginning of the ixth century (Aghâni, xvi. 139: the text has surnâh). In the viith century, Ibn Zaila shows how, by devices in the fingering and embouchure, other notes were obtained on the reed-pipe (Pers. nây). In the Persian Kans al-Tuhaf (sixth cent.) the mîzmûr, also called the nây sâfîd, is both de-
scribed and delineated. More valuable is the explanation of the actual making of the beating reed with which the instrument was played, from which we learn that it was a double reed. In the next century a Turkish author Ahmad Uğlü Şukurullah wrote extensively from this work (Lavignac, i. 3012). Ibn Ghâbi (d. 1435) says that all the notes could be obtained on the surnây nây by accommodating the fingering and the embouchure. The smaller instrument, the surnâ, was defective in the upper octave he says. A similar type of reed-pipe to the latter called the kalâban is also mentioned by him. Ewliyâ 'Celibi says that it came from Shîrâz. In the Muhammâd b. Murîd Treatise (xvith cent.) we learn that the nây arsad (≈ nây sâfîd ≈ mîzmûr) was 27 cm. long.

With the Turks, the Persian word surnây had been altered to surnân and the term had become common to both the suhr (mîzmûr) and surnân in the East Ewliyâ 'Celibi (xvith century) mentions among the Turkish reed-pipes of his day the kabs sürnân or sayîm sürnberg, the 'arabî sürnberg, the aqash sürnberg, and the zühâr sürnberg (a Mesopotamian reed-pipe). He also speaks of the sample of the suhr with which he says, was an English invention (i. 642). If this is the same as the surnaye, it was the clarionet, an instrument which Denner is said to have “invented” about 1690, which is after its mention by Ewliyâ 'Celibi. The Persians still continued to call their reed-pipe the surnân, and a xvith century design of the instrument is given by Kaeumper. Both Russell in Syria (i. 155) and Villotet in Egypt (i. 356 sq.) refer to several kinds of reed-pipes in use in the xvith century.

The latter delineates these and describes them fully. They are three, the kabs sürnân or sumâ al-kabîr, the suhr or sürnberg, and the surnân djûrâ or surm al-suçhüvîr, the first being 58.3 cm. and the last 31.2 cm. in length. The modern instrument is also delineated by Lavignac, p. 2793; Sachs, p. 428. For specimens see Brussels, Nos. 122, 355, 357; New York, No. 1731.

In the West also we find a new name, or instrument, the ghaîta or ghâyya [q. v.]. It is said to have been introduced by the Turks (Delphin and Guin, p. 48) but the name is mentioned by Ibn Raitta (d. 1377) who likens the Mesopotamian surnây to the Maghribian ghaîta (i. 126). There are, however, two kinds of ghaîta, one — a cylindrical tube blown with a single reed, and another — a conical tube blown with a double reed. This may explain why ghaîta does not always equate with surnây and mîzmûr in the West (Tâdikirât al-Nîṣâm, p. 93; Muhammâd al-Šâhîrî, p. 34). The cylindrical tube instrument is known in Egypt as the ghîta. For details see Bû 'Alî, p. 103; Delphin and Guin, p. 47. For specimens and designs see Host, p. 261, tab. xxi.; Brussels, No. 351; New York, Nrs. 402, 2824; Lavignac, p. 2921.

A reed-pipe that became quite famous in Western Europe was the kâg played with a reed. The original kâg [q. v.] was a horn or clarion, and was made of horn or metal. Pierced with holes for fingering, and played with a reed, a new type of instrument, somewhat similar to the modern saxophone, was evolved. In the xvth century, this kâg was “improved” by the Andalusian Caliph al-Hakam II (Bibli. de autores latin., li. 410). Ibn Khaldûn, who describes it, says that it was the best instrument of the sumâr family (ii. 353). Ibn Ghâbi,
in his h hologram MS. in the Bodleian Library, writes bāš, but adds, “also called bāš”, but the latter remark has been deleted. It appears in the Cantigas de Santa Maria (Kiaño, fig. 41, b).

Another interesting instrument is the ḥisābīya or ṭrāṭbīya, which may have been the forerunner of the European racket. It has a cylindrical pipe and is played with a double reed. It is probably the descendant of the Nāy al-ṭrāṭbīq that al-Ghazāli (d. 1111 A.D.) speaks of. It is delineated and fully described by Villoteau (i. 943 sq.). Examples are given at Brussels, No. 124; New York, No. 2861.

With Islamic peoples, reed-pipes belong to outdoor music. Just as we see them in the Af Lāla or Lāla as being essential to folk, ceremonial, processional, and martial music, so they are today, and probably have always been.

Double reed-pipes. Ibn Khurdaḏḏbih says that the Persians “invented” the double reed-pipe called the diyāmīlī (al-Maṣūdī, Murūḏī, viii. 90), the earliest instrument of this type that we know by name in Arabic literature, although it appears in the viiith century frescoes at Ḥusār ʿAmrā (Musil, pl. xxiv.). It has been suggested that the word should be dūnīya, but diyāmīlī is also given by al-Fārābī (see my Studies, p. 57), who describes and delineates the instrument which, he says, was also called the muṣūmār al-muḥdānī or muḥḍānī. The two pipes were of equal length and each was pierced by five finger-holes, which gave an octave between them. Probably the instrument known in the Middle Ages as the sūmmāra (vulg. sūmmāra) was actually the old diyāmīlī, although it merely equates with ṣāḥula in the Glossary Latino-Arabicum (xith century) and the Vocabulista (xiiith century). As early as the xith century we read of the muṣūlī in Egypt (al-Maḵṭūṭī, f. 136). The name itself means “joined” (see my Studies, p. 78), and it was doubtless a double reed-pipe. Since the viiiith century at least, sūmmāra has been the name for this instrument in the East (cf. Niebuhr, i. 145), and Lane (p. 397) describes and delineates it. It has cylindrical tubes and is played with a single beating reed. It is to be found with a varying number of finger-holes and is named accordingly (Sachs, p. 433). In the Maghrib it is called the muḥraḏūn and mahriūn (Lavignac, p. 2793: R.A., 1866), whilst in Syria it is given a vulgarized or metathetical form of the old muṣūmdwj (cf. Sachs, p. 257; Dalman, Pal. Divan). For specimens and descriptions see Brussels, Nos. 115-118; New York, Nos. 2167, 2633; and Z.D.P.V., 1927, p. 19. Specimens in my collection range from 18 to 43 cm. in length.

Another type of double reed-pipe has only one pipe pierced with finger-holes, whilst the other serves as a drone. This also carries the name sūmmāra when the two pipes are of the same length (cf. Niebuhr, i. 145). When the drone pipe is longer than the chanter pipe it is known as the arghūli (arghūli, Mushākra, p. 29; ṣūmūn, Lavignac, p. 2812) in modern times (cf. Freytag, Christ. Arab., 1834, p. 34) in Egypt and Syria. Villoteau (i. 962) gives a detailed description with scales and designs of three sizes, 107, 82.6 and 38.6 cm. in length. (In South Kensington Museum there is one 144 cm. long.) Like the preceding instrument it is played with single beating reeds. The drone pipe is furnished with additional finger-holes (ṣydāf) which are affixed to lower the pitch. In Syria the smaller type of arghūli is named the mahriūn, a most significant name, in spite of it being ignored in the lexicons. Lane (p. 367) figures a six finger-holed instrument which, he says, was used at ḍāhirs, and by Nile boatmen. For specimens see Brussels, Nos. 342—346; Z.D. P.V., 1927, pl. 2.

Bagpipe. An ancient instrument in the Orient. Just prior to Islam we have it figured on Sasanian sculptures (Ker Porter, Travels, ii., pl. 64). We do not know its ancient Semitic name, but Ibn Simʿa and Ibn Zālīa mention it as the mizmār al-ǧīrāb, describing it as being played by “an artificial contrivance”. Although Niebuhr (i. 146) calls it the sūmmār al-kūrlī, and Lane, p. 358, names it the sūmmār bīṣṭān, the more general term used in Arabic speaking countries is sukrā, although we find mizwād used in Tunisia (von Hornbostel, p. 4). The word sukrā is given variations by some European writers as in the suqāra of Villoteau (i. 970) and the sukara of Rouanet (Lavignac, p. 2812). In Persia, the bagpipe has long been known as the nāy anfūn and nāy maḏakhir or maḏakāh (Burhan-i maḏakh) from whence the Hindūstāni name maḏakhir (Tagore, p. 24; Day, p. 151). In Turkey, the older word was tūlūm, tūlūm or tūlūm (Meninski, Sachs; cf. Ewliya Čelebi, i. 642: tūlūm daḏik), but gūstā would appear to be equally popular. It is to be found throughout the Balkan countries (cf. Arab. gūstū; Span. gaix; Engl. waygheet).

The bagpipe used by Islamic peoples is generally equipped with a chanter pipe (with five or six finger-holes) and mouthpiece, but rarely with a drone pipe. The chanter, terminating in a horn bell (Schallstücker), is often double, a feature which was probably the original reason for the term sūmmāra being used with the bagpipe. The woodwork is sometimes inlaid with metal, whilst another feature is the adornment of the instrument with tassels, beads, shells, and other frippery. Designs may be found in Niebuhr (tab. xxv.) and Sachs (p. 434), and actual specimens in Brussels, No. 372.

Instrument of free reeds. The Chinese chūn is such an instrument. Probably it was not used by Islamic peoples although known to them. The chūn is described in the Majāṣf al-ʿUṯm as follows: “The muṣūf is a musical instrument of the Chinese. It is made of compound tubes (anōtīb), and its name in Persian is bišt maḏakhir” (p. 237). We get a little more information from Ibn Ghaibī who informs us that the ṣufī or maḏakhir-i ṣīzhī, was made of tubes of reed joined together. It was blown through a tube and the notes were obtained by finger-holes. For description and designs see Van Aalst, Chinese Music, p. 80.

Pipe-blown types.—The flutes of the Arabs, Persians and Turks, unlike those of Western Europe, are played vertically, a current of air being blown across the orifice (muṣaf) at its head. Ewliya Čelebi (f. 623, 636, 642 read چرخ) is not sure whether it was Pythagoras or Moses who “invented” the first instrument of this type, the shepherd’s flute, called the ḍawāl (cf. ʿuṣīf). Ibn Khurdaḏḏbih says that it originated with the Kurds (al-Maṣūdī, viii. 90), and Ibn Ghaibī (Shāḥr al-ʿAdwār) says that this instrument was the nāy abyafa (white nāy). We know from Ibn al-Aṣālī (d. 846) that the Arabs called
this flute or reed-pipe the ḥiya. A characteristic of the Arab flute was its length, hence the ancient Greek proverb which likened a talkative person to an Arabian flute (Meunardi Fragm.).

In the early days of Islam, the Arabs called their flute the kuṣṣāba (later modified into ḏaṣṭa), and this is the name used by the poets al-ʿAṣba (d. 629) and Ṭuba b. al-ʿAdīǧīyāī (viii century). These terms fell into desuetude in the East when Persian musical influences were at their height. The Persians called their flute the nay norm (soft nāy) so as to distinguish it from the nāy proper and the sarīnāy, which were reed-pipes, and so the Arabs of the East called their flute the nāy, although in the West the old word kuṣṣāba or ḏaṣṭa was retained. Another term for the flute in early days, perhaps a different kind, was yarā (Mafāth al-ʿUlm, p. 236), and in the xii century Glossarium Latino-Arabicum it equates with zalama. In the xiii century it was still a common name with Saft al-Din ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (p. 9) in the East, and with al-Shaḳkandī in the West (al-Maḳḳari, i. 50), raised yarā not barā. In the contemporary Vocabulary in Arabico it (yarā) agrees with “yarā.” The words håra and hara (al-Dhawarī, al-Faruḥadābī) would appear to be vulgar forms of yarā.

Whilst the diminutive ḏaṣṭa (ḥar-ḥaṣṭ) sometimes occurs in reference to a small flute, ḏaṣṭāba and ṣhabīb (V ḏaḥa “to grow up”) are the more general terms used in Irāk (Īkhwān al-Safira, i. 97), Egypt (al-Maḳḳī, i. 136), Spain (al-Shalhābī, Ṭarāb, i. 352), and the Maghrib (Ibn Khaldūn, ii. 352). It became the cavaquha of Western Europe. Another name for a small flute was ḏawī.mk, and this word also found a place in the Latinas as the joch (Du Cange). In Persia, the small flute was called the pīhta (Kanz al-Tāhuq), hence the Balkan pisot and pisot. We read of the nāy in the Aḥānī (ix. 71) but we cannot be sure whether it was a flute or a reed-pipe. Al-Farābī (Rosengarten, p. 45) ignores the flute (nāy) and says that it was inferior (muḥqr) to the mizmar (reed-pipe), but it soon gained wide recognition in chamber music probably by reason of ṣafī appraisement and the ṣafī of the darwīk. Saft al-Din ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (d. 1294) describes the nāy with eight holes for fingering, the thumb-hole at the back being called the ṣdākū (“vehement”), its name revealing its function. In the Persian Kanz al-Tāhuq (xvith cent.) we find two very small flutes mentioned, but in the Shāh al-Adwār (xvith cent.) we find that the nāy abīyad was normally 67.5 cm. long. Five larger sizes are given, the longest being 99 cm., with two smaller sizes, the limit being 31.5 cm. Ibn Ghaibī also registers several varieties including the nāy hamn of 67.5 cm. approximate in pitch to the hamn string of the lute, and the nāy wir of 33.75 cm. approximating to the wir string. Ewyālī Čelebi (xvith cent.) gives the names of a group of Turkish flutes (i. 623) including the šak maṭṣur, the dawī.mk, and the kalɛng. Vivaldo (i. 594) describes and delineates the Egyptian instruments of the late xvith century. The largest, 77.9 cm. long, was the nāy šah (ḥaṭ ṣhān), and the smallest, 48.8 cm. long, was the nāy ḏiraf, the kīraft of modern Syria (Mush̲aṭ̲a, p. 29). Other flutes named by him are the nāy muṭlaq, the nāy ṣuṭurda (ṣuṭurda), the nāy muṭlaq, and the nāy ḏurā. In Turkey the ṣuṭurda is the smallest flute used in chamber music (Lavignac, p. 3019). Turkish and Egyptian flutes are usually well made, with a head to support the lips. In Palestine and the Maghrib they still retain, more or less, a primitive appearance, and although the seven holed flute is common (Christianowitsch, pl. 2), the five and six holed instrument has acceptance (Delphin et Guin, p. 45; Z. D. P. V., 1927, pl. 1). In the Maghrib the flutes in the orchestras still retain the name of ḏaṣṭa (vulg. ḏaṣṭa), and they are generally about 40 cm. long, whilst the ḏawī.mk or ṣhabīb ( ṣhabīb) is smaller. In the interior, longer flutes like the gībī and ṣuṭṣulā may be found. Delphin and Guin give an account of these.

The recorder, or flute à bec, also found favour in the East. This is the Arabic nāy ṭabak (mouth nāy), the Persian ṭūt, the Turkish ḏūdūk, and the Hindūstānī alchargā. As early as the Ikhwān al-Safira and the Mafāth al-ʿUlm (xvith cent.) we read of the ṣafīrā, which was doubtless a flute à bec (see my Studies, p. 83). Vivaldo (i. 951) says that it was an instrument of this type in his day in Egypt. The ḏūdūk or ḏudūk is mentioned by Ewyālī Čelebi in nine different species (i. 642), and is also mentioned by Ḥāḍḍī Khālīfa (i. 400). The ṣhāhīn would appear to have been a small three-holed recorder such as was common with pipe and tabor players in Mediaeval Western Europe. It was played with the fingers of one hand, the other hand being used for beating the tabl or drum, hence the phrase in al-Ghazzālī: “the ṣhāhīn of the drum (rabīka)!”

Panpipes are also common to the folk. Both Pythagoras and Moses are credited by Ewyālī Čelebi (i. 624, 636) with the “invention” of the mūṣkār or panpipes. Although the word stands for “composer of melodies” in the Mafāth al-ʿUlm (see also Meninski), it referred to a musical instrument in the xvith century (N. E. xiv. 312). A contemporary writer, Ibn Ghaibī, says that “the mūṣkār is one of the wind instruments with free pipes. Its notes are determined by size [of pipes]. The longest have the low notes, and the shortest the high notes”. We find the instrument called mūṣkāl (Farhang-i Šahīrī) whilst Ḥāḍḍī Khālīfa (i. 400) has mūṣkāl, and Toderī (i. 237) mescal, which probably gave birth to the Roumanian muscal. The term mūṣkāl survived up to modern times (Vivaldo, i. 963), but the more general word used today (Mush̲aṭ̲a, p. 29) is ḏunā. (Pedro de Alcalā [1503] mentions a harp by this name, but perhaps he confused the name with ḏunāk). Russell (The Natural History of Aleppo, i. 156) writing in Syria in the xvith century says that panpipes were to be found with from three to twenty-three pipes. Kaeunder, p. 743, delineates a xvith century Persian instrument.

The names of instruments in the masāmīr group in Arabic are legion. Many of those not mentioned in this article are regional and are of folk origin, their source being often discernable, such as in the zamāṣa and zamākhar, to name only two. More interesting however, are the older words like ḥuṭbīk, ṭabak, and zamākhar. The first two occur in al-Faruḥadābī (d. 1414), and mūṣkāl, which equates with mizmar, reminds us of the much debated passage in Esekhiel, xxvii. 13. Zamāḥīk occurs in al-Azhari (d. 981) and even earlier (cf. Lane). The Greek sas̲p̲h̲a and the Latin sambūca were stringed instruments, and Isidore of Seville’s samb̲u̲ca as a “wood-wind” instrument has long been
suspect, but since ṣambak is to be found in Arabic equating with samnara and mismar there would appear to be good reason for accepting Isidoire of Seville.

**Bibliography:** Farmer, *A history of Arabian Music to the sixteenth century*; d'o, *Studios in Oriental musical instruments*; d'o, *The Organ of the Ancients from Easter-Saint.*
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**MÖBEDH, a Persian word which passed into**

Arabic in the form مُبِد١ or مُبِد٢; we also find in Arabic the Persian plural, möbeṭhān, but usually combined with möbedh in the expression möbeṭhān möbedh, which means “chief of the möbedh”, “grand möbedh”. It is also found alone (möbeṭhān) standing for möbeṭhān möbedh. The Arabic plural is mājūfat. Möbedh is derived from the Levantine majūf, which means “chief of the majūf” and therefore indicates a priestly office: according to al-Mas'ūdī, Kītāb al-Tanah wa l-Iṣrafi, *F. G. A.*, vii. 103, the word would mean ḥāṣ al-din and be derived from mu = “religion” and ḍāh = “protector”, and according to al-Ya'qūbī (Ṭarīq, i. 207) ʿalīm al-ʿalamā. In Armenian texts the word is rendered by magapat, in the Greek acts of martyrs by μαύστρα μαύστρας μαύστραν; in Syriac and especially in the acts of the Persian martyrs not only by مَجَأَبَت but also by مَجَأَبَت; in one passage (Hofmann, *Auszüge*, p. 88, cf. below), the word مَجَأَبَت is used immediately before مُبِد٢. The Syriac has also rīz ṭēğul or ṭēğūlahygh corresponding to the Greek ἁγιος ἁγίους του μαγίων. We have no satisfactory information regarding the functions of the möbedh; we know more about those of the chief of the möbedh or möbeṭhān möbedh. The information given below relates to the Sasanian period, a period in which the clergy were reorganised and which is reflected in the Arabic and Persian Muslim sources.

In the later Avesta we find references to the sacerdotal organisation but the names do not agree with those of the Sasanian period; for example, the principal office, that given in the Sasanian period to the möbeṭhān möbedh, is called Zara-thustretem, and had judicial functions like the chief of the möbedh. The term magapat is only found in the Pehlevi commentaries on the Avesta. The sources from which we can extract information about the möbedh, and the möbeṭhān möbedh or chief of the möbedh, are of course Pehlevi or go back to Pehlevi texts. Among the former which have come down to us is the Bundahish which among other things contains a list of möbeṭhān möbedh; the Ardā Wiraf Namak; the Karnamak-i Ashashtir-i Pāpakān (transl. by Noldeke in the *Benfey-Festschrift* = Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, iv. 1878, and by Pagliaro in L'Indo-Italico nel Medio Evo persiano, Florence 1927; a part of the text 1—3 is reprinted in the *Hilfsbuch für das Pehlevi by Nyberg*; the Māthān-i hasār Dāte-
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stan, a legal work studied by Bartholomae in Zion sasanischen Recht. Sitzungsber., d. Heidel. Akad. d Wissenschaft. 1922, is valuable for our knowledge of the judicial function of the möbedis and moldedis möbedis, a few short moral treatises preserving traces of law (cf. Pagliaro in R.S.O., x, 1925, p. 468—577) etc. The numerous references to the möbedis and the möbedis möbedis which we find in Persian and Arabic sources come from lost Pelevi sources or Arabic and Persian versions of them. Thus the Book of Kings especially in the latter part contains some information about the möbedis but nothing very full or precise about their functions; the matter of the Sāhānān is taken, as we know, from a Persian prose version of the Kavadātārāmāgh. The version which we have of the letter of Tansar (publ. and transl. by Darmesteter in Z.A., 1904, i.) gives very interesting information about the Sāsānian hierarchy and about the möbedis; it comes from a Pelevi document which, according to Christensen, goes back not to the time of Ardashir but rather to that of Khosrow the Great (cf. Empire des Sassanides, 111—112, and more recently Abdussam et Tansar, in Acta Orientalia, x, 43 sqq.).

The numerous writers in Arabic and Persian whose works give us no information on the möbedis derive their matter, as regards Persia, from information supplied directly by contemporary möbedis or grand möbedis, from Pelevi works translated into Arabic (especially the translations of Ibn al Mukaffa) which no longer exist, such as the Kavdānāmāgh at the Abūl-Fazl, or the Kavdānārāmāgh (cf. below). Of great importance is the Kīdār al-Tādīs or Akbār al-Mudāliq by al-Dhāīqī (cf. F. Gabrieli, in K.S.O., x, 1928, p. 232—308) and others written by al-Dhāīqī himself and the Kīdār al-Mashā'in wa'l-Addād which is attributed to him; very important also are the works of the historians, chroniclers, geographers and polygraphers or men of letters like al-Ya'qubi, Ibn Khaldun, al-Dinawari, al-Tabari, al-Mas'udi, Ḥamza al-Iṣṭahārī, al-Tha'labi, al-Nuwairi, al-Shahrestānī, etc.

Of course all these sources bear different relations to the Pelevi originals or their mother and they differ greatly in value, apart from the fact that they frequently combine legendary matter with accurate statements, e.g., some concerning certain of the functions of the möbedis.

Information of value can also be extracted from Syriac, Greek (especially Acts of Martyrs) and Armenian (historians etc.) sources.

Even by combining all these sources it is not possible to give a precise account of the offices of the möbedis in the Sasanian ecclesiastical hierarchy as laid down in the organisation of the kingdom attributed to Ardashir (cf. Kīdār al-Tādīs, p. 23—30) nor to follow its developments (cf. the letter from Tansar, al-Mas'udi, Tābīkh, p. 103—104 and Maqārid, ii, 156; al-Ya'qubi, Historian, i. 202; al-Shahrestānī, ed. Curzon, p. 192), transl. Haarbrucker, i. 292). Nothing definite can be deduced from the Parsi hierarchy of the present day as the ecclesiastical organisation has profoundly changed. But we may assume that high priests regularly called möbedis were given the task of supervising in the different divisions of the empire (one might say dioce-e) the very varied work of the hereditary clergy, the magi, who had so great an influence over the lives of the Persians; that is to say not only the very elaborate ceremonies of worship, the sacrifices, the care of the pyres, but also the cure of souls and the education of the people. These möbedis and their chief (cf. below) were like all priests the repositories of learning, profane as well as sacred (cf. Tābīkh, p. 97), where there is an allusion to the unbounded knowledge of the möbedis and hārēbēd, and the Arab writers must also have obtained information from möbedis (cf. Inostranetz, Études sasanides, p. 10). The möbedis had also judicial functions (cf. below); in the Acts of the martyrs they appear vested with executive power; but since courts of inquiry were composed of lay officers and priests, it is probable that this power was exercised by the whole college or by delegation. It is also certain that the title of möbed is not applied exclusively to these heads of administrative divisions or dioceses (of whom it is nevertheless characteristic) because at the court of the king, according to the sources, especially the Sāhānān, there were many high priests called möbedis or hārēbēd who formed a kind of council around the grand möbed (cf. below) or who had other special offices. Gradually the name möbed must have come to mean, as at the present day, a priest fully qualified to do everything in connection with worship. The other terms for Persian priests seem to refer rather, either to their dignity (e.g., distir) or to functions occasionally performed by them (cf. Zoroastrianism). Kāt and maguspat are sometimes put on the same level. The relation of the hārēbēd to the other degrees of the hierarchy like the kīdārū (another office of the same order having control over a body of priests, is not clear. Al-Mas'udi says in the Tābīkh, p. 103, that hārēbēd were lower in rank than möbedis.

At the head of the hierarchy of priests were no doubt the kīdārū hārēbēd or chief of the hārēbēd and the möbedis möbed or chief of the möbedis. Tansar, the writer of the famous letter, is called by the Dinbāri; kīdārū hārēbēd, according to Darmesteter “chief of the religion”, while al-Mas'udi (Tābīkh, p. 99) calls him better the möbed of Ardashir. Indeed it is quite certain from our sources that the supreme head of the ecclesiastical organisation of the Sasanian möbedis (möbedis möbedis) who was also the first dignitary of the court; all the power of the Zoroastrian clergy which constituted a state within the state was concentrated in this pontiff. Al-Mas'udi in the Tābīkh, p. 103, says of his rank that it was almost equal to that of a prophet.

In accounts of the ceremonial of the Sasanids, he is always given first place and he frequently appears surrounded by a council of high priests, hārēbēd or möbedis. Besides all the functions which he exercised as head of the clergy, i.e., the supervision of the whole religious life of the country, the settlement of theological questions, of problems of ecclesiastical policy, the appointment and dismissal of ecclesiastical officeholders, he had others which we must outline. Christensen thinks he can deduce from several sources (letter of Tansar, al-Mas'udi, Tābīkh, p. 103—104; Ya'qubi, Historiae, i. 201—202), that four or five high officials formed with the king a kind of ministry, the composition and number of members of which perhaps changed from time to time but which always included the möbedis möbed (cf. e.g., the Sāhānān, ed. Mohl, vii, 215 where the möbed is called the king's vizier). But he was also supreme judge as head of the möbedes of the administrative divisions, as the latter were the
judges of higher degree in their respective areas. It is evident from the studies of Bartholomeae on the Formal texts (and especially on the Aṣaṣṣar Dātānā; cf. Zum Sarandānischen Recht; p. 34, etc.) that in the different districts there were judges of first instance and of two degrees (as lower, mas higher), above whom was the mābedh of the district. The supreme judge was ultimately the mābedhān mābedh whose final sentence could not be disputed. For the judicial functions of the mābedh it is interesting to consult the acts of the Persian martyr in Syria and Greek (cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Martyrer, Leipzig 1880; the texts of Beşan, etc., in Patrologia Oriental., etc.). The Arab writers also give us a pretty clear idea, especially as regards the mābedhān mābedh, for example in Tabari, i. 352; Noldeke, Gesch. d. Perser u. Araber, p. 230, the mābedhān mābedh in advising the king in the matter of the son of Dāh Yazan, lays particular stress on the young man's right to have his prayer granted; al-Masudi, Maruqī, i. 156 and Tanbih, p. 103, calls him ḍāfi' l-fūgārī; in the Maruqī also (ii. 211) we are told in connection with the abuses of Hurmuz son of Khurasan that, having abolished the jurisdiction of the mābedh, the good old tradition and the ancient laws fell into desuetude. In al-Tha'alībi, Hist. Pers., p. 506-7, we find two answers which are interesting in this connection; they were given by the mābedhān mābedh to the king, who had consulted him with regard to the sentence of death to be pronounced against his chief wife and her cook; in the Kitāb al-Tādīb, p. 78, it is related that king Kavād's full of admiration for a subtle answer given by the mābedh exclaimed: 'It is with justice that kings have given you the first place and that they have entrusted you with the control of jurisdiction.'

Some Arabic sources also allude to the court of justice which was held on the occasion of the great festivals of the Anvarī and the Mērzān (e.g. Kitāb al-Tādīb, p. 159-63; al-Maḥṣūn wa l-Aṣṣar, p. 359-65; al-Hirunī, al-Ādhar al-Ālāba, ed. Sachau, p. 215-219, 222-233; Sināt-e-nāmā, ed. Schefter, p. 38-40, etc.). According to these stories, the people on those days had the right to bring any complaint against the king before a commission of which the grand mābedh was the most important member; the first complaint was judged by the grand mābedh who thus had the right to condemn the king, the latter having pronounced a formula of submission, kneeling before him. The complaints that followed were judged by the king. According to al-Nuwaibī, the mābedh also offered to the king on these ceremonial occasions a basket of fruits over which he had uttered a prayer. Tarsar's letter (J. A., 1904, p. 544-545) informs us that in the procedure laid down by Ardashir for designating the heir to the throne the grand mābedh played the most important part, that is to say he proclaimed the new heir chosen by divine inspiration should it happen that the other dignitaries summoned to deliberate with him were not in agreement. The position of the grand mābedh as intimate councillor and mentor of the king who placed complete confidence in him (he is often called 'counsellor of the king') is very clear in the Shāhānāme as well as in the Arabic and Persian sources (cf. al-Tha'alībi, p. 504-505; al-Maṣūdi, Maruqī, ii. 171 where Bahran son of Bahran, son of Hurmuz, addresses the grand mābedh: 'Thou, support of religion, counsellor of the king and the man who directs his attention to affairs of state neglected by him').

Among the details which are preserved in the sources about the grand mābedh, we are told that he was one of the three who shared the king's table in time of war when the royal meals were very frugal; and that when a victory was won, he along with other dignitaries pronounced a discourse (Kitāb al-Tādīb, p. 173-174). A very marked feature in the sources is the wisdom of the grand mābedh and indeed of all the mābedhs (cf. below). In the Shāhānāme (we pick out only a few of the more interesting episodes) the Byzantine ambassador who was, the grand mābedh tells Khurasan, of the school of Plato, put seven questions to the mābedh which he answers (Mobh, vi. 3 sqq.) and thus excites the admiration of the king. In this story, as usual, the grand mābedh appears surrounded by other priests called mābedhs or mawrads as the case may be, and he is also given the title dāstān. Cf. also the questions put by the grand mābedh to Khurasan Anūharwān (Mobh, vi. 394 sqq.) and the assembly of the mābedhs under the presidency of the grand mābedh to put questions to Hurmuz son of Anūharwān (ibid., p. 424-430). Another passage (Mobh, vi. 442 sqq.) describes the heroic piety of the grand mābedh who consoles a high official, a victim of King Hurmuz, and is poisoned by the latter. The grand mābedh is also represented as interpreting the language of birds (cf. also al-Maṣūdi, Maruqī, ii. 169-170: the dialogue of the owls denouncing the cruelty of King Bahram son of Bahram son of Hurmuz [276-293 A. D.]), and in al-Ṭabarī (i. 905; Noldeke, p. 250) he explains the invasion of jackals in the reign of Khurasan as a punishment for the impiety of the land.

The story is very well known among the Arabs of the dream of the grand mābedh in the night of the birth of the Prophet and his interpretation of other marvellous happenings of the same night (al-Ṭabarī, i. 982 sqq.; Noldeke, p. 253: Amīr al-Dīn Īlam, i. 150); Ḥamza al-Īṣām (ed. Gottwaldt, p. 27) quotes a list of Saʿādīan kings drawn up by the mābedh Bahram son of Mardangāh (Noldeke, p. 401). In religious discussions the steps to be taken against heretics, in the persecutions and inquisitions against the Christians, the mābedhs and the grand mābedh are always most prominent (Hoffmann, Auszüge aus Beşan, Patrologia Oriental., etc.). Cf. also the articles MĀBEDH in ASIA, A.A. A list of grand mābedhs in the Saʿādīan period and of mābedhs contemporary with the last editors of the book is found in the Pundakānān, ch. 33 (Christensen, Empire des Sassanides, p. 35). The first grand mābedh appointed by Ardashir was, according to Tabari (Noldeke, p. 9), a man named Pahr (cf. The mābedhān mābedh Aturpašt Zartushtān lived, according to the Pelevi sources, 150 years and was grand mābedh for 90. Elisee (Langlois, ii. 230) mentions a grand mābedh, who had the honorific title of Ḥamdušān ("the who knows all religion") on account of his vast theological learning; this title seems to have been often given to the
A number of names of grand mōlēthas are given in various sources, among them the Acts of the Martyrs in Syria, Greek and Armenian; some are also preserved on the seals published by Herzfeld in his work on the monument of Paikuli. Mazākas was according to some texts mōbēdh or even grand mōbēdh. In Ibn al-Fakhrī, p. 216, we hardly have an inscription in verse of pictures representing, with other dignitaries "their mōbēdh and their hārida" who judges ignorantly and iniquitously.

On the zondāch cf. the article ZOARASIANISM and Goldziher, Muḥammadiānātul Siyāsāt, i. 170 and al-Dārijī, Bayān, ed. Sandallā, Cairo 1927, iii, 7, on al-Sūr ʿalāw. It is known that the Zorastrian clergy played an important part in the Sūr ʿalāwīya movement (Ioannidēs, Ἐπίσκοποι, St. Petersberg 1909, p. 10–15).

After the Muhammadan conquest the importance of the grand mōbēdh and of the mōbēdh diminished as Islam spread; our sources of course continue to mention them and Arab writers give information obtained directly from mōbēdh (al-Tabari, i. 2874, year 31 A.H.), mentions the mōbēdh who advised the governor Māwaḥīdh not to kill king Yazdīrī; al-Māsīḥī, Kitāb al-Tuhhī, p. 104 gives the name of the mōbēdh of all Persia in 345 A.H. etc.

The organisation of the Parsi at the present day is different; mōbēdh means a priest qualified to perform all the offices of worship. This, however, is beyond the scope of this article.


MODON, a town on the south-west point of Messenia, about 20 miles N.W. of Cape Arkaita, opposite the island of Sapientia at the foot of Mount Teneus. Modon is frequently mentioned in ancient times under the names Mēśōn and Mēšōnv; from the latter comes the Italian name of the town, Modon, under which it has been known since the middle ages in Europe. In the middle ages it was of much greater importance than in antiquity. The good harbour of the town, sheltered by cliffs of varying heights, has long been a haven of refuge and of supply for ships going from the west to the Levant. Hence pilgrims frequently mention the town and their accounts of their travels even contain maps.

The Arab Idrisi, in his geographical work finished in 548 (1153) for Roger II of Sicily, enumerates many seaports and towns on the mainland of Greece. Among these is Modon of which he records that it is a fortified town and has a citadel which commands the sea (Geographie d'Éditis, ed. A. Joubert, Paris 1846, p. 305). By the treaty of 1199 with the Byzantine emperor Alexius III, Venice was allowed to trade freely in Modon. The town had suffered severely at the hands of the Venetians in 1125 and again of the Normans in 1146 but was recovering again slowly. After the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders (1204) and the division of the lands which had previously formed the Byzantine empire, Modon fell to the Venetians, under whose rule it remained for nearly three centuries. It is this period that marks the golden age of the town, which, carrying on her trade with foreign mercantile, developed a new prosperity and became an important and secure centre for trading with Egypt and Syria, while previously it had often been a nest of pirates. In the xvth century the population of Modon was a mixed one of Greeks, Jews, Albanians, Turks, Gipsies and Western Europeans. The Turks of the neighbourhood reared swine which they sold to the townspeople. According to some sources, at the end of the xvth century five thousand swine were exported annually from Modon to Venice. About the same time a settlement of gipsies in Modon is mentioned, who came from Gyppe, a district about forty miles from Modon, from which they said they had fled— for the sake of the Christian faith — and were seeking refuge in all lands with a letter of recommendation from the Pope (cf. Die Pilgerfahrten des Ritters Adnold von Hanf, ed. E. v. Groote, Cologne 1860, p. xxviii, 67 sq.; Z.D.P.V., xvii, 1894, p. 144). The fact is, however, that the gipsies of Modon after 1500 went over en masse to Islam, about the end of the xvth century were again mainly Christians, outwardly at least, after 1715 again became Muslims and finally after 1821 became Christians again.

During the second half of the xvi century the population of Modon increased considerably for many Christians and Jews of the Peloponnesus, seeking to escape the Turkish yoke, took refuge here. While the town itself was immune, the country round, which was flat, suffered a great deal from the Turks. Thus for example about 1480, the Turks raided this plain and destroyed by fire the olive-trees there. In the last decades of the xvi century, the Venetian republic had much anxiety about Modon and her other possessions in the East, which the Turks had long coveted. In 1499 the Admiral Antonio Grisani was ordered by his government to move to the defence of Modon against the Turks. In July of this year, the Turkish fleet came to the vicinity of Modon and soon afterwards several naval encounters with the Venetian fleet took place In a naval battle fought on Aug. 8, 1499, outside Modon, the heroic Venetian Andrea Loredano, governor of Corfu, was taken by the Turks and put to death. Another Venetian admiral, Melchior Trevisano, was now entrusted by the Venetian republic with the defence of Modon and her other possessions in the East. At the same time the republic endeavoured to make peace with Turkey, but the negotiations broke down in face of the impossible conditions laid down by Bayazid II. Among other things he insisted on the surrender of Modon. In the meanwhile on March 23, 1500, the Turks had occupied Merona, a little town near Modon. Marcus Gabrieli, the commander of Modon, had previously, on February 18, 1500, reported to the Venetian government the great straits of the town. According to his report, the garrison was not sufficient to defend the town against the Turks, and for a successful defence it would require four thousand trained men, in addition to artillery, arms, munitions and gunpowder, which the town lacked. In spite of her difficult financial
situation, Venice managed to provide the town with money, troops and artillery. But the Turkish fleet again appeared before Modon while Bâyazid II advanced on the town by land at the head of a well-equipped army. An attempt by the Venetian fleet under Admiral Hieronymus Cancel to raise the blockade on July 24, 1500 failed with heavy loss. The Turkish fleet, according to the Venetian admiral, had very good artillery. In the meanwhile famine had broken out in the garrison so that they could hold out no longer. Four Venetian galleys were able to steal through the Turkish fleet into the harbour and bring the garrison food, munitions, and men, but this could not avert the fate of the town. After a siege of twenty-eight days during which the town was bombarded by heavy artillery, the Turks stormed it. On Sunday, August 9, 1500, the Venetian garrison had to yield to this onslaught.

The lot of the surviving garrison and other inhabitants of the town was a hard one. They were either massacred in most inhuman fashion or sent into slavery. Very few of them succeeded in escaping. But the number of people captured did not come up to the expectation of the Turks, because the Venetian authorities had earlier sent thousands of old men, women and children from Modon to Cete and Zante. Among those who fell at the capture of the town was the Roman Catholic bishop of Modon, Andreas Falcus, a number of prominent Venetians and high officials of other origin. When the news of the capture of Modon by the Turks reached Venice, it was plunged into deep mourning. This is reflected in a letter which the Doge Augustino Barbarigo sent on September 7 to the Pope and several European rulers with reference to the cataclysm. The sole consolation of the Venetians was the deceitful hope that their fleet might succeed in retaking Modon. The Venetian Senate at once saw to the settlement of a number of the refugees from Modon in Cephalonia. Sultan Bâyazid II regarded the conquest of Modon, at the fortifications of which he was rightly angered, as a gift from God. When he entered the town as a victorious conqueror, it had already been partly consumed by fire which had been begun by the defenders themselves. The fugitives from Modon, who had taken refuge in Zante, watched the flames that were destroying their homes burn for several days. Sultan Bâyazid II promoted the first janissary to leap over the walls of Modon to the rank of Saray-bey. He had two towers built of the skulls of the fallen and massacred Christians and turned the cathedral of the town, the venerable church of St. John, into a mosque. On August 14, 1500, he went to the new mosque to return his thanks in prayer. He then saw to the resettlement of Modon, the walls of which were rebuilt. By imperial decrees, each Peloponnesian village had to send five families to become permanent settlers in Modon, the revenues of which were allotted to Mocca. After a brief stay, Sultan Bâyazid left his new conquest. He took with him as a prisoner the last Venetian defender of the town, Marcus Gabriel, whose life he had spared with the intention of using him for his own purposes later. The historian Safati, a native of Sinopi, wrote some time before 1521 an account of the taking of Lepanto (Naupactus) and Modon (Pelekaniou, Anastabashi we-Modon). The brief description of the capture of Modon written by Muslih Seiyid Mehemd also gives details of the sultan’s treatment of the town (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., Leipzig 1909, p. 49).

In 1531 the Knights of St. John endeavoured to take Modon from the Turks and to establish themselves there. To do this they equipped a small fleet under the command of the Abbot Fra Bernardo Solbiati, a nephew of Pope Clement VII. The Greeks employed in the harbour of Modon and Johannes Skandalis, a Greek from Zante, whose father was a customs officer in Modon, were to assist the enterprise. The fleet, led by Solbiati with two merchant ships, which also concealed soldiers, sailed for Sapenza. The war-ships were hidden in the vicinity of this island, while the two merchant ships under the guidance of Johannes Skandalis, made for the harbour of Modon. Permission to land was given without trouble to the crews of the two ships, who gave themselves out to be some merchants and some janissaries, and they were allowed to spend the night in the tower at the harbour. Johannes Skandalis and his little body of followers then succeeded in overpowering the Turkish garrison at the tower and taking nearly the whole town. The rest of the Turkish garrison shut themselves in the palace which had once housed the Venetian governors of the town, and offered a stubborn resistance. In order to overcome the Turkish garrison on the war-ships hidden at Sapenza were necessary. These now came up, although very late, and bombarded the town with their guns. Scarcely had they begun when a strong Turkish fleet appeared. The Knights and John Skandalis therefore abandoned Modon but not without carrying off some sixteen hundred prisoners.

The years 1534-1534, during which a Spanish force in the service of Charles V occupied the adjoining Coroni, were a critical period for the Turks in Modon. But after this, it was left in peace for a considerable period. The Tratels of Evliya Celebi who visited the Morea in 1667 to 1668 contain valuable notes on Modon and its vicinity, while Hâdıji Khalifa (d. 1658) contains nothing essential.

During the war which broke out in 1684 between Turks and Venetians in which Germans, Poles and Russians also shared as allies, Modon with the whole of the Morea was restored to the Venetians. General Francesco Morosini in 1686 broke the resistance of the Turkish garrison with the help of Greek and German troops and secured it for the Adriatic republic. The chief mosque of the city, i.e. the old cathedral, was once more dedicated to Christian worship. Only in 1699 after the peace of Carlowitz, did the Turks recognise the Venetian claim to Modon. Venice now did her utmost to restore the city which, with its commerce, had much declined during the Turkish occupation. Of the seven administrative divisions (camera) into which the Venetians had divided the Morea, the third was that of Modon. This district was again divided into four areas (Fanari, Arcades, Navarinou and Modon). From a Venetian record of September 29, 1690, giving the results of a census by the Venetian officials, we see that the district of Modon had been populated to an incredible degree. The 218 villages detailed in this list were inhabited only by 11,202 souls. Modon itself, including the citadel, had only 236 inhabitants of whom some must have been Muhammadans. A large number of villages which at the turn of the xvith—xviiiht centuries belonged to the district of Modon, have
Turkish names, some of which survive to this day. These villages were originally fiefs granted to Turks whose names in time passed to the village (cf. S. P. Lambros, in Delton, publication of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, vol. ii., 1885, p. 686—710. pl. vii.; thereon Ιστορία Μιλέτουμα, Athens 1894, p. 114 sqq.; Pier Antonio Pacifico, Breve descrizione corregrifica del Peloponese o η Μού, Venice 1704, p. 125 sqq.).

After the conquest by Morosini whose services to Modon are commemorated in inscriptions still in existence, the town remained for some nineteen years under Venetian rule. In 1715 the grand vizier Ali Kamurri with the help of a number of Greeks took not only Modon but almost the whole of the Morea from the Venetians in a very short time. The Venetian garrisons of Navarino and Coroni as well as the inhabitants abandoned them when the Turkish army approached in the summer of 1715, in order to take refuge in Modon, which was much more strongly fortified. Soon afterwards the Turkish fleet and army began the siege of the town. After a brief resistance Modon surrendered voluntarily. After the capture of the town the grand vizier ordered a general slaughter of the Christians. Many in the district thereupon adopted Islam in order to save life and property in this way. The Turks who had formerly owned property in Modon or the neighbourhood were allowed by imperial edict to resume possession of it. The peace of Pessarowitz (1718) finally ceded Modon to Turkey. The town recovered from the catastrophe of 1715. From 1725 onwards a busy trade developed between Modon and the lands of North Africa, especially Algeria and Tunis; this trade had existed previously but not to the same extent. Modon played a certain part during the war between Turkey and Russia in 1768—1774. The Russian vice-general Georg Vladimir Dolgoruki in 1769 with 500 Russians, 150 Montenegrins and 100 Greeks (mainly Macedonia) besieged Modon. The Turkish garrison of Modon consisted of 800 janissaries and a large number of Turks of the town and vicinity able to bear arms. The walls of the citadel were in good condition, and the supply of food and munitions ample. The siege lasted a long time; the fighting was conducted mainly by the artillery on both sides. The Russians had also two warships co-operating on the sea. At the end of May 1769, Turks and Albanians from the interior of the Morea came to the help of the besieged who undertook a valiant sortie, when they learned of the approach of help. In the battle that now developed the Russians suffered heavily. They were forced to abandon most of their artillery and to escape to Navarino, from which they sailed with the rest of the Russian army and a few Greek notables. A few years later, the Turks in Modon were still displaying the guns which they had taken from the Russians in 1769. According to reliable sources, the Turkish population of Modon about 1820 was four to five hundred fighting men. About the same time Ali Agha was prominent among the Turks of the town for his wealth and in other respects also. The vicinity of Modon was almost exclusively inhabited by Greeks who cultivated the land, which mainly belonged to the Turks, and were despised by them as contemptible menials. During the Greek War of Independence of 1821—1827, all the attempts of the Greeks to take the town failed. At the end of March 1821, a Peloponnesian force led by the orthodox patriarch of Methone, named Gregory, and other notables, besieged Modon and the adjoining towns of Koroni and Neokastron. The besiegers were joined in the spring by Greeks from the Ionian islands and later by Philhellenes from Europe. On May 18, 1821, Greek ships, under the captains of the Spezios, Nikolaou Mousias and Anastasios Koladrutos blockaded Modon. But neither the Turkish garrison nor the armed Turkish civilians in the town were the least dismayed. On the contrary, they undertook raids in all directions and did their best to impede the progress of Greek emancipation. Many fierce encounters took place between the Turks of Modon and their besiegers. In July 1821, Turkish ships re-provisioned Modon but they were not successful in their attempt to re-provision Neokastron, the garrison of which was in dire straits from want of food and even water. On August 8, 1821, the Turks of Modon decided to attempt the relief of their compatriots in Neokastron, who had in the meanwhile been forced to capitulate to their Greek besiegers. On the road between Modon and Neokastron a battle was fought on August 8, 1821, in which the valiant chief Constantine Pierrakos Mavromichalis, a member of a notable Mainote family, fell. On the same day, the Greeks took Neokastron; but they gradually abandoned the siege of Modon. The town was able to continue to hold out, only, however, with the frequent help of the Turkish fleet.

When Ibrahim Pasha, the adopted son of Mehemed Ali, undertook to suppress the Greek rising and to pacify the Morea, Modon and its neighbourhood formed his main base. There he landed troops on February 24, 1825, and dug entrenchments. Modon became an important base for Ibrahim Pasha's operations. On October 8, 1825 the town was taken from him by the French General Maison. Not before 1833 the French left Modon and has since then belonged to the Greeks.

MODON — MOGADOR

1602, p. 22 sqq., 43; G. Cogo, La guerra di Terra conti i Turci (1499—1501), in Nuovo archivio Veneto, vol. xviii. (1888), p. 25 sqq.; Spadanino in C. N. Sathas, loc. cit., vol. ix., p. 193—194; G. Bosio, Della istoria della Sacra Religione et illustrissima Militia di S. Giovanni Giesuniani, Rome 1594, p. 75—76, 103—117; D'Herdt, l'Isolato de Agadir et de Boran, transl. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 112, 120 sqq.; Ceballos, Celelis, Síria-Çasartesi, viii., Stambul 1828, p. 334 sqq.; K. N. Sathas, Τουρκοκατοικούμενη Ελλάδα, Athens 1869, passim; P. M. Kontogiani, Η Ελλαδική κατά τον πρώτο χρόνο της Άσυραίας στην Μεσοποταμική ηλικία (1768—1774). Athens 1903, p. 170, 174 sqq., 185 sqq.; A. Komnenos, Hipsilantis, Τα μετά της Άσυρας, Constantinople 1870, p. 31, 299 sqq.; Pouqueville, Voyage de la Grèce, vi., Paris 1826, p. 61 sqq.; W. M. Leake, Travels in the Morea, i., London 1830, p. 208, 428 sqq.; J. Philemon, Διαφορικὰ Ιστορικά της Ελληνικής δυτικής περιοχῆς, Athens 1859—1861, passim; K. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Gschichte Griechenlands von der Erkentung Konstantinopels durch die Türken... bis auf unsere T assumption, part i and ii., Leipzig 1870—1877, passim; A. Buchon, La Grèce continentale et le Maghreb, Paris 1843, p. 97 (Nikos A. Beka [bks] MOGADOR, a town in Morocco on the Atlantic coast. The Bay of Mogador, protected against the north winds by the rocky promontory on which the town is built, is a fertile oasis, not large and inaccessible for ships of large tonnage, has however the merit of being accessible at all seasons, an advantage which secures it a favourite place among the anchorages of the Atlantic coast of Morocco which is, generally speaking, inhospitable. This favoured situation was taken advantage of at a very early period. In spite of the lack of precision in the sources, it is probable that we should seek at Mogador the site of one of the five Phoenician colonies founded by Hanno (260 B.C.). The island seems to have been known as the island of Hera or of Juno. Pliny records that at the end of the first century A.C. the king Juba II founded purple dye-works on the Purpuraria Insulæ, islands in the Ocean. "opposite the Antioche", a Getulic people who lived in the north of the High Atlas. Getulic purple, which was celebrated at Rome, was supplied by the molluscs abundant on this coast. It is only at Mogador that we find an island and islands which can be identified as the Purpuraria Insulæ, but an archaeological discovery has yet been made to confirm the deductions made from the ancient geographers.

In the xii century of the Christian era, according to al-Maskić (who finished his book in 1068) Anogdil, a very safe anchorage, was the port for all the province of Safi. We see in the name of that of a local saint, Sidi Mogadil, still venerated in this region, whose tomb is on the lawn near the mouth of the Wadi 'I-Kob. It is however possible that the saint of whom we know nothing, gets his name from an old Berber place-name. Mogador is only a Spanish or Portuguese transcription of Mogadil, though the names Mogodil, Mogador, which we sometimes find in the texts. The harbour and the island bear the name of Mogador or Mogodil on a series of ports of the xivth and xvth century (publ. by Ch. de la Roncière, La Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen-Age, 1925) but there was not a town here, when in Sept. 1506, the king of Portugal Dom Manuel I commanded a gentleman of his court, Diogo d'Agambua, to build a fortress here which was called Castello Real of Mogador. Built with great difficulty in face of the hostility of the natives, the Portuguese stronghold did not long resist them. While at Safi and Santa Cruz of Cape Guer, (Agadir), the state of anarchy in which the tribes lived favoured the rapid progress of the Portuguese, it seems that at Mogador they came up against strong resistance probably organized by the old Berber marabout body of the Karkiyà. The garrison had to remain blockaded in Castello Real, revictualled with difficulty from Portugal and Madeira, until in October or November 1510, the tribes were strong enough to seize the fortress in circumstances which we do not know.

A sketch of the xviith century and plans of the xvith leave no doubt as to the site of Castello Real. It was situated, not at the mouth of the Wadi 'I-Kob, where it is now shown an alleged Portuguese fort which however dates from the end of the xvth century, but on the shore of the northern passage opposite the island, on the rocky point which supports the mole west of the present harbour. Sometimes abandoned, sometimes more or less restored by the rulers of Morocco, who from time to time kept a small garrison there, the old Portuguese castle survived till 1764 or 1765 and was only destroyed when the town was built.

In spite of the lack of success of the Portuguese attempt, this privileged situation continued to attract the envy of European nations. At the beginning of the xviiith century, Spain, fearing that Moorish, Algerian or even European corsairs would establish themselves at Mogador, thought of seizing it herself to protect the route to the Indies. At the same time, English agents were thinking of making Mogador a base against Spain. The Sultan-Mawlay Zaidan in 1611—1612 and his son 'Abd al-Malik in 1628 drew up a scheme to fortify the place to prevent foreigners from establishing themselves there. This was the time when in France Richelieu and Père Joseph were drawing up schemes for a colonial policy. The Chevalier de Razilly in 1626 suggested to the occupation of Mogador and the organisation of a factory and f-herres there. He had it reconnoitred in 1628 but found it impossible to take it by surprise.

In spite of so many projects and attempts against it, the island and the shores remained practically deserted. Ships however frequented the roadstead. It was through Mogador that in the first quarter of the xviiith century, the greater part of the trade between Marrakûsh and Holland took place. Later, in the time of Mawly I-mâîl, the harbour was mainly used as a refuge for corsairs who came there to rest and repair their vessels.

In 1751, Sidi Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâth, then khalîfa of his father for the district of Marrakûsh, desiring to develop commercial relations between his subjects and Europe, ceded the island of Mogador to a Danish company, which however preferred to establish a centre at Agadir and was not successful there. A few years later on becoming sultân and having made Marrakûsh his capital, Sidi Muhammad decided himself to found a town at Mogador and to conduct all the commerce of
the south of his kingdom through it, to the greater benefit of the royal treasury, which would obtain not only the customs from this increased trade but also profit by the rents of the buildings, most of which had been built by the sovereign and were his private property. The harbour also served as a base for the corsairs who, through the menace they offered to the fleets of Europe, forced the Christian nations to conclude treaties with the Sultan by which he received valuable presents and even sums of money. In order to populate the town and start business in it, he demanded that European consuls and merchants should settle there and have houses built at their own expense.

By 1760 he had begun work but it is from the autumn of 1764 that the foundation of the town really dates; it was given the name al-Suwa'ira (Souia), the little fortress, by which it is known to the natives; the name Mogador is only used by Europeans. We also find a Berberised form (Taourirt). The Sultan went in person to choose and distribute the sites for the buildings. He had asked the English to send him an architect. They sent him a French "engineer", a native of Avignon, called Nicolas Cournot, who had made the plans for the fortifications of some places in Roussillon. He was an adventurer who, after working in France as a contractor, had entered the English service during the Seven Years' War. He was living at Gibraltar where he entered Sidi Muhammad's service. The Sultan did not gain much by his services and sent him back to France at the beginning of 1767. None of the present buildings in Mogador can be attributed with certainty to Cournot, for after him a number of European architects and masons worked for the Sultan, notably a Genoese architect who built the battery called the skala situated on the western rampart facing the sea. Mogador owed to its builders the narrow streets, massive gateways and bastions of European type, the like of which cannot be found in other Moroccan towns and which give it quite a specific character. Sidi Muhammad also built outside the town a country palace which still stands half buried in sand opposite the little village of Diyabat.

The dreams of the Sultan were only imperfectly realised. The merchants, attracted to Mogador by the promise of a reduction in the export duties on goods, were soon undeceived when they saw that the sovereign did not keep his promises but constantly imposed new burdens on trade. The prosperity of Mogador remained insignificant under Sidi Muhammad and declined under his successors. The situation of the town, a long way from great cities and main roads, made it frequently used in the 17th century as a political prison and compulsory place of residence for high officials in disgrace. Mogador remained however the starting place for the caravans to Sissi, Mauritania and the Sidi Annas and has retained from this position a certain commercial importance, to which the opening of the port of Agadir to commerce will now do considerable harm.

On August 15, 1844, after the battle of Ily, a French squadron commanded by the Prince de Joinville, who had just bombarded Tangier, came and bombarded Mogador. It was intended to make an impression on Sultan Moulay Abd al-Rahman by striking at a town which belonged to him personally and from which he drew considerable revenue. A three hours' bombardment silenced the batteries; the French army then disembarked on the island, the garrison of which, entrenched in the mosque, made a vigorous defence until the next morning. On August 16, a detachment of 600 men went to spike the guns, throw the gunpowder into the sea and destroy the last defences of Mogador. The town, which had suffered very little from the French shot, but had been evacuated by the inhabitants, was burned and plundered by the tribes of the country round (Shayadna and Hala). Mogador is now the headquarters of a contreband. It had 18,401 inhabitants at the census of 1926. The Jewish element is particularly large, numbering 3,020.

The extremely temperate climate is remarkably beautiful; but it is spoiled by the wind which blows almost incessantly, laden with the sand from the neighbouring dunes.


MOGHUL [See MUGHAL.]

MOHUR, an Indian gold coin. The name is the Persian mahr, which is a loanword from the Sanskrit muvari, seal or die. The earliest occurrence of the word on coins is on the forced currency of Muhammad b. Tughlaq where it has the literal meaning of "sealed" or "stamped." By the 11th century it had come to be used as a popular rather than precise name for gold coins in general.

Very little gold had been issued in India for two centuries before the reign of Akbar. One of his reforms was the issue of an extensive coinage in gold. In addition to many pieces which had only a brief circulation, he revived the old gold tanka [q.v.] of the Sultans of Delhi on a standard of 170 grains (1102 grammes) to which he gave the name mohur. That the name at first could be applied to any gold coin is shown by Djabangir's reference in his Mima'am (transl. A. Rogers, P.T.P., vol. ix., p. 10) to mohurs of 100, 50, 20, 10, 5, 1 rup. After the numismatic experiments of Akbar and Djabangir, only one gold piece was struck, occasionally with subdivisions so that the general name acquired a particular meaning, especially among the English merchants in India. Mohurs continued to be struck to the end of the Mughal Empire and by the states into which it broke up in the 18th and 19th centuries. Akbar and Djabangir issued
square as well as round pieces and the former also struck a few mbhit pieces, so called from their shape. The numerous large denominations recorded by Abu al-Fazl and Dāhā ngir, only 5 half pieces of Akbar and of Dāhā ngir are known to exist. As the silver rupee was the standard unit of India the value of the mohur fluctuated with the price of gold. In the latter half of the xviiith and xixth centuries, the East India Company endeavoured to make gold the standard of India and introduced mohurs (called gold rupees) in Bombay with the legends of the Moghul Emperor. None of their attempts to keep gold and silver in currency at a fixed rate were successful. When in 1855 a uniform currency was introduced for British India a gold mohur or 15 rupee piece with English types was struck in name of William IV but never trained general circulation; this was the last attempt to restore the mohur to circulation. The mohurs occasionally seen of Victoria of 1861, 1862 and other dates are patterns.


(J. Allan)

Mokhā, a small seaport on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea in 13° 15' 50" N. Lat. and 43° 12' 10" East Long. (Greenwich).

The once imposing town lies on a small bay between two promontories with forts on each about one and a half miles apart. The wall which surrounds the town in a semicircle is pierced by four gates. In the north the Bāb al-Hamūdiyya leads to the citadel of the town and to a tongue of land which runs out into the sea; in the east roughly in the centre of the wall is the Bāb al-Shādhili through which the fort of al-Burāḍh is reached and to the east the road to the Taiz is reached, while the road to the Hodedea runs north via Bāb al-Fakh. In the south the Bāb al Sunníd admits to the port of al-Bahār and the road to 'Aden; in the west through the Bāb al-Bahār the harbour is reached; its stone breakwater is now much decayed. This also holds of the wall which connects the various gates. Seen from the sea the town, which covers an area of about half a square mile, still looks very fine; the white mass of houses stands brightly out from the dark blue waters of the Red Sea. But as one approaches, the damage which wars, dilapidation and turbulent times have done to the often sore tried town, is apparent; the houses are for the most part deteclted, the inhabitants, consisting of Arabs, Somaliis, Danakilis, and a few Parsees, have settled in huts outside the town. East of the Bāb al-Shādhili, for example, there is a large group of huts, inhabited by Arabs, south of this another group belonging to Somaliis, while farther south and on the other side of the Wadi al-Kebr is the Jewish quarter (Kāf al-Yahūd).

In the north lies the great cemetery and a whiteashed mosque which contains the tomb of the patron saint of the town. Shaikh 'Ali b 'Umar al-Shādhili; in the east of the town is a second important mosque with a minaret 118 feet high, which forms a landmark visible from a considerable distance, along with several smaller ones. The country round is barren. Drinking water is brought by a conduit from the Mawṣā twenty-four miles to the north. The population has varied considerably in the last hundred years. In 1824 it was 20,000, in 1878–1879: 5–8,000, in 1882 it was put at 1,500 inside the town and in 1901 it had sunk to about 400.

Mokhā is briefly mentioned by al-Hamdānī in connection with al-Mandab as lying in the land of the Banū Madjid; al-Masudi also refers to it briefly in his geographical work. The Portuguese gave the town the name by which it has become known in Europe: Moça. P. Manoel d'Almeida calls it Megyu in his Historia geral de Ethiopia a seta no Esteres Telles (Coimbra 1660).

About 850 years ago Mokhā was an insignificant village, but rapidly grew in importance when Shākh Shādhili discovered the peculiar qualities of the coffee bean and introduced the habit of drinking coffee. In 1513 Alfonso Albuquerquque found Mokhā still a modest place but by 1610 it had become the most important port for trade with Abyssinia, and England was endeavouring to trade with it while the Dutch had a factory here. Coffee was the chief article of export along with other specialties of the Yemen, and received its name from the town. As late as 1763 Nieuhof found the town very prosperous; but the capture of 'Aden by the English put an end to its prosperity. 'Aden and al-Hodeida attracted all the trade of Southern Yemen. Under Turkish rule Mokhā was a kādā in the sandjak of Taiz but its trade was insignificant. In 1916 for example, only about £10,000 worth of coffee was sent to 'Aden. There is a minimum of industrial activity and that only to supply local needs. Indigo dyeing and the manufacture of spirits may be mentioned; the latter is in the hand of Jews. Mokhā is connected by telegraph with San'a' (via Taiz), al-Hodeida (via Zabid), Shaikh Safīd and Petim. Mokhā has acquired a new importance by the creation of the Imāamate of Yemen and is now beginning to share the trade with al-Hodeida.


(A. Grohmann)

MOLĀ. [See Mawā'.]

MOLĀ KHUSRAW. [See Muḥammad b. Fārāb.]
to the Indian Ocean. This peculiarity of its situation suggested to the late W. E. Taylor the derivation of the name Mvita (the "Curtained Headland") from *vita* "point". The more usual derivation from *vita* "war" seems inadmissible on phonetic grounds; another explanation connects it with *vita* "hidden", either from its hidden position, or from the inhabitants, as it is said, having hidden themselves in the bushes during a raid from Pate.

The town of Mombasa is situated at the eastern end of the island and, being the terminus of the Uganda railway and the only port of the colony, is of considerable commercial importance. The population, according to the latest information available, is something over 44,000, of whom 26,906 are classed as "Africans" (i.e. the permanent residents, mostly Swahili, and a floating contingent of labourers belonging to other tribes). The remainder includes 7,523 Arabs, 7,556 Indians, 1,000 Europeans, and a proportion of "other races". The Arabs, Swahili and many of the Indians are Moslems; the two former chiefly Sunni of the Ṣafī'ī sect, though a few of the older men belong to the Ḥanīfī. These are the real inhabitants of the island, and on the plain buildings, as a rule, and devoid of minarets; the *mudawdūn* stands on the flat roof to give the call to prayer. The largest and most imposing of these structures is that belonging to the Khodjas.

The origin of Mombasa is involved in some obscurity. It is certain that Arab trading stations existed on the East African coast at the beginning of the Christian era, and we learn from the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* that the traders frequented married native women. This indicates a fairly early origin for the Swahili race. The first permanent settlements, however, seem to have been post-Islamic: 69 (685) is given as the date for the settlement of Pate; and, as Lamu is said by native tradition to have been founded by colonists sent out by ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (A.D. 684–705), these two towns were no doubt contemporary.

There is no mention of Mombasa in the traditions of Lamu or Pate, at this period, except for a statement made to the late Captain Stigand (Tow of Zanzib., p. 29), that ʿAbd al-Malik sent out Syrians, who "built the cities of Pate, Malindi, Zanzibar, Mombasa, Lamu and Kilwa". Other authorities place the founding of Kilwa much later, viz. 365 (976). The *Chronicle of Kilwa* states that ʿAli b. Ḥasan al-Shirazi, the founder and first ruler of Kilwa, installed one of his sons as ruler of Mombasa, no doubt the first of the "Shirazi Shilhāq", the last of whom was deposed by the Portuguese. It would appear that Mombasa was for some time under the suzerainty of Kilwa; but how far the "King of the Zandi" described by Idrisi and, later, by Ibn Saʿīd as residing at Mombasa, was independent, is not clear. The names of the twelve tribes (called indifferently *kaṭiba* or *fāṭīf*) said by native authorities to make up the Swahili population indicate a composite origin and possibly a late one, as the bulk of the people came from settlements already founded. It is possible that the Wanzurua (who either take their name from the city or gave theirs to it) go back to the alleged foundation under ʿAbd al-Malik; but against this is the assertion, repeatedly made, that the Wachangamwe, Wakiindini and Watangana are the *rafa tatu*, "the three" — i.e. the three aboriginal — "tribes". Some native authorities give these three as "Kilindini", separate from Mombasa.

Mombasa is a village on the mainland, a mile or two from the crossing at Makupa; Kilindini (now important as the principal harbour for steamers from Europe) is at the western end of the island. Tradition says that Kilindini was a city before Mombasa existed, and, in fact, the jungle near the present port contains numerous ruins of uncertain date, which, so far as I know, have not yet been competently examined. Tanganyika is on the island of Mombasa and is now included in the town. The remaining tribes are those of Kilifi (1) (a town to the north of Mombasa; its inhabitants are said to have come from "Shirazi"), either Shirazi in Persia or a town of the same name in Tanganyika Territory, a colony from the original Shirazi, Pate, Paza (or Faza, in the island of Pate), Shaka (a Persian settlement near the mouth of the Tana), Mtwapata (between Mombasa and Takaungu), Jomvu (on the creek known as Port Tudor), the Wagunya (the people on the mainland north of the Lamu archipelago) and the Wakatwa (the Somalis).

Another account omits this last name and substitutes that of the Wamalindi. Krapf (*Dictionary*, p. 240) mentions a tradition that the town was built (on or near Kilifi) in 69 (685) under the direction of Ibn Batūtā. One of his companions, he says, named himself after Bani Marwān, but his reference to the ʿAbd al-Malik foundation must be understood. Ibn Batūtā, who spent one night there, describes it as a "large island, two days' journey by sea from the Sawahi country. It possesses no territory on the mainland. They have fruit-trees on the island, but no cereals, which have to be brought to them from the Sawahi. Their food consists chiefly of bananas and fish. The inhabitants are pious, honourable and upright, and they have well-built wooden mosques". This would imply that the coast opposite Mombasa was not reckoned as part of the Sawahi. Present-day Sawahis restrict the term "Sawahili" to the strip of coast between Malindi and Lamu, which they look upon as the cradle of their race and this might be taken as intended by Ibn Batūtā, but for his reference to cereals being brought from "Sawahil", which would place it in the south, since the dhows laden with millet come up from that quarter with the S. W. monsoon (cf. Taylor, *Aphorisms*, § 128).

The first European to reach Mombasa was Vasco da Gama, who touched there, April 7, 1498, but did not land, owing to the real or suspected treachery of the Arab pilot sent by the Shaikh. He went on to the rival state of Malindi and established friendly relations with its ruler, who hoped to find in him an ally against Mombasa. Mombasa — after the city had been repeatedly destroyed, in whole or in part, by Almeida in 1505, by Nuno da Cunha in 1528 and by Continho in 1589 — was rendered tributary to the Portuguese in or about 1590, after the adventurer Mir ʿAli Bey had induced the Shaikh to tender his allegiance to the Turkish Sultan and had been

1) In these names of places, I omit the *war*, which is the prefix indicating plurality of persons.
driven off by Continho’s fleet. At the same time occurred the invasion of the Zimbabs, an unidentified tribe who had spread desolation on their march north-eastward, “probably from some locality on or near the West coast” (cf. Theil, i. 352). From Mombasa they passed on to Malindi, where the Portuguese garrison, with the help of native allies, effectually resisted them, and, if not exterminated, they ceased to exist as a tribe. The fort, still in existence, was erected between 1593 and 1596, and Mombasa was held by the Portuguese for some sixty years. The last Shirazi Shaikh, Shaho Mshahom b. Hisham, was deposed and the Shaikh of Malindi, Ahmad, installed in his stead with the title of Sultan. Immigration from Portugal was encouraged, but in 1615 the settlers, apart from the garrison, only numbered 50 (cf. Stranies, p. 173). In 1605, a convent of Augustinian monks was founded, which, with other ecclesiastical establishments, was under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa till 1612. In that year a separate diocese of Mozambique was created. Shaikh Ahmad died in 1609 and was succeeded by his son Hasan, whose treatment by the Portuguese authorities ranks among the scandals of Colonial history. He was finally murdered, at the instigation of the Governor, De Mello Pereira (1615). His son, Yisuf, aged seven, was sent to Goa to be educated and thereafter baptized by the name of Geronimo Chingulun. After an inquiry held at Lisbon in 1618, the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Portugal pronounced Hasan innocent and decreed that Yisuf should be restored to his inheritance. In 1630 he was sent home and installed as Sulthan. continued for a time to profess Christianity, but, being accused of apostasy because he had been seen praying at his father’s tomb and apprehensive of being sent to Goa (the seat of the Inquisition), revolted, openly declared himself a Moslem and massacred all the Portuguese in Mombasa (cf. Faria y Sousa, vol. iii., iv., i., p. 391). His example was followed by Tanga, Mtangata and some other towns (1631). Mombasa was besieged for three months by F. de Mowra, with a fleet from Goa, but without success. Yisuf, however, probably seeing that he would be unable to hold the position, retreated to Arabia after dismantling the fort and destroying the town. The new governor, Seixas de Calheira, subdued the revolted towns and repaired the fort, as recorded in the inscription still legible above the gateway. The Portuguese rule becoming more and more oppressive, the Coast Arabs appealed in or about 1660 to Sulthan b. Seif al-Yaarabbi, Imam of Omman, who had already expelled the Portuguese from Maskat. He took Mombasa after a long siege and various operations; and though it was retaken shortly afterwards, the power of Portugal was already on the wane, and Seif b. Sulthan again captured Mombasa in 1698 and installed Nasyir b. Abd Allah al-Mazari as governor. Internal quarrels and a revolt against this governor laid the town open to a last Portuguese attack in 1728, when Luis de Mello Sampayo, one of the help of Iwana Tsun Mikan (Abu Bakr b. Muhammad), Sulthan of Pate. This occupation lasted but a short time and was terminated by another massacre, probably that commemorated in the tradition recorded by Taylor (Apologies, § 401). A period of anarchy ensued, which became so intolerable that not only the "Twelve Tribes" of Mombasa but the chiefs of the pagan Wanyika on the mainland, appealed to Seif b. Sulthan for help. He sent three ships and appointed a governor. In 1739 this office was held by Muhammad b. Othman al-Mazari, the first of a line who became practically independent rulers of Mombasa. When the Yaarabbi Imams were ousted by the Al Bii Saldi, the Mazri refused to recognise the new dynasty. They were left undisturbed for a considerable time, but the more energetic policy pursued by Sa’d b. Sulthan (1801—1856) induced them to seek British protection in 1823. This was provisionally granted by Captain Owen, but withdrawn three years later, as the Home government refused to sanction it. Sali’s finally gained possession of Mombasa in 1857, when the leading Mazri were captured by treachery and deported to Bander ‘Abbasi. From that time till the establishment of the British protectorate in 1890, Mombasa remained subject to the Saliyid (now called Sulthan) of Zanzibar, who indeed retains a certain jurisdiction over the ten-mile strip of coast leased from him by the British East Africa Company in 1887. The principal event in its history since that date is the rising of the Mazri in 1895, coincident with, but not caused by the proclamation of the British protectorate over the mainland territory, which was taken over from the Company by the Imperial Government. Since then the completion of the Uganda Railway and the harbour works al-Kilindini have noticeably changed the character of Mombasa, which is now a flourishing seaport, much frequented by European shipping.

The dialect of Swahili spoken at Mombasa was considered by the late W. E. Taylor “the truly central” language, “the best fitted for accurate statement and grave discussion”; though that of Zanzibar has now attained a wider currency. The art of poetry was, till recently, much cultivated there: the best known of the native poets are Muyuca b. Mwinyi Haji, Mwalimu Sikuva (died 1891), and Hemedi b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Mambassi, who was still living during the last decade of the sixteenth century (since deceased), Muhammad b. Ahmad, ‘Abd Allah Borashidi, Mwinyi Mugwama.

MONASTIR (pronounced Munastir, Mestir; ethnic Mystiri), a town in the Sheheli, the eastern coast of Tunisia, on the site of the ancient Rasina at the end of a cape which runs out to the south-east of Susa. The Arabic name raises a problem which is not yet solved. The name clearly conceals the Greek word monastérion which suggests that there was an important Christian monastery here at one time. This is however a pure hypothesis, supported by no text, although Tissot (Geographie comparée de la province d'AFRICA, ii, 165-166) seems to take it for granted. If on the other hand we remember that the Arab Monastir from the end of the eighth century was a great Muslim monastery and probably the first to be founded in the west, it is tempting to accept the explanation (suggested by St Hassan 'Abd al-Wahhab) that the name was given to the Muslim foundation by the Greeks of the country or Berbers speaking Greek, still Christians or recently converted to Islam.

It was in 180 (769) that Harthama b. 'Aiyâno, who ruled the province of Ifriqiya in the name of the 'Abbásid caliph Harûn ar-Rashid, founded the ribât of Monastir. This fortified monastery attained considerable importance in Western Islam. A century after its foundation, Hàfizîs were quoted which proclaimed its great importance and promised the highest rewards to those who came there to fight the infidel or to prepare themselves for the holy war. The Prophet foreseeing the foundation of al-Monastir is said to have said: "On the coast of Ifriqiya, there is one of the gates of Paradise which is called al-Monastir; one enters it by the grace of God's mercy and leaves it by the effect of his pardon"; or again: "He who keeps watch in the frontier town of al-Monastir for three days has the right to Paradise" (cf. Abu l-'Arab, Class des sanctuaires de l'Ifrîqiya, transl. Ben Cheneb, § 7, 9, 14, 15; Ibn Istîhâr, Bayânî, transl. Fagan, i, 11). In the 9th century al-Balki gives a description of Monastir, the existence of which is taken from al-Warrâq (d. 973) and which is not quite clear to us. It is a large fortress (kàfîr) he says, which contains a quarter (râbûbî) of considerable size. In the middle of this quarter stands a citadel (dhîn) which contains suites of rooms, oratories and castles (kârâb) of several stories. To the south of this citadel is a great court (qâmân) with khânqâs, called khêtâb gâmiân, around which women who wish to devote themselves to religion come to live. It seems that the fortresses was the town itself with its ramparts, still known by the same, common in Tunisia, of beld. Outside the beld the quarter is also encircled by ramparts and turrets in which we have the ribât. This occupies the north-east angle of this fâtâbgh; its walls and high tower called nadhûm dominate with their proud silhouette the shore and the country round. To the south is a courtyard with tombs; hence no doubt we have to locate the abodes of the pious women mentioned by al-Warrâq. The interior of the ribât shows traces of frequent attention and repairs which makes its plan singularly complicated. We can however perhaps recognize the general arrangements of which the ribât of Sûsa, founded twenty-five years later, gives us a clearer scheme on a smaller scale: a central rectangular court surrounded by two storeys of cells. On the first floor on the south side, the cells are replaced by a hall for prayer of no great height, very simple with cradle vaulting. It is probably the same as is mentioned by al-Balki: "On the first storey is a mosque where there is always a khâtîb of great virtue and merit, who has the direction of the community". The signal tower, circular in plan, occupies almost the same position as that which dominates the ribât of Sûsa. In addition to the dwellings of the marabouts there are reservoirs, baths and "Persian mills" in the monastery. Every year a great fair was held at Monastir on the 'Ashûra' day when the pious began their temporary withdrawals from the world. Some, however, shut themselves up for life and devoted themselves entirely to prayer and the defence of the lands of Islam. The people of Kairuân supplied them with provisions, in itself a pious work.

The ninth century was undoubtedly the golden age of the ribât of Monastir. Its importance however must have diminished somewhat as a result of the foundation in 821 of the ribât of Sûsa, which was the starting point for the expedition to Sicily. Al-Balki would regard the ribât of Monastir as a dependency on that of Sûsa. It was nevertheless, as well as the land around it, an auspicious place. We can date to about 1000 A.D. the building of the Great Mosque, close to the ribât, and that of the little mosque of the Saiyida, both of which have preserved mihrabs of a very curious transitional style. It is probable that the "Lady" whose tomb has given its name to the oratory of the Saiyida was a princess of the family of the Zîriids of Kairuân. Monastir was, especially after the Hilâl invasion (middle of the 12th century), the St. Denis of the Sanhâdja rulers. According to al-Idrîsî (11th century), the dead were brought there by boat (the roads were by no means safe at this time) from the town of Mahdiya. The tombs of this period are numerous in the cemetery in which the patron saint of Monastir, Sidi al-Mezari, is buried.

Although Monastir did not play a great part in history after this period, the town and the ribât continued to be an object of care to various Tunisian dynasties. From the Hashîd al-Mustanshir (1260) date the two gates of the beld: Bab al-Dirb and Bab al-Sir. As to the ribât, one of the gates was rebuilt by the Hashîd Ali Fâris in 828 (1424); another dates from 1058 (1648) and is the work of the Turks.

Monastir is at the present day a town of some 7,000 inhabitants. Three little islands, one of which contains a number of puzzling artificial caves, shelter the roadstead outside, which is frequented by a considerable number of ships at the tunny and sardine fishing season.

of Montenegro and the latter in the Mediterranean area around Lake Skutarí down to the coast. After the destruction in 168 B.C. of the Illyrian kingdom of the Ardiae whose last capital was Skutari, to which they, along with the Herzegovina, Southern Dalmatia and Northern Albania, had belonzed, they came under the rule of the Romans and later formed part of the province of Dalmatia. In the first century A.D., we find the two tribal areas replaced each by a towa organised on Roman lines, with the old tribal territories attached to them, but still defined: Docelea, at the corner formed by the junction of the Morače and Zeta, and Scodra, now Skutari, which latter, in the division of Dalmatia under Diocletian, became the capital of the provincia Praecta dinata or Praecala: and has maintained a dominating position almost down to the present time [cf. SKUTARI]. Docelea, on the other hand, is representative for Montenegro of the economic and cultural decline of south-west Europe since ancient times. In spite of the step-motherly nature of the country, we know from the ruins of public and private buildings being in the miserable desert of the Karst and from epigraphic evidence that it was once a prosperous city with considerable trade, with the interior across Lake Skutari and on the Bayana which flows out of it (Patsch. in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopaedie der klass. Altertumsweisenschaft. v. 1254 sqq.). It suffered severely in 395 when the Balkans suffered so much at the hand of the Teutons at the time of the migration of the Visigoths, but in spite of the plundering of the Adriatic territory which followed at other hands also, it was still the see of a bishop in 602, in the period when the towns of the peninsula were finally destroyed as a result of the raids of the Avars and Slavs and the permanent settlement of the latter, who having no understanding of town life, retained in their new home their traditional poor and primitive mode of life, for the most part in family groups settled on the land and mainly engaged in cattle breeding.

II. Its situation and tradition, from traces in place-names, remnants of the old population and the city walls, now much decayed, preserved for the ruined town of Docelea which ituberto had held the position later occupied by Montenegro, its old ecclesiastical position — there is a record of a bishopric of Docelea subordinate to the Greek metropolis of Durazzo — and seem also to have given it a military and political preponderance, since the little Slav state which later grew up here bore after it the name of Doinča, Slav Didikia down to the 16th century. This originally comprised only southern Montenegro and the stretch of territory called Krania along the west bank of the Lake Skutari. The littoral itself (with Cattaro, Budva, Antivari and Ulcinj) and Northern Albania, with many Roman towns like Skutari and Drinovo, remained Byzantine on the contrary, as part of the theme (province) of Dyrrachion down to the 12th century, while eastern and northern Montenegro belonged to Serbia and the north-west to the principality of Travunia (capital Trebinje).

Of the early obscure pre-history of Doinča all that we have is a Byzantine seal of a ruler of probably the tenth century: ΠΤΩΤΩΝ ΧΡΗΣΩΝ ΔΙΟΝΙΣΙΟΣ; the country was then not only ecclesiastically and culturally but also politically under Greek influence like the larger Slav Adriatic state. From the 10th century our information is fuller, if not absolutely reliable.
Prince John Vladimir, a figure much obscured by legend, is inextricably associated with the last efforts of the Western Bulgar state. First a prisoner, then the son-in-law of the Czar Samuel (d. 1014), he was murdered (drowned in Lake Prespa) by the last Czar John Vladislav (1015—1018) in the Bulgar capital. Remembered in Montenegro as a saint by Christians and Muslims alike, he now rests in the monastery of Shen Jon near Elbassan in Central Albania.

In the years that followed, Byzantium, after the Bulgars, its opponents for centuries, had been finally disposed of by the Emperor Basil II. But by 1018, being again in possession of the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, enforced its suzerainty to the northwest also. Dociolia, under three able rulers not only survived this danger but attained an importance never reached by Montenegro itself in its best days. Prince Stephan Voyislav — it is not known in what relationship he stood to John Vladimir — in spite of great opposition from the Byzantines (1036—1042) obtained Travunia (see above), Zachlumia, adjoining it (on the central and lower Narenta), almost the whole Adriatic coast between the Narenta and Boyana along with Cattaro and Antiwara as well as Northern Albania with Skutari and established the still existing Latin bishopric in Antiwara, out of political hostility to Byzantinism. His son Michael was the first to take the title of king; the choice of his son Constantine Bodin as Bulgar Czar by rebels in Macedonia (1075) ended however in a — temporary — humiliation of Dociolia. Michael and Bodin, who succeeded his father presumably in 1082, made an alliance with the Normans in Italy and supported Robert Guiscard in his fighting in the west of the Balkan peninsula (1081—1085) with Alexius I Comnenus. Bodin succeeded at the same time in extending his rule over Bosnia also (then practically only the territory on the lower course of the Bosna, the Vrbas and the Narenta) and Serbia or Raszia (in the modern north and eastern Montenegro, the sandjak of Novi Pazar in Serbia and S. E. Bosnia). The kingdom of Dociolia attained its greatest extent with the conquests of Stephan Voyislav — but only for a brief period. Bodin's good fortune faded away. After the restoration of Byzantine rule on the Adriatic, reprisals were begun (1085—1094) under the personal direction of the emperor Alexius. The king was defeated: the links that bound the various parts of his kingdom together were loosened and quarrels broke out within the royal family itself. In 1096 Bodin could still receive Crusaders in his capital Skutari: Provencals under Raymond of Toulouse, who had marched through Dalmatia and probably through the Zeta valley (cf. above) and were making for Durazzo in order to reach Con-stantinople from there by the old Via Egnatia. After this we have no certain information about him and his successors. All that is certain is that Dociolia was driven from the coast and out of Northern Albania by the Byzantines and became tributary to them, while Serbia, which had hitherto been politically insignificant in comparison, began to expand at the expense of Dociolia under the Grand Zupan Vikan, Bodin's governor, and his successors, especially after the Byzantine empire fell steadily into decline from 1180 onwards. The Grand Zupan Stephan Nemanya, a native of Dociolia, deprived it of the former possessions of Dociolia in Northern Albania and on the coast from the eastern shore of Lake Skutari to Cattaro, disposed of the last Dioclian prince Michael in 1189, and united his territory with Serbia. From the 13th century the old name of the country was replaced by that of the river Zeta (Latin: Zenta, Genta).

III. Under Nemanya's dynasty Zeta (with Northern Albania and the coast) remained for 170 years under princes, repeatedly by heirs to the throne. Widows of kings also had estates on this sunny strip of coast. A beneficess of the land as a builder was Helena (d. 1314), the French wife of Stefan Luč i (1243—1276) who had the towns on Lake Skutari restored, which had suffered severely from the Mongol storm which in 1242 had swept southwards along the Adriatic, and built and repaired numerous churches and monasteries in the predominantly Roman Catholic territory around the Lake and on the coast which was under the bishops of Antivari and numerous suffragan bishops, including also the great Benedictine Abbey of Ss. Sergius and Bacchus on the Boyana (now the ruins of Kisha e Shirijt), at which there was an important trading centre with much visited animal markets. St. Sava (d. 1236) created an Eastern Greek bishopric for the Zeta on the island of Prevlaka on the Gulf of Cattaro; the land also had many well-endowed monasteries of this creed on the islands in the Lake Skutari (like Vranyina), and what fertile soil existed elsewhere belonged for the most part to monasteries in Serbia, on Athos and in Jerusalem, granted by the, in this respect, extravagant Serbian ruler. The population received a considerable admixture, now completely absorbed, by the immigration of Wallachians and Albanians.

A grave danger to Serbia was the power of the nobles, which had increased out of all proportion as a result of the constant feuds in the royal family. When after the death of the Czar Stephan Dušan (d. 1355) a general collapse of the great but only loosely knit state began, the centrifugal forces led in Zeta also (1365) to the formation once more of an independent principality by the brothers Stracimir, George and Balsa, sons of Balsa, a nobleman of Wallachian origin, to whom the government of the country was entrusted.

IV. The break-up of Serbia took place just at the time when the Ottomans were vigorously extending their power in the Balkan peninsula. Their victories at Cirmen on the Marica (1371) and at Kosovo ("field of the blackbird", 1389) destroyed the independence of the petty Serbian states in Macedonia and reduced Serbia itself to the district of the Morava, where it however not only maintained itself till 1459 but, as a result of the Turkish defeat at the hands of the Mongols at Angora (1402), was able for a time to rise to considerable power again. In spite of the danger which threatened Zeta also, George and Balsa exhausted their strength in continual feuds with their neighbours over pieces of land, and in the reign of George II the turbulent nobles, among whom the most prominent were the Crnojević or Gyurjević between Budva, Cattaro and the lower Morava, broke the kingdom up into little baronies. The result was that when the Ottomans under Khair al-Din entered Albania from Macedonia, Balsa in 1385 lost a battle and his life north of Valona, and George II after fighting with varying
fortune, realising his own weakness, handed over
his Albanian possessions in the south and east of
Lake Skutari as far as Tuzi (S. E. of Podgorica)
for an annual pension of 1,000 ducats (1396) to
Venice, who thus became till 1479 the southern
defender of Zeta against the Ottomans. George
retained Dulegno, Antivari and Budna for himself
as well as the lands west and north of Lake
Skutari.

\[\text{Balša II (d. 1421)}\]

But even this reduced territory found no peace.
Under Balša II, the last of his warlike but un-
important house, two long and trying wars with
Venice were fought: during the second, the prince
died (1421) and left his lands to the despot (Duke)
of Serbia, Stephan Lazarević, who lost Dulegno
to the republic.

V. The second period of Serbian rule very soon
alienated the sympathy with which it was at first
received and had to fight increasing difficulties
carried, by the influent Crnovjević (see above).
In addition there was an inroad by the Turks in
1439 and the demands of Venice. The latter took
Antivari and Budna and appointed the voivod
Stephan Crnovjević its salaried governor in the
little mountain country now quite cut off from the
coast; he (1455) induced the people to take the
oath of fealty to the republic in the island monastery
of Vranjina (cf. above). The end of Serbia (1459)
seemed to secure Venice complete possession of
the lands round Lake Skutari, but soon afterwards
the Ottomans surrounded this land on all sides,
for the conquest of Bosnia (1463) was followed
(1466) by the annexion of the Herzegovina and
of the present Northern Montenegro as far as
Nikšić, which then belonged to it.

Like Stephan Crnovjević (d. 1465) his son Ivan
(1465-1490) who called himself Gospodar Zetski
(Jord of Zeta), was also a vassal of Venice, who gave
him at first little support in the wars with Muhammad II
over Upper Albania that, after the evacuation of
Skutari (1479), he had to fly to Italy, and Zeta
was occupied by the Turks, which was the beginning
of their long rule here. The contest for the throne
after the Sultan's death (1481) induced Ivan to return
and renew the struggle, which however ended in
1482 with the recognition of Turkish suzerainty. His
youngest son Stanis, a hostage in Constantinople,
adopted Islam in 1485, and took the name Skender
Beg. Ivan, also called Ivan Beg — his country was
also known as Ivanbegovina — resided in Cetinje
where he built a small monastery in 1484-1485,
to which the Eastern Greek bishop of Zeta (see
above) moved. The state suffered from the great
independence of the tribes, who had strong separatist
tendencies, like the Nyegysi, Biyelce, Oznikci, and
Čeklići; each formed a political entity with a
well-defined territory, its own chief chosen for life,
courts, tribal and family feuds, blood-vengeance,
etc., institutions which survived in Montenegro down
to the sixteenth century and existed in the north
Albanian highlands until quite recently.

Not even the greatest submissiveness earned for
Ivan's elder sons, at constant enmity with one
another, the goodwill of the Turks. George (1490-
1496) who introduced the printing-press into
Cetinje and in 1493-95 printed beautiful Cyrillic
ecclesiastical works, died in Asia Minor in exile.
Stephan (1496-1499) was interned in Skutari,
where he is said to have ended his days as a monk.
On the other hand in 1514, a separate sandjak with
capital Zahlyak (to the north of Lake Skutari) was
created for the Muslim Stanisa Skender Beg
Crnojević out of Zeta, which had been incorporated
in the sandjak of Skutar. The latter did not
deny his descent; he was also tolerant in matters
of religion, used his Slav mother-tongue in his
 correspondent and was in regular communication
with Venice, although their relations were occasion-
ally overloaded; in Venice Božidar Vuković of
Podgorica (d. 1540) and others from 1519 printed
Cyrillic ecclesiastical works. Skender Beg's title
Sandžak Crnogorski naturalised the name Crna Gora
for the country, which we find as early as 1455
and as Montenegro in 1496 for the highlands above
Cattaro. In 1528 all notices of this remarkable
Montenegrin-Turkish ruler are lost. Crna Gora again
becomes a kadii of the sandjak of Skutari.

Montenegro under Turkey, under the unassuming
ecclesiastical suzerainty of the bishop or Vladika
of Cetinje chosen by the tribal chiefs, formed five
nahiyas or districts in the shape of a small triangle
between Cattaro, Podgorica and the N.W. end of
Lake Skutari, which in 1614 contained 90 villages,
with 3,524 houses and 8,027 men capable of
bearing arms, of whom however only 1,000 had
guns. The poll-tax was readily paid and they
shared in the wars of the Porte against Venice
and in suppressing rebellions in the adjoining
lands, such as the closely related Bida, which had
much more desire for independence. This long
sterotyped monotonous did not change till 1688
when the Montenegrins with the Vladika Viskarion
placed themselves under the protection of Venice,
whose lands marched with those of the Turks,
and who since the failure of the siege of Venice had
been fighting with the Turks from 1684 to the
peace of Carlowitz (1699). After the failure of his
first attacks Sulaiman Pasha, Sandžak of Skutari,
as a punishment destroyed Cetinje in 1692 with
the support of a number of Montenegrin tribes.

VI. The process of liberation thus begun found
vigorous support in the warlike Vladika Danilo I
Petrović Nyeguš (1697-1735) 2 after whom the
dignity of bishop became hereditary in the family,
and its holder gradually increased his importance
at the expense of the tribal chiefs. In 1711 an
embassy from Peter the Great introduced relations
with Russia, which however were only occasionally
of benefit to the land. Even in the joint war on the
Porte which immediately followed, Montenegro
was left in the lurch at the peace of the Pruth
(1711). The protection which fugitive Montenegrins
found in Dalmatia was used in 1714 as a pretext
by Turkey for declaring war on Venice. In the same
year Nušman Pasha Koprulu laid waste Montenegro
entirely, Cetinje which had been rebuilt in 1704
being once more destroyed. As a result of the peace
of Passarowitz (1718) more peaceful conditions

1) The story that all Mohammadans in Monte-
negro who would not be baptised or leave the
country were put to death as partisans of Turkey
on Christmas Eve 1707 is however a patriotic fable.
began to prevail except for the almost daily guerilla fighting on the frontiers. Danilo took advantage of the peace to build up the country again after the overthrow of the Turkish administration, with the help of Venetian subsidies, so far as the poverty and the intractable nature of the people permitted. In 1724 Cetinje was rebuilt.

Under his incapable successor Sava Petrović Nyegiš (1735—1752), there was a complete relapse into the previous barbarism: no authority, clan and blood feuds, murders. No one dared to leave his house unarmed. The whole people lived by murder and robbery. In addition there were secret conspiracies against the Turks against their own countrymen, abject appeals to Venice and journeys of appeal to St. Petersburg, notably that of the able but powerless episcopal condutor Vasilije (d. 1766).

In the general distress the Vladika only thought of enriching himself. Some relief was afforded Montenegro in 1767 by the south Slav Šćepan Mali (Little Stephen), the Lažni (false) Czar, who was accepted as the Czar Peter III murdered in 1762, and received such general recognition, out of respect for Russia, that in spite of his unmasking by the mission of prince Yuriy Volodymirovych Dolgorukiy (1769), he was tolerated by Russia also until he was murdered by a servant in 1773. Able, unselfish, strict and just, he restored for a time unwonted order and security.

There was no considerable war with Turkey for a long period. All the more serious then were the relations with the suzerain in the reign of Peter I the Saint (1782—1830). The hereditary wazir of Skutari, Kara Mahmud Paša Buzhatli, taking advantage of tribal feuds, laid waste the whole country in 1785, forced it to pay the poll-tax again and burned down Cetinje. During the Austro-Russian-Turkish war of 1787—1792, there were only trivial encounters, for which in 1795 Kara Mahmud Paša again threatened serious reprisals. He was however defeated in 1796 at Slatina and later killed in the great battle of Kruse; his head was long preserved as a trophy in Cetinje, in keeping with the Montenegrin head-hunting custom which had become a regular practice in war. The consequence was that the tribes of Bijelo Polavci and Pripet, in the Brda east of the Zeta valley, joined Montenegro.

A welcome and more profitable change were the wars of 1806—1808 and 1813—1814 in alliance first with the inhabitants of the Bocche di Cattaro and the Russians, later with the English against the French, who had occupied Dalmatia under General Marmont after the peace of Pressburg (1805). Numerous ruins stretching as far as Ragusa still testify to the thirst of the Montenegrins for destruction and plunder even on Christian soil.

Peter I, a cultured ecclesiastic educated in Russia, full of good intentions, endeavoured throughout his life by legislative (1798 and 1803) and personal effort to unite his people, raise their moral tone and avert distress by introducing the potato, but in spite of great patience he met with bitter hostility, contributed to also by Russia, which only after being appealed to for a long time, in 1799 granted 1,000 ducats a year for public purposes but did not pay it regularly.

The first ruler over the Montenegrins, Gospodor Crnogorski i Brdski, was Peter II (1830—51), a highly gifted man of the world, bishop only in name, one of the greatest of Serbian poets and also of unbending vigour which did not hesitate at severe punishments and death sentences. The Radonjić family which claimed secular (governor) power for itself had to leave the country. Supported by Russia from 1837 by a grant of 9,000 ducats yearly and occasional gifts of grain, and on this account more highly esteemed by his covetous countrymen, he concentrated the government in his own hands. The powers of the tribal chiefs were restricted. A senate of 12 regularly paid members under the presidency of the Vladika henceforth formed the supreme governing body and court of justice: its authority was enforced by well-paid troops stationed throughout the country, the Gardiva, in addition to whom the head of the state had a bodyguard, Pervanici. The building of the first public school and a small state printing-press in the capital, the purchase of two cannons and the building of a powder mill, show the small scale of the state but mark the desire for progress. The innovations, and still more poverty and a great increase of population, as in earlier times led to the emigration of numerous families to Serbia and Russia.

Foreign politics were mainly characterised by troubles on the Austrian frontier, continual fighting, celebrated in song, with the neighbouring Muhammadans, especially in the Herzegovina, which was then ruled by 'Ali Paša Rizwanbegović (d. 1851) as a practically independent sovereign, under whom Smail Aga Čengić (d. 1840) distinguished himself in the fighting.

VII. Centralisation and reforms generally formed the programme of the next two reigns, which was firmly and successfully carried through in spite of much opposition. Under Danilo II (1852—60) the clan system was dealt a shattering blow, when the chiefs were replaced by captains of princely birth and legislation regulated by the code of 1855. His accession however marks the close of a period in as much as a hereditary secular power now replaced a theocracy. Danilo renounced his spiritual rank and with the approval of Russia and Austria had himself proclaimed Knyaz i Gospodar Crne Gore i Brda. The attempt of the Porte to obtain by force under Serdar Ekrem 'Omar Paša in 1852—53 recognition of her suzerainty thus threatened was vigorously opposed by Austria after giving ample assistance in 1853 through Feldmarschalleutnant Count Leinningen's mission to Constantinople. During the Crimean War (1853—56) Danilo remained neutral to the discontent of his people. On the other hand, he became involved in a war in 1858 because he supported the rebels in the Herzegovina; this ended in the defeat of the Turks in the valley of Grabovo (north of Risano) and in an enlargement of Montenegrin territory in 1859. In 1860 the ruler, who had previously had to put down conspiracies, some led by relatives, was murdered in Cattaro by a Montenegrin emigrant.

His able nephew Nikola I (1860—1918, d. March 1, 1921) who had been educated in Trieste and in France, son of the doughty Woivođ Mirko (d. 1867), completed the building of the state. By long steady work, first as an absolute and from 1905 as a constitutional ruler, and by very skilfully managing foreign relations, he created out of the ill-famed, unfertile, rocky little country a kingdom which was enlarged by the addition
fertile valleys with its own sea coast, good communications and post routes, a busy economic life, modest prosperity increased by emigration to America, more law abiding and secure since the institution of the civil code of 1888, with a good system of education and a well organised soldiery with modern equipment to be reckoned with in Balkan questions. Relationship by marriage, notably with Serbia, in 1875, gave reflected glory to the pretty little capital of Belgrade which had also become a centre of culture; 1910 crowned the work by raising Montenegro to a kingdom.

While interested great powers, notably Russia, gave grants of money, arms, munitions, etc., which were readily accepted and also requested, this development was conducted mainly at the expense of Turkey, with whom three wars were waged at longer intervals in addition to minor friction in 1859-1870, 1872, 1874-1875, 1895, 1898, 1911, 1912. The first (1862), a combined attack by Derwisch Pasha from the north and Serdar Ekrem Pasha from the south in the Zeta valley as a reprisal for the support given to the rising led by Luka Vukalovic in the eastern Herzegovina, forced Nikola by the threat to Cetinje to conclude an unsuccessful peace in Skutar. The second war was declared in 1876 by Montenegro in alliance with Serbia in order to profit by the new insurrection in the Herzegovina which had begun in summer of 1875 in Nevesina. His victory over Muktar Pasha at Vrbica and at Bileca and the defeat of Serbs were followed by a truce and the intervention of Russia in 1877. Sulaiman Pasha succeeded at heavy cost in fighting his way out of the Herzegovina through the Zeta valley into Albania, but in 1877 Nikola took Niksic and Antivari and in 1878 Dulcigno. The Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878, Articles 26-33) recognised the independency of Montenegro and granted it, after cutting down very much the terms of the preliminary peace of San Stefano, a broad ring of land around the original land of Montenegro with Antivari, Niksic, Hanjani, Piva, Kolazin, Spuz, Podgorica, Zabljak and the district of Gusinje. The latter, as a result of the opposition of the Albanians, was exchanged for Dulcigno in 1880. The area was increased from 4,356 to 9,058 square kilometres with 327,000 inhabitants, including 12,500 Catholic Albanians; there was on the other hand a considerable emigration of Muslims from the new territories.

The third war with Turkey was the first Balkan War, which Montenegro began on Oct. 8, 1912, before its allies, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece; but while the sandjak of Novi Pazar and Upper Albania were easily occupied, Skutar, the main objective, was only taken after a long siege and with the help of treachery on April 23, 1913. After the allies had quarrelled among themselves, Montenegro also took part in the second Balkan War against Bulgaria. By the peace of Bucharest (Aug. 10, 1913) it received the south-western half of the sandjak of Novi Pazar (with Pjiveve, Bule Polje and Berane), the greater part of the Metohia plain (with Peć and Gjakova), the valley of Gusinje and lands round Lake Skutar, increasing its area by 9,593 square kilometres to 15,017 square kilometres, with 437,000 inhabitants.

In the Great War, King Nikola reluctantly declared war on Austria-Hungary on Aug. 5, 1914. After the capture of the Lowcien (see above) the Montenegrin laid down their arms unconditionally on Jan. 16, 1916 and the country, which had gone back a great deal since 1912, was administered by an Austrian military general-governor. The king went first to Italy, then to France, never to return again, for after the War he was deposed along with his sons on Nov. 29, 1918 by an assembly in Podgorica on the charge of treachery.
MOORS, a rather vague name still applied in the sixteenth century to certain elements in the Muslim town population of various countries and especially to the inhabitants of the Mediterranean ports of North Africa. The word, presumably of Phoenician origin, corresponds to the ancient local name of the natives of Barbary reproduced by the Romans as Maures, Mauri and by the Greeks as Mauropoi (Strabo, vii. 2:25). The term Mauri used by the Romans in a general way for the Berbers passed into Spain in the form Moro, and it was by the name of Moros that the people of the Iberian peninsula throughout the whole period of Muslim rule knew the Arab conquerors and arabised Berbers who had come to settle in Spain from the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar. The name Moros passed into various European languages: French Maure, English Moors, German Mauren. At the time of the "Reconquista" the name Moriscos was applied in Spain to these Muslims (usually crypto-Muslims) who had remained in the country until their final expulsion in 1610. The Moriscos went mainly to North Africa, where they were known to the natives as Mandus while Christian travellers gave them the general name of Moors.

In modern times the Moors to the European were therefore the urban population of the North African ports, irrespective of the proportion of immigrants from Spain. Since then the word has been generally used with the meaning Muslim of the towns of the western end of the Mediterranean (cf. such expressions as Moorish bath, Moorish coffee etc.).

The name Moors has also been given to the Arab or Berber peoples, pure or mixed with negro blood, who live to the north in the Senegal in the province to which the French now give the ancient name of Mauritania (see below), and to the offspring of the marriages of Arabs from South Arabia and Cingalese who form an important Muslim colony in Ceylon (c. 200,000).

The land of the Moors is Mauritania or Mauretania. This name which has been derived either from a Phoenician word Maszarhm or the Western or with more probability from the name of a tribe living before the Christian era in North Africa, was applied in ancient times to northern Morocco (Mauretania Tingitana) and to the north-west of Algeria (Cassareen Mauretania). At a later date, by extending the application, Europeans have given the general name of Moors to the Arabo-Berber peoples of Mediterranean and Saharan Africa. Then gradually they came to distinguish out of this mass the groups with which they came more frequently into contact (Tripolitans, Tunisians, Algerians, Moroccans), so that the name Moors came to be limited to the people of Spanish (Muslim), Jewish or Turkish origin of North Africa and particularly to the nomads of the western Sahara, who traverse what Ahmad al-Shinâhî (in al-Wasif, Cairo 1329 A.H.) calls the "land of Shuniq"; from the name of its chief village; this country is bounded, says the author, by the Atlantic Ocean, the valley of the Sakiat al-Hasni, the plain of Ibn Haiba (plain of the Brâkna) on the right bank of the Senegal and by the two towns of Walata and Na'ma (Nema); if, like him, we take into account all inhabited areas, we ought to extend it to the east as far as the meridian of Timbuktu.

Mauritania, which now forms one of the eight colonies of French West Africa, is only a part of this vast area. It lies to the north of the Senegal between this river, the Atlantic Ocean and the marigot of Karakoro; to the north and east, a frontier settled by agreements separates it from the Spanish Sahara (June 27, 1900; Oct. 3, 1904; Nov. 27, 1912) and from the territories of the south of Algeria (agreement of June 7, 1905) and from the French Sûdan (decree of 25th April, 1913). It has an area of 835,000 square kilometres, 285,000 inhabitants, the density of population being 0.34.

Except for the banks of the Senegal, the country is steppe or desert, and only suitable for stock rearing. To be brief, it is a military frontier district defending on the north the more favoured lands of the Senegal rather than a country suitable for development by colonisation.

I. GEOGRAPHY.

A semi-circular range of hills of no great height, worn by erosion but often difficult of access, starts as it were out of the ocean to the south of the Rio de Oro and reaches the middle course of the Senegal after running round the contours of an ancient gulf of the quaternary period. The Adrâr Timar and the Tâgant separated by the depression of the Khât form as it were the cornerstones of this system and are continued to the north-west in the "petrified sea" (a plain scattered over with rocky islets) of the Tiris and by the arêtes of the Adrâr Suuf, to the south by the Rgaba and Asâba.

The interior of this gulf consists almost entirely of sands, brought from the desert by the predominating north-east winds. The dunes in the south are all fixed and are called "dead"; in the north they are "alive" and constantly changing. Like the other dunes of the western Sahara they run in the direction of the wind, N.E.-S.W., and are separated from one another by contours of firmer soil along which traffic can go.

The Shâmanah is a plain, formed of lands of alluvial origin, along the lower Senegal and as such particularly suitable for cultivation; as we go up the river it is known as Litauma and then as Gidimaka. Other plains, those of the Brâkna and the Gorgol, are more remote from the river; they contain permanent pools of water to which their girdles of high trees gave a characteristic appearance (zâmûr). To the north of the Shâmanah and the land of the Brâkna stretches a series of dunes among which may be mentioned those of Amatîsh. The couloir of the Inshîr continued by that of the Amaîga separates the latter from the similar ranges, the Aksar and the Azeifâl, which stretch to the Tiris; they are difficult to cross, but between them the Tijur supplies an easy route. Beyond to the north-west, the Tasiast and the Swîhel al-Abyad are great plains of denudation.

On their convex face, the Adrâr and Tâgant are prolonged to the north in the massif of the Kudiât Ijel and by that of the Zemmur, separated by the Tizel-kad, towards the north-east by the cliffs of the Dhar Adrâr and the Hânk and by the plateau of the Eglab, which stretches to the
great sand-dunes of the Igdah, to the east by the Dar Tichit which runs to Walata. Between these lines of rock, great ridges of moving dunes make passage difficult but provide good pasturage for the rocks; these are from north to south, the Erg al-Hamami, the Maghter, the Waran, the Aderar and the Aukar. Lastly, to the north of all these masses of sand, the Ghallaman, Kenet and Yetta are vast marshes without water, or hard and flat soil, which run as far as the Hammada of the Draa.

The coast consists of dunes and piazeaus with numerous sahâlas or salt lakes. There is usually a large sand-bar; nevertheless the sea, which is very rich in fish, gives a livelihood to a population of fishermen.

The Sahara in the proper sense of the word hardly extends beyond a line marked by Cape Tiznit, Mejriya (Moundjeria), the northern bank of the Tâgant (depression of Khat), the southern margin of the Aderar and Walata. It is especially dry on both sides of the Aderar: to the west in the region of Port Etienne and in the dunes bordering on the Tiris, and especially to the east where to the north of Walata, the Mraya, Liqt and the western part of the Erg Sêbakh, still almost unknown, form a waterless no man's-land; this district is visited only by antelopes, gazelles and ostriches, and by the nomad hunters who can manage to go for days without water and live like their game on green stuffs.

To the south of the line above given, the steppe gradually changes to forest as we near the river. The climate is very hot: the influence of the sea is not felt beyond a score of miles inland. Subtropical rains fall as far as the north of the Aderar.

II. POPULATION.

At the earliest period to which the chronicles and native traditions go back, Mauritania seems to have been peopled by negroes. Later, in the course of centuries, it received various immigrations of Berbers, especially Sanhagia and Zenata, Arabs and probably also of Jews. The Sanhagia came first, certainly before the Fatimids; later, the development of Trans-Saharan commerce brought to the few towns that had been built, merchants of varied origin (Arabs, Berbers, Zenata, Nafusa, Lwata, Natâwâ, etc.); at different periods, Jews came there to seek refuge from persecution, the last of which drove them out of Tâlaut at the end of the xvi century; lastly, the Arabs belonging to the Mâgli group in turn invaded the country from the xvi century onwards, bringing with them more Zenata or driving them in front of them.

The Jews have been completely absorbed into the Berbers (they form, it is believed, the foundation of the caste of smiths, machellem) or into the Arab, so that it is not possible to estimate their numbers at the present day. The negroes, who have been gradually driven towards the river, are represented by approximately 30,000 Libuss (Fâhir), 21,000 Sarakole and 13,000 Wolof, Fula and Bambara. The Arabo-Berber Moors number about 210,000.

III. HISTORY.

a. Prehistory. Such researches as have been made in Mauritania, notably in the Aderar and in the Aukar, have revealed there, as throughout the Sahara, the existence of important prehistoric sites; if it is not possible to date them, they are at least evidence of a very early population whose utensils seem to connect them with the negroes. These conclusions are further confirmed by the native chronicles and traditions, and perhaps we ought to connect with these remote inhabitants of the country the Bajara, to whom the Moors attribute the creation of the palm-groves of the Aderar and who are said to have built a town, the "city of the dogs," on the site of the present Azougui, ten miles S.W. of Aït. What seems probable in any case is that these black Mauritaniens were more or less subjects of the first kingdoms known to the southwest of the desert: that of Iakir, which ruled Senegalese Futa; that of Ghana, the capital of which was on the site of the modern Kumbâ, 100 miles S.W. of Walata and that of Lwata which succeeded them and ruled the whole of the western Sudan. To the north, the lands of the negroes do not doubt matched with the lands in which the Sanhagia and Zenata berbers led a nomadic life in the south of Morocco.

b. The Sanhagia invasion. We do not know what date the Sanhagia invaded Mauritania; but it was certainly a very early one. It is possible that expeditions by the Arab emirs to al-Maghrib al-Aksa, beginning in the later years of the seventh century, which marked the first contact of the Sanhagia with Islam, may have driven them to the south but their first incursions into the Tiris, into the Aderar and to the Tâgant were probably much earlier. Their conquest of the country, it is true, seems to have been fairly slow and it was not, it appears, till the 9th century that they succeeded in reaching the banks of the Senegal for the first time.

c. The first Sanhagia kingdom. At the beginning of the ninth century, a certain number of Sanhagia tribes among them the Lemtûna, the Gündâla and the Benna Wârëf, occupied the Aderar, with their advanced posts in the Tâgant, and made raids into the Haawi (Hadi) against the negro-soninke emirate of Ghana. The Lemtûna supplied them with chiefs at this time, and one of them, Tiltûn (d. in 839 or 837), succeeded in imposing his authority on all the berbers and making twenty negro kings pay tribute to him. The chief towns of his dominion were Azougui and especially Audâghast, forty miles N.E. of the site of the modern Kifân (Kif). Audâghast seems to have been founded in the seventh century by the Soninke and its name as a centre of trans-Saharan trade brought it a large foreign population, already in part converted to Islam; Berbers of different branches and Arabs. In spite of this brilliant start, this Lemtûna dynasty lasted only a short time and disappeared in 919. Each tribe then led an independent existence and the emperors of Ghana were able to extend their power towards the Tagant and to take Audâghast at the end of the tenth century.

d. The second Sanhagia kingdom. Towards 1029, the chiefs of the various Sanhagia tribes agreed to combine again as in the time of Tiltûn and thus to resist the encroachments of the Soninke. The power was placed in the hands of a Lemtûni called Taisnà, who seems to have been the first really Muslim Zâgri ruler. He went to Mecca and his enthusiasm as a new convert led him to a holy war on the negroes, in which he lost his life (1032). His son-in-law Yalîya b.
Ibrahim of the tribe of the Gudala succeeded him, according to the custom which made the supreme command go to the two tribes alternately. Like Tassina, he was a zealot and on returning from the pilgrimage, he brought from Morocco a holy man, 'Abd Allah b. Yasin, to whom he entrusted the task of educating his brothers, who were well acquainted with the principles of Islam. The saqat was at first well received by the Sahāda and he made them build the town of Aret-Neuma near the site of the modern Tishlt. But soon his commands appeared too difficult for the nomads, who rebelled against him. He sought refuge with his disciples in a niṣāb or fortified monastery on an island in the ocean (sometimes identified with Tidra) and they were henceforth known as the al-Murābiṭūn (the men of the niṣāb), a word which has been corrupted in Europe to Almoravids under which name they have become famous.

c. The Almoravids. Their reputation for sanctity spread very rapidly and attracted many disciples to them. When 'Abd Allah had gathered around him a sufficiently large body of men, he led them against their rebellious brethren and against the negroes. In a few years they subdued the whole of the western Sahara, from Tafilalt and the Dra to the Senegal. In 1050, Yahya b. Ibrahim died, and Yahya b. 'Umar, chief of the Lemūna, became the political head of the confederation, 'Abd Allah b. Yasin remaining the religious chief. While the first recaptured and plundered Audaghost, the second attempted the conquest of the Maghrib. But soon they were both slain, Yahya in a rising in the Adrar in which the negroes of the Takeri tried in vain to help him, and 'Abd Allah in fighting the Bargha-wātī heretics of the plains of Morocco. Abu Bakri, brother of Yahya, was then for some time supreme chief of the Almoravids, then to gratify his ambitious nephew Vassul b. Tahsin he handed over to him his conquests in North Africa, keeping only to himself the sovereignty of the south. He devoted himself to a holy war against the negroes and to their conversion to Islam. He succeeded in driving them back towards the river and in taking Ghana in 1076 and the capital of the Takrur in 1080, extending his teaching, the tradition says, as far as the lands of a Mandingo prince of the Upper Niger. He was slain in the Tagant in 1087 and his death marked the break up of the Sahāda confederation in Mauritania; each tribe regained its independence.

d. The Tashmuḥa and the negro reaction. Between this date and the end of the xvith century we know very little of the history of Mauritania. We only suspect that the influence of the negro kingdom of Mali must have extended up to the Adrar and Tagant and that a new Marabout Berber element formed by the Tashmuḥa of Gna came and settled in the country. The Tashmuḥa seem to have had at first taken up the mantle of the Almoravids and to have made themselves the champions of the qiyasid against the negroes. But after a few successes, they were driven back from the region of the river and fell back upon the Tiris and Adrar, where they gave up fighting and devoted themselves to study and religious devotion. The successes of the negroes then became serious: Wolofs, Soninkés and Tuaregs recaptured a whole part of Mauritania and might perhaps have succeeded in subjecting the Berbers, who were exhausted by their campaigns of conquest in the Mediterranean region, if the coming of the Maqṣil Arabs had not checked them.

e. The Maqṣil invasion. It is not possible to date this new invasion exactly; it is, however, certain that it was not a single effort. It went almost down to the nineteenth century with little groups filtering into the Sahāda encampments and at length submerging them.

Setting out from Egypt, the Maqṣil passed along the northern border of the desert and reached the Ocean to the south of Morocco in the first half of the xiiith century. They then entered the service of the Marinid rulers of Fas, who used them to keep in subjection the provinces beyond the Atlas and to collect taxes. These undisciplined nomads very soon took advantage of their privileged position. Measures had to be taken against their brigandage and their threats to overrun Morocco, and military expeditions were sent against them. Either as a result of these reprisals, or because they were called in by the Sahāda to help them against the negroes, or because a year of drought drove them in search of new pasturage, some of them, belonging to the confederation of the Diw Hasan or Beni Hasan, went down towards Mauritania. But the chronicles do not say why. In any case, having helped to drive the negroes back towards the river, supported by the Zanata Kunta who came from Tuat at the same time as the first of them, they reduced to vassalage the Sahāda of Upper Mauritania (Ijel and Zamzum) in the xvith century, Western Mauritania, Wadan and Tagant in the xviith and the Adrar and Lower Mauritania in the xvith century. Throughout the long period from the xvith century to the present day, we find the authority in the hands of a certain number of Udaya tribes: the Ulid Rug, the Mghātā Ulid Muluk, the Bra'lena, the Tārza and the Ulyd Yahya b. 'Umu'man. Other Beni Hasan also went south, but barely reached Mauritania. The Ulid Dilm have always remained in the desert zone and the Brābiṣi seem to have passed some years a little to the north of the Senegal before migrating to the region of Timbuktu.

f. The Maqṣil and the Sultanats of Morocco. From their first sojourn in the south of Morocco, these Maqṣil long retained the character of Makhen tribes; under the Sa'dian and Alawis, many of them supplied contingents to the gītā tribes. This status gave their migration southwards the appearance of a conquest in name of the Sultanats. This was no doubt the legal justification of the tribute which they exacted from the conquered Bedouins; it also explains why the rulers of Fas or Marrakesh sometimes claimed as theirs the territory of Mauritania, why they sent several expeditions there in the xviith and xviiith centuries, why they granted investiture to certain chiefs and lastly why the author of al-Harīf, after consulting several learned men, thought that the 'Hadd of Shindī' was mixed with the Maghrīb and not with the Sudān.

i. The Sahāda reaction. Whatever was the actual success of the Arab conquests in Mauritania, it was not effected without violent reaction on the part of the Sahāda. The poverty of the Tashmuḥa, the negro danger and the looseness of links between the various bodies of invaders facilitated the settlement of the early Arab invaders. But the tyranny of the Maqṣil towards the Berbers...
brought them in the xviiith century to such desperation that a general rising broke out in the form of an attempted restoration of the Almoravids led by Nâṣr al-Dîn, a marabout descendant of the Lémina. This individual, who lived in western Mauritania, first preached a holy war there against the negroes, being sure of re- uniting the various contingents against the traditional enemy. Then having given the troops sufficient training in a campaign which brought them across the river to plunder the left bank, he turned openly against the Arabs. This was the celebrated “War of Eldalah”, in the course of which the Arabs were held in check for thirty years; but in the end, getters within the Sanhaqis ranks destroyed their strength and in 1674 the defeat at Tin Yeflad doomed them to vassalage.

In much the same way in 1745 the Idebrehi Berbers of the Adrar had to bow before the Ma’dil and at the end of the xixth century we find them again rising against the Arab amir and assassinating him. Finally in the Tagant, the Sanhaqis Idrissi well led by their chief Muhammad Shein regained their independence at the end of the xvith century. They almost succeeded in seizing the Adrar in 1932, drove the Zanata Kunta out of the Tagant and extended their power to the Senegal, under the able rule of amirs who are still reigning and claim to be the descendants of the Almoravids.

2. The rule of the amirs. All over, from the xvith century, the political situation of the tribes became stabilised, and regular little nomad states seem to have been formed, usually under Arab chiefs. Thus we now find the dynasty of the Ulâd Ahmad b. Daman ruling among the Tierara with distinguished sovereigns like Ab Li Shuđara (1705-1727) who, supported by Sultan Mawâl ibn Ismail, delivered his tribe from Brâkânia domination, and especially Muhammad al-Jâlibb (1827-1860) whose long reign is marked by the first Moorish resistance to European penetration. Among the Iblekina also, the Ulâd Abîd Allah amirs played a preponderating role after the war of Babalh and their possessions extended from the Tagant to the Atlantic Ocean. Later, and particularly from the xixth century, their power declined, in spite of the brillant reign of Ahmadudda I (1848-1851), and their defeat in resistance to the advance of the French caused them to disappear from the political scene. In Adrar the Ulâd Ya’qub b. al-Idman also furnished great leaders: Ahmad ulid Muhammad (1871-1891) who was able to keep his turbulent subjects at peace with their neighbours and who tried to develop trans-Saharan commerce, and Ahmad ulid Sulîn Ahmad (1891-1899) who by his military successes earned the title of “amir of war”. Lastly in the person of Bakar ulid Ahmad, a descendant of Muhammad Shein, the Tagant produced the greatest Moorish ruler of the xixth century.

The rule of these amirs was continually beset with great difficulties, produced by their rivalries, the lack of discipline, rebellion and intrigues among their subjects, by the warlike raids of the Tuaregs and particularly by the efforts of Europeans to establish their rule on the Atlantic coast and on the banks of the river.

3. European rivalries on the coast of Mauritania. It was in the first half of the xixth century that the Portuguese visited the coast of Mauritania and the mouth of the Senegal for the first time. At the instigation of the Infante Henry the Navigator, expeditions followed which brought back slaves, gold and gums. After Joao Fernandez had gone to Wadjan in the eastern Adrar, where he spent some months among the Sanhaqis in 1446, a permanent settlement was founded in 1445 on the island of Arguin, which afforded excellent conditions of security. From there the Portuguese endeavoured to extend their power into the interior and to command the great caravan routes which led from the Sudan to Morocco; to them are attributed the fortresses, now in ruins, near Wadjan and at Arzugi. But if it is certain that for a short time they extended their relations as far as the capital of the negro empire of Mali on the Upper Niger, it seems that they did not own factories for any length of time except on the coast.

The trade of Arguin flourished for two centuries in the hands of the Portuguese, then of the Spaniards and it extended as far as Lower Mauritania through Portendik (corruption of “Post d’Addi” from the name of an emir of Trarza), a not very good roadstead where barrier was carried on. The French at a later date established themselves at the mouth of the Senegal (1920), the Dutch were in war with Spain and took Arguin in 1618, which the English took from them in 1665 and a struggle for influence began among these three nations which lasted for a century. Arguin and Portendik continued changed hands, while France developed her trade along the Senegal by building factories. Finally the Treaty of Vensailles (Sept. 3. 1793) recognised her exclusive sovereignty over the Atlantic coast from Cape Blanc to the mouth of the Salam. The wars at the beginning of the xixth century brought the English back there for a time, and it was only in 1817, three years after the treaty of Paris, that France definitely took possession of the country. Arguin and Portendik had in the meantime been almost completely ruined as a result of these vicissitudes.

4. The French conquest. Down to 1857 England retained the right to trade at Portendik, which allowed the Trarza chiefs and in particular Muhammad al-Jâlibb to play off against one another the two nations who seemed to threaten their independence, and thus to gain a footing on the left bank of the Senegal. The position of the Europeans with regard to the natives was, however, difficult and trade with them was permitted only on payment of heavy customs duties. It was only in 1854 with the appointment of Flandin as governor of Senegal that a more vigorous policy was introduced into Lower Mauritania. In four years he reduced Walo on the left bank to submission and drove the Moors out of it and forced the emirs of Trarza and Brâkânia to sign a treaty, which if it did not abolish the customs, at least recognised that France had a right of suzerainty over the peoples living near the river and guaranteed the freedom of trade there.

For nearly fifty years, these treaties were respected and the Moorish chiefs, too much occupied in maintaining peace among their subjects and in defending themselves from the intrigues of pre- tenders, no longer thought of coming into conflict with French troops; commercial agreements were made which extended as far as with the Iblekina of the Tagant and one treaty was even made with the emir of the Adrar. This period also saw a great deal of exploration of the interior, after
Mungo Park (1795–1796), Caillé (1825), Caillé (1843) and Panet (1850), Vincent, Ibu el-Mugidad, Bounel, Alium Sal, Mage, Felcrand, Aube, Soleillet, Quroga and Cervera, Douls, Soller, Fabert, Donnet, Blanchet, Gravel and Chadeau contributed to our knowledge of this country and prepared the way for its occupation.

In the last years of the sixteenth century the troubles of which Lower Mauritania was the centre finally had repercussions on the trading centres on the river which became daily more serious. The insecurity hampered commerce and in proportion as the memory of the vigorous policy of Faishherbe became obliterated, marauders ravaged the country down to the left bank of the river, right into the administered country. The conquest of Mauritania had to be planned in order to protect effectively the colony of Senegal and with this object an enterprise was made to use the influence of the marabouts, tired of a perpetual warfare, of which too often they bore the expense. The diplomatic action of M. Coppolani, Commissaire Général of the government since 1902, judiciously supported by police operations, brought about the occupation of the Tafza country in 1903, of the Brakna country in 1904 and of the Tàqant in 1905.

This rapid advance, however, was checked before the anti-French propaganda of a marabout of the Hasso, Mâ al-Ainâin, on Muhammad Fâqil, who after spending a long period in Upper Mauritania, had been settled for some years at Smara near Sagiat el-Hamara. His prestige as a magician, supported by the veneration shown him by the Moroccan soulsan, was not long in winning him the support of the greater number of the Moors tribes, and especially of those of the Adrâr, the emir of which had been brought up in his entourage. At his instigation, Coppolani was assassinated and a cousin of the Sultan Mawlâl Idris came to lead the djihâd in Mauritanian. A success gained by him at Nyanlan led to nothing, but on the return of a delegation of Moorish chiefs who had gone to seek help from the sovereignty of Morocco, a general offensive was begun against the French troops (1905). To put an end to an agitation which threatened to become dangerous, Colonel Gouraud conquered the Adrâr in 1909 and his victory was completed in 1910 by the death of Mâ al-Ainân and in 1912 by the capture of Tízit and jointing up with the troops of the Hasso. The conquest of Mauritania by the French was thus practically completed. The march of el-Heiba, son of Mâ al-Ainân, on Mârâkesb in 1912 revived some inclination to rebel among the Moors, but the destruction of Smara in 1913 checked this, and France now only had to secure the protection of her colony from raiders from the Sahara.

IV. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

The negroes are settled agriculturists who have their village—mainly in the Shamannah and the Gorgol and in the main they belong rather to Senegal than to Mauritania. The Moors have a few villages (the principal are Apar, Shangût, Wadan, Tijinaj, Tishît) with palm groves and a few farms in the Adrâr, the Tàqant and the Dhar. They are great nomads, who live under cone-shaped tents of camel-skin and follow the rainfall with their flocks. Those who wander in the zone of the steppes oscillate between the river and the desert, except the fàrza of western Mauritania, where, on account of the dryness of their country, move over a much greater area and sometimes even reach Tiris and Adrâr Suft. The people of the Adrâr go down as far as Tâqant, and on the north at one time were in contact with the Tekna of the south of Morocco around the Sagiat al-Hamara. Their supply of meat is very scanty and it is not an exaggeration when Pachari calls them "the most wretched of mankind".

Their groups have been much graded by the constant influx of Moroccans. Before French rule, the Hasan, pure Arabs, formed the noble and warrior class who protected the encampments and lived by cattle-rearing and trading. The Zouaoua and marabouts, generally Šâhâlâ or Zanâta Berbers, paid an annual sum called ghânfar to the Hasan for their security; they were likewise breeders of cattle, but also included among them merchants and men of letters who were regular travelling universities; the more or less open practice of sorcery served them as a means of defence against the exactions of the Hasan. The Zargu or tributaries (1902) of the Brakna country in 1904, of the Tâqant in 1905. The feudal dues which they paid to the Arabs (jumla) did not always exempt them from periodical payments to the marabouts nor from arbitrary sums levied upon them by one or the other. They were in part agriculturists. The Harâfin, freed slaves, formed tribes of serfs, usually better treated than the preceding. Finally the Hasan and the marabouts owned numerous slaves in which they did a busy trade. On the fringe of all these groups, the Mu'tâlima, the goutis (qâunan) and the Nmadi were respectively the workmen, poets and singers and hunters who supplied the encampments of eastern Mauritania with meat.

The barriers between these castes were in theory rigid. A certain number of marabouts, however, and even of Znâgâs succeeded in escaping from Arab tutelage, like the Idu'sâigh of the Tâqant, and devoted themselves to the adventurous life of the Nmadi hunter (gâmner) just as "penitent" Hasan sometimes adopted the pious life of the Zwaya (Tiyâb).

French administration has left this traditional organisation intact, only suppressing slavery; it has, however, checked the abuses of the Hasan by putting a stop almost everywhere to the payment of the horns and gharîs.

Economic Life. Mauritania has only one port, Port-Étienne, on the peninsula of Cape Blanc; it is, however, only a fishing centre. The course of the Senegal is used as far as Polder in the dry season, as far as Bakel in the winter months. No road has yet been made, but the important points are linked up by automobile or caravan services. The telephone is in use only in the south, but its place is taken by the wireless, which connects Mauritania with Dakar, Casablanca, Agadir, Bamako and Timbuktu.

The principal source of wealth of the country is stock-breeding: 51,000 cattle, 3,800 horses, 23,900 goats, 2,000,000 sheep, 2,000,000 goats and sheep, 66,000 asses. The abundant game (antelope, gazelle, ostriches, guinea fowl and bustards) supplies further food for the inhabitants. Among agricultural products, special mention may be made of the date-pains in the north (3,000 tons of date a year), along the river and in a few favoured valleys of
the plateaux, millet, rice, maize, wheat and barley. In the south gum is a traditional article of export (1,500–2,500 tons a year).

The natural resources of the country have hardly been investigated as yet. We may mention, however, the salt of the Sèkkhtat Ijel, which has for long supplied the caravans to the south; along the coast a few salt-panns are worked by the Moors. The annual export is 4,700 tons.

Industry is in a very rudimentary stage and confined almost entirely to the manufacture of leather goods which form the equipment of the camel-driver and the furniture of his tent. Fishing supplies the enclaves near the coast.

A certain number of caravans transport merchandise from the north to the south along the coast and through the Adrar and Tagant to the trading centres on the river and the Sudán. They take with them animals, gums, salt, dates, ostrich feathers, skins and leather, and bring back cloth, arms, powder, candles, sugar, tea, spices and cereals. Supply the markets of Targit, Simgit, Wadan and Tijjana. As a result of the insecurity in the desert there is no longer any regular trans-Saharan trade.

V. POLITICAL LIFE.

The negroes are ruled by their village headmen and chief of districts. The Moors are grouped into tribes under the authority of a shaikh assisted by a council of notables or Jemáa. Sometimes several tribes are combined in a hereditary amirate, the ruler of which surrounds himself with a regular court generally recruited from among the Znaga or Harratun. The shaikh or amir is practically all-powerful; only the right to judge in civil matters is not completely his; the kàdî exercises it. The amir further reserves to himself a kind of right to supervise the judgments through the intermediary of his private kàdî who forms a court of appeal.

The French administration has been superseded on this traditional organization. A Lieutenant-Governor, residing at St. Louis, on the right bank of the river, is the head of the colony and is assisted by a military commandant, an inspector of administrative affairs, a secretary for military and political affairs, a secretary for finance and a department of public works. The local administration carried out by adminstrators or officers is divided into eight districts (Trarza, Boutam, Gidilmaka, Aassala, Tagant, Adrar and Baie du Levant) and seventeen sub-divisions or administrative posts. It controls the native administrative and judicial organizations.

The Moors pay the Kurânic taxes (zakât and asbus) from which their ruling-camels and gums alone are exempt. The negroes pay a poll-tax and a tax on cattle. Indirect contributions are paid by the market, salt-panns, the carrying of arms, the exploitation of the woods and ferries. The Budget for Mauritania for 1935 was 14,623,000 francs.

VI. LANGUAGE.

The language spoken in Mauritania is Arabic, the tamoukal or language of the kebbt, the "whites". Some 5,000 Znaga in the south have retained a Berber dialect related to that of the dialects of southwestern Morocco. At Wadan and Tishit, the language amir (Azet) which is a form of Soninke is now spoken by only a few individuals. Lastly the negroes of the river have retained their own language.

VII. RELIGIOUS AND INTELLUCTUAL LIFE.

History does not tell us what was the religion of the Sanhadja before their conversion to Islam; we can only think that they had to some extent been influenced by a monothetic faith like Judaism or even Christianity. Their first contact with Islam probably dates from Ibn b. Nafi's expedition to the south of Morocco (681), but it is certain that their real conversion was much later and can hardly have been earlier than the energetic proselytising campaign of Abd Allah b. Yasîm. At the present day all the inhabitants of Mauritania are Muslims of the Málìiki rite, but many of them and more particularly the warriors and the Nmadí have only a very superficial acquaintance with their religion and take little interest in it; superstitions and sorcery further corrupt their Islam almost everywhere, revealing the primitive state of the people and negro influence. Islam is not really known and practised, except among the tribes of marabouts; amongst the latter, a mystical tradition and a fairly advanced culture have always made themselves felt, and for this reason they play in Moorish society the part of a kind of sacred body such as is found nowhere else in the Muslim world of the west. This is no doubt a remote consequence of the Almoravid movement, revived for a time in the war of Babalh, and of the peculiar situation of these Muslim nomads, who have here long been the advance-guard of the white race, face to face with the negro fez-hipsters of the Senegal and Sudán. Perhaps, like Renan and Pichon, we ought also to give credit to the influence of religious Christianity in the desert. In any case in thus assuming a kind of sacred character and surrounding it with a magic prestige, certain Berbers have had a regular revenge of their amour-propre on the pride of race of the Arab invaders and have opposed to their tyranny and brigandage a defensive weapon which has not been without effect.

The principal brotherhoods of Mauritania are those of the Tedjâniya and of the Kâdiriya: their influence extends into the lands of the negroes. The first are represented by the Ima Wali of the Trarza, the Tagant and of the Adrar, who claim to be shorfas and say they came from Tabelbala at the beginning of the sixth century. Since the early years of the sixth century they have been connected with the branch of the Tedjâniya in Fas. The second are much more numerous and influential; they have several branches: that of the Pekka ya dates from the sixth—seventh centuries and is represented from the bend of the Niger to the Tagant and Adrar by the tribe of the Kunta. About a century ago it received a fresh impulse in a new "path" and its autonomy in Lower Mauritania was secured by the great prestige of the Şahîb Sidiya, of the Ulud Bii (d. 1924). We may also mention the branch of the Kâdiriya, founded in the early years of the sixth century, which enjoyed particular fame some 20 years ago under the direction of Ma' al-A'inin and his brother the Şahîb Sa'd Bii. These two branches have lost their importance since the deaths of the famous individuals. Lastly the Kâdiriya are still represented by the some 600 members of the
Ghafīya brotherhood, whose practices are regarded as heretical by the other Muslims.

Shingiț, benefiting by its situation on the route of the caravans which came from western Morocco or Selīkhet Idrī down to the Haḍr or the Senegal was at one period an intellectual centre, the reputation of which extended to all the western Sahara and to the Sudān. We see this in the fact that it was able to give its name to all the Moorish tribes (Shingița) and to the territory in which they led their nomadic life and that the tradition of the country makes it one of the "seven holy cities" of Islam. It has now lost its old prestige. In the xviiith century the fame of the medersas of Timbuktu must have offered serious competition to it. At the present day Shingiț is seriously threatened by the sands of the Warān and its trade is much reduced. Aṭar is assuming an increasing importance; the insecurity and eccentic development of North Africa and the Sudān have led to the almost complete disappearance of the trans-Saharan trade by which it lived and in particular, as is natural in a land of nomads, it has been rather under tents and particularly in the marabout encampments of western Mauritania that intellectual culture has developed. Universities have been created there where the teaching of the Kur'ān, theology, law, grammar and logic still flourishes. Some of them have known outbursts of glory under famous teachers, who have sometimes created schools of mystic initiation, like those directed by the Shāhiṣh Sīdīya, Mā' al-'Ainīn or Sa'd Bū like that of the Aḥb Muḥammad Sālīm, which is a kind of university in the Tiris which produces almost all the jurists of Mauritania.

A whole original literature has been able to develop. Kur'ānic matter, Hadīth, law according to Sūdi Khalīl and his commentators, are its essential elements, with the doctrines of the Sūfis and their mysticism. But historical studies have also had and still have their eager followers, especially among the tribe of the Ulīd Dāman (Trārza). Lastly poetry is held in honour among all the tribes, warrior and marabout alike, and supports a whole caste of troubadours, the griots, who enjoy the favour of the courts of the emirs.


(MORADABAD (Murādābād), a district in the Rohilkhand division of the United Provinces of India and also the chief town in it. The district has an area of about 2,300 square miles and a population of 1,200,000 of whom over 420,000 are Muhammadans. Nothing is known of the early history of the district. In the Muhammadan period it was successively ruled by the Sultān of Delhi, from whom it was occasionally taken by the Sultān of Dehli and the Moghuls, the Rohillas, and the Nawābs of Oudh until it was ceded to the British in 1801. Murādābād is the principal town in the district; it is situated on the Delhi-Bareilly road and on the main line of the Oudh-Rohilkhand railway. It has a population of 75,000 of whom over half are Muslims. The town is a Moghul foundation of the second quarter of the xviiiith century. Its founder was Rustam Khān who also built the Dāmī Masjid, as an inscription testifies, in 1632. The town takes its name from Muḥammad Bākhsh, the ill-fated son of Shāh Dāmīn. It rapidly ousted Sambhal from its place as the chief town of the district. Its industries are flourishing (chiefly textiles and brass-work). It was a mint of the Moghul Emperors and also of Ahmad Shah Durrānī during his invasion of India in 1760. Sambhal is a very ancient site but has lost much of the importance it possessed in mediæval times. It has an old mosque, an interesting example of Pathan architecture which has even been claimed as a converted Hindu temple. It is said to have been built by Būsūr but it is undoubtedly earlier. Amroha is the great Muhammadan centre of the district, the majority of its population being Shaikhs and Sayyids. The chief saint of the Sayyids is Shafīr al-Dīn Shāh Wāfīyāt, a descendant of the tenth Imām, who came here about 1500. His tomb is still shown here. The Dāmī Masjid is a Hindu temple converted into a mosque in the reign of Akbar. It is much visited by pilgrims, mainly Hindus who seek relief from mental diseases through the power of Sadr al-Dīn, a former mu'allimulān of the mosque, whose virtues are still believed to be efficacious. There are over a hundred other mosques in the town.


MOREA is the usual name in mediæval and modern times for the peninsula of the Peloponnesus, which was regarded in ancient times as the 'exile of Greece. The name Morea is first found in 1171 A.D. in the subscription to fol. 143r of the Greek manuscript Brit. Mus. Add.
with the mulberry-tree. This is evident for example from Joh. Leunclavius (Annales Sultaniarm Othomandarum a Turciis sua lociscripti, 1596, p. 63): “Nomen ipsum (= Moreas) derivat Graeci numque ab arbore nobile qua tota regione scilicet arbore haec frequens est”.

In the mediaeval Muslim writers there is a confusion between Amoría (= Amorion in Phrygia and Lamoría = Moreas, Peloponnese. But Amuríada or Amoriáda, Amuríða, Amoriáda etc.) in Abu ‘l-Kásim Firdawsi can only be Amoría, which used to be described as the capital and “eye of the kingdom of the Kúmr. In the geographical table of Nasır al-dín al-Ṭúsí (middle of the xivth century) and of Luzzu Bag, Amoría should rather be identified with Amoría than with Moreas = Peloponnese (cf. P. Karolidis, in Wissenschaftliches Jahrbuch [Festgabe] der Universität Athen, iii. 1909, p. 288–297; A. Hantsiz, in Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Jahrbuch, ix., 1931, p. 65 sqq.) In the little map by the Arab Idrisi, of the year 1126 A.D., Belbínum = Peloponnese is given (i.e. the old classical name of the peninsula). On the other hand, we find Moría = Moreas = Peloponnese (i.e. its mediaeval and modern name) in the Arabic geographical table of the Paris MS. 2214, which is supposed to contain the cosmography of Ibn Sa’d of the year 1276 A.D. based for the most part on Idrisi (1154 A.D.; cf. K. Miller, Montre Arabe, i. 1926).

The Muslim peoples really only became acquainted with the Moreas in the xivth century A.D. Hellenistic culture was long extinct there and Christianity had become predominant. At the end of the fourth century (395 A.D.), Alaric had almost the whole of the Moreas waste and destroyed many towns and sanctuaries famed in ancient times. About two centuries later, c. 580, the Avars (a Turkish nomadic people) allied with Slav tribes are said to have invaded the Moreas and settled permanently. It should be expressly noted that it is only late and tendentious sources which tell us this. What scholars of the sixth century put forward as a historical fact, namely that an independent Avar or Avar-Slav kingdom, intractable to Byzantine or Greek Christian influence, existed in the western half of the Moreas for 218 years (580–807), must be relegated to the realms of fable (cf. E. Curtius, Polychronia, i., Gotha 1851, p. 86). It is certain, however, that considerable ethnological changes took place in the middle ages in the Moreas. In the xivth century in the reign of the Byzantine emperor Constantine V (741–775), if not earlier, numerous Slav tribes had pushed their way into the Moreas, which had been much depopulated from 746 by a terrible pestilence. This epidemic had also made great gaps in the population of Constantinople, which Constantine V is said to have endeavoured to fill with people from the Moreas; this imperial edict must have further contributed to reduce the Greek element in the peninsula. It may be assumed that the Slavs who at this time were settling mainly in Arcadia and Messenia, Elis and Laconia, sought and found new homes in the Moreas, which had been favoured by nature with a milder climate, not only as hostile robber hordes but also as peaceful colonists from the north.

According to Schafarik (Slavische Altertümer, German transl. by Wuttké, vol. ii., p. 192), the spread of the Slavs over the Moreas can be fixed
between 746 and 799. Nevertheless there can be no question of a complete slavisation of the country nor of a complete annihilation of the Greek element in it — as Fallmayer and his followers hold. The immigrant Slavs in Greece proper cannot have been very numerous. They were really nomad herdsmen and peasants, who settled here and there in the open country. Their level of culture must have been very low. On the other hand, the Hellenic element in Greece proper and no less in the Morea had always had control of the coasts and of the towns and fortresses in the interior, and it was moreover strong enough as regards culture to assert itself through the centuries and even to leave its mark on the foreign Slavs. The Slav settlers often caused trouble to the Byzantine government, so that the latter found themselves forced to send expeditions against them. For example in 753 A.D. the Athenian empress Irene ordered the Patriarch Staurakios to punish the Slav tribes of the Morea and the rest of the mainland of Greece. He appeared to have had numerous troops at his command and was able to carry out his task satisfactorily in a few months. He subdued the Slavs and forced them to pay an annual tribute to the imperial treasury. He returned to Constantinople with many prisoners and considerable booty and celebrated a triumph in the Hippodrome there.

After some time, the Slavs again rose in the Morea against Byzantine authority. They became a great danger and even threatened the towns on the coast. Supported by Saracens from Africa, the Slavs in 807 (805 by another reckoning) blockaded Patras from the land. The citizens of this important town defended themselves bravely in spite of a shortage of provisions, water and other supplies. When the help sought from the imperial strategos in Corinth did not come, the citizens of Patras made a vigorous sortie. They put the enemy to flight and drove them far from their town. Greek superstition seems to have ascribed the victory won at Patras over the Slav hordes to St. Andrew, the patron saint of the town. Nothing is recorded of the fate of the Saracen allies of the Slav besiegers of Patras. It is supposed that it was they who ravaged not only Patras but also Rhodes and other islands by the caliph's order in 807 A.D. With the defeat at Patras the strength of the Slavs of the Morea was broken. It is true that they again and again attempted to win their independence of the Byzantines by force of arms but without success. In 860 A.D., the doughty Byzantine general Theoktistos Bryoutos subdued all the Slav districts of the Morea as far as the mountains on the Tagetos and Parnon, where two rebel Slav tribes, the Ezerites and Melinges, had settled. These two tribes survived longest, sometimes as vassals of the Byzantines and sometimes as their open enemies. As early as the ninth century A.D. began the conversions of the Slavs to Christianity to which is due also their gradual hellenisation. The intermixture of the Greek Moreotics (Turk. Moralis) with the Slavs undoubtedly contributed considerably to the former process.

The Normans in Sicily in the following period disturbed not only the coasts of the mainland of Greece but also the interior of various Balkan provinces of the Byzantine empire. The Norman king Roger II in his campaign in 1146 against Greece sailed round the Morea and occupied with-out a blow — after successfully storming the strongly fortified Malvasia — Corinth, celebrated for and prosperous from its trade and industry. It was for this very king, that the Arab Idris composed his Nuzhat al-Majalis, finished about 1153 A.D. According to this work, Morea (Belonech), a flourishing and prosperous island of the Mediterranean, had 13 large and important towns, many citadels or fortified places and villages. Of the towns of the Morea Idris mentions the following among others: Corinth, "a large and populous city"; Batta (=: Patras), "situated on a promontory", has a "famous" church (of the apostle St. Andrew); Arcadia (=: the ancient Kythrassia), "a large and thickly populated town", whose harbour is visited by many ships; Irouda (=: Navarino) "a very commodious harbour"; Motonisia (=: Modon: q.v.), "a fortified town"; it was protected by a fort which commanded the sea; Coronia (=: Koroni), "a little town" with a citadel commanding the sea; el-Kalemounia (=: Lacedaemonia, the mediaeval Sparta), "a flourishing and important town, six miles from the sea"; Malasas (=: Monemassia, Malasia), "a town defended by a very high citadel commanding the sea, from which the island of Crete can be seen"; Argo (=: Argos), "a famous place and beautiful country"; Anaboli (=: Nauplia, Napoli de Romania). According to Idris, Morea (the extent of which he puts at 1,000 miles) is connected with the mainland "only by an isthmus, the length of which is six miles" (= Hexamilon, cf. below). Only small ships could be taken through the isthmus from the Gulf of Corinth into that of Saron; ships of larger size had to sail all round the peninsula of Morea. The confusion in Idris between the promontory of Malea and Talarnon is not peculiar in mediaeval works. Idris's statements are not based to any extent on his own observations (cf. Geographie d'Edrisi, transl. by A. Joubert, ii., 1840, p. 122 and also Th. Luc. Fc. Tafel, De provinciis regni byzantinii liber secundus: Europa, Tubingen 1845, p. 27 sqq.).

We get much and varied information supplementing the Arab geographer's account of the Morea from various 13th century sources, e.g. the Travels of Benjamin of Tudela (d. 1173) who starting from Saragossa visited the Greek east and other lands in order to become acquainted with the Jewish diaspora.

The conquest of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204 and the resulting division of the Byzantine empire, which had now collapsed, had a great influence on the future of the Morea. Boniface of Montferrat in 1204 founded the kingdom of Thessalonica in Macedonia which he took in exchange for Asia Minor allotted to him by treaty. By a comparatively slight effort he was able to conquer within a year a great part of the mainland of Greece as well as the Morea. Two knights, William of Champlitte, Count of Champagne, and Godfrey of Villehardouin the younger, may be regarded as the men who brought the Morea under Frankish rule. When William of Champlitte had to leave the Morea in 1209, Godfrey of Villehardouin continued the work of conquest alone and organised the Frankish administration of the country which was henceforth known as the principality of Achaea to Europeans. Soon after the Frankish occupation of the country, it was reorganised on western lines. But the feudal system did not find
its way into the Morea only after 1204. It had already existed in the country in the time of the

The Frankish rulers built new citadels and forts in the plains and on the mountains, most of which survived into the period of Turkish rule. A number of fiefs which were formed by the Franks in 1205 became after the middle of the 16th century hereditary possessions of the Ottomans.

It must also be pointed out that the Venetians after the Fourth Crusade had secured important trading centres and depots in the Morea. The Republic in this way acquired the province of Lacedaemonia, Kalabryta, Modon and Patras, and in the case of the last two seaports, some of the surrounding country including the possessions of a number of distinguished families of the Byzantine aristocracy. During this period, Venice succeeded in extending her territory and commercial influence and privileges further in the Morea and even in taking possession of the whole of it (cf below).

The fourth prince of Achaia (Morea), William of Villehardouin (1245—1278), the second son of the above-mentioned Godfrey, had vigorously completed the conquest of the country. In 1245 he forced Monembasia, which had so far remained independent in alliance with the Greek kings of Nicaea, to capitulate under certain conditions. The same ruler also conquered a number of Morean tribes who had shown themselves hostile to Frankish rule and who played a prominent part in later times when the Turks occupied the country. To keep in check the wild tribes of Zaconia and Laconia, William II of Villehardouin in 1249 built near the ancient Sparta, on a hill jutting out in front of the Taygetos, Mystira (Mystra), the fortress of the same name. A Frankish-Byzantine town soon grew up around this fortress which became a centre of art and classical studies. The town of Mystra was destined to be the capital of the later depots of the Morea, and even in the period of Turkish rule it did not completely lose its old importance.

Frankish rule in the Morea, which reached its zenith under William II, was destined to suffer a severe reverse within his reign. In October 1259 a fierce battle was fought between Castoria and Monastery (Pelagonia) at Longos Vorilla. In this battle fought the armies of the Despot of Epirus Michael Angelos and of the king of Nicaea and later Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus. As a result of treachery on the part of an illegitimate son of the despot Michael Angelos, the Seboktihor Johannes, the troops and allies of the former suffered a reverse. Even William II of Villehardouin, safe in flight only to be shortly afterwards enticed from his hiding-place and captured. He was not released till 1262, after taking the oath of vassalage to the Byzantine emperor and ceding him four important fortresses of the Morea: Mystra, Maina, Geraki and Monembasia, as well as a considerable part of Laconia. The Byzantines thus gained important bases in S. E. Morea from which they were able to reconquer the whole peninsula, which was all the more necessary as William II of Villehardouin only kept his pledge of fealty for a short time.

Relations between the Muslim peoples and the Morea now became closer. At the end of 1262 the Seboktihor Constantine, a step-brother of the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus, landed in the Morea at the head of a large army which consisted mainly of Macedonians and Turks. This step-brother of the Emperor came to the Morea as administrator of the Byzantine lands there and occupied all the citadels which William of Villehardouin had been forced to cede in order to secure his release.

The Byzantine governor took up his residence in Mystra. Soon afterwards open war broke out between the Franks and Byzantines. To strengthen the latter there landed at Monembasia in the spring of 1263 a new Turkish army corps of 5,000 (according to others, 3,000) mercenaries in the service of Michael VIII Palaeologus, led by two men named Malik and Shalik. They had an accurate record of the name and descent of these Turkish chiefs, who, so far as we know, were the first to appear in the Morea. They must have been either Saudjags, or Turks of other descent who had no shame about selling their services to Christian rulers. The Turkish mercenaries under Malik and Shalik contributed greatly to the successes which the Seboktihor Constantine gained over the Franks at the beginning of 1262. Along with Greeks, mainly from Zaconia and other provinces of the east, Slavs from the Morea, Dasmuls (of Greek-Frankish descent), the Turkish mercenaries attacked from Lacoenia Elis, which was the capital of the Frankish principality. The bands of Malik and Shalik then pressed into the highlands of Skorta. Here they ravaged their will. With the approval of the Seboktihor Constantine, they plundered the country, carried off and slaughtered the cattle. In these circumstances the Skortians were forced to pay homage to the Byzantine emperor and to operate with his army against the Franks. Constantine's army, composed of so many different racial stocks, occupied the market-town of Veliogosti (near Megalopolis) and burned it, without however being able to take its citadel; they then conquered Kalabrya and burned the famous Latin monastery of Isova. But soon afterwards they suffered a terrible defeat not far from Olympia.

In the spring of the year following (1264), the Seboktihor Constantine continued the war on the Franks. He had no success and also quarrelled with his Turkish allies, whose pay was six months in arrears. Malik and Shalik at once led him with their men for this reason and retreated undisturbed to the district of Kayaia. Constantine tried to win them over again but they went to William of Villehardouin who accepted their assistance. Thereupon Malik and Shalik with their followers went over to the camp of the, as they thought, generous Frankish leader in the conviction that the latter would keep his word. By the accession to the Franks of this Turkish force, the tide was turned in their favour. The Turkish chiefs who were inspired by an ardent desire to avenge themselves in battle on their false employers, now advised William II of Villehardouin's knights to meet the imperial Byzantine army on the frontiers of Messenia and Arcadia. While the Frankish-Turkish army was going through the pass of Makryplagi (between Megalopolis and Kalamata, i.e. the line of the modern railway), they were attacked by an ambush of the Byzantine army, whose leader was no longer the Seboktihor Constantine but the strategos Alexius Phylus, Malvemos and Alexius Kabellaris. Twice the vanguard of the Frankish-Turkish force led by Anselm de Toucy had to give way before the numerous Byzantines who occupied the heights of the pass of Makryplagi, but finally they won the
hotly contested summit of the pass, from which they ousted the enemy. The Turks under Malik and Shalik followed up and completed the victory. The leaders of the army so disastrously defeated sought refuge in the neighbouring caves of Garilik where they were be-seiged by the Turks. The latter took the caves and led their occupants prisoners to William II of Villehardouin. The latter thereupon ordered the Turks to raid and plunder the districts of Morea previously occupied by the Byzantines, notably the districts of Zacoia, Helos, Vatika and Monemvasia.

After the battle in the Makryplagi pass came the news that Skoritians had again taken up arms against the Franks and stormed the fortress of Bachelet (Araklonov) and Karytaina. As the valiant Godfrey Brunieres, Baron of Karytaina, who had always been able to keep the turbulent Skoritians in check, was no longer in the Morea, William II of Villehardouin ordered the Turkish leader Malik and his men to go to Skorta to put down the rising. Terified by the ravages and cruelties of the Turkic mercenaries, the surviving Skoritians submitted to the Prince of the Morea and begged for mercy which was granted them.

The Chronicle of the Morea, which has survived in four languages (Greek, French, Catalan and Italian), is the only source which tells us of the activities of the Turkish mercenaries in the Morea (1262–1265). The same Chronicle adds that the Turks in 1265 sought permission to leave the Morea and to be allowed to return to their Asiatic home. Malik took his leave in the friendliest fashion from the Prince of the Morea and began his journey home. The Chronicle however specially mentions that individual Turks preferred to settle in the Morea. They were baptised and married morean women. About the first half of the sixteenth century, there were still descendants of Malik's followers there, baptised Turks settled in Ellis. It is natural to think that the modern villages in N.W. Morea of Malikti (Demos Vuprasion) and Turkochori (= village of the Turks", Demos Tritias) owe their names to the Turkish settlers in the time of William II of Villehardouin. This prince gave two of Malik's followers who remained in the Morea the rank of knighthood and even granted them fiefs. According to the Catalan version of the Chronicle of the Morea, Malik himself married a noble Frankish lady, a widow, through the intermedialy of William II of Villehardouin. It is a historical fact that Turkish-Moreote relations date from the second half of the sixteenth century. After the death of William II in 1278 we find a reference to estates which this prince had given to his Turkish allies and which were occupied about 1280 by the soldiers of Galerano d'Ivry, who acted for a time as governon of the Morea for Charles of Naples and Sicily. Charles I and his immediate successors in rule over the Morea had not infrequently Turkish warriors in their service. From the beginning of the sixteenth century it not infrequently happened that Muhammadan pirates from Asia Minor raided and plundered the coastslands of the Morea. Sometimes they had allies of the Christian faith, notably Catalans.

About the middle of the sixteenth century, an important change took place in the administration of the Byzantine possessions in the Morea. The Emperor Johannes Kantakuzenos in 1349 created an appanage for his second son out of these lands which he called the despote of Mystra and which lasted till the Ottoman conquest (1349–1380). In this period fell the rule of the first despots of Mystra, Manuel Kantakuzenos, the second son of the Emperor. He assisted the Morea to ward off the Turkish attacks, which had reduced the once flourishing Corinth and the country round to such misery that the Corinthians in 1358 were forced to send an urgent appeal for assistance to their sovereign, the titular Emperor of Constantinople and prince of Achaia, Robert II. The latter gave a ready ear to their appeal. On April 23, 1358, he gave the Florentine Grand Seneschal Niccolo Acciajoli and his descendants the extensive district of Corinth as a hereditary barony. The princely family of the Acciajoli survived in the Morea and on the mainland of Greece for two centuries, during which they had much to do with Muslim peoples. A series of circumstances, including the irruptions of the Turks as early as the middle of the sixteenth century and the advance of the Ottomans, whose strength was steadily increasing, brought to an end the Albanian rule in Greece. The first despots of Mystra, Manuel Kantakuzenos, had them settled in various desert regions where they became distinguished as warriors, agriculturists and as huntsmen. Thus we find them in Arcadia and Lacoia where they seem to have come in large numbers. Later another 10,000 Albanian families were peacefully settled by another despots of Mystra, namely Theodoros Palaeologos (1384–1407), son of the Byzantine Emperor John V. According to reliable sources, these 10,000 families left Thessaly and Acarnania with their cattle and goods and chattels on account of the Turkish raids and for other reasons and reached the isthmus. There they pitched their camp and sent messengers to Theodore I with the request that they might be allowed to settle in his Morean territory. Theodore I acceded to their request and allowed them to spread over a considerable portion of the Morea. The story of G. Bosio (Dell' Istorica della Sacra Religione et illustrissima Militia di F. Gio. Giero- seliotiano, vol. ii, Rome 1594, p. 126–129) to the effect that the Turks had occupied Patras by 1378 and conquered the Morea shortly before must be relegated to the realm of fable. About this time, there were again great changes in the Morea. The Company of Navarre, which in 1380 had entered the service of the titular Emperor Jacob de Baux of Constantinople and prince of Achaia and were seeking their fortune on Greek soil, became after the death of the Emperor in Tarso in 1383 absolute masters of a great part of the Morea. In 1386 the Company made Captain Pierre de St. Exupery ( Bordel of S. Superan) their leader. The latter was able to extend his power and influence in the Morea by inciting the Turks and also the Greek archontes against Theodore I. During the period 1396–1402 he even bore the title of hereditary prince of Achaia (which was given him instead of money by king Ladislaus of Naples). Sometime before, a vigorous and enterprising Florentine, Nerio I Acciajoli (Sept. 29, 1394), had been playing an important part on the mainland of Greece. This man, a nephew of the Niccolo I Acciajoli, already mentioned, had acquired considerable territory in the Morea, partly by inheritance and partly by purchase. Shortly before his death he attained the height of his glory when he was appointed by king
Ladislaus of Naples as hereditary Duke of Athens and the lands belonging to it. In 1389 the Venetians occupied the important fortress of Nauplion and set about the conquest of Argos. The despot of Mystra, Theodoros I Palaeologus, the son-in-law of Nerio I Acciajol, at his father-in-law's instigation anticipated the Venetians and occupied Argos. As a result, hostilities broke out among the Christian states, which could end only to the advantage of the Turks. The despot of Mystra replied to the demands of Venice to give up Argos by saying he could only do so with the Sultan's approval. Later the Venetians joined up with the Navarrese. Through treachery Boro of S. Superan succeeded in taking Nerio I Acciajol prisoner on Sept. 10, 1389. The latter remained for nearly a year in the hands of the leader of the Navarrese but in the end obtained his freedom.

An epoch-making event was the great battle on the field of the blackbird (June 13, 1389) at Pristina, which decided Turkish rule for centuries in the Balkans. A Turkish army appeared in the Morea at the end of 1392 under Ewenos Beg in order to aid, at their request, the Navarrese against the despot of Mystra. The Turks thereupon occupied a number of strongholds in the peninsula. Nerio I Acciajol, who had been appointed governor of the Morea, now pledged himself to pay tribute to Sultan Bayazid and to be his vassal. After the death of Nerio I Acciajol, a fatal quarrel broke out between his son-in-law Theodore I of Mystra and Charles Tocco, during which the Turks won important successes on the mainland of Greece. The fear of the danger from the Turk—probably induced Charles Tocco and Theodore I—to make up their quarrel, after long negotiations with the Greek national party in Athens, who hated the Latins. Turkish forces under the Pasha Timurtash entered Attica from Thessaly. At the end of 1394 or in the first seven weeks of 1395, the Venetians occupied Athens including the Acropolis, after driving back the Turkish besiegers. Theodoros prepared to advance against the Turks on the isthmus. The latter, however, defeated on Sept. 28, 1396 at Nicopolis the flower of the chivalry of Hungary, Germany, and France and thus laid the foundations for their dominion over the lands below the Danube. Bayazid thereupon decided to attack the remnants of the Byzantine empire as well as the little principalities of the mainland of Greece. He therefore sent his generals Vaqib, Pasha of Rumelia, and the already mentioned Ewenos Beg with an army of 50,000 men to cross the isthmus again. Vaqib occupied Argos; Ewenos Beg at the same time fell upon the Venetian possessions in Messenia. The prince of Achaea, Boro of S. Superan, and Theodoros I of Mystra found themselves forced as a result of the Turkish successes to pay tribute to the Porte. laden with incautious booty the armies of Vaqib Pasha and Ewenos Beg returned across the isthmus and in 1397 even occupied Athens for a brief period. In addition to Greek sources, Turkish writers record that the "city of the wise", as Athens is frequently called in Muslim works, was taken by Sultan Bayazid's men (cf. J. II. Mordtmann, in Byzant. Vorzeit. Fachb. 11, 1923, 146 sqq.). As a result of his troubles, especially the Turkish raids, Theodoros I of Mystra became utterly tired of his position. He therefore resolved to sell his towns and castles to the knights of St. John of Rhodes, who after negotiations readily purchased Corinth, Kalabryta and Mystra in the years 1400—1402. But they could not establish themselves permanently in the Morea, for the Greek national party in the country, especially in Mystra, rebelled against the sale, which the Sultan, the suzerain of Theodoros of Mystra, also declined to recognize. Theodoros therefore cancelled the sale and compensated the knights partly in money and partly by ceding the county of Salona and the barony of Zituni. Theodoros I had been able to take these lands from the Ottomans after their defeat at Angora in 1402.

Sultan Sulaiman I (1403—1411) abandoned any claim to suzerainty over the Morea. At this time the influence and power of the Venetian colonies in the Morea were increasing. In 1407 the Venetians occupied Lepanto. In the following year, they seized Patras and the country round it and from these two strongholds which lay opposite one another, the so-called little Dardanelles, they were able to keep in check the Turkish pirates who made the Gulf of Corinth unsafe. At an earlier date, the Albanian family of Spata had settled in Lepanto and had occasionally made common cause with the Turks. Patras at this time was ruled by the archbishop Stephan Zaccaria in name of the Pope. As he suffered a great deal from the Turks, he pledged the town and the country round it with the Venetian power together with the support of Astros in Zaccoia. They restored the fortifications of Nauplia and other strongholds in their possession. The Republic of St. Mark in 1396 and 1411 concluded treaties with Sultan Sulaiman I, by virtue of which they secured their colonies in the Morea and the East generally. But in the reign of Murad II (1421—1451) danger again threatened from the Turks. The Venetians were however able to take the necessary measures for the defence of their possessions in the Morea. In the districts of Nauplia and Argos as well as in their flourishing Messenian colonies they settled numerous Albanians who loved fighting. In Corinth and Attica also the Albanians were welcomed by the Acciajol. The Albanian element was therefore very strongly represented in the Morea in the first half of the xv century; later they spread to the islands around the Morea. In the wars of the Greeks and Venetians against the Ottomans, the Albanians frequently distinguished themselves; on the other hand, their morals left much to be desired. To this day we still can find descendants of these Albanian colonists in the Morea and in the adjoining territories.

After the battle of Angora, at the time when Frankish power in the Morea was declining, the Byzantines vigorously resumed their efforts to reconquer the whole peninsula. Theodoros I of Mystra had previously wanted, with Venetian support, to erect on the isthmus a great bulwark against the Turks which would make access to the Morea impossible for them. Manuel II Palaeologus again took up Theodore's plan and began to put it into execution with vigour. Not far from Corinth on the isthmus, which was usually called "Tinamlim" in the middle ages, he built a wall 24 miles long from sea to sea with castles at each end and in the middle and no less than 155 strong towers besides deep ditches. The building material was taken from older walls and defences. In the course of 25 days (April 8—May 3, 1415), i.e. at a most rapid rate, the great wall was completed which, like the
isthmus itself, was called "Hexamilion"; the greatest hopes were built upon it, but they soon proved deceitful. The Turks usually called the wall "Gez-
mekiar. In 1416. Manuel II left the Morea after reimposing his suzerainty upon the prince of Achaea Centurione II Zacarria and humbling several Greek archons of whom he carried off with him to Constantinople.

The peaceful relations which had existed between the Byzantine and the Ottomans under Sultan I and Bayazid suddenly ceased when Murad II ascended the throne. In 1423 he ordered the celebrated Pasha Turakhan to clear up the small states. With an army of 25,000 men, which was joined by the Duke of Attica Antonio I as the Sultan's vassal, Turakhan set out from Thessaly to obey his master's orders. The celebrated Hexamilion wall proved an insufficient bulwark against the onslaught of the Janissaries. Turakhan had the most of it destroyed and advanced into the Morea. The despot Theodoros II of Mystra could scarcely have checked the Ottoman flood which swept into his land, plundering and murdering the Lacedaemonians (on the Makrylagi pass) and other Byzantine and Latin towns fell into Turakhan's hands. But he suffered one serious reverse. The Moreots caught a portion of his army in the pass of Lonsari, where they were victorious and took much booty or, to be more accurate, recaptured their own property. In the Arcadian town of Tavia (the modern Davia, on the road from Tribolita to Wytina), the Albanians assembled and chose one of themselves as their leader and decided to attack Turakhan on his way back from the south. In the battle that followed, the Albanians did not stand their ground but fled. Turakhan pursued them and slew many besides taking some 500 prisoners. These he put to death and, according to the Turkish practice, built towers of their skulls. Heavily laden with plunder, Turakhan returned soon afterwards across the isthmus to Thessaly. He had however in 1423 not yet completed Murad's order to subdue the Christian states of the Morea.

Soon after the withdrawal of the Ottomans, Manuel II Palaeologus besought Murad II for peace and concluded a treaty with him, by which the despot of Mystra was to pay an annual tribute of 100,000 hyperpyra to the Sultan and further to declare his readiness to give up the Hexamilion wall. Venice, whose colonies in the Morea had suffered much from Turakhan's raid in 1423 and were continually troubled by Muslim pirates, recommended all the Christian powers interested to form a united front. This appeal for unity, however, fell on deaf ears. The various Christian rulers of the Morea quarrelled among themselves in spite of the critical times and even took up arms against one another. The Albanian inhabitants followed their own inclinations entirely and even began separatist movements of a political nature.

It is remarkable that the Greek political consciousness was strengthened in the Morea in this period of political confusion. Mystra became the centre of a kind of renaissance and a centre of learning and study of classical antiquity. In this period there appeared in the Morea a great scholar who was a philosopher of the Platonic school and also a fervent patriot of radical tendencies in social and political reforms. He was Georgios Gemistsos or as he called himself "Plethon". His teaching was of a mystical nature. It was directed against Christi-
the Turks of the Thessalian plain. An Albanian clan settled in Phthiotis, whose autonomy had been recognised by the Sultān, joined the victorious Palaeologoi. The latter also occupied the little town of Witrintra (on the Gulf of Corinth) which the Turks had ceded to the Venetians. He installed a chief of the Pindus Wallachians who lived in Fanar (at the foot of the Ithome mountains).

The battle of Barna (Nov. 10, 1444) brought a change in the Balkans which was fateful also for the Morea. The Turks reinforced once again turned their attention to the south. Nero II Accajoli of Athens found favour with Murad II after most humbly promising to be his vassal and to pay the usual tribute. In order to save their colonies in the Morea, the Venetians also made a treaty of peace with the Turks soon after the battle of Barna. It thus came about that the Palaeologoi were left to face the Turkish onslaught quite isolated, a danger which they apparently did not clearly realise. After Nero II Accajoli had again recognised Turkish suzerainty, Constantine Palaeologos with a large force invaded Attica and besieged Athens. The consequence was that Nero II Accajoli turned for assistance to Murad II. The latter demanded that Constantine should evacuate not only Attica but also all the Turkish territory which Constantine had seized in the course of 1444 on the mainland of Greece and in southern Thessaly. Constantine replied to Murad II through his ambassadors that he would keep the lands he had won. Murad II was furious at this manly attitude of Constantine II. Incited by Nero II and Turakhān, the Sultān resolved on a campaign into the Morea. By his command powerful Turkish forces were assembled in 1446 at Serres in Macedonia from Europe and Asia. Constantine Palaeologos and his brother Thomas also raised a very large army for that time which was assembled on the isthmus. In the winter of 1446, Sultān Murad II led his army from Macedonia to the isthmus, without meeting opposition. He encamped at Mingae (the modern Marzē) and began to get his artillery and other arms ready. On his able picked staff was the experienced old Turakhān who, as already mentioned, had been twice in the Morea and therefore knew the country and the people. According to the historian Chalcocypides (ed. Darke, ii. 114), Sultān Murad's camp on the isthmus was the best organised that had ever been known. A bloody battle developed for the gateway to the Morea. The Turks with their artillery bombarded the Hexamion wall for days. A Serbian Janissary succeeded in leaping over the wall under the eyes of the Sultān and others followed him. The defenders so far as they were not killed by the Janissaries took to flight in a panic. The wall was thus in the hands of the Turks, who entered the Morea either through the gates or through the breaches their guns had made. In the Chronicle of Georgios Phrantzes the date of the capture of the Hexamion wall, the "last bulwark of liberty in Greece", is given as Dec. 10, 1446. The Chronicle of Ioannīnus Catanaeus gives Dec. 14, 1446, a date which has been accepted as correct by most modern historians.

The reports of the Palaeologoi to pursue the Palaeologoi with 1,000 men and he himself with his army marched along the south coast of the Gulf of Corinth towards Patras. He burned the lower town, laid waste the country as far as Cleonaea and then turned eastwards to Corinth. In the meanwhile Turakhān had returned from his pursuit of the Palaeologoi with much booty and many prisoners. The Palaeologoi now began to negotiate for peace with the Sultān. They declared themselves ready to cede the lands in Greece proper and in Thessaly which they had acquired in 1444 and to pay an annual tribute. On these conditions the Sultān left them in possession of their lands in the Morea. The Emperor John VIII Palaeologos died on Oct. 3, 1448, and on Jan. 6, 1449 his brother Constantine, the despot of the Morea, was solemnly hailed as Byzantine Emperor in the Metropolis church in Mystra. Of course he ascended the throne with the permission of Murad II, whose tributary he was. An event of importance in the history of the world soon afterwards took place on the Bosporus. On May 29, 1453, Constantinople was taken by the Turks; the valiant Constantine died defending the city and thus the line of Byzantine emperors came to an end. When his brothers Thomas and Demetrius heard of the fall of Constantinople they sent envoys to Muhammad II asking to be allowed to retain their lands in the Morea, on payment of the usual tribute. After many humiliations, their request was granted them. The remainder of the period of Palaeologoi rule was a brief one and their authority only nominal. In 1453 50,000 Albanians in the Morea rebelled against the Palaeologoi. In July 1454 Venice sent Vettore Capello to the Morea, to settle certain business of the republic and at the same time to make peace between the Palaeologoi and the Albanians. But their effort failed. In the meantime Muhammad II had ordered Turakhān's second son Omar to intervene in the Morea on behalf of the Palaeologoi (end of 1453). He succeeded in putting down the Albanians. The Palaeologoi were now able to enjoy their lands as vassals of the Sultān. For a few years they paid their tribute regularly, then they refused to do so with various excuses. At the same time they endeavoured to form alliances with western rulers against the Turks, a thing to which the Sultān could not remain indifferent.

The rule of the Palaeologoi was gradually approaching its end. The west scarcely troubled itself about the brothers of the last Byzantine emperor, who were not united and yet had to gather their last forces against the Turks. When a fleet belonging to the Pope Callixtus III appeared in the Aegean, Thomas Palaeologos took courage and announced his refusal of tribute to Muhammad II. Already the latter had received no tribute from the Palaeologoi for the past three years in spite of repeated warnings. He therefore thought it was time to settle matters himself in the Morea and to teach his rebellious vassals a lesson. In the middle of May 1458, Muhammad II came to the Morea with a large army, laid siege to Taras, a village in two parts, N.W. of Nemea and N.E. of the Lake of Inion, and forced it to capitulate. The citadel of Rupeli in Arcadia, to which many Greeks had fled with their women and children, surrendered after two days' stubborn defence. Muhammad II turned from Arcadia to N.W. Morea. Patras, the headquarters of Thomas Palaeologus, was abandoned.
by its citizens. The garrison left in its citadel did not dare to offer resistance. The Sulţan treated the town of Patras very generously. By July 1458 Muḥammad II had reached Corinth after taking Bostâza (Aegaeon) on the way. On Aug. 6, 1458, its commanders left the citadel to negotiate its surrender with the Sulţan. The loss of Corinth to the Turks seriously alarmed the Palaeologoi. The negotiations for peace, which were now begun, were conducted by Mathaios Asasís. The Sulţan then made peace with the despots of Morea but the price was a high one. In the beginning of the autumn of 1458, Muḥammad II left the Morea to return to the north via Athens, which shortly before had passed into his hands. The sources do not agree regarding his activity in the Morea in this year. As a rule, Muḥammad’s campaign in the Morea in 1458 is regarded, by modern historians also, as one of destruction. It is true, he was generous to the people of Patras and left the Corinthians unharmed after taking their city. He carried off however a large number of Christians to Constantinople and its neighbourhood. These settled there as artisans and peasants and produced the productive element in the capital of the Ottoman empire.

In the year 1458 Muḥammad II for administrative purposes combined his possessions in the Morea with Thessaly and placed the newly constituted province under the governorship of Turâkhan’s son ‘Omar. The Sulţan had hardly left the country when the Palaeologoi again began to stir up trouble. Muḥammad therefore deprived ‘Omar of his office in Thessaly and the Morea and decided to go in person to the Morea again in order to be done with the Palaeologoi once and for all and make the whole peninsula a Turkish province. Demetrius Palaeologos was not the man who could defend and save Mystra. He did shut himself up in the citadel with the intention of defending it, but very soon surrendered it to the Turks. Demetrius after many adventures died as the monk Dorotheos in Adrianople in 1470 (cf. Th. Spandugino, I Commentari di... de l’Origine de principe Turchi, Florence 1551, p. 43 sq.). After disposing of Demetrius, the Sulţan turned his attention to his brother Thomas. After the Turks had occupied Mystra he had not dared to do anything to defend his lands. He was rather seeking to leave a way open to escape from the Morea, if necessary. One town after the other fell almost without resistance into the hands of the Ottomans. Thomas Palaeologos embarked with his family at Porto Longo (at Navarino) in Corfu, which he reached on July 28, 1459 but went on 3 months later to Rome where he died on May 12, 1459. After the disappearance of his chief opponent, Muḥammad II continued his victorious march from Messenia to Northern Morea. He left the Morea towards the end of summer 1460. The plan which he had decided on when he entered the Morea, was practically carried through. Except for a few places, the peninsula was now Turkish territory. Zaganos Pasha was installed as governor of the Morea by the Sulţan and entrusted with the reorganisation of the peninsula, which had become much depopulated and was a great deal poorer economically. In 1458 and again in 1460 Muḥammad II combined the Morea with Thessaly for administrative purposes. This union was later dissolved. As early as the xvth century we already find the Morea a sazda by itself with 109 ziamets and 342 timar. Down to about 1570, the residence of the governor was by turns in Corinth, Lendari or Mystra, then in Nauplion and in 1760–1821 in Tropoïdha (cf. below). The division of the country under Turkish rule, usual from the middle of the xvith century, into 22 or 25 provinces or beyliks is partly suggested by nature and partly a survival of the older Byzantine organisation.

There is no doubt that the Turks introduced their own feudal system after their occupation of the Morea. The Turkish-Muslim element in the country was thus able to expand. Even during the first period of Turkish rule (1458–1687), other factors contributed to this, like the immigration into the Morea of Muslims from other parts of the Ottoman empire, the conversion of Christian Moreotes to Islam, the carrying off of Christian women into Turkish harems, etc. While in the north of the Balkan Peninsula and in Asia Minor, countless Christians had adopted Islam either voluntarily or under compulsion, the Christian element in the Morea at the time of the Turkish conquest was morally strong enough to remain in the faith faithful to the Christian religion. The relatively few Moreotes became Muslims, and these were principally Albanians, who always adopted Islam more readily (cf. thereon: C. Jireleék, Studien zur Geschichte und Geographic Albaniens im Mittelalter, Budapest 1916). As in Asia Minor, Bosnia, Crete etc., so in the Morea also members of the nobility and middle classes, especially those of Frankish origin, had adopted Islam in order to retain possession of their estates. There were also in the Morea crypto-Christians, as well as people whose Islam was very superficial. These were usually called waqfât (impure) in the Morea. These superficial Muslims, who continued to retain much that related to Christian worship, lived mainly in what is now the province of Olympia and were almost all exterminated during the Greek War of Liberation (cf. the articles by Photios Chrysanthopoulos-Photakos in the Athens periodical Εθνικός, vol. ii., 1886, p. 1). The Bardiniots were also for the most part superficially Muslims. As to the survival of the Greek Moreote element, there are theories current in modern literature which can hardly be right. It is said for example that Sulţan Muḥammad II’s ordinance regulating the relations of the Christian subjects to the Ottoman empire benefited also the Christian Moreotes. But it is wrong to credit Muḥammad II with any such ordinance (cf. Fr. Giese, in I. E., xix., 1931, p. 264 sq.). It is however a historical fact that the Greek Orthodox Church contributed a great deal to maintain the Christian element in the Morea as in the East generally. The Christian clergy of the Morea were frequently able to maintain a privileged attitude towards the Turkish officials and to this further the interests of their co-religionists. The Christian Moreotes were also often cleverly able to avoid having their children taken by the Turks for the Janissaries. The Christians of the Morea held this, the “blood tax”, to be the greatest degradation they suffered under the Turkish yoke and a dreadful disgrace to their race. After the death of Sulţan Sulaimân the Magnificent (1566), the lot of the Christian Moreotes gradually became worse. Ownerless lands were confiscated by the Sulţan and given to his soldiers or allotted to the mosques as waqf’s or given to private individuals as gifts. During the
long period of Turkish rule in the Morea, the largest and best part of the land was in Turkish hands. As a rule, Christians were not allowed to own large estates. The peasants had to pay over annually the fifth of the produce of the land and pay all kinds of annual taxes, were never sure of their property, nor even of their wives and children, and suffered unspeakably in every way from arbitrary Turkish rule.

In view of the abuses of the Turkish authorities, the Christian Morcote preferred to abandon the fertile regions and retire to barren lands and into the mountains, where he could breathe more freely and more easily escape the despotism of his rulers and shape his course of life a little more pleasantly. We thus find that within the period 1360-1521 the mountains of the Morea were predominantly inhabited by Christians. Of the factors which contributed to the survival of Greek culture in the Morea during Turkish rule special stress must be laid on the political concessions which were made to them by the Ottomans. These lay mainly in the freedom to govern their own communities. Greek local government, as we find it during Turkish rule, is said to have been a continuation of old Greek institutions. In the period from 1715 to 1821, if not earlier, the freedom of the Greek community was not infrequently limited by the Turkish authorities. They interfered indirectly in the appointment of local officials and made propaganda for their favourites. It even happened that the Köşjabashe, through the influence of the Turks, were not only appointed for a number of years, but were also able to hand down their offices to children and granddaughters. Undoubtedly, those Morcotes were better off who lived in Turkish villages which were allotted to the sacred places of Islam or to members of the Ottoman imperial family. The town of Dimitzana in Gortynia for example was originally a waál of Mecca under the protection of the Sultan's mother.

The peace between their Turkish rulers and Christians could only be external. In the Morea also there were the so-called ‘Klefs’ who would not submit to the existing government and took up arms against it. Against them the Turks used the Armatuli force, a gendarmerie of Christians organised on military lines. In the period from 1715-1521 the Turks for the security of the country built watchhouses (derbent) in which a garrison was stationed to watch those who passed, especially at the passes. The Derbenekia (kaúrk derbent) between Corinth and Argos and the Derbenia of Lomati, the passes between Argiria and Messenia (Makriplagi; cf. above) were all very important. The Mainotes in their wild mountains felt little of the Turkish yoke which weighed heavily on the rest of the Morea. The Mainote tribes who were distinguished for their valour, were from 1460 to 1821 in constant rebellion against every foreign power. The Porte found itself forced to recognise officially the independence of Maima, in return for which the Mainotes were to pay tribute, but did not always do so. Although the Christians in the Morea were exempt from military service, the warlike spirit which they had so often displayed in the Frankish period continued to survive. An eloquent testimony to their love of freedom was the fact that they continually took up arms against their Turkish oppressors, sometimes alone, sometimes with allies.

For a long period after the year 1460, when Sultan Muhammad II had made the greater part of the Morea a province of his empire, this land became the scene of desperate fighting between Turks and Venetians, in which the latter had the majority of the Christian population on their side. The great champion of the Christians, Skanderbeg [q.v.], the leader of the Venetian mercenaries, died in 1468. Two years later, Turkish rule over Euboea was firmly established and they could record further successes in the Morea.

In the spring of 1499 a new war between Venice and Turkey broke out. On Aug. 29-30, 1499, Lepanto had to surrender to the Turks. In 1500 Sultan Bayezid II ordered Yağık Paşa to blockade Modon with his fleet, while he himself set out by land from Constantinople with a well-equipped army for the Morea. On Aug. 9, 1500 (according to Hâджî Khalîfa; on 14th Muḥarram 916), Modon [q.v.] fell after a long siege in the presence of the Sultan. Bayezid II turned the cathedrals at Modon and Koron into mosques and offered up thanks in them and gave these towns to Mecca as waâds. He then paid attention to the defence of the newly acquired towns and to the repopulation of Modon. In 1502-1503 Venice concluded a treaty of peace with Turkey in which she surrendered her Messenian colonies and also Maima, which had in the meanwhile been taken by a son of Krokodilos Kladas in name of the Republic. In 1532 the Morea became the scene of notable battles. The emperor Charles V had decided to intervene in the Morea. A considerable fleet assembled in Messina in June 1532. The Pope and the Knights of St. John, the Genoese and the Sicilians also showed a readiness to join in the expedition, the leader of which was Andrea Andreu (Turkish: Andreviâus). After repeated and costly attacks, the allies succeeded in taking a considerable part of the lower town of Koron. The Turks who had retired into the citadel of Koron were forced to capitulate. From Koron Andrea Doria turned his attention to Patras, which also capitulated. He then returned with rich booty. Sulaimân I, who was now on the throne, gave the sandjak of the Morea to Muḥammad Beg, a son of Yağık Paşa and commissioned him to reconquer the fortresses taken by Andrea Doria. Sulaimân I declared war on Venice in 1537. Kâsim Paşa, the sandjak-beg of the Morea, was commissioned to conquer the Venetian colonies in the Morea. Nîr al-Dîn Barlakos had inflicted several defeats on Venice in her colonies and she had besides every reason to complain of her allies, the Pope, Paul III and the Emperor Charles V. In the summer of 1540 Venice made peace with Sulaimân I in order to save what was left of her possessions. The majority of the Venetian colonies in the East, including Nauplion and Monemvasia, was the price paid. The Turks endeavoured to populate once more their new possessions in the Morea. About 1550, there were about 42,000 Christian families in the whole Morea. We know nothing definite of the Muslim population at this time. It may be assumed however that, then as later, Muslims were in a minority. Even when Ottoman power was at its height, the oppressed Moreotes, always desirous of liberty, rose against their oppressors. In the xvith century the lot of the Christians in the Morea was not unbearable. Two Turkish sources of the xivith century are of considerable importance for the history of the Morea. These are the ‘Survey of
the World” (Qāhiān-nāma) of Ḥāḍīḏī Khatībī (d. Oct. 1657) and the Travels (Siyāḥat-nāma) of Ewliya Celebi, who visited the Morea in 1668 and 1709. There is no fuller work on the Morea than the latter among Muslim sources. Ewliya Celebi’s narrative was based on personal observation and experience, and is distinguished by a vividness of description and to some extent by a tendency to exaggerate. In the treatment of the Morea, given in his vol. viii., it is hardly possible to trace his literary sources. What he tells us about Muslim buildings and religious orders is of importance, and his account of the Christians is also of value. He naturally takes the Ottoman point of view (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Siyāḥat-nāma, vol. viii., Stambul 1928; Fr. Lassinger, G. O. W., p. 219 sqq.; Fr. Taeschner, in sol., vol. xviii., 1928, p. 299 sqq.). When Ewliya Celebi visited the Morea, various Muslim orders and corporations had settled there. They included jurūjīr brotherhoods, dervish orders, some of which were anti-Islamic, and Shī‘ī Bekāšīye. The existence of such brotherhoods were widely propagated in the Greek east from the xv century, can be proved for the Morea as late as 1828 (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, vol. i.—ii., Oxford 1929).

At the end of 1685 another coalition against the Porte was formed by Venice, Poland, Germany, Russia and the Pope. Francesco Morosini was appointed by his government to begin operations against the Turks as speedily as possible. He was given command of the allied naval forces. After 42 days of fighting by land and sea, Koron was stormed by Morosini. In the period from the late summer of 1685 to July 1686 Morosini, Count Otto Wilhelm von Königsmark and Hannibal von Degengeld took from the Turks Old and New Navarino, Kalamata, Modon, Zarnata, Passava, Celefa and Višo as well as other fortified places in southern Morea. The Sereņšer İsmā‘il Paşa was defeated in several battles and had to retire to the interior of the Morea. Hasan Paşa, who was in Maina, negotiated with Morosini and surrendered voluntarily. The Turkish garrisons of many towns, on the other hand, offered a desperate resistance. It cost the Venetians and their allies much time and heavy sacrifices to take Nauplion. The capture of the latter contributed a great deal to increase their confidence. By the end of 1687 Morea up to Monemvasia was Venetian. Continual Turkish raids, however, continued to disturb the security of the peninsula. By the peace of Cullowicz (Jan. 26, 1699), the Porte had to cede the Morea to Venice. The seas of the Morea and of the mainland of Greece were now open to Turkey as well as to Venice. For the last period of Venetian rule in the Morea (1669—1715 or 1718), the reader may be referred to L. Ranke, Zur venezianischen Geschichte, Leipzig 1878, p. 277—361. The services of Venice to the peninsula in the period 1688—1714 must not be underestimated, especially as she had found it at a very low level.

The occupation of the Morea by the Venetians now attracted the attention of western scholars to the celebrated peninsula. The Turkish empire, which had been able to profit a good deal by the troubles in Europe at the beginning of the xvii century, resolved at the end of 1771 to reconquer the Morea. Many Greeks felt that the Venetians had not respected their rights, religious and family matters, were hostile to their own government; and even wanted the Turks back again (cf. De la Montray, Voyages, vol. i., p. 462). Except for a few larger towns which offered a resistance, the land was easily taken by the Turks and so the Morea once again became Turkish. The history of this conquest was written by several contemporary writers.

The peace of Passarowitz (June 10, 1718) ceded Morea finally to the Turks. We are most fully informed about the rule from 1718 to 1821. The extant sources, especially in Greek, enable us to study the period to the smallest detail. After 1715 many Christians again adopted İlim. A census taken in 1720 gave 60,000 male Christians of 11 years of age and over. The Muhammadan inhabitants are said to have been in the minority at this time. On the other hand, the Turkish element increased in the period 1769—1780 while the number of Christians diminished considerably, as did the total number of the population. From 1715 to ca. 1750 the Morea was governed by a Paşa, the Moreawali, who had three Pashas under him: first Pasha Murad; his person was fixed and inefinite. He was usually assisted by two other Paşas, who were under him and were granted two Kuids. A change was made in 1780. From this date to 1821 the government of the Morea was no longer given to a particular Paşa but to a simple mufti of the Porte, who was however given the title of Pasha. The higher offices were held by a muhallebi, a defterkuchaya and a Christian dragoman. Under the official system of administrative divisions, the Morea was divided into 22 districts. In this period Christian local autonomy gained more strength. After the many disappointments they had suffered from the western powers, the Moreotes now looked to Russia to liberate them from the Turkish yoke. From the time of Peter the Great the bonds between Greeks and Russians had been growing stronger. In the middle of the xvii century, Russian propaganda increased very much among the Orthodox of the Balkans. Under Catherine II, the Russians easily succeeded, with the help of Greek agents, in stirring up Greek notables and clergy in the Morea to rebel against the Turks. Among these the most distinguished was the influential and wealthy Panayotis Mpenakis of Kalamata. This secret propaganda did not escape the Turks. By 1767—1768 the Christians were preparing for rebellion. On Oct. 15, 1768, Turkey declared war on Russia. Russian fleets, whose equipment left much to be desired, appeared in the Mediterranean. On Feb. 17, 1776, Theodoros Orloff landed at Vitylo and received a warm welcome from the Maimotes; but, as the ships had neither sufficient men, guns or munitions, the first enthusiasm of the Greeks soon died down. On July 24, 1774, a treaty of peace was concluded at Kučak Kainardji between Russia and Turkey. Full religious liberty and other concessions were granted to the Christian subjects of the Turks. About three months later, the Porte granted a general amnesty to the Christians of the Morea and resolved to clear the land of Albanian bandits. After 1770 the Porte had confiscated a number of Christian estates in the Morea and granted them to mosques and imaretés. By the treaties of Kučak Kainardji and Kaimali Kanak (10th March 1779), the Turks now promised to return these or to compensate their owners, but the promises were not kept. Nevertheless, the Moreote
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P. 432b, l. 11 at infra, add: According to Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg, i. 314, 375, cf. Yatut, iv. 294) Kawadh destituted al-Mundhar b. Ms al-Sama because of his refusal to accept Mardakism and appointed in his place the Kindite al-Harit b. Amr, who had embraced the new faith. Whatever may be the truth, the relations between the king of Persia and the Arabs have been influenced by Mardakism.

P. 496b, line 11, 12 at infra, read: Timur who stayed in Balat (Milet) on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Cuneo, p. 76; ed. Bein, various readings).

P. 497a, srt. Mila, Bibliography; A complete discussion of the ruins of Pelit by R. M. Riechold will appear in An archaeological Journey in Southwestern Anatolia (discussion of the inscriptions by F. Wittke).

P. 505b, l. 19: instead of Nukai, read Nukai.
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Christians benefited considerably by the treaties between Russia and Turkey; this was not however the case with the treaties later concluded (June 10, 1783 and Dec. 29, 1791). The Christians of the Morea to trade under the Russian flag contributed to their economic expansion in the period 1775–1821. Intellectual relations between western Europe and the Greeks of the Morea became closer and closer after 1790. A new generation grew up among the Greeks of the Morea and other provinces. Since the peace of Paris of 1815, the Moreots and other Greeks had become convinced that only their own national salvation could preserve them of the Turkish yoke. Careful preparations were in anticipation of the right moment. In the spring of 1821 open rebellion broke out among the Greeks of the Morea, when the Turkish governor Kurthas Pasha was besieging the rebel Ali Pasha at Yanina. Soon after the beginning of the rising, in which a prominent part was played by Theodoros Kolokotronis of a famous Kefal family, the Moreots were masters of the lowlands and even occupied several strongholds. The 1st of October, the Porte commissioned Ibrahim Pasha, the adopted son of Mehmed Ali of Egypt, to put down the Greek rising. Ibrahim Pasha landed his forces in Messenia. He was able to restore Turkish rule over most of the Morea, but he failed to put down the Greek rebellion. In the meanwhile, philhellenism had made progress in Europe and America, and it thus came about that the cabinets of Europe began to take an interest in the question of Greek freedom. On July 6, 1827, England, France and Russia concluded a treaty in London, by which the Morea and other parts of the Greek mainland were to form an independent principality but to pay tribute to the Porte. The Turks insisted on their point of view and declined the intercession of the great powers as regards the rebel Greeks. On Oct. 20, 1827, the combined fleets of the above mentioned powers destroyed the Turk-Egyptian fleet at Navarino. On Jan. 13, 1828, Johannes Kapodistrias came to Nauplion, having been elected President of the Greek Free State by the National Assembly at Troezen. On Aug. 6, 1828, England concluded a treaty with Mehmed Ali of Egypt for the evacuation of the Morea by the Egyptian troops. French troops, led by General N. J. Maucon, soon afterwards landed in Messenia by order of Charles X to drive the Turk-Egyptian troops out of the Morea. In the autumn of 1828 Ibrahim Pasha withdrew to Egypt after turning the Morea into a heap of ruins during his 3½ years in the Peninsula. After long diplomatic negotiations, much quarrelling among the great powers and disagreement between the Moreots and the other Greeks, Prince Otto, the second son of the philellene Ludwig of Bavaria, landed at Nauplion on Feb. 6, 1833 as the first king of Greece. Henceforth the Morea formed a part of the kingdom of Greece. During the rising of 1821–1827 and later, many Moreote Muslims adopted Christianity. To this day, many buildings, inscriptions and especially place-names recall the days when the Morea was under the Crescent. 


**Nikos A. Bees** [brees]

**MORISCOS, (MORESCOS),** the name given in Spain to the Muslims who remained in the country after the capture of Granada by the Catholic Kings, Ferdinand and Isabella, on Jan. 2, 1492 and the dethronement of the last ruler of the Nasrid dynasty.

It is mainly from Spanish sources that we learn the history of the Morescos down to their final expulsion from Spain. Arabic texts relating to them are very rare; the only record at all detailed is that of the Maghribi al-Majzari, a contemporary of the exodus of the Morescos, in his *Nafa al-Thik*. In proportion as the Spanish *reconquest* proceeded, groups of Muslims gradually increasing in

---

**THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, III.**
number found themselves under Christian rule. These Muslims for the most part remained attached to their religion and the largest bodies of them were in Aragon and the district of Valencia; they kept up relations with their co-religionists of the kingdom of Granada. But the latter were suddenly placed in the same position with the fall of the capital of the Naṣir kingdom. The treaty for the capitulation of Granada contained, it is true, a large number of clauses safeguarding the liberty and property of Muslims, granting freedom for their beliefs and for the practice of the Muslim religion. But these clauses were not long respected and very soon attempts were made to convert the people of Granada under the stimulus of the Cardinal de Cisneros and the Archbishop Henando of Talavera. Cisneros in particular began his work in 1499; he tried persuasion at first, then he tried to withdraw from circulation by burning them as many Arabic books as possible dealing with different branches of Muslim learning. His efforts did produce a few voluntary converts, but also caused a rising which began in Granada itself in the Albacin quarter (al-Bayḍalā) and soon spread throughout the country of Alpujarras (al-Bayḍār, q.v.) between the southern slopes of the Sierra Nevada and the Mediterranean, and spread to the towns of Almería, Baza and Guadix and the Serranía of Ronda. The result was in 1501 the promulgation of a law which gave Muslims a choice between leaving Spain and adopting Christianity. It does not seem however to have been strictly applied and the Moors of the kingdom of Granada, retiring to the mountains, enjoyed practical independence for over a half a century.

But this first edict brought about the conversion of the majority of the Muslims of Castile. As to the Moors of Aragon, in spite of a few restrictions on their status they were not much disturbed and orders were given to this effect to the Inquisition. Nevertheless in the early years of the xvth century we find the Muslims of Albarracín, Teruel and Manises being converted en masse. The reaction became stronger, encouraged by Joan the Foolish, then by Charles I. In 1526 the Moors of Valencia received their order of expulsion. The situation remained somewhat confused down to 1556, a date at which a series of vexatious measures were decided upon in Madrid and began to be applied against the Moors who still remained in Spain: the use of the Arabic language was forbidden then; it was in any case losing ground daily, even among the communities which remained Muslim; they were also ordered to abandon their worship, their costume and to modify their manner of life. This time the Moors of Granada and Alpujarras did not hesitate to rebel openly. The rising once again started in the Albacín of Granada in 1568 and spread to the mountains; it was at first led by an individual named Ibn Umniya, the Abenhumayya of the Spanish chroniclers and afterwards by ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abdū (Ahenaboo). It took costly expeditions to put down this movement, and the war lasted for several years, conducted successively by the Marquis of Modéjar and Don John of Austria.

The final decree of expulsion was not issued by Philip II although he had the intention of doing so in 1582. It was Philip III who signed it in 1609 and in this and the following years, a large number of Moors—estimated at half a million—had to cross the sea without hope of returning. Islam was definitely uprooted from Iberian soil.

According to the Arab authors, the great exodus at the beginning of the xvth century was a most cruel hardship for the Moors. A large number died on their enforced journey. Many went to France, from which they tried to reach Muslim lands. A few colonies of Muslims from Spain settled in Egypt and Constantinople. But the majority went direct from Spanish ports to North Africa, their nearest refuge, where they were known as Andalusis and where they were not always welcomed, at least in Morocco, with open arms. The principal settlements were those at Sa‘id and Rabāb on the one hand and Tetwān on the other, where their descendants still form the most prosperous and most industrious section of the population. The Andalus of the seaports of the Atlantic coast of Morocco soon began to devote themselves to piracy: the celebrated Moroccan corsairs were almost all Moors, who had retained the use of the Spanish language. On the other hand, the Moroccan Sultan organized corps of picked troops from the Andalus and they played a prominent part under the Sa‘idans, especially in the conquest of the South of Morocco, was also very keen on a large colony of Moors of Fās. In Algeria, a number settled in the towns of Tlemcenn, Oran and Algiers. At Tunis they were well received by the Dey Uthman: they settled together in two quarters which took their name (cf. Tunes, iv., p. 886). Those who had not been town-dwellers settled in little villages which soon became prosperous and still have a characteristic Spanish look. Such are the villages of Solmán, Grumballa, Djeideida, Zaghwān, Tebura, Testur and Gal‘et el-Andalis (Kal‘at al-Andalus).


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)
MOROCCO, a country and Muslim state of northern Africa. The name (Spanish Marruecos, French Maroc) is a corruption of Marrakush, the largest town in southern Morocco [see the article MARRAKUSH].

1. Geography.

Morocco occupies the western part of Barbary; it corresponds to the Maghrib al-Askā of the Arab geographers [see the article MAGHRIB]. Lying between 5° and 15° W. longitude (Greenwich) on the one hand and between 26° and 36° N. on the other, it covers approximately an area of between 500,000 and 550,000 square kilometres. On the North it is bounded by the Mediterranean, on the West by the Atlantic and on the South by the Sahara. On the eastern side it stretches to the Tell and to the plateau of Oran. The boundary which separates it from Algeria is quite conventional and fixed definitely only on the northern side, for a length of 80 miles, from the mouth of the Wāḍī Kis to Thenyet al-Sāsi.

Although Morocco forms one with the northern part of Africa it is chiefly oriented to the West. It is, one might say, the Atlantic slope of Barbary; it is nevertheless an oriental country. The coast does not lend itself to a maritime population; the Mediterranean coast is steep and inhospitable; the Atlantic coastline straight and lacking in natural shelters. The estuaries of the rivers are of very little value because of the sandbars which obstruct their entrances. The geological structure is somewhat complicated. Below the folds of the primary age, of which there still exists much eroded evidence covered by secondary deposits, have risen strata contemporary with the Alps. The actual relief which has resulted from these movements of the earth's surface and from these successive modifications consists of folded mountain chains, plateaux and plains. The chains are two in number, the Rif and the Atlas. The Rif is the continuation from the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar of the Betican Cordillera [cf. Rif]. The Atlas chain forms the backbone of Morocco. It breaks into the High Atlas oriented West-North-East, linked by the volcanic massif of Sirwā to the Anti-Atlas which lies more to the South, and also to the Middle Atlas running in a diagonal line from the South-West to the North-East, as far as the country of the outer foothills of the Rif, from which it is separated by the corridor of Tāfā [see the article ATLAS]. From these different chains stretch plateaux. Those of the east connect the High Atlas to the Saharan Algeria; those of the West gradually descend towards the Atlantic. Amongst the latter some are only the vestiges of the primary layer raised and eroded; others are composed of sedimentary deposits of varying origins.

In consequence of the oblique orientation of the Middle Atlas, which gradually draws away from the coast, the plains, which occupy in Morocco a more important place than in the rest of Barbary, lie mainly on the Atlantic side. They are composed of two series, the one stretching diagonally from the mouth of the Wāḍī Tensift to that of the Muluya (the sub-Atlantic plains, the plain of Sebī, the corridor of Tāzā, the plain of the seaport Muluya). The other stretches to the foot of the High Atlas (Hawz of Marrakush) and disappears in the heart of the middle Atlas.

Climate. The climate of Morocco has been defined as "an Atlantic variety of the Mediterranean climate" (Gentil). This however must not be taken to apply to the whole of the country; the different regions differ as much in regard to temperature as in the distribution of rain. On the Atlantic coast the climate is relatively mild in winter and cool in summer; only small differences are recorded between the coldest month and the warmest (57° at Mogador and 10° at Rabat). In the interior on the other hand, the seasonal variations and even the daily ones increase the farther one goes inland. They become excessive in character in eastern Morocco where the climate is distinctly continental. The rainfall is equally lacking in uniformity. Brought by the West and S.-W. winds, the rains are abundant in the autumn, the winter and the beginning of spring but they are very rare during the summer. The Atlantic coast has everywhere a copious rainfall although the quantity which falls decreases as one goes from North to South (Tangier: 32 inches, Casablanca: 16 inches). It also enjoys the benefit of an atmosphere which is saturated with moisture even in summer. The interior is not so well served. The rains diminish in quantity from West to East. The mountain massifs are always permanent. They condense the moisture in the form of rain and even snow which, although it is by no means perpetual, nevertheless covers the high summits of the Atlas mountains until the beginning of the summer. Eastern Morocco on the other hand, isolated by the barrier of the Middle Atlas, is not subject to oceanic influences and only receives, except in the immediate neighbourhood of the Mediterranean, rare and irregular downfalls of rain.

The flora reveals in striking fashion these variations of climate. Forests of evergreen oak, of oak and of cedar clothe the peaks of the High and the Middle Atlas and of the Rif. The cork tree is found in extensive forests in the massifs of the Za'īr and Zayān and as far as the region of the Atlantic (forest of the Ma'mūra). The thuya and the arganier (a tree peculiar to the S.-W. of Morocco) are already more disseminated. Poplars, willows, elms and tamarisks form a fringe of verdure along the wāḍi. The olive tree is met almost everywhere in its wild state. But, as the rain-fall decreases, the forest gives place to scrub where the jujube tree and the mastic abound, then to prairie and steppes. The prairie, which hardly goes beyond the limits of the maritime plains, is the home of plants which are used for fodder and of bulbous plants. The steppe is the home of shrubs and bushes (aretmusia, drun, alfa) which are adapted to a dry soil and to extreme variations in temperature. The steppes cover a part of the interior plains of Western Morocco and practically the whole of Eastern Morocco, where they extend to the neighbourhood of the Mediterranean. As regards the desert, it is devoid of vegetation in the hammaḍa [see AHARA], although the oases form spots of verdure in the midst of the general desolation.

Hydrography. The structure of the country and the relative abundance of rainfall affect the hydrography. Morocco is much richer in running streams and in subterranean waters than any other country in Northern Africa. Wāḍis (wells) are here more numerous; their courses are longer and their volume larger. A number of them even deserve the name of rivers. The waters flow in three different
directions: towards the Atlantic, towards the Mediterranean and towards the basin of the Sahara. The Atlantic rivers are in all respects the most important. They can be divided into three groups: those of the North (Lükko and Sebû), those of the centre (Bû Raggag and Umm al-Rabi'î), and those of the South (Tensift and Sûs). The Lükko drains the districts of the Gharb; the Sebû, those of the Middle Atlas, of the Zährûn, and the southern slope of the Rif. On emerging from the mountains it takes numerous turns and windings across the alluvial plain and reaches the ocean after a course of 500 miles through subject to considerable variation in volume, according to the season, it never dries up completely. It is even navigable in its lower course. The Bû Raggag and the Umm al-Rabi'î run for a part of their course through the Central Plateau, the Moroccan "Meseta". The irregularity of their courses makes them useless for navigation. The Tensift, to the North of the High Atlas, the Wâdi Sûs to the South, which are much less in volume approach more nearly to the classic type of wadi of Northern Africa. The watercourses of the Sahara (Wâd Gîr, Wâd Zîc, Wâd Dar'â) diminish in volume as they go farther away from the mountains and end by disappearing in the sand. The Dar'â alone reaches the Atlantic, but it only flows intermittently in its lower course [see the article Dar'â]. As for the Mediterranean rivers, they are only torrents with violent and rapid floods. The Mulya alone forms an exception. It collects water from the slopes of the Middle Atlas but only reaches the sea in much diminished volume on account of the loss it suffers in crossing the steppes.

Although the common characteristics of all the countries of Barbary are found in Morocco, the greater or less differences in relief, the differences in climate, the peculiarities of vegetation bring in their train a diversity more marked than in Algeria or Tunisia. The combination of these different elements determines the existence of regions which differ the one from the other in their configuration, their resources, the density and manner of existence of their population. We may distinguish six such regions: Northern Morocco, the basin of the Sebû, Central Morocco, the country of the Atlas, Eastern Morocco, and Moroccan Sahara.

Northern Morocco. Northern Morocco comprises a mountainous zone (the mountains of the Rif properly so-called which are to the North-West continued in the "domes" of the Djeballa as far as the Strait of Gibraltar) and regions less rugged in character which to the South-East and the West form the transition into the adjoining countries. The mountains, split into deep ravines by the courses of the wâdins, for the most part only leave between their last escarpment and the sea-shore a narrow strip, or a few bays enclosed between the rocky promontories. A few cuttings which run across the ranges afford communication between the two watersheds. The Rif, therefore, must seem to be a world very little accessible to influences from without. Arab influence has scarcely grazed it. The population has always vigorously opposed the political measures of the sultâns as well as the attempts of Europeans to settle themselves there. Condemned into a limited territory, since the highest parts of the mountains are useless, the Rifians find their chief means of subsistence in the cultivation of vegetables and fruits. A number of them gain from temporary emigration an addition to their resources. They are not nomadic but inhabit villages perched on the slopes. Towns are represented only by Shafâwân and Wazzin, religious and commercial centres, situated the one on the northern side and the other on the southern side of the Djeballa. Towards the South-East, plains interspersed with mountain masses extend as far as the Muluya. The lack of rain gives to these plains (Salwân, Gâret) the aspect of steppes more fitted to a pastoral life than to agriculture and a settled life. Towards the West the lowlying coastland, still a very narrow border at the strait of Gibraltar, increases considerably from the North to the South between the Atlantic coast and the last slopes of the Djeballa. This district commonly called the Gharb is a corridor. It still keeps in this respect its historical significance, but its economic value is diminished by the stagnation of its waters in the hollows in the flat bottoms of the valleys, and by the insecurity resulting from the proximity of the warlike tribes of the high mountains. A few townships have however succeeded in establishing themselves, either at the crossing of roads such as al-Kaṣr al-Kabîr [q.v.] or in proximity to the coast like Ceuta, Tangier and Larache [see the articles Tânîn, Ceuta, Tangier, al-Âlî]. The Rif flows intermittently in its lower course [see the article Dar'â]. As for the Southern Morocco, there (Zerbûn, Zâlîgh, mountains of Gerwân) offer no insuperable obstacles to communication. The high plains of Sâsîs and Meknes are contrasted with the lower plains of the Shråda and the alluvial plains of the lower course of the Sebû. The influence of the Atlantic is felt far into the interior and combines with the numerous streams that flow into the Sebû and its tributaries and the subterranean waters to promote the development of all forms of vegetation. Forests cover the higher slopes of the mountains; fruit-trees flourish on the sunny slopes and cereals on the high plains; the merjû, temporary marshes produced by the Sebû, in its lower course are used for grazing until they are sufficiently dry to be of use to agriculture. This combination of circumstances, so auspicious for human habitation, has made the valley of the Sebû a centre of intensive settlement. The most diverse ethnic elements have settled together and mixed there. All types of habitation are found there, as well as all degrees of attachment to the soil from a nomadic to settled town life. Human activities are displayed in the most varied forms (grazing, agriculture, arboriculture, commerce, industry). The country villages, douars of "nuwâlas" in the plains, villages of houses of clay in the mountains, are numerous, the towns are flourishing. Mawâli Idrîs is the sacred city of Morocco, Sebû on the borders of the plain of Sâsîs and the high limestone plateau lives by trading with the people of the mountains and the industry of its weavers and makers of slippers. Fâs and Meknes are among the great cities of Morocco.

The first of these towns has remained to this day the political, religious, intellectual and economic centre of Morocco. It has resisted all the usual
causes of decline. From all time the ownership of the high plains of the Sebu has been bitterly contested. Their possession has been the condition for the establishment and survival of the dynasties which have succeeded one another in Morocco. Their political significance and role in history correspond closely to their geographical position and economic value.

Central Morocco. Between the valley of the Sebu, the ranges of the Atlas and the Atlantic, covering about a quarter of habitable Morocco, lies the region called by the geologists the Moroccan Meseta. It includes districts of very different character, the only feature uniting them being the possession of a common substratum, the Hercynian pakenplains covered almost everywhere by sedimentary horizontal formations. Differences of structure and of climate distinguish clearly the various parts: the Atlantic plain, the plateaux of the centre, and the interior plain of the Hauz. The maritime plain lies along the Ocean from Rabat to Mogador. Very narrow at its northern and southern ends, it broadens near the centre (Dukkala, Shitwiya) to a width of 50 miles. To the rains and the constant moisture from the vicinity of the Atlantic, the abundance of running streams and subterranean waters, the natural fertility of the soil further adds to the conditions for prosperity. The irri or black lands which run in an unbroken line behind the coast from the Bu Ragrag to Tensift are admirably suited for the cultivation of cereals. The rural population, almost everywhere settled, is therefore considerable. The land of the Dukkala has 40 people to the square kilometer, a very much greater than that of the other districts of Morocco. The towns of the coast, Salé, Rabat, Casablanca, Mazagan, Azemmour, Safi, Mogador [q. v.], benefit by the richness of the hinterland. The exportation of agricultural produce has at all times been a branch of commerce, and has been much developed since the settlement of Europeans there. While facility for communications and the continual relations with the valley of the Sebu opened the plain to Arab influences, the ports of the coast maintained contact with abroad and permitted the infiltration of European influences.

The interior is much more broken. The ground rises gradually to a height of 2,000-2,500 feet. The predominant formation is plateaux terminating on the north in the very old masses of the Zafr and Zayân, which are real mountains in character, in the south in the equally old but less elevated massif of the Râhîmna. These plateaux deeply cut into by the course of the Umm Rabî overlook on the west side the low-lying coastslands from the top of cliffs, and slope gently on the S. E. to the plain of Tâdla. This, a depression, over 120 miles in length, running to the north into the heart of the Middle Atlas where it terminates in a cul de sac, while it broadens greatly in its southern part. A low pass enables communication to be made between the Tâdla and the Hauz of Marrakush, a basin shut in by the High Atlas in the south, the Middle Atlas in the east, the Ijilfi in the north and the hills of the Shiyâdima in the west. The economic value of this inner region is very unequal. On the mountains of the north the rains and streams support forests and the natives devote themselves to cattle-rearing. The plateaux of the centre covered with a surface of limestone have great stretches of bare rock and cultivation is barely possible. The Tâdla is no better favoured except in the zone adjoining the Atlas, watered by torrents descending from the mountains. The plain of the Hauz would also suffer disastrously from drought, if human industry had not averted this danger. An ingenious system of irrigation has transformed the country round Marrakush into a vast palmyrove and it is filled to a particularly dense population (100 to the square kilometre). Comparatively large towns (Amâsinir, Demnât, Tallâlât) and especially Marrakush [q. v.] have been enabled to rise and prosper. Between this region, already half Saharan, and the high lying plains of the Sebu, the plateaux of the centre and the mountains of the north which come down to within a short distance of the shore, interpose a barrier which the attitude of its inhabitants makes still more difficult to cross. The Zafrân, the Zafr, the Zemmât, over whom the authority of the Makhzen has never been very securely exercised, have more than once cut direct communication between Fès and Marrakush. These two cities have been at different periods the capitals of distinct and even hostile kingdoms.

The region of the Atlas. In spite of the marked differences between the different elements of the Atlas, the whole region nevertheless has general characteristics of its own. Between Atlantic Morocco on the one hand and Saharan Morocco on the other, the Atlas lies as an almost continuous barrier. Only the few transverse fractures in the Middle Atlas permit passage between the basins of the Sebu and the Saharan oases, while in the High Atlas, valleys running right into the heart of the massif give access to passes opening on the valleys of Sûs and the Wadi Dâra. Moister and colder, the Middle Atlas is covered with forests which are denser and more extensive than those of the High Atlas. Both however are great water-heds. From the Middle Atlas come the great rivers of the Atlantic slope (Sebul, Gign, Umm Rabî, Wûdi T'Addi), from the High Atlas the Tassât and the Tensît. The lands of the Atlas are nevertheless poor. The high mountains offer little to support mankind. Human activities are found mainly in the zones of contact between the mountains and the plains (dir) of the Middle Atlas and in some specially favoured valley of the High Atlas. Except in the Middle Atlas, where the nomadic mode of life results in the exodus in the bad season of the inhabitants who lead a pastoral life, and on the plateaux of the High Atlas on the Atlantic side (Hîs, Shiyâdima) the inhabitants of which are mainly engaged in cattle-rearing, the natives are settled. They live in villages perched on the slopes and terraces between wâïds or scattered along the valleys. There is nothing approaching a town in size. These regions, defended by the nature of the country, have almost completely escaped outside influence, they are still almost exclusively the domain of Berber tribes (Berbîrber in the Middle Atlas and Shîtûî in the High Atlas). The customs and institutions peculiar to this people [cf. Berbîs] have survived to a greater extent here than in any other region of North Africa. In particular their political organization is still most rudimentary : municipal republics administered by a âdâlmâ in the Middle Atlas, feudal lordships ruled in patriarchal and despotic fashion by a few powerful families in the High Atlas. The people of these regions have also always opposed vigorously the
central power; the authority of the Maakhir over the Berbers of the High Atlas has never been exerted except through the local chiefs. As to the tribes of the Middle Atlas they have retained to the present day almost complete independence. Even the most vigorous sultans have never succeeded in forcing them into obedience for any length of time.

Eastern Morocco. Eastern Morocco may be described as the continuation of the Central Maghribi of which it has the distinctive characteristics. In it, as in Orania, we have a tell zone and a zone rising by successive stages up to 6,000 feet. The upper valley of the Muluya separates them from the Middle Atlas. The monotony of these vast spaces is only broken by the outcrops of girt, flat beds of rocks cut up by erosion and by the depressions of the shuwall [q.v.]. Beaten by the winds, exposed to the rigours of an extreme climate, these lands are only fit for the pastoral life led by the nomads who raise sheep. The valley of the Muluya is no better favoured, except in the vicinity of the Atlas, where villages surrounded by vineyards with a settled population are found along the tributaries of the river. As to the Tell, hills of no very great height (the most important being that of the Beni Snassen which does not exceed 5,000 feet) divide it up into compartments occupied by plains (plains of the Aïwald Mansur, on the coast, of the Trifa, of the Angad which in the south reaches the cliffs in which the high plateaux end). The dryness of the climate frequently gives these plains a steppe-like character; only the western part of the plain of the Angad with a fertile and well watered soil lends itself to cereal cultivation. This is the key to procure grain. But this region owes its importance less to its natural resources than to its situation on the natural route between Atlantic Morocco and the rest of Barbary. Udjda [q.v.] which commands the pass, has thus been enabled to escape various causes of decay that have threatened it. A border district, eastern Morocco has always been a disputed region, a march for which the lords of Tlemcen and Fas have contended. The authority of the latter was never solidly enough established here to impose itself on the settled inhabitants of the mountains and on the nomads of the plateaux and uplands. Down to the French occupation the country was left to anarchy and disorder.

The Moroccan Sahara. The Moroccan Sahara is the N.W. corner of the Sahara. There we find the general characteristics of this desert region [cf. Saharan]]. Only the parts adjoining the Atlantic and the threshold of the mountains offer favourable conditions for man. In the plain of Suss [q.v.] shut in between the Atlas and the Anti-Atlas, the rivers and the irrigation canals enable shrubs to grow. The Darafa, Ziz and Gibr are in their upper courses fringed by a thin border of cultivated land, pasturage, vineyards, and in their middle course assure the growth of palmgroves of which the best known, if not the most prosperous, is that of Tafiltalt [q.v.]; only relative it is true — of these oases is in contrast with the desolation of the rocky plateaux (hammadas) which form the greater part of the Moroccan Sahara.

The natural conditions determine the mode of life of the inhabitants. Some lead a nomadic life and drive their flocks up and down the plateaux; others are permanently settled on the Suss, in the high valleys and in the oases. Suss contains numerous villages and even towns (Agadir, Tiznit, Toudaoudant); the oases have a settled population in the ksar. Those of Taflalt, Tamgrüt, Bu Dnib and Figgarg carry on a certain amount of commerce between Atlantic Morocco and the Sahara. But this very circumstance has prevented them escaping as completely as the lands of the Atlas from the political and intellectual influence of Western Morocco, especially Tafiltalt where considerable groups of Arab tribe have been long established in the midst of Berber populations. But, although the present dynasty actually came from Tafiltalt, the people of this region have frequently escaped Shanfan authority.

In the last years of the x16th century, methodically pursued since the French occupation, the scientific exploration of Morocco is not yet completed. From the results so far attained one thing is clear: the lack of uniformity in the country. Thus its geography may explain to some extent the historical development of the country.


II. History.

Morocco before Islam. Morocco, like the other parts of North Africa, has probably been inhabited from a very remote period. We know, however, nothing definite about its earliest inhabitants. The traces which they have left, weapons and tools of chipped flint, pottery, rock-paintings, some of which represent animals of the quaternary period, now extinct, megalithic monuments identical with those found all round the Mediterranean basin give us no information in this respect. At most, we may suppose that the primitive population consisted of emigrants from southern Europe, the Sahara and perhaps from Egypt. The fusion of these diverse elements gave birth to a race, the members of which, frequently different in type and physical features, were united by a community of language. The ancient writers called them Libyans and Moors. They were the ancestors of the present Berbers [q.v.].

The first historical fact known, and that only imperfectly, is the appearance in the 8th century B.C. of the Phoenicians on the Moroccan coast. The sale of Tyre and Sidon built factories there, where they exchanged goods of eastern origin for local products (cattle, wool, hides) and slaves. But Phoenician influence was exercised mainly through the intermediary of Carthage when it in turn had become the metropolis of a great maritime empire. The Carthaginians rebuilt the ruined factories and added new ones. In the middle of the 5th century, Hanno in the course of his celebrated "periplus" established on the Atlantic coast seven colonies of which one was at the mouth of the Sebu. Rusaddir (Melilla), Septem (Ceuta), Tingis (Tangier), Lixus (Larache), Sala (Sale) were the principal Carthaginian establishments, of which does not seem, however, that Hanno had sought to extend his power into the interior. She was content no doubt to conclude treaties with the native chiefs and to recruit mercenaries from the country. Morocco remained independent, but the tribes which inhabited it were not organised into states, except perhaps in the east, where ancient writers mention in the period of the Punic Wars the existence of a kingdom of Mauretania or Marusa, extending along both banks of the Muluya.

The destruction of the Carthaginian empire hardly altered this state of affairs. For two centuries Rome administered only the "Province of Africa" directly, and the other territories of Barbary in the hands of native chieftains under a more or less severe protectorate. Northern Morocco shared the fate of Mauretania down to the annexation of this kingdom in 42 A.D. The region to the east of the Muluya formed part of Caesarian Mauretania. The lands stretching from the Muluya to the ocean formed Mauretania Tingitana, an imperial province governed by a procurator. When the empire was reorganised by Diocletian, it was attached to Spain.

Roman Morocco never covered more than a small portion of the modern Morocco. On the Atlantic coast, it barely extended beyond the mouth of the Bô Rârag, and in the interior to the massif of the Zarhân. The plateaux and sub-Atlantic plains and the mountains of the Rif, Middle and High Atlas escaped the authority of Rome. It was the same with the Sahara. The expedition of Suetonius Paulinus, who in 43 A.D. advanced as far as the wâdi Gîr, remained an isolated incident.

To defend herself against the rebellions of her own subjects and to protect the country from Berber inroads, Rome had to keep in Tingitana an army of ten thousand men, to build strategic roads and to establish fortified posts on the sides of the triangle: Sala, Zarhân, Tingis. With the exception of Volubilis, the importance of which has been revealed by its ruins, methodically excavated in recent years, and which was undoubtedly a centre of influence of Roman culture on the people of the interior as well as a military base, the towns were all on the coast. They were Lixus and Tingis raised to the rank of "coloniae", and Ceuta. They owed their prosperity mainly to trade with Spain to which were exported oil and wheat, the two main products of the country. On the whole, however, Rome's influence on Morocco was superficial and has left little trace.

Without any really firm hold on the country, weakened by native risings and by the quarrels between the dominion and the orthodox, Roman rule was to collapse suddenly at the beginning of the 5th century. Germanic invaders, the Vandals, came from Spain and in 429 A.D. conquered without opposition Tingitana which they gave back a few years later to the Romans. Soon afterwards the western empire disappeared and the natives seized the opportunity to become independent. The Byzantines, who in the sixth century destroyed the Vandal kingdom, were content to re-occupy the two strongholds of Ceuta and Tangier. The rest of Morocco was in the hands of the Berbers. The latter were divided into a large number of tribes, of whom the principal were the Gâomâra on the Mediterranean coast, the Barghuma, and the Qadis [q.v.] on the Atlantic coast between the strait of Gibraltar and the mouth of the Sebu, the Minkâa in the central district, the Bâlûna, on the western slope of the High Atlas and on the coast from the Sebu to the Sûs; the Hikûra between the Sûs and the Dârâ; the Sanû and Iâmûna on the left bank of the Dârâ. These Berbers were all of Sanhâja stock; some professed Chri-tianity or Judaism but the majority still followed the old nature worship. The Arab conquest brought them a new religion: Islam.

The Introduction of Islam. The Arabs appeared in the extreme Maghrib at the end of the 7th century A.D. Tradition relates that Sîdî 'Oûkâ, the founder of Kairawan, in 684—685 undertook an expedition which carried him as far as the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. This raid, however, if it ever took place, was too transitory to have any permanent results. But at the beginning of the following century, Mûsâ b. Nu'sîr [q.v.] who had just completed the conquest of Ifrikiya, took Tangier, installed a governor there and set himself to conquer and convert the native. He succeeded without much trouble. Attracted by the hopes of gain, the Berbers adopted Islam and enrolled themselves in the armies which were invading Spain. They were not long, however, in
rising against the Arabs. Dissatisfied with the share allotted them of lands taken from the Christians in the Peninsula, and exasperated by the exactions of the governors of Tangier, they took up arms in 740 on the call of the porter Matsura [q.v.]. The rebellion was both religious and political in character. With the same readiness with which they had adopted Islam, the Berbers adopted Kharidist doctrines from the east, teachings which also appealed to their egalitarian tendencies and to their spirit of independence. The army sent from Syria to establish order was destroyed on the banks of the Sebût (742) and the extreme Maghrib was lost at one stroke to the caliph and to orthodoxy. Berber principalities were organised in the Rif [seemiddâma]; in the west, the Barghawata [q.v.] recognised the authority of a certain Sahh, founder of a rival religion to Islam, who had composed a Qur'ân, that is a sacred book, in Berber. None of these little states was strong enough to impose its authority on the others and to collect all the Berber tribes under one rule.

It was for a time as if the Idrisid dynasty [q.v.] were to play this part. Idris I and his successor Idris II, actually enforced their authority over the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and successful expeditions extended their kingdom from the shores of the Mediterranean to the High Atlas and from the Atlantic to beyond Tlemcen. Ardent champions of Islam, they imposed their religion on those peoples who did not yet practise it or who had abandoned it after once adopting it. The conversion of the extreme Maghrib to Islam is their work much more than that of the Arab conquerors. Zealous defenders of orthodoxy, in spite of their 'Aliid origin, they fought the Kharidjis with the same vigour but did not, however, succeed in completely exterminating the heresy. It is not without good reason that legend has transformed these rude warriors into saints, the one Idris I, patron saint of Morocco, the other Idris II, the patron saint of the city of Fas [q.v.] which he had founded. The building of this city had enduring results. It gave northern Morocco a religious, political and economic centre which it had lacked since the disappearance of Roman rule. Favoured by its position, Fas prospered rapidly. It survived all causes of decline, even the collapse of the Idrisid power.

The Idrisids indeed rapidly declined. The various groups which had recognised the authority of the founders of the dynasty were not long in casting it off and fighting with one another. These rivalries were taken advantage of by the Fatimids of Ifriqiya and the Umayyads of Spain, who during the tenth century A.D. disputed the possession of the Miknâsa, the Umayyads in the end remained masters of the country. They were in their turn ousted by the Maghrawa [q.v.], whose chief Ziri b. Attiya, abandoning the cause of the Umayyads, seized Fas where his descendants ruled for three quarters of a century.

The Almoravids and the Almohads. The extreme Maghrib seemed to be condemned to anarchy and to be broken up among small factions when the Almoravid invasion came [cf. ALMORAVIS]. After having first of all subjected all the lands south of the High Atlas, then established themselves solidly on the northern slopes, at the foot of which Yusuf b. Tashfin founded Marrâ-
kush [q.v.]. In 1062, these Saharan hordes turned to the centre, east and north of Morocco, sweeping everything before them: Fas, Tangier, the Rif, Oran and Ténès fell before them. The Berber principalities of the Maghrawa, the Barghawata and Banû Ifrîn disappeared. In less than twenty years, Yusuf b. Tashfin became sole master of the extreme Maghrib as far as Algiers. To these territories, already vast, was soon to be added half of Spain. Summoned by the Muslim emirs who were threatened by the king of Castile, Yusuf b. Tashfin checked the Christian advance at Zallaqa (1086), then possessed the petty Muslim rulers to his own advantage. Morocco was thus extended across the Straits of Gibraltar as far as the Ebro and to the Balearic Islands. The fortunes of the Almoravids were, it is true, as ephemeral as they were brilliant. In contact with Andalusian civilization, the Saharan rapidly became decadent. The rigid orthodoxy, which had been their strength, relaxed; they in their turn were regarded as infidels, "anthropomorphists" (mudâjjissimâ), whom it was lawful and meritorious to slay. The Almoravids were not the only group of Berbers to attempt the construction of orthodoxy that the Maşūmâ and the Himilâta of the High Atlas under the leadership of Ibn Tûmart and 'Abd al-Mu'min entered into the struggle against the Almoravids.

This struggle ended in the displacement of the Almoravids by the Almohads [see ALMOHADES and 'ABD AL-MU'MIN]. In seven years (1139—1146 A.D.) 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered all Morocco; Sidjlâma, Oran, Tlemcen, and Ceuta fell one after the other into his hands. Next came the turn of Salé, Fas, and finally Marrâkush, the gates of which were opened to him by the treachery of the Christian mercenaries. Muslim Spain was also conquered with the exception of the Balearic Islands. Even in Africa, the Hâmâhid kingdom of Bougie was conquered in 545—546 (1151—1152). A few years later (554—555 = 1159—1160) a new expedition led 'Abd al-Mu'min into Ifriqiya and secured him possession of the interior and of the coast, which he took from the Normans of Sicily who had occupied it some time before. Morocco in the strict sense of the word was now merely a province in the vast Berber empire. The unification of these territories under one ruler had important consequences for the Maghrib. It facilitated the diffusion in North Africa of the Hispânico-Moorish civilization, which was to be perpetuated in Morocco after it had disappeared from the Peninsula itself. Further it brought into the extreme Maghrib a new ethnic element: the Arab, 'Abd al-Mu'min, as well as his successors, on several occasions deported Ilîlî tribes from the Central Maghrib and Ifriqiya, where they continually created unrest, to the sub-Atlantic plains where other groups of Arabs joined them of their own free will.

The Almohad empire was too vast, it comprised regions of too different a nature, peoples too foreign to one another to last long united. The Almohad caliphs were powerless to restrain the separatist tendencies which revealed themselves on all sides. In the first half of the xiith century A.D., the Almohad empire broke up. Ifriqiya and the Central Maghrib recovered their independence; local dynasties set up in Tunis, Ifads and Tlem-
sen ('Abd al-Wâïdîs). The extreme Maghrib endured by slipping away from the descendants of 'Abd al-Mu'min who were replaced by the Merînids [q.v.].
The Merinids. Berbers of Zenata stock, driven by the Hilâli Arabs on to the plateau of Oran and into the central valley of the Muluya, the Banû Merin had at first entered the service of the Almohads, then turned against them, when the power of the dynasty began to decline. By repeated razzias they made themselves masters of almost all northern Morocco. After the death of the caliph al-Sâif, who had been able to arrest their progress for a time, their leader Abû Yahyâ (1243–1258) seized Fâs, Meknes, Rabat and Sidjilmisa. The capture of Marrakûsh (1269) by Abû Yusuf, successor of Yahyâ, marked the final triumph of the Merinids. Heirs of the Almohads, the first Merinids endeavoured to reconstitute the empire of their predecessors. In Spain, they enforced their authority on the Muslims of Andalusia. In Africa, they endeavoured to take the central Maghrib from the ‘Abd al-Wâdids. They were successful when Timessen, besieged seven times in sixty years, finally fell into the hands of Sultan Abu ‘l-Hasan (1337 A.D.). Ten years later, the same ruler took Bougie, Constantine and Tunis, but his hold on them was very uncertain. At the end of barely a year, Abu ‘l-Hasan, defeated by the Arabs, found himself forced to abandon Ifrikiya, the Hafsids returned to Tunis and the ‘Abd al-Wâdids to Timessen, while the sultan’s own son Abû ‘Inan rose against him in Morocco. Attaining to power, Abû ‘Inan renewed his father’s efforts. He re-occupied Timessen and Tunis, it is true, but could not retain them (1560 A.D.). The Hafsids and ‘Abd al-Wâdids recovered their kingdoms almost at once.

Separatist tendencies thus triumphed and on this occasion in a most definite fashion. The extreme Maghribi, the history of which had hitherto been so often that of Barbary, began to live its own life. The Merinid kingdom, while its boundaries in the east were still vague and changing, already corresponded roughly to modern Morocco and the Merinids may be regarded as the first strictly Moroccan rulers. Lacking the religious prestige of their predecessors, they endeavoured to secure the moral authority which they lacked by taking as their patron saints the apostles of Islam in the Maghrib. The cult of Mawlû ‘Idris in the xivth and particularly the xvth century assumed an importance which it has retained to the present day. No less characteristic is the development of intellectual life and the arts. The Iñsâno-Moorish civilisation never flourished more brilliantly in Morocco than in the Merinid period. The rulers attracted to their court the poets, men of letters and lawyers of the Iberian Peninsula and of the Maghrib. The university of al-Karaouyin attracted students from all the lands of the western Muslim world. Fâs, which the Merinids, abandoning Marrakush and Rabat, the capitals of their predecessors, chose as their royal residence, was given splendid buildings by them, palaces, mosques and madrasas. It was at the same time a commercial city in which African and Spanish merchants mixed with Christian traders.

This brilliant exterior, however, was quite deceptive. Merinid Morocco was never able to organise itself on a solid basis. The central power was very weak and did not succeed in imposing authority everywhere. The accession of each sultan was an occasion for outbreaks. The pretenders who arose always found supporters readily, either among the Arabs or the Berbers. Powerless in the interior, the sultans were no more fortunate in their enterprises against their neighbours of the Central Maghrib or against the kings of Granada. Their prestige and their authority could not survive these checks. The Merinids in the strict sense disappeared from the scene in 1465, after the assassination of the sultan by an Idrisid shairf. The Banû Wâq, descended from a collateral branch, the chief of whom seized the power in 1470, had themselves a wretched existence. Their kingdom broke up into a large number of independent little groups, principalities at Fâs and Marrakûsh, Berber republics in the Atlas, Marabout fiefs in the Rif, the Gharb and in Dar’s and Sûs. The sultans were quite powerless to prevent this decomposition.

The Christian offensive and the revival of Islam. Of all the causes which combined to enfeeble and discredit these rulers, the principal was undoubtedly their impotence against the offensive of the Christians against the Maghrib. In 1415 the Portugeese took Ceuta, in 1465 al-Kasr al-Sâbah, in 1471 Tangier, documents and collections of operations in the north while by the occupation of Aigâr and Anfa (Casablanca; q.v.) they secured a footing on the Atlantic coast. In the early years of the xvth century, they built fortified posts at Santa Cruz (Aqâdir) and Mazagan (q.v.) and took by force of arms Safi and Azemmûr (q.v.). Holding all places of importance except Larache [see al-Arâbîyyîn] they brought under their protectorate all the lands near the coast (Shawiya, Hîja, Dukkala), forced the natives to pay them tribute and to hand over to them strategic points up to the environs of Marrakûsh. Their expeditions had no other aim than plunder, no other result than to exasperate the inhabitants who saw their towns destroyed, their douars burned, their women and children massacred or sold as slaves.

Menaced in the west by the Portuguese, Morocco was threatened in the east by the Spaniards also. The latter completed the reconquest by the taking of Granada (1492). Thus free to go further afield, and still fired with the religious enthusiasm of Ximenes, they too went over to fight the Muslims on African soil. The occupation of al-Masrât al-Kabîr (1507) and of Oran (1509) and the establishment of a Spanish protectorate over the kingdom of Timessen constituted a serious danger to the Muslims of Morocco.

The threat from the Christians produced an awakening of religious sentiment. This remembrance of Islam in the xivth and xvth centuries, the results of which are still to be felt at the present day, is beyond question the great event in the history of Morocco since the Idrisid period. The way for it had, moreover, been prepared by the Sufi teachings imported from the east and by the development of the brotherhoods in which the adepts of these doctrines were organized. It also found a favourable soil owing to the persistence of maraboutism among the Berbers. The khulûl or the charlatan, who had always been an object of public consideration, became readily identified with the shairf, the preacher of the khulûl. Cooperating with one another, these pious individuals became the religious leaders of the people of Morocco. They strengthened orthodoxy, excited the zeal of the faithful, preached the holy war, and led the defenders of the faith into battle. The ascendancy
which they exercised, the wealth they accumulated in their zāwiya, made them independent of the sultan. They thus became temporal leaders also, all the more readily as the sovereigns could not fulfill their office of defenders of Islam owing to lack of energy and also of means. The activity of these religious leaders was always of a local nature; it was only effectively exercised within a limited area and did not extend over the country generally. The religious solidarity thus established, the kind of common conscience thus created, did not put a check to the political decline until the time when the Sa’di’ān shorfa took direction of the movement and exploited it for their own benefit.

The Sharīfian dynasties. A. The Sa’di’āns [q.v.]. The Sa’di’ān shorfa benefited by the prestige which the religious awakening had restored to the descendents, real or presumed, of Fātimah, the daughter of the Prophet. Coming from Arabia at the end of the xiv century and settling in the valley of the wādi Dā’a, while another branch of the family settled at Tafshelf (Hasan or Aflīd shorfa), they became long in acquiring a considerable influence over the tribes of the south. Thus were naturally led to support the people of the south, who were exposed to the attacks of the Portuguese of Santa Cruz. In 1511, the sharif of Tāmādāret, requested by the Muslims to put himself at their head against the Christians, agreed to do so. Supported by the marabouts who gave him valuable assistance, he began hostilities against the Portuguese. The holy war regularly waged to secure to his sons, Aḥmad al-ʿAraḍ and Muḥammad al-Mahdi, the possession of the whole of southern Morocco up to the ūmm al-Rabī’. The intervention of the Merinid sultan in the quarrels which broke out between the two brothers only resulted in his own downfall being hastened. Muḥammad al-Mahdi took Fās in 1550; the foiling of an attempt to restore the Merinids in 1554, with the help of the Turks of Algiers, secured the definite triumph of the Sa’di’āns.

The coming of the Sa’di’āns meant a regular reconstitution of Morocco. Muḥammad al-Mahdi and his successors imposed their authority on the whole country, protected it against foreign foes and increased the extent of their territory by distant conquests. They finally triumphed over the difficulties created by the Turks of Algiers, and at the battle of al-Kāṣr al-Kābir in 1578 arrested a counter-offensive of the Portuguese. Aḥmad al-Manṣūr (1578–1606) occupied Timbuktu (q.v.), and destroyed the Askia empire of Gao. For half a century the Moroccans were masters of the Western Sa’di’ān, from the banks of the Senegal as far as Bornū. The plunder taken on this campaign of conquest enabled the sultan to keep a splendid court, the hierarchy of which was modelled on the Ottoman court, and to adorn his capital Marrakesh with magnificent monuments.

To the same period also belongs the organisation of the maḥzen [q.v.]. The early Sa’di’āns had relied for support on the Arab tribes of the south. To these al-Manṣūr added the Arab tribes of the region of Tlemcen and Ujda driven into Morocco by the Turkish conquest. These ghurāqa, as they were called, received lands around Fās in return for the military service they were forced to give. Reinforced by a regular army formed of renegades, Spanish Moors and negroes, trained by Turkish deserters, the maḥzen provided the sultan with the means of preserving order and levying taxes; it was thus the essential instrument of sharifian government and tended to become the government itself.

This instrument proved sufficient in the hands of an energetic ruler but was inefficient in weaker hands and in moments of crisis. The Sa’di’āns were soon found out. The tendencies to disruption which had been held in check by the energy of al-Manṣūr broke out again on his death. The dispute for the throne set his sons against one another. One of them, Zā’di’ān, ended by triumphing over his rivals but could not prevent the break-up of the empire. Larache was occupied by the Spaniards; Fās cast off sharifian authority. The Andalus of Rabat and Salé [q.v.], enriched by their piracy, formed an independent republic. Finally the Sa’di’āns, although they had owed their elevation to the religious movement, now found the marabouts rising against them. Delivered from the restraints which the distrust of al-Mahdi and his successors had placed upon them, the latter began to gain more and more hold over the south. Thus were led to the run of the sharifian authority. Süs was in the control of one of them, Süli ʿAli; Tafshelf was under the Hasan shorfa, the Gharb under al-ʿAiyāshī, leader of the “volunteers of the faith”. In the centre, the power of the marabout of Dilâ (a zāwiya on the upper course of the Wādi L’Abid) increased. Muhammad al-Ḥāḍidj, their leader, victorious over the Sa’di’āns and over al-ʿAiyāshī, lord of Salé and Fās, seemed on the point of founding a new Berber empire from the Atlantic to the Mulaya. Incapable, in spite of the support given them by the English and Dutch, of disposing of the adversities, the Sa’di’āns now held only Marrakesh and its immediate environs. The last representative of the dynasty died in 1660, assassinated by the shaikh of the tribe of Shabbānāt.

B. The Hasan shorfa. The disintegration of Morocco was arrested by the coming of the Hasan shorfa. The latter had taken advantage of the disorder to assert their authority in Tafshelf, then by expeditions, which partook of the nature of brigandage as much as of warfare, they had conquered eastern Morocco. One of them, Mawāli Muḥammad, had even tried, without success, it is true, to take Fās from the Dilâ’s. His successor Mawāli al-Raṣḥid (1660–1702) was more successful. He took Fās, disposed of Ghailān, an adventurer who had established himself securely in the Gharb, destroyed the zāwiya of Dilâ, reconquered Marrakesh, thus rebuilding as it were piece by piece the sharifian empire. Installed by force of arms, the new dynasty recognised the necessity of securing the moral prestige which their origin could not give them. They therefore sought to attract to their side the sharifian families. They helped favours on the shorfa of Wazzān, whose patronage was a guarantee even for the rulers.

The work begun by Mawāli al-Raṣḥid continued and brought to a successful conclusion by his successor Ismā’il (1672–1729). During the first fifteen years of his reign, he did not cease to wage war on the rulers who disputed the districts of Marrakesh and Süs with him. While fighting his enemies, he was engaged in building up an army which would work his will. To the maḥzen formed by the Shrāğa and Uḍayā he added a body of black slaves, the ʿAbid al-Bukhārī (Bābkheer), the property
of the sultan; their children were specially trained for military service. The number of effectives in this corps by the end of the reign numbered one hundred and fifty thousand men. The sultan was thus able to reduce to obedience the Berbers of the Atlas and the upper Muluya. Defeated and disarmed, the latter were kept in control by garrisons placed in kasbas built at the exits to the valleys or commanding the lines of communication. The notables whom the sultan had taken into his service or united to himself by matrimonial alliances forced their tribesmen to live in peace. The bilâd al-maghârib, i.e. the country where tribute was regularly paid, extended over almost the whole of the extreme Maghrib. The pacification of the interior did not cause Mawli l Ismâ'il to forget the obligations imposed on every Muslim ruler to fight the infidels. He therefore continued the holy war against the Christians of the coast. He recaptured al-Mahdiya, Larache, Asâl, and Tangier, evacuated by the English in 1684, but could not take Ceuta from the Spaniards in spite of a siege or rather an uninterrupted blockade for seventeen years. He was no more successful in his enterprise against the Turks of Algiers, who disputed with the Moroccans the possession of the plains of eastern Morocco and the ksar of southern Oran. The expeditions which he directed against the Algerians ended in failure, and the lower course of the Muluya continued to be the boundary of the sharifian empire. In spite of his lack of success here, Mawli l Ismâ'il is nevertheless the great figure of the Hassani dynasty, the model the Moroccon sultans have set themselves to the present day. Morocco, however, remained what it was before, i.e. an aggregation of different groups, the cohesion of which depended on the personal energy of the sovereign. The processes of administration were in no way altered: the sharif enforced obedience by drastic executions; he squeezed his subjects to the utmost to get the money necessary for the building of his capital Meknes [q.v.], the palaces of which were built by the forced labour of the natives and of Christian slaves.

On the death of Mawli l Ismâ'il, a reaction set in. For thirty years his sons fought with one another. The real masters of the situation were the 'Abid who made and unmade sultans as they pleased. One of them, Mawli l 'Abd Allâh, was proclaimed and deposed six times. He succeeded, however, in triumphing over his competitors by playing the Berbers off against the 'Abid, the importance of whom gradually diminished with the years. The remedy, however, was not much better than the disease. This period was for Morocco one of misery and rain. The authority of the sharifs emerged much weakened from it.

Mawli Muhammad (1577—1792) succeeded, however, in restoring it. Inheriting the energy and vigour of his grandfather Ismâ'il, he brought the rebel Berbers back to their allegiance, and by the taking of Marrakesh in 1706 destroyed the last trace of Portuguese power on the Atlantic coast. Convinced, on the other hand, that the weakness of the central power was mainly due to a lack of financial resources, he endeavoured to procure money by encouraging the development of foreign trade. He inaugurated a mercantile policy, concluded treaties of commerce with Denmark, Sweden, England, and France and endeavoured to attract foreign merchants to his kingdom by founding for them the town of Mogador [q.v.] in 1764. Heavy taxes, however, severely impeded the progress of this policy. Morocco remained a poor country and did not open itself, as had been hoped, to European penetration. It also remained in a perpetual turmoil. Under Mawli l Vâjid (1792—1794) the country was once more handed over to anarchy. Mawli l Slimâ'n (Sulâmân) (1794—1822), after at first being able to restore order, had to spend the last ten years of his reign in putting down the continual risings of the Berbers of the middle Atlas; in the course of one of these expeditions he actually fell into the hands of the rebels. This rebelliousness caused the sultan much misgiving; he also wanted to prevent the infiltration of foreign and anti-Muslim influences which he believed would aggravate it. He forbade his subjects to leave the country and restricted to a minimum their intercourse with Christians. The diplomatic and consular agents were relegated to Tangier, and access to the interior was made almost impossible for Europeans. His successors followed his example. Down to the end of the sixth century, Morocco was more rigorously closed than it had been in the time of the Merinids and Sâ'dîs and even in the early days of the Hassani sharifs. In spite of this systematic isolation, the sultans had nevertheless to face the same difficulties as Mawli l Slimâ'n and had no more success than he in overcoming them.

For half a century the domestic history of Morocco was a series of rebellions which the sovereigns had great difficulty in suppressing. The regions remote from the centre, Rif, Tâfnât, Figûére, and even eastern Morocco, escaped the authority of the makhzen. In the very heart of the country, the Berbers cut communications between Fès and Marrakesh, forcing the sultans when they wanted to move from one capital to the other to make a great detour by Rabat. The empire broke up more and more. Mawli l-Hasan (1873—1894) postponed for a few years the inevitable collapse. His reign resembled that of Mawli l Ismâ'il. At the head of his army, the artillery of which had been reorganised by a French military mission, he was continually in the field raiding the rebels and tearing down kasbas. He re-established order in the region of Chérif, forced the people of Sûs to recognise his kâids, reduced to obedience the Zaâr and Zayân, endeavoured to extend the makhzen country by expeditions against the independent Berbers, endeavoured to develop his influence in the Saharan regions and to restore his authority in Tutân. But he died before completing his task and all had to be begun again.

Morocco and the Christian powers. The situation was the more critical that the fate of Morocco could no longer be a matter of indifference to the European powers. It increased the unpredictability of some and aroused the curiosity of others. In spite of their desire for isolation, the sultans had not been able to break every link with Europe. They had al-nâ to take account of the proximity of Spain, established for three centuries in the presidio of the Mediterranean of the French who had replaced the Turks in Algeria [q.v.]. The conquest of the old Regency, destroying all the sharifs' hopes of extension eastwards, had caused great irritation in Morocco.

'Abd al-Kâdir [q.v.] found followers among the peoples of this country and support hardly disguised on the part of the makhzen. This hostile
attitude resulted in the Franco-Moroccan war of 1911. The sharifian army was crushed at the battle of Isly, the ports of Tangier and Mogador bombarded. The moderation of France alone enabled the mahkzen to come fairly well out of this unfortunate ecapade. Henceforth the relations between France and Morocco remained peaceful, although the impotence of the sharifian government to guarantee security on its borders forced France to military demonstrations like the B. Snæssen campaign (1859) and the wâdi Gis expedition (1870). Spain in turn being unable to obtain satisfaction from the attacks directed against her garrisons decided also to resort to arms. The campaign of 1859–1860, ended by the victory of O'Donnell, revealed the military weakness of Morocco. The treaty of Tetwâna (1860) granted to Spain, along with some trilling territorial aggrandizement, an indemnity of 100,000,000 reals. To pay this debt, the sharifian government had to raise a loan in London on the security of the Moroccan customs and to accept the control of European commissioners. For the first time foreigners intervened in the domestic administration of the empire. The breach thus made was continually enlarged. The exercise of the right of protection, the erection of a lighthouse on Cape Spartel, served as a pretext for diplomatic negotiations and for the extension of international control. European ambitions were not dissimulated. In order to protect itself against them, the mahkzen tried to play one off against the other and confined itself to granting, as it did at the conference of Madrid (1880), concessions devoid of all practical significance. Mawlî al-Hassan excelled in this difficult game and the vizier Bû Almad, who directed affairs during the early years of the reign of 'Abd al-'Azîz, Mawlî al-Hassan's successor, displayed no less skill. Morocco was thus the object of a very keen struggle for influence. England wanted to maintain her economic preponderance along with the control of the Strait; France wanted to ensure the security of her Algerian possessions and of the roads leading to the Saharan oases occupied in 1901–1902; Spain appealed to her "historics rights"; Germany lastly was preparing to seize the opportunity to acquire openings for her commerce and emigrants. The Moroccan crisis and the establishment of the French protectorate. Such a position could not last. The imprudences of Sulîn 'Abîl-Îzîz precipitated the crisis. The whims of the sovereign and his immoderate desire for European innovations displeased the strictest Muslims. The modifications in the fiscal policy made by the tarîfîs disturbed the people already taxed to the utmost. Rebellion broke out everywhere. A pretender, the rûgî Bû Hamâmî, rose in the region of Tûzû and routed an army sent against him. It was in vain that France by the agreements of 1901 and 1902 endeavoured to organise the activities of the mahkzen against the rebels and to postpone the inevitable catastrophe. On the failure of this effort, France decided to arrange with England and Spain to settle the Moroccan question and prevent the dismemberment of the empire. In return for recognition of the protectorate de facto exercised by England in Egypt and the granting to Spain of a sphere of influence in northern Morocco, these two powers recognised the right of France to act as her interests best demanded. France hastened to propose to the sulîn a plan for reforming the sharifian administration. The intervention of Germany prevented its realisation. On March 31, 1905, William II landed at Tangier and in a sensational speech posed as the defender of the independence of the sulîn. On the advice of the German representative, 'Abd al-'Azîz appealed for the constitution of an international conference to study the reforms to be introduced into the Maghrib. The conference met at Algiers (Jan. 15—April 7, 1906) and affirmed the three principles of the sovereignty of the sulîn, the territorial integrity and economic freedom of Morocco. It did not, however, settle the Moroccan question. The two international bodies which it decided to set up, the police for the ports and the state bank, both capable of being of great service, could not take the place of the general reforms necessary for the salvation of the empire. Disorders continued, acts of hostility against Europeans in Morocco itself and acts of brigandage on the frontiers increased in number. Not being able to obtain satisfaction for outrages on its subjects, the French government ordered the occupation of Ujdâa and Casablanca in 1907. The country was then pacified around these two centres and order restored in eastern Morocco and in the Shawiya to the great benefit of the natives themselves. The Spaniards in their turn for similar reasons intervened in 1908 in the adjoining region of Melïlla and after a severe campaign in 1909 occupied Salwâa and a number of strategic points.

During this period war broke out between 'Abd al-'Azîz and his brother Mawlî 'Abd al-Hafîz, proclaimed sulîn at Marrakûsh. Supported by the anti-Moroccan party, the pretender was victorious. All the powers, including France and Spain, recognised him, after he had promised to respect the agreement of Algeciras, the international treaties and all the engagements entered into by his predecessors. France and Spain announced their intention of not prolonging their occupation of sharifian territory. The Franco-Moroccan agreements of March 4, 1910, and the Hispano-Moroccan of Nov. 19 of the same year, stipulated that the occupation should cease as soon as the mahkzen should have a force sufficient to guarantee the security of life and property and peace within its frontiers. This settlement seemed all the more desirable as there had been occasional friction between France and Germany which had only been smoothed over with great difficulty, the most serious being the affair of the deserters from Casablanca in Sept. 1908. A disquieting state of tension remained between these two powers, although France had endeavoured to give satisfaction to Germany in signifying, by the agreement of Feb. 8, 1909, her willingness not to impede the economic freedom nor hinder the development of German interests.

The aggravation of the situation in the interior hastened the dénouement. The sulîn's rule was no more effective than that of his predecessors; the exactions of the sharifian agents in the spring of 1911 provoked a rising of the Arab and Berber tribes in the region of Fas. Besieged in his capital and on the point of succumbing, the sulîn appealed to the French. They decided to send an expeditionary force to the help of the sulîn. France ordered its commander to accept any arrangement in the independence of the sulîn and any occupation of new territory. Vigorously commanded by General
Moinier, the military operations had the desired effect. Fès was relieved on May 21, and after certain police operations necessary to secure the peace of the district, the expeditionary force returned to the coast. But, while the danger was thus banished from the interior, unexpected complications arose in Spain, taking advantage of the occasion to take possession of the sphere of influence reserved for her by the agreement of 1904, established herself in Larache and al-Ḳasī, Germany, feeling the moment was decisive, claimed compensation in her turn and sent a warship to Agadir. This demonstration provoked the greatest alarm in France and in Europe generally. In the end, however, a peaceful settlement was reached. After four months of difficult negotiations, the agreement of Nov. 4, 1911 put an end to the dispute. Germany abandoned all political claims to Morocco and admitted with certain reservations, chiefly of an economic nature, the principle of the French protectorate. There was no longer any obstacle to the establishment of this regime, which the sultan accepted by the treaty of March 30, 1912. This diplomatic document stipulated the maintenance of the sovereignty of the sultan, the representation of and protection by French diplomatic and consular agents of Moroccan subjects and interests abroad, the carrying out, with the collaboration of and under the direction of France, of a number of administrative reforms, judicial, financial and military, intended to "give the shahifian empire a new régime, while safeguarding the traditional prestige and honour of the sultan, the practice of the Muslim faith and the institutions of religion".

The French protectorate now extends over the whole of Morocco, but the Spanish sphere of influence enjoys by the agreement of Nov. 27, 1912 complete autonomy from the administrative and military point of view, while Tangier and its environs form an international zone, the status of which is not yet definitely regulated.

The establishment of the protectorate was to have had as its first result the restoration of the authority of the shahif, whose support was essential for the carrying out of the reforms. This could only be attained by a considerable effort. The central power was weaker than it had ever been at the time when the conclusion of the protectorate treaty put an end to the crisis. The chief of the guerîs was almost non-existent. France had to conquer Morocco for the sultan. The name of Marshal Lyautey, appointed High Commissioner and Resident General, will remain inseparable from the history of the pacification of Morocco, like that of Bugeaud in the history of the conquest of Algeria. Very difficult in itself, for it brought the French into contact with warlike tribes, some of whom had never recognised the authority of the mahzen, the task was further complicated by events abroad. Order had hardly been restored around the chief towns, Fès, Meknes, Marrakûsh and communication restored between eastern and western Morocco, when the War of 1914 broke out. For a moment it was feared that the French were going to abandon the interior and fall back on the coast, but the progress of the pacification of the country was only slowed down, not interrupted. All the conquered positions were retained and the rebels held on all fronts. The counter-offensives of the rebels in the Târass corridor, along the Middle Atlas and in Sûs were crushed. The War finished, the offensive was resumed to reduce the districts still unsubdued (Middle Atlas, south of the High Atlas, upper valley of the Moulouya). Three years of difficult fighting (1921—1924) ended in the occupation of "all Morocco of value"; i.e. those regions of economic, political or military importance. The Rifian offensive in 1925 was the greatest, soups to compromise all the success achieved. A Rifian chief, Abd al-Karim, had gathered around him the greater part of the tribes of northern Morocco and inflicted serious reverses on the Spaniards and forced them to abandon a portion of the territory which they had occupied. Crossing the Spanish zone, he invaded the valley of the Wargha and threatened Fès. The resistance of the posts echeloned along the frontier gave reinforcements time to reach the scene of hostilities. Checked in the autumn, the Rifian advance was definitely crushed in the spring of 1926 thanks to the combined action of France and Spain. At the moment of writing, the conquest may be regarded as completed: only a few tribes of the Central Atlas and of the oases of the Sahara have not yet been reached by the French, but their reduction is only a matter of time.

The administrative reorganisation has kept pace with the pacification. The old machinery has been retained but submitted to a control which guarantees the natives against abuse of their power and excesses by the agents of the mahzen. Technical services have been created to give the country the works necessary for its economic life. The remarkable results obtained in all fields have been facilitated by the influx of European immigrants and capital. Morocco seemed condemned to regression. Now it is being completely transformed. A new epoch is beginning, very different from any that have preceded it.


be possible to estimate the total population of Morocco to within a few hundred thousands.

The total usually given is 5,000,000, of whom a tenth, 500,000, are in the zone of the Spanish protectorate. This population is very unequally distributed and its density varies with geographical conditions. The most thickly populated part is that of the plains of western Morocco between the massif of the Djebala in the north and the Great Atlas in the south: Gharb, Shâwya, Tâdla, Dukhâla and 'Abda. The density of the population also varies with the fertility of the soil. The population of this region is estimated at two fifths of the total. The mountainous regions, Djebala, Rif, Middle Atlas are not thickly populated, as we might have expected from the comparatively dense population of Kabylia, in another mountainous region of North Africa. As to the Sahara zone, outside the belts of oases in the Wâdi Gir, the Wâdi Ziz (Tâflâût) and the Wâdi Darâ (Dra), it is very sparsely inhabited.

b. Elements of the population. The population of Morocco consists for the most part of Berbers and Arabs, the former being the older element and the latter invaders. As to the Berbers, who do not seem to be a homogeneous race and whose origin is obscure, see the separate article on them. As to the Arabs, they are in a minority, but it is often difficult to attribute an exact ethnic origin to certain tribes or federations, so much have the Arabs and Berbers become mixed since the Muslim conquest, and intermingled either by peaceful or warlike methods. It will be more prudent and will give a more accurate result if we distinguish in Morocco between those who speak Arabic and those who speak Berber (see below VII. LANGUAGES). The former live entirely in the plains, while with the exception of the massif of the Djebala, the inhabitants of the mountains speak Berber.

1. Berbers. Three main groups may be distinguished among the Berbers of Morocco: in the north the Rifans and the Beni Zuâsîn; in the centre the Znîga (Sanhâjja) and the Harrâb (Harâbî); who form the population of the Middle Atlas; the third group is that of the Shâhî [cf. the article Shâhid] who occupy the western part of the High Atlas and of the Anti-Atlas, as well as the plain of Sûs. In addition to these main groups, we may mention the Djebala, arabised Berbers, to the N.W. of Fès, and the Harrâtîn (plur. of the Arabic Harâfîn), who seem to be regarded as an intermixture of Berbers and Sudânese and form the basis of the settled population of the zone of the Saharan oases.

2. Arabs. The early invasions at the time of the Muslim conquest do not seem to have appreciably modified the ethnology of the country. Down to the xiii

III. Population.

da. Total population and density. It is difficult to fix with any precision the total population of Morocco. The attempts made at a census in recent years in the parts subject to the shari'în mahzûn enable, it is true, comparatively accurate estimates to be made for the greater part of the country and corroborate for most districts the estimates made by European travellers before the establishment of the French protectorate. But the parts of the shari'în empire still outside the authority of the mahzûn and those whose southern boundaries are not exactly known have not been seriously investigated from this point of view, and until they have been scientifically studied it will not
plain, may be divided into two main ethnic groups: the Banû Hilâl [q.v.] and the Ma‘ālik. The latter occupies almost exclusively the valley of the Upper Muluya as well as the lands south of the Atlas. The Banû Hilâl occupy the sub-Atlantic plains and the steppes of Eastern Morocco.

3. Jews. There are about 150,000 Jews in Morocco, mainly living in the towns. There are also a considerable number among the tribes of the Great Atlas. They also form the principal element in the population of the two little towns of Debdû and Demnût [q.v.]. The origin of the earliest elements in this Jewish population is obscure: it is difficult to ascertain whether they were Jews who had migrated from Palestine or were judaized Berbers. The modern element is made up of Jews who fled from Spain to Morocco in the xvith century. The former call themselves *phishfitim* (Paisantinns) and are called *forasteros* (foreigners) by the Spanish immigrants, who are practically all settled in the towns of the coast and are rapidly becoming Europeanized.

Miscellaneous elements. The negroes, of whom there are considerable numbers in Morocco, do not however form a distinct group there. In the north we find many, who are almost all of slave origin. The predilection of the townsmen of Morocco for black concubines, noted for their domestic virtues, has brought into the population, especially in bourgeois circles, a very considerable amount of negro blood. To the south of the Atlas in the oases, the intermarriage of negroes and Berbers has produced the Haraţî. Finally the negroes of the Sûdân, since the Middle Ages, have always been esteemed as mercenaries to form the imperial guards, especially since the taking of Timbuctu by the armies of the Sa’dîan Sultan Ahmad al-Manşûr [q.v.].

Large numbers of Muslims from Spain, whether of Arab origin or descendants of Christian inhabitants of the Peninsula, have contributed to form the population of the towns at various times: Cordovans banished by al-Hakam I at the beginning of the third century A.H. after the "revolt of the suburb" and Muslims expelled from Spain at the "Reconquista".

We must not omit the influence that may have been exercised on the population of Morocco by Europeans (renegades, who had adopted Islam, mercenaries recruited outside Morocco and settled in the country), and finally we may note that frequently the sultâns have purchased women for their harems in Constantinople.

IV. Social and Economic Life.

a. Country. The population of Morocco, although for the most part rural, nevertheless has a larger proportion of town-dwellers than Central Barbary and, like the rest of North Africa, might be divided into nomadic and settled; this division does not at all coincide with that into Arabs and Berbers; there are still nomadic Berbers, while certain Arab tribes are becoming settled on the lands which they cultivate.

It has been shown that the nomadic or settled life of the country-people in North Africa does not depend, as was long thought, on ethnic factors, but is entirely conditioned by geographical considerations. It is the rule for dwellers in the mountains to be settled while the people of the desert steppes, forced to move about in search of pasture for their flocks, are nomads. There are however means between these two extremes and especially in Morocco, where we find many semi-nomads, who move only short distances, principally on the borders of the various mountains of the centre and south. But generally nomadism is the outcome of pastoral migration and its geographical extension to the rainfall and therefore to the nature of the vegetation.

It is in eastern Morocco, in the steppes which lie to the east of the Muluya, and to the south of the Great Atlas, towards the Sahara, that we find the principal groups of nomads in Morocco. In eastern Morocco, we may mention among the large tribes which lead a nomadic life the confederation of the Beni Gil, between Bergent and Figi; on the other side of the Atlas, the Ait Seddât, the Ait Lqâllâl, the Idrâû-hilâl, the Ait-â-Mribet; lastly to the south of the Drâa (Dra) country, the Rgilha, the Shkarna and the Awâl Dlim. As to the semi-nomads, we find them, outside the Middle Atlas, in the great plains of the Gharb, in the north, the Râhâmna and the Sbyadûna, in the south, where a pastoral life has not yet completely disappeared before a more settled state of society.

Nevertheless Morocco is, of the three countries of Barbary, that which has in its rural population the largest proportion of settled people, of fixed habitat and living not only in tents but also in houses. The latter are rarely found isolated in the country, but on the contrary are grouped into villages of more or less importance and more or less near one another, according to the density of the population.

The type of dwelling varies with the district. In the mountains the inhabitants build of unbaked bricks or stone with a gabled thatch or a flat roof. In the plains, the tent predominates, more or less fixed to the spot, and with it we find more and more the hut of branches, with a conical roof called *muccûl*. In the Saharan oases, the population collects within a walled area or *żiur* (sg. * żımur*, from the class *kṣm*); these conglomerations sometimes possess the elements of town-life. The villages are called *duar* (dâwûr) in the plains, and *dghar* in the mountains. In some hill regions we find survivals of cave-dwelling.

b. Town. Among the towns of his country, the Moroccan distinguishes a certain number that he definitely regards as cities (*hadâriyya*). These are Fâs, Rabat-Sâle and Tetwan, which have been more than others subjected to the influence of Spanish culture. It must however be noted that in the majority of the other towns we can still find traces of the existence of colonies formed by Muslims from Spain, especially from the xvith century onwards. The population of the *hadâriyya* towns is found to be composed of rustic elements but little urbanised. This is the case with Uджda and Mazagan (country Beduins) and also with Tangier (countrymen from the hills). Marrâkush and Meknès owe their special urban character to the fact that as capitals they have contained the courts of two Shâfi’i dynasties, both of Bedouin origin; they are *marakzâniyya* towns in which the standard of civilization does not reach the refinement of the *hadâriyya* Spanish towns. The ports of Tangier, Larache, Mazagan, Safi and Mogador were for long the only points of contact between Morocco and European influences, politically as well as commercially. Lastly in the mountains,
little towns like Sheshawan, Wazzan, Sefra, Debda, Demmat, and Debda. Demmat and Debda are mainly Jewish towns. As to Sefra, it seems probable that it is the survival of an old Berber town. We may also mention as towns of secondary importance on the Mediterranean coast, Ceuta, completely Europeanized for several centuries, on the Atlantic coast Azilal (Asaila), Casablanca, which owes its origin to the little port of Anfa, Aszmour, Agadir. In the interior, al-Kasr al-Kabir (el-Ksar, Spanish spelling: Alcazarquivir), Taza, Tarradant. Several ancient towns have now disappeared, e.g. Nakur and Bādis on the Mediterranean. Ti to the south of Mzagan, the two Agmat and Tinmalal to the south of Marrakush and several others, descriptions of which have been given by the geographers like al-Bakrī, al-Idrisī and Leo Africanus.

As a rule, the Moroccan town is grouped round a citadel or kasbah (pop. kalba) which is the seat of authority. Under the protection of the citadel lies the mellah or Jewish quarter. All around spreads the town proper or medina with its great mosque, markets and fàsir or rzāk (q.v.). It is surrounded by a rampart and beyond which there are usually the suburbs more or less rural in character. The town itself is divided into quarters (kaoune) with streets (zanka), alleys (zahr) and squares (rāba).

V. Economic Life. The country people, whether settled or nomadic, who form at least four fifths of the population of Morocco, live on the land, either by agriculture or stock-raising, most often combining the two. Those in the highlands grow cereals (wheat, barley), certain leguminous (broad beans, chick-peas, vetches) and fruit-trees. They also exploit their forests in a very primitive fashion (thuyas, cedars). The people of the plains devote themselves mainly to cereals and the raising of cattle, sheep, camels, horses and asses. In the oases of the south, the population cultivates the date-palm and understands the art of irrigating the land.

The rural industries are very primitive. They are limited to supplying the necessary implements of agriculture, and weaving wool into the material for garments, tents and carpets. The Berbers of Sās show a certain aptitude at metal-working (arms and jewels). Sās no longer exports the cane-sugar and copper, which formed considerable articles of trade under the Saadians.

Each tribe has a certain number of markets (sīk) which are held in the open country and bear the name of the day on which they are held. It is in the sīk that the peasant sells his produce and buys the manufactured articles that are brought by the merchants from the towns. Cereals are preserved in silos (moutirya); in the Great Atlas and to the south of it we find fortified storehouses, which belong to the community and are called āgardīr.

It is in the towns that we find industrial activity concentrated. Each trade, which originally formed a guild (hanta), is grouped in one street which bears its name. In it the articles are made and sold. The stocks are kept in the fondaks (Ar. fondāk) which correspond to the khān and wakilah of the east. Some products, like grain, oil, coal, wool, are sold in special places called rāba. The monopolies of exporting (ījār) corn and hides established by the sultāns at the end of the sixteenth century have now been abolished. Several European products have become of the first necessity in Morocco and form the subjects of an important traffic: cotton goods, tea and sugar and candles. For the history of the weights, measures and coins in use in Morocco before the establishment of the protectorate see the works by Massignan and Michaux-Bollaix quoted in the Bibliography. The very vivid picture drawn by Leo Africanus of the commercial and industrial activity of Fās in the Middle Ages is still very valuable.

The Jews, who devote themselves specially to certain trades that flourish in larger centres (goldsmiths, embroiderers), also play an important part as brokers. The citizens of Fās, who have a large number of converted Jews among their number, had almost a monopoly of the import trade of Morocco, especially from England, and for this reason had little colonies in the sea-ports.

The Berbers of Sās like to settle in the towns as grocers (baṣṣil) and having made their fortunes return to the country. Since the war of 1914—1918 a large number of them have migrated to France as labourers and they settle in groups, according to their original tribes, in the suburbs of certain large industrial towns.

V. Political Organization.

It is only at rare intervals and for short periods that Morocco has been entirely under the authority of the sultān; whence the distinction between the territory subjected to the government (bīlād al-makhzen) and the territory unsubjucted (bīlād al-saibā). As a rule, the makhzen territory included the towns, valleys and plains. The mountains, on the other hand, remained more or less independent, according to the degree of power possessed by the sovereign. For further details cf. the article MAHazen.

Outside the towns the population is grouped into tribes (kahila). Several are sometimes grouped together under a common name, without however being a confederation in the strict sense of the word; this is the case with the Qhumān in the north, the Hāša, the Dūkāla, the Shāwiya in the south. The tribe is subdivided into sections (rūk, khumay, fakhdha), which are subdivided into sub-sections comprising a certain number of villages of tents or houses.

The tribes who own the sultān's sway are governed by a kā'id appointed by the makhzen. His duty is to allot and levy the taxes, to raise contingents of soldiers and keep good order. He has under his command a shaikh for each section under whom are the maṣ'addam of the sub-sections.

For the distinction between makhzen, shaikh (vulg glīsh) and nība tribes see the article MAHazen.

In the tribes not subject to the makhzen, political activity is confined to the ġurna, i.e. an assembly of men, whose task it is to hear, argue and deal with all the business of the tribe, civil, criminal, financial and political. It administers justice following local custom (Arabic 'urf, Berber 'irf). It elect a shaikh (Berber amghar) who is only an agent to carry out its decisions. Alongside of the ġurna of the tribe, there are ġurna's of the sections and sub-sections but their powers are limited.

All the tribes of the bīlād al-saibā are divided into opposing factions or laff. When a tribe of
a certain laff is attacked, those neighbouring tribes who belong to the same faction take up arms and come to its assistance.

In the towns, the mahzen is represented by a governor whose official title is bi’id but in certain large towns he is often called bāghi. The title of ‘amīr has been sometimes given to the governor of Ugdja. The bi’id of the town, generally speaking, has the same functions as the bi’id of the district. He acts as judge in case of any violation of the law. He has an assistant or khalīfa. Alongside of him, the mawāṣis supervises the corporations, fixes their average prices and looks after public morals.

The bi’id has under his orders the mawāṣis and his police (mawāṣis) carrying out his instructions. Among the officials sent by the mahzen to each town may also be mentioned the nāzir or inspector of endowments (nijār), the trustee of vacant inheritances (sukkāl al-nūrābat, popularly bi-nawāṣis = abu l-nawāṣis), the collector of local taxes and market-dues (amin al-mustafā’). Lastly in the harbour and frontier towns, the customs are collected by officials called umāna (sg. amin).

Justice is administered by the bi’id or by the bāghi, as the case may be. The latter deals with questions of personal law; official reports on the cases are drawn up by the nāzir. In technical cases he appeals to experts: master-masons, agriculturists, veterinary surgeons (mawāṣis ‘an-nawāṣis, ardhīl et-turkā, faštān, batṣar). The legal opinions (fatawa) given by eminent jurists on the same question being often contradictory, the Sharifian government has recently created a council of appeal (mawāṣis al-as-andā’ī) at Rabat.

The landed property takes a number of different forms. In the first place, there are the state-domains; they are either managed directly by the mahzen (crown-lands) or they are allotted to gihā tribes in return for the military service for which they are liable; others of these lands may be granted in temporary or definite ownership to private individuals by imperial edict (sahīr or tarīfīn).

The kūbīs lands may be urban or rural. In the towns, they do not infrequently cover half the area. They are let out under special conditions which give the tenants some privileges, mawjūd as gāz (class. Ar. gazā‘). In the country, the kūbīs lands consist mainly of fields and orchards. In all cases, the revenue from these lands is set aside for the maintenance of buildings of a religious character or of public utility (mosques, colleges, schools, fountains) and for the payment of the officials attached to these establishments.

In Morocco, there are vast tracts of land which are not the property of any one individual, either as a result of the insecurity prevailing or of the sparsity of the population. These lands belong undivided to the whole tribe; they are called common lands (bi’id al-juma‘at).

Lastly, lands which have come to belong to foreign individuals (mulk) by inheritance or purchase have their character confirmed by a certificate of ownership (mulkīya).

The old Muslim imposts (sakīt and ‘ugrāf) have recently been merged into a single tax, the terīf. In addition to this tax, from which the state draws the essential part of its revenues, we may mention the duties levied at the gates of towns and in the markets (mukāḥ), unpopular with the people and not countenanced by religion, and the urban tax on buildings (tarīfī). In addition to these, the main taxes, there is the hādiya or present offered to the sultān on the occasion of the three great Muslim festivities. The hīya or poll-tax paid by non-Muslims and the mu‘āba or payment for exemption from military service by certain Arab tribes have been abolished.

VI. RELIGIOUS LIFE.

a. The Berbers before Islam. For lack of documents it is difficult to get any accurate idea of the religious beliefs and practices of the Berbers of Morocco, before their conversion to Islam and it is only from the survival of animistic cults which can still be observed in the country, that we can guess what the primitive religion was. The figures on two carved stones found in Morocco seem to be evidence of the existence of a solar worship. On animistic practices surviving in modern Islam in Morocco see below d. Islam in Modern Morocco.

b. Conversion to Islam. At the time of their invasion, the Arabs forced them in the districts around the towns the people were more or less under the influence of Jewish and Christian teachings; but there is little doubt that they did not practise these religions in their true form. It will be more correct to think of them as professing Judaism or Christianity rather than as real Jews or Christians. It seems evident that these influences had prepared the Berber population around the mountains to adopt the new monothetic religion, which the invaders imposed upon them. The two earliest invasions, that of ‘Uṣba b. Nāfi‘ in 640 and that of Mūsā b. Nūṣīr in 711, could result only in a very partial and superficial Islamisation, for very few Arab elements remained in the country. Islam, a town religion, was for long confined to larger centres. The Berbers generally became converted in the hope of escaping the vexations of the conquerors: but when the latter wanted to treat them simply as tributaries, they did not hesitate to apostatisate, on seven different occasions, if we may believe the Arab historians. One thing is certain, that while remaining Muslims, they were not long in trying to cast off the authority of the caliphs of Baghdad by adopting the heterodox doctrines of the Kūfrīs (q.v. and the article al-sūfīya). The Berbers of Morocco went even further when new local religions arose among them more or less based on Islam, with their own prophets and Kūfīs. After the attempt at rebellion by the Berber of Tangiers, Maisara (q.v.), which was quickly suppressed, the Barghawatī recognized as their prophet one of their number, Sāliḥ b. Tarīf, who gave them a religion and a Kūfī in the Berber language. This religion, the progress of which was opposed by the early Moroccan dynasties, seems to have been finally exterminated by the Almohad rulers of the 12th century. This Barghawatī movement was the most lasting; we also note that which was created by Hā-Mu‘āwī (d. 313 A.H.) among the Qumārī, near Tétouan.

In spite of these reactions, Islam, having become the official religion of increasingly powerful dynasties, gradually gained ground and penetrated slowly into the Berber mountains, but it is only from the death of ‘Abd al-Mu‘min, who destroyed the religion of the Barghawatī and put an end to the rule of the “anthropomorphist” (muḍassīmīn) Almo
ravid, that we can date the complete unification of Islam in Morocco. Till then, Islam had had in Morocco champions who were soldiers rather than theologians, and who after forcing the people to adopt Islam at the point of the sword, were little fitted to instruct them in it. It required a Berber of the Great Atlas, Ibn Tûmâr [q. v.], a theologian who had been educated in the east, to come back to his country and to secure the devoted support of a mass of followers in order to found the movement, which was political as well as religious, of the Almohads [q. v.] or "preachers of tawhir" [q. v.].

If the Almohad reformation was only temporary in Morocco, it was nevertheless strong enough while it lasted to obliterate in the country all trace of schism or heresy and to establish thoroughly in it the school of Malik b. Anas [q. v.] which it still follows.

c. Evolution of Moroccan Islam. From the time of the fall of the Almohad dynasty, Moroccan Islam rapidly acquired features of its own. Islam, defeated in Spain, was gradually driven out of it, then attacked in Morocco itself by the Christians of the Peninsula. The western frontier of the Dâr al-Islâm was brought back to its own territory and then thrust farther back. Islam in Morocco, attacked by Christianity and forced to dîjârâ, became an active principle. It required all the moral forces of the country, even those of which the orthodoxy seemed doubtful; in order to utilise them, it was not hesitate to absorb them by covering them with a more or less superficial veneer of orthodoxy. It was at this period that the cult of dead and living saints, and to a certain point Shariafism, which had hitherto only existed along side of Islam in Morocco, were adopted into it and received a kind of official recognition from the malikis.

Before the Marinids, Islam had required the constant assistance of the temporal power to maintain itself and advance. From the time of this dynasty, sprung from a Berber nomad tribe, the roles are inverted; it is now the sovereigns who utilise Islam to increase their own power, and try to monopolise it by creating official colleges for religious instruction (madrasa); the first of these (Madrasat al-Sufîn) was founded in 679 (1280) by the Sultan Abû Yûsuf at Fas, the capital of the dynasty, which made it the great centre of Muslim culture in Western Barbary [cf. FAS]. The immediate successors of the Marinids, the Banû Waqîs, established in the same town the cult of their founder Idris II. The mausoleum in which he is said to be buried was henceforth an object of great veneration. He is the earliest in date and the most important of the innumerable canonised Muslims who are the objects of a regular cult in Morocco, even on the part of the religious leaders and the aristocracy. When the cult of Idris was established, its descendants — more or less authentic — claimed the title of shurfa and soon played a preponderating part in Moroccan society, as a political and moral influence. The power of the Idrisid shurfa was soon reinforced by the claim of another shurfa descended from 'Ali through al-Hasan and this is the origin of the two great groups of shurfas in Morocco, the Idrisids and the 'Alids. To the latter belong the two Shari'ah dynasties, the Sa'dian and Fâhî, the latter still in power. From the moment of their accession to the throne, the influence of the shurfa on the destinies of the country became more and more preponderant.

The phenomenon of shari'ah is closely connected on the other hand with the development of religious brotherhoods [cf. the article ТАРИК]. Although we find evidence of their existence at the end of the Almohad dynasty (Hudjdjâd, Maghîrijîn, Amgaârîn), it is only as a result of al-Idrîsî's [q. v., d. 1645 A.D.] campaign in favour of dîjârâ against the Portuguese, that we find the principles of the brotherhoods, as we know them today, first coming into existence.

d. Islam in Modern Morocco. Here we will only give a survey of the principal points of detail in which the people of Morocco differ from the rest of the Muslim community as regards the practice of their religion. With the exception of a few isolated groups, still little studied, who are credited with heterodox or heretical practices (Zkârîa in the neighbourhood of the Bni Znîm, in eastern Morocco, Bâtâlwa, in the Gharb, not far from al-Ksar al-Kabîr), all the Muslims of Morocco are Sunnîs and since the Almoravid period have followed the Mâlikî rite, which prevailed in the west over that of al-Awzâî. It is in the last years that the power of the Sultan is not strictly the chief duties of the religion. The Beduins of the plains and the Berbers of the mountains are rather lukewarm Muslims. The Dâjâla, however, between Fas and Tangier, are very devoted to Islam, show great piety, and Kûr'ânic studies, are very much in favour with them; it is from them that are recruited a great number of schoolmasters who practise their calling in the Islamic states [cf. SHA'T]. It is also practically only among the hillmen of the north and south that we find a mosque in every village.

In spite of the great distance they have to traverse, the Moroccans like to accomplish the canonical pilgrimage. A considerable number settle in the east (there are Moroccan colonies in Alexandria and Cairo); the importance of these colonies had even induced the Sultan Abî al-Asif to appoint a Moroccan consul, amîn al-Maghârîba, for Egypt.

In addition to the two canonical festivals of Islam (Idcir hâbrîn and Idcir taghirîn), the Moroccans celebrate the festival of the Prophet (mi'âd, class. maszîhid) and that of 'Ablhârî (10th Mu-harram). The mi'âd, established in Morocco by the Marinids, has become a kind of national festival, since the accession to power of sovereigns claiming descent from the Prophet; this festival in Morocco almost surpasses in importance the two canonical feasts.

The peculiarities just mentioned would not be sufficient to give Moroccan Islam a special character, nor would its religious brotherhoods, if they were not confined to the practices of imitation or imitation of the faith and to satisfying the need for an elevated mysticism among their adepts. These religious brotherhoods are fairly numerous: Tîlā'i'ya, Darqâwîa, Taiyîbiya-Tuklîna, Kattâniya [q. v.] etc. But alongside of these brotherhoods, whose members are almost exclusively recruited from the literate or well-to-do classes of the towns and country, there are popular brotherhoods in considerable numbers, in which preoccupation with religion gives place to charlatanism practices and sanguinary displays. Such are the Dajâla, the 'Asâwâ, the 'Imdâgha, the Dâfûghîya. Some of these brotherhoods recruit their members ex-
clusively from a particular class of society; thus the ruāḥ (class. rūmāl) is a brotherhood of marksmen, and the Gañwa, a negro brotherhood. All these brotherhoods have this feature in common that their founder has become a famous saint (wali).

The cult of saints is highly developed in Morocco and undoubtedly was so before the introduction of Islām, which found itself obliged to tolerate it. There are however very different categories of saints, from the venerated patron saint of a capital or of a district to the local holy man whose name is forgotten, between whom comes the saḥīf who is marked by a ṣaḥbā (chapel surrounded by a dome), more or less elaborate. The more humble saints are recognised by the circular wall (ḥawš) which surrounds their tombs.

These venerated individuals, male and female, have attained sanctity by very different ways, in some of their lifetime, by their learning, devotion, asceticism, miraculous powers (baraka), sometimes even by more or less mystic mania (piyād-džiāf); the others, after their deaths, have been distinguished by miracle, apparitions etc. The warrior in the holy war (dījāl, rīfāt), slain fighting against the infidel is frequently beatified — hence his name of mutarrīfī or mutarrīf — French and English "marabout". But the early significance of this term was frequently lost sight of and the term mutarrīfī came to be generally applied to saints, who never took part in a dījāl in their lifetime. Mutarrīfī thus came into general use as a synonym of the other words used for saint in Morocco: wali, sa'yīd, šāhī. But it is the only one applied to the descendants of a saint, who possess the baraka of their ancestor. Among the Berbers, the saint is called agurum. The names of great saints have wawālī prefixed, the others the title šīh, while women saints of Berber origin are called fāla.

The saint to whom sanctuaries are most frequently dedicated — modest though they are (masāfūn, bižidīn) — was not a native of the country but the famous patron saint of Baghādād, ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Gillānī, popularly called al-Dījīlī, who was undoubtedly never visited Morocco. But the saint whose cult is surrounded with the greatest splendour is the famous Mawāli Idrīs, founder and patron saint of Fās. Among the other great Moroccan saints may be mentioned: Mawāli ʿAbd al-Salām Ibn Masjīb, patron of the Dījīlī, buried on the Dījīlī al-ʾĀlī, Mawāli al-Šāhīn, in the Ḥaibr; Mawāli Abu l-Ṣiḥāf al-Khawāṣir (Mawāli Būhshīfī), in the north of Fās; Sīdī Muhammad b. ʿĪsā, patron of Meknes and founder of the brotherhood of the Ṭiswā; Mawāli Abu Shuʿrābī (Būhshīfī), at Azemmūr; Mawāli Abū Yaḥyā (Būʾaṣṣāb), in the Tāḍāl; Sīdī Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Shabītī (Sīdī Bel ʿAbīs), born at Ceuta and patron of Marrākūsh. All these and others less famous are the subjects of a hagiographical literature which will be dealt with later.

Devotion to individuals canonised in their lifetime or after their death is in Morocco not confined to Muslims. The Jews have also their saints, relatively as numerous as the Muslim saints. Some of the Jewish saints have acquired a reputation so great that even Muslims revere their tombs: e.g., those of the Rabbi ʾAmīn in Adjen, near Wazzān and of Rabbi Ben Zmir of Safi. On the other hand, the Jews of Morocco show a special reverence for certain of the great Muslim saints of the country.

The area, surrounding the tomb of each of the principal saints is sacred (ḥanūm) and hence regarded as an inviolable asylum; among the best known are the ḥanūm of Mawāli Idrīs in Fās and that of Mawāli ʿAbd al-Salām b. Masjīb in the mountains of the northwest. These pieces of ground are the exclusive property of the families who are descended or claim to be descended from the saint. They are exempt from state taxes: more than that, the descendants of the saints have the right to levy for their own benefit certain special dues, by a privilege officially recognised by the sultan. The levying of these dues is not the only way by which the saint's chapel benefits his descendants. The principal source of revenue is the offerings of pilgrims when visiting the tomb; this is the ṣiyār. In general once a year, there is a kind of patronal festival at the tomb of the saint which is called murāsh (class. M. mawsīn); a vast crowd, some of them from a considerable distance, gather there to pay their devotion to the saḥīf and to see the display of fireworks given in his honour. On this occasion the offerings flow in and are shared among themselves by the saint's de-scendants.

In these circumstances, it is usual for every sanctuary of any importance to be regularly organised. The chapel which contains the tomb and the buildings attached to it, an oratory and guest-house, is called the zāwiya. It is superintended by a ṭuḥāʾidūm who collects and distributes the revenues. These do not come entirely from the zāwiya. The zāwiya often owns lands, sometimes extensive, which are let out and the profits shared with the tenants. They are called ʿašā and the tenants are called ʿaṣābī. These farms, sometimes acquired by purchase, often come from bequests or donations (ḥiṣān) from pious private individuals.

We can thus see how certain famous and wealthy zāwiya may exert a moral and political influence in the country round them, independent of their religious influence. The latter is however also very important. The great Moroccan zāwiya are centres of orthodoxy and give life and vigour to Islām in the country. Some are centres of mysticism and they are always centres of religious instruction. This explains the enviable position occupied in Moroccan society by any group of descendants of a famous saint, or of marabouts. If their ancestor had, in addition to the virtues for which he was canonised, the honour to be a descendant of the Prophet, they are at the same time ẓorfi, which further increases their material privileges. The descendants of a saint who was not a shorfi try to claim this origin for him by inventing more or less fictitious genealogies. The marabouts who have in this way "infiltrated" into the social category of the ẓorfi are very numerous in Morocco. A Moroccan zāwiya is not only a centre of hagiolatry; it is also in the majority of cases a body of ẓorfi and the centre of a religious brotherhood or of a branch of one, or of a secondary order affiliated to a brotherhood. The zāwiya itself may have offspring. Many of the establishments of this name are daughters of a mother zāwiya and are sometimes at a considerable distance from it.

Hagiolatry, religious brotherhoods and sharīfi thus form three special aspects of Islām in Morocco, which are profoundly intermingled, and it is diffi-
cult to study them separately. For a detailed account of the principal families of ʃorfā in Morocco of genuine shafi'i origin or simply marabouts see the article ʃorfā. Here we shall only mention the principal ones whose origin is considered authentic by the Moroccan genealogists. They are descended from al-Hasan and ʿAbd Allāh al-Kamil through the latter’s three sons, Idris, Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakīya and Mūsā al-Ijawn. The descendants of Idris or ʿIrāsid are subdivided into ʿIrāsid (Shābīnīya, Ṭafīlīya, Ṭal główni, Ghabīnīya), Dabbāghīnīya, Kattānīnīya, ʿAlānīnīya (descendants of Mawlid Allāh ibn Sulaym ibn Muḥibn, buried on the ʿIrāsid, whence their names, and themselves divided into Shābīnīnīya, Ṭal główni, Kattānīnīya and Ghabīnīya). The descendants of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakīya are the ʃorfā of Suljīmānīya or Fūlā (Fulīnīya; nisba from Ṭafīlīl). i.e. those of the reigning Sharifian dynasty; lastly, the descendants of Mūsā al-Ijawn are the ʃorfā ʿIrāsid, who take their name from the great saint of Islam ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Gilānī. We also find in Morocco, but in small numbers, Ḥusaynī ʃorfā, also descended from ʿAlī though al-Ḥusayn, the brother of al-Hasan; these are the ʃorfā called ʿIrāsid and Ṭal główne, who came from Andalus. The great marabout families are that of the Naṣira from Tāmgūrt in Darra, the Ṣahrīna [q.v.] in Tādla, the Darra and Wazzanīnīya to the northwest of Fès. The ʃorfā Wazzanīnīya (ʃarīfs of Wazzan), whose chief is also head of the great brotherhood of the Ṣahrīna-Tahama (cf. above), have for long played a considerable part in politics and have been the object of particular attention from the makhzen. Even more than the other representatives of the great marabout families, they have in fact rendered great services to the central power by using for its benefit the great moral and political influence which they possess among that part of the population, which is lukewarm or hostile to the makhzen. They have meditated in the most successful fashion between the sulṭān and the unsophisticated body of the people.

The ʃorfā are thus at the head of Moroccan society. Some have assumed the power, others are the auxiliaries of the ruler, and all have a great influence. We shall see that they have occupied a very high place in the intellectual life of Morocco since the end of the middle ages. Lastly shariʿism, an important social factor, has been able still further to strengthen itself by the support which maraboutism has brought it, by incorporating itself in it, and the religious brotherhoods which very frequently spring directly from it.

e. Survivals of Berber culture. The cult of saints, accepted and even recognised, as we have seen above, by Islam, is in Morocco much earlier than the introduction of this religion. Indeed, alongside of saints of note, there are others who are essentially popular, in the country as well as in the towns. In the large cities like Fès, the great saiyidens venerated by all classes of society with humble marabouts whose names show clearly their popular origin; these are Sidi ʿl-Mahfi (Rev. the Haddan One), Sidi Ama ʿl-Khasir (Rev. Good Evenings), or Sidi Kāthī Ḥāḏī (the reverend gentleman who procures what is wanted) and notices are given of them by hagiographers like the author of the Salwat al-.Infās (cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, Le Historiens des ʃorfā, p. 383 infra). The humble, often anonymous, khalīcuς, which abound in Morocco, undoubtedly are to be connected with earlier mythic individuals, already worshipped in the same place before the coming of Islam. Besides this devotion to popular saints, there are the animistic cult, which we see everywhere in Morocco observed by the lower classes of the population: worship of high places, of caves, springs, trees and rocks. These cults are now being seriously studied and the results will perhaps enable us to reconstruct without too great risk of error, the type of religion practised by the Berbers before the introduction into their land of the three great monotheistic religions.

It is hardly possible to separate from these animistic cults that of Mawlid Yaʿqūb in Morocco, who always has a ḥabba beside thermal springs, whose curative virtues are recognised.

Survivals of paganism in every case completely foreign to orthodox Islam may be found everywhere in Morocco; they are hardly distinguishable from what one finds in other parts of Barbary. The rites which accompany birth and the ceremonies connected with it (giving of the name and circumcision), marriage and death are now beginning to be well known. They constitute practices quite foreign to the prescriptions of the Sunna but they are not regarded by those who follow them as in any way heterodox. It is especially in the life of the country people that we see most clearly traces of pre-Islamic practices. Many of them are strangely like agricultural customs of the Romans. The Moroccan peasant has retained the use of the Julian calendar, no doubt introduced into the country by the Romans; it is of course much more suitable for the needs of agriculture than the Muslim lunar calendar. The names of the months are retained in their Latin form with little change: January = Januarius from the Latin Ianuari(m). The beginning of the solar year in Morocco is the occasion of a festival celebrated, especially in the country, under the name of hajī'ta; the festival of the summer solstice (tamra) is also celebrated and on that day it is usual to have fireworks. Similarly the agrarian rites, which are still observed every year, are chiefly observed by the peasants, and in Morocco are completely foreign to the canonical prescriptions of Islam. They are mainly ceremonies of inauguration (of death and rebirth of the land, first day of labour, first day of harvest); rites to protect the crops from the evil eye, or to preserve the baraka which they contain while standing, finally special rites to secure rain and good weather. These various ceremonies, to which ethnographers like Biarnay and Westermarc have already devoted detailed studies to which the reader may be referred, are sometimes closely linked up with ceremonies prescribed by Islam: thus the different pagan rites for producing rain (carnival processions, a large spoon dressed in women's clothes and solemnly carried round) do not exclude the worship of saints specially noted as rain-makers like Mawlid Bishāḥa, now the celebration of the orthodox ceremony of tājmīk. It is also in the worship of spirits (jāmīn, gāvor, dūn) that we find ceremonies of a strongly Islamic stamp associated with quite profane rites. This cult is especially practised by the lower classes of society, and in the town
particular by women. The djinns are regarded as supernatural powers, who have to be conciliated to avert their evil influence or fought when one is attacked by them. The rites which deal with them are either propitiatory or intended to overcome harm done. In spite of the many sacred formulas of Islam, which are found in the celebration of these two kinds of rites, one gets a strong impression of paganism from them; they undoubtedly remain practically what they were before the introduction of Islam into Morocco.


**VII Linguistic Survey.**

Two languages are spoken in Morocco: Berber and dialects of Arabic. Berber is the oldest language attested in Morocco and we have no evidence of an earlier language being used; as to Arabic, it was introduced by the Muslim conquest of the viith and viith centuries, but until the arrival in Morocco of the Banu Hilal and of the Sulaym (ixth century), it seems that Arabic, the language of an essentially urban culture, was spoken mainly in the towns while the country people continued to talk Berber; it was only after the occupation of the plains by the Arab tribes that their language spread there. With the exception of the region of the Jhala to be mentioned later, the highlands of Morocco alone have remained faithful to the Berber language, while the towns and lowlands are at the present day almost completely Arabic speaking.

In his Annuaire du Monde Musulman (p. 162) L. Massignon gives a proportion of 60% of Berber speakers (5,200,000 to 2,000,000). A. Bernard
thinks this exaggerated and reduces it to 40% (cf. Arabophones et Berbérophones au Maroc, 1924, p. 278).

A. Berber.

1. Berber dialects. According to the works of E. Destaing, the Berber dialects of Morocco can be divided into two main groups.

The first is the northern group which includes the dialects of the Rif, those of the Bni Znassen and of the Berber speaking tribes of the neighbourhood and those of the Ait Seghraigh-Shen, Marrësh, Ait Warain etc. to the north of the Middle Atlas. These dialects are characterised phonetically by their strong tendency to spirantisation of the dentals and palatals. In comparing these dialects with those which in Algeria the natives call Zmiriya, E. Destaing has been led to describe the group as the group of Zanita dialects.

The second or southern group includes, according to the same author, the remainder of the Berber dialects of Morocco; he distinguishes two sub-groups:

a. that of the Tamazight, the dialect spoken by the Berber of the Central Atlas, from the vicinity of Meknes to the edge of the Great Atlas; the dialects of the north are also distinguished from those of the south. It is with this sub-group that we should connect the dialect of the Sanhaja-d-es-Saâr, an important highland confederation to the northeast of Fas, and perhaps an office of the language of the sections of the Ghumara who still speak Berber.

b. Sub-group of the Taqtilhèth, the dialect once spoken by the Massouli of the Great Atlas and by the Shilh (usual French orthography: Chichih) of Sùs and the Anti-Atlas.

The three groups of Moroccan Berber dialects seem to correspond very exactly to the three main ethnic divisions of the Berbers of the country: Zanita in the N.E., Sanhaja-Zanaga in the centre and Massouli in the south. Going back to the old division of the Berbers given by Ibn Khaldûn, E. Destaing proposes to make the first group correspond to the But tribes and the two others to the Baraîtis tribes.

For the bibliography of Berber studies see the list of works given by E. Laoust at the beginning of his Mots et Choses Berbères, Paris 1920, p. xvii; since that date see the Moroccan bibliography annually published by Hejéro. A map showing the division of Morocco between Arabic and Berber is given in the articles by A. Bernard and P. Mousard, Arabophones et Berbérophones au Maroc (Annales Soc. Géogr., vol. 33, Paris 1924). For the north, there is a more accurate map by R. Montagne and Pennès published at the end of the Manuel de berbère marocain (dialecte rifain) by Justnard (Paris 1926).

There is no evidence of the existence of another language before Berber in Morocco. Very few of those "Libyan" inscriptions have been found which, although they are not yet read, are admitted to be in old Berber; one was found in the Roman ruins of Tamuda, a few miles S.W. of Tetwân, and is preserved in the museum of the latter town. Other Libyan inscriptions have been found in the region of Petitjena.

The earliest evidence of the use of Berber in Morocco is given by the Geography of al-Bakri (xth century) who says that the prophet Hâ-Mîm, killed in 927 A.D., had given the Berbers a Kurzâan written "in their own language". This can only refer to their Berber speech; the same author tells us that the Baraghwata had also a Berber Kurzân from their prophet Sâlih (d. in 750). For the beginning of the Almohad period, a passage in Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, p. 67, says that at this time Berber was spoken on the Umm Rabi'. It is in the same work that we find the earliest recorded phrases in Moroccan Berber (Tâqtilhèth dialect) transcribed in Arabic characters (cf. p. 26, 30, 36, 38, 39, 67, 117).

Ibn Khaldûn seems to have been the first to interest himself in the creation of a scientific system of trans-literation of Berber into Arabic characters. Using certain graphic methods used by specialists in Tâqtilhèth, he invented compound characters to render sounds peculiar to Berber (g, z [emphato], and ñ on isolated 3). Unfortunately Ibn Khaldûn, who in his Muqadima gives interesting chapters on the urban and Beduin Arabic dialects, does not seem to have devoted any attention to the Berber language; one of the few passages to be noted in his book, as far as Morocco is concerned, is his reference to the existence of Berber speaking peoples among the Sanhaja tribes settled in the valley of the Wargha and around the fortress of Amargû (cf. Histoire des Berbères, ed. de Slane, text, i, p. 273, l. 11). For the beginning of the xviith century, Leo Africanus (p. 28) gives us more detailed information. The five Berber ethnic groups (Sanhaja, Massouli, Zanita, Hawwâra and Ghumâra) have a special language which they call amarân (asamâmarân), i.e. "noble language" (cf. the present name of the Tamazight dialect) (ed. Scherer). Berber was still the language of a part of the Ghumara, for, he says, Arabic is used by almost all the people (op. cit. i, 29). It even looks as if the Shâwâyân ("Soava") of the Tâmasnân still spoke Berber ("African language") like all the other Shâwâyân of North Africa with the exception of some who lived to the south of Tunis (op. cit., i, p. 83).

We have to come down to the Danish Consul G. Host, in the xviith century, to find the first Moroccan Berber vocabulary collected from a tâbât of "Tamenart", a place probably in the region of Agadir (cf. Etrevervingen om Marokos og Per., Copenhagen 1779, p. 128—133).

2. Berber literature of Morocco. Although Berber was the language of the Moroccan dynasties who followed between the Ifrisids and the Sâhans, it does not seem that, contrary to what was done in Egypt for the Turkish of the Mamlûks, Berber was made the subject of grammatical studies in Morocco, nor that it was used for the purpose of literary expression. A passage in the Kirda recalls the fact that khvâbas were pronounced in Berber in the great mosque of Fas but the text of them has not been preserved. The celebrated Almohad reformer Ibn Tîmirî is said to have composed in Berber theological and legal treatises which have now disappeared. The Berber Kûran of the Ghumara and Baraghwata have also disappeared although al-Bakri has fortunately preserved some extracts in an Arabic translation. The only texts which we now have are translations of or commentaries on religious works of the type of the Kirda of Al-Kattâwânî or of the Makhtâtht of Khallîl; all these Berber texts come without exception from Sùs, whether because this region
had a more advanced culture or its dialect with a more oclusive consonant system and clearer vowel system was better suited than others for transcription in the Arabic alphabet. The Moroccan Berbers have a large stock of fables, legends, songs of love, war and work etc., many of which have already been collected by French and German students of Berber (on Berber literature, written and oral cf. Henri Basset, *Essai sur la littérature des Berbères*, Algiers 1920).

Among Arab authors the Berber language is *qājantya*, the non-Arab language; *barbariya*; *Berber; rujāna, "jargon"; in the *Documentum indicium* *d'histoire almohade* we several times come across the expression *al-ṭālān al-ghurri, "the Moroccan language"*. In Moroccan Arabic, Berber is usually called *kātib*.

b. Arabic

The *Arabic dialects*. The Arabic language was introduced into Morocco in at least two stages: first in the eighth century at the time of the first Muslim conquest, then in the xiith at the coming of the Banū Hilal and the Salūm. Down to the coming of the latter, who were brought to Morocco by the Almoravid ruler Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr, Arabic seems to have been spoken almost exclusively in the large towns of the north, where it was used by a considerable Arab population who enjoyed a double prestige, religious and political. It was the language of religion and law. From the towns Arabic spread among the people of the surrounding country, and al-Idrisi (*Description de l’Afrique et de l’Espagne*, text p. 79, transl. p. 90) already notes that in the xiith century the Berber tribes of the southern hinterland of Fās (Banū Yūsuf, Fandālāwā, Bahīl, Zawāwā, Maggāša, Ghiyāṣa and Salāgīn) spoke Arabic.

It is this linguistic influence exerted by the towns on the country around them that explains the arabisation of the mountainous country of the Ṣābāla (plur. of ṣabāli, "highlanders") while the rest of the Moroccan highlands remained Berber speaking. The land of the Ṣābāla, in the wide sense, stretches in the form of a crescent from Tangier to Taza. It was surrounded by a cord of towns: Nakūr, Rādis, Tīgha, Tetwān, Ceuta, al-Kasr al-Šaghlu, Tangier, Arzīla, al-Kasr al-Kabīr, Barsa, Azdījan, Banū Tawwādī, Wallow, Fās, and Taza, which were the only ports or markets available for the tribes of the region; besides, the massif itself was traversed by the most important commercial routes of Northern Morocco: the roads from Fās to Tangier, to Ceuta, to Ṣābāla, to Nakūr and to Ghassāna; it was therefore natural that being subject to the direct and indirect influences of the towns, the highlands of Ṣābāla should be the first region of Morocco to be arabised. The process was further favoured by several other factors: 1. the existence in the mountains of numerous large villages, almost towns, which became secondary centres of Ḥrijāfic culture; 2. the settlement almost everywhere in the xith century among the Ṣābāla of Idrisiid sharifs who, driven from Fās by Mūsà b. Abī l-l-Aṭīfa al-Miṣkānī, founded independent principalities in the mountains, which bāre-coming of the main cultural life of Muslim urban culture; 3. the tribes of the Ṣābāla furnished a considerable part of the contingents which went to wage the holy war in Spain and returned home after being more or less arabised by contact with the great Muslim towns of Andalusia; 4. lastly the rebellions and civil wars which so frequently disturbed Muslim Spain, the emigrations or expulsions caused by the progress of the Christian reconquest, brought to Africa, from the rising at Cordova (in 814) down to the xvth century, an important element which settled in the region of the Ṣābāla either in the towns around the mountains or in the villages of the highlands (resettlement of Ṣabālū, foundation of Shafshāwān) bringing there along with the Arabic language, the prestige of their cultural, intellectual and material superiority.

This rapid sketch of the spread of the Arabic language in Morocco explains why, after studying the question, three categories of Arabic dialects have been distinguished.

a. Urban dialects; b. Highland dialects; c. Beduin dialects; and we may add: d. the Jewish dialects.

d. Urban dialects. In Morocco not all the town dialects are "urban dialects". There are towns like Casablanca, Mazagan, Safi and Mogadou (and to a certain degree Mīknās and Marrākūsh) the population of which is entirely or for the most part of rural origin and where the absence of an old nucleus of town-dwellers has not enabled them to become urbanised. The Moroccans however distinguish quite clearly such places from towns with a really urban culture, more or less influenced by Andalusi-an culture. The principal towns with urban dialects are Fās, Kābrī-Salē, Tetwān, Taza, al-Kasr al-Kabīr; Tangier, Wazzān and Shafshāwān also have urban dialects but these are much contaminated by the surrounding Highland dialects. Mīknās and Marrākūsh have been influenced by the Beduin elements introduced by the maḥṣūrīn groups into the dialects of these two old capitals. It is interesting to note the case of Azemmūr where the old town (Azemmūr al-Hadār) has an urban dialect, while the new town, which has in recent years grown up beside it around the sanctuary of Mawārāb Abī Shīrāb (wālī al-Bī Shīrāb), uses a Berber dialect. The urban dialects of Morocco form one group with those of the western part of the Central Maghrib, notably with those of Thlemek, Nédroma and Algiers. Their phonetic characteristics are the loss of the interdental in the classical language, the affricate pronunciation (κ) of (d), the frequent attenuation of (k) to ḥamza. In Fās, b, m, k, g and ġim assimilate the šīm of the article and are treated as "shals"; the simple ġim is pronounced like the French j (= Persian ʃ), but when it is geminated, it gives jy in Fās and dji in Tangier. The r is often pronounced very close to the French uvular r.

As peculiarities of the dialect of Fās, we may note the construction kētētī “she has written it” for kētēt - a, and the use of an invariable relative di representing the old dialectal dīn. Tangier and Tetwān have a preposition m- “to” which is used before nouns (m-lātīr “to the house”) but not before suffixed pronouns To translate “of”. Marrākūsh uses t-; the dialect of this town uses certain Berber adverbs: aškā “because”, hēlī “only”.

All the urban dialects use the characteristic prefix of the present indicative: ka- in the north, ta- in the south. Fās uses one almost as much as the other.

d. Highland dialects. These are at least as well known as those of the towns. In 1920 I published notes on that of the Ṣūkī and the
Brânes in the north of Taza; in 1922, E. Lévi-Provençal published texts, prefaced by a grammatical sketch, of the dialects of the middle valley of the Wargha; since then I have had an opportunity of studying those of the Bni Hôyèsar (near Tetwán), of the Me-tása (near Bades) and of the Ghaâwa (near Shaâfshâwân).

The highland dialects are of course more differentiated than the urban dialects. The tribes which use them belong to two political clans probably originally of different racial origin: the Ghumàra, the old inhabitants, and the Sanhadja, the invaders. In the present state of our knowledge it does not seem possible to make the dialects coincide with political or racial boundaries; but we can nevertheless recognise two main groups of highland dialects:

1. The northern dialects, extending from the Straits of Gibraltar to the south of Shaâfshâwân and embracing in the east the confederation of the Ghumâra;
2. the southern dialects, from Wazzân to Taza, used by two great classes of tribes: first, the Sanhadja tribes of the valley of the Wargha; Sanhadja of the Central Wargha, Sanhadja of the Sun and of the Shade, of Mo-bâdhi and of Gheïdor; secondly, the But tribes, more or less closely related to the Zanàta and occupying the lands south of the region of Taza: Mernissa, Brânes, Tsûl, Maghara and Meknès. It seems to be a historical fact that these Zanàta and Sanhadja peoples only settled in their present habitats long after the first Arab conquest; the Sanhadja of the Central Wargha certainly now occupy lands which before the Almoravid period were peopled by the Ghumâra. We should therefore regard these southern highland dialects as younger than those of the northern group. The slight differences noted between the two groups may then be due to two main causes: 1. an evolution of the neighbouring urban dialects which would have taken place during the period between the arabisation of the Ghumâra and that of the Sanhadja-Zanàta; 2. the decay of the Berber substrata.

To the two main groups, Benmara and Sanhadja-Zanàta, we may perhaps add two little islands in the south: the highlanders of the region of Scfrû to the south of Fâs (Bhind, Bni Yagha etc.), and the Ghiyûtra to the south of Taza: they probably constitute the last vestiges of a continuous Arabic-speaking blue which stretched to the south of the Fâs-Taza corridor, the existence of which in the thirteenth century we know from al-Idrîsî.

Phonetically, the Moroccan highland dialects are characterised by the profound changes undergone by the Arabic consonantal system as a result of the spirantisation of the dental and post-palatal occlusives. We find the interdental ð and ð̄, which do not reprent the classical interdentials tê and dê, have given in these dialects t and d respectively, which remain occlusive only at the beginning of the word or after a consonant or gemination, but after a vowel we have ð and ð̄: bêt "daughter", plur. bêtî and after a vowel also kêt is pronounced as a spirant like the z of modern Greek. The representative of the group  in the classical language is usually d, sometimes hardened to t, but among the Ghumâra we have ð (emphatic dê). The sound ð̄ is fairly common. The short vowels are commoner than in the towns; many of the short vowels i and u of the classical language are preserved: this is how we find a considerable number of imperfects îr1 îr2 îr3 and a few îr1 îr2 îr3.

As to morphology, the fem. personal suffixes -a (- assessment) and pl. -em (- assessment) are characteristic: they are the complement of the series begin by the masc. -a, -ô (- assessment). Among the northern Jbila we find the use of a suffix -êh marking the plural: it seems really to be a borrowing from Latin. The dual, reserved for names of parts of the body which occurs in pairs and for names of various measurements (of weight, length, volume and time) is in -êyôn: ghadîyôn "two months", tîdîzêh "his hands". The relative, pronoun and adjective, is ì. The classical construct state (îâyô) is very rare and is only found in a few stereotyped phrases: it is in general replaced by analytical constructions in which the preposition ì of is used, expressing possession as well as the material of a thing.

Almost everywhere the prefixes of the 2nd pers. com. and of the 3rd pers. fem. of the aorist are ì- (and not ì-): dêkêb "thou writest, she writes". The passive participle of hollow verbs is often of the type mîfîl: mîbûs "sold", mîwazîs "filled up". Finally we may note a few traces of a passive of the form fîl-fûl: kîth to be taken". As evidence of conservatism, we may mention that in these dialects we have the word ìsîr "mouth" which seems to have disappeared since old Arabic.

Just as the urban dialects of Morocco may be linked with a number of urban dialects of Algeria, so have the highland dialects of Morocco correspondents in the latter country. W. Marçais, who is the first to have isolated and described this group of Maghribi dialects and prefers to use the name of "parlers villageois" for them, classes along with the dialects of the Moroccan Jbila two other similar groups, also characterised by the defacement of the Arabic consonant system (liquidation, affrication, spirantisation), by the use of these dialects in syntax and structural forms taken from Berber and by the replacement in the vocabulary of Arabic elements sometimes strongly archaic and very abundant Berber elements. These are firstly the Oarn group of the Tîrâ in the country which extends from Lalla Maghânya to the ña, a mountainous country traversed by the roads connecting Tlemcen, the capital of the Bani Abd al-Wad, with the ports of Illan and Araghûn. It is with the dialects of the Tîrâ that the dialects of these Moroccan Jbila show most agreement.

The second group, which differs more, is that of the highland dialects of Eastern Kabylia, a mountainous region of the department of Constantine, traversed by the roads connecting Constantine with the ports of Djeddâ and Collo; this was also the old habitat of the Kutama, whom the support of the Fattimûd movement must have caused to be rapidly arabicized. Alongside of these three groups of highland dialects (Jbila, Tîrâ, Eastern Kabylia), W. Marçais classes a fourth in the villages of the Tunisian Sâbî, which lie in the coast zone traversed by the roads which connect Kairaûn with the ports of Sâs, Mahdia and Monastir. These Tunisian dialects, of which that of Takrûnû, studied by W. Marçais, is a specimen, are however much arabised and hardly seem to have been subjected in their phonetics, morphology, syntax and vocabulary to the profound
Berber influences which characterize the first three groups.

In spite of their divergencies, which are due mainly to pronunciation and to the local use of words and phrases corresponding to two very distinct forms of culture, the urban dialects and the highland dialects cannot be either historically or linguistically separated. The fundamental disparity is that which exists between the urban and highland group and the Beduin group. It is the townsmen who have taught the highlanders to speak Arabic, but the urban dialects, used by individuals whose intellectual activity is greater, have evolved more rapidly. They are also more sensitive to external influence, literary and political.

These facts added to the predominance of Berber blood in the highlands suffice to explain why the dialects of the Jbâla still seem coarse and quaint to the townsmen. On the other hand, the towns have been frequently repopulated, wholly or in part by people from the neighbouring hills. All this explains the family resemblance which the linguist finds between the dialects of the towns and those of the hills; perhaps the latter, being more conservative, are also the more interesting for the history of the language. W. Marçais regards them as valuable representatives of the Arabic spoken in the country district of the Maghrib before the coming of the Banî Hilâl and the Sulaim (cf. W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Tabrouna, vol. i, preface, p. xxviii).

The principal features which are common to the urban-highland group and which distinguish it from the Beduin group are the following:

- loss of the classical interdentalis;
- pronunciation of kaf as k or hamza (and not g as among the Beduins);
- tendency to the syllabic grouping R1 R2 in R3, when R2 is not a laryngal or non-syllabic;
- rarity of the construct state;
- suffix of the 3rd pers. masc. sing. in -n, -a (and not -ah, as among the Beduins);
- relative rarity of the addition of personal suffixes, but regular use of the analytical phrase with dovâl: el-dâr, el-dîl, “my house”;
- diminutive of R1 R2 e R3 becomes R1 R2 iyê R3: kîyyel, “little dog”;
- diminutive of adjectives of the types R1 R2 e R3 (< class.: afdal) and R1 R2; R3 becomes R1 R2; R3: hûmir, “little red”; kîler, “little large”;
- plural of the adjectives R1 R2 e R3 (< class. afdal) becomes R1 n R2, R3: kôdâh, “black” (plur.);
- reductions of the plurals C1 C2 C3 C4 to C1 by C2 C3 C4: mîfizâh, “keys”;
- use of a verbal prefix to mark the indicative present: ka- or na- in the towns and la- in the hills;
- in the singular of the perfect, the feminine person is in general used for the masculine: e.g. kûbitt, “thou hast written” (m.), whence we find in Rabat for the plural, an analogous form kûbitin, “you have written”;
- in the vocabulary, shiâtal, “how much?”; dîbat, “now”; ìba (Ìba, ìba), “to do”, are characteristic;
- in the imperfect of the defective verbs, the plural is formed on analogy of the singular: yebhùn, “they remain”; yebhûn, “they weep”.

1. Beduin dialects. These are in Morocco the dialects of the plains: the Atlantic plain from Arzila to Mogador with its continuations into the interior, the valley of the Mulûya, the plateaus of eastern Morocco and the region of the Moroccan Sahara (Wâd Ghrîb, Wâd Zîz etc.); they are still little known; only that of the Hawwâr of Sûs has been studied, but only in Europe and from authorities who had already travelled a good deal elsewhere. That of the Dukkala of the north (tribe Bî ‘Azîz, Ulîd Ibrîd), have myself examined it corresponds in almost all its details to the dialect of the Ulîd Brîmât of Sûnta (Oranîa) on which W. Marçais has written a monograph. There is no doubt that on examination one can divide the Beduin dialects into groups characterized by more or less conservatism; should those of the ‘Azîlî perhaps be separated from those of the Banî Hilâl? Perhaps a distinction should also be made between the dialects of the purely Arab tribes and those of the Atlantic regions where powerful Berber tribes (Jhâla, Raggâta, Dukkala, Barghawata) have been arabized and more or less submerged by the Beduin dialect. Least in the historical period the latter have been infinitely less stable than the tribes of Berber origin (speaking Arabic or Berber): whether because they were taken to form the gûlî, which guards each large town (environ of Fâs, Meknes, Rabat-Sale and Marrâkùsh) or because they were transported far from their original homes as a measure of repression (case of the Shûrûd), the Arab tribes of the Atlantic plains have become much broken up and mixed. The Beduin dialects which have most chance of having preserved their original character are those of the tribes of the Saharan steppes who have remained relatively stable and intact; Bâl Gît, Xhîba, Dhour Xnî, Ulîd Dîrî etc. In any case, the following are the main characteristics of these dialects: firstly the kaf is pronounced as g (as kaf mûkhdhir), and it is already this pronunciation which for Ibn Khaldûn characterizes the Beduin dialect of his time. The û, ûû, ûûû are retained, with their interdental value. The short vowels are indistinct; the sound i is almost completely absent and many short unaccented vowels sound practically like a labial e. Characteristic are the appearance of an extremely short transitional vowel of a character, which is developed after k, g and kû and placed before a consonant or an e, e.g. kûnir, “green” (plur.), igéirl, “the sits down”, êbûmêd, “tale”, ghsurî, “gazelle”, shkôrâ, “saddle-bag”, ngârây, “thin” (plur.). A similar sound is found after bb, m and hh, e.g. mmânhâ, “the cats”, mûnhô, “sound”; by analogy the combinations mm, mm are reduced to mm and f, e.g. bîmmânâ, “the (little) place”, lîmmâ, “the entails”.


The personal suffix of the 3rd pres. masc. is -ah. The dialectal preposition translating of “is” is ûû or ûûû, from the classical ma‘û, according as the word before it is feminine or plural, this preposition becomes ûûûû or ûûûûû (lûûûû).
It does not seem that the Beduin dialects know the use of the verbal prefix indicating the indicative present. In the plural personal forms of the defective verb, there is a selection of the diphthongs: gina-r, from the verb g3na- "to try"; nis-r,yama, from the verb ma-. "to forget".

We may al-also note the use of a preposition li, "to"; 3i-funa, "he told us".

From the point of view of vocabulary, some words are characteristic of Beduin dialects: daira, "to make do," hajki, "to wish," yema, "when," sinie, "yesterday," diwa wok, gilb, "now," from the classical diwa-waft. We may add the particle ma which used to indicate interrogation: ma3aft taft, "have you seen so and so?" and the phrase ma li ma, "he no longer comes".

3. Jewish dialects. The Jews who emigrated from Spain have as a rule retained the use of an archaic Spanish; many have also learned Arabic for business reasons. Alongside of the Spanish Jews, we have in the Berber highlands and in the towns of the interior Moroccans Jews of unknown origin whom the former call forasteros (Span. "foreigners"); according to the district, they speak Berber or Arabic, but in the towns their dialects have not yet been studied. They have a literature in an Arabic dialect written in Hebrew characters (and called, certainly wrongly: Jawa:i: or Arabic): piyautin, songs at family festivals (cf. Tadjouri, in Horizons, ill, 1923, p. 408-420), satirical songs and songs dealing with real happenings; some of these texts have been printed at Fez and Constantine; a newspaper written in an Arabic dialect and printed in Hebrew characters called al'aflisia, "The Liberty" has been published as a periodical for a number of years among the shari\us (in the plural). They have been divided into a number of groups.

4. Relations of the linguistic groups of Morocco to one another. Morocco appears to the philologist a wonderful field for the study of the influence of the substratum on an imported language, since the language of the substratum, i.e. Berber, is still alive alongside of the Arabic and quite well known. The results of the examination are very meagre: the phenomena actually ascribable to the action of the substratum alone are infinitesimal; this may, however, be due to the fact that Arabic, a Semitic language, and Berber, a proto-Semitic language, are not sufficiently differentiated.

From the phonetic point of view, there is hardly any sound change found in the highland dialects of the arabised Berbers, for which a corresponding change cannot be found in the dialectal phenomena of old Arabic; only, perhaps, their tendency to spirantisation should be connected with the identical tendency observed in the northern Berber dialects found in the confines of the Siha land.

If we consider the morphology, we see that in the highland dialects the verb has lost feminine forms of the plural of the old Arabic, which still survive in some Beduin dialects and are still found in Berber. A Berber origin has been sought for the use of the verbal prefix indicating the present of the indicative; but similar prefixes are found in Egypt and in Syria where there are very different substrata.

Certainy Berber is the scheme to -- -r which forms nouns indicating trades (ra-bennati, "trade of a ma:son") and names of abstract qualities (ra-brami-t, "roguey"), it is however curious to note that in modern Berber, this scheme has not this significance and is only used to form the feminine and secondarily the diminutive.

In the syntax of the highland dialects, we find indissoluble traces of Berber influence; plural treatment of singulars applied to liquids (water, urine), phrases translated or stereotyped, e.g. baina Kaddur, "Kaddur's brother", with retention of the Berber particle indicating belonging to, -in.

But it is in the vocabulary that the Berber substratum makes its influence most felt. Whether surviving in the highland dialects or borrowed in the Beduin dialects, many of the terms relating to country life are Berber (names of plants, animals, rocks, agricultural implements and tools); they have often retained in Arabic the Berber pseudoarticle a-, which, still felt to have its original value, makes them unfit to take the Arabic article also; alongside of the singular in a-, we usually have a Berber plural in a-3an also retained. It is curious by the way but intelligible to find in the highland dialects words of Arabic origin with the Berber article. These must be Arabic words borrowed and berberised at a time when the Jhala still spoke Berber and which have been retained just as they were in their Arabic dialect after being arabised, e.g. a-kfir, "ditch", plur. a-kfran; in Tangier the name of the mosque is called a-bait; at Rabat two words imported from Europe have a Berber form: a-haf, "the sultan's boat" and a-tay, "tea".

Some Berber words have survived in the administrative language of the Mahzen: afrag, "a wall of cloth surrounding the sultan's camp"; aga:la, "a pasture reserved for the sultan's animals"; asef, "lash to punish the guilty"; merzor, "syndic (nabk) of the shari\us (in the plural)."

The Beduin dialects naturally contain much fewer Berber elements than the urban dialects and still less than the highland dialects; their rustic vocabulary nevertheless made numerous borrowings from the technical vocabulary of the previous Berber tillers of the plains.

Within the Arabic area, the highland and urban dialects have borrowed a certain number of terms relating to the rural activities of the Beduins; they are as a rule revealed by the pronunciation of kaf as g. The Beduin dialects in their turn borrow from the towns their words relating to a more advanced culture; but, for economic, political and, to a certain extent, aesthetic reasons, they give more than they borrow.

Some words, which are used in the urban and highland dialects as well as by the Beduin dialects but unknown to the Spanish and Maltese dialects, are perhaps of "Hilali" origin; the principal seem to be gnaul, "horse", balluf, "boar" and sif:sif, "to see".

In addition to the Berber and Arabic elements, the Moroccan vocabulary contains a fairly important number of European loanwords. They come from the vocabulary of a higher culture and relate to the flora (in cultivation or its products), to agriculture, to food and dress, to furniture and housing, sometimes even to parts of the body. There are Greek or Latin borrowings of the oldest period, Romance or Spanish for later periods; but neither their meaning nor their phonetic treatment enables us always to be able to date precisely the time of their introduction and their origin.

These "European" loanwords are naturally found in larger numbers in Northern Morocco, which
has been more subject to Mediterranean influences, which, though refugees from Spain have been felt as far as the northern part of the Middle Atlas. The Beduin dialects have escaped these influences (cf. 1. Simonet, *Glossario de voces árabes y latinas usadas entre los Mozárabes*, Madrid 1888; 2. Schuchardt, *Die romanischen Lehmsprachen im Berberischen*, Vienna 1918; 3. G. S. Colin, *Etymologie maghrébines*, in *Hespéris* [1926 and 1927]; 4. A. Fischer, *Zur Lautlehre der Moränikisch-arabischen* [chap. ii., iii. and Ex. uxor], Leipzig 1917).

Between the two extremes marked by the most conservative Beduin dialects and the most characteristic highland dialects lies a whole gamut of intermediate varieties, which are in the transitional stages; they include the highland dialects whose characteristic features have been reduced through contact with the plains of the southern periphery of the massif of the Jbala, as well as certain dialects of Beduin type used in the Atlantic plains, notably in the non-ḥadīya towns. "But however extensive and deep may have been the interpenetration of the two types, it has not abolished their fundamental unlikeness" (W. Marçais).

In spite of the profound differences which separate them, the highland and Beduin dialects of Morocco (and of the Maghrib) agree in one essential and characteristic morphological feature: the forms sing. *n-* to *n-* in the first persons of the aorist. Now this fact is attested in the xiiith century for Almoravid Spain and Norman Sicily, i.e. in languages from which Hilālī influence is clearly excluded; it is also found in Maltese; it must then be admitted that the two groups of dialects have independently brought about this innovation, which seems to have remained exceptional in the dialects of the east. The two groups agree also in the loss of short vowels in open syllables; this phonetic peculiarity is also found in many eastern dialects; but it is curious that it has become general in the Maghrib while the dialects of Spain and Egypt do not have it.

It is in the Documents inédits d'histoire almohade that we find the first information about Moroccan Arabic [use of biGD, "in order that", māa, "of", first persons of the aorist in *n-* (sing.), *n-* (plur.); but we have to wait till D. de Torres to find a few phrases transcribed (cf. French translation, *Paris*, 1886, p. 241, 325, 339). Monette, who was captured by the Moors in 1670 and was for a long time a prisoner, has left us a *Dictionnaire arabesque* in French and Moroccan, in transcription (cf. *Relation de la Capitale*, Paris 1653, pp. 330–362). The first grammatical notes were collected by Host (cf. *Études maghrébines*, 1779, ch. 8, p. 202–510), who has also given us a Berber-Danish-Moroccan Arabic vocabulary (ep. cit., p. 128–133). It is to Fr. de Dombay that we owe the first monograph on Moroccan dialects, which is also the first serious contribution to the study of Arabic dialects; the dialect which he deals with is that of Tangier (*Grammatica linguae materiae- arabiar*), Vindobona (1800). Since then, there have been a number of studies: for works before 1911 see the bibliography given by W. Marçais in his *Textes arabes de Tangier*, p. 207–215; for later works see the bibliography in *Textes arabes de Rabat* by L. Brunot (now in the press).

2. Literature of the Arabic dialects.

Like all popular literatures, the literature of the Arabic dialects of Morocco is essentially poetical. The only texts in prose are those which have been collected recently by European students of dialects. In the Arabic poetry two periods must be distinguished: the first extending down to the beginning of the Sa'dian dynasty, the first known texts are those which Ibn Khaldūn gives at the end of his *Mubaddima* among the specimens of the poetry of the towns. To these we may add a mass of poems composed in honour of the Prophet (*Ma'ārekhiyat*) of which numerous collections exist in manuscript. Ibn Qusaymīs (ed. Schefer, ii, p. 150) says that under the Marinids, poets used to compose verses in "vulgar African" on the Mawild and also on erotic subjects. These poems were recited in the presence of the sultan, who gave prizes to the winners of the competition. From this group cannot be separated the poems which accompany classical Moroccan music, "Andalusian" music, many of which must have been composed in Morocco; these were collected and classified by al-Hā'ik, a musician of Spanish origin who had settled in Tetwān. All these poems belonging to this first period are written in the Spanish Arabic dialect, which after the great success of the Cordovan Ibn Qusaymīs (xiiith century) became the classical language of the new poetic genre called *zājīl*, which had this in common with the *makākit* dialect that, while employing like it new metres, its prosody was based on the classical metre on the quantity long or short of the syllables, but the *zājīl* differed from the *makākit* in that it was written in the Spanish dialect and not in the classical language.

The main characteristics of the poetry of the Moroccan dialects of the first period are attention to the quantity of each syllable as in Latin and the use of the Spanish dialect.

The second period, on the other hand, is distinguished by a system of prosody founded exclusively on the number of syllables in each verse (as in French) and by the use of a special language called *meltiàn*, a kind of *kafili* adapted to literary purposes, based on the Moroccan dialect but influenced partially by the Beduin dialects; it seems moreover that this poetry is of Beduin origin and it was under the beduinating dynasties of the Sa'dians and 'Abd al-Malik that it arose and flourished. The first known author of a *kafili* written in *meltiàn* appears in the xiiith century: he was Abū Fāris ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Maghrawī, who was one of the poets of the Sa'dian Sulān al-Manṣūr al-Dhahabī (1578–1602). His fame is still great and preserved in the proverb: *Kull wašīd khitā, khar uwašma all-meltiàn* "Nothing that is long is of interest except the palm-tree and the Maghrawī". Other poets followed him. It was at this time that the saint ʿAbd al-Kuṣaymīs al-Madhjibī al-Dhakhārī (d. in 1569) wrote his mystic *rūḥīyya*, but many of his poetry of the verses now attributed to him are apocryphal. After these, we have the poets from Tetwān, an important centre of *meltiàn* poetry: first ʿAbd b. ʿAbd Allāḥ al-Mindīs al-Tihmāna, author of the celebrated ʿHā'īrīa, who left his native town to live at the court of the first ʿAbd Allāḥ Sulān, Muḥammad b. al-Shirīf (d. in 1664) and al-Raqīd (d. in 1672); a pupil of al-Mindīs, Ahmad b. al-Tunakhī, banished from Tetwān in 1672 by the Turks, also came to settle in Morocco among the Rai Zānen. But we have to come down to the xixith and especially the xiiith century for the coming of a whole school of poets writing in *meltiàn*. The three principal centres of literary activity were Fās, Mekecnes and
Marrakush. The subjects treated are most varied: love poems, mystic, erotic and satirical (discourse between a white woman and a negress, between a townswoman and a Beduin woman etc.), political (on the occasion of the French conquest and the establishment of the protectorate), didactic (manufacture of powder, target-shooting, falconry) poems or burlesques (parodies of ḥuṭbās declaimed by the students at their fetes).

Among the numerous authors we may mention: Si Muhammad b. Sulaimān, Si al-Thāmil b. al-Madaghri, al-Gandāz, al-Ḥungh; we owe humorous Ḷaṣidas to Si al-Madani al-Turkumāni of Marrakush; Si Khudur al-ʿĀlamī buried at Meknes specialised in mystical and medical poetry. The Durātī Muhammad al-Ḥaṭṭak of Tetwān (d. 1845) also wrote mystical Ḷaṣidas in mālān which are collected at the end of the lithographed edition of his Dīwān (Tunis 1331; Fās, n.d.). At the beginning of the xxth century, al-Saʿādī of Fās was composing political Ḷaṣidas.

Mālān poetry has completely replaced poetry in the Spanish dialect; it constitutes a very vigorous branch of literature, much in favour with all classes of society; we frequently find almost illiterate authors, and people say that their talent is a poetical gift given by God (mawākiḥ); on the other hand, even the rulers have not disdain ed this popular poetry and one of the last Ṣāliḥ Ṣulṭān, Mawlay ʿAbd al-Ḥafiz, wrote numerous Ḷaṣidas in mālān which have been collected in a Dīwān lithographed at Fās.

Alongside of this men's poetry, there are the songs of the women (songs of women working at the mill, songs of gossers, songs of family fêtes, lullabies), the children's songs which are often strangely conservative, epigrams and proverbs [cf. A. Fischer, Das Liederbuch eines marokkanischen Sängers, Leipzig 1918; C. Sonneck, Chants arabs du Maghreb, Paris 1902 (Nrs. 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 74, 84, 85, 88, 89, 94-97, 115 and 116 are Moroccan)]; E. Lévi-Provençal, Un chant populaire religieux du Dyabul Morocain, in Revue Africaine, 1918; H. de Castries, Les gnomes de Sidr, Abd el-Rahman al-Majdoub, Paris 1906; on the poetry mālān in general, cf. Abū ʿAli al-Gawthi, Ḳądī al-Ḳiṣṣa ʿan Abū ʿAli al-Qisw, Algiers 1904, p. 49-93; S. Barnay, Notes d'ethnographie et de linguistique nord-africaines, Paris 1924 (songs of women and children); L. Brunot, Proverbes et dictons arabs de Kabyl, in Hespéris, 1928 (with Moroccan bibliography of the subject).

III. Other Languages. A sketch of the languages of Morocco which only took account of Berber and Arabic dialects would be incomplete, for three other elements of secondary importance have to be considered:

a. Classical Arabic, the official language is used only in writing, for sermons, lectures and conferences; it is never the language of conversation. But as religious studies are considerably developed in the towns (especially Fās) and also among the Jūlad (Kūrānic studies and especially ḥārān), many words of classical Arabic have been introduced into the popular dialect by the educated classes. The phonetic peculiarity to notice in borrowed classical words is the retention of the short vowels of the classical language, as a result of the process of elongation; e.g. classical ǧāhir, plur. ǧāhir, "decreet of the sultan", borrowed by the popular dialect in the form ǧāhir, whence a dialect plural ǧāḥhar. Several Kūrānic expressions or phrases of exegesis hence passed into everyday language as adverbs: ḥālā ḥalē "guilty" (taken from Kūrān vi. 153), bêtālā biḥālī "slowly", lit. "in commenting on", ʿawālīs "perhaps". Morocoo, as a whole being little arabised, seems incapable of borrowing a part of the classical vocabulary and adapting it to its own dialect. Its borrowings from classical Arabic almost always look like borrowings from a foreign language.

b. Spanish was the only language spoken by many of the Muslims of Spain, who in the xvth century and especially in the xvi th took refuge in Morocco, mainly at Tetwān and Rabat-Salé. Mouette, who was taken a prisoner to Morocco in 1670, says that Spanish was as common there as Arabic; his remark is probably true only of the towns already mentioned. The descendants of these emigrants from Spain later learned Arabic and forgot Spanish, under the influence of Islamic culture. Not having been subject to the latter influence, the Jews of Spanish origin still speak an archaic Spanish, sprinkled with Arabic terms moulded to the flexions of Latin morphology.

c. At the present day, in the palace of the sultan, many servants of both sexes still speak Sudānese dialects, but these seem to have had no influence on the Arabic dialects of Morocco. No trace has so far been found of the existence in Morocco of secret languages; one could hardly put in this category the argots of certain guilds (butchers) nor those of the students, the originality of which consist simply in transposing certain letters of each word of the ordinary language and in the addition of certain prearranged syllables. (Georges S. Colin)

VIII. INTELLECTUAL LIFE.

More especially since the end of the middle ages, Morocco has occupied a place by itself, often important, in the history of Muslim civilisation. From the point of view of intellectual life, it was for long under the tutelage, more or less marked, of neighbouring countries, and it was only from the time it became an independent state with well-defined frontiers that it began to show independence in this respect also. The great activity at the centre of learning in Arab Spain down to the end of the xiii th century had undoubtedly an influence in Morocco, but it was after the return of the Iberian Peninsula to Christianity, that, owing to the migration of refugees from Spain to Morocco, where there happened to be ruling princes anxious to further Islamic studies, it was able to preserve the last and only centres of study in the Muslim west. In any case, in spite of the relatively large number of scholars which it has produced in various branches of ʿilm, this country is far from having inherited in the eyes of the rest of Islam the reputation and intellectual prestige, which Spain enjoyed when it was a Muslim country. However, it may be said that the towns of Morocco have always held in recent centuries a large proportion of men of letters, much attached to their traditional culture. Lastly, it may be noted that this culture, to the end of the xiii th century at least, never allowed the slightest place for modern sciences, the study of which, if it has gradually become more or less established in the Muslim east, has never interested the west.

The characteristic feature of this culture, which
is essentially founded on religion, is that it has remained unchanging. In this country, where only a few years ago tradition strictly regulated all acts of public and private life, it is not surprising that the intellectual ideal has always remained the same. It has already been remarked that the Moroccan faših of to-day, whether he be magistrate, teacher, or official of the Sharifian government, possesses the same stock of knowledge as a faših of the periods of the Marinids or Saʿdians. The same instruction has been given him and by the same methods. He has received first of all an elementary education in the Kurʾānic school [see Mafkar], he has learned the Kurʾān by heart, often completely, and some of the elements of grammar. Next he became a student (jaṭīb), and the faših al-ʿilām, which he studied, is governed by no rules or programmes other than the traditional ones.

He first of all studied the “mother-works” (um-mahār), compendia made to be memorised readily, on theology and grammar (usualy the Muḥāk Maʿmūn of Ibn Ādhir and the Aqīyrwānī). It was only then that he entered upon a more thorough study of more advanced texts, usually commentaries (sharīk) or glosses (ḥāṣiyā) on works (maṭaʿ) of established reputation and exclusively Islamic in character. The whole trend of his studies is toward a better knowledge of theology and law.

The result is that in most cases in Morocco men of learning are almost entirely jurists and that they differentiate between purely Islamic sciences (wilāma) and profane learning (fiṣāh) with some contempt for the latter. We understand also why the part played by Morocco in Arabic literature is primarily in the domain of subjects directly connected with the Kurʾān and the Sunna, theology, law and ʿaṣār.

The centres of learning have varied with periods and historical circumstances. The early ones seem to have been the points nearest to Spain, Ceuta and Tangier. The foundation of Fās and the building in this city of the great Mosque of the Kairawānīs (Qāmiṣ al-Karawīyīn) facilitated the establishment of a centre of culture in the interior.

A little later, Marrākch, the capital of the Almoravids and of the Almohads, became by desire of its rulers the centre of attraction for Maghribi scholars and even for a certain number from Spain. But it is from the Marinid dynasty, who saw in the development of educational centres in Morocco a means to make themselves popular in the country and to acquire prestige in the eyes of the Muslim world, that the rise of Fās as an intellectual centre dates: it was the metropolis of learning in the country from the sixteenth century. Not only did the Marinid princes make it the political capital but by the foundation of a series of colleges or madrasas (in Morocco: madaʿa) around the Qāmiṣ al-Karawīyīn and mosque of New Fās, they were able to attract to this city a host of students from all parts of the country and to give it the renown for learning, which it still jealously claims to-day. In the Marinid period, madrasas were also multiplied outside Fās: Mekez, Salé and Marrākch had their own, which shows that regular education was given in these towns.

In addition to the part played by the madrasas, there was the activity of the zāwiyyas, directly connected with the development of maraboutism and sharīfism in the country in the period when the Spaniards and Portuguese were trying to establish themselves in Morocco in the sixteenth century. The zāwiyyas, religious centres, headquarters of the ḍīḥād, naturally became centres of teaching. At the time when Fās could only with difficulty keep its character as the principal centre of learning in the country, the zāwiyyas, in which teaching was carried on, became more and more numerous, e.g. the zāwiyya of al-Dilā in the Middle Atlas, the zāwiyya of Tāmārt in the land of Darā and the zāwiyya of Wazzān in the north. The most famous scholars were frequently either heads of brotherhoods or šaṭīḥ, who taught in the mother-house of their order.

We do not intend here to give a detailed sketch of the Arabic literature of Morocco, but will be content with a few general indication-and names distinguishing where possible, between Islamic and profane sciences.

It was not till the Muslim west adopted the Mālikī rite that Morocco began to produce work in the domain of fiṣāh in close accord, a already mentioned, with the school of Spain. In this period of intellectual independence, the relations between the two countries were continued and the Maghrībī students, down to the eighteenth century considered a sojourn in Cordova, Murena or Valencia necessary to finish their course. The east did not yet seem to exert the attraction that it did later. This period, besides, the Islamisation and Arabisation of the berber masses was still too recent. Only a few names may be mentioned for this early period, Darās b. Ismāʿīl, of whom much is recorded is legendary; the famous reformer Ibn Ṭumār [q.v.], creator of the Almohad movement and author of several ṣaḥīḥ or ʿaṣār on his teaching; the ʿaṣār ʿIyād [q.v.], born at Ceuta in 476 (1083), d. at Marrākch in 544 (1149), author of numerous works on Muslim learning of which the most famous are the Kādāb al-Muḥājīr and the Maghārīb al-Muṣār with a collection of biographies of learned Mālikīs, entitled al-Muṣdārīk.

During the modern period, on the other hand, the number of learned Moroccans becomes more and more considerable. The best known are for Kūrāt: Ibn Barri (eighth century A. H.); Ibn Fakkāh (ninth century); the scholar of Meknūn Ibn Ghāzī (919); ʿAbd al-Kaḥmān Ibn al-Kaḥī (1082); ʿAbd al-Kaḥmān b. ʿIdris Mandār (1179); Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Sālim al-Ṭāfī (1248); Ṣahīḥ: Vahāʾ al-Saʿrawādī (808); Sukkān al-ʿAṣārī (956); Ṣāḥib al-Dīrīnī (991) Muhammad b. Khāsim al-Kaṣārī (1012); ʿIdris al-Ṭarāqī (1228); for ʿaṣār: Abu ʿIṣāḥān al-Suṣuṭī, commentator of the Awnul-munawwīn; Ibn al-Ṭazīlī [q.v.] and ʿAlī ʿAṣārī and ʿAlī ʿAṣārī (ninth century) commentators of the Kūrāt of Ibn Abī Qalūb al-Kairawānī; al-Walāsī (995); al-Maḥfūz (995); ʿAbd al-Qaṭīr (1040); ʿAbd al-Qaṭīr (1072); for the science of the Mālikī law: al-Makki (1087); Ibn Zakari (999). Their works have for the most part been recorded and will be found detailed either in Broekelmann, G. A. L. or in Benchemen's work on the individuals mentioned in the Liqāsī of ʿAbd al-Ṣaʿīd al-Ṭāfī. Only a small number have found a place in eastern libraries; but on the other hand, they all form the foundations of the collections of manuscripts formed and preserved in the imperial palaces and mosques of Morocco.

Some Moroccan scholars have written works on ʿaṣār or collections of poems, in addition to books of a strictly Muslim character. None of
them can claim any great originality and purely literary dwains are rare. Poetry, as a rule — when it is not didactic (tulūs) — is religious or mystic. At the courts, there were always a few literary men maintained by the princes, who were the pomegranists, often very loyal, of their patrons.

It is at the courts also, especially from the xivth century, that we find the few historians who have given us original chronicles or compilations. Their works, planned on a singularly curious conception of history, have nevertheless the merit of giving us the only detailed information about the political history of the country in the period of the author or immediately preceding it. Those which date from the Middle Ages are however much the best. The kind of work not only did not improve later, but became simply dry chronicles in which events are related in a bare and colourless fashion.

The only historians of Morocco — if we except the Iberian genealogists about whom we do not know very much — are contemporaries of the Almoravid dynasty. A little later, the Almohads found a historian in the person of a companionship of the Marinid I. Tūmār, Abū Bakr al-Baidhāqī al-Sanhājī, the interest of whose memoirs contrasts strikingly with many later chroniclers. Alongside of the work of al-Baidhāqī may be placed the chronicles of Ibn al-Kaṣīf and of Abū al-Walid al-Marrakushī as of high value. But it was in the Marinid period that the historian found most favour in Morocco. Leaving out Ibn Khaldūn, whom Morocco is not the only one to claim, we may mention Ibn al-Dhahar, a scholar of Marrakush, to whom we owe a history of North Africa and Spain, the Bajān al-Mughribī; that of Ibn Abī Zarī, author of a history of Fās and the Moroccan dynasties, Rawḍ al-Kāfirī; Ibn Marrāk, author of the Muradd, a monograph on the sultan Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAṭī; Ibn al-Ḥāfiz of the family of the kings of Granada, the author of Rawdāt al-Nasirīn. Under the Saʿdīans, the principal historians were al-Fīsīḥaḍī, al-Ibrāhīm, author of the Nasbat al-Ḥādīth; finally under the ʿAlawīs, al-Zayyān and Aksūnī.

Geography is represented in modern Moroccan literature only in the form of rihās or accouts of the travels of pilgrims, in which the description of the country passed through only occupies an insignificant place. Nevertheless, the geographer al-Idrīsī [q.v.] and the great traveller Ibn Battūta were of Moroccan origin.

The biographical literature of Morocco is considerable. The collections of marāḥī [q.v.] of saints, monographs dealing with families of shūrfā or religious brotherhoods are abundant, especially in the modern period. There are also collections by town or century, some of which are of a certain interest, even from the point of view of history. All these biographies have been surveyed in E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Historiens des Chorfa. The most notable biographers down to the middle of the xivth century are Ibn ʿAskar, author of the Dawkat al-Naqīṣ; Ibn al-Kāfī, the author of the Durrat al-Muḥādīl the Mauhūt al-Ḥarith; the historian al-Ibrāhīm, author of the Sabūʿat man intaṣar; and al-Kāfī, author of the Naḥīr al-Makhtūnī and the Ilīsāt al-Durar.

As to medicine and natural science, Morocco down to the xivth century was closely dependent on Spain. The physicians of the Almoravid and Almohad princes were from Spain, like Ibn Bāḍja (Avenpace), Ibn Tufail and the celebrated Ibn Rushd (Averroes) and Ibn Zuhr (Avenzoar). In the modern period, we find at the courts of the sultans several physicians of Moroccan origin who have left works. The chief were, in the Saʿdīan period: Abū Muḥammad al-Kāsim al-Wazīr al-Qushānī, in the Alawī period: Ibn Shuṭṭrīn, Abū al-Walāḥ Maḥir Abū Darā', Abū Allāh b. ʿAzāz al-Marrakkushī, Abū al-Walāḥ Maḥir Abū Darā', Abū al Salah al-ʿAlamī. Finally, two famous Moroccans studied the exact science of the xivth century: Abū ʿAli al-Ḥasan b. ʻUmar al-Marrakushī, author of a treatise on astronomical instruments, part of which has been translated by Sèdillic, and Abū al-Rahmān al-Banātī, to whom we owe several works on arithmetic, geometry, algebra, astronomy, astrology and alchemy.

At the end of the xivth century, the reign of Mawlānī al-Ḥasan was marked by a kind of renaissance in Muslim studies in Morocco, particularly characterised by the need which writers felt of getting their works printed to make them more widely known. The lithographic presses of Fās acquired a certain importance at this time and became the means of widely circulating only in manuscripts. A little later, there appeared at Fās the three volumes of the Sallāt al-Anfās of Abū al-Qādir al-Kattāntī [q.v.], an excellent biographical dictionary of the celebrities of the northern capital. At the same time, there was published in Cairo the great Moroccan history of Abū al-Khālid al-Naṣīrī al-Salawi [q.v.] entitled Kitāb al-Iṣṭiṣāḥ li-Abbār Dusayl al-Maṣhirī al-Aṭābī.

The establishment of the French protectorate in Morocco and the remarkable spread of French civilisation in the large towns have already profoundly modified the intellectual ideals of the younger generation in Morocco. It is however still too early to foretell the orientation that Arabic literature will take in this country in the years to come.


MORÓN, Arab. Mawzār, a little town in the south of Spain, on the right bank of the Guadaira and on the foot of the Sierra de Morón to the S.W. of Cordova and S.E. of Seville. It was in the Muslim period the capital of a khāra
or district and an agricultural centre with numerous olive-groves. At the beginning of the tenth century, it was one of the centres of resistance of the famous rebel 'Umar b. Ḥafṣūn; its citadel was taken by the troops of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib in 311 (923). In the next century during the period of the petty kingdoms of the reṣa taṣfān, Morón was the capital of a little Berber dynasty, the Bābāl Dāmar, which ruled in the region of Gades in Tunisia. The first member of the dynasty to declare his independence in 433 (1041) was Muḥammad b. Nūh; his father Nūh b. Āba Tātīb had lived in Morón from 1031 without actually recognising the government of Cordova. Muḥammad b. Nūh soon joined the jealousy of the ʿAbbāsid of Seville al-Muʿtādī who made an attempt on his life. He died in 449 (1057). His son Maʿnād b. ʿAbd al-Dawla, who succeeded him, was soon besieged in Morón by al-Muʿtādī and in return for his liberty surrendered the town in 458 (1066). Morón and its territory were annexed to the kingdom of Seville and henceforth shared the fate of the capital.


**MOROS.** [See MOORS.]

**MOSTAGANEM (MOSTAGHNUM), a coast town in Algeria, eight miles E. of the mouth of the Šekel (S E. Long. [Greenwich]) does not occupy the site of any known ancient town. There is no natural harbour here; two capes, not particularly well marked (Kharaba and Salamander), leave vessels without protection against winds from the north and west. It is therefore not as a port that al-Bakrī (10th century) mentions Mostaganem for the first time. He describes it as a town situated "not far from the sea" (it is less than a mile away) living on the produce of its rich territory, notably the cotton plantations. From this time onwards it was surrounded by a wall which strengthened its defences. The old town occupies a triangular plateau formed by the sharp bend of the ʿAin Sefra and the wall runs along the top of the ravine. On the point of this natural stronghold, the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Tāšṭīn is said to have built in 1082 a fortress which was later called Burdja al-Majlāḥ, from the name of one of the tribes of the neighbourhood, and is now a prison. Like the other towns of the coast, Nedroma or Algiers, Mostaganem was probably given a small Almoravid garrison. Thus strengthened, the town would serve as a place of refuge against an attack from the sea and one could keep at a distance the Berber tribes of the hinterland, who belonged for the most part to the Maghrībī confederation. It must thus have developed to some extent. In the middle of the 11th century, Idrīsī tells us that it had bazaars and baths; he emphasises the abundance of the water which irrigated the gardens and orchards and drove mills.

The name of Mostaganem does not figure in history throughout all this period when the Almohads in theory held the central Maghrib. The decline of the Almohads enabled the Maghrawa to become completely masters of the country. In 1267 and 1271 the Zayyānī sultān of Tlemcen Yaghmorāsīn reduced these turbulent tribes and incorporated their lands in the empire which he had founded. In 1580 (1581) he entrusted the government of Mostaganem to one of his cousins, al-Zāmī b. Yāḥṣīb, a descendant of one of the collateral branches of the family of the Bābāl Zayyān, in spite of the lack of confidence he had in those relatives whom he had deprived of the throne. These fears proved well founded. Al-Zāmī, having roused the Maghrawa to rebel, declared himself independent. Yaghmorāsīn had to march on Mostaganem; he blockaded the town strictly and the rebel surrendered after obtaining permission to cross to Spain.

Like all the coast region, Mostaganem in 735 or 736 (1335–1336) passed to the Merinid Abu ʿl-Ḥasan, who was engaged in the siege of Tlemcen. In 742 (1340) the victorious sultān built a mosque in Mostaganem. We have an inscription attesting this foundation of the interregnum of the Moroccan princes. Regained by the sultāns of Tlemcen, the town suffered disastrously from their weakness. The Saʿwād Arabs of the great Zoghība confederation became undisputed masters of the whole district. Mostaganem led a precarious existence. Leo Africanus at the beginning of the 16th century says that it occupied only a third of its former area. He credits it with 1,500 hearths, however, tells us of the weavers and of the roadstead to which ships from Europe came. He says the river runs "through the city", which shows that in addition to the old stronghold on the left bank there were now quarters on the right bank. In the Turkish period we know of two suburbs: Tibdīt (the New) and Matmor (the Old). In 1516 Khabar al-Dīn [q.v.] considerably strengthened its defences. Shaw at the beginning of the 18th century speaks of the citadel (the Fort of the East) which, built on a height, commanded the town and vicinity. In 1830 the garrison consisted of some hundreds of Turks and Kologhīs. The French took them into their service and put them under the command of the Kādī l-jorāhim. Distrusting the loyalty of the latter and thinking he had an agreement with the Medjāhīr, an undisciplined tribe of the neighbourhood (general Desmichels occupied the town in 1833. The troops whom he stationed there were attacked by ʿAbd al-Kādir. The vaxuous results of the treaty signed by Desmichels with the Emir forced Clauzel to retake Mostaganem (1835). Under Bugeaud, Mostaganem became the point of disembarkation and the centre of operations against ʿAbd al-Kādir. It was there that in 1847 the first battalion of Algerian Tirailleurs (Turcos) was raised, and the town has since been an important centre for recruiting native troops.

Mostaganem has developed considerably since the early days of the French occupation; it has now over 27,000 inhabitants. Its harbour, which owes nothing to nature, has been improved by two jetties which still afford only a rather mediocre shelter to shipping.

MOSTAGANEM — MOSTAR


MOSTAR, the capital of the Herzegovina in the kingdom of Jugoslavia, one hundred miles S.W. of Sarajevo, on the Sarajevo—Mostar—Dubrovnik railway. By the new (Oct. 3, 1929) division of Jugoslavia into nine banats, Mostar passed to the coast banat, the capital of which is Split (Spalato). The picturesque town lies two hundred feet above sea-level on both banks of the Neretva (Narenta) between the slopes of the Podveležje and the Hum. The old quarters of the town (Konak, Caršija, etc.) are in the east, the new in the west. In 1929, the number of inhabitants was 18,938 (in 1931 a little more: 18,760). Mostar covers an area of 16 square kilometres, has 2,916 houses, 33 mosques, 2 Serbian Orthodox and one Roman Catholic church. Mostar has a district mutfaq and a žanar judge (žanj). Its trade is considerable as is its production of fruit, wine and tobacco. The climate is warm and windy.

In the time of the Roman empire, there was a colony in the town of Mostar, which was destroyed during the period of migrations. In the centuries following, the immigrant Slavs conquered the Zabunije district with its capital Blagaj (near the modern Mostar). According to the Dalmatian writers Ortinin and Lucarelli (both at the beginning of the xviith century), the new town of Mostar was founded in 1440 by Radivoj Gost, a vassal of Stefan Vukčić Kosača, afterwards Duke of St. Sava. In historical documents the earliest mention is in 1452 of the two forts on the Neretva bridge (de castelli al ponte de Neretva); the name of the town itself is not found till 1499. It was only after the Turkish conquest of the Herzegovina (1483; cf. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 628), which resulted in the decline of Blagaj that the new settlement began to develop rapidly, first as an important strategic point in the Neretva valley, then as a prosperous commercial town in addition. Since it grew up around a wooden bridge, it was called simply Most (bridge), Mostići or Mostar, properly Mostari (plur. “the bridges”). This “place of the bridge” was by 1522 the residence of the Turkish sandjak-beg of the Herzegovina, who had previously lived in Foča. According to Hādjiî Khašıf, the crossing of the Neretva was exceedingly dangerous: the wooden bridge, being on chains, had no piés and swung so that “one only crossed it in fear of death”. The inhabitants therefore petitioned Sultan Sulman to have a stone one built in its place. The architect sent by the Sultan, the celebrated Sinan (q.v.), is said to have declared impossible to build a bridge at this spot, whereupon a local architect built the fine bridge which crosses the river in a single bold arch, thirty yards in length and sixty feet high. This is said to have been done in 1544—1567. The two Turkish chronograms given by Ewliya Čelebi and Ževecen and Köprisli Bey, both given actually give this date. This bridge not only gave Mostar its name but formed its chief sight, as it still is. The French traveller A. Poullot in 1658 says that its “fabricque est plus hardie, sans comparaison, & des plus d’étrangeté que n’est celle de Rételle à Venise, que yzelle y se estimé est une merveille”. E. Grünzweig calls it Herzegovini (hereafter quoted as: Gl. s. m.), xx. (1908), 49.

A modern traveller regards the old bridge at Mostar as the finest in the whole world (R. Michel, Fahrten in den Reichslanden, Bilder und Skizzen aus B. und der H. [Vienna and Leipzig, 1912], p. 31). In his earlier book on Mostar he describes this bridge as a “crecent in stone”. The building of the bridge was often ascribed to the Romans and indeed its foundations perhaps date from them but the modern bridge undoubtly dates from the Turkish period and “is the work of Dalmatico-Italian architects” (J. de Asboth, An official tour through Bosnia and Herzegovina, London 1890, p. 257). Ewliya Čelebi visited Mostar in 1075 (1664—1665) and gives in his ituary a number of details about the town, e.g. that it has fifty-three maqṣālas, three thousand and forty solidly built houses of stone, three hundred and fifty shops and forty-five mosques. Of the latter he mentions eight by name: 1. Old mosque in the Caršija, built in 878 (1473); 2. Hādjiî Mehmëd-beg mosque, built in 905 (1505); 3. Masjīd of Hādjiî ‘Alî-beg in the Caršija, built in 1016 (1607); 4. Deftedar-pasha mosque, built in 1017 (1608); 5. Koški Mehmëpasha mosque, built in 1027 (1617); 6. Ibrāhīm-beg, built in 1044 (1634); 7. Rūznâmadeji Ibrāhīm-Efendi-mosque and 8. Hādjiî ‘Ali mosque. For the two latter mosques neither the chronogram nor the year of building is given. The finest and largest of all is the mosque of Hādjiî Mehmëd Bey, which is usually called “Karagyoğbegova džamiya”. The monograph, quoted below, by Pecz gives the names of twenty-seven mosques and twenty-six vakufs (vakf) and in each he mentions whether their foundation records are preserved or not.

It is the course of the xviith and xviiith century Mostar was several times threatened by Venetian troops (1652, 1693, 1717). At a late date (1763), the Herzegovina was incorporated in the vilâyet of Bosnian and Mostar was only the residence of the musellim. This lasted till 1832, when the land was again made a vilâyet and Mostar became the headquarters of the newly appointed Herzegovinian vazir ‘Ali Paša Rizvanbegović.

During the Turkish period Mostar produced a number of men of note in Turkish and Muslim literature and learning. Of poets we may note: 1. Dīyāzî (d. 972 = 1564); 2. Derwīsh Paša, (Bayezidagi; 1599 and in 1601 governor of Bosnia); 3. his son Ahmed-beg Sālḫī and Ahmed Rūzštî (born 1047 = 1637). The following learned men were natives of Mostar: 1. ‘Ali Dede b. Muṣṭafā (d. 1007 = 1598); 2. Muṣṭafā Ayyūbîzadeh, called Sheyyūq (d. 1119 = 1710). Muftî of Mostar, commentator of various works; 3. Ahmed Efendi Mostari (Mostarac d. 1193 = 1770), whose father (Muṣṭafā ‘Ali) were very popular in Bosnia, and 4. Muṣṭafā Ṣıldık (Karašbeg), Mufti of Mostar (murdered
in 1878), whose comprehensive 
Haddiya... 'ala Mihrāt al-Uṣūl was printed in Sarajevo (1316).

A few days after the murder of the last-named, Mostar was taken without resistance by the Austrian troops (Aug. 5, 1878) and on Oct. 5, 1898, annexed to the Danubian monarchy, in which it remained till 1918. During these forty years (1878–1918) Mostar was frequently the centre of Muslim (and of Serbian Orthodox) opposition to the government. In Mostar originated also the Muslim agitation for autonomy in religious affairs (cf. i., p. 760), which went on for ten years (1899–1909). The leader of the movement, ʿAli Fehmi Dabić, the then mufti of Mostar, had to escape to Constantinople at the end of January 1902, where he was appointed professor of Arabic literature in the University, in which capacity he published among other things his book Hujn al-Ṣaḥāba fi ʿArāb ʿAqlīf al-Ṣaḥāba (Constantinople 1324). In connection with the struggle for religious autonomy, which was published from 1906 (the Muslim political paper Muslīnāt) (in spite of its Arabic title written in the Serbo-Croat language). Shortly before the World War I, Muslim family papers Biser ("Pearl") (from 1912) was started in Mostar and the Jezigranska biblioteka (Muslib Library) which attained thirty volumes.

Since the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in 1918, Mostar has belonged to Jugoslavia.

Bibliography: Haddiji Khalifa, Rumeli und Bosna, geographically described, transl. by J. V. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 175; S. Novaković, Hadži-Kafta... o Balkanskom poljustru (= Sponenri XVIII of the Rev. Soc. Ac., Belgrad 1802), p. 91a; Evića Čelebi, Sivžk-annāte, Constantinople 1318, ii. 481–486 (cf. also Gl. 2. n. xx. [1908], 328–332; C. J. Jireček, Die Handelstrassen and Wergwege of Serbien and Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Prague 1879, p. 79–80; M. H. Mulabadić, Stara čupija u Mostaru in Gl. 2. n., 1898, part 3, p. 109–115 (German in Wissenschaft. Mitteilungen aus Bosn. und der H., i. 510–512); C. Pees, Mostar and sein Cultural, Leipzig 1891 (with plan); H. Renner, Durch Bosnien and die Herzegovina breve und gur, 2nd ed., Berlin 1897, p. 297–316; S. beg Bašagić, Kratka uputa u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1900, p. 184–185 (list of the Herzegovinian governors); L. Grgići Bjelokosij, Mostar nekad i sad, reprint from Zvezda, Belgrad 1901; Die osterrungs. Monarchie in Wort und Bild: Bosnien and Herzegovina, Vienna 1901, p. 112–120; A. Walny, Bosnischer Bote fur das Jahr 1903 (Sarajevo), p. 224–225; Dr. M. Mandić, Povijest okupacije B. i H., Zagreb 1910, p. 45–46; S. beg Bašagić, Bosnian i Herzegovino u islamskoj književnosti, Sarajevo 1912, s. index; V. Corović, Bosne i Herzegovine, Belgrad 1925, p. 165; V. Corović and M. Filipović, in Avroba enciklopedija, Zagreb 1926–1929, i. 889; Almanah kraljevine Jugoslavije (Zagreb since 1930), i. 99 and 433–434.

MOŠUL (AL-MAWSIL), the capital of Diyar- Rabi’ā (q.v.) on the west bank of the Tigris, opposite the ancient Niniveh.

Whether the town already existed in antiquity is unknown. E. Herzfeld (Archaeol. Reise, ii. 207, 259) has suggested that Xenophon's Mēṣīlā reproduces its old name and that we should read Mēṣīlā (= Mawsīl); but against this view we have the simple fact that this town lay on the east bank of the Tigris (P. H. Weissbach in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., xv., col. 1164).

The Muslims placed the foundation of the town in mythical antiquity and ascribed it to Kēwānd b. Bīwarāsp Adamhāk. According to another tradition, its earlier name was Khšurān. The Persian satrap of Mošul bore the title Būd-Ardashir, so that the official name of the town was Būd-Ardashir (Le Strange, Eastern Caliphate, p. 87; Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 208). Lastly Bar Bahlul says that an old Persian king gave it the name Bih Hormez-Kowād (G. Hoffmann, Aeusser an syr. Akten pers. Martyrs., p. 178).

As the metropolis of the diocese of Aṯūr, Mošul took the place of Niniveh whither Christianity had penetrated by the beginning of the second century a.d. Rabban Īsho'-yāhūb called Bar Kāsār about 570 a.d. founded on the west bank of the Tigris opposite Niniveh a monastery (still called Mār Īsho'yā) around which Khšurāw II built many buildings. This settlement is probably the fortress mentioned in the Syriac chronicle edited by Guidi and H. Meinards (according to Herzfeld, citadel on the opposite bank) (Nicolai, S. B. Ak. Wien, xxvii., fasc. ix., 1893, p. 209; Sachau, Chronik von Arbel, chap. iv., p. 48, i; Heiskel, op. cit., p. 208) which later was developed into a town by the Arabs (Chronicle of Sefr, at the end).

After the taking of Niniveh by ʿUtba b. Farkad (20 = 641) in the reign of ʿOmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the Arabs crossed the Tigris whereupon the garrison of the fortress on the west bank surrendered on promising to pay the poll-tax and obtained permission to go where they pleased. Under the same caliph, ʿUtba was dismissed from his post as commander of Mošul and Hariljama b. ʿAradja al-Bāriʾi succeeded him. The latter settled Arabs in houses of their own, then allotted them lands and made Mošul a camp city (miṣr) in which he also built a Friday Mosque (al-Balāḏurī, ed. de Goeje, p. 332). According to al-Waḍī̀kī, ʿAbd al-Malik (65–86) appointed his son Saʿād as governor of al-Mawsil while he put his brother Muhammad over Arminiya and al-Djazīra. According to al-Muʿṣāfī b. Tāʾūs on the other hand, Muhammad was also governor of Ādharbājīyān and al-Mawsil, and his chief of police Ibn Talid paved the town and built a wall round it (al-Balāḏurī, op. cit.). His son Marān b. al-Mawsil is also described as a builder and extender of the town; he is said to have organized its administration and built roads, walls and a bridge of boats over the Tigris (Ibn Fākīh, ed. de Goeje, p. 128; Yākūṭ, Maḏbaḥa, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 682–684). The foundation of a Friday Mosque was also ascribed to him. Mošul became under him the capital of the province of al-Djazīra. After Mutawakkil's death the Khārūjī Musāwir seized a part of the territory of Mošul and made al-Hadīthja his headquarters. The then governor of Mošul, the Khurayj ʿAkbā b. Muhammad, was deposed by the Taḏḥibī Ayyāb b. ʿAbd who put his own son Hasan in his place. Soon afterwards the ʿAzdī ʿAbd Allah b. Sulaimān became the governor of al-Mawsil. The Khārūjī took the town from him and Musāwir entered into possession of it. Muʿtamicj appointed the Turkish general Aṣṭāgin governor of the town, but in Dhuʾmādād I 259 the latter sent his son Askūṭārin there as his...
deputy. The latter was soon driven out by the citizens of the town who chose Yahya b. Sulaiman as their ruler.

Haitham b. 'Abd Allah whom Asadagin then sent to Mosul had to return after achieving nothing. The Taghlibi Ismail b. Aiyub whom Asadagin sent with 20,000 men against Mosul, among whom was Hamdan b. Hamdun, entered Mosul after winning a battle, but was soon driven out again.

In 261 the Taghlibi Khidjar b. Ahammad and in 267 Ismail b. Kandjagh was appointed governor of Mosul by Mutamid. A year after Ismail's death, his son Muhammed sent Hurun b. Sulaiman to Mosul, but when he was driven out by the inhabitants he asked the Banu Sahibn for assistance and besieged the town with him. The inhabitants led by Hurun b. 'Abd Allah and Hamdan b. Hamdun after an initial victory were surprised and defeated by the Sahibn; shortly afterwards Muhammad b. Ismail was deposed by the Kudari b. Dawud.

When Munadid became caliph in 279, Hamdun (the grandfather of Saff al-Dawla) managed to make himself very popular with him at first, but in 282 he rebelled in Mosul. When an army was sent by the caliph against him under Usuf and Naasir, he escaped while his son Husain surrendered. The caliph of Mosul was stormed and destroyed and Hamdun soon afterwards was captured and thrown into prison. Naasir was then ordered to collect tribute in Mosul and thus came into conflict with the followers of the Kharijites Hurun; Hurun was defeated and fled into the desert. In place of Turkam, who was imprisoned, the Caliph appointed Hasan b. 'Ali governor of Mosul and sent against Hurun, the main cause of the strife, the Hamdunid Husain who took him prisoner in 283. The family thus regained the caliph's favour.

When after the subjection of the Kharijites, raiding Kurds began to disturb the country round Mosul, Muktafi again gave a Hamdunid, namely Husain's brother Abu 'l-Hajjaj 'Abd Allah, the task of bringing them to book, as the latter could rely on the assistance of the Taghlibis settled around Mosul, to whom the Hamduns belonged. Abu 'l-Hajjaj came to Mosul in the beginning of Muharram 293 and in the following year subdued the Kurds whose leader Muhammad b. Bhul submitted and came to live in Mosul.

From this time the Hamduns [q.v.] ruled Mosul, first as governors for the caliph, then from 317 (Nasir al-Dawla Hasan) as sovereign rulers.

The 'Uqailids who followed them (386-409) belonged to the tribe of the Banu Khaich. Their kingdom, founded by Husain al-Dawla al-Mukhallad, whose independence was recognised by the Buyid, extended as far as Taki (Ishik), al-Madain, and Kifia. In 489 (1095-1096) Mosul passed to the Saljukids.

The town developed considerably under the Atabeg 'Imad al-Din Zangi who put an end to Saljuk rule in 521 (1127-1128); Mosul, which was for the most part in ruins, was given splendid buildings by him; the fortifications were restored and flourishing gardens surrounded the town. Under one of his successors, 'Izz al-Din Mansur I, Mosul was twice unsuccessfully besieged by Saladin (1182 and 1185 A.H.); after the conclusion of peace 'Izz al-Din however found himself forced to re-cognise Saladin as his suzerain.

The town was this time defended by a strong

citadel and a double wall, the towers of which were washed on the east side by the Tigris. To the south lay a great suburb, laid out by the vizier Muhammad al-Din Karmaz (d. 595). From 607 his son Badr al-Din Lu'lu' [q.v.] ruled over Mosul first as vizier of the last Zangids and from 631 as an independent ruler. In 642 he submitted to Hullagi and accompanied him on his campaigns, so that Mosul was spared the usual sackings. When however his son Malik Salluh Ismail joined Baibars against the Mongols the town was plundered in 660 (1261-1262); the ruler himself fell in battle (van Berchem, Poeschrijven f. Th. Noëldé, 1906, p. 157 f.).

The Mongol dynasty of the Djalai succeeded the Ilkhauns in Baghdad and Sultan Shawk Uways in 756 (1356-1355) incorporated Mosul in his kingdom. The world conqueror Timur not only spared Mosul but gave rich endowments to the tombs of Nabi Yunus and Nabi Lijdji, to which he made a pilgrimage, and restored the bridge of boats between Mosul and these holy places.

The Turkoman dynasty of the Aq Koyunlu whose founder Baba' al-Din Karai Othman had been appointed vizier of Diyar Bakr by Timur, was followed about 920 (1514-1515) by the Persian Safawids. After long fighting the Ottomans in 1047 (1637-1638) finally took the town from them. In 1079 (1669) it was visited by a severe earthquake, in 1156 (1743) besieged by Nadir Shah Afshar and heroically defended by Christians and Muslims. It was then under a Pasha of the local family of the 'Abd al-Djalal who had ruled the town for a long period, fairly independent of the Porte. In the 18th century Mosul was an important provincial town of the Turkish empire. After the World War the vilayet of Mosul after long negotiations was placed in the mandated territory of Iraq. The town has now about 70-90,000 inhabitants.

The Arab geographers compare its plan to a headcloth (talasih), i.e. to an elongated rectangle. Ibn Hawqal who visited Mosul in 358 (968-969), describes it as a beautiful town with fertile surroundings. The population in his time consisted mainly of Kurds. According to al-Makdisi (c. 375 = 985-986), the town was very beautifully built. Its plan was in the form of a semi-circle. The citadel was called al-Murabba'a and stood where the Nahr Zubaid canal joined the Tigris (now 'Ikhla' or Bash Tahliya; cf. Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 209). Within its walls were a Wednesday market (Suk al-Isra'itin) after which it was sometimes called. The Friday Mosque built by Marwan stood on an eminence not far from the Tigris to which steps led up. The streets in the market were for the most part roofed over. Al-Makdisi (op. cit., p. 135) gives the eight main streets of the town (discussed in Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 209). The castle of the caliph (Kasr al-Khalifat) stood on the east bank; half a mile from the town and commanded Nimrud; in the time of al-Makdisi it was already in ruins, through which the Nahr al-Khawarsi flowed.

Ibn Lubbaih visited Mosul on 22nd-26th Safar 580 (June 4-8, 1184). Shortly before, Nür al-Din had built a new Friday Mosque on the marketplace. At the highest point in the town was the citadel (now: Bash Tahliya); it was known as al-Hadba' "the hunch-backed" and perhaps as the synonymous al-Difa'da (G. Hoffmann, Auszug aus
MOZARABS, the name given in the middle ages to those CHRISTIANS who lived in districts under Muslim rule and bore the stamp of Spanish Moorish culture. The word comes from the Arabic muṣarrāb, the meaning of which is exactly that of the Spanish mozárabe; the Arabic form itself is found in documents in the archives of medieval Spain.

We know that in principle at the time of conquest the new subjects of the Muslim conquerors could either adopt Islam or continue to profess their own faith, in the latter case falling into the category of tributaries (dhimmī; q.v.). The early Arab rulers of Spain showed considerable tolerance in this connection and the treaties of capitulation were definite on this point, at least if we may judge by one of them of which the text has been preserved and which was concluded between the Visigoth Theodemir, lord of the district of Murcia [9, v.], and Alī ibn al-'Azīz b. Mūsā b. Nuṣayr. This attitude of Spanish Islam to the Christians hardly altered in the centuries following until the coming of the Almoravids and Almohads. It is true there were occasional anti-Christian reactions under the first Umayyads which found vent in persecution. But these persecutions seem to have been dictated by political considerations rather than by the fanaticism of individual rulers. The Christian communities of the large towns were the most active nurseries of the nationalist movements which broke out in Spain mainly in the ninth century. Among the most important we may mention that led by the Mozarab 'Omar b. Ḥāfnūn [9, v.], which passed far beyond the limits of a purely religious movement. At Cordova in particular a few illuminati had to be sent to the scaffold because they insisted the religion of the Prophet. The Muslim judges seem to have sentenced them to the supreme penalty with considerable reluctance and the central authorities took the initiative in summoning a council, so that the church itself put a stop to the demonstrations of certain mystics like Euclio and Alvaro.

In any case in the tenth century the Mozarabs of the caliphate were living in harmony with all classes of Muslim society and were themselves considerably influenced by Arab culture. They spoke Arabic, just as the Muslims spoke the Romance language, and were acquainted with Islamic literature. The reciprocal influences were therefore considerable and were to continue so till the end of the middle ages.

As regards administration, the Christian communities of Muslim Spain under the Umayyads were under the direct authority of officials chosen by themselves from their own number and appointed with the approval of the Muslim authorities. Their head, who is sometimes given the Latin title of defensor or protector, was most frequently called Count (Comōs, Sp. Cond., Ar. kūmās). The taxes which the Christians had to pay were collected by an agent called exceptor. To settle their differences they had a special judge (Ar. kādi 'l-naẓārā or kādi 'l-faggām, Lat. cens) who administered the Visigothic code (Liber Judicium, later the Fuero Juzgo).

The Christian communities of Cordova and Seville were among the most important but were less important than that of Toledo, which was during the caliphate the residence of the metropolitain (μητρόπολις) of Spain. The clergy were under bishops (ἄρχοντες). Public worship was celebrated.
in the churches: there were monasteries (dair) with monks (rabîb) in the neighbourhood of the larger towns: for example that of Aimilii (Quadramellato) near Cordova. The history of the Mozarab of Spain is of course closely connected with the political history of Islam in Spain and with the "reconquista." But its development is mainly interesting as throwing light on the peculiar culture of Moorish Spain which remained alive even after the fall of Muslim power. The recent publication of a considerable number of documents from the archives of the cathedral of Toledo mainly of the xii and xiii centuries enables us to estimate how great was the arabisation of all classes in re-conquered Spain, which we find influencing civil, military and economic institutions and even ecclesiastical ritual (Mozarab rite). It is similarly to the Mozarab communities and their representatives who went to the north of the Peninsula that we must attribute the origin of a special art. Mozarab art, directly derived from Cordovan art and characterized by almost regular use of the horse-shoe arch and the vault.


Mshatta, a ruined palace in Transjordania.

Description of the building. The ruins of al-Mshatta (the winter camp) lie east of the Jordan about 130 miles south of Damascus and 25 east of the northern shore of the Dead Sea, near the Darab al-Hadîl, the pilgrims’ road from Damascus to Medina and Mecca. It consists of a rectangular outer wall, defended by towers at the corners, each side being 157 yards long. The entrance gateway is in the centre of the south side and is flanked by two pentagonal half-towers rising out of an octagonal base, across which runs an octagonal colonnade, the long frieze 16 feet high and over 45 yards long. This part has been taken to Berlin and is the most famous monument of early Muslim architecture and decorative art and much discussed centre of interest in Oriental archaeology. The building of the whole area within the wall was planned in three sections of which however only the central one was carried through, at least in part. This again is divided into three parts: the entrance area, the central rectangular open court and the royal residence. The plan by B. Schusl (cf. Jährbuch d. preuss. Kunstammlungen, vol. xxv., 1904) shows a gateway and an entrance hall, both of which were intended to be vaulted, and a series of surrounding rooms, of which the oblong room to the right of the entrance has been said by Herzfeld and others to be a mosque because it has a niche in it which is taken to be a mihrab. Only the foundations of the walls of this part however are still standing. In the large quadrangular court on the western side is a waterbasin built of brick and traces of a second one mentioned by Tristram on the opposite side, so that Schulz thought they were originally intended to be four for the sake of symmetry. The palace consists of a great hall with three aisles, a domed chamber and the living rooms at the sides. The walls are about five feet high, of blocks of limestone and above that of brick (21 x 21 and 27 x 27, 65 cm. thick). The rooms at the sides to the left and right of the great hall with its three aisles, are all barrel-vaulted; the smaller vaultings still exist and, like the relieving arches of the doors, are remarkable for their pointed arches. Schulz was able with certainty to reconstruct the façade which had fallen and was still lying on the ground. It consisted of three round arches on pillars corresponding to the three aisles. The hall was divided into three sections by pillars of which a few shafts and a Corinthian capital with painting and remains of gilding have been found. Holes and gutters at the bases and on the shafts suggested to Schulz that the columns had originally been taken from another building and used again here. The horizontal termination of the façade also shows that this hall was intended to have a flat, and not a basilical roof, or actually had one. To give it its height the two supporting rows of pillars had a second story of pillars placed upon them, an arrangement usual in Syrian architecture also. The quadrangular hall of audience and ceremonial, entered from the oblong hall by a second door, was covered by a dome and three half domes of brick, all of which have collapsed. Focussing on the inside of the surrounding wall shows that it was intended to build on to the sides of the palace dwellings for soldiers and other retainers. On the evidence of these projections from the wall, Schulz has prepared his reconstruction of the plan of these wings. The quadrangular surrounding walls with the round towers had barely been half built when the half-finished work was stopped. The principal motive of the great frieze at the part of the wall containing the main gateway is a zigzag pattern in high relief which forms 44 half triangles. These triangular areas are, wherever the frieze was finished, thickly covered with tendrils in low relief. In the centres of the pairs of interlocking perpendicular and suspended triangles, bosses are set in high relief decorated with acanthus rosettes. The socket of the frieze is in the form of a modified Attic base consisting of a euthynteria and two tresses. The border which frames the frieze at the sides and above consists of a leaf frieze at the foot and a second larger crowning it. According to Schulz’s photograph, before the frieze was removed, the half left of the door up to the main border was finished but the right half only up to half height of the frieze.

The patterns of foliage in the fields of the triangles show great variety. Here we follow the scheme of the official publication in the Jahrb.
The triangles A and B have within circles vines with buds picking grapes; in the apex of triangle A there is also a Chinese fabulous animal with a human head such as was very popular in Chinese sepulchral plastic art. In C the circles are interlaced and lotus flowers appear in addition to the vine-tendrils. In D—I the vines which are here more realistic grow out of vases which are flanked by lions and winged griffins; buffaloes, panthers, lynxes and gazelles also relieve the foliage. In triangle J the tendrils grow straight out of the ground; this area also has the remarkable addition of men picking the grapes. Triangle L is the first right of the door and is the last to contain animals. The areas of the triangles of the right half show a quite different style. M—T have, it is true, still vines but of the greatest, lace-like delicacy and closeness of pattern which varies from triangle to triangle. U and V lastly are filled with palm-leaves and cone-shaped figures instead of vines and crowned with spirals.

**Form and purpose of the building.** The plan is that of a hippod, i.e. the Arab type of camp, reproduced in building materials, and so called after the Lakhmids capital, with the prince’s tent or house on the central axis just as is described by Mas’ud in his account of Sarmara (cf. E. Herzfeld, Eber vorender Bericht über die Ausgrabungen von Sarmara, Berlin 1912, p. 39 sq.). Mshatta, Khirbat and Sarmara are descendants of this eastern type of palace. Just as the form could only be recognised as typical after the examination of Khirbat in the Tjrān, and by the excavation of Sarmara, so it was the investigations of H. Lammens that first elucidated the purpose of these buildings (La Bābiya et La Hira sous les Omeides, in M.F.O.B., iv.). Following Lammens, Herzfeld explained Mshatta as a bābiya [q. v.], i.e. a country palace which was built in the form of a hippod for an Umayyad as an occasional residence.

**History of exploration, bibliography and date.** After its first discovery by H. B. Tristram in 1872, Mshatta was explained by its archaeological adviser J. Ferguson as a Sasanian palace, built by Khusrav II after his conquest of Syria in 614 A.D. It found a place in literature with this description in Tristram’s The Land of Moab (London 1873). It was not till about the end of the century that Mshatta became a subject of archaeological study and discussion when it was visited in 1898 by A. Musil and soon afterwards examined by R. E. Brunnow and A. v. Damascenski and published in their Provincia Arabia (1904—1909). In the meanwhile the Russian expedition sent to take it down under B. Schulz had already been there and the Berlin publication by Schulz and Strzygowski appeared in the Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunst., 1904. To Professor Strzygowski is due the credit of having urged W. Bode to bring the façade to Berlin. Thanks to the interest displayed by the Emperor William II in the plan and his friendly relations with Sultan Abd al-Hamid, the latter, with the traditional generosity of an Oriental despot, gave the German Emperor a present of this ornament of the desert. As a result of his study of the architecture and decoration, Strzygowski dated Mshatta between 540 and 600 a. D. M. v. Berchem with Clermont-Ganneau and Dussaud decided on historical grounds for the Lakhmids dating, i.e. that it was built as early as the fourth century A. D. (Aux pays de Moab et d’Edom, iv., J.S., 1909, p. 401—408) while Brunnow and Musil assumed a Chaldaean origin. On the other hand in his review of Strzygowski (Z. A., xix., 1905—1906, p. 419 sqq. and Islamstudien, p. 276 sqq.), C. H. Becker championed the Umayyad dating, which E. Herzfeld in his Genesis der islam. Kunst und des Mshattaproblem (Ist., i., 1910, p. 27—63 and 105—144) supported with evidence from the history of art, and was strengthened by the appearance at the same time in M. F. O. B., iv., 1910, p. 91—112 of H. Lammens’ study Bābiya et Hira. This Umayyad dating Herzfeld tried to make more convincing in his Mshatta, Hira und Bābiya (Jb. d. preuss. Kst., 1921) and finally crowned his work with the discovery of an inscription drawn up by Walid II himself recording repairs done by him; Walid II was murdered after a year’s reign (125 = 743—744) and work on the building was not completed. This attribution found further support in a story quoted by H. Lammens (in J. A., 1915) from Ibn al-Muksafi, according to which Walid II was murdered by a man named ‘Abārīm while building a “town” in the desert, which was to bear his name, Lammens identifies this town with Mshatta. Recently the Syrian desert palaces were again thoroughly investigated by the two fathers and teachers of the École Biblique St. Étienne in Jerusalem, Jaussen and Savignac (Mission Arch. en Arabie III, Les châteaux Arabes de Cever Amra, Haraach et Tāba, 2 vols., Paris 1922). As regards Tāba and Mshatta the two students came to the same conclusion as Miller scholars, namely that they belong to the same period. As it seemed to them impossible to attribute them to the Umayyad period, they attributed them to the pre-Islamic period; as both buildings were left unfinished, they must have been built towards the end of a dynasty or kingdom. The discovery of idols at Mshatta also, they said, prevented its being attributed to the Umayyad period (cf. Dier, Die Kunst d. islamischen Volker, 11th ed., 1926, p. 153).

**Establishment of the Umayyad date of Mshatta.** The archaeological material at Strzygowski’s disposal when he wrote on Mshatta in 1904 was still insufficient for the proper appreciation of the historical position. It was not yet possible to have a complete conception of Umayyad art. Herzfeld, who knew the lands in question by long residence and frequent travels was able six years later to approach the problem from much more solid premises. The most important monument from which deductions could be drawn was the Mihrāb of the Qāmil al-Khāṣṣaki, discovered by Sarre and Herzfeld in the meanwhile in Baghdād, which must be either pre- or early ‘Abbāsid and the decoration of which formed a parallel to that of Mshatta (Ist., i. 33 sq. and plate i.). The explanation of the niche in the chamber right of the gateway as a mihrāb had to be decisively rejected and indeed less emphasis had been laid on it by Herzfeld than by superficial writers on the question for whom the “mihrāb” meant an easy proof of their point. Schulz had previously ascertained on the spot that this niche is not a mihrāb, and a study of the plan and Schulz’s measurements shows a piece of masonry jutting 65 cm. out of the wall, containing a niche 1.62 m. broad and 1.48 deep. The fact that the mihrāb is never in a projection from the wall (an exception
would prove nothing) as well as the breadth of the niche which would be exceptional, even in very large mosques of late date (such a depth is hardly ever found anywhere), prove that this can only be a tribunal niche or something of the kind. Kašir al-Tuba has in its south wall four similar semi-circular apse-like niches about 10 feet broad, which surely no Muslim archaeologist would claim as muqarnas. Mshatta, however, does not require such illusive evidence to prove its Umayyad date. The three found proofs are found in the variety of material used and architectural styles in the application of the principles of the minor arts to the decoration of buildings, already noticed but not correctly interpreted by Strzygowski, and the variety of styles in the areas of the triangles which fall into four groups.

The combination of Irāq brickwork with Syrian stonework in the royal residence proves the cooperation of different groups of workmen working on the system of con-cription which was revived by the Umayyads. The construction of the brick arches is also Irāq in form and, besides, they are pointed arches which were unknown before the beginning of the seventh century, so that it is impossible to put the date before 600 A.D. It was only in the early Muslim period that they spread. We find Syrian torus profiles on the basilical building and North Mesopotamian profiles on the frieze. The pillars in the basilical hall are taken from older buildings as was the custom wherever possible in the early Muslim period. In the pre-Muhammadan period neither wooden braces in the arches nor material from older buildings were used (Herzfeld).

On the significance of the decorative façade we may add a little to Strzygowski's and Herzfeld's observations. Two points were hardly touched on in the previous discussion: that the frieze is to be considered and understood only as the basis of a great façade which was planned but was never finished, and the origin of this system of decoration from Persian textile art, which alone could supply the foundation for it and explain the sudden appearance of this completely new world hitherto unknown in architectural ornamentation. The façade proper planned above this architectural border would have contained a pattern on a much larger scale just as we see on carpets. The thum-mandol op-ed groups of animals still to be found on Russian carpets and textiles influenced from Persia and the Caucasus of the xvinth—sixth centuries and the rug margin filled with tendrils, each with a cypress (in place of rosette) in the centre show the popularity and wide distribution and permanence of this motive. When it was taken over for architectural decoration, the popular textile form, however, were translated into the traditional forms of the art of the land and time. This explains the different stylistic execution of the same plan by the stonemasons.

This historic breach with tradition, this surprising control over a differently oriented artistic tendency presupposes a radical change and reorganization of society and outlook. An artistic creed so perfect and complete in itself cannot possibly be explained by the ambition of some upstart of a desert sheikh but it presupposes in addition to enormous wealth and far-reaching power a highly trained artistic sense, which was only possible at the time of the Umayyad Court and actually existed there, as we know from many sources. Only a passionate builder and lover of architecture could visualise such a work and only at a court filled with scholars, poets and artists from all countries could the plans for it be drawn up. This illuminating emancipation from the Hellenistic façade with its pillared niches is only to be explained as the expression of a new outlook rooted in religion and proudly conscious of its quite different ideals, as was the case with young Islam. For the first time, the new teaching was here given artistic expression in a design on a figured ground, which was to develop into the frieze of incriptions on the Sūrūn in Khārgūrd in the xith century (cf. Diez, Churmschische Baukunst, p. 152).

Bibliography: given in the article.
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MA'ADHDHIN. [See MAQDIS, I, H, 4 and ABDUllAH]

AL-MALIK AL-MU'A'IYAD SAIF AL-DIN, Shaikh al-Malджidi (so-called after his first owner) al-Khaššaši (member of the bodyguard), a Circassian by birth, was brought as a slave to Cairo and purchased by the Alībeg Bārikū. When the latter came Sultan in 727, he gave him his freedom, put him in the corps of pages (dawandar, q.v.), moved him to the corps of cup-bearers (qādār, q.v.) and later appointed him to the bodyguard (bāshār, whence his nickname). Bārikū's son, Nāṣir Farādž (q.v.), on his accession in 801 (1399) appointed him emir of a thousand and in the following year governor of Tripoli. He served as a troop commander in the battle of Damascus against Timūr, was taken prisoner, soon after his release again became governor of Tripoli and later of Damascus. The reign of Sultan Farādž was a period of uninterrupted fighting between the Sultan and his governors and Shaikh was always in the midst of intrigues; often he was on the Sultan's side, more often in rebellion against him. His relations with his rival, the powerful governor Nawwūr, were similar. Finally the Sultan succumbed to the emirs, was deposed and put to death: the caliph ʿAbbas b. Muhammad al-Mustā'in succeeded him in 815 (1412). The governor Shaikh who was in Cairo at the time, was appointed first minister (nakūm al-maldated) and retained power by filling all available offices with his followers. A rebellion of the Egyptian Beduins gave a pretext for deposing the Sultan al-Mustā'in. The emirs demanded that a man of vigour should occupy the throne and in Shāʾin of the same year chose Shaikh as Sultan. While he encountered no difficulties in Egypt, the governors of the Syrian provinces refused to recognise him. He had himself to go to Syria to bring them to reason. He gradually succeeded in taking one after the other prisoner, and after he had executed his chief enemy Nawwūr his throne was secure. The last rebellion in 818 (1415) he put down with comparative ease.

The defeat of the Ottoman Sultan Baysızid in 804 (1402) by Timūr and the civil strife in the Mamlūk kingdom had been utilised by the neighbouring rulers in the buffer-states between Egypt and the Ottoman empire to capture a number of towns and fortresses in southern Asia Minor up to a line Iarenda-Alabustân-Iarenda, which had previously been under Mamlūk rule. Sultan Shaikh regarded it as his duty to recapture these fortresses and again force these former vassals to recognise
his suzerainty in order to give his kingdom the necessary strength to resist its enemy, the Ottoman Sultan, and to protect the northern frontiers against the plundering raids of the Turkomans. The first campaign took place in 820 (1418) because, in spite of repeated demands, the prince Muhammad b. 'Ali of the house of Karamân would not surrender the town of Tarâsî, which he had taken, although he was ready to recognize the Sultan’s suzerainty on the coins and in the khatû. The Sultan set out from Cairo, receiving in Syria envoys from the families of Dhu ‘l-Ghâdîr, Karamân and Ramânjan, who brought the submission of their chiefs. Malaja, Abulustain, Darendz and Tarâsî were successively occupied, then Behesnâ, Kahtâ and Kakkîr west of the Euphrates; the citadels of the two last-named were besieged, but the siege was raised when the commanders recognised the suzerainty of the Sultan. In the following year, a dangerous enemy of the Sultan, Kârû Yüsuf, chief of the Black Sheep, invaded Northern Syria in pursuit of Kârû Yelek, chief of the White Sheep (both called after their banners), plundered the towns in the N. E. of the Mandîk empire but then returned to Baghánd. The Sultan’s successes were rendered useless by his return to Egypt, as the Syrian governors did not succeed in retaking the citadels. The Sultan therefore sent his son Ibrâhîm with a strong army to Asia Minor. The latter reached Kaisarîya, appointed friendly chiefs as governors, while several hostile chiefs were taken prisoners and put to death and others slain in their flight. Ibrâhîm himself returned to Cairo in triumph but died there in 825 (1421) to the great grief of his father (the story that the latter poisoned him out of jealousy of his fame is absurd). Kârû Yusuf was threatening the eastern frontier, but he had to turn his attention to his enemies, a rebellious son and Timûr’s grandson Shâh Rûkh, and at the end of the year he was poisoned. The Sultan himself had suffered for years from an affection of the foot; his illness (probably inflammation) became so serious that he could scarcely leave his bed. He had installed his eighteen months’ old son as his successor and three of his emirs formed a kind of regency. His death took place on the 8th Muḥarram 826 (Jan. 14, 1427). His kingdom was secure, the frontiers consolidated, but at home there was a lack of order. Hedûnis were plundering the country and Alexandria was not infrequently exposed to attacks from the sea by Frankish pirates. Offices were freely sold and the people suffered much from the extortions of the officials. From time to time the Sultan deprived high officials of the profits of their extortions or imposed severe punishments on them. Taxes oppressed the country. The Sultan himself was brave and to the end of his life fulfilled his duties as a ruler in spite of his painful affliction — he had frequently to be carried. Although he led a life of pomp and gave popular entertainments, firework's and feasts with great splendour, he was outwardly a pious and humble Muslim, who in times of famine and pestilence took part in prayers in the penitential garb of the Şâfîs on the bare ground and like a pious Muslim observed a three-days’ fast in times of drought. He was harsh on Jews and Christians, dismissed them from government offices where they had clerical and administrative posts, and punished them in addition. The old strict regulations about dress were again enforced and all kinds of humiliations heaped on the *'unbelievers*.
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**AL-MU’AIYAD FI ‘L-DIN**

separable comrade of Bâyazid. When Sultan Mehmed heard from various sources, especially from a complaint in verse by Halimi Lutf Allah, Kaft of Siwâs, who had been gravely insulted by the entourage of the prince, of alleged abuses at the prince's court, especially the orgies of drug-taking (mukhayyifat: boc, aqîn, mukîn), he sent a commission of inquiry which arrived in Amsa when the prince was with Mu'ayyad on a pleasure trip to Ladik. The result of the inquiry was the issue of an order for the execution of the two chief culprits, one of whom was Mu'ayyad (this hukum al-shurif is given in Feridun, Mevlevî-i Munâzir, Constantinople 1274, ii. 270—271).

From a note by Mu'ayyad in a book bought by him during his stay in Ladik in Rabî' 1382 (June 1477) (the Ziyât of Shems al-Dîn) the date is exactly fixed (the date in Feridun should therefore be altered from 884 to 883; cf. Husâm al-Dîn, Amîrât-i Zîrûrî, Istanbul 1927, ii. 270 note 1). Mu'ayyad, receiving timely warning of the fate threatening him, escaped from Amsa, provided with everything necessary by Bâyazid, and after a short stay in Halab went to Shiraz, where he completed his theological studies under the celebrated Qâmil al-Dîn al-Dawwânî.

When Mu'ayyad returned home, on hearing of Bâyazid's accession, he received an iqâda (teacher's diploma) from Dawwânî. In 887 (1482) he reached Amsa where his father had died three months earlier. After staying six weeks here he went to Constantinople where his extensive learning soon gained him a reputation among the theologians. Bâyazid appointed him muflsîs at the Kalender-khâne-medrese in Constantinople. In 891 (1486) Mu'ayyad married the daughter of the famous legist Mu'âsh al-Dîn Kasîlî (Mawliâna Kasîlî) who was the last Kaftâsker-general of the Turkish empire and after the reforms by which this office was divided became Kaftâsker of Rumelia. Mu'ayyad had a brilliant career: in 899 (1494) he became Kaftâ of Adrianople; in 907 (1501) Kaftâsker of Anatólia; in 910 (1504—1506) Kaftâsker of Rumelia and head of all the ulâmâ. In 917 (1511) the Janissaries who had taken part of prince Selim plundered his house because his sympathies were with Ahmad, the favourite son of Bâyazid. He himself was dismissed by the now senile Sultan under pressure from the Janissaries. Selim I soon after his accession recalled however him to his old office as he saw in him the right man to carry through the important duties of a Kaftâsker. Selim took him with him on his campaign to Persia against Shah Lâmî (1510). But on the way back Mu'ayyad was deprived of his office in Cuân Kapора, as symptoms of a mental breakdown had begun to show themselves (920 = 1514). He died in 922 (1516) in Constantinople and was buried in Eyüp.

Mu'ayyad wrote a number of treatises on law and theology especially on Kürân exegesis. Brockelmann, G. A. L. i. 227 and Brusalf Mehmêd Tâhir, Odâsenü Muflsîliyèri, Istanbul 1333, i. 355, give a list of his works that survive in MS. Under the nom-de-plume of Khâmî, Mu'ayyad also wrote poetry in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. His great service to Turkish literature lies however less in his own original work than in the magnificant liberality with which he encouraged rising young talent, like the poets Nafizî and Zâti, the historians Kemal-Pasha-Zaide and Mahîyî al-Dîn Mehmed, the jurist Abu 'l-Su'îd and others. Mu'ayyad was also famed as a calligraphist. He was the first Ottoman to form a private library of over 7,000 volumes, a huge figure for the time.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works already quoted: Şahkûf, Şafaq-i nu'mânîya, Constantinople 1269, p. 308—311; transl. into German by Rescher, Constantinople 1275, p. 191—194, 86; Schi, Hecht bibel, Constantinople 1275, p. 27—28; Latifi, Tekere, Constantinople 1314, p. 238; Habib, Khatîr-u-Kâfitî, Constantinople 1306, p. 116; M. Şehî, Ḳâmil evâm al-Tawassûkî, Constantinople 1295, p. 165; Thuriya, Suğlî ol-evâmî, iii. 310; Sâmi, Kamus-i Alâm, iv. 30, 70—71; Hammer, G. O. D., i. 305; Gibb, H. O. F., ii. 29—31, (Th. Menzel).

MU'AYYAD AL-DAWLA, ABD MANSûR BEVE B. RUKÚN AL-DAWLÁ, Bâyîd governor born in Diyarbakr 1320 (= February-March 942), died in Diyarbekr in Şhāhân 373 (January—February 984). See the article Fâhir al-Dawla.

AL-MUAKHİR. [See Alâhî, II.]

AL-MU'ÂMÂM, anagram, sometimes a râde, a kind of enigma propounded in verse and rarely in prose; its meaning is made "blind" or obscure with the object of misleading the wits and the eye. It is formed by designating one or more words by various allusions to the letters forming it or them or by allusions relating to the pronunciation: the alphabetic value, the numerical value of the letters, misinterpretation or inversion (kâlî). Very frequently no notice is taken of the vowels or of letters only connected with the spelling. Good taste is the rule.

There are several varieties of muâmâm which will be found enumerated in the works given in the Bibliography.

The invention of the muâmâm is attributed to Khalîl b. Ahmad, the inventor of prosody, while the Persians of course attribute it to 'Ali b. Abî Tâlib. The following is an example of a muâmâm on the name Ahmad: Aowadlal alûlluq tafâhân, wa-râbi 'l-tufâhû thâtâî, Waowadl al-mabîn laû tâlîn, wa-'akhûr 'l-warda li-dhâhû. Its first is the first of [the word] tufâh (apple) = A; and the fourth of [the word] tufâh (apples) is its second = H; and the first of [the word] musk (musk) is its third = M; and the last of [the word] word (oses) is the remainder of it = D'. Here is a Persian example on the word râdk: Nâm-e behtam in mãh âsâf, hâjtâft bâhlâlîsî adâlu: "The name of my idol, this [woman] fair as the moon, is seen in Persian and Arabic." The word râdk divided into two, gives sat or sît which in Arabic means "six" and is or yek which in Persian means "one", whence we have 6 + 1 = 7.

MUĀWIYA, the first Umayyad caliph, son of Abū Sufyān [q. v.] and Hind [q. v.], was born in Mecca in the first decade of the seventh century A. D. Under the training of his father, the most influential personage in, if not the actual leader of the merchant republic of Mecca, he had an opportunity to be initiated into the principles of government as the Meccans understood it. Converted to Islam in the year of the hijra or surrender of Mecca, he made himself useful to the Prophet in the capacity of scribe. Here he gained an insight into the workings of the new regime and learned to know the men with whom he was later to work or struggle: the autocratic ' Omar, the presumptuous ' Ali, a whole crowd of ambitious people, like 'Abd al-Haqq, Zubair and 'Aisha, sometimes redoubtable for their talents and capacity for intrigue, like 'Amr b. al-As [q. v.] and Mughira b. Shu'ba [q. v.]. This dual training early matured the young Mu'awiya who was remarkably gifted, and prepared him from the first for his high destiny.

In the caliphate of Abu Bakr he was sent to the conquest of Syria as second in command to his brother Yazid; in this new field he displayed an astonishing activity and distinguished himself by military successes, like the taking of Damascus and other cities of the Phœnician coast. On the premature death of Yazid, he took his place as governor of Damascus. In 'Omar's reign, with the advance of Arab arms, he added to this office the governorships of the other provinces of Syria. 'Othman, who was related to him, confirmed him in these offices and still further increased his authority. Mu'awiya gained the attachment of those under him and established in Syria during the twenty years of his governorship a model province, the best organized, and with the best disciplined troops of the young empire. Not having been able to prevent the assassination of 'Othman, he was able cleverly to take upon himself the task of avenging him. This was to lead him to the caliphate and bring him into open conflict with 'Ali. Delaying his attack, he let his rival use up his resources and lose his prestige in civil strife and in sterile conflicts with the dissenters ("Uthmaniyas, q. v.) and others, who accused him of complicity in the murder of his predecessor. The indecisive battle of Siffin [q. v.] resulted in the abdication of Adhrā' [q. v.]. In pronouncing that 'Ali should lose the caliphate, the verdict restored to Mu'awiya liberty of movement. He had won over 'Amr b. al-As to his side and at once used this valuable supporter for the conquest of Egypt. Encouraged by his military and diplomatic successes, he allowed his troops to proclaim him caliph and continuously harassed the provinces that still recognized 'Ali. Ibn Muljam's crime removed the last obstacle separating him from the throne. Mu'awiya profited by it to inaugurate his reign in Jerusalem. To him the title of caliph merely meant official recognition of a fait accompli, the result of twenty years of labour and devotion to those under his governorship in Syria. To law-abiding men, he alone seemed capable of putting an end to the anarchy in which the empire had been struggling for more than ten years. In the course of a rapid campaign in the Hijaz in 41 (661), he acquired from Hāsān b. 'Ali a definite renunciation of his family's claims. The submission of the provinces to the east of the Tigris restored the unity of the caliphate. This

year is known as the year of reunion (al-‘iqmā’).

One man continued to sustain in Persia the flag of the ‘Abbāsid, Ziyād b. Abihi [q. v.], Mu‘awiyah won him over by ʿiḥlāl, a procedure by which he recognised him as his half-brother, son of Abū Sufyān. This bold stroke secured him the support of the ablest governor of the caliphate, a worthy rival of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ and Mughira b. Shuṭah, already supporters of the caliph. Against the combination of these four brains all the plots hatched by the anti-ʿUmayyad opposition were to come to nothing. On the death of Mughira, Ziyād added the governorship of Kāfā to his own of Basra and for eight years ruled the whole of the eastern provinces. By his ability and loyalty, Ziyād showed himself most worthy of the confidence placed in him. Freed from anxiety about this half of the empire, Mu‘awiyah devoted his energies to the pacification and development of the prosperity of other parts of his vast empire and to removing the traces of the long struggle from which it had emerged. He organised the Arab navy while his lieutenants actively pursued the work of foreign conquest. He took Cyprus and Rhodes and on two occasions his son Yazid closely blockaded Constantinople. His great work was the creation of the Syrian army and the training of the army of Jund al-ʿArab, which he reconstituted. He formed the great military reserve of the empire for his successors, an inexhaustible nursery of soldiers and leaders. He was able to keep it in training by annual invasions of Byzantine territory: razzias on a large scale rather than campaigns with a definite plan of conquest. By thus keeping the enemy engaged at home, he managed to defend his own frontiers very efficaciously. Taken at a disadvantage during his tense struggle with ʿAli by an invasion of the Mardātes [q. v.], he did not hesitate to purchase the withdrawal of these adventurers from the emperor. If after his elevation to the caliphate he rarely left Damasus — henceforth the official capital — to lead his armies in person, he nevertheless was still the "real organiser of victory". He saw to the comfort and equipment of the troops, doubled their pay and saw that they were paid with a regularity hitherto unknown. His rival ʿAli said that on the call of Mu‘awiyah the Syrian army "would take the field without demanding pay, not two or three times a year only, wherever it pleased its leaders to take them". His intuition everywhere chose the ablest administrators, the best leaders among the Ḥurūf and other tribes. To the names already mentioned we may add those of Dāhbjāk b. Kais, Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUṣāma, Muslim b. ʿUṣāma, Bāzir b. Abī Arjān, Ḥabib b. Maslama [q. v.]. By the help of enormous subsidies and by his magnanimity he was able to keep the members of the Prophet’s family, the ʿAbbāsid and the Ḥāshimīn, quiet: Ibn ʿAbd Allāh and Ibn Ḫaṭṭār, ʿAbd Allāh, the brother, and the two ʿUmmāns, al-Ḥasan, the son of ʿAlī. He used the business experience of the Ǧārūḥīs to organise the financial administration. This fiscal reform gave him the resources required to maintain his armies, carry out desirable public works and pay the subsidies necessary to secure the success of his plans. He continuously interested himself in agriculture. He paid special attention to the development of the province least favoured by nature, the Ḥīdjar. His example, which was copied by his relations and most influential contemporaries, brought this region a century of prosperity under the ʿUmāyids such as it was never to see again.

In the lands of Medina and Mecca and Taʾif, Mu‘awiyah carried out great irrigation schemes, sank wells and built dams.

In Syria he strengthened his authority by a close alliance with the fellow-tribesmen of his Kalbī wife Māṣūn [q. v.] and through them with the other tribes of Kaʿbā and those from the Yemen; these groups formed the bulk of the Arab population of Syria. It was on these foundations that the hegemony exercised by Syria throughout the ʿUmāyid period was built and consolidated. His policy towards Christians was a tolerant one. Lastly, he endeavoured to train his son Yazid to be an able capa-ble of continuing his traditions of government, by checking certain tendencies of his well endowed but impetuous nature with its fondness for pleasure. Seeing his end approaching, he skillfully succeeded in getting Yazid recognised as his successor, first of all in Syria and then in other provinces. These difficult negotiations were the last of his political successes. Mu‘awiyah was now entering on the twentieth year of his caliphate, in 60 (Oct. 679) and probably was in the 80th year of a life which had been marked by constant success. By the year 3 or 4, contrary to the tradition of Dāmīr b. ʿĀṣī al-ʿIṣfahānī, he must have reached manhood, for four years later he was secretary to the Prophet. In the course of the forty years of his public career, no serious check ever interrupted his progress. After the abdication of Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, he had "reigned without a rival, without losing any of the conquests of ʿĪṣām. Neither ʿAbd al-Malik, nor Manṣūr, nor Ḥārūn al-Rašīd earned this praise, unique in the annals of ʿĪsām" (Dhahabi). He died at Damasus in the month of Raḏjab of the year 60 (April 680) and was buried in the cemetery of Bāb al-ṣaghir where his tomb still survives. Before his death he entrusted the regency to Dāhbjāk b. Kais and to Muslim b. ʿUṣāma until Yazid should return from Anatolia. Companion and secretary of the Prophet, brother of Umm Ḥabība [q. v.], "the mother of the believers", these claims have not preserved him from the hatred of the Shīʿīs and the official maledictions pronounced by certain ʿAbbāsid caliphs. More tolerant to his memory than to that of his son Yazid, orthodoxy generally agrees to recognise his right to the respect which is due to the ʿĀshībās. The Syrians long cherished the memory of his glorious reign and even beyond the bounds of Syria he had partisans among the Ḥanbalīs, called ṣaḥīlīt, the enthusiasts for Mu‘awiyah.

II. Mu‘awiyah’s policy. In the historical and anecdotal literature of the Arabs there are few collections which do not devote a paragraph to Mu‘awiyah’s "the mildness and complete self-control" (Wellhausen), qualities which the Arabs include under the term ḥilm. By this supreme virtue they claim to recognise the true statesman. The ʿUmayyid sovereign is said to have owed the great success of his career to it. "Mu‘awiyah’s ḥilm" thus became proverbial. A somewhat mixed virtue, essentially opportunistic in character, it may be combined with astuteness, or the less scrupulous forms of diplomacy. In our hero this quality has been found even in the most difficult trials inflicted on his amour-propre. His smiling imper- turability was able to disarm the proudest of his adversaries, who were then completely won over by his generosity. With the golden chains of pensions
and rich gifts the ruler was able to hold in leash his most intractable enemies. When his friends expressed surprise at the vastness of certain donations, he would reply "a war costs infinitely more". This was his favourite method of dealing with the 'Alids and Hashimids. He has been unjustly accused of having introduced the custom of publicly cursing the name of 'Ali from the pulpit of the mosque. There is no certain evidence of this practice before the time of the Marwanids.

The collateral branches of the Umayyad family supplied him with distinguished assistants. He was careful not to bring the more ambitious of them too much to the front or to leave them too long in one office. He was studious to inculcate into all his relations the feeling that they must stand by one another and that this consisted in the blind execution of his orders. The Umayyads formed his natural supporters. He could not do without them. But the unsettled problem, of the dynastic succession made him distrustful of relatives called upon to share the responsibilities of power. He did not fail to keep a close watch over them. With men like Ibn 'Amir, Sa'd b. al-As, Marwan b. al-Hakam [q.v.], of remarkable gifts, and considerable influence, who did not conceal their aspirations, he came to know in time a way that would effectively discourage them from following the dictates of their ambitions. As to the sons of the Caliph 'Othāmīn, they seemed to him too insignificant to cause him any disquiet. On the other hand, Marwan and Sa'd were appointed to succeed one another at about regular intervals in the government of the Hijāz, the cradle of Islam and of the ruling family. Mu'āwiya was unwilling to give them time to create in such an important centre a position for themselves and connections which might have compromised the future of the dynasty. Ultimately he decided to replace these two relatives by a nephew of his own, now almost grown up, the Sufyān b. Walid b. 'Uqba [q.v.]. In the important governorship of the Ṭirāk, which controlled the eastern provinces, Mu'āwiya showed his preference for Ḥṣafṣī officials, Mughira, Ziyād and the latter's son 'Uqba b.rale. He appreciated the devotion of these men, who came from the shrewd society in Ṭis, suspected by the other Umayyad families, compelled to rely on their sovereign, the author of their fortunes. For a moment, the extraordinary promotion of Ziyād and the confidence the Caliph showed in him suggested that he had him in view as his successor. In this attitude to his relatives, the interests of the dynasty surpassed all other considerations. The heir presumptive was young. Mu'āwiya wanted to save his Umayyads cousins from the temptation to set up as rivals of his successor. The first step was to do Yazid rather a bad turn. If, instead of the inexperienced Walid, Mu'āwiya had retained or restored for another period of office in the governorship of the Hijāz, the energetic Marwan, there is no reason to think that this would not have turned the incunctious Ḥusain from the hopeless explīt of Kābālīn.

In the traditional view Mu'āwiya appears as the perfect type of Arab ruler. When writers, jurists, and historians who compile anthologies have to quote a trait or a saying illustrating kingship, or the conduct of states, they rarely hesitate to credit it to our hero. This unambiguity which reflects so much to his credit has been transformed into censure by orthodoxy. Mu'āwiya is reproached with having transformed the kalifāt, the vice-regacy of the Prophet, into mukāb, into a temporal sovereignty, with having, if we may use the term, secularized the supreme power, really a purely lay one, in the heart of Islam. This criticism is an attempt to throw odium on Mu'āwiya while in reality it calls attention to his great merit. In him the ruler, the "king", i.e., the organizer and administrator, appear very distinctly while they are difficult to find in his predecessors, painfully fighting against the outbursts of Bedouin anarchy. This transformation of the patriarchal power had begun with 'Omār who was the first to realize that it was possible to give the mukāb the semblance of the new state and attempted to realize it. Mu'āwiya endeavoured to hasten its evolution towards more effective centralization, an extension of the powers and personal authority of the sovereign. To secure for the latter the advantages of external pomp, the prestige given by formalities, he gave more ceremony to the hitherto democratic appearance of the caliph at the Friday services. He appeared in the mukāb or pulpit, surrounded by a žīāta or guard — 'Ali had already had one — and remained seated while delivering his address, the κhāifa. Some have thought to see in this attitude a sign of pretension. This is to forget that the caliph as the mukāb was the seat of the ruler, the sovereign's throne, before it became by liturgical significance as the pulpit of the mosque, after the latter had become a building for religious worship. This charge of mukāb was also intended to render suspect the sincerity of the faith of the Suṣyānīd monarch. But austerity characterised his morals and private life. He was a good father and a devoted husband. We find him conscientiously performing his religious duties and dying at length a good Muslim.

The chroniclers unanimously find in the complex character of Mu'āwiya another trait besides hīm: political finesse, what the Arabs call ūdiya. To be credited with this it was necessary to have in addition to diplomatic skill, a remarkable gift of eloquence, force of decision, a resourceful nature and a conscience broad enough not to shrink from the use of trickery. Mu'āwiya was reckoned among the five best Kūraish orators of his time. He was fond of saying "I have won more success with the tongue than Ziyād (b. Abīhi) with the sword". Arab writers prefer to attribute these successes to the Machiavellian nature of the sovereign. He is said never to have shrunk from recourse to violence or the use of poison when he wished to get rid of troublesome adversaries. To support this charge the cases of 'Abd al-Rahman b. Khawād, Husayn b. 'Alī and Aṣhtar b. Mālik [q.v.] are quoted. But each of the examples is capable of a more natural explanation. We would readily put Mu'āwiya in the category of those statesmen to whom useless crime is naturally repugnant, too wise to allow themselves to be tempted by violent solutions but not scrupulous enough to hesitate in such an extremity, if reasons of state seemed to advise it. One of his successors, 'Abd al-Malik, called him "the cunning (mudālam) caliph". The pleasure-loving son of 'Alī, ruined by his easy life, forgotten and retired to Medina, did not deserve to be feared. The two other individuals above mentioned died by accident or were victims of private vengeance.

The poets, the "journalists" of the period, had an undoubted influence on their contemporaries. This influence the sovereign succeeded in controlling
and subjecting to dynastic interests. Himself very susceptible to the charms of verse, he would have liked to see poetry confine itself to developing patriotism, and renouncing satire which was a source of dissension among the tribes. The restorer of \( \ddot{y} \dddot{a}n\ddot{a} \), national unity, felt more than anyone the necessity for this concord to heal the wounds caused by anarchy. Powerless to prevent the incursions of poetasters into the field of politics he endeavoured to win them over to his side by gifts and the use of tact. To win them over was to have "a good press"; and at the same time gain their tribes to the cause of order, for the tribes usually agreed with the ideas spread by their bards. He exploited his son Yazid's relations and friendships with the poets to compromise them in favour of the Umayyads and make them less amenable to the advances of the reactionary parties. He paid for their panegyrics: he took them under his protection whenever their lack of discipline brought them into trouble with the local authorities. He did not hesitate to shut his eyes to some of their poetical outbursts, which seem to compromise the reputation of his own hearth; under the 'Abbasids such audacity would have meant death. He further left it to these indiscriminate auxiliaries to deal with abuses by officials and found in them a useful check on arbitrary exercise of authority by his lieutenants. It was at the same time a satisfaction of their amour-propre, allowed to the vanity of these rhapsodists, who were courted by all parties and intoxicated by the terror which their wit inspired. In return for this toleration, he was able to get less disinterested services from them. He imposed on them the duty of preparing public opinion in favour of the \( \dot{b}a\'\dot{b} \), the recognition, of Yazid as heir-apparent. To accustom the Arabs to this step so repulsive to their democratic instincts, to give the caliphs leisure to calculate its chances of success, there was nothing so useful as the intervention of these heralds with their echoing phrases. It enabled the government to remain discreetly in the background, ready to come out at the opportune moment.

The biased Mas\ud\i himself could not help admiring the crafty ease of Mu\'awiyah's policy, "his great genius, who takes his subjects and the benefits which he heaped upon them; winning their sympathies and seducing their hearts with such skill that they put him before their kinsmen and natural affections". Firmness in administration, skill in managing men according to their rank, cordiality, these are some of the qualities credited by this historian, the friend of 'Ali, to the successful rival of F\atima's husband.

Let us now deal with the charges brought against him by orthodoxy. With the object of making them more readily accepted, the indictment is carefully put in the mouth of the austere Hasan al-Bayri. Mu\'awiyah committed four crimes — one of them alone would suffice to cover him with dishonour: he abandoned the nation to men of no repute, deprived it without consulting it (by the \( \dot{b}a\'\dot{b} \) of Yazid) of the control of its destinies and that in the life-time (i.e. to the detriment) of numerous Companions and virtuous individuals. He chose his successor an incorrigible drunkard, robed in silk and playing the harp. He adopted Ziyad. Lastly he condemned Hudhr b. 'Adi [q.v.] to death". The imperial historian will have little difficulty in clearing the sovereign from these charges, which reveal his political flair, his instinct for rulership which raised him high above the prejudices of his contemporaries. The measures for which he is blamed secured the caliphate twenty years of peace and prosperity, the longest period it ever knew.

To sum up, Mu\'awiyah appears in the series of Muslim rulers as one of the most attractive individuals and one of all round ability. In him the Arabs see the very incarnation of sovereignty. In the opinion of Mas\ud\i his successors at best could only try to copy him without being able to equal him. In spite of their little liking for the able Sufy\nnid, the Marwanids frequently appealed to his traditions and the methods of government inaugurated by him. He was, beyond doubt, the least oriental and the most modern of the rulers of Islam. He did not disdain public opinion. One must be grateful to him for not having believed in the power of force alone in the management of men, for not having sought to reestablish, as the 'Abbasids were to do, the old Asiatic autocracies, for having preferred that his subjects should become voluntarily attached to him by winning their sympathies, for proclaiming that "the world is more surely led by the tongue than by the sword". This conviction led him to adopt several institutions of Beduin democracy — such as the \( \ddot{w}a\dot{f} \), deputations from the provinces and the principal tribes — to consult the views of such assemblies on as many occasions as possible, to associate them openly with public business by recognising their right of remonstrance. The astuteness of the sovereign knew how to direct these manifestations of the old individualism of the nomads and to bring them to cooperate with his designs. To quote the comparison of the Byzantine historians, he appeared as a \( \ddot{p}r\ddot{a}t\ddot{e}n\ddot{u}\ddot{b}u\ddot{v}e\ddot{n} \), in the midst of his \( \ddot{c}\ddot{u}b\ddot{a}b\ddot{a} \); in the deliberations of his Syrian parliament, he posed as \( p\ddot{r}i\ddot{u}m\, p\ddot{i}t\ddot{e}r\ddot{p}r\ddot{a}e \). He was gradually able to advance the political education of his subjects and to control the signs of lack of discipline. He was never perturbed by their criticisms nor by the satires of the poets. "I do not trouble" he said "about words so long as they do not lead to deeds". These liberal principles became restricted under the Marwanids and disappeared with the coming of power of the absolute monarchy of the 'Abbasids.

As is frequently the case with men who have grown old in politics, a long period of power — he exercised it without interruption for 40 years — had made him a skeptic. This benevolent scepticism was revealed in a knowing smile when, with eyes half closed, he used to listen without missing a word to the petitions and recriminations of his visitors and pretended to be taken in by their customary excesses. From his youth, passed in the cosmopolitan city of Mecca, then in Medina in the very mixed society of the Companions, he had been in too close contact with his contemporaries to be under any illusions about their disinterestedness. He had not to invent, but no one managed better than he, that in-trument of government, the i\ddot{t}\ddot{h}\ddot{is} \ddot{a}l-\ddot{g}ul\ddot{h}, the rallying of the troops, an ingenious euphemism of the Kur\\u0131an, meaning the art of purchasing hesitating adherents. Other caliphs surpassed him in courage, in outward austerity, \( \ddot{s}u\ddot{d} \), in love of knowledge, and other qualities that dazzle the eyes of the multitude. No one possessed to such a degree as Mu\'awiyah the gifts of the founder of an empire: vision,
energy and promptitude in action, breadth of view, logical thinking, absence of antiquated prejudices, skill in adapting the prestige and ceremonial of his position to Arab taste, ability to use men and to deal tactfully with their prejudices so as not to offend them directly. This rare combination of qualities enabled him to extract order out of the chaos of Beduin anarchy. If we endeavour to appreciate fairly Mu'awiya's work with its inevitable deficiencies, one must take into account the intractable material on which he had to work and the resistance opposed by the inveterate individualism of the nomads. He succeeded not only in disciplining them but also in transforming them into conquerors, able to rule over peoples of superior culture, heirs to the oldest civilisations.

For achieving this result, the son of Muhammad's old opponent has deserved well of Islam. In the list of those responsible for this great revolution his name should come after that of the Prophet beside the name of the caliph 'Omar. Orthodox tradition likes to exalt the latter and present him as the ideal of Islam. Of European writers, Sprenger and von Kremer have popularised this view. In it we may recognise the reply of the schools of the Hijaz to the Irak legend woven round the memory of 'Ali. To their work we owe the fantastic proportions assumed by the personality of 'Omar; it absorbs not only Abû Bakr, but even throws its shadow upon the Prophet. 'Omar is brought into the origin of all religious and administrative institutions, especially of all those that cannot decently be credited to the author of the Qur'an. This exaggerated admiration of the Hijaz was to provoke the protestations of the Abbasids. The counterblast of Shi'a tradition was to place 'Ali alongside of 'Omar to direct him and if necessary to correct him. The indisputable merits of the second caliph lie elsewhere. In the midst of the terrible confusion that resulted from the conquests he was able to maintain the unity and cohesion of the empire, immensely enlarged, to bring the Arab world under successive control. Closely watched, harassed by the selfish claims of his Medinese senate and its disturbing element formed by the redoubtable group of the "ten nabazghara" or "the chosen" and the oldest friends of the Master, he succeeded in neutralising their restless activities, their dire passion for intriguing and in exploiting their greed and mutual jealousies. In the provinces the generals and governors showed an obedience scarcely less intermittent. 'Omar had frequently to resign himself to approving by sanatio in radice in order not to lose touch with such undisciplined auxiliaries and to remind all of the existence of the vicariate of the Prophet. The day on which he thought of a more effective centralisation, of a less ideal systematisation, assassination brutally delivered him from his error. The same fate was to overtake 'Othman, when under pressure from the Umayyads, he took up his predecessor's programme where it had been interrupted. With 'Ali the caliphate relapsed into chaos and lost a quarter of a century of progress on the way to reorganisation. One province alone formed an exception, Syria, which had been governed since its creation by the Umayyads.

But for the intervention of Mu'awiya and his able lieutenants, the 'Amr, Ziyâd and Marwan, the Muslim empire would have been transformed — like the Irak and Khurâsân — into an arena to which the Arabs came to settle their petty tribal quarrels. Once on the throne, the Sufyânids worked to extend gradually to the rest of the caliphate the methods of government which had secured the prosperity of Syria. Encouraged by the results obtained in this country, he set himself to discipline the other Beduins who, according to the idea ascribed to 'Omar, formed the "substance of Islam". From this rude indigestaque motes, this rebellious mass, gradually broken in by the influence of Syria, fashioned by teachers trained in his school, the first Syrian caliph recruited soldiers, then formed them the cadres of a regular army. Wonderful troops always ready to play their double part, the ghûdî abroad, and at home the maintenance, against any threat from within, of the jumâ'a, the unity of the empire. Mu'awiya succeeded in impressing on these descendants of caravan-leaders of Arabia, nomads, all obstinate landmen, the importance of the mastery of the seas. Arab thalassocracy dates from this period. Forced to use primitive institutions, the sâwa, tradition, sanctioned by the Prophet and the Medina caliphs, he endeavoured to turn them to the needs of a great empire. He managed at least to suppress the anarchical working of the shûrâ by regulating the dynastic succession. He organised the finances; he began by revising and reducing the enormous pensions granted by preceding governments without regard to services rendered to the state. Down to his time the central treasury of the caliphate had been supplied by intermittent and always unwilling contributions extorted from the provinces. Mu'awiya endeavoured to settle the amount to be paid by each province and to regularise its collection. Under him the treasury ceased to be a relief fund which the conquerors claimed to use as they pleased. His predecessors had had to empty it periodically to secure assistance or neutrality important for the success of their policy. Hitherto mâl al-muslîmîn, the collective property of the Muslims", the treasury now became mâl 'Allâh, the treasury of the state, intended to cover general expenses, to secure the representation and the defence of the empire. These reforms made Mu'awiya the first sovereign, mali, of Islam, the first ruler to enjoy a definite authority, independent, unlike his predecessors, of the anarchic good-will of his subjects, and no longer at the mercy of an oligarchy interested in the maintenance of old abuses. The Medinese vicariate which developed from the triumvirate, could not long survive this coup d'etat, this drastic solution of the problem of the succession to the Prophet. Before Mu'awiya, the caliphate had only had a nominal existence. For this figure, the son of Abû Sufyân substituted a reality; he created the Arab state: a creation confirmed by 'Omar without having been brought to realisation.

Bibliography: We refer the reader to our Eludes sur le rôle du califat omeyyade Ma'âsia I, following our Califat de Yazid I (reprint from M.F.O.P., i.—iii.). The references are there given. One may also with advantage consult G. Levi della Vida, Il califato di 'Ali secondo il Kitâb anâb al-alâfî di al-Baladhûrî, in R.S.O., vi. 427—507; our Zaid ibn Abîthi, vice-roi de l'Iraq, lieutenant de Ma'âsia I (extract from the same periodical, iv.).

(H. LAMMENS)

MU'AWIYA B. 'UBAID ALLAH. [See Abû 'Ubaid Allah.]
MUBALLIGH. [See Masjid, I, D, e and H, 4.]

MUBARAK GHAZI, an Indian saint. In all parts of the Sura, the Muhammadan woodcutters invoke certain mythical beings to protect them from tigers and crocodiles. In the 24 Parganas it is Mubarak Ghazi who, in the Eastern parts of the Delta goes by the name of Zindah Ghazi, the living warrior. Mubarak Ghazi is said to have been a faqir (mendicant) who reclaimed the jungle tracts along the left bank of the river Hoogly. Every village has an altar dedicated to him and no one enters the forest nor do any of the boat's crew, who might sail through the districts, pass without first making offerings at one of these shrines. The faqirs in these dangerous forests, who claim to be lineally descended from the Ghazi, indicate with pieces of wood called sang the precise limits within which the forest has to be felled. Mubarak Ghazi, so the legend goes, came to Bengal when Radja Matak ruled over the Sundarbun. The saint happened to have a dispute with the chief, who thought himself to be in the right, upon which the latter agreed to give his only daughter Shushtia in marriage to the former, should his own opinion be proved wrong. This the Ghazi succeeded in doing and won his bride in consequence. Since no man saw him die, he is believed to reside in the depths of the forest, to ride about on tigers, and to keep them so obedient to his will that they dare not touch a human being without his express desire. Before entering a jungle or sailing through the narrow channels whose shady banks are infested by tigers, boatmen and woodcutters, both Hindus and Muhammadans, raise little mounds of earth and on them make offerings of rice, plantains, and sweet-meats to Mubarak Ghazi, after which they fearlessly cut the brushwood and linger in the most dangerous spots.

This strange myth, there cannot be any doubt, is borrowed from Hindus to suit the taste of the superstitious boatmen and woodcutters.


MUBARAK SHAH, Muizz-al-Din, the second king of the Sayyid dynasty of Dihli, was the son of Khair Khan, the first king, and succeeded his father on May 22, 1421. The limits of his kingdom were then restricted to a few districts of Hindustan proper and Multan, and he was obliged to desist from an attempt to establish his authority in the Pandjab by the necessity for relieving Qalawul, menaced by Haghaght of Malwa, who raised the siege and met him, but after an indecisive action came to terms and retired to Malwa From 1425 to 1427 he was engaged in attempting to restore order in Mewat, and received the formal submission of the rajas of Qalawul and Candwar (Fizūlīdī), but Muhammad Khan Awhad of Bayana, whom he had taken prisoner, escaped and took refuge in Mewat, and the work there was to do again. Muhammad Awhad, on being had pressed in Bayana, fled to Ibrahim Shāh of Dāvānpūr, and as the latter marched against Kālpī, Mubarak marched to meet him. Ibrahim, who had been plundering Mubarak's dominions, avoided a conflict for some time, but on April 2, 1428, the armies met near Candwar and Ibrahim, though not decisively defeated, retired.
the next day to Djawnpür. Mubarrak then collected revenue in the neighbourhood of Gwahlor and retired by way of Bayāna, which was evacuated by Muhammad Aḥwāli, who had returned thither. For the rest of the year his officers were engaged in restoring order in the Pāndjāb, ravaged by Djasrat the Khokar, and he in a similar task in Mewāt, and in collecting revenue by force. In 1430 Fīlād Turkhaṭa successfully defied the royal authority in Bhāṭinda, and in 1431 a rebellion broke out in Mūltān and had no sooner been suppressed than Djasrat renewed his activity in the Pāndjāb. The chronicle of the rest of the reign is a record of rebellions in the Pāndjāb, Mūltān, Sāmāna, Mewāt, Bayāna, Gwahlor, Tūjāra and Itāwā, and a rebel captured Lāhor and attacked Dālpūr. Lāhor was eventually recovered, but the whole country remained in a disturbed condition.

War broke out between Ibruḥim of Djawnpūr and Hāhang of Mālwa in connection with Kāpī, the successor of which belonged neither to and was against the Mīrzā as well as the Amārān, and the emperor turned aside to inspect Mubārakhād which he was building, and then, on February 19, 1431, he was assassinated at the instance of Sarwar al-Mulk, whom he had dismissed from the minister in the preceding year.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kāsim Firhiṯa, Guliymu'l-Ibrāhu'in, Bombay 1832; Muntakhab al-Tawārīḵh and translation by L. Col. G. S. A. Racking; Tabākāt-i Akhāri and translation by B. De (both in the Bibl. Ind. Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal); Yāhāb b. Aḥmad, Turāk-i Mubārak Shāhī, rare in MS, but reproduced by the authorities cited above.

(T. W. Hage)

MUBĀRIR AL-DIN. [Muhammad b. Mu-Ẓaffar.]

AL-MUBARRAK, ABBU 'L-'ABBEKS MUHAMMAD B. YAZĪD AL-'THUMRĀI AL-'AZDĪ, an Arab philologist, was born in 1352 at Aḥār (March 25, 826) in Baṣra, was taught by Abū ʿOmar al-Dārimī, Abū ʿOṯmān al-Māzīnī and Abū Ḥātim al-Sījdīštanī, the pupil of Asmaʾ. In his early works, the Kitāb Maṣūl al-Qalā'a, he criticised the Kitāb of Sibawaih, but only a small number of his criticisms were well founded and of these only a minority were original (al-Suyūṭī, al-Mushir, i, 188; 211, 232). Later he went to Baghdād where he became a very busy teacher, among his pupils were Nifwawī, Ibn Durustawawī and Ibn Kaṣīṣ. His rival for favour at court was the K̄ifān Ṭhalab, to whom he was far superior in ability and style; the rivalry between these two scholars seems to have been the origin of the later opposition between the schools of K̄ifā and Baghdād. His epithet al-Mubarrak seems to refer to his skill in disputation, but there are a number of anecdotes explaining it in very different ways: Mushir, ii, 207, 11 sqq.; Ṭhāqīla, i, 116-117; Ṭhāqīla, v, 137, 139; 147). He died in Baghdād in Shawwāl or Dhu l-Kaʿda 285 (Oct. 9g8).

His chief work al-K̄āmil 'ala 'l-Ẓabh is a typical example of the work of the old philologists as developed from their teaching. Without being tied down to any fixed arrangement or even aiming at cohesion in the separate chapters, it combines traditions of the Prophet, sayings of pious men, proverbs, many poems mostly of the older period, and also historical matter like the important chapter on the Khāridjīs (characteristic is the passage on p. 409 in Wright's edition: *In this chapter we shall mention something of everything in order to prevent the reader from being wearied and mix a little jest with the earnest so that heart and soul may be recuperated*; similarly p. 428; exceptions like the chapters on simile p. 447 or on laments for the dead and consolation p. 713 are rare). The important feature is the full grammatical and lexicographical commentary which he gives to every quotation. The work was given its final form with numerous additions and glosses by Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Akhhāfī (d. 315 = 927). Al-Ṭabāyūṣī wrote a commentary on it which has not survived (Mushir, i, 182, 82; 223, 3); there is an anonymous commentary in the possession of Ismāʿīl Efendi in Stambul. It was first printed in Stambul in 1286; editions: The K̄āmil of Al-Mubarrak edited for the German Oriental Society by W. Wright, part i–12, Leipzig 1856–1892; reprinted Cairo 1308, 1323, 1324 (with extracts from Ṭhāqīla on the margins), 1339; with two modern commentaries: the K̄āmil by Abū ʿl-S̄āḥī al-Iṣ̄āfī (professor at al-Azhar), 2 vols. and Raghībat al-ʿArīm min Kitāb al-K̄āmil by Saiyid Ibn ʿAlī al-Mārsāfī (professor at al-Azhar), 8 vols. Cairo 345–346 (1927–1928); Das Khāridjiennerkapitel aus dem K., trans. into German by O. Rescher, Stuttgart 1922. His second collection of material, the Kitāb al-Muṣṭaqqāf, met with less success, because it is said, it had been transmitted by the heretic Ibn al-Rāwandi; it is preserved with a commentary by Saʿīd b. Saʿīd al-Fārīki (d. 301 = 1000; see Yākūt, Irshād, iv, 240) in the Escurial manuscript p, i 111 and in Stambul, Kopurul, N. 1507–1508 (cf. Rescher, in Z. D. M. G., lxxiv, 197; photograph in Cairo; Fihrist, ii, 123). Of his numerous other works given by his biographers we only have the Kitāb al-Taʾāṣī, Escurial, p. 534; the Kitāb Naṣīr al-Aḏḏān wa al-K̄āmil, in Stambul Nīf Efendi, 2003 (M. F. O. B., v, 491) = Welt der D., 3178 (M. F. O. B., vii, 108), Escurial, Ĉarsi 1700, fol. 59–68 (s. Levi Iliesa Vida, Les livres des chevaux, Leyden 1928, p. xiii), his answer to a letter from Aḥmad b. Wāḥīk on the question whether poetry is superior to eloquence, in Munich 791 and in a fragment in Berlin, Ahlw. 777 as well as the Kitāb al-Muṣṭarḥār wa ʿl-Muṣṭanīs as transmitted by Abū ʿAlī al-Fāṣī, in Damascus, Zayāt, p. 36, N. 135, 2. His other works are only known from quotations, e.g. his Kitāb al-Iḥtiyār, which he himself quotes. Kâmil, p. 760, 4, the Kitāb Gharb al-Hadīth, which Ibn al-ʿArīf mentions among his sources in the preface to the Nīf; the Kitāb maʿtaṣaṣīn Lajmūn wa Bīlaftul Maʿālim (Sūyūṭī, Sharḥ al-Mushir, Cairo 1322, p. 195–206); the Kitāb al-Kawāla, a collection of poems by contemporary poets beginning with Abū Nūrīs, Aḥmadī, vii, 15, 20, 25, 15, 25, 15, 25, 15, 25, 15; al-Djūjjīnī, Kitāb al-K̄āmil, 29; Ibn al-ʿArīf, al-Maṣḥāl al-ʿarīr, 185, 186; the Kitāb al-ʿIṯīnān on the causes of the poetical strife between Djarīr and Farazdāk: Ḍab al-ʿĀdār al-Baghdādī, K̄āmil al-ʿAbīb, i, 305–32; Kitāb al-Sharq (i.e. Sharḥ Kaṣīṣ al-ʿArīb), i, 193 infra.

AL-MUBARRAZ, a fortress on the Persian Gulf, about a mile north of al-Hufuf, surrounded by open villages and date palm-groves. The population of the fortress and of the hamlets that belong to it is given, sometimes at 10,000, sometimes at 30,000.


AL-MUBDI. [See Allah.]

AL-MUḌĀDI, name of sūra xxxii, which is also called al-nādiḍ or al-djin." (M. Benger)

MUḌĀR. [See Kāfir.]

MUḌĀR, the twelfth metre in Arabic proseody, which is very rarely used. Theoretically each of its hemistichs consists of three feet (māfadān fāʿilān māfadān); in practice the third foot is lacking. It has one ʿarād and one ʿafār only: māfadān fāʿilān: māfadān fāʿilān. Māfadān however must become māfā'en. The first māfadān may lose its m, in that case the form is fāʿilān (= māfā'en) and fāʿilān. (M. Benger)

AL-MUḌĀWĀNA. [See Sāḥīn.]

AL-MUḌĀTĀTHIR, title of sūra lxxiv.

AL-MUḌHILL. [See Allah.]

MUḌĪR, title of the governors of the Egyptian provinces, called muḍīriya. The use of the word muḍīr in this meaning is no doubt of Turkish origin. The office was created by Muhammad 'Ali, who, shortly after 1813, recognized the administrative division of Egypt, instituting seven muḍīriyas; this number has been changed several times. The present day there are 14 muḍīriyas. The chief task of the muḍīr is the controlling of the agricultural administration and of the irrigation, as executed by his subordinates, viz. the muḍīr, who administers a mākā: and the muṣīr who controls the kisā which is again a subdivision of the muḍīr. Under Sa'd Pasha the office of muḍīr was temporarily abolished with a view to preventing oppression. Until that time they had been without exception Turks, but under Isma'il Pasha, when the function was instituted again, this high administrative position was opened also to native Egyptians.


AL-MUḌJĀDILA, title of sūra liii.

AL-MUḌJĀHID. [See Rasūlus.]

MUḌJĀSIMA. [See Tashkīl.]

MUḌJAWWAZA. [See Turfan, iv, 890 sq.]

AL-MUḌJIB. [See Allah.]

MUḌĪR AL-DIN. [See al-ʿOlām.]

MUḌĪZA (A.), part. act. iv. of ʿaḍ-d-. Ilt. "the overhelming", has become the technical term for miracle. It does not occur in the Kurān, which contains miracles in connection with Muḥammad, whereas it emphasizes his ʿsigns", ʿaḍ-d-. i.e. verses of the Kurān: cf. the art. KURĀN. Even in later literature Muḥammad's chief miracle is the Kurān (cf. Abū Nuʿaim, Dālī al-Nuḥwān, p. 74). Muḍīza and ʿaḍ-d-. have become synonyms; they denote the miracles performed by Allāh in order to prove the sincerity of His apostles. The term kārūnā (q.v.) is used in connection with the saints; it differs from muḍīza in so far as it denotes nothing but a personal distinction granted by Allāh to a saint.

Miracles of Apostles and Prophets, especially those of Muḥammad, occur in the sūra and in Ḥadīṣ. Yet in this literature the term muḍīza is still lacking, as it is in the oldest forms of the creed. The ʿFīḥ Akbar, ii., art. 16, mentions the ʿaḍ-d-. of the prophets and the kārūnā of the saints. Muḍīza occurs in the creed of Abū Ḥāfiz ʿUmar al-Nasafi (ed. Cureton, p. 4; ed. Taftāzānī, p. 165): "And He has fortified them (the apostles) by miracles contradicting the usual course of things".

Taftāzānī explains it in this way: A thing deviating from the usual course of things, appearing at the hands of him who pretends to be a prophet, as a challenge to those who deny this, of such a nature that it makes it impossible for them to produce the like of it. It is Allāh's testimony to the sincerity of His apostles.

A very complete and systematic description occurs in al-Īḍā's Muṣabīḥ. He gives the following definition of muḍīza: "It means to prove the sincerity of him who pretends to be an apostle of Allāh. Further he enumerates the following conditions: 1. It must be an act of Allāh; 2. it must be contrary to the usual course of things; 3. contradiction to it must be impossible; 4. it must happen at the hands of him who pretends to be an apostle, so that it appears as a confirmation of his sincerity; 5. it must be in conformity with the announcement of it; 6. the miracle itself must not be a disavowal of his claim (daʾwāʾ); 7. it must follow on his daʾwā.

Further, according to al-Īḍā, the miracle happens in this way that Allāh produces it at the hands of him whose sincerity He wishes to show, in order to realise His will, viz. the salvation of men through the preaching of His apostle. Finally, as to its effect, it produces, in accordance with Allāh's custom, in those who witness it, the conviction of the apostle's being sincere.


MUḌĪTAHD. [See Ḥattāhd.]

MUḌĪTATHTH, the fourteenth metre in Arabic proseody, has theoretically three feet, consisting of two successive faʿilān in every hemistich; in practice there are two feet only.

It has one ʿarād, and one ʿafār only: faʿilān faʿilān. The foot faʿilān of the ʿafār and also, though seldom, that of the ʿarād, may become faʿilān, on condition that faʿilān retains its n; it loses its n when faʿilān loses its s.

Faʿilān loses its s, when the preceding faʿilān retains its n; it also loses its n, when faʿilān following it, does not become faʿilān.

(M. H. Benger)
Al-Mu'afidāl, like his contemporary Ḥammād ʿUqī, bore the epithet and title of honour of ʿAbd al-Muṣūr, and was regarded as an apostate poet. As a partisan of the house of ‘Abbās he took part in the rising against the ‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Maḥdī led by Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh ʿUqī, son of al-Nafs al-Sakūṭī. The rising was put down and Ibrāhīm killed; al-Mu'afidāl was taken prisoner but pardoned by the caliph and appointed tutor to his son, the future caliph al-Mahdī, and in his train he visited Ḥurrāsān. He then worked in Kūfah as a philologist and teacher; among his pupils was his stepson al-ʿArābī. The date of his death is variously given; the Fikrist does not give it at all while others give 164, 165 or 170.
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and was in turn commented on by the
Baghdâdî Na'îd al-Shârîf al-Murâdî, the work on
law and tradition given second below was also the
basis upon which his pupil Shââkh Tûsî [q. v.]
ruled as a commentary his Taqâlîd al-Adâkîm,
one of the "4 (5) books" of the Twelvers. Mufid
wrote pamphlets against Dju'dhâ's. Dja'râb b. Harb,
Ibn Kûllûb, Karâbîsî, the Ma'âtîslûn, Zaidîs,
the followers of al-Hâllâj, Ha'bâlî, Dju'dhî and the
Ummâniyâ (for other collected titles see al-Khâyâtìs,
A'îd al-Adâkîm, p. 156). The number of his writings
runs to nearly 200. In addition to those preserved
in European libraries, there are many other manuscipt
in Shi'a libraries, e. g. in Na'daf. Among
them are the usual handbooks of Hadis, on the
juhûd e. g. on the ma'mûrâ as well as the jâfûf e. g. on
the juhûd and the law of inheritance; also treatises
on fundamental philosophical conceptions such as
the predicate, the state of being created etc.; but it
is with specifically Shi'a problems that he mainly
deals. Mufid, as the titles of several of his works
and his influence on later writers show, championed
the enhancement of the dogma of Prophets, dealt
with the question, a painful one for the Shi'a,
whether Abu Tâlib was a believer, with the imâmâte
of 'Ali and the proof that the Imams are higher
than the angels. He naturally dealt also with the
usual special tenets of the Twelvers, like the
concealment of the Imam and the prohibition of meat
buttered by the "People of the Book". He also
wrote guides for pilgrims to the peculiarly Shi'a
holy places.
Mufid died in Ramadan 28, 413 (Nov. 26, 1022).
The na'îd al-Shârîf al-Murâdî conducted the funeral
service; he was buried beside Ibn Bâbîyû [q. v.]
at the feet of the ninth imâm Muhammad al-Djâwâd
in al-Kâshâ. Bibliography: His own works: al-Mukhtâr,
Teheran 1308; al-Mukhtâr fi 'l-Fihûf (fih.), ed.
the life by al-Bâhâni is printed at the beginning,
Làfâs al-Bahrân; Taqâlîd al-Imâmîyâ,
with notes by Hîbat al-Din in the Mura'dî,
and ii., Baghdad 1344 sq.: Tûsî, Fihrist,
No. 86; al-Allâmâ al-Hîlî al-Mu'tahârih,
Kisâh al-Askâl fi 'l-Murâdî al-Rûqûl,
Teheran 1312, p. 255 sq.; Astarâbâdi,
Mura'dî al-Mukhtâr fi Taqâlîd al-Askâl al-Rûqûl,
Teheran 1304, p. 360; Kusâsâri, Kastâr al-Dirân,
Teheran 1304—1306, p. 663—670; Ûdây al-Husây al-Kântâri,
Kisâh al-Hâfîz mûlâ l-Astâr,
Culcutta 1330, No. 167, 240—241, 245—
2459, 2460, 2474—2477 and pass. C. Brockel-
mann, G. A. L., i., 188; K. Strothmann,
Dzi Zuveler-Sûlva, Leipzig 1926, index; also
L. Massignon, al-Hallâl, Paris 1922, index; W.
Heffingen, Das islamische Freiheitsrecht, Hanover
1925, index. (R. Strothmann)
MUFTI. [See FATWA.]
MUGHAL. The name given to the dynasty
of Emperors of Hindustân founded by Bâbur in 932 (1526), in virtue of the claim made
by Timûr, the ancestor of the dynasty, to relationship
with the family of the Mongol (Mughal) Çingiz Khan (q. v.). For the detailed history of the dynasty see the articles BÀBAR, HUMÀYUN, AKBAR, UMÀNÎNâ, SHÀH-JÀHÀN, AWARÀNÎB, and their
successors.
I. THE MUGHAL EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF AWARÀNÀB
a. Military Organization
b. Economics and Administration
II. THE DECLINE OF THE MUGHAL EMPIRE
III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA
A. Military Organization of the Mughal Empire.
The army which Bâbur led into India, and with which he defeated at Panipat the army of Ibrahim Lodû, 100,000 strong, consisted of about
10,000 combatants, mainly cavalry, but comprising a corps of artillery and a small proportion of
infantry, chiefly matchlockmen. Bâbur's son and
successor, Humàyûn, though hampered by the
virtual independence of his brother Kâmûnî,
governor of Kûbul, who annexed the Pandjâb,
and thus cut him off from the best recruiting
grounds of the Muslim army in Northern India.
Afghanistan, and Transjûf, was nevertheless
able to lead to the field at the battle of the
Ganges, near Kanadâd, where he was defeated by
Shir Jâh, an army of 100,000 men. On his return
to India in 1555 he left Kûbul with an army of
no more than 15,000 men, and it was his son
and successor, Akbar, who was the creator of the
empire of which he was, in fact, the founder.
The empire was a military despotism. The
Governer of a province was entitled zîrân-àdîrî,
or "commander-in-chief", the governor of a pargana,
or sub-district, faqûdâdîr, or "commandant", and
practically all courtiers and officials, even those
holding civil and judicial posts, were graded as
commanders of horse. Thus we find Shââkh Abu
'l-Fadl, Akbar's secretary, graded as a commander
of 2,500; Rûdja's Bar, court wit and Hindi
poet laureate, as a commander of 1,000; Sâliyûd
Muhammad, Mir 'Adî, a judge, as a commander
of 900; and Shââkh Fâidî, the poet, as a commander
of 400 horse. A command of horse was known
as mânzûh ("rank") or "dignity"), and its holder
as mânzûdîr ("officer."). Each of these nominally
commanding from 500 to 2,500 horse was classed
as an amûr ("noble"), and each of these nominally
commanding more as amûr-i-kâtîr ("great noble")
These commands were nominal, conferred merely
for the purpose of regulating the rank of the official
holding them, and were styled mânzûbâbâtî ("personal rank"). Each of those actually exercising military authority had, in addition to
his personal rank, sawâr (horseman) rank. Thus,
a commander of 5,000 might be described as
"commander of 5,000, with 4,000 horsemen", that
is to say, one ranking as a commander of 5,000,
but supposed to maintain only 4,000 horsemen.
In Akbar's reign, apart from the rank held by
the royal princes, commands ranged from 10 to
5,000 horsemen, but at the end of the reign
two or three nobles were promoted to commands
of 6,000 and 7,000. In these two high commands
there was no distinction of grade, but each of the
other commands was divided into three classes, viz.:
1. those whose sawâr rank was equal to their
personal rank, 2. those whose sawâr rank was
half or more, of their personal rank, and 3. those
whose sawâr rank was less than half of their
personal rank. Thus, a commander of 5,000 with
5,000 horsemen would be in the first class of his
rank, a commander of 5,000 with 3,000 horsemen in the second, and a commander of 5,000 with 2,000 horsemen in the third. A purely civil official often had no sayyid rank, but the distinction between military and civil officials was less clearly marked than it is to-day, and all officials were, in theory, soldiers. The secretary, Abu 'l-Fadl, served, at least on one occasion, in the field, and Akbar once entrusted military commands in the field to his court wit and to a leading physician, with disastrous results.

The lists of "commanders of horse" given in such works as the Fihrist Akbari, the Tahābalat-i Akhbari, and the Fath-i Akbari are not "army lists", but gradated lists of the whole establishment of public servants, civil as well as military. Even where, as in the Fath-i Akbari, sayyid rank is given as well as personal rank, the lists are no guide to the effective strength of the imperial army, for commanders with sayyid rank did not maintain, and were not even expected to maintain, the number of horse indicated by that rank. Thus, Shāh Jahan issued an edict to the effect that commanders were required to maintain more than one-third, and, in some cases, as much as one-quarter of the number of horse indicated by their sayyid rank, and in the Balkh campaign they were not required to muster more than one-fifth of their nominal quota.

The yearly salaries of "commanders of horse" ranged from Rs 350,000 a year for a commander of 7,000 down to Rs 4,000 a year for a commander of 100, but in the commands in which there were three classes the salary varied with the class. Thus, in the 5,000 command an officer of the first class received Rs 250,000; an officer of the second Rs 242,500; and an officer of the third Rs 235,000. These salaries were attached to the personal rank, and were intended to enable the official to maintain his position at court or in the provinces, his household, his transport, and such horsemen as he might require for his personal service. For the payment of troops actually maintained separate allowances were made.

The horsemen were styled ta'biran ("followers" or "troops"), and the majority of them provided and maintained their own horses and arms, and, in the field, their own transport. They were divided into three classes: three-horsed and two-horsed men, each of whom received nearly Rs 25 a month, and one-horsed men, each of whom received rather more than Rs 16½ a month. At a later date higher rates of pay than these were allowed in the Dakhan. Horsemen who could not supply their own horses were styled barāg, and were the servants or followers of those who supplied them. The proportion of these classes in every ten troopers was usually three three-horsed, and one two-horsed, and three onehorsed troopers, or ten men and twenty horses.

The payment of the contingents maintained by the manṣabārs was at first provided for by the grant of ḍājūrs, or fevs, so that the army was maintained on a feudal system, which, however, differed from the feudal system of Europe in that the fevs were not hereditary, and the ḍājūrs, or fev-holders, had no proprietary rights in them. A fev-holder might be transferred from one fev to another, or a portion of his fev, or even the whole of it, might be resumed. In 1574 an edict was promulgated by Akbar resuming all fevs and converting them into crown lands, the payment of the troops being provided for by orders on the treasury for payments in cash. This edict caused much discontent, for the ḍājūrs system was, for many reasons, far more popular than the naqd, or cash-payment, system. Under the naqd system a muster-parade might at any time be made a condition precedent to the issue of a payment order; and a ḍājūr might reap much profit by economizing in the administration of his fev, by rack-renting the landholders, and by encroachments, but the naqd system furnished him with no such means of enriching himself. The edict was immediately modified, and though the naqd system was introduced in the settled provinces of the empire, the ḍājūr system was retained in the more recently conquered provinces of Bengal, Gujrat, and Sind, and, after Akbar's death, was restored, in many cases, in other provinces.

Another reform introduced at the same time, the ilāgh u-naḥalli, or branding regulation, was resented even more than the substitution of the naqd for the ḍājūr system. It was seldom that manṣabārs maintained their full quota of troopers; "false musters were an evil from which the Moghul army suffered, even in its most palmy days. Nobles would lend each other the men to make up their quota, or needy idlers from the bazaars would be mounted on the first baggage pony that came to hand, and counted in with the others as efficient soldiers". It was to check such fraudulent practices that Akbar introduced the ilāgh u-naḥalli regulation, which required the preparation of descriptive rolls of men and horses, the latter being branded on being passed as fit for service; and at muster-parades only these who produced branded horses were paid. This system originated, apparently, with the Sanżūks in Transoxania and Persia, and was introduced into India by 'Alī al-Lin Khaṭūbī in 1532, but was not enforced after his death until it was revived by Shīr Shīh in 1541. After his death it was again abandoned, and Akbar had great difficulty in reviving it, owing to the determined opposition to any measure designed to prevent public officials from enriching themselves by defrauding the state. Even he was obliged to exempt commanders of 5,000, or a greater number, of horse from its operation, though these were required to parade their contingents for inspection when ordered. In the later days of the empire, the regulation was not enforced, and when Burhan al-Mulk joined Muḥammad Shīh at Kanūnī, to meet Nādir Shīh, a historian considers it worth while to describe his contingent as manṣabālu na kāḥūlī, that is, "actually present, not merely on paper"; and later, in 1750, an officer in Bengal receiving pay for 1,700 men was said not to have been able to muster more than seventy or eighty.

Besides the contingents of the princes and the manṣabārs there were the sovereign's personal troops. His body-guard was a corps known as the Wāliākāhī, composed chiefly of men who had been attached to him from his youth, and had served under him as a prince. Manucci refers to these as the emperor's slaves, and says that they numbered 4,000 under Awrangzīb. Details of their pay are not given, but they probably received more than the troopers serving in the contingents of the manṣabārs. There was also a corps d'élite first formed by Akbar, and styled the Aḥsāni corps. Abu 'l-Fadl, in a characteristically foolish passage says that they were so called because they were
fit for a "harmonious unity", whatever that may mean; but they seem to have been called *ahādi* because they enlisted singly in the personal service of the emperor, and were not brought into the service in bodies by a *mangahārār*. They stood, in rank, between the lower *mangahārārs* and the *tābbān*, and received nearly double the pay of the latter. They may be compared to "gentlemen of the life-guard", and many were seconded from the corps in order that they might hold civil appointments. The proportion of three-horsed, two-horsed, and one-horsed troopers was the same in the *Ahādī* corps as in the contingents of the *mangahārārs*.

A commander of horse, whether he held a *dīdar* or whether he drew the pay of his contingent from the treasury, made his own arrangements for its disbursement. He was entitled to retain five percent of the pay of his men for himself, and pay was not always allowed for a whole year; often only for six, five, or four months. Manucci, writing of the army in the reign of Awrangzib, says, "in respect of one year's service they receive six or eight months' pay. Even that is not all in coin; they are always foisted off as respects two months' pay with clothes and old raiment from the household. Over and above this, there is almost always due to them the pay for two or three years' service. The soldiers are obliged to borrow money at interest from the *sarīfās*, or money-changers. These men lend to them, it is true, but it is hardly ever without a command from the general or officer; and these latter have an understanding with them about the profit from interest, which they share between them. Sometimes the soldiers sell their papers to these money-changers, who for a note of hand for one hundred rupees will give them twenty or twenty-five. It is by these and such-like extortions that these generals ruin the wretched soldier, who, unable to find other means of gaining his bread, is forced to remain on in his service. Speaking generally, it is impossible for them to escape such extortions, for these disorders reign throughout all the princes' establishments. If any one resigns service at his own request, they deduct two months' pay. Nevertheless service in the cavalry was socially an honourable profession; a common trooper was looked upon as being, to some extent, a gentleman, and such were, even when illiterate, often used to the highest positions."

The infantry was, in every respect, an inferior arm. With it were classed doorkeepers, watchmen, runners and spies, gladiators, wrestlers and palanquin-bearers, but the combatant branch consisted of musketeers or matchlockmen (*bārdandācs*, archers, and spear-men. Akbar maintained a corps of 12,000 matchlockmen, the officer in command of which was styled *dārūgāhā*. A secretary and a treasurer kept the accounts and disbursed the pay of these troops. The non-commissioned officers of the corps were graded in four classes, the first of which received 7½, the second 7, the third 6½, and the fourth 6½ rupees a month. The privates were divided into five classes, the pay of which ranged from 4½ down to 2½ rupees a month.

Besides this corps was a number of troops styled *dākhlī*, of which one-fourth were matchlockmen and three-fourth archers. These were the troops allowed to the *faujīdārs* in the pagans or sub-districts, to assist them in maintaining order and collecting the revenue. The non-commissioned officers of the matchlockmen received Rs 4 a month, and the privates Rs 3½ each. The archers were considered more efficient than the matchlockmen, for the matchlock was not an arm of rapid fire or precision, and an archer could shoot many arrows while a matchlockman was loading his matchlock. Neither matchlockmen nor archers could, as a rule, face cavalry in the field, and it was not until the emperors and their vassals were brought face to face with troops armed and drilled after the European fashion that they discovered that infantry was the queen of battles; but belief in the superior efficiency of cavalry died hard.

The artillery was divided into two classes, the heavy and the light. Bābar had an efficient corps of artillery, and used it with great effect, but the Muslims of India were not skilled artillerists, and the heavy artillery was usually officered and partly manned by 'Uthmānī Turks, Portuguese renegades of pure or mixed blood, and occasionally by other Europeans. The light artillery consisted of field-pieces carried on bullock-carts, wall-pieces on animals' backs, and *zambūrāks*, or still lighter service-guns, carried on and fired from the backs of camels. The heavy artillery was drawn by strings of oxen, or, occasionally, by elephants, and, as the army gradually declined in efficiency the heavy guns increased in length and calibre until they became so heavy as hardly to be mobile, so that often they could not be dragged to their destination but were left stranded by their road. A defeated army could seldom save its heavy and field artillery. All that it could do was to spike its guns and leave them. The ammunition was solid shot, sometimes of stone, sometimes of iron, and field guns and heavy guns in the field were sometimes loaded to the muzzle with the rough copper coin of the time, which took the place of case-shot, and did great execution at close quarters. The artillery also comprised a corps of rocketeers. The whole of the artillery was commanded by an officer entitled *Mir-i Aīnšā*, or "lord of fire". The officers were entitled *gādīwāl* ("commander of 100") corresponding to a battery commander, and *nirīslāhā* (commander of 10), who had charge of a subdivision, or one gun. The wall-pieces and *zambūrāks*, which were numerous, account for the enormous numbers of "guns" mentioned in accounts of armies in the field.

Akbar used elephants freely in battle, and brought them into the field in great numbers. They usually carried archers or musketeers on their backs. Their use as a fighting force was, however, soon abandoned, and would have been abandoned even earlier if it had not been for their imposing appearance, for it had long been established that they were more dangerous to their own side than to the enemy. "To the last some elephants protected by armour were brought into the battle-field, but their use was confined almost entirely to carrying the generals or great nobles, and displaying their standards. The baggage elephants were assembled in rear with those bearing the īrām, the women remaining mounted on the latter during the battle, and protected by a strong force posted round them".

Under Akbar the elephants ridden by the emperor were called *kāyās* ("special"), and all others were arranged in groups of ten, twenty, or thirty, called *huīka* ("ring", or "circle"). In later reigns the same classification was employed, but with
a more extended meaning, *khāṣpa* then including all riding, and *halāka* all baggage elephants. *Manjubārs* from 7,000 down to 500 were required to maintain each one riding elephant, and, in addition, five baggage elephants for each Rs 2,500 of pay. It appears that these elephants belonged to the emperor, and were not even made over to the *manjubārs* for use, except in the field. In the *Aini Akbari* Abu 'l-Fadl says that 'Akbar put several *halākas* under the charge of every grandee, and required him to look after them'.

The commander-in-chief of the army was the emperor himself, but at the head of the military administration was an officer entitled *Bakhshī al-Mansūr*, whose position may be described as that of adjutant-general, and muskermaster-general. He was assisted by three *bakhshīs* and a number of *bīṭhīs*, or clerks, and the duties of this department included enlistment, mustering, and passing the pay of both *manjubārs* and *qalīnān*, for which purpose they were obliged to see that the branding regulations, so long as they were enforced, were observed by those to whom they applied. Manucci says, "twice a year the *bakhshī* holds a review of all the cavalry present at court, examines all the horses, and sees whether any of them are old and unfit for service. In the latter case he makes the owners get rid of them and buy others". These officers remained at headquarters, and from some authorities it appears that one of them had charge of the *bakhshīs*, or body-guard, but the *Abādi* corps, which was commanded by one of the great nobles, had its own *disnān*, or paymaster and quartermaster, and its own *bakhshī*, both officers being assisted by *bīṭhīs*. Certificates granted by the *bakhshī* were recorded by the *wali* or *wali*-nīgār, or writer of the official diary, and were sent to the office of the minister, who, after passing them, sent them to the office of revision and record, but pay was issued on the minister's order. "In addition to the *bakhshīs* at headquarters there were officers with similar functions attached to the governor of every province", their office being generally combined with that of the *wali*-nīgār, or provincial diary-writer: and in imitation of the imperial establishments each great noble had his own *bakhshī*, who performed for him the same duties as those performed for the emperor by the imperial *bakhshīs*.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the strength of the army in Akbar's reign, for the *saʿārī* rank of the *manjubārs* is not given, either in the *Aini Akbari* or in the *Tābakāt-i Akbari*. He maintained 12,000 matchlockmen, and Blochmann estimates the whole strength of his army at 25,000, of which 12,000 were cavalry and the rest matchlockmen and artillery, but this seems to be much too low an estimate. Humâyūn could put 100,000 cavalry into the field, and it is not likely that Akbar, with far wider dominions, would have been content, or could have ruled and extended his empire with a smaller army. It seems probable that Blochmann's estimate included only the emperor's personal household troops, in the latter half of Shāh-Uljahān's reign the contingents of the princes and nobles would have numbered 425,500 if each *manjubār* had maintained the full quota of his *saʿārī* rank, but this they were not even expected to do. Fortunately a fairly exact return of the strength of the army is given in the *Padshahānāma*. There were 8,000 *manjubārs* of all ranks, 7,000 mounted *Abādis* and *baraqāndāzs*, 200,000 cavalry, exclusive of the troops allowed to *fandāshīs* for the maintenance of order and the collection of the revenue, and 40,000 foot matchlockmen, artillerists, and rocketeers, of whom 10,000 were at headquarters and 10,000 in the provinces and the forts. It is not quite clear what is meant by the mounted *baraqāndāz* classed with the *Abādis*, for *baraqāndāz* is the word used for a matchlockman, and horsemen certainly did not carry the cumbersome matchlock, and carbines and pistols had not been introduced, but it may be that a few men carrying a lighter musket than the ordinary matchlock were attached to the *Abādi* corps. Of the army in the reign of Awarangzīb Manucci writes, "ordinarily the king keeps fifty thousand horse in garrison besides those in movement every day, an almost equal number. He has twenty thousand infantry, all Rājpūts; out of them twelve thousand are in charge of the artillery; the rest are for guarding the royal palace, mounting sentry, and *et cetera".

The army of the Mughal emperors was not drilled. Muster parades consisted merely in the troopers passing in single file before the *bakhshī*, and the nearest approach to any manoeuvres was the participation of the army, or part of it, in a royal hunt, when the troops, aided by the people of the country side, acted as beaters, surrounded a large tract of country, and, day by day, closed inwards until in a small area was enclosed an enormous quantity of game, which was then slaughtered wholesale by the emperor and those who were permitted a share in the "sport". Apart from this species of hunting styled *chikāri kamargha*, the army was never exercised in any combined movements, or drill; but the individual trooper paid great attention to the training of his body, exercising himself with all his weapons, sabre, spear, mace, battle-axe, buckler, dagger, and bow and arrows. The bow was considered a most effective weapon, as a hor-eman could shoot six times before a musketeer could fire twice. The trooper also went through various exercises for strengthening his limbs and his body, both with and without apparatus, the latter consisting of dumb-bells, *mugālar*, or Indian clubs, and the *lecam* a strong bow with a steel chain instead of a string, most effective in training these muscles employed by an archer. The horses were also trained in a sort of manège.


E. Economics and Administration.

The Mughal Empire lived mainly by agriculture. The only metals available in quantity were iron and copper; both were relatively expensive, and local supplies of the latter were failing in the xvith century. The existence of coal was unknown, and of other minerals only lime, salt, saltpetre, and, locally, building stone were largely produced. The agricultural land was divided into areas known as
villages (dák), usually, but not always, inhabited. The villages were grouped traditionally in larger areas (purana), which were usually treated as administrative units (mahall). Most villages, but not all, were occupied by a community of peasants, held together by the tie of common ancestry; each member of these bodies had separate possession of the land which he cultivated, but the community acted as a whole, through the headmen (mukaddums), in the management of the village, letting surplus land to tenants, paying the revenue and other expenses, and transacting such other business as emerged.

The population was predominantly vegetarian. Meat for the officials and the army was provided where required, but its supply lay outside the ordinary course of agriculture. The products of the land were mainly food, cereals, millets and pulses, with, on a smaller scale, sugar, vegetables, and condiments. Oil-seeds were grown for local needs; opium was produced largely, and tobacco, a recent introduction, had spread rapidly through the empire; cotton and some other fibres, together with indigo and other dyes, were the chief industrial crops. Holdings were usually small, and were worked largely by the peasant himself with the aid of his family and the landless labourers of the village. Oxen were used for tillage; implements were few and primitive, and there was in general a scarcity of agricultural capital, necessitating prompt sales of produce at each harvest, to the peasant’s loss and the middleman’s gain.

Handicrafts were numerous and varied, but weaving was by far the most important. Cotton cloth was woven all over the empire, most of it for local consumption, but near the coasts production was directed largely to supplying overseas markets, while finer goods—muslins and prints—were carried long distances by land. Most of the consuming markets were conservative, adhering closely to established styles and patterns. There was thus little scope for invention; copying was safer than designing; and such developments as were recorded were the result of either patronage by wealthy amateurs, or the extension of the European demand. Silk-weaving was locally important in Bengal and Gudjarát, in the latter case from imported material; jute and hemp also were only of local importance, but in the xviiith century an export trade in sacks and sacking was beginning to develop.

In peaceful regions commerce was active, and, for the period, highly organised. Funds were ordinarily transmitted by bills of exchange, which could be negotiated in all the principal towns, and in some centres outside the empire. Merchants were, however, disinclined to carry large stocks of commodities, and preferred to utilise their funds in money-lending; the rate of interest in commercial transactions was commonly about 10 or 12 per cent, but the charge was much higher when the element of risk was great.

External land-trade was almost limited to the two caravan routes westward by way of Kábul and Kandahar, though there was some small traffic with Tibet. By sea, Gudjarát had old-established connections with the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, with East Africa, and with Sumatra, Malacca and further East; on a much smaller scale Sind had relations with Persia; while Bengal dealt chiefly with the south of India and with Burma and Siam.

During the xviith century all the sea routes were dominated by the Portuguese, who were concerned rather to exploit than develop; the chief extension of trade due to their efforts was the supply of cloth to Brazil and West Africa, but most of this was drawn off the East Coast, which was outside the empire until almost the end of the xviith century. After “factories” (i.e. agencies) had been established at Sírat by the English (1611) and the Dutch (1617), an important trade with western Europe grew up in indigo and calico. In the middle of the century the indigo-trade yielded to competition from the West Indies, while the depopulation of Gudjarát by the famine of 1630 transferred the bulk of the calico trade to the East Coast; Sírat remained, however, an important centre until its supersession by Bombay. In the second quarter of the xviith century the Dutch, followed by the English, established factories on the Húglí in Bengal, and trade developed in silk, salt petre, fine calico, and muslin. Towards the close of the century a change of fashions in Europe produced a great demand for muslin and print, which was met partly by Bengal, and partly by Madras, by this time technically within the limits of the empire.

The outstanding feature of all trade with India was the need for importing gold and silver. India bought little beyond the industrial metals and luxury goods, but was eager to sell produce for cash; and, since Western Europe could not supply what was most in demand, the operations of the trading Companies were necessarily so organised as to direct streams of gold and silver to India from those countries which would part with them, notably, at this period, gold from China, and silver, and later gold, from Japan. The seaports serving the empire were thus brought into a complex but efficient organisation, which took whatever they had to sell, supplied whatever they wanted to buy, and, so far as was possible, satisfied the demand for gold and silver.

Inland transport was necessarily less efficient. The Indus, the Ganges, the Djamna, and the waterways of Bengal were largely used, but the bulk of the empire depended on what were then called roads, unmetalled tracks, sometimes defined by lines of trees, with halting-places which were generally walled or otherwise defended against robbers, and usually furnished with supplies. Transport was effected by carts and pack-animals, generally oxen but in some places camels. Passengers travelled on horseback, in palanquins, or in carts drawn by fast oxen. There were excellent arrangements for the rapid transit of letters, but these were for official use, and were not ordinarily available for private persons, who hired messengers when required, or in a few cases, clubbed together to send messengers periodically.

Standards of life presented sharp contrasts. The mass of the population, peasants, artisans and labourers, lived in such extreme poverty as to excite the commiseration of European visitors. An almost equally low standard prevailed among the numerically important class of servants in the towns, whether freemen or slaves, who, however, enjoyed a more secure life than the rural population. The middle classes, comparatively smaller in numbers than now, were thrifty and frugal; and, even when wealthy, were careful to avoid any display which might lead to exactions by officials. The superior
grades of officers employed by the State were exceedingly well paid when allowance is made for the high purchasing power of money, and spent their incomes freely in extravagance and display, increased by the fact that on their death their property reverted to the treasury.

The prosperity of the empire depended mainly on three factors: the character of the rainfall, the degree of internal tranquillity, and the working of the revenue administration. The seasonal rainfall was, as it still is, uncertain, and any serious defect resulted in insufficiency of food. The difficulty of transport made it impossible to afford adequate relief on the spot, the people abandoned their homes to wander in search of food, and in contemporary narratives we read again and again of the then familiar features of deaths from starvation, cannibalism, and the sale of children into slavery. Recovery from such a calamity was a slow process, and the famine which desolated Gujarat and the Dakhan in 1650-1651 left its mark for at least a generation. This particular famine might also prove calamitous, though not to the same extent. There was no local market for the surplus produce, prices fell to a ruinous level, and in official regulations low prices were treated as a calamity requiring relief on the same footing as drought or hail.

The dominance of the weather was inevitable; the other influences on prosperity were matters of administration. Here a clear distinction must be drawn between the general and the revenue administration, a distinction denoted by the current phrase mulki wa-muli. The emperor was of course supreme in both branches, and was assisted at his headquarters by four principal officers, the Wazir or Prime Minister, the Nasir or Revenue Minister, the Bakhsh (see col. 629), and the Sadir, who was in charge of Islamic law and also administered the department dealing with charitable grants and endowments. The post of Wazir was not always filled, and when it was in abeyance the duties attaching to it devolved on the Wazir. In practice the powers of these Ministers depended on the personality of the Emperor; under Akbar or Shāh Jahan they were definitely subordinate, while Dāhāngīr's Prime Minister was at times practically the ruler of the country.

The system of general administration to which the Mughals succeeded in Northern India was not highly developed. The great bulk of the country was held by officers in assignment (a term explained below); the assignee was responsible for keeping the peace, and in practice had a free hand in the methods employed. Under Akbar a more effective system was established, which was maintained throughout the period. The empire was divided into provinces (sīnha), each of which was in charge of a Viceroy (Spahsīlār, Sāhākhār), who at first was responsible to the Emperor for all branches of administration, but after 1595 was relieved of revenue work. Apart from the Viceroy, officers who may be described as Governors were stationed at selected places, with the duty of keeping the peace and putting down rebellion, a term which covered failure to pay the revenue due. The ordinary designation of these Governors was Fāqīdhār, but in outlying regions which were controlled by fortresses the Governor was the fortress-commander (Khalīlār), while in a few large assignments the assignee exercised the powers of a Governor. Cities were governed by officers designated Kotwāl, who combined the functions of magistrate, police-commandant, municipality, and censor of morals. There was no regular police force at the disposal of these officers, who were expected to employ the troops they maintained as a condition of their rank, obtaining help when their own forces were insufficient. The efficiency of this organisation varied with that of the central administration, which depended mainly on the personality of the Emperor; by the close of the xvith century it was definitely breaking down, and conditions of anarchy were spreading over the empire.

It is difficult to state in precise terms the relation of this organisation to the extensive portions of the empire where internal jurisdiction remained in the hands of Hindu Chiefs; but apparently the Chief was regarded officially as assignee of his territories, and was expected to maintain order within them. If he failed to do so, the Viceroy or Governor concerned might intervene, but his action would ordinarily be directed against the Chief rather than against the people.

The revenue administration was controlled by the Wazir, sitting in the Revenue Ministry, which was known as Dīwān, as opposed to Huḍūr, or the Court, whence orders were issued by, or in the name of, the Emperor. Revenue at this period meant practically Land Revenue; the Imperial Treasury had receipts from other sources — Customs, Salt, Mint, Presents, Inheritance, and, under Awrangzīb, the Capital Tax (qāla). But, taken collectively, they were of little importance compared with the income obtained from the peasants. Under the system traditional in India, and emboldened in Hindu law, every person cultivating land was required to pay a share of the produce to the King, who determined, within somewhat elastic limits, the amount of the share, and who also prescribed the methods of assessment and collection. The first Muslim conquerors accepted this "King's share" as the kharāja to which they were entitled under Islamic law; the question of property in land was not raised, but occupants were ordinarily allowed to retain possession subject to due payment of the revenue.

In the Mughal period agricultural land fell into three classes: Chiefs', Reserved and Assigned. The areas governed by the more important Chiefs were not assessed to revenue (kharāja) by the Wazir; that was the privilege of the Chief, and any payments which he made to the treasury were in the nature of a tribute, determined by negotiation. The treatment of the numerous smaller Chiefs is not on record; but the few facts which have survived are consistent with the view that assessment was made through them, and that they were allowed to retain a portion of the revenue in return for their services. In the regions which were directly administered, certain areas of land, described as kāhāna, were reserved to furnish the treasury with cash, and were managed by the staff employed by the Revenue Ministry; at first the local staff was under the provincial Viceroy, but in 1596 a Dīwān was posted to each province, to manage all revenue business directly under the Minister, and in this way emerged the dichotomy into diwānī (revenue business) and fāqīdhāra (general business) which henceforward characterised the local administration.

The land not reserved for the treasury was
available for assignment. Every officer appointed to the Emperor’s service was entitled to an income
defined in cash, which represented both his personal
salary and the cost of the troops he was required
to maintain. For a short period in Akbar’s reign,
this income was paid, as well as defined, in cash, but
the ordinary practice in the empire was to assign
to each officer an area (gāğī, tīrūl, or īkō),
estimated to yield as revenue the amount of his
stated income; and the officer thereupon took
charge of the area assigned to him, and assessed
and collected the revenue in accordance, at least
theoretically, with the general orders in force. If
the yield proved insufficient, he could claim the
balance from the treasury, while he could be re-
quired to account for any excess receipts; but in
practice these matters seem usually to have been
adjusted by bribery, for which there was also
an extensive scope in securing profitable assignments,
and in getting rid of those which had been squeezed
dry. Changes of assignment were ordinarily so
frequent that an officer would have been unwise
to spend money on fostering agricultural develop-
ment or do anything beyond the barest minimum
income which his assignment could be made to
yield. The great bulk of the land was ordinarily
assigned, the reserved area being one-sixth or one-
seventh of the whole.

The share of the peasants’ produce claimed by
Akbar was one-third; later, at some uncertain
time in the first half of the xvith century, this
figure became the minimum, with a maximum of
one-half, which inevitably tended to become the
standard. Three principal methods of assessment
were in vogue: Sharing (gāła baḥkīdi), Measurement
(pāmātī shīk), and Group-Assessment (nasãk).
In Sharing, the produce of each peasant was or-
dinarily estimated (or occasionally ascertained at
harvest), and the prescribed share valued to deter-
mine the cash-revenue due for that season. In
Measurement, a fixed charge, varying with the
crop, was made on each unit of area sown; it
might be fixed in either cash or produce and in the
latter case it was valued at current prices. Under
both these systems payment in cash was the general
rule, but payments in kind were permitted in some
backward regions where currency was scarce. In
Group-Assessment, the official concerned came to
terms with the headmen of the village to pay a
sum fixed in cash for the year, thus avoiding the
necessity of detailed assessments on individuals;
this system tended to pass into Farming, when
terms were made, not with the headmen, but with
an outsider.

Each ruler determined at his pleasure which of
these methods should be employed, and in what
regions. Group-Assessment was the prevailing
system at the time of Bibi’s conquest, and
apparently was accepted by him. After the expul-
sion of Humayīn from India. Shīr Shah introduced
Measurement throughout his kingdom, and his
methods were at first adopted by Akbar; the
revenue claimed from each unit of area was at
this time a stated quantity of produce, calculated
to be one-third of the average yield, and, except
in the tracts where payment in kind was practised,
this amount of produce was commuted to cash at
prices fixed officially for each season. Practical
difficulties arose, however, in regard to commutation;
and in 1579–1580 the revenue was put definitely
on a cash basis, the charge on each unit of area
sown being a fixed number of dām (reckoned at
40 to the rupee) instead of a fixed weight of
produce. Schedules of cash-rates adapted to the
varying productivity of different regions were now
drawn up, which remained in operation during
the rest of Akbar’s reign. At some uncertain period,
probably under Dāhāṅgīr, these schedules were
discarded, and a return was made to Group-Assess-
ment, which was the standard system in the middle
of the xvith century, and survived into the British
period; Sharing was now practised only in back-
ward tracts, or in some cases where the headmen
refused to pay what the assessor thought a reason-
able revenue, in which case he proceeded to
detailed assessment on individuals, by Sharing or
by Measurement according to circumstances.

Such was the history of assessment in the heart
of the empire, but the outlying provinces were
not brought into rigid uniformity, local conditions
determining the system applied in each; while in
the Dakhan provinces a distinct and elaborate
system was introduced in the middle of the xviith
century in order to promote recovery from the
effects of war and famine.

It would be futile to criticise these varying in-
stitutions, for the value of all alike depended
on the spirit in which they were worked. In admini-
strative circles there was throughout the Muslim
period a definite ideal of agricultural prosperity
as the foundation of the State, its elements being
extension of cultivation, improvement in the class
of crops, and development of irrigation. Against
this ideal operated the urgent need for the largest
immediate revenue that could be wrung from the
peasants. The course of the struggle cannot be traced
in detail but the central fact is that by the middle
of the xviith century agriculture had ceased to be
an attractive career, and the peasants were deserting
the land for other occupations; the resulting decline
in agricultural production was the chief economic
factor in the eventual collapse of the empire.

The remaining branches of the administration
require little description. Customs duties were formal-
ly low, but their incidence was increased by
arbitrary over-valuation and unauthorised payments
required to secure prompt clearance of goods. In
the towns, civil justice was administered mainly
by the kātī; in the country, disputes were apparently
decided summarily by the executive officials. Punish-
ments for crime were summary and drastic, and
were not always in accordance with Islamic law.
By Indian tradition, local officials raised a large
revenue for local purposes by a multitude of taxes
and excises of a most oppressive nature; these
were prohibited en masse by Akbar, and again by
Aurangzeb, but the system survived. Its worst
feature was the levy of transit dues on internal trade,
which were a cause of constant complaint by Indians as well as foreigners.

Special attention was given to the coinage, as
being a recognised appanage of sovereignty. Gold,
silver and copper were coined, all the coins cir-
culating at their metallic value, so that the exchange
rate between different denominations fluctuated;
but gold was not in general circulation. The chief
coin of the empire was the silver rupee, containing
nearly 180 grains of almost pure silver; the prin-
cipal copper coin was the dām, of nearly 324
grains; and there were various smaller coins of
both metals.

The unit of weight used in wholesale commerce
was the maund or man, which varied in different parts of the country. In the south of India it ranged round about 25 lb; in Gujrat it was 33 lb, but in 1635 this was raised to 37 lb; in North India, it was 52 lb at Akbar's accession, was raised by him to 55 lb, by Djiàhàngir to 60 lb, and by Sháh Djiàhàn to 74 lb. In Bengal, it was 64 lb in the 16th and 60 lb in the 17th century. These figures are given to the nearest lb. The unit for retail trade varied from place to place, but was ordinarily smaller than those which have been named. Measures of capacity were not used in wholesale commerce. The measure of length in the North was the gaj or yard, which was standardised by Akbar at about 33 inches, and by his successor at about 40 inches, but the smaller unit survived; in the South the hásá, or cubit, of about 18 inches was used: it was smaller than the yard and in Bengal about 27 inches.


(W. H. MORELAND)

II. THE DECLINE OF THE MUGHAL EMPIRE.

The decline of Mughal authority, already manifest during the reign of Aurangzîb, rapidly developed under his immediate successors. Bahadur Shah [q.v.] (1707—1712) was too amiable, Dzûhândîr Shah [q.v.] (1712—1713) was too vicious, Farrukhsîyâr [q.v.] (1713—1719) was too feeble, to revive the empire. In seven bloody battles of succession, fought within six years of Aurangzîb's death, the imperial family attested its inherent lawlessness and declining power. Then it became the sport of rival factions. For a while the two famous Saiyid brothers, 'Abd Allâh and Husâm al-Mulâk rose in arms. Husâm Alî marched against him, but was murdered with the connivance of Muhammmad Shâh, the emperor whom he and his brother had set up in 1719. Shortly afterwards, his brother 'Abd Allâh was defeated and, after lying in prison at Dîlí for two years, was poisoned. When they fell, Niţâm al-Mulâk strove hard to restore something like the old order of administration. But he was unwilling to force himself upon Muhammmad Shâh as the Saiyids had forced themselves upon Farrukhsîyâr. When the emperor whom he had delivered refused his advice, and the favourites of the court made fun of his antiquated dress and ceremonious manners, he preferred to retire and rule the Dakhân in virtual independence. Ironically enough, Mu-
MUGHAL.

Hamid Shah believed that Niẓām al-Mulk had been plotting his overthrow.

With Niẓām al-Mulk’s departure from Dihli the last chances of a revival of the empire vanished. Never did a falling state betray greater incapacity for reformaiton. No phoenix could arise from those shameless ashes. Even while Niẓām al-Mulk still retained the nominal control of affairs, extraordinary incidents could occur. At Dihli itself, for example, a Hindu clerk in one of the imperial offices turned Muslim, and, when his wife and daughter refused to follow his change of faith, he laid a complaint against them, alleging that, as his daughter had not attained puberty, she was therefore of her father’s religion. The case offered certain technical difficulties, was at last referred to the ṣadr al-ṣuḥūr. His treatment of the case displeased the Dihli mob. Riots arose, the recital of the ḥijāth at the Dāhān-nunā Masjīd was interrupted, two or three Hindus were seized and circumcised. To pacify the rioters, the girl was imprisoned, and, a few days later, buried with Muslim ceremonial. “To cut a long story,” says Kāmwar Khān who relates the incident, “she was killed; otherwise there would have been many headaches and much vexation.”

Niẓām al-Mulk’s successors were worthy of the frivolous emperor whom they professed to serve. For twelve years the imperial councils were directed by a man called Shāh ʿAbd al-Qādir. By origin a cotton-weaver of Tatbīr, he had lived both as ṣajj and ḫāṭir. Claiming magical powers and popularly believed to consort with djinn and devils, he was summoned to interpret the dreams of the emperor’s mother. This led him into the imperial service, and he contrived to accumulate in his own hand a great number of offices, producing a revenue of 5,000 rupees a day, apart from the bribes which he received, said to amount to as much more. This man was pithily described as never having spent money on a good work, never having conferred a favour, and never having done a kindness. He was a miser, and at his downfall (for even at Dihli under Muhammad Shāh such qualities at last produced their natural reaction) more than a crore of rupees was found in his private hoards. But the unpopularity which his character and habits naturally evoked was nothing compared with the detestation with which his son and daughter were regarded. No one in Dihli was safe who displeased them or denied them anything that they desired.

Amid such confusion and under such rulers the empire rapidly lost its cohesion. The Marājīhs [q.v.], whom even Avrangzēb sought in vain to subdue, soon became the most formidable power in India. On Avrangzēb’s death, his successor, Bahādur Shāh, had released the Marājī prince, Shāhī Rādā, in the desperate hope of reestablishing through him the form, if not the substance of imperial control. Shāhī Rādā met with influential and talented support. In 1708 he took possession of Satara and by the next year was generally recognised as ruler. A Chitpavan Brahman, Bāḏājī Ṣiṁhānāth, became his ṣajjūn or first minister, and began to develop the characteristic Marājī policy, which was to play a part in the enfeeblement of the empire. This was to put forward claims to a share (under the title of ḫan or a quarter part) in the imperial revenues in as many provinces as possible. In 1709 the Mughal governor in the Dakhan admitted this claim, and, although later governors contested it, it was again recognised by the Bārha Saiyids in 1719. In the next year Bāḏājī Ṣiṁhānāth was succeeded by his son, Bāḏājī Rāo I, and the process was extended farther afield. Particular provinces were assigned to particular officers, who were to realise the ḫaṭkh either by collecting the amount from the provincial governor, or by plundering the country. Bāḏājī Rāo employed Plāḍājī Gāckwār as his chief leader in raids in Gujārāt; Rāghuḍājī Bhonsla established himself at Nāgpūr; these and other leaders spread the terror of Marājī devastations in all directions, and it was no longer possible for the provincial governors to maintain any semblance of control. At the same time, seeing that their tenure of office was coming to depend more and more upon their own power and resources, the governors tended to become virtually independent rulers. Aṣaf Dījā Niẓām al-Mulk in the Dakhān continued to profess himself a humble servant of the emperor, but he repelled by force of arms the persons who came with imperial ṣafarīn ordering his supercession, and when he died in 1748 he was succeeded by his son. In Bengal too the succession had become a matter of heredity or war. But the respect which the name of the empire still enjoyed and the degradation into which the empire itself had fallen were exemplified by the large gifts sent by a new ruler for ṣafarīn of investiture and the unhesitating compliance with which they were issued.

The troubles bred by this internal dissolution were enhanced by those of foreign invasion. In 1722 the Ṣafawīs were overthrown in Persia, and, after a short period of great confusion, the Turkmān Nādir Kūli established himself as ruler under the title of Nādir Shāh [q.v.]. With him difficulties arose over the Kandahār frontier. He was engaged in reducing the Ghilzais there to submission. Thrice he sent envoys to the court of Dihli requesting that his enemies should not receive shelter in the Mughal territory. But by this time the Kábul province was falling into a like disorder with the rest. The governor spent his time in prayer and hunting. The money which had been regularly sent from Dihli to bribe the hill-tribes into quietude and pay the troops ceased to be sent, partly because of the growing imperial penury, partly because it was believed that it never reached the governor but was embezzled by his patron at court. Large bodies of Ghilzais therefore were able without the least difficulty to take shelter from Nādir Shāh’s troops in the Mughal province, while the Mughal court foolishly supposed it was evading its difficulties by neglecting to answer Nādir Shāh’s repeated demands. The ineptitude of the court, therefore, rather than (as used to be supposed) any elaborate intrigue of party against party, made Nādir Shāh resolve to invade India. No effective opposition could be offered in either the Kābul province or the Pandžāb. In 1738 Kābul was occupied. In the next year Nādir Shāh’s army appeared before Dihli. The emperor went out, not to strike a blow in his own defence, but to make his humble submission. Conqueror and captive then entered the city. The Dihli mob, grievously mistaking its strength, attempted to massacre the foreigners. As a punishment Nādir Shāh deliberately let loose his troops for five long hours— from 9 o’clock in the morning till 2 in the afternoon— during which some 20,000 of the inhabitants were believed to
to have perished; and beyond this toll of life a great ransom was exacted, including 50 stores' worth of those wonderful jewels which earlier Mughal sovereigns had heaped up for their delight. From this time onwards the annals of the Mughal empire contain nothing but dishonour. Nâdir Shâh fell; but Ahmad Shâh Durânî established on the borders of India another empire and repeatedly invaded India between 1748, the year of the ignominious Muhammad Shâh's death, and 1761, the year in which he inflicted the severest defeat in all their history upon the Marâthâs at Panipat. Until the decay of the Durânî empire in the early years of the nineteenth century, the provinces of Kâbr, Kâsîn, and Kâshmîr, were dependencies of the Afghan kingdom.

Europeans in India—Dutch, French, and English—had observed these events with great concern. Early in the eighteenth century the Dutch had sent a great embassy to Bahâdur Shâh, and a little later the English had sent one to Farnâkhsîyâr. Both had secured far-reaching falsâs from profuse expenditure; both had found that their falsâs were waste paper wherever they ran counter to the interests of local governors. But it was the Frenchman Dupleix who first sought to put into practice the conclusions to be drawn from this situation. Others were convinced that European force could easily establish itself in India; but he began experiments, and, in the hope of keeping the English motless while he acted, he professed to be acting on behalf and in the name of the Mughal emperor. This fiction became the traditional basis of French policy in India, and down to the end of the century Frenchmen were elaborating plans (which their failure to control the sea brought to nothing) for establishing themselves in India and expelling their rivals under cover of imperial grants. With equal consistency the English adopted a political realism which squared far better with the circumstances of the time. They fought and overcame Dupleix in the name of their national interests. When they acquired Bengal, they carefully avoided all obligation to reestablish the imperial authority; and it appears that their acceptance of the dâwâr of Bengal was dictated, not by any desire to mask the reality of their power (which no one in India doubted), but by the desire to take on behalf of the East India Company something which could not be taken over by the English crown as a territorial sovereignty certainly would have been. Thus it was that Prince 'Ali Gawhar, who professed himself as Shâh 'Alam II [q. v.] in 1760, on learning of his father 'Alamgir's murder by his wazir, Ghâzâl al-Din, first came under the protection of the English. He had for some years been attacking the province of Bbâr with the aid of the Nawâb Wazir of Oudh. But after the battle of Bakar in 1764 he had given up the struggle, joined the English camp, and in the following year on Clive's demand bestowed on the East India Company the dâwâr of the provinces it held in return for an annual allowance of 26 lakhs of rupees. At the same time the districts of Kora and Allahâbâd were assigned to him and he proceeded to reside in the latter city. Soon however, he wearied of his position of dependence, and departed to join the Marâthâs, who, having recovered from their defeat at Panipat, were once more invading northern India. On this Warren Hastings decided to hand Kora and Allahâbâd over to the Nawâb Wazir and refused to continue the payment of the 26 lakhs. From this time until the close of the century he remained under the control of the Marâthâs, except at such times as their internal dissensions led to the recall of their forces from the north. One of their chief leaders at this time, Mahadâjî Sindhia, gradually built up a strong principality for himself, conquering the provinces of Agra and Dîli, and becoming the emperor's real custodian. So matters remained till Sindhia's defeat by the English in 1803 transferred the guardianship of Shâh 'Alam into the hands of the latter. They carefully refrained from entering into engagements with him, but they assigned revenues for the maintenance of the imperial family, they permitted all orders issued in the city of Dîli to run in the emperor's name, though the actual administration was conducted by an English agent, and they attempted no interference within the precincts of the palace. Gradually the traditional observances broke down. The Mughal emperor and the British governor-general met with the ceremonials of equals. The emperor's name was removed from the coinage. And it had been resolved no longer to recognize the imperial title after the death of its holder, Bahâdur Shâh II, when the Indian Mutiny, in which several of the imperial princes took an active part although they seem to have had little share in bringing it about, led to the formal trial and deposition of the emperor and the disappearance of the shadowy court which for a century had lingered on under the toleration of the real powers of India.


III. MUGHAL ARCHITECTURE IN INDIA.

The Mughal dynasty brought to India strong Central Asian predilections and a keen feeling for natural beauty. But each in succession obeyed his own instincts, education and caprices. Hence they patronised no "schools" of art, but came to employ an almost cosmopolitan body of artists, Persian, Indian, Turk and even European, who one after another had to adapt their own canons to the aesthetic moods of their employers. In general the Mughals forbade any sculpture of the human form, but like the Orthodox Greek Church, were usually rigid towards paintings of it and even fostered portraiture till it reached a high level. Yet, with relatively few exceptions, the Mughal buildings were all religious, comprising mosques and tombs or shrines. Hence their scope was limited, though within their limits they express the religious feelings and policies of the dynasty. Even the conqueror Bbâr found leisure in his brief reign of five years, 1526—1531, to build at Panipat the Kâbal Shâh mosque, whose name commemorates at once his love of Kâbul and his victory at Panipat in 1526. His mosque at Sâmbhal in Rohilkhand is marked by an akind jawâb. When he required constructive work Bbâr summoned pupils of Sinan, an Albanian, from Constantinople, and avoided Indian, Hindu or indigenous standards, though he must have employed Indian workmen in spite of his dis-
paragement of Indian skill and knowledge in design or architecture.

Humayun's longer but still more chequered reign produced many buildings, of which few remain. His mosque at Fatehpur near Dhill is massive and well-proportioned, recalling the Tughlaq or Turkish period, with domes rather more than hemispherical. It is decorated with enamelled tiles in the Persian manner, apparently the earliest example of that style now extant. His tomb at Dhill, doubtless begun, as is customary among Pious Easterns, during his lifetime, is of red sandstone and also Persian in style, but in it coloured tiles are replaced by white marble, of which the dome is wholly composed, the rest of the masonry being also infaid with that material. The main dome has a narrow neck, the first of its type to appear in India. The four corner cupolas, also a new feature, support domes of an earlier style.

Akbar (1556—1605) was versatile in his architecture as he was in his religion. In the Fort at Agra he built the palace—one of the few secular buildings of the Mughal period which survive—called the Dzahangri Mahall. His other buildings at Agra were demolished by Shahr-Dzahahn. This palace, built of red sandstone which has weathered badly, bears the impress of Akbar's vigour and originality. Throughout arches are used sparingly, the horizontal style of construction being the rule. Its forms also are as Hindu as its construction, but the ornamentation, carved on all flat surfaces, is of a type used by Akbar but not found in other buildings. During the early part of his reign was erected at Gwalior the tomb of Muhammad Gawa'h, who died in 1562. Closely resembling that of Sibz Shiz at Sahsaram, it marks a considerable advance in tomb-building during the brief period that had elapsed between the erection of the two; an advance ascribed by Ferguson to the invigorating touch of Akbar's genius, but doubtless due in great measure to the skill of the Gwalior school of architects and masons who were probably Hindus.

The tomb is a square, 100 ft. each way, exclusive of the hexagonal towers, and its chamber forms a hall, 43 ft. square, with the angles cut off by pointed arches so as to form an octagon on which the dome rests. Around this square building is a wide gallery, enclosed on all sides by a screen of exquisite tracery in pierced stonework with a projecting porch on each face.

At Fatehpur-Sikri, the new capital founded by Akbar where the court resided from 1569 to 1584, the emperor's eclectic phase found its fullest expression. Its architecture is admirably illustrated in W. E. Smith's works, but all its significance has not yet been explained. The site was chosen because Akbar's patron saint, the Shift Salim Chisti, lived in a cave on its summit. Akbar's own residence was the "House of Dreams," the Khwab-gah, an unpretentious structure standing on the roof of the Mahall-i Khayy, which contains paintings attributed by Smith to Chinese artists and apparently depicting Buddha as Yamantaka. However this may be, the design of his throne in the Diwan-i Khayy massive pillar symbolizes that he sat there as a Cakravartin or ruler of the four quarters, as Havell suggests, though it is conceivable that he signified his claim to the supreme headship of his new religion, the Din-Illah. But it is rash to dogmatise on the symbolism of a builder who seems to have had no settled design for the plan of his new city. The Mahall-i Khayy, regarded by Ferguson as the original block of building at Fatehpur-Sikri, has two spacious courtyards and is larger than the Red Palace at Agra, but its surrounding structures are inferior in richness of design and ornamentation. From time to time Akbar added courts and pavilions as if to compensate for this inferiority. While the Diwan-i Khayy is square as before as the Hall of Audience, the Daftar-Khana or Record Office is peristylar like the one erected by Akbar at Allahabad. The Panç Mahall, a five-storied open pavilion with richly carved pillars, and long colonnades and walls connecting these buildings one with another, complete this group of structures. The most characteristic and beautiful of his designs here are the three small buildings, the Mahall or apartment of Birbal's daughter, the house of Mariam Zamāni, mother of Dzahangir, and the palace of the Rāmi Sulzāna, Rukaiya Begam, a cousin of Akbar and his first consort. Akbar's greatness however demanded more grandiose monuments. The Dzami Masjid or cathedral mosque, erected in 1571 (the year in which he proclaimed himself the mugafadd of his age and openly claimed the spiritual headship of Islam), commemorated his victories in the Dakhah (Southern India). It ranks amongst the finest ecclesiastical buildings of India. According to its inscription, it was designed by Shaikh Salim Chisti himself and modelled on the Ka'ba. Though highly ornate it betrays few or no traces of Iranian influence. The tomb of the Shaikh, in its courtyard, is built wholly of white marble, with windows of pierced tracery of the most exquisite geometrical patterns, and a deep cornice of marble supported by brackets of a design so elaborate as to be almost fantastic. The other tomb in the courtyard, that of Salim's grandson, Shaikh Islam Khan, is of sober and excellent design but eclipsed by its surroundings. The Baland Darwāzah or "lofty gateway," built in 1602, commemorates Akbar's conquest of Khandesh and shows even the Dzami Masjid Hall it is the grandest gateway in India and one of the loveliest in the world, its height being enhanced by its position on the brow of the hill on which Fatehpur-Sikri stands. Its architect placed its portals at the back of a semi-dome, which thus became its porch or portico, and its dimensions impress themselves as those of the actual portal. It must be added that Akbar intended his new capital to be a school of all the arts and that he allied architecture to painting. From the fragments of interior mural paintings which survive, it is clear that he employed Persian and Indian artists, who worked independently, and some idea of their technique is doubtless to be gathered from the miniatures of this period, as mural artists were also required to illustrate manuscripts.

2) The tomb of Salim Chisti is described and illustrated in Smith's work cited above and in F. Indian Art, Nrs. 64 (vol. viii., p. 41 and sqq.), 1898.
At Allāhabād, the city where Akbar was compelled by administrative duties to reside more than at his new but isolated capital, he built the pavilion of the Cālis Sītān or “Forty Pillars”, of which only the hall survives. Its plan is square, supported by eight rows of columns, eight in each row, making sixty-four in all; and it is surrounded by a deep verandah of double columns, with groups of four at the angles, all surmounted by bracket capitals of the richest design.

But perhaps the most characteristic of Akbar’s buildings, observes Fergusson, is his tomb at Sikandra, begun in his lifetime but completed by his successor. Unfortunately Dāhāngīr, in his Tikān (from 1548 to 1556), asserts that the greater part of Akbar’s work and reconstructed the tomb. But, seeing that the plan of the building is unique in India and has no Persian or Saracen parallel, it is more likely that only its exterior is the work of the fastidious orthodox Dāhāngīr. Its original plan was modelled on the Panāh Mahāll, being composed of five square terraces diminishing in size as they ascend. Thus the outline of the structure is pyramidal, not domical. Standing in an extensive garden it is approached by a single gateway and stands on a raised platform. Excluding the angle towers the lowest storey measures 320 ft. each way, and on this terrace stand three more, similar in design but more ornate, each about half the height of the lowest storey or terrace. Within and above the highest storey is a white marble enclosure, 157 ft. square, contrasting with the red sandstone of which the rest of the structure is built. The outer wall of this enclosure is entirely composed of beautiful trellis-work; and inside it is a colonnade or cloister, also of white marble, in the centre of which is placed the tomb of Akbar, resting on a platform of exquisite arabesque tracery. This doubtless typifies Akbar’s celestial resting-place, for below it lie his remains under a far plainer tombstone in the basement. That Dāhāngīr here departed from the original plan is certain. According to W. Finch, the tomb was to have been covered with a canopy of “curious white and speckled gold richly inwrought”. What Akbar planned and what he meant to express by his design must remain a matter of conjecture. Fergusson postulates a Buddhist model, and even sees in the pavilions which adorn the upper storeys reminiscences of the cells which stand on the edge of the great rock-cut rath at Māmalapram; but these may have been intended for use as a theological college like the rooms and pavilions in the upper storey of Humāyūn’s tomb. He also thought that a domical chamber over the tombstone formed part of the original design, since no such royal tomb remains exposed to the air in any Indian mausoleum — a dangerous generalization. Havell sees in the building an Indian five-storeyed Assembly-Hall, apparently a meeting-house for the royal order, the Dīn Ḫilī, the four lower pavilions (or terraces) corresponding to the four grades of the order. Even Cambodian influences have been conjectured 1). Yet it is not impossible that a Zoroastrian model was kept in view, as Akbar borrowed from that faith among others.

As compared with Akbar Dāhāngīr contributed little to the architectural magnificence of Mughal India. At Lahore, which he made his capital, he added the Bārā Khwāb-gah or greater sleeping apartment to the Fort; and the tomb of Anārkhā was also erected in that city. Near Srinagar in Kashmir he made the Shālmār gardens with their summer-houses; and the fine gateway to the Surā at Nūrnāhāl near Dājandhar is also ascribed to his reign. The quadrangle at Lahore was doubtless executed by Hindu artisans, as the colonnade which surrounds three sides of its area, is supported by pillars of red sandstone with bracket capitals and carved figures of elephants, peacocks and conventional animals like those found in the Red Palace at Āgra. Dāhāngīr’s greatest buildings were however erected at Dākka, in Eastern Bengal, where he made a new provincial capital in succession of Gavin; but his structures there were principally built of brick, covered with stucco, only the pillars and brackets being of stone, and they have been almost destroyed by the jungle. In one respect only did Dāhāngīr innovate. In 1600 he built the Mott Māsджīd or “Pearl Mosque” at Lahore, the first of its kind in India. Between Akbar’s style and that of Dāhāngīr little difference exists. The former had used colour ornamentation at Fathpur-Sikri; its later buildings were richly decorated with wall-paintings, and marble mosaic was used in the Djiām Māsджīd. Dāhāngīr relied still more on mosaic decoration, e.g. in Akbar’s tomb at Sikandra, but soon after its completion we find variegated marble mosaic supplemented by pīṭra dūra, as in I’timād al-Dawla’s tomb, and in the Tādji we still find inlay almost exclusively used. Akbar had continued the use of enamelled tiles at Fathpur-Sikri for roofing and more sparingly for ornamentation; and they were employed by Dāhāngīr at Sikandra and by Wāzīr Khān, his wazīr, on his mosque at Lahore. Indeed this mosque is only noteworthy on account of this decoration. Akbar had also introduced painting on interior walls.

Dāhāngīr’s wife Nur Mahāll or Nur Dāhān erected at Āgra the tomb of her father, I’timād al-Dawla, completed in 1628. Built almost entirely of white marble, enriched with semi-precious pīṭra dūra patterns, it foreshadowed the finest work of Shāh-Dāhān’s reign. Dāhāngīr’s tomb, at Shāh-darā near Lahore, has little architectural merit, consisting of a vast platform 209 ft. square, with a minaret at each corner. The façades are decorated with white marble let into the red sandstone and the flat roof with geometrical mosaics. The emperor’s remains are probably buried beneath an opening in the roof so that the rain and dew of heaven might fall on his tomb, as his earliest chronicler says 2). In brief the actual grave was hypaethral 3).

2) Muhammad Šāhī Kambū, in his Shāh-Dāhān-Nāma (also called the Amāli Šāhī in Elliot and Dowson’s Hist. of India, vii., p. 125) cited in Arch. Survey of India, Annual Rep., 1906—1907, p. 13.
3) A contrary view, that the tomb had a closed
THE EMISSARIES, a name often applied in the Ḥurūr to those followers of Muhammad who had migrated from Mecca to Medina with him. The word is derived from ḥāfiṣ, which does not mean “flight” but breach, dissolution of an association based on origin, in the place of which a new connection is formed. The term ṣaḥḥāf is not applied to the Prophet himself but to those who migrated with him and later went on to make up a considerable portion of the population of Medina. The followers of the Prophet who were natives of Mecca were given the name Anṣār [q.v.] to distinguish them from the Muḥājirūn, because the migrants were not dependent on their help and active support after they had given up their homes and livelihoods in Mecca. It now became one of Muhammad’s main objects to arouse sympathy for them, because in the early days after their migration they were for the most part in very needy circumstances. With the greatest eloquence he describes them as the particular favourites of Allah who will receive a splendid reward for their sacrifices “when those who have adopted the faith, who have migrated and fought for Allah’s cause may hope for his grace” (Sūra ii. 215); “the sins of the emigrants and of those driven from home are forgiven” (iii. 191). Those who remained in Mecca and feared to migrate although the earth was large enough to afford them shelter were severely censured. He who emigrates finds a home on the earth and if he dies Allah will reward him (iii. 103). This was however at first only an imaginary hope which had not yet materialised, and in addition to these rosy utterances (cf. xvi. 43; viii. 75; xxii. 57) the Prophet made more practical efforts to help those who were living in difficult circumstances. A portion of the plunder taken in fighting was given to the poor emigrants who had been driven from their possessions in order to aid Allah: “they are the trustworthy” (lxxv. 8). In order to make the bond between them and the Medinese as tight as possible it is announced in Sūra vii. 73 that the emigrants who had left their homes to fight for the true religion and those who gave them shelter (cf. Ibn Ḥishām, p. 321 sqq.) and assistance (the Anṣār) should enjoy rights of kinship with one another while on the other hand, those who, while adopting Islam had not migrated, should not have any rights of kinship. According to the usual interpretation, this passage refers to the peculiar bond of brotherhood which Muhammad instituted between each emigrant and a Medinese believer, an explanation which is however not quite certain as the passage perhaps only expresses a general principle (cf. Fr. Buhl, Leben Muḥam- med’s, p. 209). Besides, the usual exegesis sees in the regulations for inheritance (Sūra iv. 13, 15) a proof that this special bond was very early abolished again.

AL-MUGHIRĀ B. SHU’BA


AL-MUGHIRĀ [See ALLĀH II.]

AL-MUḤĀDĪRŪNA

The high esteem in which the emigrants were held finds expression in Sūra ix. 20, where we read “those who believed and migrated and expended blood and treasure in fighting for the cause of Allah, occupy a higher position (than other believers); they are the fortunate ones”. Muḥādīr in this way became a title of honour (cf. Sūra xxix. 25 where Ḥādī is so called). Individuals who had migrated not to Medina but to Abyssinia also proudly called themselves muḥādīr (see Fr. Buhl, op. cit., p. 172). But the real “migration” was that to Medina in which the Prophet himself took part. The number of the Muḥādīrūn gradually grew as the increasing power of Muḥammad from time to time induced Meccans to leave their heathen city and go to Medina. It is to them that Sūra viii. 76 refers, where those who adopted Islam later than the first emigrants who migrated and afterwards fought alongside of the older Muḥādīrūn are acknowledged as belonging to the community (“they are of you”). After the treaty of Ḥudaybiyya [q.v.] in particular, we hear of Meccan women who left their pagan husbands and went to Medina where in accordance with Muḥammad’s interpretation of the treaty they were not surrendered if they once took the so-called women’s pledge (see Sūra lx. 11 sqq.). Thus the Muḥādīrūn, later and earlier, formed an increasing element in the population of Medina, whom Muḥammad often mentions along with other sections of the community as possessing equal rights with them (e.g. Sūra xxxiii. 6, 49) in which connection it should be noted that Muḥādīrūn is never, as was the case among the Anṣār, used in genealogies.

That these emigrants were specially dear to Muḥammad is easily intelligible, for they had shared his sufferings in Mecca and made the greatest sacrifices for him and included in their number men who had adopted his teaching out of pure conviction. With the occupation of Mecca, the migration ceased while the Muḥādīrūn remained as a separate highly honoured body. It is natural to suppose that a certain amount of rivalry might easily arise between them and the other elements of the community, and that there was actually a certain amount of friction between the emigrants and the Medinese is evident from the fact that in the troubles after the Prophet’s death the Medinese endeavoured to set up one of their number, Sa’d b. Ḫūdān, as successor to the Prophet. The attempt failed through the energetic action of Ṭāhir, Aḥbār Bakr and Aḥbā’i Ṭāhir, and the leadership of the community remained in the hands of the Muḥādīrūn until the descendants of Muḥammad’s old opponents in Mecca seized power for themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The biography of Muḥammad, especially Ibn Ḥishām, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 541 sqq. (FR. BUHL)

MUḤĀL [see MANTIṣ].

AL-MUḤALLAB B. ABI SUFRA, ABD SĀĪD AL-ĀZĪD, AN ARAB GENERAL. Al-Muḥallab is said to have been born two years before the death of Muḥammad. In the reign of Muḥāwiyah he used to campaign against the country between Kažib and Muhārān (44 = 664–665). He next distinguished himself in the expeditions of the governors of Khurāsān against Samarkand. Then however, he left the Umayyads and joined the anti-Caliph ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair who gave him the governorship of Khurāsān. When he was just about to start for there, he was appointed commander-in-chief in the war against the Azrāḳ
following the precedent set by Bābur. The sarcophagus is of white marble, inlaid with *pietra dura*, and it stands in an octagonal chamber 21 ft. high and 201/2 ft. in diameter. This chamber is enclosed in nearly solid walls of masonry. 56 ft. thick on all sides, and access to it is afforded by two oblong apartments, one on each side, but it does not open into any of the forty other rooms, behind the arches which surround the structure, each façade having a central arch with five smaller arches on each side.

Under Shāh-Djāhān (1627—1666) Mughal architecture attained its zenith. One of his earliest buildings was the incomparable Tādž Mahāl [q. v.], begun the year after the death of the empress, Asdujand Hānā Begam, entitled Mumtāz Mahāl, or the “Chosen One of the Palace”. For himself Shāh Djāhān planned a corresponding tomb of equal magnificence on the opposite bank of the river Djamnā, but Awrangzēb did not carry out the scheme, probably because it savoured of paganism.

Considerable controversy has raged over the question of its architect. Shāh-Djāhān’s style was essentially Persian, with an indefinable difference of expression, and it is sharply distinguished from those of Isphān and Constantinople by a lavish use of white marble, sumptuously decorated with *pietra dura*. Coloured tiles had by now become rare. Spacious grandeur was combined with feminine elegance, to which inimitable open-work tracery contributed. In the mosques colour was eschewed, and the finest art is found in the Pearl Mosques at Agra and Dihli. The former was built in 1646—1653. Meanwhile Shāh-Djāhān had founded Shāh-Djāhānābād, the great palace near modern Dihli, recently restored to something like its pristine beauty. A Persian engineer, ‘Ali Mardān Khān, had tapped the Djamnā 6 miles above Dihli, and his canal fed the new capital with many streams. The most favoured of them was the Nahr-i Bihāšt of “Stream of Paradise”, which was so named by Shāh-Djāhān himself. It fell in a cascade down a marble chute in a pavilion — the Shāh Būrgī — and flowing along the terrace which bordered the Hayat-Bakhtā (“life-giving”) garden, it traversed the chain of stately edifices that lined the eastern wall of the Palace — the Ḥamnām, Divvān-i Khāss and Khvāār-gāh — silently gliding beneath the Mīzān-i Inṣāf (“Balance of Justice”) across a sun-bathed court into the cool of the Imamī Mahāl or “Palace of Distinction”, styled later the Rāng Mahāl Kalān or “Greater Colour Palace”, from its elaborate painted decoration and gilding. Set on a marble terrace which formerly swept from end to end of the Fort, it overhung the Djamnā whose course then flowed along the base of the red sandstone walls. On the West an orchard separated it from the Divvān-i ‘Am. Thence, still southward, it passed through the Lesser Rāng Mahāl, the Mumtāz Mahāl and other buildings of the imperial castrum. Thus Dihli combined the Mughal love of enclosed gardens, watered by running channels, with their passion for architectural beauty. It preserved Bābur’s love of nature, and perhaps added to it a sense of landscape which also found expression in the Mughal gardens of Kashmir.

With Awrangzēb (1659—1707) set in the period of decline, due no doubt largely to that emperor’s orthodox prejudice against art, but partly also to his conscientious parsimony. He declined to complete Shāh-Djāhān’s tomb, ostensibly on the ground of expense, but also perhaps because he regarded the scheme as savouring of paganism. Yet he constructed at Benares the great mosque with its lofty graceful minarets, built a copy of the Dihli mosque at Lahore, and at Awrangzbād imitated, though on a smaller scale and with success, the Tādž in the tomb of his favourite wife. Awrangzēb’s own tomb, at Khuldībād, a hamlet just above the caves at Ellāt, is mean and insignificant. But some of his buildings, in spite of their incipient decadence, are the last great examples of the Mughal style. His Djamnī or Bādshāhī mosque at Lahore is pleasing in form, though the marble ornamentation of its great central and front façade is very inferior in detail to its prototype at Dihli. Its three domes of white marble and the imposing gateway of red sandstone and marble leading to it from the Ḥazīr Bāgh are its finest features.

Near Dihli the tomb (1756) of Nawwāb Sa’dar Djang, Wazīr of Oudh, is a passable copy of a Humāyūn’s mausoleum, but its interior is marred by indifferent plaster decoration.

At Lucknow, the capital of the Nawwāb Wazīr of Oudh, the buildings erected by that dynasty and its noblest descendant are to be classed as Mughal. The one exception is the vast Imāmābād, built by the fourth Nawwāb, ‘Āṣaf al-Dawla, in 1784. Conceived on a grand scale for the celebration of the Maharram according to the Shi’a rite, its details will not bear close examination, though its solidity is impressive. The buildings of the Maharram dynasty of Mysore (1760—1777) have still less claim to be regarded as Mughal.

To conclude, the architecture of the Mughals was, like all their arts, a resultant of many forces.
But its essential distinction over Hindu art lay in its balanced use of purely Indian and imported techniques; while it recognised the value of symbolism in its structures, it never made its arts merely a vehicle for symbols, as Hindu sculpture tended to do.


MUGHAMMAK: According to historians MUGHAMMAK was a valley near Mecca on the borders of the sacred area. According to tradition, Abraha [q.v.] ordered his army to encamp here when he was going to attack Mecca, but was prevented from doing so as birds slew his soldiers by dropping stones on them. In Mughammas is shown the tomb of the Tā’fī Abū Righāl who died here after acting as guide to Abraha. He was so hated by the Meccans for this that the custom grew up of casting stones on his grave [cf. Al-MAJRAK]. Whether this explanation is true or not is unknown, but in any case a verse of Hassān b. Thābit (ed. Hirschfeld, LXII), shows that in the time of the Prophet the mention of his name was sufficient to insult the Tā’ifs. The antiquity of the custom of stoning his tomb is shown by a verse of Dājjār: “When al-Farazād died, stone him as you stone the grave of Abū Righāl.”


FR. BÜHL)

AL-MUGHIRA B. SHUBA, of the sept of the Ḩathīf, a subdivision of the Ḥathīf, further a member of the clan of the Banū M‘āṭīb — guardians of the sanctuary of al-Lat — and nephew of ‘Urwah b. Mas‘ūd [q.v.], companion and martyr. For having attacked and plundered some travelling companions during their sleep, he was forced to leave Tā’fī, his native town, and came to Medina to offer his services to Muhammad. The latter used him to attract the Ḥathīf to Islam and after the submission of Tā’fī, sent him to this town to supervise the destruction of the national sanctuary and the liquidation of the treasure of al-Lat. In the caliphate of Abū Bakr, although he never succeeded in attaining to one of the great posts which were reserved for the Kurajsh, Mughira was able to keep a position in governing circles. ‘Ōmar, while under no illusions about his morals, appointed him governor of Başra. A scandalous incident temporarily interrupted his administrative career. He was accused of adultery. The evidence was overwhelming: instead of having him stoned, ‘Ōmar only dismissed him. Mughira holds in tradition the record for marriages and divorces; the figures of 300, 700 and 1,000 are given. In the year 21 (642), recalled to public life, he was appointed to the important governorship of Kūfah. His slave Abū Lu‘yān, who lived in Medina, assassinated the Caliph ‘Umar. Under ‘Uthmān, Mughira retired to private life. In the reign of ‘Ali, he withdrew to Tā’fī to watch the course of events. He went without having been invited to the conference of Adhrā [q.v.]. In 40 (660), taking advantage of the general confusion that followed the assassination of ‘Ali, he produced an alleged certificate of appointment from Mu‘āwiyah and took over the control of the annual pilgrimage.

The great Sufyānī was able to appreciate at their true value auxiliaries of the stamp of Mughira, one of the chief dā’iyas of his time, the man “who could get himself out of the most hopeless difficulty”: “if (it was said) he were shut behind seven doors, his cunning would have found a way to burst all the locks”. Of shocking morals, free from any attachment to the ‘Alīd party, equally free from any claims to the caliphate, free from the jealousies of the Kurajsh, and, as well as the narrowmindedness of the Anṣār clan, a member of the intelligent and enterprising tribe of Ḥathīf, everything attracted Mu‘āwiyah’s attention to him. In the year 41 (661), this Caliph appointed him governor of Kūfah, a region disturbed by the intrigues of the Shī‘a and the continual risings of the Khaṭībdīs. Mughira succeeded in not compromising himself with the former: he was content to advise them to avoid any too striking outburst. Now nearly sixty, the able Ḥathīf felt the unusual ambition of remaining where he was and of finishing his troubled career in peace and honour. This opportunist, who had come over to the Sufyānīs after cool calculation, felt little desire to sacrifice his own peace and leisure for the consolidation of the Omayyad dynasty; he was solely concerned with keeping on the right side of the sanguinous Mu‘āwiyah. The sudden rising of the Khaṭībdī leader Mustawrid failed to disturb his equanimity. With remarkable cleverness he was able to let loose against these rebels their born enemies, “the fine flower of the Shī‘a”. Whichever was victorious, it could not fail to lighten his responsibilities. By setting them against one another he rendered harmless the most dangerous elements of disorder in his province. The crushing of the Khaṭībdīs enabled him to breathe freely.

Thanks to this combination of mildness and astuteness, and by knowing when to shut his eyes, Mughira succeeded in avoiding desperate measures against the people of the ‘Irāq, who were a continual source of trouble, and succeeded in retaining his position. He was even regretted by his former subjects after he was gone. Not quite satisfied, Mu‘āwiyah thought of breaking this lieutenant of his who was playing a double game. Mughira was always able at the opportune moment to provoke troubles which required the continuation of his services. In this way he prepared the return to favour of Ziyād b. Abīhi [q.v.], destined to be his successor. He is also said to have disarmed the Caliph’s suspicions by suggesting the plan of proclaiming Yazid heir-apparent. As the general situation had considerably improved in the ‘Irāq and order prevailed, on the surface at least, the Caliph left him in office till his death, the date of which is uncertain but which must be placed between 48 and 51 (668—671). Mughira died, the plague at the age of about 70.
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**K. V. ZETTERSTÉEN**

**AL-MUHALLABI, ABDU’L MUHAMMAD AL-HASAN B. MUHAMMAD, A VIZIER OF MU’IZZ AL-DAWLA.**

He belonged to Bajra and was born in Muharram 291 (31 Dec. 390). In 334 (945) when Mu’izz al-Dawla was marching northward, he sent him in advance to negotiate with the Caliph and on Ljumála I, 27, 359 (= Nov. 950) al-Muhallabi was appointed vizier. He was given the supreme command in the war with Imam b. Sháhín [cf. Mu’izz al-Dawla] and had brought him into a very precarious position when he himself fell into an ambush and could only save himself with difficulty, whereupon Mu’izz al-Dawla had to conclude a truce with Imam. In 341 (952—953) the ruler of Oman, Yúsuf b. Wáqí’l, undertook a campaign against Bajra; al-Muhallabi, however, anticipated him, occupied the town and defeated Yúsuf. In the same year, he fell into disgrace but was able to retain his office and the good relations between Mu’izz al-Dawla and his vizier were restored. A few years later, Mu’izz al-Dawla equipped an expedition against Oman and put al-Muhallabi in command. The latter set out in Ljumála II, 372 (= June/July 963) but soon fell ill and decided to return to Rayhad. He died on the way on 26th Sháhín of the same year (= 19th Sept. 963) and was buried in Rayhad. On his death Mu’izz al-Dawla confiscated all his property, which aroused general indignation.


**MUHAMMAD, THE FOUNDER OF ISLAM, was a native of the city of Mecca.**

The energetic Khùsáf had in the sixth century created a flourishing centre of commerce by exploiting the much visited places of pilgrimage there. In consequence of the unlikelihood of the sources at our disposal the very question a biographer has to ask, namely when was his hero born, cannot be answered with certainty. That Muhammad’s activity in Medina covered ten years (622—632) is certain; but we have no certain data for the Meccan period. There is however no cogent reason to doubt the statement in a poem ascribed sometimes to Abū Ka‘b b. Abi Amr and sometimes to Usámah b. Thābit (ed. Husainfeld, *NÖ* 19, 1) to the effect that his prophetic activity in Mecca lasted “ten and some years”. The parallelism between the two periods, which might be brought forward as a ground of suspicion, is not complete, and on the other hand, the annual recurrence of the great pilgrimage at Mecca must have made it easy for the inhabitants to reckon by them, so that a chronological statement originating there deserves more confidence than others. The Meccan period in any case must not be put too short. According to ‘Urwa’s story mentioned below (Tabari, *l. c.* 1181), “seven years” passed after the migration of his followers to Abyssinia before they returned, after which new difficulties arose which produced the migration to Medina. — For the period before he came forth as a religious reformer we have only the indefinite expression *anaw* (Sîra x. 17).

**The Encyclopedia of Islam, III.**
The only thing certain from the Qur'an is that Muhammad grew up as an orphan in very miserable circumstances (Sûra, xiii. 6 sq.). The first tangible historical figures among his relatives are his uncles: Abû Tâlib, with whom tradition records that he found a kindly reception; Abû Bakr, Hamza [q.v.] and Abû al-Âzîz [cf. Abû Lahab]. On the idyllic little story of the boy's stay with the Median sheikhs, b. Bahîr, see the article JâLÎMA. The story of the cleansing of his breast (a similar story is related of Ummayy b. Abî 'Âsâ'; cf. Goldziher, Abb. d. Arab. Phil., i. 213) is a materialisation of Sûra xiv. 1.

In Sûra xiii. already quoted, we are told that Allah made the poor orphan prosperous. Corresponding to this in tradition is the marriage of Muhammad with a rich merchant's widow, in whose service he had been [cf. KHAĐÎJA]. She bore him four daughters, who play a part in later history, and several sons all of whom died in infancy: one of them at least must be his historical as his pagan name was Abû Manâf (Sprenger, i. 199 sq.; Caetani, i. 173): could not be invented by later writers; such a fiction in any case, as posthumous comfort to alleviate the disgrace of the lack of male heirs (Lammens), would be very inadequate, if it had to make the sons die again after their death. The interest in business matters apparent in the Qur'an (Sûra ii. 194; Is.l. 9 sq.) as well as his fondness for business expressions (cf. however similar expressions in the Wisdom of Solomon, iv. 20; Pirg. Abot, iii. 16; iv. 22; Horn, Gesch. d. Pers. Lit., p. 10) are very natural if Muhammad took part in business transactions as Khaṭîja's assistant and husband. On the other hand, it would be wiser to set aside the alleged trading journeys into neighbouring lands, which is said to have made even as a child with Abû Talib and later in Khadyja's service: in the form in which they are given, they have distinctly apologetic tendencies [cf. Bâkıra] and are quite unnecessary to explain his later religious development. Sûra xxxvii. 137 sq. in any case is referring to a period which however might be interpreted merely as a polite formula; cf. Song of Solomon, vi. 2; Dalman, Patristischer Divan, p. 190, 255 sq.; E. Littmann, Neuhochdeutsche Volkssprache, p. 141). On the other hand, the Meccan enemies of the Prophet say in Sûra xiii. 30 that they would have been more confident if he had been one of the prominent men of the two cities (Mecca and Ta'f). The Hashim family in any case could not compare with the most prominent families like the Makkûh and Cmâyâh: and what is recorded of the needy circumstances of Muhammad and some of his relatives suggests that the Hashim family must have been exceedingly poverty stricken at this time. On his mother's side he had connections, which are not clear to us, with Medina [cf. Amîna and Hashim]; according to Mâsâ b. 'Uqîla the Medineans called Abû al-Mutallib their "sister's son" (cf. Ibn Sa'd, i. 128, 8, 12). We know nothing more that is definite about his own life or of what is related is legend. His father, who is said to have died before his birth, is quite a colourless figure, whose name 'Abû Allâh is perhaps only a later improvement on a heathen name. His grandfather is called Shaib or Abû al-Mutallib; the connection between these two names is however obscure as is that between Abû al-Mutallib and the oft mentioned family of Mutallib (Hashim b. Thälîb, nº 154, 2; Ibn Hâschim, p. 230, 13, 156, 14; or the Banû Shâibah (Ibn Sa'd, 1/1, 94; 1/1, 124; 29).
he relates of Mary, Joseph, Zacharia and John; the story of the Seven Sleepers (cf. Aqīb al-Kaḥf and M. Huber, Die Wanderlinge von den Siebenschlafern, 1910) also presupposes Christian authorities. One therefore cannot blame his enemies when they said that he had foreign teachers (xvi. 105; xxv. 5 sq.; xlv. 13), which is certainly not related by the reply in xvi. 105. Further it is clear from the Kur'ān that he did not come into contact in this indirect way with the books of the Bible in their simple form, but that his authorities had drawn on Midrashic and Apocryphal works, which is easily explained by the varied and luxuriant character of the religious tendencies in Arabia. In particular what he tells of the birth and childhood of Jesus (xxix. 22 sq.; iii. 41; v. 109 sq.) comes from Apocryphal sources, and his account of the death of Jesus (iv. 156) has parallels among the Manichaean and Buddhist.

To state exactly what religion exercised particular influence on Muhammad's ideas is hardly possible in view of the scanty information and the lack of conditions in these "possessors of a scripture" — Judaism and Christianity — and he was conscious of this, in as much as he repeatedly emphasised the agreement between his teaching and these older religions of revelation as irrefutable evidence of its truth (cf. the significant passage: "If thou art in doubt about what We have revealed, ask them who read the scripture before thee", Sūra x. 94). The only question is, in what way did he become possessed of these new ideas. This much only is certain, that he did not get them from his own reading of the holy scriptures of the Jews and Christians. The word ummī (q. v.) applies to him (Sūra vii. 156) signifies, without committing us to anything about his ability in reading or writing — as a merchant he must have had a certain knowledge of these arts — that he was an illiterate layman, who was not able to read the Hebrew or Greek Bible, and that this was actually the case, the Kur'ān shows on every page. For this explanation of the term Wensinecke, Acta orient., ii. 191 and (citing the Hebrew ummī ḫaššālim) Horovitz, Kornische Untersuchungen, p. 52 would put "pagan", Enaj, but, although this might fit some passages, it could hardly suit Sūra ii. 73 where there is a reference to a difference between the "possessors of a scripture" and the musallānān among the Jews. The usual explanation suits well enough, as it is certain and it is confirmed by the Kur'ān everywhere that, while Muhammad had some notion of the books of the Bible, the Hebrew and Greek Bibles were closed books to him. Utterances like the saying that Jesus "received" the Gospels (iii. 44; v. 50; iv. 27) and that it should be "observed" like the law (v. 70, 72) clearly show that he did not know its real contents. Sūra xxi. 105 contains a quotation from the Psalms, but this is quite an isolated instance and he knew nothing of the Psalms as a part of the Old Testament (xvii. 57). The parable of the camel and the eye of a needle (vii. 38) proves of course no literacy dependence and the alleged description of Muḥammad and his followers in the Gospels (xlv. 29) shows what he could build up on a vague recollection of something he had heard. On the other hand the stories reproduced, e. g. the long account of Joseph (Sūra xii.), show that he was indirectly dependent on the Bible and not only on the Old but also on the New Testament (cf. what
which decided the whole course of his life: he felt himself called to proclaim to his countrymen as a prophet the revelations which were communicated to him in a mysterious way. When Caecum wishes to see in this the result of a long development and continued reflection, this is certainly not correct. We must rather oppose to the tradition which tells of a sudden outbreak of conviction that he was called to proclaim the Word of God. For this view we have the analogy of prophets in general, from the Old Testament prophets down to Joseph Smith; and no long drawn reflections but only an overwhelming spiritual happening could give him the unshakable conviction of his call. This is also confirmed by several passages in the Koran, which point to a deciding moment, definite in time (xlv. 2 sq.; xxviii. 11; n. 184), in which connection it is of minor importance whether it is possible to identify the revelation of the call itself among the Suras of the Koran (according to a common opinion, xcvii. 1 sqq.; according to some, on the basis of its language, xcvii. 1 sqq.; especially as one must reckon with the possibility that the very earliest revelations were not written down. If this really was the case, however, the reason certainly was not that they were deliberately suppressed, since a revolutionary change of his world of ideas into its diametrical opposite while retaining the earlier apparatus of inspiration would be quite an untenable hypothesis.

The Koran gives only a few hints about the manner of these inspirations; a veil lay over them which the Prophet either could not or would not raise completely. Perhaps the wrapping up (lxxviii. 1; lxxxiv. 1) refers to a preparation for the reception of the revelations in the manner of the old Arab kätaru; but we are taken further in an indirect way by the oft recurring accusation of his enemies that Muhammad was possessed (massignin), a soothsayer (kätän), a magician (safar), for they show that in his moments of inspiration he made an impression similar to those figures well known in ancient Arabia. In addition there are several traditions which describe his condition in such moments more fully and may undoubtedly be regarded as genuine, since they are the last thing later Muhammadanism might be expected to invent, while these mysterious seizures afforded to those around him the most valid evidence for the superhuman origin of his inspirations. In Byzantine authors we find it stated that the Prophet was an epileptic (e.g., Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. de Boor, i. 334); and modern psychiatrists recognize the correctness of the e descriptions of his attacks; we must of course leave it to them to define the exact nature of his condition. From the scientific point of view the fact is that the voice heard by him only uttered what he had from time to time heard from others and which now cropped up out of his subconscious. The scientific student therefore does not see in Muhammad a deceiver but fully agrees with the impression of sincerity and truthfulness which his utterances in the older revelations make (e.g., Si. 8, 16, 20, 113; xxviii. 85 sq.); Isl. 44: 16 sq.; cf. vii. 202; xvi. 100; the cogent impevements lxxv. 21; xcvii. 1; the self-denunciation lxxv. 1 sqq., etc.) along with the fact that he upheld his enduring years of hostility and humiliation in Mecca, the unshakable conviction of his lofty task. It is more difficult with the later Medinese revelations, in which it is only too easy to
detect the human associations, to avoid the sup-
position that his paroxysms (e.g. at the battle of
'Tahira: Ibn Hisân, p. 444: in the slandering of
NSS. of his enemies, he artificially
bought off, and there is even a tradition which
makes 'Aisha say to the Prophet: "Thy Lord
seems to have been very quick in fulfilling thy
prayers". It must not be forgotten however that
taures like this, without actually being conscious of
of it, are able to provoke the same states of exci-
tation, which earlier races without their assistance;
and so probably not only were his followers
in Medina (cf. Kâb b. Malik in Ibn Hisân, p. 614): but even he himself convinced, that
the spirit was continually hovering about him to
communicate the revelations to him. By this
we do not of course mean that in his ecstatic
condition he received the divine communications
in the air, as we now have them in the Kur'ân:
only the foundations were given him, which he
earlier developed into discourses of greater
length. Since in doing this he used the external
forms of the old Arab soothsayers it is natural
that the Meccans took him for one, but it does
not follow that he was spiritually akin from
the first to those soothsayers who were inspired by
djins. The inclination with which he objects
to being associated with them is not a proof of
such a relationship of which he wished to rid
himself, simply because he was conscious of the
similarity, but a natural result of the fact that
the enlightened Meccans saw in persons of this
kind licentious fanatics of the lowest kind, while
he was firmly convinced that he was filled with
quite a different spirit, one quite unfamiliar to
his enemies.

While it is in this way possible with the help of
the Kur'ân and Tradition, to get an on the
whole satisfactory picture of Muhammad's develop-
ment and his condition when prophesying, he him-
self gives in the Kur'ân quite a different interpretation of
the revelations that came to him, which is based
on a peculiar theory which he apparently did not
invent himself but adopted from others. The
fundamental idea in it is the conception of a
divine book existing in heaven, al-Kitâb, a well
conceived book, which only the pure may touch (Ixxvii. 76 sqq.); a well guarded tablet (Ixxxv. 21 sqq.),
the master of the book (xlii. 2 sqq.), on heavenly
leaves, exalted and pure, by the hands of noble
and pious scribes (Ixxxv. 13 sqq.). He himself did
not read this book, as E. Meyer erroneously thinks,
but it was communicated to him orally piece by
piece, not in its original form but in an Arabic
version intelligible to him and his countrymen
(cf. xlii. 1; xlii. 37; xx. 112; xlvii. 102 sqq.; xl.
2; liiv. 58 and especially xlv. 44: "If we had
made it a Kur'ân in a foreign tongue, they would
say: Why are its signs not expounded intelligibly, a
foreign text and an Arab reader"). In
addition there is the fact that Muhammad was aware
that the complete contents of the book were
not communicated to him, as he expresses states,
e.g. of the stories of the prophets, not all of
which were related to him (xlvii. 78; iv. 162). He
received the communications orally, Allah rehear-
sing to him the substance of the separate sections
(Ixxxv. 16 sqq. etc.), while in several passages it
is stated more precisely that the revelations were
communicated through the Spirit (xlvii. 162 sqq.;
xvi. 104; xlii. 52) or the Angel (xvi. 2; xv. 8;
cf. liii. 5 sqq.; lxiii. 23 sqq.); a late passage of the Medina period (li. 91) is even more precise in
saying that they were communicated by Gabriel.
References to visions are rare (e.g. the encouraging
apparitions in Sûra vii. 45; Sûra viii. 27; the night
journey must also have been a vision) and even in
such cases the main thing is not what he heard (lii.
10; lxvi. 10). These communications were the
great miracle that was granted him, while he
expressly and repeatedly says that the ability to
perform miracles in the usual sense was denied to
him (unlike Jesus).

From this book in heaven, the all-compromising
contents of which are not by any means exhausted in
the extracts forming the Kur'ân, also came the
older religions of revelation of the possessors of
a scripture, whose religions are therefore in his view
coincident with his and, as he often says, were
confirmed by it (cf. Hassân b. Thâlit, No. 134.3). This
again is connected with a theory expounded
by him of a line of prophets which began with
Adam, and of which he was the last representative.
His source for this idea was not Judaism, for
he does not know of the great prophets who
wrote books of the Old Testament; instead of them
he mentions individuals, whom the Jews do not
count as prophets, e.g. Lot, Joseph, Solomon, Job,
etc.; on the other hand the fact that Jesus and
John the Baptist are the last links in the chain of
prophets clearly suggests a Christian origin, and
though parallels in more or less heretical early Christian
literature can be demonstrated. Of the prophets
Muhammad relates a number of stories, which do
not begin to appear in any number until the
middle Meccan period when the Meccans were
beginning sharply to reject his mission.

The ideas in the oldest, passionately excited
inspiration, developed under a baroque power of
imagination rarely reached later, are very simple.
They are based not on the dogmatic conception
of monotheism but on the strong general religious
and moral impression which contact with older
religions had made upon him, which was bound
finally to lead to a breach with polytheism. In
particular he was filled with the idea of the moral
responsibility of man created by Allah, and with
the idea of the judgment to take place on the day of
resurrection, which again points undoubtedly more
to Christian than Jewish influence (especially
the introductory sounding of trumps, not found among
the Jews). To this are added vivid descriptions
of the tortures of the damned and seductive pictures
of the joys of Paradise, which are further of interest
because they reveal Muhammad's strongly sensu-
al temperament. Gradually monotheism was empha-
sized as an overruling basic idea and at the
same time he attained a somewhat weakened concept of the Deity. With all the vigour of an elemental
religious nature, he points to the wonders of
everyday life, especially to the marvellous pheno-
menon of man (in this connection cf. the poem
of the Jew Sama'il, al-Iraq, ed. Al-Bawqâî, No. 209.) The religious duties which he imposes on
himself and others are simple and few in number; one
should believe in God, appeal to Him for forgiveness
of sins (xxviii. 11), offer prayers frequently on
the model of the Jews and Christians, in the night
also (xi. 116; lxiii. 20: cf. lxvi. 25 sq.); assist one's
fellows, especially those who are in need, free
oneself from the love of delusive wealth and — what
is significant for the commercial life of Mecca — from all forms of cheating (xxvi. 182 sq.; lv. 8 sq.), lead a chaste life and not expose newborn girls, as the barbarous custom of the time was (according to Sūra vi. 152, xvii. 33 from poverty, cf. al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 277; originally perhaps a kind of magic to procure sons, when only girls had been born, cf. Musil, Lātīn-ʿArab., p. 38; even before Muhammad's time there had been people who fought against this barbarous custom, cf. al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, loc. cit.). This is the ideal of the truly pious man who is called by the name of musulm (lxvii. 35; xxi. 108 etc.) or bānī (s. 105; xxi. 29; xvii. 4; cf. vi. 79 and the article). Cf. in this connection the list of Muhammad's precepts in Alāʾ's poem (Ibn Hisnām, p. 255: Morgenlandische Forschungen, p. 25 sq.).

From all this, it is quite evident that Muhammad had at this time no thought of founding a new religion. His task was only to be a "warner" (li. 59; lixv. 2; lixiv. 45; lxxv. 11; lxxviii. 21 sq.), in view of the approach of the kiss of judgment, to his countrymen, whom no prophet had yet been sent (vi. 157; xvii. 46; xxii. 3; xxiv. 43; xxvi. 51; no notice is taken here of Hūd and Sālih) and as a result of the revelations granted him to give them, in the form of a lucid Arabic Qurʾān (see above), what the "possessors of a scripture" had in their scriptures, which were not accessible to the Arabs and thereby to save them from the divine wrath. The Jews and Christians also must therefore testify to the truth of his preaching (s. 94; xvi. 45; xxi. 7; xcvii. 197; xxviii. 52 etc.). On account of the insufficiency of the sources, it is very difficult to ascertain in detail how Muḥammad's relations with the Meccans developed. The Qurʾān contains only vague hints, which permit no chronological arrangement, and the traditions are very full but little reliable. Only one report, which ʿUrwā composed for the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (Tabari, i. 1150 sq.; 1224 sq.), the value of which has already been indicated by Spenger, gives a brief but apparently trustworthy glimpse of the main events (cf. also al-Zahiri in Ibn Saʿīd, ii. 133). At first Muhammad met with no serious opposition and in not a few cases his preaching fell on fruitful soil: indeed in the words addressed to Sāliḥ (xi. 64) we may find a hint that he had at first aroused considerable expectations among the Meccans. All traditions agree that Khadijah was the first believer, while they differ as to who was the first male adherent. In any case Abī Bakr, the manumitted slave Zaid b. Ṣāhīḥa, Ḳabīr b. al-ʿAwwām, Ťalha b. ʿUbayd Allāh, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAfī. Saʿīd b. ʿAbī Waṣāṣ, and Muhammad's cousin ʿAli [q. v.] were among his earliest followers. The majority of those who were won over by his preaching were however young and of no great social standing, while the well-to-do and influential held back (xix. 74; xxi. 30 sqq.; xxviii. 62 sq.; lixiv. 11; lxxv. 1 sqq.; cf. the veiled references in vii. 73; xi. 29; xvii. 17; xxvi. 111). This became still more the case when the full consequences of his ideas became clear to him and he openly attacked the religion of his native town; for the Meccans, to the majority of whom such devotional meetings had been a matter of complete indifference, now discovered that a religious revolution might be dangerous to their fairs and their trade. That this was the salient feature of their resistance to Muhammad is evident from the fact that he frequently endeavours to calm the fears of the Kurānī on this point: the Meccan sanctuary, he said, belonged to his god Allāh, whom the Meccans also recognised as the highest god (xxvi. 24; xxix. 39; cf. Kaʿīs b. al-Khaṭím, ed. Kowalski, v. 14; xii. 12 where Allāh is the Lord of the Kaʿbah) and he will protect and bless his sanctuary, if they submit to him (xxvii. 93; xxvii. 57; xxix. 67; cvi. 1 sqq.). In addition there was the conservative attitude of these merchants in the field of religion and their animosity to new and fantastic ideas, particularly to that of the resurrection of the dead.

Traditions record at great length the persecution and ill treatment which Muhammad and his followers suffered at the hands of the Meccans. These descriptions are undoubtedly much exaggerated, for the object was to glorify the self-sacrifice of the believers and no doubt also to put the old patrician families of Mecca in an unfavourable light. But it is equally certain that there is some foundation for these stories, for ʿUrwā speaks of two turns (jumma) which twice forced the believers to migrate, and in the Kurān there is mention of "trials" which their opponents inflicted upon the believers, men and women (lxxv. 10), and it is expressly mentioned that the influential wished to prevent Muhammad from praying (xvi. 9 sq.; cf. the veiled account vii. 84), while on the other hand, the complaints about what they would have liked to do should not be taken at their face value without more ado (vii. 26; xxi. 17; xviii. 78; cf. xi. 93). The peculiar feature, repeatedly found in stories of the prophets, that their opponents threaten them and their followers with stoning (Sūra xi. 93 and frequently) might suggest the hypothesis that Muhammad was actually threatened in this way by the Meccans, but this would probably only have been in a momentary outburst of passion and in any case the quarrel was mainly conducted in endless wordy disputations in which the spiritual advantage lay with Muhammad. His strength lay in the consciousness that he lived in a higher intellectual world which was closed to the Meccans and that he proclaimed ideas, "the equal of which neither men nor djinn with combined efforts could produce" (xvii. 90). Very pertinently he often points to the lack of logic in his enemies, when they recognise Allāh as the real true God but will not draw the logical deductions from this. But even his most crushing arguments rebounded from the impregnable wall of their prejudices which were based on their material interests. This contumacy now began to influence the matter of his preaching in a very remarkable way. When his opponents mocked him because the divine judgment threatened by him did not come (xxviii. 15; lxx. 5) he began to describe in an increasing degree in his stories how the contemporaries of earlier prophets had met them with incredulity and had therefore brought on their heads dreadful punishments. That he did not use such means at the very beginning of his mission is evident from the fact that his preaching, according to the already mentioned credible tradition, at first gave no offence, and indeed this feature is lacking in the sūras which are certainly the oldest. It was the hardness of heart of his countrymen which forced him to take to this weapon in order to stir them. At first it proved by no means ineffective, as the Arabs knew of old trading peoples like the
Hamid [q.v.], whose destruction might well give
them cause for reflection. But gradually this line
of attack lost its effect. To Muhammad however
the resistance to the obvious truth was something
so unintelligible that he could only find solace in
an idea, which was to be of far-reaching importance
in the further development of Muhammadan dogma-
nces: Allah, the immeasurably exalted and al-
mighty, could of course not be impeded by the
resistance of mortals; the unbelief of the Prophet’s
opponents was therefore an effect of the divine will: “Allah makes to err whom he will and guid- whom he will” (x. 99; xxxii. 12 sqq.; xxxv. 9; lviii. 34 etc.), a view which his enemies endeavoured
not unskilfully to turn against himself (xii. 37;
xxvi. 47).

Several episodes stand out in the Meccan period
which are unfortunately more or less obscure and
may be interpreted in various equally uncertain
ways. It is certain, in spite of the silence main-
tained about it in the Kur'an (even xvi. 45 sq.
does not refer to it), that Muhammad’s commu-
ity was at one time in so great distress that a con-
siderable section of them migrated to Abyssinia.
The later view was that participation in this flight
became a patent of nobility similar to that conferred
by the great Hijra to Medina, which was actually
granted as a titular distinction (Weilhassen, Niss-
zen, iv. 113); but the Prophet gave the advice to seek
protection among the Abyssinian Christians;
ly to those of his followers, of whom he was aware
that they had not sufficient strength to maintain
their faith under the difficult conditions in Mecca
(cf. the significant story of the cool reception
which some of the exiles later received on their
return to Medina; Bukhari, ed. Kreidl, ii. 128)
M. Hartmann’s view that the emigrants were to
conduct political propaganda in Abyssinia is not
capable of proof. According to ‘Umar, the emi-
grats (i.e. probably the greater number of them)
returned to their native town, when Islam had
become strengthened by the accession to its ranks
of a number of individuals of position. At the
same time there is a different story of their return,
which it would not be difficult to combine with
‘Umar’s story if we assume that they gradually
drifted back. We are told that Muhammad pro-
claimed in one of his sermons that the favorite
deities of the Meccans, al-Lat, al-Uzza and Manat
[see these articles], might be regarded as divine
beings whose intercession was effectual with Allah.
This led to a general reconciliation, news of which
reached Abyssinia and induced a number of the
Muslims there to return home. Here however they
learned to their horror that the agreement had been
of short duration, as the Prophet had very
soon recognised these words as interposit as of
Satan, and had substituted for them the words which
we now have in Sura lxi. 19—23. The credibility
of this story has been doubted, certainly wrongly:
br for in view of the absolute impossibility of such
a story being a later invention, any possible ob-
jections to the reliability of the authorities cited
(Tahari, i. 1192, 1195; Ibn Sa’d, iii. 137 sq.) hardly
deserve consideration and passages like vi. 56,
57; xvii. 75 sqq. (cf. iv. 113) amply show that the
incident was quite possible from the psychol-
ogical point of view.

It is much more difficult to elucidate another
episode of the Meccan period, the story of the
boycott of the Hashimids. That Muhammad’s whole
position during his struggle with the Meccans was
only made possible by the support given him by
his own family has already been indicated. All
members of the family of Hisham, the reception of
Abd Lahab [q.v.], who on this account is
perpetually damned in the Kur’an along with his
wife, chivalrously fulfilled their duty in this
respect, although only a few of them believed in
his call. It would therefore be not unnatural in
itself for the Meccans in the end to attempt to
make the whole family innocuous without bringing
on themselves the guilt of bloodshed by an open
attack. The story, however, which tells how they
forced the Hashimids to withdraw into their own
part of the town and pledged themselves to refrain
from intermarriage or commerce with them, is
confirmed neither by the Kur’an nor by ‘Umar,
but sounds in itself somewhat suspicious and is
probably much exaggerated. That the effort finally
failed is conceded by the story itself. On the
other hand, it is quite possible that Khadija’s
fortune may have suffered considerably from
Muhammad’s obligations to his necessary followers
and from the enmity of the influential merchant
princes.

To the last portion of the Meccan period most
probably belongs Muhammad’s nocturnal journey,
later so celebrated, to the “ remotest place of prayer”
which xvii. 1 (perhaps also verse 62) briefly refers,
no doubt a vision, which however make an impres-
sion of reality. According to the pre-
vailing opinion, the terminus of this journey was
the temple in Jerusalem, and conclusions are
drawn from this about the great significance which
this city then had for him. Schr 4 (f. vi. 1 sqq.) and Horovitz (loc. cit. ix. 156 sqq.) have how-
ever sought to show that musafir al-arš refers to
the place of prayer of the angels in heaven
(cf. vii. 205; xxxix. 75; for which view several
cogent arguments can be produced, notably that
the nocturnal journey is associated with the journey
to heaven as early as in the tradition given by Ibn
Ishaq and that in the Kur’an there several times a reference to an angel’s journey into heaven (vi.
35; xxxii. 6 sqq.; tv. 14 sq.)

Of other details we may further recall that
Muhammad, who, as already remarked, was firmly
convinced that his preaching agreed with the
religion of the “poissors of a scripture”, never-
theless had already begun in Mecca to reject the
christological dogmas of the church. This is cer-
tain from the conversation with his pagan opponents
(Ahin. 57 sqq.) which can only have taken place
in Mecca. This however does not affect his idea
of the fundamental identity of his with the other
revelations but only the false doctrine later adopted
in the church, for he makes Jesus vigorously reject
this doctrine of his divinity: but this limitation
of his theory was not without importance and was
able to serve him as a model in his later
criticism of Judaism.

The sources are somewhat fuller for the close
of the Meccan period. Although late tendentious
historiography has coloured everything in the
traditions. According to ‘Umar’s account, Mu-
hammad did, it is true, succeed in winning a few
notables in Mecca (including probably ‘Umar) for
his teaching, after the emigration of a number of his
fellow-Meccan to Abyssinia. But on the whole his
attempt at a religious reformation could be regarded
as having failed, and when Khadija and Abä
Tâhid died, his position gradually became more and more hopeless. An attempt to establish himself in Tâhid brought him into considerable danger, according to the narrative, although the approval of his preaching expressed by some djinns (cf. Al-Ma'âlik 11), certainly raised his drooping spirits. It was probably at this period that 'Abâ ibn 'Abî took him under his protection, which is corroborated by REFER (N9, III.vii.vii.). He could now have consorted himself with the reflection that he had done his duty; as a “warner” and could regard it as the will of Allâh that his contrivances were not to be saved (cf. x. 99; xili. Sg). But the consciousness of being a chosen instrument of Allâh had gradually become so powerful within him that he was no longer able to sink back into an inglorious existence with his object unachieved. His unassuming gift of being able to exert a powerful religious suggestion even on men who were intellectually superior to him impetuously demanded a wider sphere of activity than a small number of adherents, not only without influence. In addition, there was a factor of which he himself was certainly unconscious but which is apparent on every page of the Meccan sûras, namely his mental exhaustion. All this brought him to the idea of looking for a new sphere of activity outside Mecca, however difficult it must have been for an Arab to break the links that bound him to his tribe and family. The congress of people from all parts at the pilgrimage gave him good opportunities to attempt to find one. After several unsuccessful negotiations, he found a favourable soil for his scheme with some men from Medina. Unfortunately we know very little about conditions at this time in this town (q.v.) but we may safely assume that the large number of Jews in it had contributed to make the peasant population of Medina somewhat familiar with religious ideas (cf. Ibn Hishâm, p. 178).

There is however no question that the Medinese did not so much want to attract an inspired preacher to themselves as to get a political leader, who would readjust their political relations, which had been shattered in the tribal conflicts climaxing in the battle of Badr (q.v.). With this we are faced with one of the most difficult problems in the biography of Muhammad, the double personality, which he presents to us. The inspired religious enthusiasm, who ideas mainly centered around the coming last judgment, who had borne all insults and attacks, who only timidly touched on the possibility of active resistance (xvi. 127) and preferred to leave everything to Allâh’s intervention, with the migration to Medina enters upon a secular stage and at one stroke shows himself a brilliant political genius. That Muhammad’s eye in Mecca took in the wider political situation is evident from the prophecies in sûra xxx. 1 et seq.; but the passage is quite isolated there and in any case M. Hartmann’s effort (Die älteren Propheten, p. 53), to make him play the part of a far-seeking diplomat in international politics is based on fanciful arguments with no basis in the sources. Nevertheless in the despatch of a section of his followers to Abyssinia and in the attempt to reach a compromise with the polytheists in Mecca, we have hints which to some extent bridge over the gulf between the two figures. The decisive point however is that the Medinese would certainly not have thought of seeking in him a savior from their social and political difficulties, if they had not been much impressed by his abilities in this direction. After Muhammad had entered into relations with some Medinese who had come as pilgrims to Mecca, the latter began to spread Islam in their native town along with men whom he had sent there and thus he was able after a preliminary conference in al-‘Akabah (q.v.) to conclude at the pilgrimage next year (622) at the same place a formal agreement with a considerable number of Medinese, in which they pledged themselves in the name of their fellow-citizens, to take him into their community and to protect him as one of their own citizens, which, as the further history shows, was also to hold for his Meccan followers if they moved to Medina. Tradition, and no doubt rightly, here mentions only the promise of the Medinese to take Muhammad under their protection and not any further obligations. On the other hand according to Ibn Hishâm, p. 287, at the first conference at ‘Akabah Muhammad is said to have imposed a series of commands upon them; but this so-called “women’s homage” is, as the very name shows, taken from the later Sûra 1x. 12 and is clearly adapted to Meccan conditions (cf. especially the vow not to kill children). These negotiations, which could not remain unknown to the Meccans, produced great bitterness, and a second kitab, as ‘Urwâ says, began for the believers, which must have still more confirmed them in their resolution to migrate to Medina. They slipped away in larger or smaller bodies, so that finally only Muhammad with Abu Bakr and, according to the story, ‘Ali was left. That the Prophet did not go with the others was certainly due to the fact that the Meccans otherwise would have prevented the whole emigration. They knew him well enough to see the danger if he were to ally himself with another tribe and there is therefore no reason to doubt Tradition when it relates, although with much legendary embellishment (cf. on David’s flight: Tabaqat, i. 556), how he had to be the last to flee from the town. Tradition is also confirmed by Sûra 40 where there is mention of Muhammad and his companion (Abî Bakr) stopping in the cave.

The migration of the Prophet, the Hijra (q.v.), has been with justice taken by the Muslims as the starting-point of their chronology, for it forms the first stage in a movement which in a short time became of significance in the history of the world. According to the usual calculation, he arrived in Kûbah, a suburb of Medina, on the 12th Râdi’ of the first year, i.e. Sept. 24. 622 and shortly after went into his new home. The tasks which awaited him placed the greatest strain on his diplomatic and organizing abilities. He could only rely with absolute certainty on those who had migrated with him (the Muhâjirûn; q.v.) for their whole future existence depended entirely on him and of course only those had migrated who were familiar with the truth of his mission. In addition, there were those Medinese who had already adopted Islam or did so soon after his arrival, the so-called Ansâr (q.v.) or “helpers”, who however formed only a portion of the inhabitants of Medina. He only found direct opposition in a few families, like the ‘Aws Allâh; but at the same time there were a number who while they did not exactly oppose him only reluctantly accepted the new relations, the so called Munaqibah (q.v.), who were to cause
him much anxiety. Fortunately for him, they were led by a man, the Khaṣṣādī Abī Ummayy, who possessed the muqtaṣī quality of misrepresentation to such an extent that he regularly let slip every occasion on which he might have offered successful opposition. A further danger lay in the fact that the old and bitter feud between the two chief parties, the Jews and the Khaṣṣādīs, had by no means died down, but might easily break out again on any occasion. Finally there were the Jews (in the first place al-Kātimīn, i.e. the Nabūdī and Kurānī; cf. Kāsī b. al-Khaṭīm, ed. Kowalski, xx; Ḥasan b. Thābit, Nō. 216, 19; Ibn Ḥishām, p. 660 and Ibn Sa’d, viii. 86, 91) and the judaized tribes in Medina, who played an important part because of their wealth and the support they had in the Jewish colonies in Khābar etc. For Muḥammad they were on the whole a plus factor in his calculations for, according to his theory already mentioned, he ought to expect that they would champion the truth of his preaching. His relations with the Christians in Medina (cf. Ḥasan ib. Thābit, Nō. 153, 17) were no longer absolutely unimportant, since he had begun in Mecca to reject the orthodox Christians and to use them against the law and the Jews, who were insignificant and could be ignored. He also had a much greater sympathy with them than with the Jews (v. 85; lvii. 27).

Muḥammad had to form a united community out of these heterogeneous elements. The first problem to be tackled was how to procure the necessary means of subsistence for the emigrants, who were for the most part without means or work, which could for the time being only be done through the self-sacrifice of the Anṣār and certainly only very inadequately. To strengthen their claims for protection, he ordered the relationship of brotherhood to be created between each emigrant and a man of Medina. This arrangement, to which was added brotherhood between every two emigrants, was abolished after the battle of Badr by Ṣa’d xxxiii. 6 and left only a few traces with Ibn Sa’d, iii. xxxiv. On the other hand, we possess for a somewhat later period, when relations between Muḥammad and the Jews had begun to be strained, a very valuable document in Muḥammad’s constitution of the community which has been preserved by Ibn Ḥishām. It reveals his great diplomatic gifts, for it allows the ideal which he cherished of an umma definitely religious in outlook to sink temporarily into the background and is shaped essentially by practical considerations. It is true that the highest authority is with Allah and Muḥammad, but before whom all matters of importance are to be laid; but the umma included also Jews and pagans, so that the legal forms of the old Arab tribes had to be substantially preserved. This scheme had however no considerable practical importance: it is nowhere mentioned in the Kurān (hardly even in viii. 58), because it was soon rendered obsolete by the rapidly changing conditions.

It is a proof of the Prophet’s political wisdom that he endeavoured to attach the Jews to himself by taking over several features of their worship. Thus he made the 10th Muḥarram a fast-day, obviously in imitation of the Jewish fast on the 10th Thārī, the day of atonement, which is particularly obvious in its name, taken from the Aramaic ʿšūrān). On Jewish practice are probably also based the introduction of the midday salāt, which was now (ii. 239) added to the morning and evening salāts and the easier rule about purification before the salāt (iv. 46; v. 97). On the other hand, Friday as the day of the common salāt, which probably goes back to the Jewish day of preparation (cf. Becker’s correction to Ibn Sa’d, iii. 83, 23, in alh., iii. 519), is said to have been already introduced before the Hijra by Masʿūd b. Umair (according to others, Asad b. Zairaj). Whether the Friday of Jerusalem as the ʿidhā (cf. v. x.) was one of the concessions made to the Meṣṣāḥ Jews is uncertain as the statements about his attitude in Mecca on this point differ. But it is improbable that he should have turned towards the Kaḥā there, otherwise it is difficult to understand how the different stories could have arisen. But whether he then used Jerusalem as the ʿidhā, which need not necessarily mean a borrowing from the Jews, as this direction of prayer was elsewhere found in the east, e.g. among the Ebonites and Elle-alites, whether he turned to the east like many Christians, or whether he had a ʿidhā at all (the Kurān is silent on the point) is uncertain, but in any case the balance of probability is in favour of the Jerusalem ʿidhā having been one of the alterations made to gratify the Jews. If some writers have seen in the immediate erection of a place of prayer (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 336) a copying of the Jewish synagogues, Caetani has with weighty reason argued that this was not a building definitely assigned to the worship of God, since the alleged masjid was also used for all kinds of secular purposes, because in reality it was simply the court-yard (ṣarār) occupied by Muḥammad and his family, while the assemblages for regular worship were held on the miqāṣ (cf. MAIIF). But nevertheless the “mosque of opposition” so called by the Prophet with horror (Ṣūra ix. 108; see below) seems to have been an actual building recalling the Jewish synagogues. In spite of these concessions to the Jews, it soon became obvious that he had seriously miscalculated with regard to them. Although they undoubtedly cheri-hed lively expectations of the coming of the Mīṣṣāḥ (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 286, 373 617) they could not possibly recognize an Arab as the expected Mīṣṣāḥ and he had soon reason to lament that only a few among them believed in him (iii. 106). In particular, the misunderstandings in his reproduction of the Old Testament stories or laws aroused the notorious Jewish love of ridicule and thus brought him into an unfortunate position. His conviction of the divine origin of his mission and his position among the believers would not allow him to confess that he had made a mistake and on the other hand he had too often himself appealed to the testimony of the other religions of revelation to be able to ignore this criticism. He rescued himself from this dilemma by asserting that the Jews had only received a portion of the revelation (iv. 47; cf. iii. 115) and even this included a number of special laws adapted to a particular age (iv. 158; vi. 147; xvi. 119) but they had also concealed all sorts of things in their holy scriptures (i. 30, 141, 143, 169; iii. 64 etc.) and indeed had even falsified their scriptures (i. 56; iv. 48; v. 16, 45; vi. 162; cf. Ḥasan b. Thābit, Nō. 96., and the article ʿaṣurān), in short they obtained hardly more benefit from their scriptures than an ass from the books which he is carrying on his back (lvi. 5). The Jews were not able to refute these assertions for, although he challenged them to produce these scriptures
(iii. 87) neither he nor his followers could read a word of them. He therefore now poured forth the vials of his wrath upon the Jews in many speeches and awaited the time when he would be able to refute their criticism and malicious vituperation and tergitiation in convincing fashion (e.g. iii. 177 sq.; iv. 48). As he had begun to regard the church doctrine of the Christians as a corruption of the true teaching of Jesus, he felt himself called upon to reform the degenerate religions of revelation, each of which as he saw it was the only true one (ii. 107). As a result he now claimed a special place among the prophets: he is the seal of the prophets (xxixii. 40); a metaphorical expression which Mani among others applied to himself and which indicates the conclusion of the series, he is the last prophet, to whom Jesus himself had pointed under the name Ahmad (lxii. 6; cf. iii. 75). Still he is not thinking any more than before of introducing a new religion but only of restoring the religion proclaimed by the prophets from the beginning. But nevertheless the early years after the migration were the period when Muhammadanism was born as an independent religious system parallel with his criticism of the religions of revelation and in particular opposition to Judaism ran a positive shaping of Islam, through which he was emancipating himself in important points from his previous models. He gave his religion a pronounced national character by taking over various elements from the worship of the old Arabs and associating them with his religious ideas. In the second year of the Hijra (July 622—June 624) after some hesitation, he ordered that Jerusalem should no longer be the hajra at prayer but the ancient sanctuary of the Black Stone at Mecca (ii. 136—145) for it “is a gathering-place and a safe retreat for men” (ii. 119). His native town was thus made the centre of the true religion. As a substitute for the pilgrimage which he now adopted into his religion as one of the main rites, but from which he and his followers were temporarily cut off, he had an animal sacrificed in this year on the 10th Dhu-l-Hijja on the mawil or in Medina (Tabari, i. 1362; according to Ibn Sa'd, t.iii. 9 he continued this after the occupation of Mecca) and in the following year he calls the hajj one of the obligations of believers towards Allah (iii. 90 sq.). Frail retained its significance but was not to be a day of rest like the Jewish Sabbath (xxii. 9 sq.), which is connected with his rejection of the Old Testament idea of God resting after the creation (i. 37). In place of the fasting on Ashura, he substituted quite a new particular rite, according to which his followers were to fast throughout Ramadan, the month, in which he had received the fundamental revelation (i. 281), as long as the sun was visible in the heavens. The Manichaean had a similar cu-tom: but whether he took the new revelation from them or from another sect cannot be ascertained [cf. KAMALAN].

This nationalisation of Islam, which was to have so many results, gave Muhammad a final legitimisation, which brought it into harmony with his earlier appeal to the religions of revelation, as he came forward as the restorer of the religion of Abraham (sunnat Ibrahim) which had been corrupted by the Jews and Christians. Abraham, whom Jews and Christians alike regarded as the great type of faith and whom he had, himelf emphatically indicated as the true hanif (e.g. vi. 79), now becomes the great hanif, not only in contrast to the heathen but also to the possessors of a scripture (neither polytheist, nor Jew nor Christian) (ii. 129; iii. 60, 89) wherefore, as Snouck Huyghens has shown. vi. 162 and xvi. 124 must also be Medine). He and his son Ishmael, the ancestor of the Arabs, founded the Meccan sanctuary and the sacred city of Mecca now corrupted by the heathen, which Muhammad is to restore (ii. 118 sq.; xxii. 25 sqg.). Whether this bold idea, which according to Sura iii. 58 met with opposition from the possessors of a scripture, was an original one and in this case a really brilliant invention of Muhammad's or whether it was already in existence, for example among arabised Jews, cannot be decided. The only thing certain is that he cannot have been acquainted with it in Mecca for we meet it nowhere in connection with mentions of the Kab'a and it is actually excluded by the passages mentioned above (p. 726a).

While his religion was being transformed in this way, Muhammad's personal position was being gradually changed by the altered conditions. According to the already mentioned constitution of the community, all important matters were to be laid before Allah and himself. It now became a fundamental duty of the believers to be obedient to Allah and to himself (iii. 3, 29, 126, 166; iv. 17 sq., 62 [where it is added: "and to those among you who have to exercise authority"]; v. 93; xxiv. 51. 62; cf. also ii. 12, the "women's homage" which is inserted in the account of the second conference at 'Akaba, Ibn Hisham, p. 289) and those who are disobedient are threatened with the terrors of hell (lx. 64). Alongside of the belief in Allah now appears belief in the Prophet (xxv. 9; lix. 8 etc.). Allah is his protector, his guardian, Gabriel, and the angels are his disposal (lxvi. 4). He claims certain privileges, which suggest a worldly mortal rather than a spiritual leader (xxiv. 62; xlix. 2 sqg.; xxiv. 63; liii. 13 sqg.; lxxxi. 53) but which however must be described as quite moderate demands.

The elevation of Mecca to be the centre of his religion imposed on Muhammad new tasks, which were soon to lead to unexpected results. If visiting the holy places in and around Mecca was a duty of the Muslims, who were excluded from the town (xxii. 25 sqg.), the result was the inevitable necessity of forcing admission to them. In addition the Prophet had an account to settle with the Meccans, for by his expulsion they had triumphed over him in the eyes of the world and the punishment repeatedly threatened them had not materialised, unlike the stereotyped punishments of the godless in the stories of the prophets. This led to a new command, that of the holy war ("war on the path of Allah", al-jihad, q. v.), and to set such a war in motion now became the object of his endeavour, which he tenaciously pursued. There were however considerable difficulties in the way of achieving this object. The Medine-e had only pledged themselves to defend him like one of their number if he were attacked, and the anything but warlike merchants of Mecca were not inclined to oblige him by beginning. The emigrants were, it is true, not bound in this way, but it went nevertheless very much against their feelings as Arabs openly slight members of their tribe and blood relations. How much their resistance vexed him is shown by the vigorous reproaches which he makes to his
followers in this connection (ti. 212; xxi. 39 sqq. ex.) He succeeded however in finding a way out of the difficulty, which might be able to pave the way for military enterprises without injuring these feelings too much. After he had sent different men with small armed forces who did not succeed in encountering the enemy, in Badr, one of the sacred months in which all fighting was forbidden, the sent some of his followers to Nakhl, where a caravan was expected and gave their leader sealed orders in which he left it to their judgment what they should do. They did not disappoint him for they fell upon the caravan which felt secure until the end of the month and one of the Meccans was killed. The rich plunder was sent to Medina, where in the meanwhile a storm of indignation had broken out. Muhammad however gave the people time to recover and finally calmed them by the revelation ii. 214. The success of the coup had had such an effect in Medina that not only emigrants but also a number of Angar offered their services, when he appealed for followers in Ramadan 2 A.H., in a new raid, which would himself lead. On this occasion chance came to his aid in an unexpected fashion. He had learned that a Jewish caravan was to take a way from Syria and he decided to ambush it at Badr [q.v.]. The very cautious Abi Safян [q.v.] who was leading the caravan got wind of his plan however and sent messengers to Mecca for help. But when by a diversion to the coast he had reached safety, he soon afterwards sent other messengers to Mecca to cancel the first message. The angered Meccans had however already collected an army which was three times the size of Muhammad’s little handful of men and were unwilling to let the opportunity escape of properly chastising them trouble-some enemy. They went to Badr where soon afterwards Muhammad arrived with his men, excepting that one of the Jewish caravans had been attacked and its goods taken, and on learning this he turned quickly back towards Mecca. The Prophet was thus saved from the worst, but he had to lament many fallen friends including Hamza [q.v.] and his newly acquired prestige naturally also suffered. With all the eloquence in his power he endeavoured to raise the morale of his followers by exhortation and courage alike (ii. 1. 114 sq., 133-154, 159-200) but the consequence of his reverse did not fail to materialise. The Jews who had taken part in the fighting (according to Ibn Ishaq, they were observing the Nabath), made no secret of their delight at his misfortune, and several Beduin tribes next year (A.H. 3, June 625—beginning of June 626; the eclipse of the moon which took place in Garuda II of this year was that visible in Medina in the night of Nov. 19-20, 625, of Rhodokanakis, in W. Z. K. M., III. 105: 101: 16). Thus the number of the Meccans was reduced and Mecca enjoyed such great prestige in Arabia that its conqueror was bound to attract all eyes to himself. He therefore displayed even greater energy and was able to utilise the advantages he had won. After he had drawn up the programme given in Sura vii. 57 sqq. he began to besiege the Jewish tribe of Kamaqa in their forts. The Munafikina did not dare to oppose him seriously and the other Jews left their co-religionists in the lurch in shame-ful fashion (cf. lix 14) so that the latter were forced to migrate to Transjordania.

In order to protect himself while fighting from attacks from another foe, Muhammad at this time adopted a plan which is a further proof of his outstanding political ability. He concluded, as a number of letters that have been preserved show (cf. J. Speiser, Mitteilungen der Seminar für Orient, 1916), an alliance with a number of Beduin tribes in which he had been pledged to himself to assist one another. In the year 3 A.H. (June 624—June 625) Muhammed continued his attacks on the Meccan caravans so that the Kuraiš finally saw the necessity of taking more vigorous measures and revenging themselves for Badr. An army of 3,000 men was equipped and set out with much display for Medina under the leadership of Abi Safян, who was little suited for the task. Although several of his followers advised Muhammad to make his defence within the town, he decided to go out with his forces, which, had been much reduced by the departure of the Munafikina and took up a position near the foot of the hill of Uhud [q.v.]. In spite of his numerical superiority of the Meccans, the fighting at first went in favour of the Muslims, until a number of archers who had been placed to defend his flank joined against Muhammad’s express orders in the battle, which promised to yield rich booty and this at once enabled Khalid b. al-Walid to fall upon Muhammad’s flank. The tables were now turned and many of the Muslims began to flee, especially when the rumour spread that the Prophet had fallen (cf. iii. 138). In reality he was only wounded and escaped with a few faithful followers through a ravine on to the south side of the hill. Fortunately however, the Meccans were quite incompetent to follow up their victory and as they thought that Muhammad had been punished and their honour saved, they turned quietly back towards Mecca. The Prophet was thus saved from the worst, but he had to lament many fallen friends including Hamza [q.v.] and his newly acquired prestige naturally also suffered. With all the eloquence in his power he endeavoured to raise the morale of his followers by exhortation and courage alike (ii. 114 sq., 133-154, 159-200) but the consequence of his reverse did not fail to materialise. The Jews who had taken no part in the fighting (according to Ibn Ishaq, they were observing the Nabath), made no secret of their delight at his misfortune, and several Beduin tribes next year (A.H. 3, June 625—beginning of June 626; the eclipse of the moon which took place in Garuda II of this year was that visible in Medina in the night of Nov. 19-20, 625, of Rhodokanakis, in W. Z. K. M., III. 105: 101: 16). Thus the number of the Meccans was reduced and Mecca enjoyed such great prestige in Arabia that its conqueror was bound to attract all eyes to himself. He therefore displayed even greater energy and was able to utilise the advantages he had won. After he had drawn up the programme given in Sura vii. 57 sqq. he began to besiege the Jewish tribe of Kamaqa in their forts. The Munafikina did not dare to oppose him seriously and the other Jews left their co-religionists in the lurch in shame-
of which on this occasion Muhammad reserved for himself (lx. 6 sqq.).

To this period most probably belongs the prohibition of the drinking of wine which is characteristic of Islam (v. 92 sqq.): cf. the inductive gradation in xxxii. 25: xvi. 69: lv. 46: li. 216, where the word "great" is to be deleted as Schwally proposes.

It has been connected with a number of features of life in the old Semitic East but the main reason should rather be sought in the connection with the maslaha games [q.v.]. Drinking-bouts with feasting on a specially slain camel and games of chance, which were in the eyes of the old Arabs the bright spots in their hard struggle for existence, and in which they endeavoured to display their nobility and hospitality, brought the Muslims into suspicious relations with pagans and with Christian and Jewish wine-sellers, which might easily lead to their faltering in their new religion (cf. Wākidī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 100; Bukhārī, ed. Krehl, ii. 270 sqq.): and this might explain why he forbade both at the same time, which of course does not exclude the possibility that forms of abstention for other reasons may have been known to him (Maslama's prohibition of wine was obviously included as asceticism [cf. the article]). While Muhammad was endeavouring to restore his weakened authority, a new and threatening storm came upon him and Medina from Mecca. The Quraysh, whose caravans were being continually harassed by him (cf. Ḥassān b. Thābit, N'o. 16, 6 sqq.) and who were urged on by the Jews of Khaibar, recognised that the victory at Uhud had only been a blow in the air and realised the necessity of occupying Medina, which they had then neglected to do. Conscious of their slight military skill, they negotiated vigorously with various Beduin tribes and thus raised a large army — said to have been 10,000 men — with which they set out against Medina in the year 5 (June 626—May 627). The various accounts of the season of the year (sometimes a month after the barley harvest, sometimes cold winter storms, the latter in agreement with Śūrā xxiii. 9: cf. Ḥassān b. Thābit, N'o. 14, 3 sqq.) may be reconciled by the possibility that the siege lasted a considerable time (cf. Doughty's description, Travels, ii. 429 sqq. of the siege of Ḥāriz, which in general illustrates this war excellently). The advance of this imposing army produced great consternation in Medina, which was still further increased by the languishing attitude of the Muhājirūn and by the discovery or perhaps only the suspicion that the Jews were conspiring with the enemy (xxiii. 10, 26) Muhammad in order to strengthen the defences had a ditch (ṣuḥaṣ, a Persian word) dug in front of the unprotected part of the town. According to several sources, he did this on the advice of a Persian named Salmān but J. Horovitz (cf. Idr. i., 175—183) would reject this as a later accretion. Modest as the defences were — about 150 years later 'Ībād Mīrāq bridged the ditch which had been restored by Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh, by throwing a few doors across it — they seem to have imposed upon the enemy who had little experience in the art of war and the siege gradually dragged on.

The able lord of Medina used the time for secret negotiations with the Ghāfarīn and cleverly stirred up distrust of one another among his opponents and when at the same time the weather conditions became unfavourable the besiegers lost heart and gradually began to retire so that the last effort of the Quraysh to destroy their sinister foe came to nothing. For one section of the participants however, the comedy of the "War of the Ditch" was to become a bloody tragedy. Hardly had the besiegers retired than the Prophet declared war on the last Jewish tribe of any size, the Quraysh, and began to besiege their quarter of the town. The Jews no doubt hoped to escape in the same easy fashion as the Nāḍir had, especially as their allies, the Ṣūrī, were very actively trying to induce Muhammad to clemency; but this time he was inexorable and carried out seriously a threat that he had previously made (lx. 3). Tradition has however endeavoured to put the responsibility for the massacre of the Quraysh on Sa'd b. Mu'ādh (cf. Ḥassān b. Thābit, N'o. 62, xxvi., who asserts Sa'd's innocence). But there are various indications that it was the Prophet himself who made the decision and perhaps induced the Jews to surrender. On this occasion the Jews showed a strength of character and nobility of spirit which threw a redeeming light on their otherwise so ignoble history.

By these amputations, which however did not remove all the Jews from Medina (cf. Ibn Ḥishām, N'o. 589): Wākidī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 269, 393: Ḥassān b. Thābit, N'o. 133, sqq.), the Prophet had come nearer his goal, the organisation of an umma on a purely religious basis, which hitherto he had to keep somewhat in the background for political reasons. For the present he continued his attack on the Meccan caravans far into the year 6 (May 627—May 628) and his raids, usually punitive expeditions, on Beduin tribes; of these expeditions, which have no particular interest, mention may be made of that against the Banū Maṣṭalīr which must have taken place about this time, as it gave rise to a serious conflict between the Muḥājirūn and the Anṣār and involved Ḥāshā [q.v.] in the celebrated adventure which nearly cost her her position as the wife of the Prophet, until finally a revelation saved her (xxiv. 4 sqq., 10—20).

Towards the end of the year 6 Muhammad thought that his position in Medina was so firmly established that he could risk a step, which would bring him nearer the desired goal. He and the emigrants were still excluded from Mecca and its holy places, but through secret confidential agents, among whom we may certainly include his carefully calculating uncle ʿAbīd, he knew that feeling in the town had been gradually coming round (cf. alviii. 15: lx. 7). An increasing number had become tired of the hopeless wars and thought it would be much more advantageous for the commerce of Mecca to make peace with their infuriating enemy, especially after he had granted his programme of the pilgrimj to their fairs, the source of the city's wealth. Trusting to this revaluation of feeling he gave his followers in Dhu ʿl-Mīrāq of the year 6, i.e. March 628 (the news of the death of the Persian king Khusraw Parvīz on the Feb. 20 of this year reached him on the way) orders to provide themselves with sacrificial victims and undertake an umra [q.v.] with him to Mecca, as Allah in a vision had promised him a successful fulfilment of the visit (alviii. 27). He probably chose an umra deliberately (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 740: Wākidī, transl. Wellhausen, p. 249 sqq. 253: cf. Śūrā, xx. 30, 34) in stead of the great pilgrimage which was soon due, as the consequences of an encounter with all manner of tribes, with whom he might
possibly have been waging war, were too incalculable for him: but perhaps he cherished also the hope that, if all went well, he might remain there in the following month also (cf. ii. 192 which perhaps belongs to this connection). The step was nevertheless a risky one, so that he asked several Bedouin tribes to accompany him in case they met with resistance. To his disappointment however, they refused (xlix 11 sq.) so that he decided to abandon the military character of the march and make his followers go as harmless pilgrims. In Mecca many were inclined to meet his wishes but the belligerent party was still strong enough to get a body of armed men sent to meet him to prevent entering the town. He therefore encamped at al-Hudaylaya ([q. v.] where he began to negotiate with the Meccans, and when this led to no result he sent Ulûmân, who was protected by his family connections, into the town as his representative. But when the latter showed no signs of returning and finally a rumour got about that he had been murdered, the situation became critical and Muhammad dropped all negotiations, collected his followers under a tree, probably one long held sacred, and made them swear to fight for him to the last, which they did with enthusiasm (xlix. 16, 18). But soon afterwards a number of Meccans arrived and offered a compromise, which is very characteristic of the amicable Meccan policy, by which he was to return this time but to be allowed to perform an 'umra next year. He agreed to the proposal, concluded a ten years' truce with the Kâbah and further promised to surrender all Meccans of dependent status who came to him. His followers, whom he had worked up into a state of great excitement by his promises and the taking of the oath, heard these conditions with secretly concealed anger; but Muhammad calmly ordered the sacrificial animals brought with them to be slain, which was to have been done at an 'umra in the town (see Lane, Lexicon, s.v. wâclîl). and had his hair cut and by his authority forced his grumbling followers to do the same. Only later did they discover that he had made a brilliant stratagem to policy for he had induced the Meccans to receive the despised fugitive as an opponent of equal rank and had concluded a peace with them which promised well for the future.

He and the participants received ample compensation for the apparently frustrated 'umra at the beginning of the year 7 (May 628—April 629) by the capture of the fertile oasis of Khudîâm ([q. v.] which was inhabited by Jews. It was the first actual conquest by the Prophet and he instituted on this occasion a practice which became regular afterwards; when Jews or Christians capitulated: he did not put the people to death or banish them but let them remain as tenants, as it were, who had to pay dues every year. This expedition which also brought the Jewish colonies of Wâdi 'l-Kûrâ in to his power, made the Muslims rich (xlix. 18-21).

In this period, although the exact date is variously given, tradition puts the despatch of letters from the Prophet to Mûjâwîs, governor of Alexandria, the ruler of Al-Qusînâ, the Byzantine emperor, the Persian king etc., in which he demanded that they should adopt Islam. The alleged original manuscript of the first of these has however proved not to be genuine (see J. A., 1854, p. 482 sqq.; Tadd, in Hilâl, 1904, p. 193 sqq.; Becker, Papias Schott-Reinschdt, i. 3). But even what is related about these epistles hardly deserves the faith most people have put in it. Even if we disregard the many apocryphal details, we must surely consider it very unlikely that so sober a politician as Muhammad, who had at this time a very definite object, the conquest of Mecca, before his eyes, should have thought of indulging in so fantastic an idea as the conversion of Heraclius or the Persian king, to whom the "Ined Arabic Kurân" was no less unintelligible than the Bible to the Prophet and his countrymen, and whom he could neither compel by force nor entice with preferred advantages. It is very doubtful if Muhammad ever thought at all of his religion as a universal religion of the world, as for example Noldeke, in W. Z. K. M., xxi. 307, Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, p. 25, and T. W. Arnold, The Preaching of Islam, p. 23 sqq. hold (against them, see Noldeke, Muhammad- Arabism, p. 45 sqq.; H. Lammen, Études sur le croy de l'Ibâdites, i. 422). The passages in the Meccan suras which can be quoted in favour of this theory (xi. 90; xxi. 104; xxi. 157; xxv. 1; xxxiv. 27; xxxv. 70; xlviii. 87; lxxi. 52; lxxii. 27; cf. from the later period: iii. 96; xxvii. 25) are limited by their context or by unanimous parallels (like vi. 92: xlv. 5 [the mother of the city, i.e. Mecca]; cf. xxvi. 214). Besides, in the Meccan period, the place of persuasion and proof ("no compulsion in religion"); ii. 257; cf. xvi. 126), was taken by the spread of Islam by force of arms, which, although based on the supremacy of Islam over other religions (iii. 79; ix. 33. xii. 4), was confined to the lands inhabited by Arabs. If after the conquest of Mecca he also declared war on the possessors of a scripture (see below) the campaigns undertaken by him prove that he was only thinking of Arabs under Byzantine or Persian rule, and it cannot be proved that he ever went beyond this in his schemes (see the gift of Hebron, Balâzjûri, ed. de Goeje, p. 129 may be confidently asserted to be a forgery; cf. the article ISHAM). The decisive consideration however is that Muhammad at the height of his power never demanded from Jews or Christians that they should adopt Islam but was content with a political subjection and the payment of tribute. The correct conclusion is therefore to reject those stories and to look for the real historical basis in negotiations of a purely political nature, e. g. with the friendly Mûjâwîs (p. v., and cf. Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt, 1902) and to assume that the idea of a great missionary enterprise arose later under the influence of Christian traditions, notably of the miracle of Pentecost.

On the other hand, the character of the genuine letters of the Prophet to the Arab tribes changes at this time, for he was no longer content with a purely political agreement but, relying on his now consolidated power, also demanded that they should adhere to his religion, which involved performing the 'âdâb and paying "alms": he even gave the Idrîslâm on the Syrian coast a re-pite (in this period) of two months after which they were to decide (see Schérer, op. cit., p. 14 sqq.).

In March 629, Muhammad performed the "umra stipulated for him by the peace of Hudaylaya (the "umra of the "contract" or "recovery"). For him who had been driven out of his native city it was undoubtedly a great satisfaction to be able to visit Mecca as the acknowledged lord of Medina;
but otherwise the significance of the occasion was more symbolic and the efforts of the practised diplomat to prolong his stay by his marriage with a sister-in-law of his secret ally 'Abdās [see MADżNAs] were politely but firmly resisted by the Meccans. On the other hand, it was of great significance that some of the most important Meccans, like 'Amr b. al-‘As and the military genius Khālid b. al-Walid, who saw he was the coming man, openly joined him, while his uncle 'Abbās and the very patriotic (Ibn Ḥīḍām, p. 275) but cautious Abu Sufyān endeavoured in secret negotiations to prepare in the most favourable way for the inevitable result. In the meanwhile he continued his military expeditions. His forces suffered a serious reverse in the first considerable effort to extend his authority over the Arabs on Byzantine soil, at Muṭa [q.v.] in Transjordania; this is also recorded by Tho- phanes (Chronographie, ed. de Boor, i. 325). But several Beduin tribes now began to see what advantages they would procure not only for the next but also for this world by joining him, and large groups like the Sulaim voluntarily adopted Islam and placed themselves under his flag.

That it was Muhammad's intention to break the truce with the Kurāsh at the first opportunity may be taken as certain; for it must have been intolerable for him that the heathen should still have Allāh's sanctuary in their control (ix. 17 sqq.; cf. viii. 5). The taciturnity of the Meccans now gave him his oppotunity. Very much against the advice of Abu Sufyān, the belligerent party in Mecca had supported the Bakt against the Kurāsh, who were Muhammad's allies, and thus given a plausible casus belli (cf. perhaps ix. 12 sqq.). In Kamādān of the year 8 (May 629—April 630) he set out at the head of an army of Muhādjīn, Anṣār, and beduins. The news produced considerable anxiety in Mecca where the number of those who wanted to fight shrank daily so that the more prudent now could take control. Abu Sufyān, who was sent out with several others (including the Khāzān Badar b. Warka who was a friend of the Prophet) met Muhammad not far from the town, paid homage to him and obtained an amnesty for all the Kurāsh who abandoned armed resistance (cf. Tūnā, Tartār. i. 1634 sqq.). Except for a few irreconcilable (cf. Diwan dr. Hudhafīz, No. 183; Muhammad, al-Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 356), they acquiesced and thus the Prophet was able to enter his native city practically without a struggle and almost all its inhabitants adopted Islam. He acted with great generosity and endeavoured to win all hearts by rich gifts (ṭa‘īf al-ṣaliḥā, a new use of the alm.: cf. iv. 60). Only he demanded ruthless destruction of all idols in and around Mecca. Only Sīra ex. seems to preserve an echo of the exultation with which this victory filled him; here as in the unusually touching passage of alvili. 1 sqq., he sees in the success of his plans a sign that Allāh has forgiven him all his sins. Muhammad did not rest long upon his laurels for not only was Ṭa‘īf, which was closely associated with Mecca, still unsubdued but the Hawāriz tribes in Central Arabia were preparing for a decisive fight. A battle was fought with these Beduins at Hunain on the road to Ṭa‘īf [q.v.] which at first threatened to be a fatal disaster to the Prophet, mainly because of the unreliability of a number of the new converts, until some of his followers succeeded in recalling the fugitives and routing the enemy (ix. 25 sqq.). On the other hand, his inexperienced troops were unable to take Ṭa‘īf with its defences (cf. the description of impregnable fortresses in Diwan der Hudhafīz, No. 66, 10 sqq.). The people of Ṭa‘īf however afterwards fell in with the spirit of the time and adopted Islam. When Muhammad, after raising the siege, was distributing the booty of Hunain, the Anṣār who as soon as he entered Mecca had expressed the fear that he would take up his residence again in his native town, became very indignant about the rich gifts that he made to his former opponents in order “to win their hearts”, while they themselves went empty-handed (cf. Ḥasan b. Thabit, No. xxxi) but he spoke so kindly to them that they burst into tears and declared themselves satisfied. His conduct on this occasion reminds us to some extent of that of David towards the Jews and Ephraïmites after Absalom's rebellion.

The characteristic feature of the year 9 (April 630—April 631) in the memory of the Muslims was the many embassies which came from different parts of Arabia to Medina, to submit on behalf of their tribes to the conqueror of Mecca (cf. ex. 3) and the letters which he sent to the tribes, to lay down the conditions of their adoption of Islam. In the autumn of this year, he made up his mind to conduct a campaign against Northern Arabia on a considerable scale, probably because the defection in Transjordania required to be avenged and because the Ghassānīd king was adopting a hostile attitude (cf. Ibn Ḥīḍām, p. 911; Bukhtārī, Maghāzī, b. 78, 79). But his appeal for followers met with little support. Muνāṣir as well as Beduins held back and even among his devotees there were some who put forward all sorts of objections, out of fear of a campaign so far away in the glowing heat (cf. iv. 45; lvi. 84—91, 98 sqq.). In particular he seems to have had to face at this time a considerable opposition in Medina (ix. 58—73, 125) so that he had to have recourse to his old instrument of intimidation and his words recall in a remarkable way the period of passion in Mecca (ix. 71, 129 sqq.). Matters came to such a pitch that some of the opposition, being whom is said by one tradition to have been his old inexorable opponent, the ascetic Abu 'Amr 'Abd Allāh, founded a house of prayer of their own “for division among the faithful and a support for those who had formerly fought against God and his Prophet” (ix. 108 sqq.). Unfortunately the expressions in the Kurān and in the tradition are quite insufficient to enable us to get a clear picture of this very remarkable affair. In spite of all opposition however, he carried through his plan but when after great hardships he had reached Tabūk on the frontier (in the land of the Byzantines: cf. Ibn Ḥīḍām, p. 956), he stayed there some time and then returned to Medina. The campaign was however not without success. His prestige had now become so great that the petty Christian and Jewish states in the north of Arabia submitted to him during his stay in Tabūk, for example the Christian king Wulhannā in Tā'ā [q.v.], the people of Aδlīr [q.v.] and the Jews in the port of Makta Khālid also occupied the important centre of Ḥimādal (cf. for a criticism of the account: Caesari, ii/266; 268; 270; 271; 272 sqq.; 272 sqq.; on the legal letter from Muhammad to the Jews in Makta, see also Wensmek, in It. li. 290).
The memory of the agreement between Muhammad’s teaching and that of the “peoples of a scripture”, earlier so much emphasised, must have contributed to this rather illogical settlement and in addition there was the fact that treating the Jews as tax-paying tenants, and allowing them to practice their religion, as had been already done at Khadîj, was much more practical for the Muslims than fighting them till they gave in. A further compounding with the “peoples of a scripture” was that believers were allowed to marry the non-believers of the “peoples of a scripture” and eat food prepared by them (v. 7). It is noteworthy that the Parâis (Mâdîz, xil. 17) were included among the “peoples of a scripture” which made a difficulty for later better informed generations (Tabîrî, i. 1055, s. 39; Râdîrî, p. 79); probably Muhammâd did not dare for political reasons to demand that they should give up their religion. This extended application of the term “peoples of a scripture” is found not in the Kur’an but in a letter of Muhammad’s to the Parâs in Hijâjar (Ibn Sà’d, i. 19) but with the limitation that the Muslims are forbidden to marry their women and eat meat killed by them.

With these exceptions, the Prophet had approached nearer the object which was always before him, although it hitherto eluded him, the formation of a ummâa on a definitely religious basis, for the inhabitants of a number of parts of Arabia were now actually bound together by religion. The old differences between the tribes with their endless feuds, their blood-vengeance and their lamas which continually stirred up new quarrels, were to disappear at the will of Muhammad and all believers were to feel themselves brethren (ix. 11; xil. 10 sqs.). There was to be no distinction among believers except in their degree of piety (xil. 13). The Prophet certainly had an ideal before him but it was realised only in a very incomplete way. The very rapid extension of Islam had been accompanied by a considerable diminution in its religious content. Alongside of the old adherents, who were really carried away by his preaching and whose faith had been tried by privations and dangers, there were now the many new converts who had been gained mainly by fear (cf. the well-known poem of Râbî b. Zuhair; the poem of the Hindî, Lisâd b. Abî Iyâs in Kosegarten, Cornelia Haiduts, No. 127) or by the prospect of material advantages. In spite of the teachers sent out to them there could be no question of any deep-seated conversion among these Arabs and how the old Arab spirit continued to flourish among them weakened is shown for example by the boasting and abuse in the poems of Ibn Hishâm, p. 934 sq., which are in no way inferior to the old poems. The Prophet himself in Sûra xil. 14 has remarked very definitely how far the Bedouins were from the true faith: they cannot say that they believe but only that they have adopted Islam. Commandments relating to religion and worship, which had considerably occupied Muhammad in the early Medinese period, gave in striking fashion to social and political regulations, a natural result of the fact that the new members were not ripe for the former. Uncertainty on these matters was still great and even at headquarters much seems still to have been in an embryonic state. This is true even of so fundamental a law as the rule for the times of daily prayer, as the five prayers later obligatory are
nowhere laid down in the Qurʾān (see above; cf. also the expression “morning and evening” in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, p. 239). That they were introduced by Muḥammad himself at the end of his life is possible, but not very probable in view of the silence on the point in the Qurʾān, and in any case it is not certain proved by the mention of the five times of prayer in a letter of the Prophet (Ibn Hishām, p. 962) as we are of justified in expecting absolutely literal accuracy in the transmission of such documents. Only one or two religious institutions are dealt with at all fully in the Qurʾān, the great pilgrimage to the sanctuaries at Mecca and the ῥazure in the town itself, but the hājdāj, or rather, the act of the hajj, was indeed the crown of his endeavors begun in Mecca and carried through with tenacity. The Prophet, although he was now lord of Mecca, did not yet take part in the pilgrimage in the year 8, which was so inexplicable to later generations that they invented an ῥazure unknown to many of his followers (Ibn Hishām, p. 586; Tabari, i. 1670; [Uwa], 1655; Wāṣīd, p. 350; Ibn Sa’d, ii. 1, 125 sq.; al-Muqaddamah, p. 58 sq.). Nor did he come in the year 9 to Mecca to the hājdāj; he showed his intentions in it, however, by sending Abū Bakr as his representative and making him read a proclamation which had momentous results (Bukhārī, ii. 163, 219; according to the usual tradition, it was ʿAlī who acted as his deputy; but this is probably a tendentious alteration; cf. Tabari, i. 1760 sq., where Abū Bakr complains about being passed over and is comforted by Muḥammad; there is also another tradition, according to which Abū Bakr commissioned Abū Hurairah to proclaim the exclusion of the heathen from the pilgrimage (Ibn Sa’d, ii. 121 sq.). This was what is known as the baḥr ʿaḥ (v. 9), in which Muḥammad, who had been for so many years excluded from the pilgrimage, forbade all heathen any participation in it and gave them a period of four months, after the expiration of which they had to choose between the adoption of Islam and merciless warfare (Ṣaḥīḥ is.). This explains his absence from the celebration in the two preceding years: he wished to wait until he could celebrate it as sole ruler and completely in agreement with his intentions or, as he said, with the ceremonies introduced by Abrahām (ii. 119 sq.). Finally all was prepared and at the end of the year 10 (April 631–March 632) he was able to carry through the first reformed pilgrimage (the “Farewell Pilgrimage” or the pilgrimage of ʿIsām), which became the standard for all time. It is remarkable that the regulations for the ceremonies of the hājdāj, the object of which was to remove all that was too obviously pagan in the old ceremony (cf. e.g. the ʾājābā in Minā in Parādak in Z. D., p. 604; Abu Ḥāshim, p. 402) and to give it an Islamic colouring, are found mainly in traditions, where later details can of course easily have been inserted, and only in fragments and more or less incidentally in the Qurʾān; but broadly speaking, the later form is undoubtedly based on what the Prophet laid down on this memorable occasion (cf. the article al-Muqaddamah).

The Farewell Pilgrimage, at which an effective address, of which somewhat variant versions have been handed down, is put in the Prophet’s mouth, marks the culminating point in his career. His feelings at this time are probably expressed in Allah’s words in Sūra v. 5: “To-day I have perfected your religion, and completed my favours for you and chosen Islam as a religion for you.” There is therefore a touch of the dramatic in the fact that his career closed a few months later. He himself hardly expected this, for only a month before his death he was preparing an expedition, which was to set out under the leadership of the young ʿUthmān (q.v.) against Tumsjūdira (note in some traditions to West of the Jordan, cf. the article ʿUṣayma) in order to avenge the death of his father. The situation was such in other directions also that it required a man in full vigour to deal with it; in several places the appearance of different “prophets” had provoked disturbances (cf. Aḥmad, Tahlīla and Muḥallima). Then Muḥammad suddenly fell ill, presumably of the ordinary Medina fever (Parādak, i. 13); but this was dangerous to a man physically and mentally overwrought. He rallied a little but then died on the 13th Rābiʿ I of the year 9 (i.e. June 8, 632; only this date suits the statement in the Ṣaḥīḥ of B. Thālib, N. cxxxiv. and all traditions that it was a Monday) on the bosom of his favourite wife ʿAḥṣa, according to the story with the words: “The highest friend” (rabīʿa, for which Goldziher once proposed raḥīmah, “the vault of heaven”) of Paradise”. He left, unfortunately however for his community, no legal successor, for even the little Ibrāhīm whom the Coptic slave Marīya bore to him had died shortly before (on Jan. 27, 632, if the statement is right that there was an eclipse of the sun on the day he died; cf. Rhodokanakis, in W. Z. K. M. xiv, p. 78 sqq.; Mahler, op. cit., p. 109 sqq.). The wild confusion which party used to settle on Mecca when his death became known had the remarkable result that his corpse remained neglected for a whole day until it was finally buried under ʿAḥṣa’s hut (Tabari, i. 1517; Ibn Sa’d, ii. 57, p. 58, 59, 71, 6).

The great difficulty which the biographer of Muḥammad feels on every page is this, that the peculiar excellence in his career, the wonderful strength of his personality and the power which those around him by suggestion, is not recorded in the early sources and indeed could not be recorded. From the Qurʾān, it is true, one becomes acquainted with his earliest remarkable inspirations, which even now are not without effect, and with his eminent political gifts later in Medina. We do of course find instances in the battle of Badr or the agreement of Ḥudaybiyya where his intellectual superiority is overwhelmingly evident; but these are only isolated flashes and for the most part we have to read the essentials between the lines and be content with instinctive analogies among which the influence of Joseph Smith on the intellectually far superior Brigham Young is a particularly striking example. The really powerful factor was his unshakable belief from beginning to end that he had been called by Allah, for a particular mission such as this, which does not admit of the slightest doubt, exercise an inestimable influence on others; and the certainty with which he came forward as the executor of Allah’s will gave his words and ordinances an authority which proved finally compelling. His real personality was revealed quite openly with its limitations; his strength and his knowledge were limited, the ability to perform miracles was denied him and he speaks quite frankly of his faults (vi. 69; xxxiv.
Apart from the revelation with which he was favoured, he is a man like any other and several times refers to the fact that he will die. The episode in Ibn Hāشم, p. 102 sg., is not historical but a tendency to connect the story against the becoming of Prophet. This is exactly the field in which later ages are of little satisfaction. They are driven mainly at such a rate of the traditions which are clearly confirmed by the Qur’an that we can only have certainty in the strictest sense of the word in case, where the stories place the Prophet in an unfavourable light, not only from our point of view but also from that of the Muslims, e.g. in the story of his temporary recognition of the three Messianic messengers or of his being confused by ‘Umar for putting off the 'ibāra between the ‘umma and hadj. On the Farewell Pilgrimage, for it is quite incredible that such features should be later inventions and as a rule in such cases the compromising stories are confirmed by the existence of variant traditions which attempt to dispose of the offensive features by glossing them over or altering them.

If the biographers of Muhammad must for these reasons impose a very considerable restraint upon themselves, there is nevertheless one essential aspect of his activity, which ought to be very strongly emphasised, particularly as justice is not always done to it in modern treatments of his life. There is a tendency in some recent writers not only to emphasise all that is unfavourable but also to neglect his real religious importance. If he had really only been an oversexed man, anxious for worldly profit and quite unscrupulous in the choice of his means, Islam, which had been created by him and developed after his death, would have been an effect without a cause. It is impossible for the unbiased historian to deny that he aroused the religious instinct of his countrymen, and gave expression to a body of religious and moral conceptions which not only satisfied his fellow-countrymen but supplied the needs of the people of his time which had old civilizations conquered by the Muslims and served them as foundations for a vigorous and far-reaching intellectual activity. Although as a result of his singular theory of inspiration, his direct claim in the older religious of revelation remained concealed, he was able in his own way to communicate to his countrymen a part of the spiritual wealth of the peoples of a scriptural faith and how he touched the soul of the Arabs best seen by the efforts of the Wahhabis at a reformation. In hands of ancient culture, Islam, it is true, was only able to carry out its task by a sometimes radical remoulding and the intellectual activity already mentioned developed also under the influence of Christianity and mysticism, but yet it was Muhammad who set the whole process in motion and he could not have gained this influence if he had only been what the writers mentioned professed to have found in him.
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Muhammed was able to maintain himself in Amasra and Tokat against Timur's governor in Nisark and against Turkoman bands. Soon after Bayazid's death in 1403, having found support with the dynasties of Karaman and Dhi l-Kadr, he conquered Brusa from his brother Isk, who had fled there after the battle of Angora. Then followed the struggle with his other brother Sultanin, who had escaped to Adrianople but reappeared in Anatolia on account of his dealings, friendly as well as hostile, with the Iznik Oglu Ljumal. Sultanin was able to take Brusa but was soon obliged to return to Rumili, where Muhammad had sent their brother Muzafar (who, after Angora, had been prisoner for some time with the Germeyin Oglu). When in 1410 the struggle between Sultanin and Musafir ended in the latter's victory, Muhammad, whose position in Anatolia was now strengthened, had to face Musafir himself. At first the conquest of Kast礼物 did not seem hopeful, but after some high functionaries, like the Ljumal-oglu Iskandar Pasha, had convinced him of his beauty Musafir was able to crush Musafir in the battle of Camurlu in Suviana (July 1413). By this battle the unity of the Ottoman state was restored: nevertheless one gets the impression that even after the battle of Angora, the supremacy of the house of Oghman over the other Muhammadan and Christian chiefs in Anatolia and the Balkan Peninsula was never seriously questioned. The hereditary enemy in Asia, Karaman Oglo Mehemel, who in the meantime had gone as far as besieging Brusa, was subdued at Djamik in 1414 and at the same time the turbulent Isik Oglo Ljumal was finally driven away from Suvagna. In 1416 the Ottoman power in the Aegean Sea was strengthened by the battle of Gallipoli against a Venetian fleet. That year witnessed the extremely serious despot revolt in Aizan and the peninsula of Kara Brusa, connected with the name of Simanwa Oglo Bahr al-Din (cf. Babinger's monograph on the subject in Isak, xi. 1-174 and, as to the date, p. 62 sqq.); its suppression required the levying of troops from all parts of Anatolia under Bayazid Pasha. In the European part of the Empire the Sultan kept up friendly relations with the Byzantine Emperor. The Turks intervened, however, in Wallachia where the succession was disputed and they built there the fortress of Djunjewevo (Turk: Var Klokau) on the northern bank of the Danube; at the same time (1419), the raids of the Turkish troops reached Hungary, Bosnia and Styria. On the Asiatic side large parts of the possessions of the prince Kastamuni, including Tosia and Kaushtur, were incorporated into the Ottoman possessions. From 1419 Muhammad had moreover to face a pretender to the throne who claimed to be his brother Musafir: this Djumia Musafir found an ally in Ljumal. Both were defeated near Selanik and had to fly to Constantinople. The Sultan died in 1423 in Adrianople, shortly after his return from Anatolia. His death was kept secret from the army during forty days, until the heir to the throne Murad had arrived at Brusa. Muhammad I has won the reputation of a mild and benevolent ruler; he often occurs with the surname of Celebi also to his brother. Another surname is Karabadi, the 'Wrestler', which takes unrecognizable forms in the European sources ("Crisia" in the Ragusan documents cited by Babinger on p. 63 of his article in Isak). Important administrative measures are not recorded under his reign; the political and religious unification and pacification occupied all his forces. Some famous edicts are connected with his name: he finished the book of the "DHUMAIN", which had been started by his brother Iskandar, and the mosque of the same name in Brusa. A new building of this Sultan was the well known Yezgih Djamik at Brusa (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Travels, ii. 15). Bibliography: The ancient Ottoman chronicles of Aşık Paşa Zade and Taşköprü: Ali: Oğhaman, edited by Gise; Crudj Bey, ed. Babinger and the later historians, especially Ali, Kuv-ah-Elghar. — Of the Byzantine writers this period is treated by Phrantzes, Ducas and Chalcedonides. Further: von Hammer, G. O. R., i. 331 sqq.; Zinkeisen, Gesch. des Ott. Reiches, Hamburg 1840, i. 385—500 and Jorga, Gesch. der Ott. Reiches, i. 351—377. (J. H. Kramers) Muhammed II, with the surname Ali-Fath, or, more popularly, Fatih, was the seventh ruler of the Ottomans, his father having reigned from 1413 until his death in 1481. He was born, according to Sijjili Oghman, i. 67, in Radjaz 832 (April 1429) and resided during his father Murad II.'s lifetime as governor in Magnesia; after the death of his brother Ala al-Din in 1444 he became heir to the throne. Before his final enthronement, Muhammad had twice resided in Adrianople, on account of the abdication of Murad II. the first time in June 1444, after a ten years peace had been concluded with Hungary. When, notwithstanding this treaty, Hungary and her Christian allies again took the offensive in July, Murad came back from Magnesia, to which he had retired, and won the battle of Varna (Nov. 10, 1444). Then Murad abdicated a second time, but a menacing revolt of the Janissaries in Adrianople made the grand vizier Kultur Pasha call him back again, after which Muhammad was relegated once more to his Anatolian government until his father's death. On Febr. 9, 1451 this new Sultan arrived at Adrianople and seemed at first peacefully inclined. In reality his reign was to become a period of untried and continual conquest under the personal leadership of Muhammad himself, who, especially in the beginning of his reign, took part in nearly all the important campaigns. His conquests did not very much enlarge the boundaries already reached at Murad II.'s death, but consisted more in a bringing under immediate Turkish rule of a large number of countries, regions and towns that were still held by local rulers under the Ottoman suzerainty. In this way Muhammad's conquest made possible the immense expansion of the Ottoman empire in the sixteenth century. The first, and at the same time most conspicuous military achievement of his reign was the conquest of Constantinople, where, by the grace of Murad I., the Palaeologue Constantine was still reigning. The preparations for this memorable siege had begun in 1452 with the construction of the castle of Riumli Ilyar (in which an inscription by Zaghano Pasha, one of the builders, of 856 [1452], is found; cf. Kultur Edhem, in T. O. E., ii. 454—497) and other military preparations, e. g. the casting of an enormous siege gun. Constantinople was taken on May 29, 1453 and Galata surrendered soon afterwards [cf. CONSTANTINOPLE]. In the next
year, the sultan obtained successes against Serbia, while Turkkhan [q. v.] intervened in Morea, where the last Palaeologue despos were at war with the Albanians. Immediately after the taking of Constantinople the grand vizier Khalid Pasha had been deposed and executed by order of the sultan, who had personal and political causes of complaint against him (cf. Taeuschner and Wittek, 272, n, 169 sqq.); he was replaced after nearly a year by Mahmūd Pasha [q. v.], who for the next twelve years was to be a no less energetic supporter of Muhammad in the achievement of the programme of conquest. The year 1455 saw both of them in Serbia and on the Aegean coast, where the principal conquests were Kavous and the island of Lesbianos [q. v.]. In 1456 they were unsuccessful in the siege of Belgrad. During the years 1458 and 1459, Serbia was made a direct Ottoman province (Semendra taken in 1459 by Muhammad), and in the same year and in 1460 the sultan took part in several campaigns in the Morea, the northern part of which was conquered from the Palaeologues. About the same time a temporary understanding was reached with Skanderbeg [q. v.] in Albania, then came the amazing Asiatic campaign of 1461. Amasya (Amastria) was taken from the Genoese and Sina (Sinia) [q. v.] from the last vladiyard Oghlou; the fall of Trebizond immediately followed [M. Parabeni], after the beginning of a conflict with Çum Hasan of the Ak-Koyunlu. In the next year the sultan’s army drove the famous Wallachian voivod Vlad Dracul from his principality, which was given to his brother Radul, and at the end of the year Muhammad and Mahmūd made an end to the rule of the Genoese dynasty of Lesbos. The years 1463 and 1464 were mainly occupied by the annexation of the kingdom of Bosnia. In 1463 began a war with Venice, which was to last seventeen years; the main theatre of hostilities was the Morea, but also in the islands of the Aegean there were continual encounters with Venetian fleets. Thus the death of the Karaman Oghlu [q. v.] Ibrahim in 1464 had first provoked the sultan’s intervention and soon nearly all the towns of this once powerful principality were conquered during Muhammad’s campaign of 1466 (battle of Lárnaca). In that same year Muhammad was successful in Albania, where he fortified the town of Ithacin [cf. SKANDERBEG].

Mahmūd Pasha had been deposed as grand vizier after the Karaman campaign and replaced by Kam Muhammad Pasha. But it was Mahmūd who as governor of Gallipoli and Kapudan Pasha, helped Muhammad in the conquest from Venice of the islands of Negroponte (Euboea) in 1470. In the same year began again a series of campaigns under Kam Muhammad and Gedik Ahmad Pasha against the last towns held by descendants of the Karaman Oghlu, who were supported by Çum Hasan [q. v.] and by Christian fleets on the sea side. When Çum Hasan had even then taken the offert piece in conquering the town of Tokat, great preparations were made for a new Asiatic campaign of the sultan, and Mahmūd was again made grand vizier. The sultan’s army won in 1473 the great victory of Erzincan, which put an end to danger from that side. In this campaign a part was played by prince Mufta, the heir to the throne, who completed in 1474 the conquest of Fili (Cilicia) but died soon afterwards. Mahmūd Pasha had been deposed again from the grand vizierate and executed in August 1474; Gedik Ahmad Pasha took his place.

In the following years, until 1480, the sultan’s chief attention was given to conquests in Europe. He built in 1471 the fortress of Sába (Bogardelen) in Syria, near Belgrad, while his troops in these and the following years made incursions into Hungary and far into Austrian territory; the war with Venice continued and in 1474 the Albanian Skutari (Shkodrā) was in vain besieged. The year 1475 brought the great success of the conquest of Kaf虆 from the Genoese and, as a result of the establishment of the Ottoman power in the Crimea, the submission of the Tatari Khānate of the Crimea to Ottoman suzerainty. In 1476 the sultan himself was successful in Moldavia, but in the next years the Turkish armies had less success against the Venetians in Albania and southern Morea; finally in 1475 Muhammad himself went to Albania and took Corfu: Skutari was besieged a long time, but surrendered only on account of the peace negotiations with Venice, which led to a peace treaty (confirmed January 26, 1479) leaving a certain number of towns in Albania and Morea to Venice. The Ionian islands, however, were conquered in 1479 by a fleet under Gedik Ahmad, who, at the same time, went so fast as to take Otranto in southern Italy. An endeavour to conquer the island of Rhodes in the same year was not successful.

Muhammad’s last campaign took place in 1480, when he intervened in the dynastic disputes of the dynasty of Dhit Tahār [q. v.], which intervention gave rise to the first difficulties with Egypt. In the next year, 1481, he had already set out for a new military enterprise in Asia, the aim of which was yet unknown, but may have been connected with the same difficulties, when he died, rather suddenly, in the place called Tekfur Câyri or Kökünk Câyrı between Skutari and Gellice (May 5, 1481). His body was transported to Constantinople and buried in the fêtir of the Fātimi Mosques. Besides being a great conqueror, Muhammad II was the builder of many important edifices, in the first place of the Fātimi Mosque in Constantinople and the mosque of Esmit (Hadżat-ESin), etc. 243 sqq. and further of the place called Tekfur Câyri or Kökünk Câyrı between Skutari and Gellice (May 5, 1481). His body was transported to Constantinople and buried in the fêtir of the Fātimi Mosque. Besides being a great conqueror, Muhammad II was the builder of many important edifices, in the first place of the Fātimi Mosque in Constantinople and the mosque of Esmit (Hadżat-ESin), etc. 243 sqq. and further of the castle of the Pianelles and other works of naval and military importance. In the army administration he succeeded in restoring discipline among the Janissaries by incorporating in them the corps of the Seghans: further his name is connected with the first Ottoman Kânar-îmâne (preceded as an appendix to the T.O.E.M., iii). He encouraged scientific studies and showed an interest in literature and poetry (he pensioned thirteen Turkish poets), even for the Renaissance arts in Italy he summoned Gentile Bellini to Constantinople, who made his portrait, etc. Also Tschoel, von alien Osmanischen Reich. Tiungen 1930, p. 189.

Bibliography: Among the early sources, the Byzantine historians (Phanes, Duces, Cacoudylos) are by far the more important. The Greek description of Muhammad’s life by Crīmulus was translated into Turkish (appendix to T.O.E.M., i, and ii). The old Ottoman chronicles (Neshri and others) often treat the beginning of Muhammad’s reign in their last parts, the later historical sources (Sad al-Dīn, All Feridun) are far from being reliable for this time. Further: von Hammer, G. P., R., u. u., Zinkeisen (u) and
MUHAMMAD, thirteenth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born on May 16, 1567, the son of Murad III and the Venetian lady Bajza, and reigned from January 27, 1595 until his death, December 22, 1603. He was the last sultan who, as crown prince, had reigned as governor in Maghreb. During his short reign he does not seem to have exercised any great influence on the policy of the Empire, being mostly under the influence of his mother who, as valide sultan, intervened in affairs of state through her protégés within and without the palace. Much against her will but on the insistence of a large part of the troops and of the high dignitaries, Muhammed took part in one campaign, namely that of 1596, in which the Hungarian town of Eger (Egri) was taken by the Turks (September 1596). This campaign was a part of the war against Austria that lasted during all his reign and occasioned every year a military expedition to Hungary or Wallachia. The grand vizier was changed not less than twice during this sultan, the most conspicuous grand vizier was İbrahim Paşa [q.v.], his brother-in-law and the protege of the valide. Ibrahim three times held the sultan’s seal, three other titulars ended their office by being executed. In the same year as the conquest of Eger, the Turks won the battle of Keresztes over the Austrians and Hungarians; the severity of the then grand vizier Çughlu Sinan caused a great number of the troops to desert and to appear some years afterwards as partisans of Gedik Ali, provoking a dangerous revolt in Asia Minor which lasted thirty years and began with the taking of Tebriz by Kara Yeddi [q.v.] in 1599. A third memorable feat of the Hungarian war was the conquest of Kanice in 1600 by Ibrahim Paşa. In other parts of the Empire the situation was relatively quiet; only in the Crimea there was a war between two rivals to the khanate, in which the Ottoman government had to intervene. Relations with the European powers were peaceful. France began already to exercise considerable influence through her ambassador; with Persia there was peace until September 1603, when a war began with the taking of Tabriz and Naftshāvān by Abāhā I.

The Empire was still supported by the traditions of Suleiman’s time, but the lack of strong government had introduced a lot of abuse, notably in the administration of the timars and of the finances. One of the consequences was the dangerous revolt in January 1603 of the sigâhis in Constantinople, who demanded the abolition of the harem régime in the capital and the re-organisation of the authority of the government in Anatolia. Two high harem functionaries fell as victims of this revolt; the grand vizier Vemeshçu Hasan was able to oppose the sigâhis with the aid of the Janissaries, thus creating an everlasting feud between the two corps, but in October of the same year this nefarious policy caused his own fall and execution.

Muhammad III was buried in a turbine of the Aya Sofia, a short time before his death, he had ordered the execution of his eldest son Mahmûd. He is said to have made a great show of piety, and had some excellent counsellors in his environment, such as the khaṣâṣja Sa’d al-Din (sied 1599), who had determined him to accompany the army in 1596; but on the whole his mother’s influence prevailed by keeping him mainly confined to the harem in the palace.

Bibliography: Among the Turkish historians the works of ‘Alî (until 1590); Bâlûkî (until 1600), Pecawî and Hasan Beg Zâde are valuable as contemporary sources, further Nâmisî and Hâdimî Khâfî. Von Hammer, G. O., etc. and the works of Zinkischen (iii.) and Jorgaarte. A contemporary European source is Laz. Saro’s, Ottomani rivi de rebus turciis libri, continens descriptiones potentiae Mahometti III, 1600.

MUHAMMAD IV, nineteenth Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was born on December 30, 1614 and was placed on the throne on August 8, 1648, after the deposition, soon followed by the execution, of his father Sultan Ibrahim. The power in the state was at that time divided between the court, where the old valide Kosem [q.v.] and Sultan Muhammad’s mother, the valide Taçhân, held the reins, and the rebellious soldiery of the Janissaries and the Sipahis. The lack of stability in the government at this time is shown by the fact, that, until the nomination of the grand vizier Köprülü Muhammad in 1656, there were no less than thirteen grand viziers. In 1657 the old valide Kosem was assassinated and at the same time the resistance of the Janissaries was broken; the regime of the court party that followed under the sultan’s mother did not improve the situation. The grand vizier of İbrahim Paşa (1652–1654) was at first seemed to be the strong man needed, but brought to an early end by his rival Murad Paşa, and in the meantime the Cretans were against Venice was exhausting the resources of the Empire. In March 1659 a military rebellion forced the sultan to allow the execution of several of his favorite courtiers.

The real strong man proved to be Köprülü Muhammed Paşa [q.v.] (Sept. 15, 1650—Oct. 31, 1661) who eliminated immediately the influence of the harem and took control and until his death the real ruler of the Empire. His régime began with a Turkish maritime defeat by the Venetians at the Lardanelles, but already in the following year he obtained as serasker successes in Transylvania and succeeded at the same time in establishing firmly the Turkish authority in the Danube principalties; the collaboration with the Crimean Khan was here of great value. In 1658 and 1659 he was able to suppress rebellions in Asia Minor, and in the Venetian war his great fleet of Venetian ships and other Christian allies did not succeed against the Turkish forces on Crete. After his death (Oct. 31, 1661), he was succeeded in his office by his son Köprülü Ahmet Paşa, who completed the work of his father by carrying through the final conquest of Crete (surrender of Candia on Sept. 4, 1669) followed by peace with Venice. In 1661 the war with Austria had begun again, where Sultan Muhammad took part in several campaigns, notably that of 1663 in which Ujvard (Neuhausen) was taken. In 1664 took place the famous battle of Vuktor, where the Turks were beaten by an allied army, a part of which was formed by French troops; still the peace concluded with Austria in 1665 was favourable for Turkey. In 1672 the sultan took part in the campaign against Poland, after the Ukrainian cossacks had invaded Ottoman
against the Polish king; the Polish war, ending in a peace treaty of 1676, strengthened still further the Empire's position in the north. Köprülü Ahmed Pasha died Oct. 30, 1676. Though the sultan, who had developed in the meantime a moody and capricious character, never showed him the same deference as to his father, Ahmed had been easily able to maintain himself against enemies in the interior, not least by forming new troops (the başkılı and the geydocu), who were far more reliable than the Janissaries and Sipahis. He had not been able, however, to put an end to the extravagant luxury of the court, which wasted enormous sums. The sultan had an abnormal liking for big hunts, that were organized at enormous cost in the environment of Adrianople, which town he preferred as a residence to Constantinople. After Ahmed's death the sultan did not himself take the affairs of state in hand; he appointed Kora Muşafı Paşa [q. v.] as his grand vizier. The latter continued in an unsteady way the tradition of the last sultans. In 1677 and 1678 he obtained successes against the Cossacks, behind whom the Muscovite power now began to gain in importance in Turkish affairs. In 1682 war broke out again with the Austrian monarchy and led to the second Turkish siege of Vienna (July 13—Sept. 12, 1683), ending in a Turkish delâce, thanks to the intervention of the Polish king Sobiesky. This disaster cost Kora Muşafı his office and his life and at the same time the influence of the Selâzil became again predominant. The grand viziers, now following proved unequal to their task and in the years 1685—1687 nearly the whole of Hungary was lost to the Austrian armies (Turkish defeat at Mohacs on June 22, 1687). At the same time the hostilities with Venice had been reopened in the Morea and in the Archipelago.

All these disasters caused a revolt of the troops in the field; they marched on the capital in September 1687 under Siyavuş Paşa of Aleppo. This time the sultan himself fell a victim to them; he was deposed on November 8, 1687 by the fa irrişkân Köprülü Muşafı Paşa and lived in seclusion in Adrianople until his death on December 17, 1692. He was buried next to his mother in the Yeni Dâmi.

Bibliography: Naîma (ii.) and Häjeddî Kâhalîa, and until 1660 the Tarîkh of Kâshir are the most important Turkish historical sources. The Siyâhat-name of Kiliyaî Çelebi describes many of the military expeditions of this period and is also otherwise a valuable source of information. Among the European sources this period is covered by P. Ricaut, Histoire des derniers empereurs des Turcs depuis 1664 jusqu'à 1677, Paris 1683. Further, von Hammer, G. O. R., v. vi. and the works of Zinkensdorp (iv. v. and vi. and Joeg (iv.). See also the monographs of Ahmed Reşit, Köprülü, Constantinople 1331—131, Ka dizâr Salğam, Constantinople 1914—1924, and Ekber Sørleri (1904—1110), Constantinople 1332 (1914).

(J. H. Kramers)

MUHAMMAD V Reshid, third and fifth Ottoman Sultan, was born on November 2, 1843 as a son of Sultan Abd al-Majid. During the reign of his brother Abd al-Hamid II he lived in seclusion; his very existence inspired 'Abd al-Hamid with such terror that even the mentioning of persons with the name Reshid had to be avoided in his presence (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verzegde Gezichten, iii. 239). He was a man of mild character, who owed his accession to the throne (April 27, 1909) only to the victory of the Young Turks; moreover he was the first constitutional ruler of Turkey, but he was unable to give direction to the very disparate political tendencies that manifested themselves within and without the parliament during the years after the Revolution, and, after the final victory of the Unionist party in January 1913, Muhammad V had to submit, much against his will, to their government.

At the very beginning of his reign, Turkey lost her last vestige of authority over Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary's annexation, and over Bulgaria by the declaration of its independence (Oct. 5, 1909). The cabinets under Hâsim Hilmi Paşa (until January 18, 1910) and Lalîeddî Hâkî Pasha (q. v. until Sept. 29, 1911) were not able to bring about a peaceful situation in the interior (revolts in Albania), Hâkî Pasha had to resign on account of the declaration of war by Italy. Under the grand viziere of Sa'id Paşa [q. v.] the Italian war led to the loss of Tripoli, confirmed by the peace treaty of Uçhisar (Oct. 15, 1912). The peace was signed under the anti-unionist cabinet of Ahmed Mâhkîr Paşa, but in the same month began the so-called Balkan War against the federated Balkan States. The reactionary cabinet of Kâmil Paşa soon showed an inclination to conclude a disastrous peace through the intermediacy of the European powers (Conference of London); then on January 23, 1913 the Unionist coup d'état brought again a Unionist government under Mâhkîr Shewket Paşa. The result was a reopening of the hostilities and, after the failure of Bulgaria, the recapture of Adrianople (July 22, 1913). In the meantime Mahîmî Shewket had been murdered (June 28) by adherents of the liberal opposition, but this did not bring about a change in the political course; his place was taken by Saîd Hilmi Paşa, whose government signed the peace-treaties with Bulgaria (Sept. 29, 1913), Greece (Nov. 14) and Serbia (March 14, 1914). From this time on, the Committee of Union and Progress, which from the beginning of Muhammad Reshid's reign had not ceased to work behind the scenes, became all powerful and its leaders 'Atatâr Bey and Emner Bey came more and more to the front. Afterwards, when at the beginning of the Great War, the Ottoman Government had decided to remain neutral, it was the unionist sympathies with Germany that brought about a gradual estrangement between Turkey and the Allies (the "goeben" and "beslan" incident), culminating in the entrance of Turkey into the war on the side of the Central Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Powers (the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea on Oct. 29 and 30, 1914). 'Atatâr Paşa himself became grand vizier in February 1917. The Allied endeavour to force a way through the Dardanelles was definitely abandoned in January 1916 and in the meantime Turkish troops fought on the Egyptian front, in Iran and on the Russian and Persian frontiers. Before the end of the war Muhammad V died unexpectedly on July 2, 1918.

Bibliography: de la Jouquière, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, 1914, ii.; Ahmad Eun, Turkey in the World War, New Haven 1930; besides many other publications on the war and on the political politics of Turkey.

(J. H. Kramers)
MUHAMMAD VI Waḥīd al-Dīn, last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was born on January 14, 1661, as son of Sultan Abūl Muḥājir. He was installed to the throne on July 3, 1708, after the death of his brother Muhammad V Rūḥānī, the former heir to the throne. His father, having died in 1661, when on October 30, 1718, nearly four months after his accession, the amirul-mu'minin was signed, he was the ruler of an empire that seemed to be at the mercy of its former enemies, whose military forces occupied the capital and other hitherto unconquered parts of Turkey. On the other hand, the power of the Committee of Union and Progress was broken, but, since in the beginning of 1719 there began in Anatolia an increasing opposition against the foreign occupation, joined with an assertion to obey the Constantinople government. Muhammad VI seemed to have no other choice than to throw in his lot with the Allies and, together with his grand vizier Dā'imī Farid Pasha, he collaborated with the Allies in the endeavours to suppress the nationalist forces (beginning of 1720); this anti-nationalist action was even sanctioned by a fatwa of the Shaikh al-Islām. As the nationalist movement grew ever stronger, the Sultan's authority could only be upheld in Constantinople by the support of the Allies. His government had to sign the Treaty of Sèvres (August 10, 1920) and the Tewfik Pasha Cabinet (since October 21, 1920) and it strove to summon the Parliament for its ratification. But in 1921 things had already gone so far that Tewfik Pasha recognized the powerlessness of his government to represent Turkey. The final success of the nationalists against the Greeks (cease of Smyrna, September 9, 1922) brought about the armistice of Mudania (October 13, 1922), to which the Sultan's government was not a party. It was still invited to represent Turkey in Lausanne, together with the Angora government. This was not accepted by the Great National Assembly, which, on November 1, 1922, declared the Ottoman sultānate abolished from March 16, 1920 (occupation of Constantinople); Tewfik Pasha's cabinet resigned accordingly (November 4) and Muhammad VI remained as Khalif in Constantinople, where, on November 10, he appeared at his last aqūmāf. When, however, the National Assembly decided some days afterwards to throw Wahid al-Dīn on a charge of high treason, this last Ottoman Sultan left Constantinople as a fugitive on a British ship (November 17, 1922) and the very next day the Angora government declared him divorced of his caliphate. Having gone first to Malta, the ex-sultan proceeded to Mecca as a guest of king Husain. From here he launched a proclamation to the Islamic world, in which he maintained that the separation of the caliphate from the sultanate was contrary to the shari'a (text in Orante Moderno, n. 702—705). This appeal found hardy any response in the Islamic world. The last Ottoman Sultan left Mecca again and went to live in San Remo, where he died on May 16, 1926. In 1924 he had even recognized king Husain's claim to the caliphate.

**Bibliography:** Jasehke und Prutsch, *Die Türken seit dem Weltkriege,* in *W. T.*, vol. x, 1927—1928, and vol. xii, Heft 1—2, 1930, where in the Introduction all available Turkish and Western sources are indicated.

(J. H. Kramers)
by his nephew Mahmud, son of Ghiyath al-Din, but the viceroy of the provinces. Asseg in Dilli, Kishn in Multan, Tadji al-Din Yildiz in Kairan, and Dilgiz in Ghaizan, became independent.


(T. W. HARK)

MUHAMMAD, TUGHLUK, the second king of the Tughrul dynasty of Dilli, was the eldest son of Ghiyath al-Din Tughrul, its founder. During the short reign of the usurper Nasir al-Din Khanaraw, he was in some peril, but escaped and joined his father, who was marching on Dilli. He was known at first as Dhiwan Khan, but received the title of Ulugh Khan and was sent in 1321 to Warangal, to reduce to obedience the raja Pratapsa Radhadeva II. In this distant region he attempted to rebel, but his army refused to believe his story of his father’s death at Dilli and to accept him as their king, and he was obliged to return in haste to the capital, where he either persuaded his father of his innocence or gained a pardon, for, though his accomplices suffered cruel deaths, he was again sent in 1323 into Telengana, and on this occasion compelled the raja to surrender and sent him to Dilli. In the following year he acted as regent during his father’s absence on an expedition into Bengal, but his conduct aroused suspicion, and his father rebuked him in letters sent from Bengal. He received the king, on his return, in a temporary hulk of wood, so constructed that the disbanding of a beam would bring the whole structure down, and by this device crushed the old man to death, and ascended the throne in February 1325.

The delineation of a character so complex and contradictory as that of Muhammad Tughrul is no easy task. He was one of the most extraordinary monarchs who ever sat upon a throne. To the most lavish generosity he united revolting and indiscriminate cruelty; to scrupulous observance of the ritual and ceremonial prescribed by the Islamic law an utter disregard of that law in all public affairs; to a debauchery and superstition-veneration for all whose descent or whose pious commands respected a ferocity which when routs repected neither the blood of the Prophet nor personal sanctity. Some of his administrative and most of his military measures, give evidence of abilities of the highest order; others are the acts of a madman.

The chronicle of his reign is largely a record of rebellion, punished with unsparing rigor. In the second year his cousin Gunishpur rebelled in the Dakan and was put down alive. In 1327 he rebuilt Mehrgir, named it Dawlatabad, made it his capital, and two years later drove the whole population of Dilli thither. In 1328 Kishn Khan rebelled in Multan and was defeated and slain, and in 1329 India was invaded by the Mughul, Alp al-Din Tarnah-jirun, who, however, was driven from the country. In the same year the enhancement of the land-tax in the Gangetic Doab drove the inhabitants into rebellion, and the measures taken to suppress the rising depopulated the country. At about the same time Muhammad issued his famous fictitious currency, decreeing that his brass tokens should be accepted as equivalent to silver tangar. No precautions were taken against counterfeiting, and when the experiment failed and the tokens were recalled the treasury was obliged to purchase mountains of brass at the price of silver.

In 1331 a rebellion in Bengal was crushed by Bahram Khan, but in 1338 he died, and a second rebellion separated the province from the kingdom of Dilli, and in 1334 Sadiq Dilmuqan al-Din Afsan established his independence in Madura. Muhammad marched to punish him, but a pestilence in his army compelled him to retreat, and on his return he established in the Dakhan the pernicious system of farming out the revenue for extravagant sums, the result of which was to drive both the impoverished cultivator and the defaulting farmer into rebellion. Hulgar of Daulatabad, believing a report of the king’s death, rebelled, but was captured and pardoned, a rare instance of clemency, but a rebellion in the Pandjab was crushed with great severity.

An enormous army raised for the conquest of Persia melted away for want of funds to maintain it, and in 1337 a heavy calamity fell on northern India, a famine of unusual severity which lasted for seven years. The king’s measures to combat the famine were, on the whole, well conceived and well executed. Ganni was plentiful in Awadh, which proved that the famine was largely due to artificial causes, and he built a temporary city, Sagar-i-Awadh (Nagavat-pur, Sambh “the Gate of Paradise”), on the western bank of the Ganges, transferred thither the revenues of Dilli, and with the assistance of Amul Mullik, governor of Awadh, fed them from the granaries of that province. In the following year he was committed one of the greatest of his many follies in assembling an army of 100,000 horse for the invasion of Tibet and sending it into the Himalayas, where it perished.

In 1339 a rebellion in the Dakhan was crushed and even the faithful Amul Mullik was高尔led into rebellion, but, in consideration of his services, was imprisoned instead of being put to death. Almost immediately afterwards Dhiwan the Afghan rebelled in Multan, but died before the king’s wrath fell on Afghanistan. The famine was now at its height, and the people were eating human flesh. Muhammad set himself to the saving of regulations which should improve and extend agriculture and obviate future famines. By that means, says the contemporary historian, with conscious or unconscious irony, agriculture would have been so promoted that plenty would have reigned throughout the earth, had they been practicable. They included the extermination of the system of farming the revenues, and local confusion and rebellion, which reacted on the king until he regarded his subjects as his natural enemies and waged war against them with all the weapons of despotic power. The tale of execution is recorded, with sickening details, by execution. Execution is recorded, with sickening details, by execution.
and proclaimed an Afghan, Isma'il Mulk, as their king. The king marched to Dawlatabād, captured the city, and besieged the rebels in the citadel, but was recalled to Gudjarat by a serious rebellion headed by a man named Taghā. He pursued the rebel in Gudjarat and Kāthīwār for three years, drove him into Sind, and followed him thither, and on March 20, 1531, died within a few miles of Thatha, where the rebel had taken refuge. "The king," as a historian says, "was freed from his people, and they from their king."

His empire, at its greatest extent, included the whole of India except the small kingdoms of the Cola and the Pandyas, in the neighbourhood of Cape Comorin and the principality of Gūr in Kāthīwār. Before his death he lost Bengal, the Dākan, the Peninsula, and Sindh, and left the tenants of his dominions weeping with discontent.

**Evolvography:** Dīwān al-Dīn Barani, Tavārid-i Fīrūz Shahī (Bibl. Ind.), also historians: Tahfīz al-Nūrī fī Ghiyāth al-Amīr, by Ibn Baṭūṭa; The Cambridge History of India, vol. iii., chap. vi. See also T. K. A. S., for July, 1922.

(T. W. HAIK)

**MUHAMMAD III, the sixth king of the Tughlūk dynasty of Dīlīhī, was the son of Fīrūz, at whose death the son of Fāṭīh Khān, his eldest son, was raised to the throne on Sept. 20, 1388, as Ṣuyūḥ al-Dīn Tughlūk II, but was slain on Feb. 19, 1389, and was succeeded by his cousin Abū Bakr, son of Zafar Khān, the second son of Fīrūz. Muhammad, the third son, contested the succession and, after suffering more than one defeat, occupied Dīlīhī and ascended the throne on Aug. 31, 1390. Abū Bakr took refuge with Bahādur Nāhir, in Mwāt but was pursued and defeated, and was imprisoned in Mirahat, where he shortly afterwards died. The old servants of Fīrūz, men of Eastern Hindūstān, who had been the principal factors in all the troubles of the kingdom, were put to the sword, after being tested by a shabboleth which distinguished them from the natives of Dīlīhī.

A rebellion in Gudjarat was suppressed in the same year by Zafar Khān, who in 1396 became independent in that province, and in 1391 Muhammad again invaded and plundered Mevāt and returned to Dīlīsār, where he fell sick. Bahādur Nāhir took advantage of his illness to plunder some villages in the neighbourhood of Dīlīhī and Muhammad marched into Mevāt, defeated him, and put him to flight, but on his return to Muhammadābād his disorder increased, and on Jan. 20, 1394, just as he had ordered his son Humayūn Khān to march against the Khokhara, who had captured Lābor and were ravaging the Pandjāb, he died.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad Kāsim Firīsha, Gulkhāni Tābrīzī (Bombay 1832); Mutahhāb al-Lūbāb, vol. iii. (Bibl. Ind. Series of A.S.B.); Burīhān-i Muḥāθir (MSS.) and translation by Major J. S. King (The History of the Bahamīn Dynasty); An Arabic History of Gudjarat, edited by Sir E. Denison Ross (Indian Texts, vol. x.), The Cambridge History of India, vol. iii., chap. vi.

(T. W. HAIK)

**MUHAMMAD II, the fifth king of the Bahāmīn dynasty of the Dākan, was the son of Muḥāmmed Khān, the youngest son of `Alī al-Dīn Bahman Shāh, the founder of the dynasty, and was raised to the throne on May 20, 1378, after the assassination of his uncle, Dīwān Shāh. Firīsha's statement that this king's name was Muḥāmmed has misled all European historians, but is refuted by inscriptions, legends on coins, and other historians. Muhammad II was a man of peace, devoted to literature and poetry, and his reign was undisturbed by foreign wars. He invited Hādī to Dākan, his great, and the great poet set out from Shīrāz in response to the invitation, but was so terrified by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he disembarked and returned to Shīrāz, whence he sent to Muhammad his excuses in a well known ode.

Between 1387 and 1395 the Dākan was visited by a severe famine, and the king's measures of relief included the free importation of grain, the establishment of schools at which children were taught, fed, and lodged at the public expense,
and special allowances to readers of the Koran and the blind, but only those of his own faith profited by his benefactions. He died of a fever on April 20, 1437, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Muhammad ibn Muhammad, in 1437/38.

**Bibliography:** See art. MUHAMMAD I; also J.A.S.B., vol. LXXIII., part i., 1904.

(M. W. H.)

MUHAMMAD III, LASHKARI, the thirteenth king of the Bahmani dynasty of the Dakhân, was the younger son of Humâyûn Shâh, and succeeded his elder brother, Nilân Shâh, on July 30, 1463, at the age of nine. His minister was the famous Malik Gâwân, Malik al-Tûdîjâr, Khâdira Gâhwâ. A campaign against Mâlwa in 1467 was unsuccessful, but between 1469 and 1471 Muhammad Gâwân conquered the southern Konkan. In 1472 Malik Hasan Bahâr, Nîân al-Mulk, a Brâhman who had been captured in Vâdjyanagar and educated as a Muslim, led a successful expedition into southern Uçra and was rewarded by the government of Telîngâna. Fath al-Âlî 'Imdâd al-Mulk, another Brâhman with a similar history, was made governor of Barâr, and Usâf 'Adil Khân, a Turk, was appointed to Dawlatabâd. In the same year Muhammad captured the fortresses of Bankâpur and Bûlgânâw, and his conduct at the siege of the latter earned for him the title of Lashkari, "the Soldier." In 1474 the Dakhân suffered severely from a famine which lasted for two years, and in 1476 a rebellion in Konâwâr led the king into Telîngâna. He relieved Malik Hasan, who had been besieged in Râjâmahendrâ, invaded Uçra and punished the râdâja, who had supported the rebels, and on his return, in 1478, captured Konâwâr and assumed the title of Ghâzâ. He then set out to invade the eastern Kûnâtâk, but first divided the great province of Telîngâna into two governments, mortally offending Malik Hasan, the governor. The partition was part of a scheme devised by Muhammad Gâwân, to be applied to all the provinces of the kingdom.

Muhammad made Konâwâr, in the Kûnâtâk, his headquarters, and returned thither after carrying out a daring raid to Kândjewâram. From Konâwâr he issued an edict dividing the other provinces of his kingdom, Barâr, Dawlatabâd, and Gâlharâ, each into two governments. The measure was intensely unpopular, but it was only the vindictive Malik Hasan that actively resisted it. He regarded Muhammad Gâwân as the author of all the unpopular reforms, and by means of a forged letter persuaded the young king that his minister was in league with the foreign enemies of the state. Muhammad, when under the influence of his mûazzâm, summoned his faithful minister, and on April 5, 1481, without any inquiry into the circumstances of the case, caused his head to be struck off. Muhammad's innocence was established immediately after his death, and from the day of his unjust execution may be dated the collapse of the authority of the Bahmani kings. Of the two parties in the state all the foreigners, led by Usâf 'Adil Khân, who established himself in Bûljâpûr, and the respectable portion of the Dakhân, led by Fath al-Âlî 'Imdâd al-Mulk of Barâr, avoided intercourse with the king, who was thrown into the arms of the assassins, led by Malik Hasan. The latter accompanied Muhammad to Bûlhar and subsequently on an expedition to Bhâlgâwâ, but encamped apart from the royal troops, and always saluted the king from a distance, refusing to enter his presence. Muhammad attempted to drown his grief and humiliation in drink, from the effects of which he died at Bûlhar on March 22, 1482, crying out in his last moments that Muhammad Gâwân was slaying him. He was succeeded by his son Muhammad, who was never a king but in name.

**Bibliography:** See art. MUHAMMAD I.

(M. W. H.)

MUHAMMAD bin 'ABBâs [See KÂJâR.]

MUHAMMAD bin 'ABBâd ALLâh, great-grandson of Hasan, the eldest son of 'Ali and Fâjîma, was one of the 'Abîs who did not spend their time passively awaiting the fulfillment of their aspirations, but endeavoured to realise them by personal effort. He and his brother Isâ 'îbâm had, according to Wâlîdî, been brought up as future rulers and Muhammad was called al-Mahdi by his father. As early as the reign of the 'Umayyad caliph Hâshâm, the two sectarian al-Maghira [q.v.] and Payân [q.v.] who did not recognise Muhammad bin 'Abîs and 'Abîs [q.v.] endeavoured to make propaganda for them. When signs of the imminent collapse of 'Umayyad rule became apparent after Wâlîdî's death, 'Abî 'Allah's family by his command paid homage to Muhammad with the exception of al-Âlî's son Dîfâr. Wider circles also recognised him as the legitimate heir, including the Mu'ââlîs, who in those days had a distinctly ascetic character. Dîfâr, later the 'Abîs-dîfâr caliph, was at this time attached to this school and it is several times recorded that he was among those who paid homage to Muhammad. This is in itself by no means improbable and well explains his hostile attitude to him, although it remains remarkable that Muhammad later nowhere, even in his polemical letters to him, refers to this important fact. The 'Umayyad governor of Kūshâra also thought of joining him when he was besieged in Wastât in 152 (756), but dropped the matter when he received no answer to his letter.

When finally the 'Abîs-dîfâr Abu 'l-'Abbâs in the same year won the caliphate and ousted the 'Abîs, the two brothers disappeared and showed thereby that they would not recognise him. There now began for them a period full of adventure and danger, especially after Dîfâr became caliph in 136 (754). They went secretly from place to place to gain adherents; nowhere could they feel safe from the caliph but the people were on the whole favourably disposed to them and at least would not betray them. In this way they reached not only Sârâ and Kûfâ but even went as far as al-Sûrâ via 'Adên; as a rule however, they stayed in Arabia, most securely among the Dîfârîs, in whose territory lay the hill of Radâwa, which so often appears in the history of the 'Abîs. The caliph was very uneasy at the continued lack of success of his search for them; more and more angrily he demanded of his governors in Medina that they should be produced and he dismissed several in rapid succession, when they appeared, perhaps not without reason, insubordinate and lukewarm in their efforts. He himself took very active steps but with as little result. On his pilgrimage in 136 (756) he had Muhammad and 'Abîs's father thrown into prison because they would not betray their place of concealment, and on a later pilgrimage (144 = 762) the same fate met the sons and grandsons of Hasan, 'Abî 'Allah's brother. They and 'Abî 'Allah were taken to Kûfâ, treated most
bruantly and thrown into prison, where most of them died. The same thing happened to Huraym's daughter-in-law Muhammad b. Abī Alā, a deaconess of Tūmah, whose head the caliph sent to Kurāsān with a certificate on oath that it was the head of the 'Abī Muhammad in order to intimidate his followers there. Shortly before (Dec. 708), he finally found a governor after his own heart, Riyyād b. Tūmah, who conducted the search with the necessary vigour. But he was soon able to save himself the trouble for in Radjā 145 (Nov. 762), Muhammad appeared in Medina and began the revolution while his brother Abī Shāmīm went to Bāṣra to do the same. It is not clear whether they did this because in Muhammad's opinion the time was ripe or whether they were forced by circumstances to hasten their plans. In any case, the enterprise was not sufficiently prepared, for although they had a large number of followers in Kubā, Bāṣra, Egypt, where however Muhammad's son ʿAlī was arrested by the ʿAbābādī governor, in Khurāsān and even in Sind, to which another son Abī Alā ʿAlī-al-Aṣhtar was sent, there was no question of any organisation, and, as so frequently, the enthusiasm for the Ṭāhidīs was like a fire of straw which blazes up quickly but dies down as soon. In Medina where Riyyād was completely taken by surprise, Muhammad in keeping with his character acted with great mildness, he opened the prison, forbade all bloodshed and was content with arrest and iṣlaq. The best elements in the town came over to him after the jurist Mālik b. Anṣār declared invalid his oath taken to the ʿAbābādīs; Mecca also surrendered to the new ruler. The outbreak of the revolt was really a relief to Abī Dāʿīrī for he had now, as he said, entered the fox out of his hole. He hurriedly left Baghdād, with the building of which he was busy, and went to Kubā, out of his hole, He hurriedly left Baghdād, with the building of which he was busy, and went to Kubā, the point of danger. With keen instinct he saw that the weak point of the rebellion lay in Medina which must be attacked first, for in this remote spot there was a lack of materials of war and the roads thither could easily be barred. But he first of all offered a complete amnesty to Muhammad, which however only led to a characteristic exchange of letters, in which each reproached the other with the weaknesses of his family. He then sent his relative Ṭāṣā b. Mīnā a. with 4,000 men, with instructions however to settle the matter peacefully if possible. His arrival had a soothing effect upon the Medinaese, of whom a number seized the opportunity to get out of their difficult position. Muhammad however remained undismayed. He rejected the well meant advice of several men to abandon Medina as an inault to the town but left his people free to stay with him or not. He trusted in Alāʿ “from whom victory comes and in whose hand the matter lies”, and imitated all that the Prophet had done in his time in romantic fashion. For example he restored the ditch which the Prophet had dug round Medina when it was besieged by the Kurājīs; he used Muhammad’s sword and his battle-cry was the same as that of the Prophet even the old single combat before the battle of Uhud was revived. The result in these circumstances was easily foreseen Ṭāṣā, after offering a free pardon in vain for a few days, had a few days over the ditch, entered the town and began a battle in which Muhammad’s supporters became less and less in numbers until their leader finally fell (Monday, 14th Ramadān 145 = Dec. 6, 762). Muhammad’s head was cut off and sent to the caliph. For the farther course of the rebellion see the article MUHAMMAD b. ʿABD ALLĀH. Muhammad is described as tall and strong with a very dark skin, on which account the caliph sarcastically called him ʿAlī Muhammad, the “Blackened”. He was rightly called “the pure soul” (Tabāris, iii. 206) for he was an ideal character, gentle in spite of his personal bravery, but he lacked those qualities which are required of a pretender in times like his.


(Mr. Behl)

MUHAMMAD b. ʿABD ALLĀH, a Tāhirī, governor of Baghādād. Born in 209 (824—825) Muhammad in 237 (851) was summoned by the Caliph to Baghādād and appointed military governor in order to restore order in the chaos then prevailing. In spite of the great power of the Tāhirīs, who ruled Khurāsān as independent sovereigns in practice, although they nominally recognised the suzerainty of the Caliph, his task was by no means a light one. After al-Mustāmī had ascended the throne (248 = 862), he confirmed Muhammad in his office and also gave him the governorship of the Trāk along with the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina. In the following year troubles broke out in Baghādād and Sāmarrā. The Arabs were defeated by the Byzantines and the rage of the people was turned against the Caliph. The vizier Utairī however finally succeeded in restoring order with the help of the two Turkish generals Wasif and Boghā the Younger. The Ṭāhidīs also gave the government trouble on several occasions. A descendant of ʿAli named ʿAlīya b. ʿUmar rebelled in Kubā and drove out the governor of the town. After he had routed an army sent against him by Muhammad, he was attacked by the ʿAbābādī general al-Ḥabīb al-ʿAbī ʿAlī, while another division took him in the rear and he finally fell in the battle (Radjā 250 = Aug. 865). Another ʿAlīd, al-Ḥasan b. Zaid, had more success. Two prominent men in Tabaristan, who were dissatisfied with the rule of the Tāhirīs, appealed to him in 250 and very soon he was acknowledged as lord of the whole of Tabaristan. The Tāhirī governors of al-Raŷī and Kazvin were driven out and replaced by Alīs; Muhammad b. Ṭāhir, governor of Khrāsān, a nephew of the governor of Baghādād, then sent an army against al-Raŷī. The ʿAlīd governor was defeated and captured and the town had to surrender, but again fell into the hands of the ʿAlīs. When the former governor of Tabaristan, Sulaymān b. Abī Alā, invaded this province again in 257, the Tāhidīs completely, al-Ḥasan b. Zaid had to flee to Dālam where he was defeated by Muhammad b. Ṭāhir (351 = 865—866); after some years (257 = 870—871) however, he inflicted a defeat on the latter's troops in Djarādān and in 259 (872—873) he again became lord of Khrāsān, where he founded an ʿAlīd dynasty which lasted about sixty years. Arabic
also did not escape the ‘Aid plot. A descendant of Ali named Isma’îl b. Yihâf raised trouble there. In 1904, after a violent pilgrimage, he was defeated and driven from the region. In the same year, the British expedition was forced to retreat.

In the same year, the British expedition was forced to retreat. In 1905, Colonel Swaine drove back the Mulhall as far as the banks of the Nile. In 1906, Trench entered the town of Mecca and proclaimed Caliph; he then appointed his brother Abî Ahmad, later co-regent with the Caliph al-Muhammed, commander-in-chief in the war against Abî Ahmad and his government. When all negotiations failed, the latter had to take arms and was several times defeated. Fighting took place in 1906 and 1907, with varying success; during most of the year, only Amiri forces were present, and when Abî Ahmad finally began negotiations, the Mulhall was victorious, and the Caliph had to protect the region. In the meantime, the British forces were placed under the command of General Manley, and the British army entered the town of Mecca, and proclaimed the Caliph as the ‘Aid ruler. The British forces were then defeated by the British in the town of Mecca, and the British army entered the town of Mecca, and proclaimed the Caliph as the ‘Aid ruler. The British forces were then defeated by the British in the town of Mecca, and proclaimed the Caliph as the ‘Aid ruler.
Government, and further they organised the Sultān’s forces to employ them against the Mullah, thus
assuring the defence of the northern frontier of their colony. Thereupon began a series of raids
both by Sultān’s auxiliaries and especially against the Mullah’s followers in the northern valley
of the Shabella and towards Nūgēl, where Djirisani and Garād were occupied by the Sultān of Holya.
These energetic actions which took place even during the Great European war, besides wearing
down the Mullah’s army, caused him to lose political control of a very large zone where the
population concluded peaceful agreements with Italy and forced him to be continually ready to defend
his territory from the south also. However, after the end of the Great War, the British Government
decided to attack the Mullah from Berbera and to finally overthrow him. In January-March 1920
after violent bombardments of the Mullah’s defences by the British airmen, a British force advanced to
Talib, the Mullah’s last camp; he, rapidly pursued by the Camel Corps and Somali auxiliaries, lied,
Oogad and then into the Karan tribe’s ter-
ritory, where he died on November 23, 1920.
The Mullah’s career is a very typical one for the study of the Somali mind. He had begun his
movement as an agent of the Sālihiyya ṭirība, then his increasing popularity tempted him to a more
ambitious sphere and, accordingly, after placing his propaganda on a more religious basis, he
tried to become the leader of all the Somalis by making the ties of the common faith prevail
over the tribal bonds. This is really the only way to lead such a movement in Somaliland where
Islam may be regarded as a tie of brotherhood among tribes otherwise deeply divided by their
secular history of wars and revenge. Therefore Muhammed b. ʿAbd Allāh Ḥassān said in a famous
poem: “Have I not put my prayer-mat on this sea
to join together the Muslims who were not
brothers?” also alluding to his relations with the
Sālihiyya in Arabia. He desired for the same reason
that his followers should call themselves “Darā-
wīš”, forgetting even the name of their original
tribe. Therefore he affected to become angry when
he was referred to in official correspondence as “Mu-
hammed ‘Abd Allāh, the Ogođen Bah Gei” while he
used to add to his signature only the nisba: al-
Hāṣhimī (alluding to the origin of the Somali
from ʿAṣil b. Aḥs Tālīb) [see the art. SOMALILAND].
Further, instead of the tribal forces he raised
special armed corps, often with a new name, like
the Ḥagattu (“the scratchers”) recruited among the Ḥabar Gidir, the Dīgad recruited among the
Mikāhīl (“Dīgād” means “shooter”), the Kāyād recruited among the Dallasha. But he did not
pursue this policy to the end: the hostility of the
greater part of the Isāq tribes, which was a strong
appeal to the old rivalry between Isāq and Dārič; Muḥammad Śāliḥ’s letter, which was undoubtedly
a severe blow to him, since he had had already pro-
voked the hostility of the Ḥaridir and so had to rely
entirely on Sālihiyya support; the necessity of getting
booty for his soldiers who otherwise would have
hardly remained with him: all these things and his
very nature caused the religious prestige of the
Mullah as the Mahdi of Somaliland to decline and he
gradually became merely the chief of a tribe;
a powerful chief indeed of a large tribe as the
Darāwīš became, formed from various elements and therefore very similar to the federations well
known
in the Somali customary law. It was obvious that
when he began to regard himself in this light (that is regarding himself as a chief of a Somali tribe rather than the brother born from the same
father and the same mother of all the Muslims); it was very difficult for him to restrain himself
and his followers from exaggerating those tendencies
so familiar to their own national character: and therefore they came back gradually to the ancient
Somali custom of guerrilla warfare conducted in
the traditional way, even to defying the tribe of
the enemy in insulting or scornful poems or
designating them with typical ironical nicknames
or giving to every razzia a special name (“the razzia smashing the bones” was the name given
to the fight at Dilmadob; cf. the Ḥiyānī a-
Arab). It may therefore be concluded that the Mullah’s attempt to avail himself of Islam to conquer
the old rivalries between the tribes and combine the
Somalis to drive the Europeans out of the country, failed both on account of the strength of the
European arana tribe’s territory, where he died on November 23, 1920.
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(Exrico Cericlli)

MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD ALLĀH [See Ibn Al-
Abru, Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-Malik.]

MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD AL-MALIK, Arc Dža-
Far, called Ibn al-Zayyāt, vizier to several Āb-
āsids. Ibn al-Zayyāt began his career as secretary in
the chancellery in Baghdād and when the caliph
al-Mu’āsir noticed his ability and learning he
appointed him his vizier (219–220 = 834–835)
He also filled this office in the reign of al-Wāḥibī:
as but he treated the latter’s brother Dža’far, the
future caliph al-Mutawakki, with a lack of respect
he earned his hatred. After the death of al-Wāḥibī
in Dhu l-Hijja 232 (Aug. 847), Ibn al-Zayyāt
wished homage to be paid to his son Muḥammad; the
latter, however, was thought to be too young
by the Turkish general Wāṣif and in his stead
Dža’far was proclaimed caliph under the name al-
Mutawakki. The vizier was at first allowed to
remain in office but in Ṣafar of the following
year (Sept. 847), he was arrested, deprived of
his possessions and subjected to a cruel form of torture
which he himself had invented. After enduring the
most horrible cruelty he died in Rabī‘1 233
(Nov. 847).
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ed. Durenbourg, p. 202, 322–326; Weil, Gerä-
der der Chiffren, ii, 327 sq., 348 sq.

MUHAMMAD b. ’ABD AL-MALIK [See Ibn
Tufālī, Ibn Zehr.]
MUḤAMMAD b. ʿABD AL-RAḤĪM [See Ibn al-Fikrī]

MUḤAMMAD b. ʿABD AL-WAḤHĀB [See al-Waḥḥābiya]

MUḤAMMAD b. ʿABI ʿĀMIR [See al-Mansūr b. ʿAbī ʿĀmīr]

MUḤAMMAD, a son of Abū Bakr and one of his wives, Aṣmā' of the tribe of Khalīfām. He was born in the last year of Muḥammad’s life so that his father could not have exercised any influence on him, while the memories of Abū Bakr’s great friend which were kept alive in his family must have had all the more influence on the passionate nature of the boy, which receives important confirmation from the fact that Ibn Kātaba decries him as one of the “pious” (ṣīrāṣ) among the Kurāshī. When in the reign of ʿUthmān the bitterness at the preference of the Umayyads in combination with a reaction against the strong secularisation of Islam provoked a movement which grew in strength, he took part in it with great vigour and began along with ʿUthmān’s son, Abū Bakr b. Mūsā juḥātā to stir up the people of Egypt against the Caliph. He later went with other revolutionaries to Medina where his equally ardent but much wiser half-brother ʿAlī in vain advised him to go with him to Mecca and leave others to carry through the crime; but he was one of those who broke into the Caliph’s room where he ill-treated the helpless old man although it was Kinnān b. Bishr who dealt the death-blow. He was one of the few Kurāshī who joined ʿAlī and the latter apparently cherished a real affection for the young man, which his enemies of course interpreted as further evidence of his friendship with the murderers of ʿUthmān. Muhammad took part in the battle of the Camel, at the conclusion of which the chivalrous ʿAlī commissioned him to escort his half-brother to Bāṣṭa. The sources give somewhat different accounts of the last phase of his life in Egypt. According to Wāṣ ṭ kī in Baladhurī, ʿAlī and Mūsāf (Tabari, i., 589, 696) and Yākūbī, ʿAlī at once appointed him governor of Egypt after wisely recalling Kāb b. ʿAṣd; but as he soon discovered how foolish it was to appoint a youth inexperienced in war to this difficult post, he sent for his ablest follower al-Ashtar [q.v.] and gave him command in Egypt while he appeased Muhammad’s rightly injured feelings by a kind letter. The attempt to make good the mistake failed, however, for al-Ashtar was poisoned on the way in al-Kulzum at the instigation of Muʿawiyah. Al-Zuhri’s account (Tabari, i., 3242) shows ʿAlī in a considerably more favourable light. After the recall of Kāb he sent al-Ashtar as governor to Egypt and only after he was poisoned did he send Muhammad. Finally there is a third story ( Ibn al-Kalbī and Masʿūdī) according to which al-Ashtar was sent to Egypt only after the death of Muhammad, but this must be due to some misunderstanding of the first version. In any case, the choice of Muhammad was an unfortunate one for the inexperienced youth, who had had no authority and was besides insufficiently supported by ʿAlī, was not fit to meet experienced opponents like Muʿawiyah and ʿAmr b. ʿAlāʾ; anyone but ʿAlī would have seen. ʿAmr b. ʿAlāʾ came with an army and a battle was fought at al-Musannāt (the dam). When the actual murderer of ʿUthmān, Kinnān b. Bishr, had fallen after a brave resistance, the Egyptians lost heart and Muhammad, abandoned by all, was captured and killed while trying to escape (38 = 658).


(From Buhl)


MUḤAMMAD b. ʿABI ʿĀMMI [See Ibn Zātār]

MUḤAMMAD b. ʿABI MUḤAMMAD [See Ibn Zātār]

MUḤAMMAD, b. ʿABI ʿĪSĀ At Ḥabū RASSID, son of Abū ʿĪsā Diwādī, an Eastern Iranian (not Turkish) noble from ʿUthmān b. ʿAffār b. al-Nahj al-Muʿāẓir (see al-Masʿūdī, Zad al-Qudūs, M., S., p. 169). For his early career see the articles ʿAlī, ʿUthmān. After his flight with Khumarawān he returned to Baghādād (276 = 889) and appears to have remained there (cf. Tabari, in 2122) until his appointment as governor of Adhathālīdān in 279 (892). Though on his arrival he had entered friendly relations with the Baghādād king of Armenia, Sembat (see 891), after seeing Marīgha in 280 (893) he made a first invasion into Armenia, but without success. At the same time he had strengthened his position at Baghādād by giving his daughter in marriage to al-Muʿtaṣir’s confidant, the general Balār al-Muʿtaṣirī. Having been rejoined by his ʿāqṣām, the general Wasif, who had defeated the Dālūtī ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Aʿzī in the ʿAblūdī in 281 (894—895) but did not succeed in routing his territory, he made a second expedition into Armenia in 282—283 (895—896) and captured Karā, Dīmān and Wasparūkān. Subsequently he came to terms with Sembat, but his son Diwādī remained as governor of Dīmān until Muhammad’s death in 284 (897—898). Muhammad declared his independence, but finding himself unable to withstand al-Muʿtaṣirī’s prompt submission, he was pardoned, and in the following year officially recognized as governor of Armenia in addition to Adhathālīdān. About the same time he appears to have adopted the title of al-Aṣfīn, which appears on his coinage, and which was evidently intended as a claim to descent from the old princely family of ʿUthmān (see the article ʿAṣfīn and ʿAṣfīn, Imām, Nāṣīr al-Moʿāwīya, s. v. Ḵurram). In 287 (900) he made a further indirect attempt to extend his rule over the territories which were slipping from the grasp of the Tāfīlīdīs by encouraging Wasif to seize Malaya and to apply to the caliph for investiture with the government of Cilicia. Al-Muṭahhībī, however, learning that this was only a preliminary step towards the seizure of Diyar Muṣār by Wasif and al-Aṣfīn, put an end to their design by a swift and unexpected campaign against Wasif, who was himself captured. Al-Aṣfīn died a few months later (Kalbī, 1, 288 = March 901) at Baghādād.
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MUHAMMAD b. ABD AL-SAMAD — MUHAMMAD b. AMMAR

of an 'Abid, know nothing of this. This Muhammad is, generally speaking, only occasionally mentioned outside the Shi'a, along with his father, e.g. in Ibn Wādīlī al-Yaḥyāī, Ta'īīs, ed. Housain (Leiden 1883), ii. 552 and in Tabari, Annals, ii. 1129, 1102: according to al-Maqrīzī, Muḥaŷr al-Maqrīzī (Paris 1858–92), vii. 117, Muḥammad died in 120, according to vi. 171, not till the reign of al-Wādīlī, i.e. after 227. Even within the Shi'a, his role is quite a passive one. After his father's tragic end, those with Zaidi views who had hoped some day with him as Caliph to put into force their activist 'Abid political programme, went their own ways again, while those who held Imamī views, one group, as usual in such a case, became 'standardist' Wāḥīfīya and another chose Ahmad, a brother of al-Şalīh, as Imam; for Imamī Muhammad was only seven at the time. For those who remained faithful to him, there arose in the Shi'a of Imamī the question of the child Imamī's knowledge. The case was repeated with the following three Imams. But the authority to teach was in the hands of men whose activity extended through several Imāmīs; with Majdīs (l. a.), Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Shāhī, Muḥammad al-Mājdī (Teheran 1306), p. 217; Abū Amr al-Kašshāji, Mūsāfīt Abūd-Maṣarrī al-Rūḥī (Damas 1317), p. 353 sqq., 374 sqq.; Tūsī, Fī fatīh al-Shī'ayn (Būl. Ind., No. 60), No. 124, 150, p. 289, note 1. The gradual development of the dogma in question, which is associated with the child Jesus teaching in Sārā xix. 30 sqq., is not quite clear, as regards its apportionment to the various Imamīs. Heresiographers including al-Nawḥakhtī, Fīrāq al-Shī'ayn (Būl. Ist., No. 4), p. 74 sqq., quote the doctrines anonymously. Besides, there is the confusion of names (which has also entered European indices); for Muhammad b. 'Alī was also the name of one of his grandsons, who died before his father, the tenth Imam 'Alī al-Ṣaḥīḥ, but left issue; his adherents continued the immediate further, than the Twelvers through these children, while they deny the existence of the twelfth Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi as son of his brother, the eleventh Imam Hasan al-Askari. Shi'a works avoid confusion by giving the ninth Imam the kunya Abū Djasār al-Ṣāḥī, his official title is al-Ṭājī, "the God-bearing"; a common epithet is al-Ṭājīwālī, "the liberal": he said: I have paid his father's debts. As ʔaddār al-Ṣāḥī he had, like al-Ṣaḥīḥ, before him, Ummūn b. Sālih al-Ma'amī, called Sānūmān or Ṣāfā],[1] Among the usual miracles of the Imamīs, Abū Djasār al-Saffār (l. 290) in Fīrāq al-Madārij (in Majdīs, ii. 108) relates that the ninth Imam carried a woollen shirt at night from Syria to the holy sites of Kerbelā, Kūfa and Medina as well as to Mecca. The fact that his memory has been kept so green to the present day is due to the fact that he was buried beside the tomb of his grandfather, the seventh Imam, Mūsā al-Kazim [p. v.]; thus arose the double Meshed al-Kaẓimīn.


(R. STROHMAIERRY)

MUHAMMAD b. 'AMMAR [See Ibn 'Ammar.]
MUHAMMAD b. ANUSBEGIN [See KHA- 
MAD b. BA'ISHA. [See Ibn 
BIBI.] 
MUHAMMAD b. DAWUD [See INF. 711.
AL-I'MADINI.] 
MUHAMMAD b. AL-DJAZARI [See IBN 
AL-BA'ISHA.] 
MUHAMMAD b. DUSHMANZIYAR [See KAS-
ROUN.] 
MUHAMMAD b. FARAMARZ [See ISF. 11.
Q. B.] 
MUHAMMAD b. HABIB [See INF. 61.] 
MUHAMMAD b. AL-HANAFIYA, a son of 
Ali and Khawla, a woman of the tribe of 
the Banu Hamils, who had been brought a prisoner to 
Medina after the battle of 'Akabah [q. v.] and came to 
Ali's possession (cf. Suyuti's poem KAD. 
AHAD., viii. 4: "He was a servant in the house"); he was born in 16 A.H. Although he did not, 
like Hasan and Husain, have the blood of the 
Prophet in his veins, he became involved not only in 
the political tumults but also in the schemes 
which the boundless fancies of the extreme Shi'ahs 
built up around the family of 'Ali. He was not to 
blame for this, for he was of a retreating dis-
position and acted very cautiously. But when Hasan 
rather sold his rights and Husain had fallen at Karbela 
in 680, many turned their eyes to him as the 
natural head of the family. This aroused the suspicion of 
'Abd Allah b. Zubair who, after the death of 
Husain, appeared more and more openly as a 
pretender; the fact that Muhammad had no sym-
pathy with the efforts of the opposition in the 
'Umayyads is evident from the interesting statement of 
Baladhur that he definitely declared the
resolutions brought against the Caliph Yazid I by 
the Medinees to be false. The matter only became 
serious when the adventurer Mukhtar [q. v.] after 
several vain efforts to get others to join him stirred up 
a movement on a large scale in the 'Iraq in 
66 (685), as champion of Muhammad's rights.
Even now Muhammad acted with great restraint 
and declined the significant title "al-Mahdi" with 
which they wished to greet him (cf. Tabari, n. 
610 and Ibn Sa'd, v. 68, which has certainly been 
missinterpreted by Lammens). He obviously did 
not care for Mukhtar at all, and he had every rea-
son to doubt the genuineness of his enthusiasm 
for him; but in view of the many dangers which 
surrounded him and probably also from a want of 
confidence he did not wish to break with him openly.
Therefore, when some people came to him from 
Kufa to clear up his attitude to Mukhtar, he only 
gave them a diplomatic answer which was very 
commodious (cf. the somewhat different versions: 
Ibn Sa'd, v. 72; VA'ILAH, i. 308; Tabari, ii. 607 
and thereon KAMAL, p. 598) but which they inter-
preted as a kind of approval, as it did not definitely 
throw him. As a result the revolutionary move-
ment spread in extent and much blood was shed 
to avenge Husain and other 'Alids. Muhammad 
was against this also (cf. Ibn Sa'd, v. 72 sqq. 77): 
but when Ibn Zubair's attitude became more and 
more hostile and he finally imprisoned Muhammad 
and several relatives, including 'Abd Allah b. 
Akhbar, at Mecca near the Zemzem well, he saw 
nothing else for it but to appeal for help to Mukhtar. 
This was what the latter wanted and he sent a 
body of cavalry at once to Mecca and released 
Muhammad and the other prisoners in the nick 
of time but by the latter's express orders avoided 
all contact with Ibn Zubair's troops, as the town was 
not to be deserted by bloodshed. Muhammad had 
then sought shelter with his family at Minai (cf. 
KAMAL, p. 554 sqq.; KABD. AL-QADIDA, vii. 33; 
Kuwaït, ed. HOOTZ, i. 78) and later went to 
'Yazid. He made no further use of Mukhtar and was 
therefore not compromised when the revolution 
failed and his champion fell in 67 (686-687). 
In spite of the threats of Ibn Zubair and the 
demands couched in more friendly language of 
'Abd al-Malik and although a safe place of residence 
was granted him neither in 'Iraq nor in Syria, he defined his attitude by paying homage to 
neither of the two pretenders and adhered to 
the principle that he would only recognize a ruler around whom the Muslim community were united. 
He therefore appeared in the noteworthy pilgrimage 
of the year 686 along with the Zubairis, the Umayyads 
and Khawarij, as an independent head of a party, 
although only under an armed neutrality. Only 
when, after the fall of Ibn Zubair (72 = 692), the 
unanimity of the ziyad, which he had demanded, 
became a reality, did he finally recognize the 
Husaynid as the legitimate ruler and visited him 
in 78 (697-698) at Damascus. He returned how-
evertheless to Medina, where he died in 81 (700-701). 
His strict passivity in the political field is always 
attributed to purely religious motives in the 
traditions: not human force but Allah's help alone 
should assist 'Ali's family to their rights; but there 
is no doubt that a further reason was his lack of 
enterprise and self-confidence, a trait common 
to a number of 'Ali's. That, like his paternal family, 
he at the same time looked the good things of this 
world was evident from the heavy demands which 
he sent to 'Abd al-Malik for the payment of his 
debts and annual pensions for his children, 
relatives and clients; there is also evidence that 
he had the family fondness for fine clothes and 
coattails. It is all the more remarkable then that 
the more fanciful and extravagant school of 
Shi'ism seized upon him at once after his death and spread 
the belief that he was not dead but lived in a 
kind of fairy kingdom on the hill of Kadwah west 
of Medina, whence he would return as the victorious 
leader of an army (cf. KABD. AL-QADIDA, vii. n. 
87; viii. 32). This was the idea of rumaysh, which 
'Abd Allah b. Sa'd [q. v.] had associated with 
'Ali (cf. FRIEDLANDER, in Z. A., ann. 309 sqq.) and 
which was now transferred to him; and in fact it 
was now easier to bring him into the forefront 
than it had been while he maintained an attitude 
of stubborn passive resistance in his lifetime.
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MUHAMMAD b. MAHMUD

MUHAMMAD b. ILYAS [See Abu 'Ali]  
MUHAMMAD b. ISA [See Isaweya]  
MUHAMMAD b. ISHAK [See Ibn Ishak, Nadjim]  

MUHAMMAD b. AL-KASIM [See Abu'l-A'lam, Anak]  

MUHAMMAD b. KASIM, a cousin of Walid 1 (896–905) and son-in-law of al-Hajjaj. He was governor of Basra; in 92 (711), he was sent to conquer Sind. Having defeated and killed the Kairan of the place called Dahir, he took possession of that country in 93 (712) and finally penetrated as far as Multan about 500 miles from the sea, and even reached the foot of the Himalayas. Various accounts are given of the death of this general. The common story is that Muhammad b. Kasim was falsely accused by the two daughters of the Kairan of Dahir, whom he had sent to the harem of Sulaiman (96–99 = 715–717), the brother and successor of Walid, of having violated their chastity, and that he was therefore sewn up alive in a raw cow-hide, by order of the enraged caliph. Others say that Muhammad b. Kasim was mistaken, and put to death by Sahl b. Abd al-Rahman, governor of Iraq, in revenge for the murder of his brother by Hajjdij.  


MUHAMMAD b. MAHMUD

Abu Shuward Qasim al-Diyya wa-l-Din, a Sa'di in Sultan 547–554 (1153–1159), born 522 (1125), like his brother Malik Shah was educated with the atabeg Buzaba, who set them up as claimants to the throne against their uncle Mas'ud. When Buzaba in 542 (1147–1148) was taken prisoner in a fierce battle and executed, Mas'ud adopted his nephew and married Muhammad to his daughter. He probably intended him to succeed him and not Malik-shah, as Ibn al-Athir and others say, because after his death (547 = 1152) the latter was actually raised to the throne. Muhammad was away at the time but within three months he was recognised as sultan by the powerful Khayyeb, after he had come to Hamadhan, because Malik-shah proved quite incompetent. The new sultan showed his gratitude by treacherously putting Khayyeb to death and sent his head to the emirs of Maraghah and Astarabad in the hope that he would win them over. But he was disappointed for, although they hated Khayyeb, theKhayyeb's party at the cruel deed made them prefer to pay homage to Muhammad's uncle Sulaiman, who had escaped from years of imprisonment on Mas'ud's death. Muhammad therefore fled to Ispahan, but because Sulaiman was an inveterate drunkard, he could not hold out in Hamadhan and when he had gone away Muhammad returned and was henceforth recognised as sultan by the emirs. In the meanwhile Sulaiman succeeded in escaping to Ispahan and entered into relations with the Caliph al-Musta'f or li-Amir Allah. The latter was endeavouring not without success to make himself independent of the Seldjiks and let Sulaiman come to Baghdad (550 = 1153) to use
him against Muhammad. He was also able to win Malikshah over and to collect an army, which was however scattered in the following year by Muhammad with the help of Mawdud, lord of al-Mawsil, and Sulaiman was again made prisoner. Muhammad now thought himself strong enough to attack the Caliph himself and to besiege him in Baghda. Inaid al-Din, who was in the town, gives a full account of the siege (Rut. Hist. Crois., ii. 246 sqq.). Muhammad hurriedly raised the siege when news reached him that Bitgiz had occurred with Malikshah and Arslan (552 = 1157). By the time the sultan arrived there they had retired, but he was at war with them till his death in 554 (1159).

Bibliography: see the article seljuk.

Muhmmad b. Malikshah Abu Shuja' Ghiyath al-Dunya wa-l-Din Qasim Amir al-Mu'minina, a Salidjuk sulthan (498-511 = 1105-1118), was born on the 18th Shaban 474 (Jan. 20, 1082) of a slave, who was also the mother of Sandjar, and was given the Turkish name of Tapar. After his father's death, he stayed at first with Turkan Qasim and then joined his brother Barkiyaruk who granted him the town of Gandja. Arrived there, he also seized Arsan and allowed himself to be seduced by Mu'ayyad al-Mulk b. Nizam al-Mulk into dropping his brother's name out of the kufra. The two brothers fought one another with varying success in the following years until finally in 497 (1104) Barkiyaruk withdrew from the western provinces of the empire to Isfahan and left Muhammad to enforce recognition as sultan from the governors in these lands. When Barkiyaruk died soon after, at the end of 1104, Muhammad turned first to Baghda because he was sure of the homage of the Caliph, who had already received him and his brother a few years before in ceremonial audience (cf. the account in Ibn Khallak, Bilak, 1299, ii. 444, had the emir Ayar, who had at first had the kufra read for Malikshah b. Barkiyaruk, treacherously put to death and sent the king of the Arabs Sandjar back to his capital al-Hilli with orders to restore peace in Basyra and among the Arab tribes of the neighbourhood. He then hurried to Isfahan where the Bantinya had achieved great successes in the trouble in the neighborhood of Barkiyaruk and had established themselves in several hill-fortresses in the neighbourhood. One of their leaders, Ibn Atgh, had by a ruse secured possession of the fortress of Dul-Kuh of Shash-Diz built by Malikshah. The Sultan regarded it as his first duty to subdue and root out if possible these unbelievers; he sent his troops to besiege the fortress and, when it was taken, razed it to the ground and had the captured Bantinya executed in cruel fashion (500 = 1107; cf. the text of the report sent him by the Caliph's vizier in Ibn al-Kalanisi, ed. Améroz, p. 152 ff.). Nor did he hesitate to have his own vizier, Sa'id al-Mulk Abu 'l-Mahsas al-Ati', executed at the gate of Isfahan; he was suspected, according to Anusharwan wrongly, (cf. Rec. Hist. Crois., ii. 91) of having had dealings with the Bantinya.

While Muhammad was still in Isfahan, the emir Cawali Sakawu, who ruled between Fars and Khuszistan, sent his submission to him; the sultan had frequently tried in vain to bring him to obedience through the emir Mawdud. The sultan was so pleased that he granted him the town of al-Mawsil where Djekermish, who had only paid homage to him under compulsion, was in command. The latter was not inclined to submit to the arrangement, but was taken prisoner in an encounter with Cawali. The latter however was not yet lord of al-Mawsil, for the followers of Djekermish now supported his son Zangi and appealed for help to Aksoskor al-Bursuki, the governor of Baghda, to Sadaqa and to Khilid Arslan, the Salajjuk of al-Rum. The last-named alone answered the appeal and came with his troops to al-Mawsil where he had homage paid to himself as sultan, but soon afterwards, after an unsuccessful encounter, he was drowned in the Khabur on his retreat. Cawali now had little difficulty in taking the town and going on to his further task, the war against the Crusaders. It would take us too far here to sketch the course of this war, and the reader may therefore be referred to Weil, Gesch. der Chal., iii. 191 sqq. During his absence he again fell into disgrace with the Caliph, who had in the meanwhile returned to Baghda and sent his troops to attack Sadaqa, with whom he was also dissatisfied. Sadaqa fell in battle in 501 (beg. of 1101). The sultan sent Mawdud to al-Mawsil and granted him the same dignity as he had previously given Cawali. The latter after some time made peace with the sultan and was appointed as attabeg to Fars, where he fought the usual elements in the population with great energy (cf. Ibn al-Ahbar, ed. Tornberg, x. 561 sqq.). The Bantinya however gave Muhammad no peace, so long as they were able to hold their strong mountain citadel of Alamut; Abu Nasr Ahammad, a son of Nizam al-Mulk, who after Sa'id al-Mulk acted as the sultan's vizier, was therefore given orders to take this fortress and when he did not succeed, he was dismissed in 504 (1109-10). In the meanwhile the sultan was being urged more and more from different sides to prosecute the war with the Crusaders seriously, and he succeeded in persuading the various governors of the western provinces to combine and attack the Christians under the leadership of Mawdud accompanied by the young prince Mas'dud. After Mawdud's assassination (507 = 1113) Aksoskor al-Bursuki took the command and after him Bursuki assumed the supreme command but on account of the strife among the Turkish emirs, the value of the Crusaders and the complicated situation in Syria, decisive successes could not be attained. For the course of the campaign we again refer the reader to Weil, op. cit., p. 194 sqq. and the historians of the Crusaders. In the last years of his life, the sultan sent the emir Anushjestin Shirig against the Bantinya in Alamut, but he died on the 24th Dhu 'l-Hijja 511 (Apr. 18, 1118) before the fortress was taken. He was only 36 years old and this is why Weil suggests that the Bantinya had a hand in his death, but there is nothing to support this hypothesis in the oriental chronicles. On the contrary, individuals in his immediate entourage, notably the Great Hizijj 'Ali bar, seem to have been not quite innocent, because they, apparently to avert suspicion from themselves, accused the sultan's Gohar Qasim and the famous poet al-Tughra' of having caused the sultan's illness by magic arts. The former was blinded and strangulated on the day Muhammad died. The reason given by Matthias of Edessa for this (Docum. Arm., i. 120) is wrong. The sultan deserves credit for having, with the assistance of his brother Sandjar who ruled in Khurasan and the adjoining lands, restored the fortunes of the Salajjuk kingdom, which had declined since the death of Malikshah
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and for having vigorously fought infidels and sectarians in his zeal for Sunni Islam and the 'Abbāsī caliphate. He was, as Rev. Hist. Crit., ii. 118 has it, the perfect man of the Sūlāqūn and their strong be-camel.

Bibliography: given in the article SELJUKS.

Mūhammad, Abū 'Abd Allāh, Dālāl al-dawla wa-dālāl al-Milla, Abū Ahmad Mūhammad, second son of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, was born about 587 (997). He was married to a daughter of Abū Nasr Mūhammad b. Abū l-Ḥārīm 'Abd Allāh b. Mūhammad, the Fārghānī ruler of Dīrzhānān. After the death of Abū Nasr Mūhammad in 401 (1010–1011), Sultan Mahmūd assigned to his son Mūhammad the government of the province of Dīrzhānān. In 417 (1026), at the instance of Sultan Mahmūd, the 'Abbāsī Caliph al-Kādir bi 'llah conferred on him the titles of Dālāl al-dawla wa-dālāl al-Milla. Towards the close of his life, Sultan Mahmūd divided his empire between his sons, giving Ghazna, Khurāsān and India to Mūhammad and Raiy, Dīrzhānān to Maʿṣūd, and took solemn vows from both to respect this division. When Mahmūd died in Rabī' II, 421 (April 1030), Mūhammad ascended the throne at Ghazna, but Maʿṣūd, disregarding his vows, marched from Dīrzhānān to take possession of Ghazna. In the meantime, the nobles at Ghazna deposed Mūhammad on 3rd Shawwāl 421 (October 2, 1030) and read the 'ijāra in the name of Maʿṣūd. Mūhammad was then deprived of his sight by orders of Maʿṣūd and imprisoned in a fort. His reign had lasted only 6 months.

In 431 Sultan Maʿṣūd suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Sūlāqūn, and resolved to settle in India. In the beginning of 432 (September 1030), leaving Ghazna in the hands of his son Mawdūd and his wazir, he marched to India with all his treasures, but on 13th Rabī' II, 432 (December 24, 1040) his slaves deserted him and raised Mūhammad to the throne. Shortly after this, Maʿṣūd was put to death. Hearing this, Mawdūd advanced with a large army to avenge the death of his father, defeated Mūhammad near Dūnpūr on 3rd Shaṭābīn 432 (April 1041), and put him to death. The second reign of Mūhammad lasted only 4 months. Mūhammad was obedient to his father and was a man of amiable temperance. He resembled his father in appearance and speech.


Muḥammad b. Marwān, an Umayyad governor. In 65 (684–685) he was sent by his father, the caliph Marwān I, to Mesopotamia, and in the battle of Dār al-ʿAlā (72 (690) in which his brother, the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, defeated Muʿaṣṣar b. Zabār, he commanded the advanced guard of the Syrian army. In the following year ʿAbd al-Malik gave him the government of Mesopotamia and Armenia which he carried with it the command in the war with the Byzantines. On account of climatic conditions the Arab expeditions always took place in summer. In 73 (692), the emperor Justinian II was defeated at Seleucia di Cilicia. In 75 (694) Mūhammad again took the field against the Byzantines and was successful against them at Marāshī, and in the following year he invaded Armenia. Along with his nephew ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Malik he was sent to al-Ḥadīr (May 701), to support him against the rebel ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Mūhammad b. al-ʿAshār, and in the negotiations with the Persians before the battle at Dair al-Jamāḥīm the caliph was represented by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh. In the same year, Mūhammad led an expedition against Armenia, and again in 84 (793) and 85 (794). After the accession of al-Walīd (Shawwāl 86 = Oct. 795) Mūhammad fell gradually into the background while Maslama, the caliph's brother, was the actual commander; but the former retained his governorship for some time until in 91 (799–800) he was replaced by Maslama here also. Mūhammad died in 101 (797–798).


Muḥammad b. Mūkarrām (See Ibn Mānūš).

Muḥammad b. Muṣāb b. Shāhīr (See Mūsā Bānū).

Muḥammad b. al-Mustānīr (See Kūtībū).

Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar (See Muṣaffārūd).

Muḥammad b. ʿOmar (See Ibn al-Kūṭīyā).

Muḥammad b. ʿOthmān (See ʿAbd Zādān).

Muḥammad b. Rāʾīk (See Ibn ʿĀṣir).

Muḥammad b. Rāzīn (See ʿAbd al-Līḥās).

Muḥammad b. ʿSaʿūd (See Ibn Mardanisheh; Ibn Saʿūd).

Muḥammad b. ʿSālīm (See Ibn al-Wakīl).

Muḥammad b. ʿSaʿūd (See Ghiyāt al-Din).

Muḥammad b. ʿSaʿūd (properly Saʿūd) was Muḥammad of the Muqrīn clan of ʿAnaza, the founder of the Wahhābi dynasty of the ʿAlī ʿSaʿūdī in Najd (see the article Ibn ʿSaʿūd), succeeded his father as amir of Darʿiya in 1137 (1724) or 1140 (1727). His association with the reformer Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (cf. Wahhābīyā) began in 1157 (1744). Thereafter until his death (end of Rabī' I, 1179 = Sept. 1765) the history of his reign consists of an unceasing and on the whole indecisive struggle against the neighbouring settlements and tribes and his former suzerains, the ʿAbāb Khālid of al-Jāsā. He took little active part in these operations, and the personality is overshadowed by the figures of the Reformer himself and of his own son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Nevertheless his talents as a diplomatist more than
once saved the Wāhhabī state from being crushed by a coalition of its enemies, notably after the disastrous defeat by the forces of Nāṣir al-Dīn at Ḥijr in 1764.

Bibliography: The only full source is the Kitāb al-Qanawītī (vol. ii. of Rauḍat al-A‘lām) of Husain b. Ḥammām (d. 1225 H.), Ms., British Museum Add. 23, 343, fol. 30a—30b [the Bombay lighthograph (1332 H.) is very inaccurate] summarized by H. St. J. Phillips, Arabia, London 1939, p. 12—22. — See also A. Musil, Northern Syria, New York 1928, p. 258—259, and Amin al-Raiḥānī, ‘Umar Nāṣir al-Ḥāshibī, Bairut 1928, p. 50—53, and for general works the Bibliography to the article Ibn Sā’d. (H. A. R. Gibb)

MUḤAMMAD b. SIRĪN [See Ibn Sūrān.]

MUḤAMMAD b. ‘ṬĀHIR, governor of Ḥūrāsān. After the death of his father, Muḥammad reigned the governorship of Ḥūrāsān (Rājāb 248 = Sept. 562). In 250 (864—5) the ‘Allīd al-Ḥasan b. Zaid rebelled, which led to a long and serious struggle [see MUḤAMMAD b. ‘ABBĀS AL-‘Ā‘IY]. When ‘Abd al-Salām b. al-Ṭābil rebelled against Yāqūtb, Muḥammad b. al-Ṭābil al-Ṣaffār and appealed for help to Muḥammad, who appointed him governor of al-Ṭabasān and Kuṭalbūṣ, Yāqūtb found a welcome pretext to invade Ḥūrāsān. Muḥammad sent an embassy to him; but as Yāqūtb had already found a following among discontented Ḥūrāsānīs, all negotiations were in vain. In Shawwāl 259 (Aug. 873), or according to another statement in 258, he entered Nisābūr without striking a blow, put an end to the Ṭihrid dynasty and took Muḥammad prisoner. But when he rebelled against the Caliph al-Mu’tamid, he was defeated in Rājāb 262 (April 876) by the latter’s brother al-Muwaṣṣafī and Muḥammad, whom he had with him in chains, escaped. The Caliph restored the latter to his former office in Ḥūrāsān; the exiled Ṭihrid however never found an opportunity to exercise his functions. He was further appointed — probably not till 270 (884—5) — as the vizier Shu b. Malikb as his deputy as military governor of Baghād. He held this office until the accession of al-Mu’tamid (279 = 892). He died in 296 (908—9).


(K. V. Zetersteën)

MUḤAMMAD b. ‘ṬĀHIR [See Ibn al-Ka‘dā.’]

MUḤAMMAD b. TAKASH [See Kuwārīm al-Muḥammād]

MUḤAMMAD b. TŪḤDĪ b. DUFF (or Ḍuff) b. YĀLTAŠI b. FERKIN b. FEŠI b. KHĀṢHĪN, Abū Bakr, known as al-‘Īṣhrīṣī, from the title granted to him by the Caliph al-Ṭabāqī in 327 (939), was the founder of the Egyptian dynasty of the Ḥāshidids [q. v.]

He was born in 265 (882) at Baghād, and must have spent his youth in Syria, as his father, who joined the service of the Tāblkīts at about the same date, was appointed governor of Damascus and Ṭabarīya c. 270, a post which he held for some fifteen years, and he himself acted for a time as his father’s deputy for Ṭabarīya. In consequence of the overthrow of the Ḥāshidid dynasty in 292 (904), he was imprisoned at Baghād. He was released in 294 (907), attached to the wāizr al-ʿĀ‘lām b. al-Ḥassān and had many opportunities of murder, had to fly when the conspiracy of Ibn al-Muṭarr [q. v.] failed in 296 (908). He escaped to Syria and found himself reduced to a humble station. Next year he passed on to Egypt, where Ṭakin, its governor, took him into favour, so that he kept him with himself, both in Egypt and in Syria when he was transferred thither to act as governor at intervals (302—307 and 309—311), and promoted him to appointments of importance.

At this period Muḥammad came into contact with the powerful Māhrūsī family, and also attended Munīs [q. v.] when he was brought to Egypt by the Fāṣīd invasions. He had already attracted some attention at Baghād by an exploit in 306. In 316 (928), through influence at the capitol, he became governor of Kāmīn, quiting Ṭakin abruptly. In 319 he obtained a transfer to Damasc, where he became powerful, and in consequence of his defeat of Bāḥshī in 321 extended his rule over the whole of Syria. In the same year (March 933) Ṭakin died, and Muḥammad b. Tūḥdī succeeded in obtaining the appointment as governor of Egypt in his place, but only nominally and for one month (Sept. 933). Two years later, by means of a large army and fleet, he entered Fāṣīd and took possession of the country, overcoming the resistance of al-Muḍārī (Muḥammad b. ‘Allī), who by appointment from Baghād was then in control of Egypt, the governor being under his direction (ṭāfīf al-tadbirī), superior to al-Muḥammad, however, was al-Fāḍl b. Ḥaḍīr b. al-Gurārī [for whom see the article IBN AL-KA‘DĀ’]. The reining minister (wāizr al-kirāf) of Egypt and Syria, who had been specially granted full executive powers, Muḥammad b. Tūḥdī had acted with the authorization of al-Fāḍl and later (324) obtained the confirmation of al-Ḵādī to the addition of Egypt to the province of Syria already held by him. Probably at the same time he was granted the suzerainty over al-Yaman and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina, for in his letter of the following year to the Emperor Romanus he boasts of these places as part of his kingdom. Until the death of al-Fāḍl in 327 (March 959), he seems to have been subject, at least in theory, to some control by him.

In 324 a decisive victory by the troops of Muḥammad b. Tūḥdī near Alexandria (battle of Abūlq, March 31, 936) crushed the third Fāṣīd invasion of Egypt and led to overtures from the Fāṣīd Caliph al-Kā‘īm, in which the end came to nothing. Muḥammad did indeed decide three years later to recognize the Fāṣīd, and had given the order that al-Kā‘īm should be proclaimed in Egypt, out of indignation at the Ḥabbāsid government at Baghād, but was induced to recon sider his decision.

Only a month after he had received his title al-Kā‘īmī from al-Kā‘īm (Ramadan 327 = June—July 939), he found himself threatened from Rakṣa by Ibrāhīm b. Rākṣa [q. v.] and learnt that his provinces had been granted to this rival. Bakrīm [q. v.], as amir al-mu‘ādrī at Baghād, gave no answer to his appeal but that the question must be decided by the sword; the powerless Caliph could say nothing. Ibrāhīm b. Rākṣa rapidly possessed himself of Syria, driving back the forces sent to oppose him,
and had soon captured Ramla (Oct. 939). Muhammad b. Tughjdi himself confronted him with an army at Farama, and with no fighting beyond some skirmishing entered into negotiations, ending in an agreement to cede Syria from Tbabariyya to the north on condition that Ramla and the rest were restored to him. Ibn Râjk soon broke this treaty and again advanced. This time Muhammad b. Tughjdi encountered him at al-Árish and routed him (15th Ramadân 324 = June 24, 940), but as he followed him into Syria, met with a reverse in his turn, one of his detachments being surprised and badly defeated at Laddejân (15th August). Peace was then renewed on the same terms as before, and Muhammad b. Tughjdi undertook to pay an annual subsidy of 140,000 dinârs. He was back in Egypt in October.

The death of Badkjâm in 329 (April 941) drew Ibn Râjk back to Baghdad, and Muhammad b. Tughjdi was soon relieved of him completely, for he was murdered a year later by the Hadâmîns. Muhammad lost no time in recovering Syria, marching thither himself (June 942) and remaining in the country about six months before coming back to Egypt. It must have been at about this period that he succeeded in dispensing some minor encroachments on Syria from the direction of Raîkâ that are alluded to without details, those of Ádil (al-Badkjâm) and Badr al-Kharthjâmi. He had to meet more serious attacks from the Hadâmîns. One of them, al-Husain b. Sa'id, took Hâlab from him in 332 (March 944), and in May he set out to recover it. The Caliph al-Muttaqi, moreover, issued an order protecting the Hadâmîns from Tâzûn, the anîr al-ummarî, had appealed to him for help. His enemy retired at his approach and having regained the town he proceeded to Raîkâ, where he met the Caliph (Sept. 7, 944). At this time he had thoughts of becoming anîr al-ummarî himself. He urged al-Muttaqi to come with him to Syria and Egypt, and even offered to go with him to Baghdad. He begged him not to trust himself to Tâzûn, but could not dissuade him. After receiving flattering marks of honour he departed. Before he reached Fustât on his return the Hâdamîn Saif al-Dawla [q.v.] had retaken Hâlab (Oct. 944). The Egyptian army sent to meet this new aggression was severely defeated at Rastân near Hîm, and Saif al-Dawla advanced to Damascus and entered it (April-May 945). Muhammad b. Tughjdi, coming from Egypt with his army, obliged him to retreat, pursued him, brought him to battle at Kinnasrin (May—June 945), and defeated him. Again Muhammad made easy terms when victorious. Saif al-Dawla retained Syria north of Damascus and was also given a subsidy. The treaty was concluded in Kâfîr b. 334 (Oct.—Nov. 945), and Muhammad then went back to Damascus, remaining there until he died a few months later (21st Dhu ‘l-Hijja 334 = June 24, 946), just after the arrival of a Byzantine envoy concerning an exchange of prisoners for which he had opened negotiations.

Next to nothing is recorded of the internal events of Egypt during his reign; the country was doubtless quiet. Its revenue, said to have amounted to two million dinârs annually, was no longer accounted for to Baghdad, and no regular payments were made from it to the central treasury. But he sent large occasional gifts to the Caliph, so that al-Râjk considered him an exemplary vassal.

He left seven million dinârs at his death besides considerable other property. No constructive works of much importance are credited to him. At Fustât he rebuilt the shipyard on the mainland, and on its site on the island of Rawda a garden called al-Mukhtár; he enlarged the government house in which he resided, a Tulûnî building that was situated near the still existing tomb of al-Kâfîrî Bahkârî, and added a maidân; he also made another garden known later as al-Kâfîrî, afterwards the site of the western Tulûnî palace of Cairo. His armies at times seem to have been large. At the battle of Ablûk the Egyptians are said to have had 15,000 horsemen, at that of Kinnasrin 50,000 men. Such numbers must have been reached by means of levies for particular emergencies, which he is known to have raised more than once. On one occasion his personal retainers (kuttâns), on whom he more especially depended, numbered 500. The constantly repeated and universally accepted figures of 400,000 for his army and 8,000 for his bodyguard can be dismissed as ridiculous, notwithstanding that they rest on the early authority of al-Tantûbî (d. 384), and with them the accompanying myth as to his habit of concealing his sleeping places when on campaign.

The most renowned of his followers was Kâfir [q.v.]. Another of his kuttâns, Fâzik, rose to some eminence. Ali b. Muhammad b. Kâfîr was his secretary both at Damascus and in Egypt. Muhammad b. Ali b. al-Madâinî was his waiz for a few months (328–329); Muhammad b. Ali b. Mûktâlî, previously secretary to Ibn Râjk, was his waiz at his death. His four brothers were all younger than himself; al-Husayn was in command at the battle of Ablûk, and represented him in Egypt during all his absences, al-Husain was in command at Laddejân and killed there, Ublâd Allâh acted for him in Syria, Ali disappears early.

Notable Egyptian authors who flourished during his reign were the historian Ibn al-Dîya (d. 334), al-Hâmidî (d. 350), and Abu Târîk ha-Târîkî (d. 362), who came to Egypt in 329 and was in his confidence at Raîkâ in 333. Al-Masâdîî moreover visited Egypt in 330. Al-Mutanabbi, just rising to fame, recited once in his presence in Syria and addressed a verse or two to him and to his brother Ublâd Allâh (d. 333 at Ramla).

Muhammad b. Tughjdi was strong physically, but subject to occasional fits of melancholia. His character is illustrated by a number of incidents that have every appearance of being authentic. He was strict, but in no way vindictive or cruel. He often brought his officers to account, and then after punishing them by arrest or fine would restore them to favour. Hardly any executions are heard of in his reign. He would not allow torture and the maltreatment of accused persons, something he carried out in his time. His tact and sagacity were conspicuous. He was decent in his life and liked by his men and the people. On the other hand, he was certainly oppressive and unfair in some of his money exactations, and though at times not ungenerous was inclined to be mean and miserly in minor matters. The two great faults attributed to him, even to his face in his lifetime, parsimony and timidity, are not altogether without foundation. As to the latter, his own defence in a particular instance looks valid.

His career was closely parallel to that of Ahmad b. Tulûn [q.v.], even as regards several fortuitous
occurrences. It leaves no doubt of his capacity, and if admitting of occasional overcaution, will not allow of anything like cowardice. He did not make the same mark as his predecessor, but was a mild and perhaps a better ruler.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, al-Mu'arrab (ed. Tallqvist, Leyden 1899) contains the text of the biography of Muhammad, including subsidiary authorities, and a full biography in German carefully worked out from both sources. By far the most important authority is the long and detailed biography of Muhammad b. Tughdî which forms part of Ibn Sa'd's work, and appears to consist of the life composed by Ibn Zalik between 350 and 355, reproduced almost but not quite verbatim. The other principal authority is the Kitab al-Walî of al-Kindi, ed. Guest. Little, if anything, can be added from books published after al-Mu'arrab.

(R. Guest)

MUHAMMAD B. TUGHLUQ [See MUHAMMAD TUGHLUQ.]

MUHAMMAD B. TÜMART [See IBN TÜMART.]

MUHAMMAD B. 'UBAID ALLAH [See Abi 'l-Ma'âli].

MUHAMMAD B. AL-WALID [See IBN ABI RANDARA.]

MUHAMMAD B. YAHYA [See IBN BÂJUJA.]

MUHAMMAD B. YÂ'ÂTÎ, ÂBD BAKR, a chief of police in Baghdad. In 318 (930) Muhammad, whose father was chief in the capital to the Caliph al-Mukhtadîr was appointed chief of police. The maintenance of order in the capital at this time was much neglected and the praetorians conducted a regular reign of terror. In a fracas between infantry and cavalry Muhammad intervened on behalf of the latter; their opponents were cut down, some driven from the city and only a small contingent of negroes, who at once surrendered, remained unscathed (Muhammad 318 = Feb. 930). Some months later these mutinied and demanded more pay; but they were driven out of the town by Muhammad and then routed by the chief emir Mu'nis [q.v.] near Wusit. The confusion was increased by the breach between Mu'nis and Muhammad. At the instigation of Mu'nis, Muhammad was dismissed in 319 (June-July 931). Mu'nis was nevertheless not satisfied but demanded that his hated rival should be banished. The Caliph at first refused to grant his request; but when Mu'nis threatened him with force, he had to yield, whereupon Muhammad went to Sidjastân (Radjab 319 = July 931). Soon afterwards the Caliph quarreled with Mu'nis and recalled Muhammad. In Muhammad 320 (Jan. 932) the latter returned to Baghad; the Caliph then sent him with an army to al-Mashâq in the region of Takrit. But when Mu'nis advanced from Mosul, the Caliph's troops under Muhammad and Sa'id b. Jâfâr retired to Baghad without striking a blow. After the victory of Mu'nis and the murder of al-Mukhtadîr in Shawwâl of the same year (Oct. 932) the latter's son Abd al-Wâhid fled with Muhammad and his other supporters to al Madâ'in and then to Wusit where a number of his generals abandoned him. When the forces of the new Caliph al-Kâhir approached under the command of Yalshâq, 'Abd al-Wâhid and Muhammad fled to Tusshar. Muhammad was not popular on account of his arrogance and selfishness, so that once after the other laid down his arms and finally 'Abd al-Wâhid surrendered. Muhammad entered into negotiations with Yalshâq and the Caliph pardoned him. He then returned to Baghad where he gained a great influence over al-Kâhir. On the accession of al-Râfi in 322 (April 934), Muhammad became the real ruler in a short time; the Caliph appointed him chief chamberlain and also made him his commander-in-chief while the vizir Ibn Muljûk played a more subordinate part. When al-Mu'qaddîr's cousin Hârûn b. Qâbir, whom al-Kâhir had appointed governor of Mâhk al-Kûfâ, al-Dinawar and Mâsadâdbîn rebelled, Muhammad was sent with an army against him. In the resulting battle, Muhammad suffered a defeat (Lûmmâdî II 322 = May 934); soon afterwards however, Hârûn fell from his horse and was killed by one of Muhammad's slaves. With the death of their commander the resistance of Hârûn's followers collapsed; Muhammad was nevertheless unable long to retain his position of power. On the advice of Ibn Muljûk who feared his ever increasing power, al-Râfi had him arrested along with his brother al-Muqaffar and the secretary Abî İbar al-Kâstîfî on the 51st Lûmmâdî I, 323 (April 12. 935). Muhammad died in prison in the same year.


MUHAMMAD E. YAZID [See IBN MUSÂJA, AL-MURRAHÂ]

MUHAMMAD B. YÜSUF [See Abi HAYYÂN.]

MUHAMMAD 'ABD AL-KARIM 'ALAM, better known as 'Abd al-Karim Mushî, a Persian historian of the middle of the sixteenth century. His best known work is the Ta'rikh-i Ahmâd or Ahmâshabî composed for 'Abd al-Râjuhî b. Hâzîm, Muhammad Rawshân-Châin, a historian of the founder of the Durrânî dynasty in Afgânistan, Ahmad Shâh. After 'Abd al-Karîn had finished a history of Shadrî al-Mulk Durrânî and the conquest of Khudââdan in 1235 (1820), he decided to write a complete history of the Durrânîs and began his Ta'rikh-i Ahmâd. The work is based on the Ta'rikh-i Husânî of Imam al-Din Husâni (Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Lirr. Mus. lii. 904b) and is really only a paraphrase of it. It begins with the story of Ahmad Shâh which he continued to the year 1212. Then follows a description of the Panjâb and the roads between Khâbul, Hârat, Padshâwar and Kandahâr and a chapter on Turkistan under Nasirîs Bay. The work concludes with the accession of Shadrî al-Mulk. In addition to this book, 'Abd al-Karîn in 1265 (1847) wrote the Mu'âllaqa'i Kâtil ve Kamshâr, which describes the war with the English down to General Pollock's expedition (Sept.-Oct. 1842). It is again not original but based on the poem Akbar-nâmâ of Kâsim Dîân. According to Beale, Oriental Biographical Dictionary (London 1894, p. 5), he also wrote a history of the Sikh war entitled Ta'rikh-i Panjâbful Tasfâsân-i 'Aâhâsh, but there is no mention of a manuscript or lithograph of any such work in any of the European catalogues. It is possible that there is some confusion with the Panjâb section of the Ta'rikh-i Ahmâd. In the Catalogue of the Persian printed Books in the British Museum (London 1922, p. 19), E. Edwards ascribes to the author a dictionary of English and Persian homonyms
entitled *A Dictionary of Anglo-Persian homonymous words being a... Collection of... Words having nearly the same Sound and the same Meaning*, Bombay 1889; it is however unfortunately not possible to be certain that the author of the book is the same 'Abd al-Karim Mun-hi. 


**MUHAMMAD 'ABDUH, a Muslim theologian, founder of the Egyptian modernist school.**

Muhammad 'Abdul belonged to an Egyptian peasant family and was born in 1849 in Lower Egypt. He spent his childhood in the little village of Majallat Nasr in the mudiriyat of Bulhain. When Muhammad 'Abdul had learned the Kur'an by heart, he was sent in 1862 to the theological school of Taht but he left this after a year and a half discouraged and was only induced to resume his studies through the influence of a grand uncle who aroused in him an interest in mysticism. In 1865 he returned to Taht but the next year proceeded to Cairo to the Ashar Mosque. There at this moment the first movements of a new spirit were becoming apparent in the beginning of a return to the classics and an awakening interest in natural science and history, which agreed with mysticism in a lower estimation of the old traditional studies. In this milieu Muhammad 'Abdul at once devoted himself entirely to mysticism, practised asceticism and retired from the world. It was again his grand uncle who persuaded him to give this up. About the same time, 1872, Muhammad 'Abdul came into contact with Sayid Jumal al-Din al-Afghani [q.v.] who had just arrived in Egypt and was desirous to exercise a profound influence upon him. It was he who revealed traditional learning to Muhammad 'Abdul in a new light, called his attention to European works accessible in translations and attracted his interest finally to Egyptian and Islamic problems of the day. Muhammad 'Abdul, soon became his most ardent disciple and in his very first work of a mystical nature (Risālat al-Wirādit, 1290 = 1874) enthusiastically described Sayid Jumal al-Din as his spiritual guide. The influence of Sayid Jumal al-Din is still more marked on the matter of Muhammad 'Abdul's second work, notes on dogmatics entitled Ḥujjat al-Khilafal al-Dawā'ir li Ḥ-Ṣifik al-Adil 'Aṣlīya [1292 = 1876]. The influence of Sayid Jumal al-Din and the development of affairs in Egypt towards the end of the reign of the Khedive Ismail caused Muhammad 'Abdul in 1876 to take to journalism, which he practised henceforth. After concluding his studies at the Ashar mosque and acquiring the certificate of an
Theodoros K. Vrachos's and the foundation of the College for Kādis goes back primarily to his efforts. In the same year, 1899, he became a member of the Conseil Législatif, which marked the first stage in the representation of the Egyptian people. Finally, he was to resume his interest in education: in 1894 he became a member of the governing body of the Azhar, which constituted a move towards his position at his suggestion, and in this capacity he was not only acquired great renown by his reforms in the university but himself took an active part in the teaching. In addition to this many-sided activity in the fifteen years after his return he found time to publish a number of works, including his most important: the Rādūlat al-Tashīṣ (1315 = 1897), his principal theological work based on his lectures in Bairūt: the publication of a work on logic (Šarḥ Kitāb al-Baqṣīr al-Naṣiriyya, Tābīṣ al-Κaṣī Zālīn al-Dīn [1316 = 1898]): a defence of Islam against Christianity in the field of knowledge and civilization entitled al-Ḥādīs wa l-Naṣiriyya mūta l-Ilm wa l-Madārīna (1320 = 1902; first published in al-Manṣūr). Muhammad ʿAbduh was a candidate for the chair of the Kurān, on which he had great importance and of which he had published in al-Manṣūr; it was revised by his disciple and friend Sheikh Muhammad Rashid Rūdā and published first of all in al-Manṣūr. Of Muhammad ʿAbduh's numerous articles by which, along with his lectures, he most influenced public opinion, two (of 1900) were published in a French translation entitled L'Europe et l'Islam by Muhammad Taḥāt Harb Bey (1905). The advanced ideas put forward by Muhammad ʿAbduh provoked the most vigorous hostility in orthodox and conservative circles which manifested itself not only in serious refutations but also in attacks on and intrigues against him, as we see from a whole literature of pamphlets. But his teaching met with remarkable support among all seriously minded Muslims. The principal organ of his views was the monthly al-Manṣūr, which had appeared since 1897 under the editorship of Sheikh Muhammad Rashid Rūdā, who has also produced an extensive literary monument to his master (but his views and the tendencies of his periodical must not be identified offhand with those of Muhammad ʿAbduh). Muhammad ʿAbduh died in 1905; but his teaching has retained its influence steadily to the present day.

Muhammad ʿAbduh's programme according to his own statement was: 1. the reform of the Muslim religion by bringing it back to its original condition, 2. the renovation of the Arabic language, 3. the recognition of the rights of all people in relation to the government. His political activity was dominated by the idea of patriotism, which he was the first to champion enthusiastically in Egypt. As an opponent equally of the political control by Europe and of Oriental despotism in Muslim lands he favoured an inner assimilation of western civilization, without abandoning the fundamental Muslim ideas and a synthesis of the two factors. From this programme, which assures Muhammad ʿAbduh an important place among the founders of modern Egypt, must be distinguished his effort to carry it through in the field of theology. Muhammad ʿAbduh is in the first place a theologian; his life was devoted to the attempt to establish and maintain ʿAšrām, at least as a religion, against the onslaught of the west, while he abandoned without a struggle those aspects of Muslim-Oriental life in which religion was of less moment. However great a stimulus he may have received from progressive western thought, the actual foundations of his teaching came primarily from the school of Ibn Taimiya and Ibn Kaṭīb al-Luṭaynī, who favoured reform on conservative lines, and from Ghazālī's ethical conception of religion. Deeply convinced of the superiority of true Islam, unaffected by the vicissitudes of time, Muhammad ʿAbduh wished to get rid of the abuses which falsified the Muslim religion and made it out of keeping with the times, and to adapt Islam to every real advance by going back to its true principles. Muhammad ʿAbduh was thus brought to attack the muṣaddiq and taḥlīl [q.v.], to demand freedom for ḫidqīq [q.v.] and a new ʿaṣr [q.v.], in keeping with modern conditions, based on the Kurān and the true sunna, for the establishment of which he laid down strict criteria; he was also brought to reject the hairsplitting of the fuḥūlī, the worship of saints and all ʿāqād, and to the emergence of other forms of religion instead of a mechanical formalism. The antiquated system of Fikr, against which Muhammad ʿAbduh claimed full freedom, was to be replaced by new laws capable of development, in which consideration for the common good (maṣla) and the times should, in keeping with the true spirit of Islam, have if necessary preference to the literal text (naqī) of revelation, just as in any conflict between reason and tradition in setting what is laid down by religion, the verdict of reason should be followed. Alongside of the belief in the sublimity of revelation there was in Muhammad ʿAbduh the conviction that knowledge and religion, properly understood, could not come into conflict at all, so that reason need not recognise a logical impossibility as a religious truth; religion was given to man as a thread to guide him against the alternations of reason; reason must therefore, after it has tested the proofs of the truth of religion, which it is qualified to do, accept its dogmas: Muhammad ʿAbduh's object was a cooperation between religion and science. In dogmatics he adopts essentially the most rational conception that could still be reconciled with orthodoxy. At the same time he interiorises the conception of revelation (to him it is intuitive knowledge caused by God and provided with the consciousness of this origin, but this kind of religious experience is limited to the prophets) and deflects that of religion (to him it is an intuitive feeling for the paths to happiness in this and the next world, which cannot be clearly grasped by the reason). The task of prophecy for him is the moral education of the masses. Religious teaching and commandments are therefore intended for the masses and not for the elite. Muhammad ʿAbduh regards the Kurān as created and endeavour to weaken the rigidly opposed point of view of orthodoxy. The saints do not take into this system but is sceptical regarding belief in miracles. In spite of the denial of causality and laws of nature by orthodoxy, he finds a basis for explaining nature by causal laws but by quite scholastically formal reasoning. As regards the duties of religion, Muhammad ʿAbduh adheres to the four main duties: ritual prayer, the fast, alms-giving, and pilgrimage; only he shifts them, as usual in mysticism, from the sphere of worship to that of religion and morals. On the old question of free will Muhammad ʿAbduh
decides for indeterminism; he thereby opens the way to build up a moral system for society, which, excluding all fatalism, preaches vigorous activity by every one and, following the ethics of the mystics, mutual support. His view of the substance of Muslim teaching Muhammad 'Abduh defends not only against traditional orthodoxy but against Christianity also by a kind of philosophy of history of religion; the sending of prophets was a gradual process of education of step by step: the last and highest stage, that of absolute religion, is the sending of Muhammad; if the Muslim peoples of the present do not correspond to the Muslim ideal, this is only the result of the fact that they have lost the old purity of the teaching; an improvement is possible by return to it. This primitive Islam of Muhammad 'Abduh is however not the historical Islam but a very much idealised one. The superiority of Islam over Christianity in substance lies, according to Muhammad 'Abduh, in its rationalism and its closeness to reality and its avoidance of unattainable ideals of life.

In this theology, the religious content consists of humility before God, reverence for the Prophet, enthusiasm for the Kur'ān. The basis of this Islam is the recognition of a not too retrogressive system of dogmatics, its object is the observance of an ethical system which is favourable to progress, and both are influenced by a strongly marked rationalism, which is genuinely old Muslim but for Muhammad 'Abduh is no indifferent inheritance but the main weapon of defence of Islam and actually takes the place of a deepening of religion so that his theology has the character of an apologetic compromise.


MUHAMMAD AHMAD B. 'ABD ALLAH, the Mahdi of the Sudân, was born about 1258 (1843) on the island of Darâr in Dongola among the Argû islands north of el-Orde. A member of the Kunîz family of the Nubian Arab Beräbera, in later life when Mahdi to prove his kinship and mystical relationship with 'Ali and the Prophet, he traced his genealogy on his father's side to Hasan and on the mother's side to Hasan and 'Abbâs. He was the second son of a ship's carpenter and had an older sister and three brothers. Mystic tendencies early revealed themselves in him. Under the usual early education he therefore in 1277 (1861) entered the order of the Sâmmânîyya with Shaikh Muhammad Sharîf; after a seven years noviciate Muhammad Sharîf appointed him a shâkh of the order. After a short stay in Kharjîm where he married, he went to the island of Abbâ (in the White Nile, north of Kosti), built a dîwan there and a khilawâ and collected pupils around him.

His master Muhammad Sharîf, with whom he maintained a constant connection, settled near him in 1288 (1872), which seems to have been a turning point to Muhammad. Shortly after this event there arose in Muhammad the consciousness that he was the Mahdi al-muntaqar, under the influence of the traditional ideas of the Mahdi, which brought about a breach between him and his master. He now joined the enemy of his former leader, the Shaikh al-Kurashi, and in 1297 (1880) became his successor. In his wanderings (ziyâda) from Dongola to Sennâr, from the Blue Nile to Kordufân, he convinced himself of the discontent of the people, who were oppressed by the Egyptian government; the turbulent, mixed population of the Sudân, the religious fanaticism, the dissension between Turk and Arabs, the old opposition of the Shî'a to the Turkish ruling official classes, all formed a fruitful soil for his claims to be the Mahdi. The movement begun by Muhammad Ahmad which, as his letters and proclamations show, was based on a religious experience in which he earnestly believed, became from the first mixed up with political and social ideas, which in the east cannot be separated from religion, and in which finally dejection and cunning played an evil part. According to the traditional formula, Muhammad Ahmad felt himself called "to purify the world from wantonness and corruption." For this purpose he summoned the people to fight in the first place against the infidel Turks."He had previously bound a number of chiefs in Kordufân and Dârîfûr to him by beita (oaths of fealty, after the model of the Prophet: for the text see Dietrich, in Islam, 1925, p. 39) and had been cleverly able to attach men of action like the unscrupulous 'Abd Allah al-Ta'ayshii, later his Khalfii, to him; at the same time he practised a shameless nepotism. He further incited the people by numerous pamphlets and edicts, which contained his visions of the Prophet, who had appointed him Mahdi, of al-Khoji, Gabriel, the aflâm, summons "to purify religion," to "emigrate," to swear fealty, to imitate the Mahdi, to the ghîbâd etc. The hill of Gadir in Dâr Nuba became the centre of this secret propaganda; in Sha'bân 1298 (July 1881) he made his first public appearance as Mahdi. Negotiations begun by the government in Kharjîm with Muhammad Ahmad proved fruitless. Two companies sent against him under Abu l-Sâîd were destroyed; this secured further victories for him. The Egyptian government was moreover prevented by the rebellion of 'Arabî Pashâ from taking vigorous action. The expeditions of the governor of Fashoda, Rashid Pashâ, Yusuf Pashâ al-Shallâm (at Gadîr, May 1882) and of Hicks Pashâ (at Shaikân or Koshjil), all ended unsuccessfully. The Mahdiya thus spread unhindered from Kordufân via Bahr al-Ghazâl to the eastern Sudân; there in Sawâkin, 'Othman Digna, a former slave dealer, soon to be the ablest Mahdist general, entered Muhammad Ahmad's service. Attempts by the Mahdi to extend his power to the west and with this object to conclude alliances with Muhammad al-Sanûsî in Djaghbûb and with Morocco came to nothing. At the height of his power the campaign of 1301 (1884) took him to Kharjîm, where after a heroic defence by Gebril, another haskîkh, the Mahdi's hands on Jan. 20, 1885, Gordon was killed. Muhammad Ahmad did not however long survive his victory; he died, probably of typhus, on 6th Ramadân 1302 (June 22, 1885) at Omdurman near Kharjîm.
where a kubba was erected to him by his successor, the Khalifa 'Abd Allāh; it was henceforth the Mahdist capital until Kitchener put an end to 'Abd Allāh's rule and to the Mahdiya in 1898.

The organisation of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad, which was primarily to follow the sunna of the Prophet, was early developed; it was quite maritime in character, for the dhikr was considered more important than the hadj. He had four khalīfs beside him, of whom al-Ta'ayshī was the most intimate and undoubtedly had the most pernicious influence on him. Particular attention was devoted to the distribution of booty and to the administration of the treasury (hart al-mal).

Muhammad Ahmad's teaching shows some of the features of the extreme popular Sāfism and some of those of an idealised primitive Islam. His asceticism was hostile to progress; the contempt for learning in the Mahdiya and the order to burn all books on sunna and tafsir alienated the educated classes from him. The only things that had validity in addition to the Kurān were the proclamations of the Mahdi, the Kātib ('a collection of dhikr exercises) and the hadj. Contained in Muhammad Ahmad's own sunna as a substitute for the previous one but remained incomplete. In the abolition of the four mahdilahs, we see the šī'ī tendencies frequent among the Saiyids. Wahhābī influences are very probable in a number of regulations, for example in the prohibition of adornment, music, extravagance at weddings, tobacco and wine; particularly however in the zeal against the worship of saints and sorcery; as a matter of fact Muhammad Ahmad himself became an object of worship among his followers even before his death.

The only really new thing in Muhammad Ahmad is the addition to the shahāda: "... wa-anna Muḥammadun Allāhmun 'abdu 'Abbāsillāhum Allāhi Bîn Yassīn b. Yāsīn;" Where the traditions of the Mahdi did not suit him, he did not hesitate to alter them. He laid down the following 6 'aradm instead of the around of the sunna: 1. gelā, on the congregational performance of which the greatest stress was laid; 2. dhikr, in express opposition to the sunna practice and in place of the haqīq; 3. obedience to God's commandments; 4. the extended tahādā; 5. recitation of the Kurān and 6. of the Kātib.

A few extremist ideas, like that of equality between rich and poor, come partly from the revolutionary character of the old šī'ā, partly from the political and social conditions of the time; the social ideas were however not his central ones but only incidentally used cunningly to attract the masses. In practice the Mahdiya had an exceedingly unifying and equalising effect: slaves and slave-dealers fought under one banner, the humblest often rose in a short time to the highest offices.

Muhammad Ahmad's eschatology centres round the world domination of the Mahdi. The conquest of the Sūdān was to be followed by that of Egypt, Mecca, Syria and Constantinople.

The formation of legends around Muhammad Ahmad's personality began very early; sometimes deliberately encouraged by him and his immediate followers and sometimes actually believed by them. Under pressure from him his court chronicler Ismā'īl 'Abd al-Kādir composed a highly coloured sirr entitled Kitāb al-Mustahhī ila Sirat al-Imām al-Mahdi. It covered the years 1298 to 1302 A. H. but was burned in the time of the Khalīfa 'Abd Allāh. The Egyptian writer Shukair (see below) claims to have had his hands a copy that was said to have survived.

Bibliography: Na'am Shukair Bey, Turābi' al-Sūdān, Cairo 1903 (in the third part Shukair, utilizing the edicts of Muhammad Ahmad and the Khalīfa 'Abd Allāh, which were collected and printed under the Khalīfa, as well as the above mentioned Sirr and his own experiences in the Anglo-Egyptian army, gives a very full account of the Mahdiya under Muhammad Ahmad and 'Abd Allāh); Djirdj Zaidān, Rīviyyat Aḥī al-Muhammadī, Cairo 1892.— On two fatwās of the Egyptian government against the Mahdiya s. Dietrich, in, lilt, 1925, p. 83.— F. R. Win- gate, Mahdisīm in the Egyptian Sudan, London 1894; do., The Rise and Wane of the Mahdi Religion, London 1893; Jos. Ohuland, Aufstand u. Reich der Mahdis, Innsbruck 1892; Stām Pāsha, Fire and Sword in the Sudan, London 1896; Hachenleger, Geschichte Ägyptens, 3. Edit. 1904. J. Dietrich, Der Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad nach arabischen Quellen, in, lilt, 1925, p. 1—90 (with further literature); J. Darmesteter, The Mahdi, London 1888.

DIETRICH

MUḤAMMAD 'ALĪ PASHA (in European sources often Mehemet Ali or Mehemet Elı) was the well-known powerful viceroy of Egypt during the years 1805–1849 (which period comprises the entire reign of Sulṭān Muḥammad II q. v.); and the founder of the khedivial, later royal dynasty of Egypt. Seen in the light of history his life-work fully entitles him to the epithet of "the Founder of Modern Egypt".

Muhammad 'Ali was born in 1769, possibly of Albanian extraction, in the town of Kaβāla [q. v.] in Macedonia; he was engaged in the tobacco trade until he joined, as hākīb in a corps of Albanian troops, the Turkish army that landed in Egypt in 1799 and was beaten by Bonaparte at Abū Kir (July 25). In 1800 he was one of the two chiefs of the Albanian troops in Turkish service who were left behind in Egypt; this secured him an influential military position when, after the final departure of the French in 1801, Turkey began to try to recover her authority over Egypt. At the end of 1801 he fought as a general against the Mamluks, but in the troubled years that followed he was alternatively on the side of the Mamluk Beys (headed by al-Bardisi) and of the Turkish governors sent from Constantinople. He intrigued against Khawrān Pasha [q. v.], who had to leave Egypt in May 1803, and was already in the same year, appointed titular governor of the Hijādas. Under the following governorship of Khurshid Pasha, Muhammad 'Ali succeeded in winning the favour of the inhabitants of Cairo and their spiritual leaders, and used them with success in his intrigues against Khurshid, whose Turkish troops — composed of delis — were a scourge to the population, while his own Albanians were ordered to behave well. The result was that Khurshid had to withdraw in August 1803, leaving the citadel of Cairo to Muhammad 'Ali. The Turkish government, though sending several emissaries and trying to remove the Albanian troops, failed to keep Egyptian affairs under control and ended by recognizing Muhammad 'Ali's self-assumed
position (November 2, 1805); he was solemnly installed in April 1806.

The internal and external difficulties of the Sublime Porte did not allow her to interfere in any further for the moment and the new governor had soon occasion to show himself a loyal vassal when war with England — then at war with Turkey (cf. Selim III) — landed in Alexandria in March 1807. At that time Muhammad 'Ali had already undertaken the struggle against the Mamlûks Bey- al-Bardisâ and al-'Alî, the latter of whom was strongly supported by the English. He came back hastily from Upper Egypt, fortified Cairo, and gained a victory over the English army at Raṣhîl (Rosetta) in April. Soon after the departure of the British fleet in September the viceroy began the execution of his far-reaching administrative and economic measures, which were to restore Egypt's economic strength and consequently to assure for himself a more powerful position than any Turkish governor had had for the last two centuries (cf. Mamlûks). In the meantime the Beys (whose two leaders had died in 1807) continued their opposition (no doubt increased by the viceroy's land policy), which was finally broken by the massacre of about 100 Mamlûks in the citadel of Cairo on March 1, 1811, on the occasion of a festival. The persecution of the Mamlûks was at the same time extended to the other parts of the country. Muhammad 'Ali now could send, without danger to his own position, his Albanian troops in the campaign against the Wahhabîs in Arabia, to comply with a request of the Porte. The Wahhabî war began in September 1811 and was conducted, until 1816, by Muhammad 'Ali's son Tûsin; after the latter's death the command was taken over by his elder brother Ibrahim Pasha [q.v.]. Muhammad 'Ali himself took part in an expedition to Yaman, but had to return before the end of the war, because his position as governor seemed to be in danger.

The military successes of the Egyptian troops against the Wahhabî power immensely increased Muhammad 'Ali's authority all over Arabia and in a larger sense in the entire Near East; European policy began to look for the first time on Egypt as a factor of political importance. This importance was further increased by the expeditions to the south that followed immediately on the Arabian campaign: Egyptian power was established for the first time in the Südân [q.v.], where Muhammad 'Ali's third son Ismâ'il found his death in 1822, the year in which the town of Khartûm [q.v.] was founded. At this time Egyptian power was also extended in the direction of the Red Sea, which made an end to the hitherto continuous plague of the incursions of nomadic Arabs into the Nile valley; the ports of Sawâkin and Massawa (Masâwa) came under the Egyptian sphere of influence, although the direct authority of the Porte was maintained.

A new phase in the development of Muhammad 'Ali's power began by his participation in the military repression of the Greek revolt by the Turks. Only through Egyptian aid was the submission of the whole of Greece with the exception of Nauplia obtained; first by the conquest of Crete by Ibrahim Pasha (1823) and then by the Egyptian army that landed in 1825 in Morea. When in 1827 England, Russia and France intervened in the Greek question, the combined Turkish-Egyptian fleet was destroyed in the bay of Navarino (October 20, 1827); in the following year the Egyptian troops evacuated the peninsula, after a convention had been concluded between Muhammad 'Ali and the British admiral Codrington (August 6, 1828). Crete remained under Egyptian administration until 1841.

Muhammad 'Ali's power was now such that he could conclude international agreements without the sultan's cognizance; at the same time the two Mediterranean naval powers, France and England, were endeavouring to win him over as an independent political factor. In 1829 France had almost induced Muhammad 'Ali to undertake the conquest of the Barbary states of Algiers and Tunis; the viceroy, however, was more inclined to seek territorial expansion in the east, the more so as the four governorships of Syria had been promised him by the Porte as reward for his participation in the Greek war, a promise that had never been fulfilled. At the end of 1831 there arose difficulties between Muhammad 'Ali and the Porte on account of the governorship of 'Akkâ, which he claimed for himself. The conflict soon brought about the sending of an Egyptian army under Ibrahim Pasha into Syria. On May 27, 1832 'Akkâ was taken. In the following months the army that was sent by the sultan was repeatedly defeated and finally beaten near Konya (December 21, 1832). The Egyptian army, continuing in the direction of Constantinople, reached Kutahia. Here at last an armistice was concluded between the Porte and Ibrahim as representative of his father, thanks again to the intervention of the European powers.

In 1833 Muhammad 'Ali was granted the governorship of Syria and Adana by the definite peace of April 6, 1833.

During the following six years the viceroy's power was at its height. While Ibrahim administered Syria, severely but on the whole to the prosperity of the country, Muhammad 'Ali continued his administrative program in Egypt. In 1834 the Egyptian government had established a pan-Arabian policy, the aim of which was to be the union of all Arabic-speaking peoples under his leadership. In Arabia his influence was still considerable since the Wahhabî war; he now tried to extend Egyptian influence as far as the 'Iraq. This policy, while at the same time constituting a threat to the ambition of the European powers in the Near East, was to bring him again into conflict with the sultan, who, having succeeded at last in subduing too independent vassals in other parts of his empire, was waiting for an opportunity to crush his most powerful vassal in Egypt. The latter, in 1838, had even made known his intention of declaring himself independent of the Turkish government.

Not long after the outbreak of hostilities the Turkish army under Hüdâ Pasha was completely defeated at Nasîb in North Syria (June 24, 1839), while the Turkish fleet under the Kapudân Paşa was destroyed in the same battle (November 8, 1840) and went over to Muhammad 'Ali's side. In this desperate situation the authority of the Porte was saved by the intervention of the five European powers, in defence of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. The Egyptian question had thus produced an international political crisis, which was aggravated by the opposition of France, which had long been the best intentioned towards Muhammad 'Ali among the European governments. By the convention of}
London (July 5, 1840) England, Russia, Austria and Prussia agreed with the Porte upon the terms to be imposed upon Muhammad 'Ali. When the latter did not accept, there followed military demonstrations against the coastal towns in Syria ('Akka taken on November 4, 1840). Soon afterwards a British fleet appeared in Alexandria, where Admiral Napier on November 27 concluded an agreement with Muhammad 'Ali. The viceroy consented to the return of the Turkish fleet and renounced his governorship of Syria, Adana and Crete, while on the other hand he was to keep the hereditary governorship of Egypt as a part of the Turkish Empire. These terms were confirmed by an imperial firman of February 13, 1841, completed by another of May 23, in which the mutual relations of sultan and viceroy were definitely regulated. The chief points were the right of succession according to seniority in Muhammad 'Ali's family, the payment of a tribute and the permission to maintain an Egyptian army of 18,000 men, the higher officers of which were to be appointed by the sultan.

Muhammad 'Ali's last years were passed in peace. In 1846 he visited Constantinople and Kayâli; in 1848 he lost his son 'Ibrahim to whom so many of his military successes were due. On April 1, 1849 he himself died in Alexandria, to be succeeded by his son 'Abbas Pasha [q.v.]. He was buried in the new mosque which he had erected in the citadel of Cairo.

Still more amazing than the career of this once obscure Turkish officer are the enormous changes brought about by his work in the condition and the international position of Egypt: they have made him a hero in the history of the Near East. His reign is an era by itself in Egyptian history. Muhammad 'Ali's latest biographer says: "He began by seeking only to raise money. He ended by seeking, however mistakenly, to develop and civilise the country" (Dodwell, p. 220). His work indeed did not at all mean a break with the government traditions prevailing in the Turkish Empire, but the political aim that Muhammad 'Ali had set himself, seconded by his persevering energy and the continuous supervision of his efficient individuality, led after all to results which under similar conditions would otherwise have been difficult to attain, as is shown by the state of things prevailing at the same time in other provinces of the Ottoman Empire.

As the measures taken by Muhammad 'Ali in the field of administration, land policy and the industrial and commercial mobilisation of the country have been briefly sketched in the text, K.I. D.E.N. it is unnecessary to enter here into the same details. It is sufficient to point to the fact that all the main measures had as their first object to make the pasha himself the sole proprietor and administrator of the riches of Egypt. He certainly listened to the advice of European and other councillors and valued European institutions as examples to follow to a certain extent. But he followed oriental methods and made as good, if not as good use of Europeans as officials in the home administration.

This was not the case in Muhammad 'Ali's newly created army. The pasha him-self had not been entirely able to keep his mercenary troops under control (mutiny in Cairo in 1816). So he decided to form a new army, moved by the same motives that had led Sultân Selim III to create new regular troops (mutimî kâtibâtî). From 1819 this enterprise was confined to and brought to a successful end by the French captain Sève, who, after having embraced Islam, served Muhammad 'Ali as Sulâmân Pasha. A first attempt to use negro slaves from the Sudan as soldiers proved to fail, and only free Egyptians were recruited: the officers were mainly taken from among the young Mamlûks, besides whom there were not a few Europeans. With this army were won the military successes in Morea and Syria. The recruitment met with exceedingly strong opposition among the people of Egypt and later in Syria, and the methods used to get the required number were sometimes cruel, but the pasha's energy prevailed. At length this military organisation proved to be a means of education for the people and prepared the growth of national feeling among the generations to come. As has been said already, the final Imperial firman of 1841 limited the Egyptian army to 18,000 men in time of peace.

Muhammad 'Ali's attempts to create an Egyptian fleet go back as far as 1815. At first he had ships built in France and Italy and in Bombay, but soon Alexandria itself got its yards. After the destruction of the Egyptian fleet at Navarino ship-building began again and quite a number of French and Italian officers were employed in the Egyptian navy after 1851. The Egyptian fleet, however, did not long survive its founder.

On the whole, Muhammad 'Ali's rule was a Turkish character. Most of the responsible posts in the administration and in the army were held by Turks and by de-cendants of the Mamlûks. Thus the Ottoman ruling system, with some modifications applied after the European model, was imposed on Egypt most completely at the time when the country itself was politically loosened from the empire. It may be called an exception that the Armenians Boghos Bey, was for a long time Muhammad 'Ali's minister of finance and of foreign affairs, came to this exalted position, although the use of Christians (Armenians and Copts) in more subordinate offices had always been a government practice in Turkey as well as in Egypt. The viceroy himself is said never to have spoken well any language other than Turkish.

Muhammad 'Ali was not a great builder of magnificent architectural monuments. He erected a mosque after the Turkish fashion in the citadel of Cairo, but he never built costly palaces for himself. Most of his works were of public utility, such as the improvement and the enlargement of the irrigation system in the Delta, including the Nile Barrage below Cairo. This last work was undertaken in 1847, but failed.

The judgments on Muhammad 'Ali's personality were very divergent even during his life-time. Most of his admirers were found amongst the French; in view of this in the whole friendly attitude of the French government this is of course not strange. British opinion was less favourable, but all those who came into contact with the viceroy were impressed by his personal charm. Now that his era belongs to the past, the impression remains of a great man in many respects, possessed of considerable personal courage and trustworthy and loyal in a high degree. His methods were sometimes cruel and in the begin-
ning of his career he often had recourse to intrigues, but in the circumstances it is hard to understand how it could have been otherwise. As years passed by and the prosperity of the country increased, his methods of government grew more lenient, so that, at the end of his reign, he had become decidedly popular with his subjects. An equestrian statue of Muhammad 'Ali now commands the chief square of Alexandria and one of the largest thoroughfares in Cairo is called after him.


MUHAMMAD 'ALI ii. MUZAFFAR AL-DIN

[See Kādir.]

MUHAMMAD BAIRAM (MUHAMMAD B. MUṣṬAFĀ B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. ḪUSAYN B. ʿABD B. MUḤAMMAD B. ʿUṣAYN B. BAIRAM), a Tunisian patriot and man of letters, born in Tunis in Muharram 1256 (March 5—April 3, 1840) and died on Wednesday, 25th Rabi‘ II, 1307 (Dec. 18, 1889) in Egypt, at Hulwan, and was buried in Cairo near the tomb of the Imam al-Shafii. Belonging to the family of the Bairams whose
ancestor Bairam, at the head of a body of soldiers, took part in the capture of Tunisia by Sinan Pasha on 25th Djamâda 981 (Sept. 24, 1573) and of which several members had held the office of grand mufti of Tunis, Muhammad Bairam studied at the Djamâi al-Zaituna and had as teachers al-Jâbir b. Aâshîn, al-Mâshhâsî b. Sâlih, Ahmad Bairam, Muṣṭafâ Bairam, the Shaikh al-Islâm Muhammad b. Muṣâwîya and others. At the age of 17, he compiled a kamātî in which he recorded the ordinances, decrees and administrative regulations which the emir Muhammad Pasha ordered the authorities to enforce.

On the death of his paternal uncle Bairam IV, he was given charge of the Madrasat al-Cuukiyâ on al-Dhâr al-Sâbîn and the Nebi-Muhammad, demanded return on the 9th of the following month (Dec. 13) of that of the Djamâi al-Zaitunâ. Soon after this, troubles provoked by the despotic régime began to disturb Tunisia and resulted in the closing of the representative assemblies in which Bairam was interested. He published in the Kaʿīd, the official gazette, the two first political articles that ever appeared in Tunisia and in them he condemned the tyranny of the authorities, preached the love of liberty and begged the government to be liberal and to grant its subjects representative assemblies.

On 1st Safar 1291 (April 6, 1874) he was appointed to the post of audiûr, which he hastened to reorganise. The hard work ruined his health and forced him to take a journey in Europe to recuperate; this caused him to begin his Sâfīrat al-Fathâr. He left in Shawwâl 1292 (Oct. 31—Nov. 28, 1875) and visited Paris. In the same year the Sâdîqî College was founded; Bairam shared in the preparation of the regulation and programme of studies, modelled on those of European institutions, and was one of the first to enrol his son so as to encourage his compatriots to take advantage of such innovations.

On 2nd Djamâda II, 1292 (May 7, 1875) he was put in charge of the government printing works which he at once reorganised, and securing eminent assistants like Muhammad al-Sanûsî of Tunis and Ḥâmza Fâth Allâh of Cairo, produced the Ḳâīd regularly. It was at this time also that he reorganised the Maktubat al-Sâdîkîyya alongside of the Djamâi al-Zaitunâ.

In 1293 (1876) he assisted Turkey in the war with Serbia and Montenegro by sending money, horses and camels, political considerations preventing the despatch of help in men.

In the summer of 1295 (1878) he went a second time to Paris, visited the Exhibition, and was received with great consideration by President MacMahon. He took the opportunity to visit London and England and, on his way back, Algiers. He took a very prominent part in the reorganisation of the Sâdîqî Hospital which was opened on Safar 18. 1296 (Feb. 1879). At the same time he was one of the two arbitrators appointed by the Tunisian government in the case of Henshir Sinîyâd Thabit and the French government. In the middle of the same year, he was appointed by the vizier to go to Paris, to receive medical attention, it was said, but in reality to ask Germany to remove the French consul, who was interfering in the domestic affairs of the country and even managing them. The consul thwarted the plans of Bairam and the vizier. On his return he told the vizier that France intended to annex Tunisia. Tired of the vexatious pestering of the vizier Muṣṭafâ b. Ismaʿîl he obtained, after many attempts, permission to make the pilgrimage to Mecca and left Tunis to return on Shawwâl 12, 1296 (Oct. 4, 1879). He went via Malta, Alexandria and Cairo, where he was received by the Kheïdev Pacha and thence to the Hulâwân, visiting Mecca and Medina. He then went via Yambuʿ and the Suez Canal to Bairût, where he was much honoured by the people and by Midhat Pasha, the governor of Syria, and on to Constantinople. He wrote a Khâfîlâ in honour of Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd. The Tunisian government at the instigation of the French consul, who feared the establishment of closer relations between Turkey and Tunisia, demanded his return but the Sultan Porte diplomatically did not receive the request.

It was in Constantinople that he began to prepare the Sâfīrat for publication and finished the first two volumes. The penetration of France into Tunisia was a rude shock to Bairam, who in collaboration with the former vizier of Tunisia, Khair ad-Dîn, was appointed by the Sublime Porte to prepare a report on the situation created by France. Despairing of returning to his native town he went to Léghorn and was joined by his family; he then went to Geneva where he left his son to finish his education and to Vienna and Bucharest and then settled in Constantinople. The Sultan, wishing to send some horses as a present to the Emperor Frederick III of Germany, Bairam was appointed to send the letters conveying the gift. During the eighteen months which he spent in the Turkish capital, Bairam drew a pension of £25 per month. It was during this stay that he prepared the third volume of the Sâfīrat.

His health being undermined by an illness which grew worse daily and being unable to meet his expenses and fearing the machinations of his detractors, who saw in him a man to be removed, he left Constantinople on 1st Muharram 1302 (Oct. 21, 1884) to go to Egypt, where his letters of recommendation secured him the esteem of the Kheïdev Pacha, who gave him a pension.

On the 25th Rabiʿ of the same year (Jan. 13, 1883) he produced al-Mālaʿem, a political and scientific journal.

Two years later, he went to London to attend the Jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria, had medical attention in Paris and returned to Egypt via Berlin and Vienna. He then completed a work which he had begun in Constantinople entitled Tâfriq al-Sânûsî li ʿl-Khadîjat ʿašaʾi ʿl-Khâfîlâ Sinîyâd (Râzînâ), in which he refuted the arguments which Renan had advanced at a conference in the Sorbonne on March 29, 1883 on Islamisme et la Science (Paris 1883), in which he alleged that religion was an obstacle to the diffusion of science among Muslims. He also published a Râzîlā in which he declared that it was permitted to purchase bonds or shares in a Muslim government loan so that Muslim money should not leave the country, and that this had no character of usury. He wrote a report on the compulsory use of the Arabic language in the teaching even of modern sciences. He finished the fourth volume of the Sâfīrat and had begun the fifth which death prevented him from finishing.

On 12th Djamâda 1. 1306 (Jan. 14, 1889) Bairam was appointed a judge in the Tribunal de l'îer Instance in Cairo. Going to Hulâwân for a change of air, he took pleurisy and died after 25 days' illness.
He had a vast knowledge of Hadith, law, history, ancient and modern, and historical and political geography.

In addition to the works already mentioned and numerous al-Nāṣiḥahs which it would take too long to enumerate, we may mention the following: 1. Taṣawwuf al-Khāṭārī fī Ḥill ʿAlī Būn-dūr al-Kaṭībī, printed at Cairo in 1303 in which he claims that the law regards as permitted the flesh of game killed with fire-arms; 2. a treatise on prosody; 3. a riṣāla in which he says that it is permissible for men to let their hair hang down and that in the air, contrary to the opinion of several fāqihīs; 4. al-Taṣawwuf fī Maḏāra al-Kaṭībī, a study in which he shows what slavery among Muslims is according to the law, points out the motives of slavery and the rules regulating it, and concludes by saying that slaves who are sold at the present day are free men and that Muslim governments which forbid the sale of slaves are acting in accordance with the law; 5. ʿIṣbaṣl al-Fīlīlāt bi-Muṣṭawrada al-ṭarāṣ, published in 6 vols. in Cairo in 1302–1303, 1303–1304, 1304–1311, the sixth volume being devoted to the history of Muhammad Bāṣrī and his biographer by his son of the same name; it is perhaps the best treatise yet written in Arabic on political geography.


MUḤAMMAD BAṢIR, son of Shāhīt Gūlām, born in 1303 (1627), was first taught by his father and then by Shāhīt Abū ʿĀlā, called Mīrān Ḥaḍrat, and Shāhīt Nār al-Ḥaḍīṣ b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaḍīṣ Dāhlawi. After a few years he himself began teaching in his native country. He first became a muwāla or disciple of his father, and after the latter's death attached himself to the famous saint, Muḥammad Maḏūm ʿIrānī. He was pursued by Hifūẓār Kān, Mir Ḥamān, to the courts of Arwaṅgēb and accepted the duties of Bakhtī (pay master) and Wargīr (writer of the official diary), but by special favour he enjoyed much leisure, which he devoted to literary work. He died in 1304 (1693) at Bahārānūr. He is the author of 1. Mirdā Gāḥal Nama (a general history compiled under Arwaṅgēb), 2. Rūdār al-Asdārā (life of saints), 3. Taṣḥīḥrat al-Saḥrā (biographies of the poets).

Bibliography: Bakhīṭar Kān, Miṣḥ-al-ʿĀlam, fol. 478; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, viii. 145–165; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Br. Mus., iii. 890; Ethé, Cat. of Persian MSS., India Office, p. 49. (M. Hidāyot Hossain)

MUḤAMMAD BAṢHIṬĪYAR KALHIṬI was an inhabitant of Ghūr [q. v.]. He was of a very mean appearance and among other deformities of his person it is said that when he stood upright the end of his fingers extended considerably below his knees. When he reached the age of manhood he went to Ghazna [q. v.] and offered himself as a volunteer to the officers of Muhammad Ghūrī, but they refused to enrol him. He, therefore, repaired to Dihlī and was appointed by Kūṭ al-Dīn ʿAbīb [q. v.] to command an army destined for the conquest of Bahrāb about 596 (1199). Here he was very successful. He was next ordered to invade Bengal. In 600–601 (1203–1204) he proceeded to Nādiṣ, the capital of Bengal, and captured it without any bloodshed. His last attempt was directed towards the invasion of Bahrāb and Tibet, but he met with reverses which compelled him to retreat. He succeeded in reaching Dēvākot in Bengal where he died, but his body was carried to Bahrāb and buried there in 602 (1206).


MUḤAMMAD BEY ABDU DHAḤAB. (See 'Ali Bey).

MUḤAMMAD BEY ʿOTTOMĀN AL-DJALĀL was born in Egypt in 1829, the son of a judge in the Court of Appeal, named Yūsuf al-Nasīrī. When a boy he learned English, French and Turkish at the school of languages (Madrasat al-ʿĀlimīn) and when only 15 was given an appointment in the government translation bureau. His patron to the biography of Muhammad Bāṭrī and edited by his son of the same name; it is perhaps the best treatise yet written in Arabic on political geography.


MUḤAMMAD BEY ʿOTTOMĀN AL-DJALĀL was born in Egypt in 1829, the son of a judge in the Court of Appeal, named Yūsuf al-Nasīrī. When a boy he learned English, French and Turkish at the school of languages (Madrasat al-ʿĀlimīn) and when only 15 was given an appointment in the government translation bureau. His patron was the daughter of the judge of Cairo, had him appointed to the Conseil de Médicine. In 1863 he entered the War Ministry and five years later the Ministry of the Interior. In 1879 the Khedive Tewfīk Pasha appointed him to his civil cabinet and several times took him to accompany him on journeys. After the death of the Khedive he was appointed a judge in Cairo. In 1895 he was pensioned and he devoted himself to literary work till his death at the end of 1898.

In collaboration with Clot Bey, he published a sketch of the biography of Muhammad ʿAli and an elementary grammar of the Arabic and French languages and also a description in rhymed verse of his journey with the Khedive Tewfīk. He then devoted himself to the translation of poetry: first of the fables of La Fontaine, the novel Paul et Virginie, and of Racine's tragedies Alexandre Le Grand, Esther and Iphigenie. All these he translated into classical Arabic. But his real importance lies in his endeavours to translate Molière's comedies into the modern Arabic vernacular of Egypt, freely adapting them to Arabic conditions: a. Tartuffe under the title Shāhīt Matnāf, which Voltaire edited under the title Πίθαρνατ (cf. Z. D. M. G., xlvi. 71 sqq. and thereon Socin, ibid., xlvi. 131 sqq.); b. Mardavek at-Awāḏī, l'Ecole des Maris), transcribed and translated by M. Sobernheim, Berlin 1896; c. al-Miṣrī, l'École des Femmes Savantes), transcribed and translated by Fr. Kern, Berlin 1898; d. Mardavek at-Nisā, l'École de Femmes), e. Racine at-Taḥkīl (Les Fâchés), 1897. His collections of popular poems were also lithographed: Ťuqal Zadāl. The Egyptians were not much attracted by these comedies translated into the vernacular. The language did not appear cultured enough to the Egyptian public. They were hardly ever produced and the rich vocabulary which the comedies contain has not been noticed or utilised by students of modern Arabic.

MUHAMMAD ČELEBI. [See CΗAΖΑ attain] MUHAMMAD DAMAD PASHA, grand-vizier, also called OKUZ MUHAMMAD PASHA, was the son of a farrier of Constantinople and was educated (rather unusual at that time for a boy from Constantinople) in the imperial palace for a military career. He left the palace as siltahdar, but we do not know his career until he was appointed, in 1616 (1607–1608), governor of Egypt. Here he was successful in the energetic suppression of a Mamluk revolt and when he returned in 1610 to the capital with two years' tribute, he was appointed Kapudan Pasha, being at the same time married to Sultan Ahmet's seven-year-old daughter Gahwir Khan (married afterwards to Radjub Pasha and as the Khân of Suljill-i ertiomân, i. 147), which assured him the qualification damad. As Kapudan Pasha he was made responsible for a defeat inflicted in 1613 on a part of his fleet, off the island of Chios, by a small Spanish-Sicilian fleet: this blow prevented the landing of Turkish ships in Syria on an expedition against the Druses. Damad Muhammad was dismissed from the post of Kapudan, became, however, second vizier and, after Našir Pasha's execution (October 17, 1614) he was appointed grand-vizier. In this office he commanded in 1615 as kor-asker in a new campaign against Persia, the peace negotiations having ended unsuccessfully a short time before. Nothing was undertaken, however, that year, partly owing to astronomical calculations. The grand-vizier remained that winter in Aleppo. The next year the Persians were attacked in Armenia, where they had made some progress; Erivan was beleaguered and capitulated at the beginning of July 1616 after a 25 days' siege. The Turkish army was obliged, however, to withdraw with heavy losses occasioned by the rude climate and the insufficient food supplies. Damad Muhammad was dismissed in January 1617 to be succeeded by Khalif Pasha [q. v.] in the Venetian relation to Khalif Pasha and Muhammed Pasha are described as the only members of the Imperial Divan that really count. The next year, on the accession of 'Othman II, he became Khalif's el-dar-mašin during that year's Persian campaign and, after Khalif's disgrace, was appointed a second time grand-vizier (January 18, 1619). This dignity he held only a year, in which peace was concluded with Persia; the reason of his dismissal was a dispute with the Kapudan Guezelde Ali Pasha [q. v.], a favourite of the sultan (January 1620). Damad Muhammad went as governor to Aleppo after having been deprived of all his wealth by the extortion of his successor. He died soon after his arrival in Aleppo and was buried in the têrê of Shaikh Abû Bakr, where he had a tumbe made for himself.

Bibliography: The principal Turkish sources are Nâma I, Pećevi and Hâljîg Khalifa (Fëdike and Tufikât el-Khîrâ). Further from Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 442, 468, 475 sqq : 507 sqq, where some contemporaneous western sources are indicated; ʻOthman Zade, Ḥâfiqat al-Wusûrâ, p. 61; Suljill-i ertiomân, i. 147.

MIRZâ MUHAMMAD DJâفار KARADJA-DAGH, Munshi of the Kâdjar prince Djalâl al-Dîn Mirzâ and translator into Persian of the famous comedies of the Adâharzâdelân playwright Mirzâ Fath ʻAli Akhundzadé. After they had been published (1859) Mirzâ Faṭh ʻAli sent a copy of his plays to the above-mentioned Kâdjar prince in the hope that he would take notice of it. But the book lay unheeded for years in the prince's library until Muhammad Ťaťfâi opened it by chance. The munshi, delighted with the plays, at once decided to translate them into Persian. As no one would help him, he was forced to print the translation at his own expense, which brought him into considerable financial difficulties. The translation appeared in lithograph in Čeberân in 1874 under the title Tamçštâf. When the work was finished, Muhammad Ťaťfâi corresponded with the author and found out that they were related. The Persian translation is of the greatest importance for the history of Persian theatre as it gives the stimulus to the composition of original works. The influence of Akhundzâde on the work of Malkum-Khan and even on more recent dramatists, such as Muhammed, is quite apparent. From the artistic point of view, however, Muhammad Ťaťfâi's translation cannot be called successful as their language is very clumsy and filled with countless Adjarbâjdzâniism. It is remarkable that European orientalists first became acquainted with Akhundzâde's works in their Persian dress and published a considerable number of these translations (see Bibli.) as textbooks for the study of spoken Persian, although, in view of their linguistic defects, the translations cannot by any means be regarded as models of the living Persian language.


MUHAMMAD ES'AD. [See ČΗILAČE DEBE] MUHAMMAD ES'AD. [See DEEČE ENDEL]. MUHAMMAD GHAWTH GAWALIYĀR, an Iranian saint. He was a descendant of the famous saint Shiākî Fāris al-Dîn Aţājir [q. v.], his full name being Abu I-Muṣ'lih Muhammad b. Hače Di al-Dîn Kâtâl b. Kâţir al-Dîn b. Bâţir b. Fatâ al-Dîn Aţājîr. Some say that his great-grandfather Muin al-Dîn Kâţir came to India and died at Dâjapûrī. One of his brothers, Shiākî Bahā'î, who was attached to the service of Humâyûn, fell in battle and lies buried at the gate of the fort in Bayûna. According to his own statement, Muhammad Ghawth was born in 906 (1500). He was a pupil of Shiākî Żâhîr al-Dîn Ḥâfiz-i Humâyûn, and belonged to the Shâfīi sect of Shi'ism. He and his eight brothers were disciples of Shiākî Ḥādîjî Hamîd, Kâhîfâ of Shâh Kâhân, the disciple and khalîfa of Shiākî Abû ʻAlî Shâhjâhâ, after leading a solitary life.
for more than thirteen years in the mountains of Čuńā, he came to Gujdarāt, where he became acquainted with the popular saint and scholar Shaikh Wadīj al-Dīn Gujdarātī. He went to Agra in 956 (1558) and was treated with high regard by Akbar. Subsequently he returned to Gawāliyār, where he died in 970 (1562). Humayūn is also said to have been a faithful follower of Muhammad Gawāliyār.

He was the author of several Ṣūfī works, the most popular of which is Dīwān-i Khvānsa, in Arabic, which he completed in 956 (1549), and which he subsequently rendered into Persian with additional improvements. His other works are Kalila-Makhlūṣ, Bahār al-Ḥaṣāy, and Mi'rād-i Nu'mān. It is related that his ecstatic sayings in the Mi'rād-i Nu'mān were condemned by the ulamā of Gujdarāt, who passed orders for his execution, but that he was saved by the timely intervention of the above-mentioned Shaikh Wadīj al-Dīn.

**Bibliography:** Bankipore Lib., Cat., vol. xvi, Nos. 1353–1354; Aḥṣār al-Ḥaṣāyān, p. 236; Khudrat al-Aṣbāḥ, p. 969; Taḥkhir-i 'Umān-i Hind, p. 206; see also Hādīdī Khālīfah, li. 643; Ethī, India Office Lib. Cat., Nos. 1875–1876; Lōh, Arab. Cat., Nos. 13.

_Abdul Muṭadīr_ (ADUL MUṬADĪR)

MUHAMMAD GURDI PASHA. Two Ṭurkish grand-viziers are known under this name.

1. The one who is also called khādī Muhammad Pasha began his political career after having been a eunuch in the imperial palace; in 1604 he became wālī in Egypt, where he was able to establish some order; after that he was twice kātim-muḥāzin of the grand-vizierate in the capital, in 1611 and in 1615; in the meantime he had held governorships in Erzerūm, Bosnia and Belgrad. He was called to the grand-vizierate in the days of Sulṭān Muṣṭafā I's second reign, when the Janissaries and the Sipāhis were dictating their will at Constantinople (September 1622). Khādī Muhammad owed his nomination to the Sipāhs — who had obtained the dismissal of Mir Husain Pasha, the leader of the Janissaries — but also to the confidence of the wālī and to his well-earned reputation of a wise and experienced politician. He succeeded indeed in the abolition of abuses in the army administration by convoking a large council of dignitaries, where the reinforcement of the kātim was decided. When, however, in several parts of the empire, there arose opposition against the Janissary regime, especially the action of Abāzā Pasha [q.v.] in Erzerūm, the grand-vizier was unable to oppose the Janissaries in Constantinople. Their leader Mir Husain was intriguing again, while at the same time the sultan was crying for revenge for Sulṭān 'Othman II, as a result of these riots the former grand-vizier Dāwūd Pasha was killed in January 1623. On February 5 of the same year the rebellious Janissaries, declaring that a eunuch could not be their grand-vizier, obtained his dismissal in favour of Mir Husain. Gūrdī Muhammad went into exile, but after the enthronement of Murād IV he came back to the capital as vizier and acted for the third time as kātim-muḥāzin in May 1624 when the then grand-vizier went on an expedition against Abāzā. He died on March 26 and was buried in a tābi in Eṣīyāb. His age is not given in the sources. In the opinion of the English resident Roe, Gūrdī Muhammad was one of the few personalities that were able to lead the affairs of the empire.

2. One of the grand-viziers of the first period of Muhammad IV's reign, when the state affairs were governed by the wālī Kösem [q.v.] and the kīālar aghasil Sulaimān. This Gūrdī Muḥammad had already a long career as governor of Syria and other provinces before him when, at the age of 94 years, he was called to the highest dignity in the beginning of November 1651 as successor of Siyāwush Pasha, who had shown too much independence towards the court. During his grand-vizierate he is said to have shown fully his lack of capacity, taking the alarming revolts in Asia Minor of Abāzā Pasha, Iṣḥāq Pasha and Ḥāzīlī Oghlu with the greatest equanimity. He was especially responsible for the removal from the capital all possible rivals to the grand-vizierate, amongst them Muḥammad Koprūlā, which brought him, as Na'īmā says, the nickname of kātim al-sulṭānīn "the pill of the sulṭān". On June 19, 1652 he was deposed again by the court party. After having been exiled he lived some time at Eṣīyāb and died in 1664, at the age of 110 years, in Temesvār.


_J. H. Kramers_

MUHAMMAD HASAN KHĀN, a Persian man of letters, who died on 19th Shawwal 1313 (April 3, 1896). His honorific titles were Sār-i Dāvela and later l'iṭnād al-Sulṭāna.

Through his mother he was related to the Kādjarī [q.v.] and through his father he claimed descent from the Mongol rulers. His father, Ḥāsīdī 'Ali Khān of Marāgāh, was a faithful servant of Nāṣr al-Dīn Shāh (in 1852 he discovered the conspiracy of Sulaimān Khān) and the son from his youth upwards was in the service of the court.

Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān was one of the first students at the Dār al-Funūn founded in 1268 (1851) and spent 12 years there. Later he went with his father when he was appointed governor of 'Arābāt. In 1280 (1863) he was appointed second secretary to the Paris Legation and spent three and a half years there. On his return to Tehran he was appointed interpreter to the Shāh and in this capacity accompanied him on his travels. In 1288 (1871) he was appointed head of the draganate (dār al-taqrīm) and of the press bureau (dār al-tībā) as well as director of the official Rūstānâm-yi davāltā. In 1290 he was appointed superintendent of the palaces and assistant to the minister of justice and henceforth continued to rank.

E. G. Browne criticizes severely the work of
MUHAMMAD HASAN KHĀN and accuses him of having put his name to books alleged to have been written for him by indigent scholars. On the other hand, Joukovsky speaks with much respect of his works and shows that he inspired a great many literary undertakings (e.g. the printing of the Kurān with an inter-linear Persian translation, concordance and index; the foundation of a press for printing in Roman characters; the establishment of the Mushiriyat school; encouragement of the daily press etc.) although after the appearance at Bombay of a satirical work by Shahīd Ḥashimi Shāhīd, Hasan Khan was dismissed on the suggestion of Muhammad Hasan Khan.

The fact is that the number of works — often very useful — bearing the name of Muhammad Hasan Khan, is very large. Without the help of “secretaries” some of these books could not have been undertaken. To Muhammad Hasan Khan is in any case due the honour of having suggested them. His principal works deal with the history and geography of Persia and are often in the form of almanacs. They are: Mirzā al-Bulūnī, i., two editions, 1295, 1294, a dictionary of geography: letters f — w; ii., 1295 (history of the years i.—xv. of the reign of Naṣir al-Dīn and calendar); iii. (years xvi.—xxiii. of the reign of Naṣir al-Dīn and calendar); iv., 1296 (geography: letters w — e and history of 1296). In the geographical portions we find quotations from Yākūt and insular travellers along with notes specially prepared by the local authorities as an extract from the Mirzā al-Bulūnī: Tūrub-kī Bānī wa-Yanābī was published at Bombay in 3111; Tūrub-kī manāqam-Nāṣir, 3 parts, 1298—1300 (history of the time of the Ḥijāra; iii. history of the Ka‘巴巴 1194—1300); Maqāl al-Shams, 3 vols., 1301—1303 (description of the journey to Khuwāsān with important archæological data; i. 105—213 contains the autobiography of Shāh Tahmāsp and u. 469—500 a list of books in the library of the sanctuary of Masjihād); Kitāb Ḥidāya al-Sa‘ūdī fi Ḥidāya al-Shāhādā, Tihār 1304, Tabriz 1310 (history of the martys of Kharbādā); Khurṣān hukmān [cf. Šīrāz 790, 3 vols., 1304—1307 (biographies of famous women of the Islam); Kitāb Durūs al-Tiǧān fi Turāk Dash Aḥkām, 1308; 1310, 3 vols. (history of the Arάk); Kitāb al-‘Alaihī wa-l-Sawād-ī, 1309 (historical almanac for the 40th anniversary of the reign of Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh); Kitāb al-Ta‘kīn fi Aḥādīṭ Qaitābī Shāhīn, 1311 (history and geography of Sawād-khān in Māzandārān).

In the field of literature Muhammad Hasan Khan was only a translator (Swiss Family Robinson, romances of Jules Verne, discovery of America, Turākhī Inqīšāhi Yangi Donya, Tihār 1288, Memoirs on the Indian Mutiny of 1857). He also wrote a number of text-books on geography and on the French language.


(V. Minorssky)

MUHAMMAD HUSAIN TABRIZI, a famous Persian calligrapher, pupil of the celebrated Mir Sāyid Aḥmad Māshhādī and teacher of the no less famous Mīr ʻImādī. His remarkable command of the art of calligraphy, so popular in Persia, brought him the title of honour Mīrān ʻIṣā (greatest master). His father Mīrāz Shukrullah was Mustawfi al-Momālīh to the Safavid Tahmāsp I (1521—1576), the master himself, according to the Oriental sources, was vizier to Shāh Ismā‘īl II (1576—1578) but lost the favour of the sovereign and was forced to fly to India where he remained to his death. Rieu says he died about 950 (1543), but this does not agree with other biographical details and is indeed improbable. That he spent the remainder of his life in India is evident from the fact that most of the manuscripts known to have been written by him were finished in India. The inscriptions on the masjids and khānqāhs of Tabrīz are said to have been his masterpieces but unfortunately they have been almost entirely destroyed by earthquakes. After completing these inscriptions he made the obligatory pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return devoted himself exclusively to copying the masterpieces of Persian poetry. A Dīwān of the Persian poet Amir Shāhī from his pen is in the Cambridge University Library.


MUHAMMAD ISMĀ‘IL b ʻAbd al-Ḥasan al-Shāhī, born on the 28th Shawwāl 1196 (1781), of a Dīlī family that traces its origin to the Caliph ʻUmar. He was a nephew of the famous Mawlānā Shāhī ʻAbd al-‘Azīz (d. 1239 = 1823). Having lost his father early, he was brought up by his uncle Mawlānā ʻAbd al-Kadr (d. 1242 = 1826). In childhood he was inattentive to his studies and fond of swimming in the Qumma, but thanks to a retentive memory and a keen intellect he later on became a learned man.

Being shocked at the ʻirāk or idolatrous tendencies, then prevailing among Indian Muslims, he zealously preached the doctrines of Islam. Impressed by the religious sanctity of Saiyid Aḥmad al-Mudaddālī, he became his disciple and his constant companion. In 1236 (1820) they went to Mecca and then to Constantinople, where they were received with marked consideration. Six years later, on their return to Dilli, they gained many followers. In 1243 (1827) they with many disciples went to Peshāvar and declares a religious war against the Sikhs. But owing to some innovations upon the usages of the Afghans, their power declined and during a retreat they perished in a skirmish with the Sikhs in 1247 (1831).

He is the author of the following works:

1. Risālā ʻIṣāl al-Fīlāh, a treatise on the principles of Muhammadan law according to the Ḥanafī school;
2. Manṣūbī Inšātāt, a Persian treatise on the Imāmāt;
3. Taqīyyet al-Inšāt, an Urdu treatise on theology (printed 1295, translated into English by Mir Shāhūmāt ʻAli, cf. J. R. A. S., xii. 316);
4. Șīrāt al-Muṭṭallām, a treatise in Persian on the doctrines of Islam.
Bibliography: Şiiddik Hasan, İstah al-Natali, p. 416; Sait Jud Ahmad Khan, Ahsar al-Sanadid, ii, 97; and J. K. A. S., xiii, 310.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD KAZIM E. MUHAMMAD AMIN was a muhajir or secretary to Awarangzub. He was entrusted with the compilation, from official records, of the history of the emperor's reign and was ordered to submit it to him for correction. He accompanied the emperor on his journey to Adigrat where he fell ill and was consequently sent back to Dihilt and died there shortly after his return in 1092 (1681).

The history which he composed is known as Awarangzub; it begins with the departure of Awarangzub from Awarangbad in 1068 (1657) and is brought down to 1078 (1667). It has been printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1855-1868.

Bibliography: Khafi Khan, Muntazab al-Lu'lu, ii, 210; Elliot-Jones, History of India, vii, 174-180; N. Lees, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, N. S., iii, 464; and Rieu, Cat. of the Persian MSS. Br. Mus., ii, 267.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

MUHAMMAD KHALIFA. [See Muhammad e. Hosain.]

MUHAMMAD KHAN BANGASH, Nawab styled Gha'farra-Djang, was a Kuhila chief of the tribe of Bangash. The city of Farrukhabad was founded by him in the name of his patron the emperor Farrukh Siyav. When Muhammad Shih became emperor of Dihilt, he appointed him governor of Mewa in 1143 (1730), but as he could not stop the repeated attacks of the Mahrattas he was removed in 1145 (1732) and appointed governor of Lahabadd. Muhammad Khan intended to reduce the Bundelas of whom Radj Chaturul was chief. He captured several places but as he did not know the roads, Chaturasul with the help of Peswah Badji Rao, surrounded him suddenly with an army. The Nawab took refuge in the fort of Diitaghar; whereupon his son, Kasim Djang, having collected an army of Afghans marched to Diitaghar and escorted his father in safety to Lahabadd. The imperial ministers then removed him from the governorship. He died in 1156 (1742).
arrival of her step-brother. At last at the solicitation of his sister, Muhammad Muhisin came to Hagi, and when she died at the age of eighty-one in 1218 (1803), she left a will bequeathing to Muhammad Muhisin the whole of her property.

It was thus not until Haji Muhammad Muhisin had reached the age of seventy-three that he became possessed of the great wealth which greatly helped his co-religionists in Bengal in the pursuit of education. He had never married and the death of his half-sister left him without near relatives. He was anxious that his great wealth should be put to good use after his death and consequently on the April 22, 1206 (1824), he signed a Deed of Trust, setting apart the whole of his income for charitable purposes in perpetuity.

Haji Muhammad Muhisin lived for six years after making this noble disposition of his property. For his own personal use he had reserved only so much property as would bring him in about one hundred rupees a month. In 1227 (1812) he died at the age of about eighty-two and was buried in the garden adjoining the Muhammad which he had so splendidly endowed.


(M. Hidyat Husain)

MUHAMMAD MURTADA B. MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD ABU AL-RAZÅKH ABU 'L-FAUD AL-’IJASIMI AL-ZRecords Al-Hanawi, an Arabic scholar, born in 1145 (1732) in Bilgram in Khanduj in N.W. India, settled, after travelling for many years in pursuit of knowledge, in Cairo on 9th Safar 1167 (Dec. 7, 1753). There he succeeded in reviving an interest in the study of Tradition by giving lectures to specially invited companies. In Upper Egypt also he was always a welcome guest with the Arab Shaikh Humam and in the Egyptian country towns, and his fame spread to the Sudan and even to India. From the year 1191 (1777) he drew a pension from the government. He died in Shabdan 1205 (April 1791) in Cairo of the plague.

His principal works are two great treatises. He wrote the Tadí al-’Arūn on Fihristah’s Kainā, finishing it in 1181 (1767) after 14 years’ work; although in the preface he quotes over a hundred sources used by him, he takes most of the additions to the Kainā bodily from the Lisiân al-Kabir of Ibn Manzar. It was printed incompletely in 5 vols. in Cairo 1286—1287 and in 10 vols. in Cairo 1307. He wrote a commentary, also very extensive, on Ghazzali’s Iyâ’ ilm al-Din, entitled Iháj al-Sada al-muttafin, in which, in addition to explaining words he devotes special attention to establishing traditions quoted by al-Ghazzali; it was printed at Fès in 1301—1302 in 13 vols. at Cairo in 1311 in 10 vols. He also composed a number of smaller works on lexicography, Tradition and also on the genealogy of the ‘Alids: 1. Al-’Attâb al-’Iyyāf fi Bayan Ĥaqq al-Maârib wa l-’Iyâh, ed. by Landberg, Primaers arabe; l. 40—53; 2. Al-Qawl al-mabûf fi Tahâkht Lâfz al-Tâbûn, Cairo, Führst, i. 96; 3. Tahtâk al-Wazir al-Mafrâfat al-Mubâtat wa l-Rasîd, Mâsila, Dârûd, Mâzâfat, p. 140; 1; 4. Al-Amâli al-Shâhîyât, lectures on traditions, which he gave in the Djamah Shaikhui, Berlin, Ahwardt, No. 10253; 5. Khula fi Ahâdith Yuwam al-’Ammâr, Cairo, Führst, vi. 209; 6. Tahtâk al-Kâmâil fi Mabût Shaikh al-Mas‘nî illa l-’Iyyâh, u. ’Iyâh, finished on 4th Rabî‘ II 1194 (April 10, 1780), ibid., vii. 51, 7. Dhikrhot al-Ifrîzâs fi Nahaw Banû al-’Ishârâ, finished on 26th Dhu ’l-Hijja 1182 (May 2, 1769), ibid., p. 150; 8. Hikmat, a manuscript of some sixty leaves, a history of the Arabic script and of famous calligraphers, finished on 12th Dhu ’l-Hijja 1184 (March 30, 1771), ibid., p. 161; 9. Al-’Râqad al-mafir fi Nahaw al-Sâda al-Dastâr al-Mu’âth, finished on 10th Dhu ’l-Hijja 1191 (March 21, 1774), ibid., p. 343; 10. Nishât al-Sâqi al-Muhammâd Efsâni Ibn Hâwâ al-Sâmânî al-Hamadânî, ibid., p. 346, b. 8.


MUHAMMAD PASHA. [See MUMMAD, DAMAD PASA, MUHAMMAD GURHÎ PASA, KARA-MAN MEHMET PASA, SOKOLLî]

MUHAMMAD PASA, BALTADÎ, grand vizier, was born about 1660 in the town of Ôthmûndîk and, after an education in the imperial palace, entered the corps of the bâlûqash. On account of his beautiful voice he acted for some time as mîr-âsher; later on he became a scribe and rose rapidly in this career. In 1703, at Ahmed III’s accession, he became mîr-âsher and was made Kapudan Pasha in November 1704. In December of the same year he obtained the grand vizierate as successor of Kâlâyî Ahmîd Pasha, against whom, although he had been at one time his fellow bâlûqi, he had used all his power of intrigue, for which he was especially notorious, according to the historiographer Râshîd. On May 3, 1706 he was dismissed — on account of his lack of capacity, as Râshîd says — and exiled to Lemnos, but his friends obtained for him the nomination to the governorship of Erzerûm. In January 1709 he became governor of Aleppo and from here he was called, in August 1710, a second time to the grand vizierate, after Koprula Nu‘man Pasha had proved unable to restore stability in the way that had been expected from him. At that time the first great conflict with Russia was drawing near; Charles XII of Sweden, after the battle of Poltawa, remained in Turkey. The beginning of Bâltâdî Muhammad’s second grand vizierate was therefore filled with preparations for the war with Russia, which had been decided upon at a great state council in November 1710, and approved of by a fatwâ of the Shaikh al-Islâm. The grand vizier was made commander of this memorable campaign, which quickly was ended by the battle near Fâlûn (Falksen, Turk. Fâlî) on the Pruth (July 21—22, 1711). Peter the Great’s army was left in a desperate position, but his generals succeeded in concluding a truce with the
grand vizier, by the terms of which the Russian army was allowed to withdraw, while Azo was restored to the Turks. The general feeling in the Ottoman historical tradition is that Baštađi Muhammed had been bribed; his enemies at any case intrigued against him in Constantinople so that, even before his return to the capital, he was informed of his dismissal at Adrianople (Nov. 1711). The conclusion of the armistice of the Thrace was also much against the wishes of Charles XII who, on his remonstrances to the grand vizier, is said to have got the dissuading reply that, in case Peter had been taken prisoner, there would have been nobody to govern his country and that, in general, it was not good that sovereigns should leave their country (Voltaire, Histoire de Charles XII et de Pierre I). Baštađi was exiled to Lesbos and then to Lemnos, where he died in 1712, aged over fifty.

The bad reputation which this grand vizier has in Turkish history and which is also given him by von Hammer, does not seem to be confirmed by western sources (Jorga, iv. 308).

**Bibliography:** The chief Turkish authority is Rašíd's Tărık; the campaign against Russia has been described in a Tărık-i Moskov, contained in the work of Hasan of Crete and in a Munich manuscript ( habinger, G.O.W., p. 307, 310); Dilaev-Zade, Dliay to the Hadibat al-Wusara, p. 7 sqq.; Sidiğül-i othmanî, iv. 208 sqq.; von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 111 sqq., 148 sqq.; Jorga, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, iv. where other western sources are indicated; Ahmed Refik, Mamâlbûk-i othmanî yi Demir Bahâ Şahî, Constantinople 1910; Ahmed Mukhtar, Æn mabûstu gore Baštađi Mehmed Pashânın Frut sefari, T.O.E.M., vol. 8, p. 160 sqq., 238 sqq. (J. H. Kramers)

**MUHAMMAD PASHA, ELMAS,** grand vizier, was born about 1660 in a village near Sinûb as son of a ship's captain. After having been attached to the service of the pasha of Tripolis, he was educated in the khan qâne of the palace and became in 1687 sâhidâr; soon afterwards he became mihângî and obtained the rank of vizier. In Ahmad II's reign he was pasha in Bosnia, but did not yet play a prominent part, though he is said to have been one of that sultan's favourites. After Muştâfâ III's accession he was appointed kâm-naşîm of the imperial muster and, when a revolt of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Surmeli Ali Pasha's life, he was appointed in his stead (April 1695). He accompanied the new sultan during the campaign against Austria in the years 1695, 1696 and 1697. On September 11, 1697 the Turkish army was attacked by the Austrians under prince Eugène, while it was passing the Theiss near Zenta in order to march on Szegedin. The sultan had already reached the left bank, but the grand vizier, together with a number of high military chiefs, was killed that day in the battle, which meant a heavy loss for the Turkish troops. Elmas Muhammad had been against this military enterprise, but the other members of the council had persuaded the sultan to the contrary. He is said to have been the surnamer Elmas "diamond" to his accomplishments and handsome physique.


(J. H. Kramers)

**MUHAMMAD PASHA KARAMANÎ.** [See Karamanî Mehmed Pasha.]

**MUHAMMAD PASHA, LALA,** grand vizier under Ahmad I. He was a Bosnian by origin and a relation of Muhammad Şokolli Pasha. The year of his birth is not given. After having had his education in the palace, he was mîr-askor and became in 1595 agha of the Janissaries. Two years later he took part in the Austrian wars as beylerbey of Kûm-lî and was commander of Esztergom (Gran; Türkisch: Ustorgan) when this town capitulated to the Austrian army in September 1595. Disfavored the following years, Lala Muhammad was several times serscher in Hungary and when, in July 1604, the grand vizier Yavuz ʿAli had died in Belgrad, on his way to the Hungarian theatre of war, the sultan sent the imperial seal to Lala Muhammad. Although peace negotiations were continually being resumed, the new grand vizier took in that year Waitzen (Turk. Wâc) but besieged in vain Esztergom. During next year's campaign Esztergom was taken by Lala Muhammad (Sept. 29, 1605) and in November he crowned the Hungarian Bocskay as king of Hungary (without the regions occupied directly by the Turks) and Transylvania. In that same year the Turkish eastern army under Cîghale Pasha was beaten by the Persians, while the troops sent to subdue the revolt in Anatolia were routed at Bulawadin. After his return it was decided that the grand vizier should remain next year in the capital and lead the war on the two fronts and, if possible, bring about a successor and the long-drawn peace negotiations with Austria. The young sultan, however, changed his mind in keeping with the wishes of the Kapudan Pasha Derwish, who was intriguing against Lala Muhammad. Accordingly the latter was ordered to take command of the army against Persia. He had already put up his tent in Uskudar, when overthrown by sorrow because of the frustration of his plans, was seized with an apoplexy and died three days afterwards (May 23, 1606). He was buried near the twâr of Şokolli Pasha.

**Bibliography:** The tarih of Peçevî — who, as scribe, had served Lala Muhammad on several occasions (cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 192): — Na'îmû and Hasan Beyzâde; Othman Zade Tâhi, Hadibat al-Wusara, p. 52 sqq.; Sidiğül-i othmanî, iv. 140; von Hammer, G. O. R., iv.

(J. H. Kramers)

**MUHAMMAD PASHA, RÜM,** vizier and, according to some sources, grand vizier under Sultan Muhammad II. As his surname indicates, he was a Greek renegade. After having had an education in the palace he was destined for a military career and became at one time beylerbey. The dates of his birth and of his military advancements are not recorded. He had taken part in the final campaign of Muhammad II against Karaman in 1466 and was charged by the sultan with the transfer of parts of the population of the conquered region to Constantinople, instead of the grand vizier Mahmûd Pasha [q.v.] who executed these measures in too lenient a way, as the sources say. On the way back to Constantinople Mahmûd was dispossessed of his dignity in favour of Rûm Muḥammad. The latter remained grand-vizier until
1470, during which time Muhammad II went on his campaigns in Albania [cf. Skanderbeg] and Negroponte. Rûm Muhammad Pasha does not seem to have taken part in these expeditions, but, as a critical perusal of the sources has shown, he was especially charged with the problem of the repopulation of Constantinople; his commissionership for the transfer of the Karamanian population had been connected with the same problem.

As the measures taken to make the new capital again inhabited must have been unpopular in Muslim circles — the Greeks and other Christian elements were granted as favourable conditions as the Muhammadians to settle in the town — the historical tradition of the early Ottoman chronicles is rather against Muhammad Pasha. They ascribe to him the re-establishment of the house-rent in Constantinople called musâfirs, which was considered as an injustice to the new Muslim settlers. The musâfirs is said to have been instituted by the sultan, then abolished and again instituted by this grand vizier. But, as F.C. Giese has shown by an analysis of the text of AsÎhÎ-Pasha-Zade and Tursun Bey (cf. Ilk., xiii., 1931, p. 268 sqq.), these measures were part of the policy of the sultan himself and were probably already included in the commission of the grand vizier, who, being a Greek, must have had special qualifications for the difficult task. This last circumstance, however, makes him the more suspect in the eyes of the historiographers and for this reason we may perhaps assume that his reported cruelty towards the population of the Karmanian towns has been exaggerated by the sources, in order to add glory to his predecessor Mahmut Pasha, whose memory has survived as that of a national hero. It is not even beyond question that Rûm Muhammad was ever really grand vizier (Siçilî-i ıçmâni). The Hâdidat al-Wazarâ of Òîhîmân-Zade (p. 10) ascribes Mahmuân Pasha's fall to Rûm Muhammad's intrigues, but makes Iskâh Pasha his immediate successor in the grand vizierate. So do other historians.

He was dismissed in 875 (1470) and was afterwards (according to the Siçilî-i ıçmâni in 879 [1075]) appointed wali of Konya with the mission to pacify the newly conquered territory. He was defeated, however, by his own general, the Venetian, at the Cilician pass; soon afterwards he died, probably killed by order of the sultan (according to AsÎhÎ-Pasha-Zade, ed. Giese, p. 133). The chronological order of these events is not certain.

Rûm Muhammad Pasha was buried in a mosque which he had founded in Uskudar.

Bibliography: Among the old chronicles those of Nesbi and AsÎhÎ-Pasha-Zade, and among the later historians especially Òî; Siçilî-i ıçmâni, iv. 104; from Hammer, G. O. K., i. 488, 499; Hâfiz Husain al-Awânsâyât, Hâzihat al-Dhâmisî, ii. 195. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, SOKOLLI [See Sokolli, II.

MUHAMMAD PASHA, SULTAN ZADE, grand vizier under Sultan Ibrahim, was born about 1602 as son of Ahmad al-Rajmân Bey, son of the former grand vizier Ahmad Pasha (under Murad III), and by his mother a grandson of the princess of the imperial house, whence his surname Sultan Zade. After having been beylik beyi in the palace, he adopted a military career, became already in 1630 kuduk veziri and was appointed in 1638 governor of Egypt. In 1642 he was made commander of the expedition against Azof [q.v.] which town he rebuilt after it had been burned by the Cossacks before its surrender. On his return he formed with the siçilî Vüsus Pasha and the sultan's favourite Djinâdi KwaÂa a triumvirate, supported by the wâliye Kosem [q.v.]; they intrigued against the grand vizier Karâ Muştafa Pasha, who sought to remove the danger by sending Sultan Zade Muhammad in 1643 to Damascus as wâli. After Karâ Muştafa had been executed on January 1, 1644, Sultan Zade Muhammad was made grand vizier. One of his most conspicuous characteristics in this office seems to have been his ability to flatter the sultan and to satisfy his very extravagant wishes by obtaining money from all possible sources and by giving sandjakos to many of Ibrahim's favourites. At this time the Empire was at peace with Austria (which sent in August 1644 an extraordinary embassy to confirm the peace) and with Persia, although Rakocozy, the prince of Transylvania, did his best to involve Turkey in a war with Austria. There was, however, a strong desire to go to war with Venice and to conquer Crete. The grand vizier was against this undertaking, but his former confederates drew the sultan to their side. Accordingly Vüsüs Pasha was called as serdâr to Crete in the summer of 1645 and took Canea (August 17). The bad feelings that arose after Vüsüs Pasha's return led to Sultan Zade's dismissal from the post of grand vizier (December 1645). After Vüsüs Pasha in January 1646 had fallen a victim to Sultan Ibrahim's cruel capriciousness, Sultan Zade himself was made serdâr against Crete. He departed in April 1646, drove the Venetians from Tenedos, which they had taken by surprise, and died shortly after his arrival in Canea (July 1646). He was buried in the teke of Hudât in Uskudâr.

Bibliography: Namîsî's Ta'virî is the chief Turkish authority; valuable contemporary information is given in the Siçilî-nâm of Ewliya Çelebi, who himself went with the expedition against Azof. Further the Eiçilî Ta'vârişk-i Alî-Ôqûmî of Nushî Pasha Zade (cf. Babinger, G.W., p. 211) and an anonymous Nishâhat-nâmî (G.W., p. 152, note); Ôqûmî Zade Tâbih, Hâdidat al-Wazarâ, ed. Giese, p. 161; from Hammer, G. O. K., i. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MUHAMMAD PASHA, TIRYÂKÎ, grand vizier under Mahmut I, was born about 1650 at Constantinople. His father was a Janissary. He began his career as a scribe and rose to important posts; in 1730 he played a role in the peace negotiations at Belgrad with Austria. He had been kuyu of the grand vizierate, viz. minister of the interior, when the sultan, under influence of his new fêsr ebezi, the so-called Beshir the Younger, dismissed his predecessor Hasan Pasha and called him to the grand vizierate (August 1746). The twelve months of his period of office were not filled with war but with important diplomatic negotiations, in which he was supported by the new kuyu Muhammed Sâid, later grand vizier, and the reis efsâni Muştafa, both of them equally well versed in European diplomacy. During Tiryâkî Muhammad's grand vizierate peace was concluded with Nâdir Shêh of Persia (September 4, 1746) and the peace treaties with Austria and Russia were renewed. As the reason for his dismissal (August 24, 1747) is given his addiction to the use of drugs.
noble, the son of an Anatolian, who came from Kutbşa, and a Circassian mother, he received a good education. He attended the Naval School and became a naval officer but he only spent eighteen months in the navy, mainly in Crete. When quite a boy, he displayed an irresistible love for the theatre and literature and began to write at the age of 10, taking as his models the novels of Ahmed Midhat and the translations of French romances of adventure. This first production was a drama, Dönem’i yaşam Otobrücke, Kursanu’l-ı (Basin of the Coral of Gascogne). As his knowledge of French, and later of English, increased, he extended the scope of his reading and of his interests, so that at school he received the nick-name Roman opçu ça Efenidi (the novel-reader) and later Romançı (the novel-writer). His literary activity proper only began in the Naval School where he became acquainted with Georges Omnet, Octave Feuillet, Alphonse Daudet, Émile Zola, Flaubert, the French realists and naturalists and endeavoured to imitate them. His story Dişkınçî is the most notable of his efforts at this period.

When he became acquainted with the works of the modernist Usta Çitâde Khâlid Ziya [q. v.] he made complete that year against the Austrians on the Danube frontier (taking of Feth Islîm), but was nevertheless dismissed, after his return, through the influence of the Kdear oğlu Rıfşıh. Yegen Muhammed was appointed in his place (December 1737) and had to continue the peace negotiations with Austria and Russia, which were made especially complicated by the rivalry between Francis (represented by de Villeneuve) and the Sea Powers in offering their good services as mediators. The grand vizier himself was rather in favour of continuing the war and, being of a proud and arrogant character, made the negotiations still more difficult. In June 1737 he went as serdar to the Austrian front and was successful in recapturing Semendra and Orsowa (August). He was back in the capital in November. At the end of the year the Russians retired from Odakow and Kiburn, which placed Turkey in a favourable position in the never ceasing peace negotiations, in which Poland also had become involved. But not even this grand vizier was to bring the war to an end; the same influence that had disposed of his predecessor obtained his dismissal in March 1739. After that Yegen Muhammed was governor of Crete, Bonia, Aidin and Andului. When in this last office he was called to the post of serdar on the front of Kars (March 1745) against the Persians. He received large reinforcements from different quarters and thought himself strong enough to attack Nâdir Shâh in his encampment near Erivan. This battle resulted in disaster for the Turks, owing mainly to a mutiny among the irregular levées. Yegen Muhammed was killed, probably by the mutineers, in August 1745.


MUHAMMAD (MEHMED) RAÛF, an important Ottoman author and poet who plays a very prominent part in the development of the Turkish moderns and of the written language. Born on Aug. 12, 1878 (1875) in Constantinople, the son of an Anatolian, who came from Kutbşa, and a Circassian mother, he received a good education. He attended the Naval School and became a naval officer but he only spent eighteen months in the navy, mainly in Crete. When quite a boy, he displayed an irresistible love for the theatre and literature and began to write at the age of 10, taking as his models the novels of Ahmed Midhat and the translations of French romances of adventure. This first production was a drama, Dönem’i yaşam Otobrücke, Kursanu’l-ı (Basin of the Coral of Gascogne). As his knowledge of French, and later of English, increased, he extended the scope of his reading and of his interests, so that at school he received the nick-name Roman opçu ça Efenidi (the novel-reader) and later Romançı (the novel-writer). His literary activity proper only began in the Naval School where he became acquainted with Georges Omnet, Octave Feuillet, Alphonse Daudet, Émile Zola, Flaubert, the French realists and naturalists and endeavoured to imitate them. His story Dişkınçî is the most notable of his efforts at this period.

When he became acquainted with the works of the modernist Usta Çitâde Khâlid Ziya [q. v.] he made complete that year against the Austrians on the Danube frontier (taking of Feth Islîm), but was nevertheless dismissed, after his return, through the influence of the Kdear oğlu Rıfşıh. Yegen Muhammed was appointed in his place (December 1737) and had to continue the peace negotiations with Austria and Russia, which were made especially complicated by the rivalry between Francis (represented by de Villeneuve) and the Sea Powers in offering their good services as mediators. The grand vizier himself was rather in favour of continuing the war and, being of a proud and arrogant character, made the negotiations still more difficult. In June 1737 he went as serdar to the Austrian front and was successful in recapturing Semendra and Orsowa (August). He was back in the capital in November. At the end of the year the Russians retired from Odakow and Kiburn, which placed Turkey in a favourable position in the never ceasing peace negotiations, in which Poland also had become involved. But not even this grand vizier was to bring the war to an end; the same influence that had disposed of his predecessor obtained his dismissal in March 1739. After that Yegen Muhammed was governor of Crete, Bonia, Aidin and Andului. When in this last office he was called to the post of serdar on the front of Kars (March 1745) against the Persians. He received large reinforcements from different quarters and thought himself strong enough to attack Nâdir Shâh in his encampment near Erivan. This battle resulted in disaster for the Turks, owing mainly to a mutiny among the irregular levées. Yegen Muhammed was killed, probably by the mutineers, in August 1745.

vailing fashion of short sketches, tales and long
stories. Among these is his second most famous
work: Siyeh Indifler ("Black Pearls"), a collection
of poems in prose modelled on Yûnûs's Manûr
Shârâ and Beaudelaire's Fleurs du mal (Edebiyat,
No. 11, 1317); also the collection of long stories
Éğüzâne ("Emmoured") (Edebiyat, No. 16, 1325
=1910); İkâyât ("Death Agony") (Edebiyat,
No. 12, 1325); Son Emeil ("The Last Hope")
(Edebiyat, No. 29, 1329 =1913) and Bin 'Abd
-ül-Tâhâ ("History of a Love Affair") (1330=
1914), futher 4 Ul Kâhâbe ("Three Tales"); Ezkar
("Flowers"); Porwâvlel gel ("As butterflies") etc.
Raûf was no less successful as a draughtsman. He
wrote the following pieces: Penel ("The Talm"),
a drama (1910) in four acts (şufl); (Edebiyat, No. 14,
1325 =1909); Ferdi ve Şahurça ("Ferdi and Co.") in 3 acts, a dramatisation of the novel of the
same name by Ziya (Edebiyat, No. 17) and
Dinpîz ("Battle") in 5 acts (Edebiyat, No. 30,
1327 =1911); also 4 Kavuket ("Two Powers")
; Üzümruhda doluya.
Raûf died on Dec. 23, 1931 at Constantinople.
Numerous contributions by him are in the Serâtet-ı
Fünnû; the finely produced women's periodical Me-
şârîn of which he edited the only volume that
appeared. Contributions by him, some his own work,
especially poems (Raûf possessed not inconsiderable
poetic talent and was regarded as the Turkish
Beaudelaire), also essays and criticisms, of which his
analyses of the contemporary novel are valuable.
were published in different collections, periodicals
and newspapers in vast numbers. His Zâmetâ:
("Lily") brought him trouble. It was confiscat:
on account of its immorality and the author was
imprisoned. He wrote other things in the same
style which were not printed.
In his works he appears as a very artistic, rather
sentimental nature; even what he writes in prose
is pure poetry. His prose is as good as that of
Ziya, the leader of the Şerâtet-ı Fünnû movement.
He is one of the most important personalities in
this group of men of letters, although his marked
merits, in form and style are counter-balanced by
equal defects, which became worse as he paid no
attention to the cultivation of his style: in him we
find a reversed process, from the more perfect
to the less. He would have been held in higher
repute generally, if he had ceased to write after
his first works. — Owing to the identity of the name
and the parallel literary activity Muhammad Raûf
was often taken for M. Raûf, the son of Farîg
Afîn Pasha, who died on Feb. 23, 1918 and was
buried at Houdar Pasha. M. Raûf was editor of the
Rehûl-i Kûbîb. He was a dramatist and wrote:
Predâmet, Yûnefa Kürânet ("Wonder in sight"
and a comedy Akel ile Pertemelinde ("Between
Fire and Powder") and a piece entitled Tıvaâye
written jointly with Kâlif Nefzî, one of his most intimate
friends. The following dramas were never printed:
Sâhâl-ud-Din-i Eyiîh, Neîmîm and a number of
adaptations. From the English he translated Saiyid
Ameer Ali's The Life and and Teachings of Mu-
hammed or the Spirit of Islam in 2 vols. entitled
Mevâfereçenî Târîhi-î Islam.
Besides being an author, M. Raûf was also a
teacher, a task for which his extensive knowledge
of languages qualified him (in addition to French
and English, he knew Arabic, Persian, German,
Italian, Greek and others). He lectured at the
University on mythology and Greek and Italian
literature, on which he wrote two text-books: Yûnûs-i
hadım Târîhi-Edebiyat and Itâlya-Târîhi-
Edebiyat. He was also for a time teacher of
western literatures, Turkish literature and French
at various secondary schools.
Bibliography: Brussel Mehmed Tâhir, Oth-
mânî Mevâfereçenî, ii. 218; Nescelî Millî, 1330,
p. 224-238; Shukrâ-âl-Din Sulaimân, Târîhi-
Edebiyat-ı othmânî, 1328, p. 367; Ismâ'îl Hikmet,
Turk Edebiyatı Târîhi, Baku 1925, p. 931-951;
Dârâtûl Nedjîm, Turk Edebiyatı derîsî, 1338,
p. 307; Ismâ'îl Habîb, Turk Tâfiyülhâdi-Edebiyat Târîhi, 1340, p. 533;
Raûf Nefzî, Hayâtî-Edebiyat, 1922, p. 202
sgg., 287, 349, 350; Kâhil Hamid, in Serâtet-ı
Fünnû, liv. 1918, p. 82-83; Fazy and Mem-
douk. Antologiî, p. 255-259; M. Hartmann,
Die Dichter der neuen Türkî, in M.S.O.S. As., xi,
(1916), p. 124-179 and xvi (1918), p. 43 and in
Urâkum and Untersuchungen zur Geleitent-
wicklung des heutigen Orîs, ii., Berlin 1919,
p. 83-86; O. Hachtman, Die turkische Litera-
V.O. ii., 1918, p. 530 and 560; C. Frank, Zum
Gezähumî M. Renâf .. ., in V.O., ii. (1918),
167; Th. Menzel, Die turkische Literatur, in
Hinlebg's Kultur der Gegenwart, Die Orient-
alischen Literaturen, Leipzig 1925 2, p. 313.
(Th. Menzel)
MUHAMMAD SAÖDİ (Mir Dicmân), minister
of 'Abd Allah Khâtib Shâh of Haidarâbâd
during the xvith century, was originally a diamond
merchant, and was famous in the Deccan for his
wealth before he became minister. After the defeat
of his master 'Abd Allah by Aurangzeb, Mir
Dicmân took service under the latter and was
made Governor of Bengal from 1751—1755 (1660-
1664). He defeated Shât Shâtî when the latter
fought against his brother Awrangzeb. Mir
Dicmân was afterwards employed in the conquest of
Cooch Bihâr and Assâm in 1702—1703 (1661-
1662). He overran both these countries but owing
to the rainy season and the spread of disease among
his troops, he was compelled to return, only to die
of dysentery contracted during his campaign, shortly
after his arrival at Dacca in 1703 (1663).
Bibliography: Mü'âflîr al-Çinârî, iii,
p. 530; Blochemann, J. S. B., XLIV, 51; Elliot-
Dowson, History of India, vii. 199: Imperia-
Gazetteer of India, ii. 402; vii. 241; Elphin-
stone, History of India, 1889, p. 593-615.
(M. Hâvâret Hossain)
MUHAMMAD SAÖDİ. [See Kâhil Ëfrâm]
ZâEH]
MUHAMMAD SHAÎH (1131—1161 =1719—
1748), emperor of Dîhilî, surnamed Muham-
mad Râwshân Akhtar (or the Brilliant Star), was
the son of prince Ubâdah Shâh, one of the three
brothers who perished in disputing the crown with
their eldest brother, Dâhândâh Shâh, son of Bahâdûr
Shâh. He was born on Friday the 24th Rabî I
1114 (August 7, 1702), and was crowned by the
two Saiyid brothers, Saiyid 'Abd Allah and Saiyid
Iflâm, after the death of Rabî al-Dawla on the
25th Dhû-l-Âdâd 1131 (September 29, 1719).
Mohammed Shâh reigned for about 30 years and
died one month after the battle of Surhâd, which
his son fought against Ahmad Shâh Abdâlî
[q. v.]. His death took place on Thursday the
27th Rabî II 1161 (April 16, 1748). He was
buried in the court before the Mausoleum of
MUHAMMAD SHĀH — MUHAMMAD ZA'IM

(Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' at Dīlī. This emperor may be called the last of the Timurid line, who reigned in Dīlī and enjoyed any power. The few princes of that sovereign's family who were raised to the throne after Muhammad Shāh were mere puppets in the hands of the nobles of the court.


(M. Hidayat Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHĀH I, 'ALĀ' AL-DĪN KHAJĀH (695—715 = 1295—1315), was the nephew and son-in-law of Sulṭān Dīlī al-Dīn Firdūsī II, Khaḍījī, whom he murdered by treachery at Kārā Mānkuī, in the province of Lakhnāū, in 695 (1295), and ascended the throne of Dīlī in the same year. He re-conquered Gūjārāt (697 = 1297), took Cīrār and temporarily subdued the Rāsidīs (703 = 1303). His chief general, Malik Kāfīr, seized Dārgrāh and Warangal, and founded a Deccan province of the Dīlī kingdom. The empire is said to have flourished during his reign. Among contemporary poets Amir Khusrau and Ḥāfīẓ ʿAṭā Ḥasan held the first rank; Shāhī Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā', one of the greatest saints of India, flourished at the same time. He died in 715 (1315) and was buried in the tomb which he had constructed in his life-time in Old Dīlī.


(M. Hidayat Hosain)

MUHAMMAD SHĀH BAHMĀNĪ. [See Muhammad I—III, above p. 664 sq.]

MUHAMMAD SHARIF AL-NADĀFRI was born in the Deccan where he spent the first twenty-five years of his life. He afterwards visited in an official capacity Gūjārāt, Mālwa, Ḍām, Dīlī, Agra, the Pāndābā, Sind and Kashmir. He went to the last country in the train of Dīlī al-Dīn and accompanied the command of Kāmīn Kān (1031 = 1621). He became the khan Bahār of Mīravāstān, a short history of the kings of Dīlī and of the Deccan dynasties from the Mughalmen conquest to the accession of Shāh Dīlī, completed in 1018 (1628).

Biography: Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 134—140; Rice, Catec Pārsī MSS. Br. Mus., p. 907.

(M. Hidayat Hosain)

MUHAMMAD TĀHIR AL-FATANI AL-GUDJĀRATI. was born at Fata in Gūjārāt in 914 (1508). After completing his education in his native land, he proceeded to Mecca, where he studied traditions with eminent scholars such as Ibn Ḥadīr al-Hajjamī al-Makki and others. He acquired much learning from 'Ali b. Ḥusān al-Dīn al-Muṭṭakī (d. 975 = 1567) and also became his disciple in the Kādirī and Shīʿī Dīlī orders. After his return to his native country he tried his utmost to spread learning and to uproot the doctrines of Muhammad al-Dīwnūrī who had claimed to be the Muhāli of his time and had a considerable following among the Bohrās [q.v.], a community to which Muhammad Tāhir himself belonged.

In 980 (1572) Akbār went to conquer Gūjārāt. After its conquest he conferred honour on Muhammad Tāhir by tying with his own hands a turban on his head, saying that it was incumbent on him (Akbār) to spread the true principles of Islam. Khān Aʿṣūr Muhammad Kākūlātī was appointed governor of Gūjārāt and he helped Muhammad Tāhir in uprooting the new doctrines of Mahdollī. But when 'Ābd al-Rahīm Khān Khānān succeeded him as governor, Muhammad Tāhir suffered much at the hands of the followers of the Mahdollī, and proceeded to the court of Akbār in Akbarabad for redress. On his way to 'U'djīān he was murdered by some followers of the pretended Mahdollī in 986 (1578).

Among various the compositions the following may be mentioned:
1. Majmuʿ Bihār al-Anwar fi Gharīb al-Tanzil wa-Laqīf al-Maḥbūr, a copious dictionary of the Qur'an and the Traditions, lithographed, Lakhnāū 1248, 1284 and 1284; 2. al-Mugānī, a dictionary of proper names of Muhammadan traditionists, lithographed on the margin of Tabīb al-Tahābī by Ibn Ḥadīr al-ʿAskālānī (Dīlī 1290); 3. Tarāhirat al-Maṭfūʿāt, a treatise on traditions which have been incorrectly attributed to the Prophet.


MUHAMMAD ZA'IM, a Turkish historian. All that we know of his life is gleaned from his works. He was born in 930 (1532) for he tells us that at the accession of Sulṭān Murād III, i.e. in 982 (1574), he was 43. At the early age of eleven he took part in the campaign of 950 (1543) along with his elder brother Perwān Agha, who at that time was Kāpūsā Khaṭūn to the Saḥālab Beg of Lepanto, Yaḥyā Pasha Oğlu Ahmed Beg. When the latter, after the capture of Stahlwiesenburg, was appointed Saḥālab Beg there, the brothers seemed to have remained in his service probably till 952 (1545) when Abūl Kālīm al-Maḥdollī was summoned to Shahābul, in connection with the plundering of the Stahlwiesenburg churches. In 961 (1554) when Sulṭān Sulaimān took the field against Shah Tahmāsp of Persia, Muhammad Za'īm was a secretary in the service of the governor of Syria, Teki Oğlu Mehemmed, and a year later he was secretary to the powerful grand vizier Mehemmed Sokkoli and in this capacity compiled the official report of the death of Selim II and the accession of Murād III which was sent to the governor of Dijīābār, Aleppo and Baghḍād. This office, to which he perhaps succeeded on the promotion (978 = 1570) of the famous Feritli Ahmed Beg [q.v.], he must have filled till the death of Mehemmed Sokkoli in 987 (1578); see nothing further about it. He held a great feat (fūlat; hence his epithet Za'īm): he himself says: zanānī 'atqebel sefārat-i āli ummān-i āli Mehemmede ilā metalled-e ṣe-čokār. Friends requested him to write a history and he finished it within a year. He began the work in Multān 985 (beg. March 21, 1577) and had completed it in Lūh 'l-Hidjja of the same year (beg. Feb. 9, 1578). The date of his death and
the site of his tomb are not known but he is said to have left charitable endowments in Karafaria
near Salonika.
He called his book Humā-i Dāmī al-Taṣābī, and dedicated it to his master Mehmed
Meşhadi. As his sources he mentions eleven historians
from Firdawsi and Tabari down to the anonymous Taṣābī-i Dāmī al-Omān and gives as his
main source Ebdējdt al-Taṣābī, from which, as
has been proved, he copied out whole pages with-
out a qualm. The book, which is not yet printed,
is divided into a preface and five sections, subdivided into guvāb and then again into
dalābēj and concludes with an epilogue. Rieu
and others have given an account of the contents
of the manuscripts. In the fourth guvāb of the
fifth bent he deals with the Ottomans and here
alone do we have statements of any value, when
the author describes from his own experience
events from 1543 onwards. He brought his story
to the time of writing and the last event
that he mentions took place in the month
in which the book was finished.
The passages in the book relating to Hungary
have been dealt with by Thury (Took certumlbr, 136—139) who also collected the above data
for his life: the earlier from 1530 to 1476 are
given in extracts and the later from 1521 to 1566
translated in full. Of the other less valuable parts
of the book Dier (Bewurktdschr qm den, t. 212 sqq.) has edited a portion of the very early
history, dealing with Cain and his descendants,
while v. Hammer (Sur le origine russe, t. 120)
edited and translated a portion on the tribal
divisions of the Turks, where the Rūs appear as
the nth Turkish tribe. Of the later Ottoman
historians, Ibrāhīm Pecwrt utilised and quoted
from the work of Muḥammad Zāmīn from
the year 1542 onwards.

Bibliography: Babinger, G. O. W., p. 20,
98 sq., 193, where further references are given.

(W. BORKMAN)

MUḤAMMADIYA, a name of several
heretical schools, notably the ultra-Shī‘a
Muḥammdiyah.

As the example of the Kāsīniyāt [q.v.] shows,
at an early date some Shī‘a transferred the imāmate
to the Alids who were not descendants of the Prophet's
doughter Fātima and then to those who were not
Alids at all. The Manṣūrīya revered such an one
in Muḥammad al-Ja‘fār b. ‘Umayr b. ‘Oma‘ī al-
Bu‘dah, governor of the ‘Irāq, executed in the
years of the Caliph Hishām, i.e. before 125 (743).
Alī Manṣūr, rejected by the Imam ‘Ja‘far al-
Sa‘di for Shī‘a exaguation, thrust the ‘Alids aside
by still further increasing this tendency: Muḥammad’s
family, he said, was heaven, the Shī‘a the earth
tand he himself the “fragment falling from heaven”
mentioned in Sūra li. 44, as he had been
personally touched and taught by God on a
journey to heaven; he is said to have abolished
the religious laws. While one group, the Husainiyah
recognised the Imam in his son al-Husain after
the death of Abū Manṣūr, another, the Muḥammdiyah,
treter celebrated as al-Nafs al-Safahī (“the
pure heart”), who in 145 (762) fell at Mecca
fighting the troops of the ‘Abbāsid Caliph al-Manṣūr. The Muḥammdiyah quoted as authority for
the recognition of an ‘Alī again an alleged testamentary

disposition of Abū Manṣūr and compared the fol-
lower order of succession: testament of the Husainid
Muḥammad Bākir for Abū Manṣūr and of the
latter for the Husainid Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh,
with the Jewish line: first Mosé, then Joshua,
son of Nun, then the sons of Aaron (the later
priesthood is meant). This arrangement was chosen
in both cases so that conflict might not arise between
the two lines of brothers (ḥabarba‘). — We cannot
be certain that the Muḥammdiyah formed a definite
sect. The name rather records the fact that the rising
of al-Nafs al-Zakīya, which was of great extent,
attracted all circles of the Shī‘a to its ranks, even
those who belonged to the Husainid camp; and
members of the Mughīyā, the followers of Mughīn,
son of Sa‘d, killed in the year 119 (737) by Yūsuf
b. ‘Omar’s predecessor Khaled b. ‘Abd Allāh al-
Kari, probably under the leadership of Dābir
b. Yazīd al-Dūrī, supported al-Nafs al-Zakīya
with their good wishes at least.

Quite a different group is the ultra-Islāmic
Muḥammdiyah of Mi‘rimīya. It took its name from
the belief in reply to an ‘Umayyā or ‘Amīnī
who regarded ‘All as God. Its principal representative
al-Fārūq b. All was executed between 279 (892)
and 289 (902).

The Khāṛījī Muḥammdiyah was a separate
party within the strictly Khāṛījī sub-group of the
Adjurida: it is called after a certain Muḥammad b.
Zurak.

Bibliography: al-Ṣaḥābi, Malakāt al-Islāmīyā, ed. H. Ritter, Constantinople 1928,
13 sq., 22 sq.; al-Baghdādi, al-Farrā‘i b. Firaq,
Cairo 1328, p. 42 sq., 214 sq., 234 sq. IB
Ḥazm, al-Fiqal fi Ṭ-Maḥal ... Cairo 1317–21,
iv. 186 sq., cf. al-Idjī, Maṣlahat, ed. Soerensen,
Leipzig 1848, p. 353 sq.; Mas‘udi, Murūj, ed.
B. de Maynard, cf. Index: J. Friedländer, The
Heterodoxies of the Sufis, in 7 A. O. S., xxviii and xxix., cf. Index: Th. Haarbrucker (on Shams
Mustan’si’s) Khus, wasfarbkhā ni ḑulb, philשלום, ii. 300.

(R. STROHMANN)

MUḤAMMARA, a town and port at
the head of the Persian Gulf and in the Persian
province of ‘Arabān. It lies on the right bank
of the Ḥaffar channel (formerly called Nahi Bayān)
which connects the Kūrūn river with the Shat-
‘Abī‘Arab, The original village from which the town
grew appears to have lain on the left bank of
the channel, on the island of ‘Abī‘ānān [q.v.],
and Muḥammarā is probably therefore not to be
identified with the town of Bayān, though it now
lies on the same site. Further, Bayān was included
in ‘Irāq ‘Arabī by the geographers, whereas Mu-
hammarā, lying on ‘Abī‘ānān island, was part of
Persia until the shifting of a channel threw the
possession of the town into dispute between
that country and Turkey. By the treaty of Erzerum
(1847) it was assigned to Persia, but though the
government was nominally directed from ‘Aṣhār, it
remained in reality in the hands of the Arab
(of ‘Arab) sheikh of the Jaf (or Ka‘ī) tribe, who were
Shī‘a. From the fact that the Arab geographers
ignore the town, at any rate under its present
name (for references to Bayān see G. Le Strange,
below), it may be inferred that the place (‘Muḥam-
ra) was either of minor importance or of compara-
tively recent origin. At the present time the
port is of some importance for the trade of Persia,
its principal article of commerce being dates,

MUḤĀRĪB, the name of several Arab tribes (Wustenfeld, *Register zu den genan. Tabellen*, p. 320 gives five of this name) of which the most important is that of the Muḥārīb b. Khaṣaфа b. Kāsī Aḥlān (Wustenfeld, *General Tabellen*, D, 8). They do not however seem to have been of very great importance either in the Dāhilīyya or in Ṭūrān; Ibn al-Kalbī only gives them two pages of his *Dīmarṣarat al-Ṭūrān* (Brit. Mus. MS., *Add. 23.297*, fol. 163b—165b) but these add considerably to the very meagre information in the *Tabellen* especially as regards the names of Ṭāir b. Ḍarṣ b. Muḥārīb and of Bādha wa (sic) b. Ḥuṭah b. Ṭāir b. Khaṭṭāf b. Muḥārīb. A typical tribe, these latter lived in the mountainous region of southern Najd between Medina and al-Yamāma (Wustenfeld, *Register*, p. 320 following Ibn Ḥuṭah, *Kitāb al-Maqārīs*, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 41); several places in their territory are recorded in Yākūt’s geographical dictionary (cf. the index of tribes, s. v.). We know very little about their history before Islam; they were closely connected with other tribes of the great group of the Kāsī Aḥlān, like the Ḥawāzīn, with whom they are said to have shared the worship of the idol Dāhil (Yaḥūm, *Muḥjam*, ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 167, l. 2—3 = Wellhausen, *Reste*, p. 65; cf. *Ṭadī al-Ṭūrān*, iii, 115, l. 7 from below), and especially the Ghaṭāfān (notably their clan Thālāb b. Sa’d b. Ḥuṭah) alongside of whom the clan of the al-Ḥuṭah b. Tāir b. Khaṭṭāf b. Muḥārīb (the genealogy of the *Tabellen* is to be rectified in as much as al-Mālik is the name of al-Khuṭūr and not that of his father) fought the war known as the yawan al-ḥawāśib or yawan Dārat Maṣwāq alluded to by the poet of the Ḥuṭahān Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥumām in some of his poems (cf. al-Mufaddalīṣiyūt, ed. Lyall, *Nis. xxi. xxii. and the commentary of Ibn al-Anbārī, with the passages quoted in the notes).

The Muḥārīb at the beginning of Islam were hostile to Muhammad; this hostility was perhaps only the continuation of that which prevailed between the nomad tribes of the Aḥlān of al-Najd and the citizens of Mālikina. Thus we find, in the early years of the Hijrīa, that Muhammad sent against them (and against the Ghaṭāfān) a series of expeditions, of the nature of raids and conquests rather than regular military enterprises (our sources, give 30 or 40 men as the total of the Muslim forces); the details of their fighting are given in Caetani, *Annali dell’ Islama*, i, p. 537—538 (3 a. H. *S. 6*), 596—597 (5 a. H. *S. 3*), 689—690 (6 a. H. *S. 1*), 694 (6 a. H. *S. 6*) with reference to the sources utilised (we may add Ibn Sa’d, II/1, 23—24, 43—44, 61—62). One part at least of the tribe must however have been attracted within the growing sphere of Muslim influence since we find Muḥārībis in the cavalry led by al-Zubair at the taking of Mecca (Caetani, *Annali*, ii, 9 a. H. *S. 396*). But it was not only in the a. H. that the Muḥārīb sent their ambassadors to Muhammad and gave their formal adhesion to Islam (Ibn Sa’d, II/1, 43; cf. Caetani, *Annali*, ii, 344—345); even on this occasion they were conspicuous by their uncoyness, quite Beduin, of which another example is given in the anecdote of the Muḥārīb (he is said to have been called Suṣāwa b. al-Hārīb or b. Ḍarṣ, who dared to doubt the Prophet’s word in connection with the purchase of a horse (cf. Ibn Sa’d, iv, 2, 90—91 etc., and Caetani, *Annali*, ix, 627—628).

The Muḥārīb abandoned Islam during the Rīḍa but were easily brought back to obedience (*Annali*, ii, p. 594, 596, 11 a. H. *S. 115, 118*); they took part in the conquest of the Ṭūrān (Ibn Ḥaḍarah, *Iṣābā*, Cairo 1325, iv, 20—21: biography of *Aḥd b. Sa’id*, who fought at al-Kādisiya and Dāhilīyā and again, in 36 and 37, at the battle of the Camel and that of Sīfīn, where he was slain); they were encamped at Kūva in the same quarter as the Usād and Ghaṭāfān, not far from that allotted to the Tamīn (Ṭabarī, i, 2490, 2495).

The contribution of the Muḥārīb to the politics and literature of Arabia is practically nil; we need only mention the names of Lajjīt b. Buqair b. Nadr (d. 190), who belonged to a branch of the Banū ‘Ali b. Ḍarṣ b. Muḥārīb, a poet (cf. *Ṭabarī*, iii, 540), ascetic and historian (*Fihrat*, p. 94 and Yākūt, *Iṣābā*, ed. Margoliouth, vii, 218—220, give a list of his works, relating mainly to literary history).

Of the other tribes bearing the name of Muḥārīb the best known is the Meccan tribe of the Muḥārīb b. Fīhr to which al-Daḥṣāk b. Kāsī belonged (q. v.); the Muḥārīb lampooned by al-Farazāḏaḏ and celebrated by Ḏarir (Yaḥūm, ed. Bevan, p. 817 l. 1, 1039 l. 2) are difficult to identify: it is not certain, although they are so identified in the index, that they were the Muḥārīb b. Khaṣaфа.

Bibliography: given in the article. (G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

Al-MUḤARRAM (Muharram), the first month of the Muhammadian year. The name is originally not a proper name but an adjective, as the article shows, qualifying Safar. In the pre-Muhammadian period the first two months of the old Meccan year were Safar [q. v.] and I, which is reflected in the dual of a pottor “al-Safarānī” for al-Muḥarram and Safar; in the old Arab year the first half year consisted of “three months of two months each” (Wellhausen), as the two Safars were followed by two Rabi’s and two Džumāds. The first of the two Safars, as the one that belonged to the sacred months, was given the additional epithet al-muḥarram which gradually became the name of the month itself. As Dhu ‘l-Hijja also belonged to the sacred months, three of the four sacred months came together in leap year. The month intercalated to equate the year to the solar year was inserted after Dhu ‘l-Hijjada and was not sacred. It thus came about that learned Muslims described the intercalation as renaming the Muhammarran concerned Safar, i.e. as making Muḥarram not sacred; they mean that the month after the pilgrimage, which they consider as al-Muḥarram, following the custom, is not sacred i.e. is “Safar” and the second month i.e. in their view Safar, is “al-Muḥarram”. In doing this they of course overlook the fact that Safar proper now only comes third; but when the intercalary month was abolished in ISlam, the proper conception of the state of affairs was lost (cf. NASI’).

In the early period when an attempt was made
to equate with the solar year by inserting intercalary months, — which was not successful on account of the ignorance of the old Arabs in astronomical matters. — al-Muharram introduced the winter half year as the names of the first six months show. The Arab year began, like the Jewish, in autumn. After Muhammad had forbidden the portion of the intercalary months in Sura iv. 17, 1st Muharram, the beginning of the year, went through all the seasons as the year, which now consisted of 12 lunar months, had always only 354 or 355 days, as it still has. Whether the first month of the year was originally marked by a festival we do not know. Wellhausen has endeavored to show that the hajj originally fell in the first month of the year, so that Muharram was ʿAraf in its quality as "Dhuʾl-Ḥijja," this idea suggests that there was originally only one sacred month, but it was observed at different times in different parts of Arabia. Muhammad in the Kaʿbah always speaks of the sacred month (v. 194, 217: v. 2, 97): only in Sura ix. 36 in laying down the method of reckoning time does he speak of four sacred months, in which it was thought to recognize a later declaration of the equal sanctity of four different sacred months of different districts, which was however illusory, as within Islam the peace of God was not without this and, according to Sura ii. 217, the defence of the faith takes preference over the sacred month. What the sacred month referred to in the Kaʿbah is, we do not know; in Sura v. 2, at any rate, the month of the pilgrimage must be meant, which its Wellhausen’s theory excellently. The commentators think Raḍāb or Dhuʾl-ʿAraf is meant, at any rate not al-Muharram.

Al-Muharram has 30 days of which, in addition to the 1st as the beginning of the year, the following are especially noted: the 9th as the fast-day of the ʿAshura: the 10th as the anniversary of Kurʾān (60 = 680), on which al-Husayn b. ʿAli b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalib [q. v.] fell fighting against the Caliph Yazid b. Muʿawiya and therefore the great day of mourning of the Shīʿa (on the significance of the 10th month for the Sunnis see ʿAshura); celebrated by pilgrimages to the sacred places of the Shīʿa, especially to Kurʾān [see MISHAʾIR HUSAYN], in which the passion play, representing the death of Shīʿa sons [see TAʾIYĀ], plays the most important part, also the 16th as the day of the selection of Jerusalem as the Kibla [q. v.] and the 17th as the day of the arrival of the "people of the elephant" Sura iv. 17.


MUḤĀṢĪBĪ ṬABʿ AʾDALLĀH ḤĀṣIŠĪ (ASĀD M.-ʿANĀZI), called Muḥāṣībī, i. e. "who knows his conscience," was born in Baṣra; he died in Baghdad in 243 (587). A legist of the Shāfiʿī school, a theologian who advocated the use of reason (ʿaʃf), using the dialectic vocabulary of the Muʿtazilīs, which he was the first to turn against them, he finally adopted a life of a-cetic renunciation after a moral conversion long meditated which is described at the beginning of his Wirkig. Involved with the Muʿtazilīs in a general persecution as a result of Ibn Ḥanbal’s attack on the dialecticians, he had to give up all teaching in 232 (546) and died in retirement.

His principal works are: Rūfas ʿAbd Allāh, Ṭabʿ (more accurately: Ṭabʿ), Kātib al-Fuṣūl, Mālik al-ʿĀṣī wa-Mālik Ṭabʿ, Kātib al-ʿĀṣī, Faḥm al-Ṣalāt; none of them is yet printed. The Dāʾirat al-ʿĀṣīn, which Sprenger attributes to him, is of an earlier date; it was arranged by his chief teacher ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbī Ḥāmid Ṭabʿī. Muḥāṣībī is the first Sunni mystic whose works reveal a complete theological education; they combine in a very original way a keen concern for exact philosophical definitions, and a fervid reverence for the most naive traditions with the rigorous search for an increasing moral purification.

In his Rūfas he discards the foundations of the "method" of introspection which ʿAbd Allāh had envisaged; he shows that there is a difference between the series of human happenings, the external actions of the members and the intentions of the hearts (against this: ʿAbd Allāh and the majority of contemporary muṭʿaṣṣīlūn): he proves in detail that the enhancement of the states of conscience (ʿaʃf) can be guided progressively towards a perfect purity, provided an ascetic and moral rule of life is observed, the true mawāḥib mentioned in Sura xvi. 27.

His adversaries (muhāṣībatīn), especially Ḥanbalīs, attacked him for having differentiated the concepts of ʿāsha and ʿaʃf (parable of the "sower"), mawāḥib and mawāḥib (like Ibn Karrām); admitted the created character of the ʿaʃf (our pronunciation of ʿaʃf) verses); held that the elect, in Paradise, would be "summoned to enjoy directly familiarity with the divine being; chosen his references from authors not by following the formal correctness of their descriptions, but on account of their intrinsic significance, from their moral weight (ʿāsha), for the reader.

The Rūfas is his main work; it forms in 61 chapters, in the shape of advice given to a pupil, a complete manual of the inner life. Ghazālī used it before writing his Ṭabʿ; and in spite of occasional attacks, its reputation among Aramean-speaking Muslim mystics lasted for a long time and may be compared with that of the Initiation, from Christ among Christian mystics using Latin: the Shāḏīliya brotherhood, with Mūṣīr, Ibn Aḥmad Rundi and Zarghūn Burnūsī, have always recommended its use; and one of them, ʿĪṣā al-Din Makhūlī, has made a summary of it.

The Ṭabʿī theologians also esteem Muḥāṣībī as a precursor.


§ 43: Margoliouth, Third Internat. Cong. of Orientalists, Oxford 1968, c. 292–293; I. Mas-

**AL-MUHIBBI,** a family of scholars in Damascus of the 5th–6th (viii–ixth) centuries of which three members distinguished themselves in literature:

1. Muhibb al-Din Abu l-Fadl Muhammad b. Abi Bakr b. Dâwûd b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. ʿAbd al-Khair b. Muhibb al-Din ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. Taqî al-Din al-ʿUsâni al-Hamawi al-Dimashqî al-Hanafi, born in the middle of Ramdân 949 (Dec. 23, 1542) in Hamât, studied there, in Halab and Hims and after a journey to Constantinople obtained a post as teacher in the Madrasa al-Kadîya in Damascus. In 978 (1571) he accompanied the Shaikh al-Islâm and Chief Kâfi Čiye Zâde to Cairo, was for a period a kâfi there and after a second journey to Constantinople was appointed kâfi in Hims, Maṭarr al-Nuṣâr and several other towns of northern Syria. In 993 (1585) the post of a chief kâfi (al-nâbî al-kâfîr) was given to him; at the same time he was military judge, judge of the Syrian caravan, taught in several madrasas and gave fatwas at the Sultan's request. He died on the 23rd Shawwâl 1016 (Feb. 18, 1608). Of his numerous writings only three have survived: his commentary written in 969 (1561) (according to al-Muhibbi, iii. 322, on the other hand, prepared at the age of 16) on Muhammad b. al-Shînâ's (d. 815 = 1412) *Uṣūl al-Bayyina* (Mashûma fī l-Mauâna wa l-Bayān) in the Berlin, Alvaradt, Vers., No. 7256–7257 and Gottha, Pertsch, No. 2789 MSS., his *Tarjuma al-Kibîrla wa l-Ḥadi al-ʿĀṣîn wa al-Nahdîya ilā l-Diḏâr al-Màdíya*, in the Paris, Cat. de Slane, No. 2293; Cairo, Fihrist, vii. 464; Stambul, ʿĀṭif Efendi, No. 2030 (s. Rescher, in *M.F.O.B.*, v. 496) MSS., which he wrote when kâfi in Maṭarr al-Nuṣâr, and his commentary written in 1011 (1602) on the authoritative verses in Zâhâshâri's *Kadîf al-Kadîf* entitled *Tansîl al-ʿĀṣî*, pr. Bûlûk 1281, Cairo 1307–1308, and on the margin of *Kadîf al-Kadîf*, ibid. 1318.


2. His grandson Fâdî Allah b. Muhibbi Allah b. Muhibbi al-Din was born on the 17th Muharram 1031 (Dec. 2, 1621) in Damascus, at an early age showed great linguistic ability, received in 1018 (1608) from Nâzîma al-Din al-Ghazzî (d. 1016 = 1608) (see Brockelmann, *G.-A.L.*, ii. 292) the *ṣafâs* (or Hadîf) and after failing to secure something in Halab through the Shaikh al-Islâm Muhammad b. Zakariyyâ, was given by his father the latter's post at the Perwîshiyâ. In 1051 (1641) he accompanied Muhammad ʿIsâmat to Constantinople, was appointed to the Madrasa Amrâ in there, but dismissed a year later, when he returned home. In 1059 (1649) he accompanied the ցափ Մուհամեդ b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamîm al-Burqawî to Egypt and became his deputy. After a quarrel with him, he resumed his studies in al-ʿArçar and came home next year. In 1073 (1662) he again went to Constantinople and four years later was appointed ցափ of Bairût but returned to Damascus in 1079 where he died on the 23rd Dâimâdâ II, 1082 (Oct. 27, 1671). While his own *Dîwân* and his description of his journeys to Constantinople have not been preserved, his edition of the poems of his friend Մանդաժ Փաշա (d. 1080 = 1669 in Damascus) are still in existence. He first of all arranged the chronologically beginning with a poem on Sultan İbrahim I of the year 1055 (1645), its addition to the MSS. mentioned in Brockelmann, *G.-A.L.*, ii. 277 there are now Kopruš, ii. 1243 and Moşağl, Dâwûd, *Mağhârât*, No. 153, 20, their alphabetically, including poems of a later period down to 1071 (1660); this edition was printed at Damascus in 1301. In 1078 (1667) he edited the biographical work of ʿAlî ʿEnan al-Ṭurînî (d. 1024 = 1615), *Taʿrîṣî al-ʿĀṣî min Abûd al-ʿĀṣî* and published it with a supplement; we may add to the MSS. mentioned by Brockelmann, *G.-A.L.*, ii. 290: Muhammad Kurd ʿAli, in *R.A.A.D.*, iii. 1925, p. 193–202.


3. His son Muhammad al-Amin b. Fâdî Allah b. Muhibbi and Muhammad b. Jâhan al-Din al-Dimashqî b. Muhammad b. al-Din al-Dimashqî, born in 1061 (1651) in Damascus, went with his father in 1077 (1666) to Bairût but returned home several times from there. A friend of his father's, Muhammad b. Lutf Allah b. Barîm al-Izzâti, who had been kâfi in Damascus in 1065 (1655) and was military judge in Anatolia in 1078 (1668), provided him with funds to study in Brusa. He returned home after a brief stay there on 8th ʿĀṣîr 1086 (May 4, 1675) in company with the muftî Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥâlim. Al-Izzâti had in the meanwhile been appointed military judge in Adrianople and was able to procure him a post there. But his patron fell ill soon afterwards and had to resign. Muhammad accompanied him to Stambul and looked after him till his death on 10th Shawwâl 1092 (Oct. 24, 1681). He then returned to Damascus and began to write. When in 1101 (1690) he had made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he was appointed deputy kâfi and then a teacher in the Aminîya in Damascus. He died there on the 18th Dâimâdâ I 1111 (Nov. 11, 1699).

His principal work is a collection of 1,289 biographies of scholars, poets etc. of his time and the period immediately preceding it arranged in alphabetical order, entitled *Khuṭâb al-ʿĀṣîr fî ʿĀṣî al-karn al-hādiʾ aṣhar*, the first fair copy of which he finished in 1096 (1685) (printed Cairo 1254, 4 vols.). The draft of a number of biographies from the Hijâz and Yemen, which is preserved in the Biûl-Houtsma MS., No. 112 appears to be part of the preliminary work on this collection; the draft of a synopsis is in Berlin, Alvaradt, No. 9895. A synopsis was prepared by ʿAli b. ʿAbd al-Ḥâlim al-Ghazzî al-Amîri (d. 1101 = 1777); Murâdî, iii. 215; MS in Tubingen (Seybold, No. 9). A second great biographic work on personalities of all ages entitled *al-Tâbaq* was to give under each letter al-ʿĀṣîr wa l-ḥādîf wa l-kurâ wa l-ʿaimân wa l-ṣâhadet wa l-nâma thâyîlî, separately. In the draft in Leipzig (Vollers, No. 683) giving the letter min the sources, which from the articles are taken usually word for word, are generally quoted. He also wrote a continuation of al-Khâdîjî's *Râihânât al-Muhibbî* entitled *Nâṣihat al-Râihânât wa Râihânât Tâbâq al-Fâna*, which survives, in addition to the MSS. quoted by Brockelmann, *G.-A.L.*, ii. 294, in Stambul, Nûr-i Othmânîya, No. 4352 (M.S.O.S., xv. 22) and Moşağl, Dâwûd, *Mağhârât*,
The seal was changed at each accession of a new monarch (cf. Na'ima, i. 117) as was the tughrā itself. Ewliya Čelebi's statement, which implies the contrary, is therefore rather strange (vii. 300, v. 4 from below). In Persia the seal was retained but the name was changed (cf. Khatam).

The grand vizier produced the imperial seal on the ḍā‘lūn days for the Kiṣlah Bard to seal the bag (ḵāle) for the registers of the riṣāla and the archives of the Finance Department or muḥālīde (muḥālīd) (the Treasury (ḵāṭar-i Buqā) and the general Archives (ḵāṭar-i Khābā)). The grand vizier also had, like all the viziers or governors of provinces, two other seals, one, a large one, impressed at the top of ḥayvārāt or "ordinances," and the other, a small and modest one, placed at the foot of letters from the vizier, including official ones (cf. Ahmad Rūsīm, Othmān, Turābbi, iii. 1514).

The use of seals in Turkey (we know very little of those of the Sālūqū: cf. Reinaud, Mon., i. 121 note) was exceedingly wide-spread. They were used for impressions in wax (muḥār muma) and for stamping in a particular kind of ink to which saliva was added, as in Persia (cf. I.e Père Raphael du Mans, p. 129). In more modern times the seal was carried in the purse (cf. a verse by Mešāl Ṭākī in his poem Sīrār Baha). It is only recently that under the influence of the west the muḥār has been displaced by the signature. It must have received its coup de grâce with the recent adoption of the Roman alphabet and of rubber seals.

The industry of seal-engraving has thus been gradually perfected. It had at one time reached a high degree of perfection and the artists used to sign their work. These signatures were usually very brief, Miḥlī, Sāʾī, Aḥmād etc. They were written in characters so small that they could only be distinguished with a lens and only when very cleanly engraved. Quite a study could be written on these artists.

Ewliya Čelebi gives the following information about the seal engravers of Istanbul (i. 575). He distinguishes:

1. Engravers on stone. Ḥakīmatān, 105 workmen in 30 shops. They engraved on stones such as
agate, garnet, turquoise and jasper. Their patron saint or sir was Ābū Ḥabīb Yūnān, a disciple of war irās al-Karānī who is buried in Ta'izz.

2. The engravers of mukhār: mukhor-khānān who worked especially for the vizirs. So workers in 50 shops. Their sir was the Caliph al-Mu'āwīyā. In the reign of Murūd IV the most noted were Māhmūd Čelebi, Rūzā Čelebi and Ferīd Čelebi, who charged from 100 to 500 piasters for their work.

3. The engravers of silver seals and talismans: mukhor-khānān-i sīn-i ḍawāboi, 40 workers in 15 shops. Sir: ʿUkkašā who is buried near Māhān, who, having seen on the Prophet's back the mukhor-i muwaffaq (cf. above), began to engrave talismanic formulae (two of these are quoted). These workers cannot engrave Yemen agate". They were established in the area called Sīyakānār.

We may still mention the custom of making partisans, whose loyalty one wished to be sure of, stamp their seals on a Kurān (fīrūn mukhor-khānāk) i.e., in the Turkish papers of June 8, 1925, statements by a rebel Kurd.

The word maḥārūn in the old language of the Janissaries meant vouchers for their pay (M. d'Ohsson, vii. 337).

In figurative language Persian and Turkish uses the expression "to break the seal": mukhor berdağa, mukhor əmâh (or boząh, əmâh, şatava mukâh) for "to deliver a virgin" (cf. further th art. TAMHIH).

The mukhārā (mukhorā), Turk. mukhārā [cf. the article KHAṬĀN], keeper of the seals or better "private secretary" (cf. below), was therefore a very important personage. Mār Ādī Shīr Nūsārī was the mukhorā of Husayn Baikārī before becoming ʿāzīm bezī and first minister (cf. Belin, Notice sur l'lx., 1861, p. 13; cf. de Saçy, X. E., iv. 282, 261). He was succeeded in these offices by another poet, Mawrāth (ibid.). — On the mukhorā in Persia, cf. Le Père Raphaël du Mans, p. 21.

In Central Asia the title of mukhārā seems to have replaced that of tarmāzā which occurs as early as the Orkhon inscriptions.

In Turkey, each vīner had his mukhārār (Ahmad Rāsīm, ʿOṣrīm. Twiriği, i. 455). Cf. the account of the career of a mukhorār in the Sīāḥ-i ʿotbānā, ii. 31 below (Beloljet Pasha [the same as is mentioned in the Memoirs of Saïd Pasha, i. 4]).

The rūzmoğāhī had also their own mukhārārā (I. Deny, Sammār des arches turques du Caire, p. 136). At Sādī Kūn they exist a quarter called Mukhārār. For the work bearing the title Mukhārār Twiriği, cf. Babinger, G. O. V., p. 216 sq.

With the viceroys of Egypt the mukhārār was a "private secretary" of the Khedive. The title of mukhārār was abolished in 1884 but the office has remained. His salary was the same as that of the chief of the cabinet (cf. ibid., p. 92 and 476).

Bibliography: Cf. the article KHAṬĀN. We may now add: Babinger, Das Archiv des Bosnak Osman Pasha, Berlin 1931, p. 23 and note 5, where reference is made to a little known article by Riza Efencli Mudezirovic. Cf. also von Hammer, Histor. de l'Empire Othoman, iii. 425, 430, 461, vii. 2. (I. Deny)

MUḤSIN MĀLĪ, son of Shāh Ḫusāin Ḫāṭāt, was an inhabitant of Lucknow. In poetry he was the pupil of Khuwāja Wazir. He flourished in the latter part of the sixth century. He is the author of a Diwān, a collection of lyrical poems, and a biography of Urdu poets called Sarāpā Shāhān. Bibliography: Nāṣīḥ, Tuḥdim-i Shurub (Lucknow 1874), p. 419. (M. Hidayat Hosain)

AL-MUḤTAḌĪ, Ābū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, an ʿAbdāsīd caliph. After the Wālijī's death, a number of officials wished to pay homage to the young Muḥammad, son of the deceased caliph and a Greek slave; instead however, the Wālijī's brother was proclaimed his successor and only after the deposition and murder of the unfortunate al-Muṭazz (end of Raḍāb 255 = July 869) Muḥammad ascended the throne with the name al-Muṭāḍī. His ideal was the Umayyād Āmir b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Like the latter, he was distinguished for the strictness with which he conducted his life; with piety and simplicity however, he combined strength and ability and during his brief reign he did his best to raise the caliphate from its degradation and to restore the power of the Commander of the Faithful. In several provinces there were risings by ʿAlīds, real or alleged; but the most dangerous enemy of the caliph was the Turkish general Mūsā b. Bogha. When the latter, who was fighting against the ʿAlīds in Persia, heard of the accession of al-Muṭāḍī, he returned home. Reaching Sūmārā in Muḫarram 256 (Dec. 869) he forced the caliph to take an oath to bring to justice the Turkish chief Shāhī b. Wāṣīf, who had robbed the mother of the caliph al-Muṭazz of all her priceless treasures. When Shāhī concealed himself, the Turkish mercenaries mutinied and were intending to depose al-Muṭāḍī but were appeased by the resolution of the latter. Al-Muṭāḍī promised Shāhī's followers that he would pardon him; but as the latter did not appear, they went to Sūmārā and began to pillage it until they were scattered by Mūsā. Shāhī was soon afterwards discovered and killed by one of Mūsā's men. When Mūsā had taken the field against the Khuṭāfīs, al-Muṭāḍī began to incite the people against him and his brother Muḥammad b. Bogha and accused them of embezzlement. Muḥammad was brought to trial and put to death although al-Muṭāḍī had expressly guaranteed his pardon. The only course left for the caliph was to dispose of Mūsā if he wished to keep his throne. But his plan was betrayed; Mūsā advanced with superior forces and the caliph suffered a disastrous defeat. As he declined to abdicate, he was murdered in Raḍāb 256 (June 870) in horrible fashion.


MUḤTAṢĪB (A.), "censor", an officer appointed by the caliph or his vizier to see that the religious precepts of Islam are obeyed, to detect offences and punish offenders. His office was the ḥiba, and to it only men of good standing could, in theory, be appointed. Like all
Group of 29 seals accompanying the address to Muhammad 'Ali Pasha by the principal religious authorities in Mecca: the governor at the time, the imāms, khatībs, muftis of the four schools etc. The text dated at the end of the month of Muharram 1226 (Feb. 25, 1813) contains congratulations on the occasion of the victory over the Wahhābis and expressions of gratitude for the restoration of freedom of pilgrimage.

Art. MUHR
Seals of various individuals, Ottoman, Algerian and Hijjarian (beginning of the sixteenth century).

2. Esmâ Sultan, sister of Mahmud II. 11 Ram. 1222 (November 12 1807).
3. Muᾱş Pasha, kâ'īmaḫ̲ūm or grand vizier interim. 8 Shaw. 1222 (December 9 1807).
5. Kasım Âgha, chief eunuch. 19 Rab. II 1225 (May 24 1810).
8. Mehmed 'Arif Efendi, former sheikh-ul-islam. 9 Saf. 1227 (Feb. 21 1812).
9. Mehmed Sa'âd Khâlet, Minister of the Interior. 25 Dżum. II 1227 (July 4 1812).
10. Shâkir Âhmad, kâ'īmaḫ̲ūm. 28 Dżum. II 1227 (July 8 1812).
11. Mehmed Khusrâw Pasha, kapudan-pâsha (at this date). 15 Saf. 1228 (Feb. 17 1813).
12. Tosun Âhmad Pasha, son of Mehmed 'Ali. 12 Muḥ. 1228 (Jan. 15 1813).
15. Khusraw Âhmad Pasha, grand vizier. 18 Dżum. I 1228 (May 19 1813).
17. Sarf Âhmad, wa'kil al-kâlamân el-zahrîfâin at Medea. 3 Shaw. 1241 (May 11 1826).
18. Selim Thâbit, as wa'kil of Algiers at Constantinople. 7 Shaw. 1242 (May 4 1827). Cf. Nō. 4: same seal, but on this impression the signature of the engraver 'Omer appears clearly under the fleuron on the left).
22. Sulaimân Ismâ'il, gnamuk emini and wa'kil of Algiers at Durazzo. 7 Ram. 1244 (March 13 1829). To left under the fleuron: signature.
holders of public office, he had to be a Muslim and free. Generally he was a faqih, and in addition to his police functions he performed those of a magistrate. In some respects his duties were parallel with those of the kâfi, but the muhtasib's jurisdiction was limited to matters connected with commercial transactions, defective weights and measures, fraudulent sales and non-payment of debts. Even in these matters he could hear only those cases in which the truth was not in doubt. As soon as evidence had to be sifted and oaths administered the muhtasib's jurisdiction ceased. As a censor he had power to enforce the law without first requiring complaints from an injured party. He had to see that in a place where Muslims lived they did not neglect to hold a Friday service in the mosque and that if they numbered forty or more they formed themselves into an organized community. But if the number was large and there were differences of opinion on the question of worshipping together, his authority might be disputed, and it was not within his power to compel the attendance of the individual Muslim at the mosque unless he was a persistent defaulter. Even then the officer could do no more than admonish the delinquent. So far as the mosque was concerned the muhtasib could insist on the adhan and he could examine the muadhdhin in the subject of the times lawful for the adhan. If a public mosque fell into disrepair, the muhtasib was charged with the duty of calling the attention of the authorities to the matter.

An important part of the muhtasib's duties was to see that the laws of the sharî'ah were maintained. Persons breaking the fast of Ramadan, widows and divorced women who did not observe the idda (q.v.) before remarriage, and other transgressors, were liable to have to make explanations before him. Public morals, further, came under his jurisdiction. He had to prevent men from consorting with women in public and from indulging openly in wine; also the playing of forbidden musical instruments came under his ban and he had to see that games and toys did not lead to offences against the sharî'. However, he could not act on suspicion alone nor had he the right to go behind closed doors to pursue his investigations. His powers would appear to have been wider where the spiritual welfare of Muslims was concerned. Thus if a faqih propounded views contrary to idjmâ' (q.v.) it was the muhtasib's duty to admonish him and report to him to the sovereign if he persisted in preaching heretical doctrines. Also, if a person not a faqih suddenly turned to the study of the fiqh, the muhtasib had to make investigation in order to discover his motive and to prevent his misleading persons who might apply to him. Schools also had to be visited by the muhtasib, though not so much for the purpose of inspecting the character of the teaching as to ensure that teachers did not beat their pupils too severely (Ma'qzri, Kâfi¹t, i. 494). Other matters which came within his jurisdiction were concerned with public amenities rather than with morals or religious institutions. Thus, in towns where the source of drinking-water was fouled or no provision was made for poor wayfarers he could order the townsfolk to rectify matters. He had to ensure that no house overlooked the women's quarters of another belonging to a Muslim and that no house had projecting rainspouts or drains leading on to the street to the inconvenience of wayfarers, and finally that the suk was kept clean and clear of obstacles to traffic.


MUHYI L-DIN [See Allâh, b. 2.]

MUHYI L-DIN MUHAMMAD (MEHMET) b. 'ALî AL-DIN 'ÂLI AL-DJAMALî, a Turkish theologian and historian of the time of Selim I (1512-1520) and Sulaimân I (1520-1566). His father was the famous muftî Zambî 'Ali al-Djamalî, a grandson of Djamal al-Din Mehemd of Aş Serai (hence the epithet Djamalî). He received his theological training first from his maternal grandfather, Hûsân-zâde Efendi, then from his father 'Âli al-Din and later from Muayyad-zâde Efendi. He worked as madressî in several medreses, in Constantinople at the Murâd medrese and at the eight schools of the Fâtimî mosque and in Adrianople where he was also a mulla for a period. He died in retirement and was buried at Adrianople in 957 (1550); according to some, however, in 956 (1549).

His main importance lies in the fact that he edited the anonymous Ottoman chronicles, the Tawârîh-i Âlî 'Othmân, under the title Tawârîh-i 'Ali-i 'Othmânî. These chronicles which run from the beginning of the Ottoman empire were continued by him down to 956 (1549) i.e. till shortly before his death.

Two versions of his Chronicle exist, both of which go back to him: 1. a shorter one to which corresponds the translation of the Book manuscript by Gaudier-Spiegel: Chronica oder Acta von der Turkischen Tyrannen herkommen und geführte Kriegen, aus Türkischer Sprachen ver- deutlicht. Vorhin nie in Druck ausgangen. Frankfurt a/O. 1567; it was also published in Latin and German by Leunclavius: Annàles Sultanioum ot Alexandrianum a Tauricis sua lingua scripti, Frankfurt 1588; 2nd edition with index and German transl.: Neutg Chromata Turcicner Nation von Turenken selbs beschrieben, Frankfurt a/Main 1590; 2. a longer version: the so-called Veraniian Chronicle (Codex Veraniianus), edited in Latin and Iberian by Leunclavius: Historiarum Musulmanarum Turcorum et monumentorum eorum exscriptae libri XVIII, Frankfurt 1591. There were 18 books instead of the 30 planned. As early as 1590 the first three books were published in German at Frankfurt: Neuerer Musulmanner Histori, Turkischer Nation, von ihrem Herkommen, Geschichte und Taten: drey Bücher, die ersten drey, dargestellt, followed by the complete German translation of the Annales: Neuerer Musulmanner Histori Turkisner Nation, Frankfurt a/M. 1595.

In addition to his chronicle, which exists only in manuscript ( MSS. of Vienna, Munich, Berlin, Gotha, London, Constantinople etc.), Muhyî al-Din is also credited with poems in Turkish, Arabic and Persian (also extant in a manuscript) and a theological work.
Bibliography: Hâdiji Khalîfa, Kaşf al-Zunûn, Constantinople 1311, p. 218; Tashkoprûzâde, Shâhîkh al-Nûmanîye, Constantinople 1269, p. 389; transl. by O. Rescher, Constantinople 1927, p. 247; Djamal al-Dîn, Othâmânî Târîkh ve Muvessîrlîş, Ayine-i Zorefa, Constantinople 1314, p. 10 and 25; Kîrât, Rasûf al-Atûzî, p. 180; Hîrâyâ, Siyâli-i velîmînî, l. 498; Bruzul Mehmed Tâhir, Othâmânî Mûdîlîsîn, l. 63; Babinger, G. O. W., p. 72–74; J. H. Mordtmann, Id., x. 160; xii, 155 sqq.; Carl Außerer, ibid., xii, 265 sqq.; F. Giese, M.O.G., i, 49–75; P. Wittke, ibid., i, 77 sqq.; see also the Catalogues of Manuscripts.

MÜHİYİ LÂRÎ (d. 933 = 1526–1527), a Persian writer, author of the famous Fahith al-Harâmân, a poetic description of the two holy cities, Mecca and Medina, which also contains a full account of all the rites of the obligatory pilgrimage (hajûjî).

This book, written in 911 (1506) and dedicated to Mu'azzar b. Mahmûd Shâh of Guzûrât (917–932 = 1511–1526), was for a long time wrongly attributed to the celebrated poet 'Abd al-Râhîm Lîfûtî. Mumiy Lârî was a pupil of the great philosopher Muhammed al-Dâwânî (d. 907 = 1501) and made use of his extensive philosophical knowledge in a commentary on the great Kâshf of Ibn al-Fârîd, which is known as al-Târîkh al-kabîr. In this work he endeavoured, following in the footsteps of his teacher, to reconcile the principles of orthodox Muhammadan mysticism with the teachings of Aristotle in the form in which they were disseminated in the east.


(E. BERTHELS)

AL-MU'TÎD. [See AL-LÎ '\b. 2.]

MU'IN AL-DIN SULAIMÂN PARWANA, vice-regent of the Saljûq Empire in Asia Minor after the Mongol invasion of that territory. His father Muhammedîb b. Ali al-Da'llî (in some sources, such as the Târîkh-i Gâzî-i Mu'ín) is called “al-Kashî”, which implies origin from Kashân) had been a minister during the reign of Kai Khosrow II and had been able, after the battle of Ko-e Dâgh (1243), to secure for a time the continuation of the Saljûq dynasty in Asia Minor, by his intercession with the Mongol general Bairgû (Bibi Bîbî, p. 243). His son Mu‘în al-Dîn Sulaimân soon rose to hold important offices and had been commander of Tolûtî, and later of Tolûtî and Kirîdjin, when, in 1256, he was promoted, by the favour of Bairgû, to the rank of parâmîn.

The title parâmîn denoted a high administrative office (high chancellor) in the Saljûq empire and is erroneously explained by the Persian dictionaries as a synonym of farâmî (the word is fully discussed in the foot-note on p. 486 of Khalîl Edémî's article in T.O.E.M., vol. viii.; cf. also Huart, Les Saints, etc., i, 80). At the time indicated the three sons of Kai Khosrow were nominally reigning, but Mu‘în al-Dîn was already the real director of affairs. After Hûlûgû had appeared on the scene in 1260, the empire was divided into two parts, of which Rûnk al-Dîn Killoj Arslân got the eastern part with Parwana as vizier at his side. The latter had also a family connection with the dynasty, for he was married to a daughter of Kai Khosrow II, while one of his own daughters became the wife of the Sâlîq(? Ghiyâsh al-Dîn Mas‘ûd II. As vizier of Rûnk al-Dîn he conducted Sinope (Sinûb) from the Greek emperor of Trebizond; the town was given to himself, and after his death some of his descendants continued to reign there (cf. sixh and Tewûl, Sinûbâ Parwana, ed. in T.O.E.M., 1st year, p. 203). In February 1265 Parwana, warned that his successor wanted to get rid of him, had him imprisoned and afterwards strangled at Al-Serîy. The two and a half years’ old son of Rûnk al-Dîn, Ghiyâsh al-Dîn Kai Khosrow, was set up as a puppet-king. During the following years, when Parwana was, under the supervision of the Mongols, the real master in Eastern Anatolia, the wretched situation of the country induced many notable Turks to emigrate to Egypt, where they incited Sultan Baîbars to a military expedition against the Mongol domination in their country. It is highly probable that Mu‘în al-Dîn Parwana himself was secretly at the head of these negotiations. Baîbars invaded Asia Minor, defeated a Mongol army at Al-bistân and occupied the town of Kaštîriyeh in April 1277. Here he waited for Parwana to join him, but the latter had lost his confidence in the enterprise and fled to Tolûtî with the young Sultan. Baîbars returned a second time and soon a Mongol army appeared under the Ilkhan Âbâka to inflict drastic punishment on the Muslim population; he is said to have killed over 200,000 people. At the same time suspicion fell on Parwana. He was accused of having fled with his army at the battle of Al-bistân, of having not appeared before the Ilkhan after the defeat, and of having neglected to inform the Mongols of Baîbars’ approach. At first Âbâka was willing to spare him, but on the insistence of the relatives of those killed in the battle of Al-bistân, he ordered him to be executed at Al-Dâgh, together with his retainers, probably on the 1st Rabi‘ 1 676 (August 2, 1277). Al-Dâgh is, according to Khalîl Edêmî, probably the same as Kose Dageh, to the east of Siwâs. His burial place is not known. A foundation inscription on a mosque built by Mu‘în al-Dîn Parwana in 665 (1264–1265) is still extant in Marzîfûn. His death inspired several poets to make elegies on him (Munzâmîjîm Bahshî). From the tradition of the Mawlawîî order it appears that Parwana was on intimate terms with Djâlîl al-Dîn Rûmî; the latter’s work Fihî nîwâ fihî was dedicated to him (cf. Kropoulâ-Zade M. Fûkî, Ilk Muttânawîlî, p. 258).

Bibliography: The Saljûq-nîmâ’s of Ibn Bîbî (Houtsmûl, Recueil, iv.) and of Aşerî (used in manuscript by modern authors); Rashîd al-Dîn, Dîmân al-Tawârîkh, ed. Biolet, Paris 1911, p. 548; Hayton, in Historiens arménîens des Croisades, ii, 179; al-Maqrîzî, al-Sulh ul-Mardîsî al-Mulîkî, translated by Quartemère (1837–1844) and by Biolet, 1908; al-Nuwairî, Nîhâyât al- Arab (used by Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, iv.); Abu l-Vâlî, Târîkh, Constantinople, 1288, iv. 10; Mustawfî, Târîkh-i Ghûsîîa, in G. M.S. 1910, p. 484; Munzâmîjîm Bahshî, Geschichte der Ilkhanî, Darmstadt 1842, i, 299; Nedîb ‘Aşîm, Türk Târîkhî, Constantinople 1316,
Additions and Corrections

P. 530b, l. 32, p. 543a, l. 29: instead of 828, read 282.

Selejoucides.

P. 673b, l. 22: instead of 1107, read 1108; l. 62: instead of Guhaz, read Guhar.
P. 674b, l. 54: instead of SA'UD, read SÅM.
P. 686a, l. 45: instead of Wäki'almigär, read Wäki'a nígär.
P. 688a, l. 43, 55, 63: instead of Mir, read Mere; l. 66: instead of in May 1624, read in May 1624.
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p. 436 sq.; Husain Husam al-Din, Ama'is Tari'ikah, Constantinople 1920, i., u. Te'wihid.


MU'IN AL-MISKIN whose full name was Mu'in al-Din Muhammad Amin b. Hâdji Muhammad 'Abd-al-Qadir al-Harrâwi and who was bâbâlik, was Mu'inni (d. 907 = 1501–1502), a celeb. at the Turkish court. He studied Hadith for 31 years and throughout this period preached every Friday in the great mosque of Herât. He was for year kâdi of Herât but gave up the post by his own request. In 866 (1461–1462) at the request of a friend, he began to write a little book on the life of the Prophet Muhammad. Out of this little book there grew in time the great biographical work, exceedingly popular in the East, called Mârij 'i al-Nabwâwa fi Mustâdârî al-Nabwâwa, which was not finished till 891 (1386) and contains a very full account of the life of the Prophet, consisting of a Mu'adhdhina, four books and a Khâtûnu'udin. The book is based on the Bi'thâr of the Prophet, and it is true that he indeed wrote a commentary on the Kur'an entitled Bi'thâr al-Durar and a collection of forty hadîths, Kitâb al-Khatûnu'udin. His study of the history of the prophets produced a large history of Moses entitled Mu'irjatî-Mu'inni (also called Târibkî-Mu'inni or Kitâba-yî Mu'inni), which was completed in 904 (1506–1508), and the story of Yu'suf and Zulaykhat, Ahsan al-Kijâz.  


AL-MU'IZZ. [See ALLAH, II.]

AL-MU'IZZ B. BADIS. [See ZIRIDS.]

MU'IZZ AL-DAWLA, Abu 'l-Husain Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah Nasir, a Bâ'bîyid, was born in 305 (915–916). After the taking of Shîmâ by the Turco-Caucasians he brought Kîrmân under his rule in 324 (935–936). When the rebel governor of al-Ahwâz, al-Bârîdî [q. v.], after several unsuccessful encounters with Bedjikem [q. v.], the general of the 'Abbasîd caliph, sought the help of the Bâbîyid 'Imad al-Dawla, the latter sent his brother Ahmad against al-Ahwâz with an army; Bedjikem was defeated first at Arradjan and then at 'Askari Mukriam (326 = 938), whereupon Ahmad took this town; but when he demanded as a reward for the help he had given that al-Bârîdî should help the Bâbîyid Rukn al-Dawla against Wangirî, the brother of Mardawâdî [q. v.], al-Bârîdî refused and went to Bâsra. After 328 Ahmad had received reinforcements from 'Imad-al-Dawla, he was able to take al-Ahwâz. In 332 (943–944) he undertook a campaign against Wâsiit while the Amir al-Umarî, the Turkish chief Tuzan, was involved in a war with the Hâmadîn of al-Mawâlî.  

Tuzan hurriedly made peace and set out against Ahmad, and the two armies met in Dhu l-Ka'da' of this year (July 945). The Tuzanis are variously given; it is certain at least that Ahmad soon afterwards returned to al-Ahwâz. At the end of Ridâb the following year (middle of March 945), he made a further attempt to take the town but had to withdraw the next month on the approach of Tuzan. In 334 (945) he attacked Wâsiit for a third time; its governor had gone over to his side and the town surrendered without a blow being struck; he then marched against Baghdad and in December 134 (December 945) entered the capital where he at once seized the power. The caliph of the Musulmân appointed him vâlî of the capital and gave him the title Mu'izz-al-Dawla but was deposed and blinded a few weeks later because he was alleged to be dealing with the enemies of al-Mawâlî. Mu'izz al-Dawla was soon afterwards attacked by the Hâmadîn. Nâşir al-Dawla of al-Mawâlî, who advanced on Baghdad along with Abu Qâfar b. Shirzâd and very quickly occupied the eastern part of the capital. Nâşir al-Dawla was not driven back till Mawârân of the following year (Aug. 946) when he made peace with the Bâbîyids but without consulting his Turkish allies. The latter were angered at this and turned against him. Nâşir al-Dawla had to sue to the Turks in bringing the Turks to terms with the help of the Bâbîyids; he then returned to al-Mawâlî as a vassal of the Bâbîyids. Abu'l-Kâsim, son and successor of al-Bârîdî, was the next to be dealt with. Mu'izz al-Dawla sent an army against him which put his forces to flight and in 336 (947) he took the field in person. Abu'l-Kâsim fled to the Karmâzâns of al-Bâhram and Mu'izz al-Dawla occupied Bâsra. Abu'l-Kâsim's governor 'Imrân b. Shâhin however held out in al-Jamda, the capital of the Euphrates territory between Wâsiit and Bâsra, and after several years' fighting Mu'izz al-Dawla had to confirm him in his governorship. In 337 (948–949) Mu'izz al-Dawla undertook a campaign against al-Mawâlî because Nâşir al-Dawla did not send the tribute imposed on him. The latter fled to Nâfûn, but when Rukn al-Dawla, brother of Mu'izz al-Dawla, was attacked by the Sâmtâns, Mu'izz al-Dawla had to send him help and concluded peace with the Hâmadîns. In 347 (958–959) Nâşir al-Dawla rebelled again but on the approach of Mu'izz al-Dawla he left al-Mawâlî and went first of all to Nâfûn and then to Hâlab to his brother Saif al-Dawla, while Mu'izz al-Dawla advanced on al-Mawâlî and took this town and also Nâfûn. Through the intervention of Saif al-Dawla however peace was made (Mawârân 348 = March–April 959). In the last year of his life Mu'izz al-Dawla had to fight the Karmâzâns and 'Imrân b. Shâhin. The former acknowledged his suzerainty; the war against the latter was interrupted by the death of Mu'izz al-Dawla on 13th or 17th Rabi' II 356 (March 28 or April 1, 967).  

Greetings, d. Chafchen, ii. 651—653, 666 seq., 688, 692, 695—697; iii. 2—7; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 161—164. 251—253, 318 sq. (K. Y. Zettersten).

**AL-MU'IZZ LI-DIN ALLAHI**

AL-MU'IZZ LI-DIN ALLAHI, fourth Fatimid caliph, was born at Madhayya on 11th Ramadan 310 (28th Sept. 921), proclaimed heir-apparent in Shawwal of the same year (March 923). His first object was to restore the Fatimid power, which had been reestablished in Ifriqiya by his father, over the remaining provinces of the Maghrib. In 342 he led an army in the Ahrar mountains and not only reduced the turbulent tribes of that region for the first time, but also received the formal submission of the chiefs of Zenata and of the ruling princes of the west. The hostility and intrigues, however, of the Unayzah ruler of Spain, 'Abd al-Rahmân III (q. v.), maintained a situation of unrest in the Maghrib, and after ineffectual naval raids on both sides, al-Mu'izz despatched thither in 347 (958) a strong force under the command of his freedman and kābiṭ Djawhar al-Rūmī (q. v.). Tāhār and Sidjīmās were captured with little difficulty. Fās surrendered after an obstinate siege of eleven months in Ramādān 348. And the other strongholds in the Maghrib were occupied, with the exception of Salā and Sabta, which were held for 'Abd al-Rahmân. Although the results of this campaign in the western Maghrib were ephemeral, the establishment of the Šanhadji chief 'Abd b. Manâd at Tāhār placed an effective check upon the Zenata of the Central Maghrib. There can be no doubt that al-Mu'izz was already contemplating the conquest not only of Egypt and Syria, but also of Baghdad, using for this purpose the Kitâma, the ʿAbdālādā had used the army of Kūrāisān, while the Šanhadji should hold North-west Africa for him, and with this end in view he actively pursued a policy of conciliation of these tribes by lavish gifts and the abolition of financial exactions.

Though this ambition was no secret, it is represented in the official correspondence of al-Mu'izz as subsidiary to his desire (which was probably sincere) to secure the leadership in the ghâṣb against the Arber. Merchants in 350 (961) the Cretans, besieged by Nikephoros Phokas, and desiring of assistance from Kāfār, had solicited his aid. In spite of the victory claimed for al-Mu'izz by Ibn al-Athîr (viii. 404), it appears that he was unable to send assistance in time, but he seized the opportunity to denounce the treaty made with the Emperor Constantine VII in 956, and opened a fresh attack in Sicily. Taormina was captured in 351 (962), and an expeditionary force sent from Constaninople was severely defeated both on land and sea, the general Manuel Phokas being killed, and the commander Niketas taken prisoner.

In the same year (355 = 966) al-Mu'izz began his preparations for the advance on Egypt, by ordering wells to be dug along the route. His instructions with Kāfār at this time are obscure. Fāṭimid emissaries had long been engaged in active propaganda in Egypt, and had evidently made some headway, aided by the resentment of the population against the Südān troops, who were fanatical Sunnis. Their propaganda was indulgently regarded by Kāfār, and it is not impossible that, as the Fāṭiimid writers claim, he privately declared his adhesion to al-Mu'izz. His death on 21st Djamād-1 137 (24th May 958) gave the signal for the advance of the Fāṭimid army, said to have been over 100,000 strong, which set off under the command of Djawhar on 14th Rabīl I, 358 (6th Feb. 969), with the support of a naval squadron. The disorganization which prevailed in Egypt and the terror inspired by the Greek armies (who in 968 had swept over the whole of northern Syria without meeting opposition and had taken immense numbers of prisoners), contributed greatly to the prospects of its success; moreover, many of the Egyptian notables and even of the troops had sent letters to al-Mu'izz inviting his intervention. On Djawhar's approach the population made their submission by an embassy of notables, but the Ikhsched and Tuilun regiments rejected the conditions laid down in the agreement, and had to be forcibly dislodged from their positions at Djea and on the islands. The retreating Māmilūk split up into bands, some of which continued to give Djawhar much trouble as local centres of disaffection, ending only with the arrest and deportation to Africa of their commanders, and the disarmament or imprisonment of the remainder.

Djawhar, having entered Fustâţ on 17th Shabān 355 (7th July 969) and laid the foundations of the new city of al-Kāhirah, immediately took in hand the reform of the administration. Complete religious toleration was promised, and confirmed by the re-establishment of the existing officials, weekly sessions for the hearing of māqālim were instituted, several vexatious taxes were abolished and property which had been illegally sequestrated to the Treasury was restored to its owners, and regular salaries were assigned to the officers of the mosques. Another of his reforms, however, caused great resentment; this was the striking of a new coinage to replace the existing debased coinage, and the order to levy all taxes in the new currency. His difficulties were increased by a prolonged famine and by the turbulence of the Berber soldiery, and it was not until the arrival in Egypt of al-Mu'izz himself in Ramadan 362 (June 973) that the task of reorganization was completed by centralizing the financial administration under Yaḥyâ b. Kiliš (q. v.) and Aslājī b. al-Hasān, and by the removal of the Berber troops to a new camp near Helopolis.

The course of events in Syria after the occupation of Egypt is differently related and obscure in detail. Djawhar's lieutenant Dja'far b. Fālāḥ defeated the joint forces of the Ikhschedi and Karmājans under al-Hasān (in some sources al-Husain) b. 'Ubd Allāh b. Tughjī at Ramla in the early months of 359 (970), but the general disorganization and the licence of the Arab tribesmen preventing him from entering Damascus until Dhū l-Hijjādā of the same year. Shortly afterwards he detached some contingents against the Greeks, but the troops sent to recover Antioch were defeated near Iskandārūn, or, according to Yahyā b. Sa'dīd (q. v.), were halted after besieging the city for five months. Meanwhile the Karmājān general al-Hasān b. Aḥmad al-'Āṣim (in some versions al-Aghshām), in revenge, is said (but see de Goeje, Les Carnachas du Bahrāin, p. 181—190), for the stoppage of the subsidy he had received from the Ikhschedi al-Hasān, opened negotiations with the Buwahīd 'Īzz al-Dīn and
the Hamadānī amir of al-Mawṣīl, and with the aid of subsidies from them and some Ikhwānī contingents, defeated and killed Dž̲irār and recaptured Damascus in Dhu l-‘Hādīd 360 (Aug.–Sept. 971). Having shut up the remaining Egyptian forces in Yafā, he marched on Cairo and was defeated by Džawhar in Rabî’ I 361 (Dec. 971), and his fleet was destroyed at Tīnīs. The Kūrāmānī retained their hold on Damascus, however, repelled a strong Maghribī force despatched to Palestine by Džawhar in Ramadan 361, and with an army of Arab auxiliaries and Ikhwānīs (some sources also add Daulamīs) made a second descent upon Egypt after the arrival of al-Mu’izzī. By bribing the Arabs, the Caliph succeeded in dividing and defeating the Kūrāmānī army outside Cairo in Ramadan 363 (May–June 964), but not before the Kūrāmānī forces had overrun both the Delta and the Sa‘īdī. On al-Hasān’s return to al-Ahsā’, the Ç̌̄uqīlī Zālīm b. Mawḥūl occupied Damascus on behalf of al-Mu’izzī, but came into conflict with the Maghribī troops, whose indiscipline and excesses at length led the citizens to appeal to the Turkish general al-Aṣfānī, who remained in possession of the city until he was captured by al-‘Azīz [q.v.]. Meanwhile in northern Syria the Fāṭimid troops gained a series of striking successes against the Greeks. Tripoli and Bairāt were captured in 364 (975), and John Zimiskes suffered a crushing defeat both on land and sea at the hands of Rayyān, governor of Tripoli, on his attempt to recover the city.

The empire which al-Mu’izzī bequeathed to his successor, though it fell short of his ambitions, was still of imposing extent. The viceroy to whom he had submitted the western provinces, Balakkhān b. Zīrī [q.v.], proved both loyal and capable; when, on the departure of the Caliph, the Zenāta again rose in revolt, he scattered their forces and recaptured Khart and Tilimsān. The holy cities of Mecca and Madīnah acknowledged the suzerainty of the Fāṭimids, and they had a powerful following in Sind. Only in Syria had the Kūrāmānīs, on whose cooperation al-Mu’izzī had confidently relied (though the letter reproduced by al-Makriṣī, itīṣār, ed. Bunz, p. 133 sqq. is of doubtful genuineness), brought him to a halt, but by this action they had placed a fatal obstacle in his way. This disappointment preyed on his mind and, worn out by ill-health and by grief at the loss of his eldest son ‘Abd al-Allāh (died 364), he died at Cairo on 11th Rabî’ II, 365 (Dec. 975), having nominated as his successor his second son Niẓām al-‘Azīz.

The personal character of al-Mu’izzī was singularly noble; frank, accessible, simple in his habits, endowed with brilliant gifts and all the traditional qualities of kilm, he was at the same time a capable administrator and just towards his subjects, though the financial exactions of his last years left a bitter memory. No instance of cruelty is recorded of him, except the execution of his Kūrāmānī captives, and he was completely devoid of religious fanaticism.


MUIZZI, Amir Amr Abū Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik, one of the most famous of Persian court poets. His place of birth is not exactly known. According to most of the sources, he was born in Sarakand around 440 (1048–1049) but Nasā and Nishāpūr are also mentioned. The son of a little known poet ‘Abd al-Malik Burhānī, who was attached to the court of the Saljuq Alp Arslân (1065–1072), he was introduced to Sulṭān Malik-Shāh (1072–1092) by Amir ‘Ali b. Fārāmūz, ruler of Yāzdi (443–488 = 1051/1502–1095), made a favourable impression on the sultan and received from him the taḥkīlama of Muizzī, which comes from the ḥab of Malik-Shāh, Muizzī al-Din. He enjoyed even greater distinction under the last great Saljuq ruler Sandjar (1118–1157) and was appointed his nāṣib al-sīyāṣī and the head of a regular establishment of poets, said to have numbered 400. He is reputed to have become fabulously wealthy from the splendid gifts of the ruler and he received a salary paid out of the revenues of Iṣfahān. Nevertheless he continually tried to increase his fortune and, as he himself tells us, never wrote a single panegyric without making certain in advance that his work would be well paid. According to the Oriental sources, he came to a tragic end, being accidentally killed by Sulṭān Sandjar, while practising archery in his tent. This is not possible, however, as Muizzī himself mentions this incident in his Dīwān and says that, although he suffered a long illness as a result of being struck by the arrow, he completely recovered in the end. This event took place in Marw, about 496 (1102–1103), but he lived for another 40 years and died there in 542 (1147–1148). There is an elegy written on the occasion of his death in the Dīwān of Maḏj al-Din Sand al-Muizzī is one of the most brilliant writers of ḡazals in the old Ghuravic style (Cmnr) but his art was finally displaced by Anwarī’s new style and came to be forgotten.


MUŠABA, Gr. Μουσαιάς, in the Almagest, Ἀποσύνοψις, Lat. Opposita, the term in astronomy for the opposition of a planet and the sun or of two planets with one another. In opposition the
difference in longitude between the two heavenly bodies is 180°; while the modern use is to take no note of the deviations of latitude from the ecliptic, al-Battānī expressly emphasises (Opus Astronomiwm, ed. Nallino, i. 116) that we can only have the true muqādām when both bodies are either in the ecliptic itself or are in equal ecliptical latitudes when opposed: in other planes when they are diametrically opposite one another in the heavens (cf. "διενεχόμενος"). Opposition with the sun can only occur for the moon and the outer planets (in ancient astronomy only for Mars, Jupiter and Saturn), not for the two inner ones, Mercury and Venus. When an outer planet is in opposition to the sun, its conditions of visibility are at their best: at midnight it passes through the meridian and is above the horizon the whole night. When the moon is in opposition to the sun we have the full moon; the usual technical expression for this in Arabic astronomy is al-ṭabīkh which is derived from the same root as muqābala (Greek ξενάσις) and is rendered by Plato Tzetinus and other mediaeval translators by *protestation; but we not uncommonly find the general term muqābala applied to the opposition of sun and moon, while on the other hand we never find al-ṭabīkh used in the general sense of opposition of the planets (cf. al-Battānī, ii. 149, s.v. ṭabīl).

Al-muqābala, opposition, forms along with al-tarīq, quadrature (Gr. tetrasmos), lat. tetragonum, quadratum), al-ṭabīkh, trigon (Gr. tetrasmos, lat. trigonum, triangulum, triquetrum, aspectus trivium, and al-taṣīs, hexagon (Gr. ἕξαγων, lat. hexagonum, sexangulum, aspectus sexitum), the four astrological aspects (ṣāshāl, ṣalqah, ṣilmā, ṣaktāsim, ṣawṭāsim, also al-ṭalās), lat. aspectus or ratioantes), which are applied to the ecliptic differences in longitude of two planets to the amount of 180°, 90°, 120° or 60° respectively. The ṭabīkh also play a part in the astrological arrangement of the signs of the zodiac (burnīya) (cf. the astrological tables and al-Battānī, iii. 194). It should be noted that the conjunction of planets (muqārawa, Greek ἔκδοσες; for moon with sun [new moon] is never ṭabīmā) is not included among the ʿašāl, nor the position when the difference of latitude is 90° or 150° (cf. al-Battānī, op. cit.).

In horoscopes muqābala and tarīq are as a rule regarded as unfavourable in principle, ṭabīkh and taṣīs on the other hand as favourable.


(Willy Hartner)

MUQADDAM (A.). "placed in front". Applied to persons the word means the chief, the one in command, e.g. of a body of troops or of a ship (captain). Dozy, Suppl., s.v., gives a number of police appointments which have this name. In the deri√½v orders the word is used for the head of the order or the head of a monastery.

As a neuter noun the word is a technical term in logic and arithmetic. In logic it means the *prosais* in a premise in the form of a conditional sentence, e.g. "If the sun rises (it becomes day)"; where this whole sentence is to be regarded as premise of a syllogism. But as every sentence can be a premise, muqaddam is really identical with the condition in the conditional sentence. In arithmetic muqaddam means the first of two numbers in a proportion, i.e. 3 (5) or in other words the divided in a simple division. — In logic and in arithmetic the portion following the muqaddam (in brackets above) is called ṭabīkh.

Bibliography: Dozy (cf. above) and other dictionaries; Thörning, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Terminologie (Thurr. Bibl., xi.), p. 108; Dict. of Technical Terms, ed. Sprenger, p. 1215.

(M. Pleiñner)

AL-MUQADDASÍ, SHAMS AL-DIN ABD AL-AZZÁ MUHAMMAD B. ALMAD B. AL-MUBÀKH ET AL-ṢÀMÍ AL-MUQADDASÍ AL-MU'ÀRîF B. AL-BÀSHÁH b. Al-Muqaddasí as he is called on the first page of the Berlin manuscript (Cat. Alhwardt, No. 6034), is the author of the most original and at the same time one of the most valuable geographical treatises in Arabic literature. The name-form al-Muqaddasí, denoting his origin from Jerusalem, goes back to Sprenger, who brought the Berlin manuscript from India and made this author first known in Europe (A. Sprenger, Die Post- und Reiserouten des Orients, Leipzig 1864, p. xviii.), but the form al-Makdisi is probably more correct as Jerusalem is commonly spelt al-Bal al-Makdis (Yahya, Muqaddam, iv. 590). Yakhir always quotes him as al-Basßáhí.

Biographical dates on the life of this author are only to be found in the text of his treatise. In 356 (966), when he was at Mecca, he was about twenty years of age; it is probable that he lived at least as late as 1000, as the last datable information in the treatise belongs to the end of the ivth (xth) century. His grandfather Abû Bakr al-Banna was an architect in Palestine and had made for Ibn Tüllin the gates of the town of Akkâ. His mother's family was originally from Byzâr in Kūms, from where his grandfather Abû l-Tââyib b. al-Shâwa (in B.G.A., iv., p. viii., l. 12, "paternus" is to be corrected into "maternus") emigrated to Jerusalem. Muhammed b. Ahmad himself shows also a good knowledge of architecture, besides a good literary and general erudition.

The geographical treatise is known from two old manuscripts, one of which forms the basis of the Goëege's edition in the B.G.A., iii., Leyden 1877 and of his revised edition of 1905. The Berlin manuscript has the title Aḥsan al-Takâsim fi Ma'rîfât al-Âlâm, while the Constantinople manuscript (Aya Sofia, No. 2971 b.i.; cf. Ritter, in Isl. xiv., 43), written in 658 (1260), is only indicated as Kitâb al-Ârâlim. The Leyden manuscript (Cat., v. 194) is a modern copy of the Constantinople one, while another Berlin manuscript (Cat. Alhwardt, No. 6033) is a bad copy of the other Berlin manuscript. The date of composition is not certain. The text itself states that it was completed in 375 (985) (B.G.A., iii. 9), but as has been said, information of a later date has been added, while Yakhir (l. 653) gives the year 378 (988). The manuscript (Constantinople) is somewhat less extensive than Berlin) and de Goëege, hesitatingly, considers the dedication of 375 as the older one. It is dedicated to a certain Abû 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. al-Hassân and mentions the Sâmânis as the most important dynasty; B, on the contrary, does not contain the dedication and is more orientated towards the Fatimids.

The general scope of the work proves beyond doubt that it is based on the same geographical traditions as the treatises connected with the names
al-Balkhi — al-Iṣṭakhri — Ibn Ḥawḳal; the same is proved by the fact that the maps accompanying both manuscripts show the still rather primitive type of the Iṣṭakhri maps (the Maṭāsi maps have been published by K. Miller, in *Mappae Arabeae*, vol. i—v., Stuttgart 1926—1931). In this last respect al-Maḳdṣi’s work does not really reflect the considerable progress of geographical knowledge that is manifested in the text. As in the texts of al-Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Ḥawḳal the object is to treat only the Islamic world (*maḥal al-Ṣaḥāba*) of the ivth (xⅡth) century and that after a division into regions (*aḥālum*) which, on the whole, is the same as that of the two authors mentioned; the older representation of the two regions is maintained. The treatment of the western and eastern regions is maintained. The treatment is often more detailed than with the earlier authors, while the disposition of the geographical matter is the same, each region ending with a survey of the distances between the different towns. In how far al-Maḳdṣi is dependent on al-Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Ḥawḳal remains to be examined. His introductory chapters show not a few original features and are especially valuable for information about earlier geographical authors. As de Goeje has already remarked, this information is more accurate in the redaction C than in B: if the latter redaction is really later it would seem that the rather depreciating judgment he gives therein of al-Balkhi, al-Djaḥānī and others (p. 4) must be explained by the change of the author’s political predilection in favour of the Fatimids and occidental Islam. Al-Maḳdṣi’s style and language is sometimes difficult, owing to his expressly stated endeavour to adapt himself in the description of each region to the special idiom used in that region. Moreover, the reading of his text is several times made unpleasant by the boisterous way in which the author speaks of the merits of his work.

A English translation of part of the treatise was published by G. S. A. Raking and R. F. Azoo in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta 1897—1910, vol. i—iv.

**Bibliography:** The author and the work are discussed by de Goeje in the introduction to vol. iv. of the *B.G.A.*, p. vi—viii.; further cf. Brockelmann, *G.A.L.*, i. (C. J. H. Kramers)

**AL-MUḤADDIM** [See ALLAH, II.]

**MUḤALLA** (MUKALLA), a seaport on the south coast of Arabia, 2½ miles N.W. of the cape of the same name. The town lies between two bays at the foot of a reddish limestone cliff, which rises to a height of 300 feet behind the town; four towers for the defence of the town are built upon it. On the west side a wall runs from the cliff to the shore with only one gate in it. The only buildings of any size are the great mosque on the coast with a minaret which can be seen from a great distance, and the sultan’s palace; the other buildings are mainly huts with a few houses of stone. The palace is a great six-storey building with *decoration* windows which stands on a kind of platform. In the centre of the town is a large cemetery with the tomb of Walt Vaḳḳūb; in the modern western part of the town is the bazaar which is provided with all kinds of goods and has some modest industries which provide the native population with baskets, pipes of a kind of limestone, silver powder-horns and muskets without stocks. There is a yard in the harbour where the native sailing-boats are built. The country around is not fertile; a mile to the west however is an oasis belonging to the ruler, which is watered by a stream which also provides the town’s water supply. The climate of Mukalla is very dry, the coast hot; only from October to April and in June and July do fresh breezes and showers temper the heat. The population varies between 6,000 and 12,000.

Mukalla is the only place between ‘Aden and Maskat that deserves the name of harbour. It cannot however be used as an anchorage during the southwest monsoon; in this period its place is taken by Barūm, 16 miles southwest. The trade with India, Somaliland, the Red Sea and Maskat is considerable. The exports are mainly gum arabic, skins, honey from the Yebshom valley, senna and some coffee; the imports are cotton goods, metals, pottery from Bombay, dates and dried fruits from Maskat. Coffee from ‘Aden, sheep, aloes and frankincense from the African coast. The fisheries also give a considerable yield while amber is obtained in considerable quantities. Parsis and banians from Bombay play a leading part in the trade and Hindustānī is spoken almost as much as Arabic. Since 1881 Mukalla has been under the al-Kaʿīṯ dynasty with which England concluded a treaty granting a protectorate on May 1, 1888. According to Ibn al-Mudīǧīrī, the old name of the town was al-Mukannā, and the natives also call al-Mukalla, like al-Shībī. Bender al-ʿAbṣīf or Bīn al-ʿAbṣīf. The port has steam-ship communication with ‘Aden; most of the traffic is borne by native sailing-boats of 100—350 tons, which are busiest at the time of the date harvest.


(Adolf Grohmann)

**AL-MUḤALLAD** R. al-Muḥāṣibī, ḤUSAYN AL-DAWLA ʿABD HĀZZAN, an ʿUḏalmī. After the death in 386 (996) or 387 (997) of the ʿUḏalmī emir Abu l-Dhawwād Muḥammad b. al-Muṣāriḥ b. al-Muḥāṣibī (*cf. Bahāʾ al-Dawla*), a quarrel arose between his brothers, ‘Ali and al-Muḥallad, each of whom claimed power. ‘Ali was the elder; but al-Muḥallad wrote to Bahāʾ al-Dawla and promised him an annual tribute and then told his brother that Bahāʾ al-Dawla had appointed him governor of al-Mawsil and asked ‘Ali’s help to take the town. Bahāʾ al-Dawla’s general in al-Mawsil, ʿAbd Djaʿfar al-Hadjī—
MUKAN (Müğân), a steppe lying to the south of the lower course of the Araxes, one part of which (about 5,000 square kilometres) belongs to Russia (1. S. E.) and the other (50–70 x c. 50 kilometres) to Persia. The steppe, which covers what was once the bottom of the sea has been formed by the alluvial deposits from the Kar (in Russian Koura) and its tributary the Araxes. (The latter has several times changed its course and one of its arms flows directly into the gulf of Kizil-Aghaj). In the interior the only water in Müğân is from a number of springs, but it is covered with bogs and shows traces of the old system of irrigation. Müğân has a very mild climate in winter (Kazvini calls it wusrum Astarbâghân) and in the spring is covered with a rich carpet of verdure but in summer the heat makes it a regular hell and it is infested with snakes (Monœth: 384, in June the snakes literally covered the ground); cf. Abu Hamid al-Ghazwini in Kazvin, p. 1579). The name, the old Arabic transcription (Balâlûhûr, Tabari) is Müğân (without article) but quite early in certain manuscripts of the Arab geographers we find Mügân (probably a popular etymology mûghtan "maghi") which becomes general in the Mongol period. Markwart, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 633 connects the name of Mügân with that of the people mentioned by classical writers as inhabiting this region: Hectaceus, fragment 170, in Müghtân, cie. Aeqam. Pomponius Mela, book iii., ch. v.; Muchi ("and Hyrcanian fretum Albani et Moschi et Hyrcani"). This tribe is to be connected with the Cbashân which lived in this region; (cf. Hubelmann, Die älteren Ortsnamen, 1904, p. 269; cf. in Yakhir, it. 767 the genealogy invented by Ibn al-Kalbi, according to which Muktân and Djalân — both inhabitants of Tabristân — were the sons of Kâmahsh (probably Var. Bokrak), the Armenian geography Muktân, the Georgian chronicle Mwokân (another Mwokân lies near the confluençe of the Alazan with the Iora).

History. The Byzantine general Leontius in 678 subdued Iberia, Albania, Bukhâna (cf. above) and Media. The district of Muktân was conquered in 21 (642) by an officer of Surâgh Bukair who addressed a letter guaranteeing peace to “the people of Muktân of the mountains of al-Kabdî” (Caucasus; Tabari, i. 2660). According to Balâdhuri, p. 327–329, in 25 (645) Walid b. ‘Uthâna undertook a campaign against the people of Muktân (al-lMukhân), of al-Bâb (cf. Yâkūn) and al-Tâlān (Tâlsh). Another campaign of Sidi b. ‘Aš’âb against the people of Muktân and Djalân, although successful, entailed severe losses. According to Yaqût, ed. Houtsma, ii. 395, in 129 (622) the future Caliph Marwân II b. Mu’tamud undertook a campaign in Djalân and Muktân. Muktân figures several times as a stronghold of Bâbak (Tab., iii. 1174, 1178). In the third (ninith) century Ibn Khudâdhdhâb, p. 119, mentions one Shâkla (as) chief of Muktân. According to al-Mas’ûdî, Murûtû, ii. 5, in the time of the Sharwân (cf. Shirkwān) had conquered the states (manâla) of Lâyîrân (several variants) and al-Mukhâna. It appears from Ibn Miskwâhi (ed. Margoliouth, i. 399) who mentions the isphahân of Muktân b. Dalâla as ally of the Gil chief Lâshkari b. Mardî, who rebelled against the Dâlamis in 326 (937), that Muktân enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. In 339 (950) the Kurd Dâshtân sent his vizier “into the mountains (seul) of Muktân to entrench himself.” In 349 Muktân appears as a centre of rebellion (Ibn Miskwâhi, ii. 136, 178–179). The poet Kâzî mentions the rising of the isphahân of Muktân against the Rawwâdi Wahâbdân (344–378; cf. Kâzî, Fâlîhân-i gusmân, Tâbrîz 1929, ii. 94). Later we hear of Muktân mainly as an excellent area for the winter pasturage of the conquering nomads. In Yakhir (iv. 676) the time the majority of the people of Muktân were still Turkomans. In the history of the Khânâmshâh Djalân al-Din, Muktân is constantly mentioned. The sulûn sends his booty there, keeps his baggage and mobilises his troops there (Nasavi, Sûrât, p. 210, 280, 360 etc.) But in 617 (1220–1221) the Mongol generals Djebe and Subutay spent the winter in Muktân (Lâwâni, i. 116), and Kazvin, p. 379 says that Mongols took Muktân for their winter pastures and drove out the Turkomans. In the time of Timur, Muktân must have been included in the region of Kara-bâgh where this conqueror liked so much to pass the winter. During the winter of 804 (1401) Timur restored an old canal which was given the name of his tribe, the Bâlas. The canal left the Araxes at Kâsh-kî Carshâqi and at a distance of 10 to farshâd ended at Sardjâ-pul (iselâ). Since, in order to give the necessary instructions, Timur (who was to the north of the Araxes) had to cross the river (Zaflarnâma, ii. 395), we may suppose that the canal lay to the south of the Araxes, i.e. in the steppe of Muktân. It must correspond to the Vegin Gaur arâfâh of which traces can still be seen for a length of about 35 miles. Sardjâ-pul may correspond to Carcelli on the Russian map (according
to the involved description by Monteith, the Barlas canal issued in the neighbourhood of Kara-su; the canal is in any case quite distinct from another canal which Timur traced in 806 to the north of the Araxes towards the town of Balkān (Saği-namā, ii. 543).

In the 4th century AD the Karakoyunlu Muğān became the possession of the Sufi Turkoman tribes who formed the principal support of the dynasty and became known as Shāhāsee and the treaty of Guštābān of 1813 the steppe of Muğān was divided between Russia and Persia. The boundary line was more precisely defined in article iv. of the treaty of Turkmenābād (q.v.). In 1884 Russia forbade Persian nomads to cross into Russian territory. Towards the end of the 19th century the project of irrigating the land of Muğān was conceived and realised between 1902 and 1907. The four systems of canals were to make 200,000 hectares cultivable, particularly for cotton. From 1884 the steppe was occupied solely by nomads who were Russian subjects. But in 1917 there were already 46 Russian villages with 17,000 inhabitants while the Turkish nomads who had become settled on the banks of the Kūr and of the Araxes numbered 50,000 souls. As a result of the tragic events of 1918, the whole Russian population had to leave Muğān and the canals became silted up. Between 1920 and 1924 the work of restoration was carried out and the fugitives began to return. The total area of irrigated land in Muğān is estimated at 123,000 hectares, while immediately to the north of Muğān the steppe of Mil (from Mil-i Bašāğan, "the tower of Bašāğan"); cf. Khanīkī, Mem. sur les inscriptions musulmans du Caucase, in J.A., Aug. 1862, p. 72) has another 165,000 irrigated hectares.

Historical geography. The Arab geographers are fairly well acquainted with Muğān (cf. the Bibliography). In the Mongol period, Muğān must have comprised all the lands to the north of the Sağān range (which is a western outlier of Russian Tālūsh) and forms the watershed between the middle course of the Kara-su and the Bolghar, to the east of the lower course of the Kara-su (where it follows the northern direction) and to the south of the Araxes. Towards the east Muğān stretched to the Caspian Sea and included the coastal region of Russian Tālūsh. The mountainous part of the latter, held as in a vice, must also have belonged to Muğān. The same condition must have existed in the Arab period for the curious expression of Ibn Miskawa, ii. 156 referring to the Dyhaoil Muğān can only refer to the mountainous part of Russian Tālūsh.

We may note Muqaddasī's remark (p. 380) who among other wonders mentions, one marhāla (7 — 8 farsangs = 20 — 25 miles) distant from Muğān, an imposing fortress called al-Harā (7) below which are houses and palaces in which there are large quantities of gold (Zahāh bard' azim) in the form of birds and wild beasts and "many kings made plans to seize it but never succeeded in reaching it". Muqaddasī does not definitely say that the fortress belongs to Muğān and evidently speaks of it by hearsay. Is this a reference to Shīndān-kāla (which is about 50 miles = 2 marhāla to the south) or is this site of the Shahrāstān of Muğān? On this imposing mountain (6,000 feet high) can still be seen ruins of important fortifications (Radde, p. 155: "ruins of a strong castle... many ruins of brick buildings"). Finally in a Persian translation of Iṣṭakhrī, p. 186, 27, we read: "The Gilis and the Muğān are tribes on foot who rarely go on horseback" which can only refer to a few remnants of the old population dwelling in upper Tālūsh (where the highlanders are very distinct from the lowlanders).


(V. MINORSKY)

AL-MUKANṬARĀT. [See ĀSTĀRAKH.]

MUQĀṬIL B. SULĀMAṈ B. BÅGHIR AL-ÅZDI AL-KHURĀSĀNI AL-BÅLKHĪ. Abū 'l-Ḥasan, traditionist and commentator on the Kurān, was born in Balkh and lived in Marv, Baghdis and Başra. where he died in 150 (767); there is also a reference to a stay in Hārāt. Of his life we know almost nothing apart from a few details for his judgment as a traditionist. The name of his wife 'Umm Abī 'Īsha Nāh b. Abī Maryam has been preserved. According to Ibn Durayd, he was one of the masūli of the Banū Asad. He is sometimes quoted as Muqāṭil b. Dāwal dīz or Dāwal dīz. Ibn Ḥadār, 'Īsha al-Muqāṭil, expressly states in contradiction of wrong ideas that this is our Muqāṭil and that Dāwal dīz is not a ātāb of Muqāṭil himself but of his father.

Muqāṭil's prestige as a traditionist is not very great; he is reproached with not being accurate with the imāūt. His exegesis enjoys even less confidence. The biographers vie with one another in telling stories which illustrate his mendacity and particularly his professing to know everything. Contempt is poured on his memory by stories of ludicrous questions which were put to him about the most impossible things and to which he either gave fantastic answers or could make no reply. It is in keeping with this profession of universal knowledge that the sources are unanimous in talking of his extreme anthropomorphism (tašēk).
It did little to help his fame also that he is said to have told pious stories [cf. Kışâş] in the mosque, at a time when this was strictly forbidden. In politics he is said to have belonged to the Zudiyah, in theology to the Mirdâj [q.v.]

Muḥadî’s literary activity was somewhat comprehensive, yet until quite recently nothing was known of his works. Only since 1912 has a Kuṭūn commentary by him been known in the M.S. Or. 6533 of the British Museum, the genuineness of which however Goldziher did not think beyond doubt. The Fīrâqī gives a list of his works: Hâdîq al-Khalîfâ also gives some of them. They deal mainly with the language and exorcism of the Kuṭūn, but a pamphlet against the Kudâr is also mentioned. This is however hardly in keeping with another story, according to which he wrote a pamphlet against Dîhâm [q.v.] and the latter wrote against him.


(M. Plessner)

AL- MUQTAṬÂM, the part of the range of hills west of the Nile, which lies immediately to the east of Cairo and from which the mountains take a north-easterly direction, bordering the Nile delta to the south-east. It reaches a height of about 600 feet and consists, as does the greater part of the north African mountains, of limestone (cf. Description de l’Egypte, État moderne, Paris 1822, ii. 375). The name Muqtaṭâm (the Tâdîq al-Ârâma‘ records also the popular form al-Muqṣâţîn) does not go back to a pre-Mu‘amamadan nomenclature, nor is it considered, in spite of its correct Arabic formation, as a true Arabic word, for the geographers (cf. Yâkût, iv. 607 sqq.) give, hesitatingly, different explanations of its meaning. The name occurs for the first time in the historical tradition of the Egyptian Arabs, as found in the Futûh Misr of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (cf. Torrey’s edition, New Haven 1809, p. 156 sqq.), in half legendary tales in which also al-Mukawkas [q.v.] plays a part. Some of these traditions give it an eponymous hero, Muqtaṭâm b Misr b Baisar b 闩âm, or lay stress on the special sanctity of the mountain, declaring that, in some way, it is connected with the mountain of Jerusalem. As in the last mentioned traditions, Ka‘b al-AhÂlär [q.v.] is named as final authority, it seems probable that the origin of the name must be sought in Jewish legendary traditions (for Jewish traditions about mountains, cf. the Midrash Thallon on Psalm lviii. 17) and that the name has been fixed only in course of time on the ill-defined mountainous region to which it is attached since the flourishing times of al-Fustâṭ and al-Khârîra. The vagueness of the geographical definition has survived in the Arabic geographical sources, which either call Muqtaṭâm the entire eastern mountain range as far as Uswân (Yâkût), or even represent under the name Muqtaṭâm the whole of the mountain system that runs over the inhabited world from China to the Atlantic Ocean (Ibn Hawkât and others). Moreover several geographers give the legendary statement that in the Muqtaṭâm are mines of emerald and other precious stones, while in reality it contains only stone quarries, but these were used already in very ancient times. Maqrîzî, Kifâyet, ed. Bulûq, i. 123 gives a fairly complete survey of the different traditions and opinions.

It may be thus assumed that the Muqtaṭâm acquired a real geographical identity only after the foundation of al-Fustâṭ. Its geographical situation, viz. its proximity to the bank of the Nile, has deeply influenced the territorial expansion of this town and later of Cairo [q.v.]. Parts of the town and famous sites are situated on the western spur of al-Muqtaṭâm, such as the mosque of Abu tullân and the citadel of Saladin. The elevation of Ibn tullân’s mosque bears, however, the special name of Dîbal Yâshîr. The cemetery of al-Šarâfî belongs likewise to the Muqtaṭâm and it is with this cemetery that are connected the ancient traditions already mentioned, in which al-Mukawkas plays a part; al-Mukawkas is described as Amr b. al-Âs that the mountain, instead of earthy vegetation, is destined to bear the plants of Paradise and the caliph ‘Umar, informed by Amr, decides that by these plants of Paradise can only be meant Muslims who have died. Accordingly, tradition records a number of qaḥāb who are buried in al-Šarâfî. On the summit of al-Muqtaṭâm was built in the Fâtimid period the mosque of al-Dîyâshî, by Badr al-Dîjamîlî in 478 (1085); for this reason the mountain is also called Dâbâl al-Dîyāshî. On the southern slopes, towards Huwâmîn, lay the Christian monastery Dair al-Šarâfî (description by al-Šabîhîyī towards 1000; cf. Sachau, in Abb. Pr. Abh. Wiss., 1909). A historical, or perhaps legendary feature, connected with al-Muqtaṭâm is that the Fâtimid caliph al-Ĥâkim is said to have disappeared mysteriously, in the night of 27th Shabâwî 411 (Feb. 25, 1021), when he had gone for a ride in the Muqtaṭâm. — Finally it may be mentioned that the Muqtaṭâm has given its name to one of the large modern Arabic newspapers published at Cairo.

(J. H. Kramers)

AL-MUKÂWÂKAS, AL-MUKÂWÂKÂS, the individual who in Arab tradition plays the leading part on the side of the Copts and Greeks at the conquest of Egypt.

The Prophet is said to have sent a letter to him in the year 6 a.h. In the address on this letter, the text of which is given in Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam (ed. Torrey, p. 46), al-Mukrâţît (Kifâyet, i. 29), al-Su‘ûîy (Hašr al-Muḫâdara, i. 58) and al-Manûfî (p. 29), as well as in an entirely different version Pseudo-Wâkiûdî (p. 10), and also in the accounts of the incident in the Arab historians, the position of al-Mukawkas is described in the following phrases:

1. Šâhîb al-Iškandariya (Nawawi, p. 577; Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 45, 52; Abû Šâlîfî, p. 38 [100]; Ibn Kathîr, iii. fol. 1559b); 2. In Sa’d in Wehliheim, Seeken und Vororteit, iv. 3 [99]); 2. Malîk al-Iškandariya (Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, p. 49; al-Su‘ûîyî, i. 60; Pseudo-Wâkiûdî, p. 25; Ibn Hîshâm, p. 97); 3. Šâhîb Misr (Abû ‘l-Fida‘î, i. 149); 4. Malîk Misr (al-Manûfî, p. 7; cf. al-Mukrâţît, Kifâyet, i. 163, 22 sqq.); 5. Malîk Misr wa l-Iškandariya (Pseudo-Wâkiûdî, p. 10); 6. Šâhîb Misr wa l-Iškandariya (Pseudo-Wâkiûdî,
All these epithets no doubt mean simply the actual ruling authority in Egypt, whose true title was not known to the Arabs. If we remember that in the year 6 (628) the Persians were masters of Egypt, we can hardly give much credence to the story of the Arab historians. This is evident from the statement recorded by Manāfī (p. 50) that Egypt was under the rule of Mukhākas continuously from the lifetime of the Prophet, through the caliphate of Abū Bakr to the beginning of the caliphate of ʿOmar. Muḥammad’s letter to Mukhākas was long ago declared not to be genuine by E. Amelina (Frangments, p. 392) and Wellhausen (Slizzen und Vorarbeiten, iv. 90) although they did not doubt the fact of the embassy to him; later Butler (Conquest, p. 522) and Th. Noldeke (Z. D. M. G., xviii. 160) still believed in the embassy although the latter granted the possibility that tradition might have transferred the name known from the time of the conquest to the person to whom Muḥammad sent gifts, while for example S. Lane-Poole (Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 6, note 2) supposes that the Muḥākas of 628 and the Muḥākas of the conquest are two different persons. This suggestion however is disposed of by the fact that the Muḥākas of the letter is called in Ibn Kathīr ʿAbī Amīn Manī (in Abu ʿl-Fida) the patronymic has been corrupted through ʿAbī Amīn; Nawawi only gives ʿAlīrādīj, i.e. the same as the Muḥākas of the conquest: for we need not heed the patronymic of Muḥākas given by Pseudo-Wakīdī (p. 10) (Abī ʿRāmī), while the epithet al-ʿArābī al-Māʾnī, which al-Maṣʿūdī, Tanbīh, p. 261, 2 has taken in an obviously corrupt form from an old source, is the Ibn ʿArābī al-Yūnānī of the Muḥākas of the conquest. In view of the many serious contradictions, which the transposing of Muḥākas into the period of Persian rule in Egypt offers, there is no alternative but to regard with Caetani, Annali dell’Islam, iv. 90 the story of Muḥammad’s embassy to Muḥākas as legendary and devoid of any historical value (cf. also G. Rouillard, p. 187 and note 2). The genuineness of the parchment found in a monastery at Aḥmīnī by the French epigraphist E. Barthelemy in 1852, which was thought to be the original of Muḥammad’s letter to Muḥākas and was actually put among the relics of the Prophet in the old Serail, thus disappears (cf. the publication by Bell in Q., 1854, p. 482—518 and Dījhī Ṣaydān, in hitlāl, xii/2, 1904, p. 103 sq.) its falsity had already been recognised by J. Karabacek (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mosailiten, Leipzig 1874, p. 35, note 47 and Mitteilungen des K. K. Oester, Museum, xix. 1854, p. 183) (cf. also Noldeke-Schwały, Geschichte des Qurān, i., Leipzig, 1909, p. 190) As a matter of fact palaeographical grounds are clearly against any assumption of a date in the first century for this document.

The same discrepancies, which we find in the transmission of the name and title of the Muḥākas of Muḥammad’s letter are found in the Muḥākas of the conquest. In the historians we find the following names:

1. ʿDāwiḍ b. Miʿna (Abū ʿSāliḥ, p. 30 [81], 101 [230]); 2. ʿDāwiḍ b. Miʿna b. ʿArābī (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, p. 64, note 9; Ibn Ḥadjar, Ḥibbā, iii. 1900); 3. Ibn ʿArābī or Ibn ʿArābī (al-Kindī, p. 8; al-Maṣʿūdī, Kiyāfīt, i. 259, 27; Ibn Ṭaghribīrī, i. 9; Ẓāḥī, Muḥākas, vel. 894, 14).

Taking first of all the name of his grandfather, J. v. Karabacek’s emendation (p. 2) to dispose of apparent contradictions in the statements about the patronymic by assuming a double name Miʿna ʿArābī proves unnecessary, when we see the name unequivocally given in Nāṣir. 2. When Karabacek (p. 3) preferred the reading ʿArābī for ʿArābī, he was at least able to quote the form ʿArābī in the Codex Parisinus of Ibn Ṭaghribīrī, but I cannot agree with Amelina in supporting Karabacek’s emendation (p. 2) to dispose of apparent contradictions in the statements about the patronymic by assuming a double name Miʿna ʿArābī, especially if we remember the variant ʿArābī of the Ḥibbā, and Noldeke must be right when he (Z. D. M. G., xviii. 161) restores this to the Ḥibbā rejected by Karabacek. The form ʿArābī (unpointed however) has however so far been found only in one papyrus, the more usual form being ʿArābī (Z. D. M. G., i. 138). Butler’s conjecture (p. 523) on the name ʿArābī seems to me as improbable as Karabacek’s identification. He calls attention to Abū ʿSāliḥ’s observation (p. 67 [156]) that ʿArābī is a corruption of Gergorios and supposes that ʿArābī is a corruption of ʿArābī so that Ibn ʿArābī would be an error for Ibn ʿArābī and mean ‘son of Gregory’. Casanova’s proposal (in Butler, p. 523) must be dismissed as still more improbable, viz., that Ibn ʿArābī is a corruption of Abū ʿIrāb. The office filled by Muḥākas is described by the sources in the following terms: 1. ʿAbī Ṣaḥīḥ (al-Baladhuri, p. 226); 2. ʿAbī Ṣāḥīḥ Misr (al-Maṣʿūdī, Tanbīḥ, i. 163, 29 sq.; Ibn ʿArābī, n. 118); 3. ʿAbī Ṣāḥīḥ ʿArābī Misr (Ibn Ḥadjar, n. 1900); 4. ʿAbī Ṣāḥīḥ Misr (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, p. 64, note 9; al-Maṣʿūdī, p. 28); 5. ʿAbī Ṣāḥīḥ ʿArābī ʿArābī Misr (Eutychius, ii. 302). If the three first terms only mean the ruler of Egypt in general, the two last named limit the sphere of activity of Muḥākas to the administration of taxation and the expression given in 4 may be taken as synonymous with ʿAbī ʿArābī “governor”. In this connection we have the very clear evidence of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, p. 37 and Ibn ʿA Ṽābī ʿArābī, n. 119 who preserve the statement that Muḥākas was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as governor of Egypt and entrusted with the waging of war and the levying of taxation. Ibn al-ʿA Ṽābī, ʿArābī (p. 30 [81 sq.]) that Muḥākas, ʿDāwiḍ b. Miʿna had rented the taxes of Egypt from Heraclius for 18,000,000 dināres fits in with this. This makes intelligible the statement of Eutychius (ii. 302) who calls Muḥākas controller of the land taxes (ʿAbī ʿArābī ʿArābī) and traces his attitude to the Arabs to his embezzling the taxes raised, and further explains the description of Muḥākas (Muḥākas) as the patriarch of the Ethiopian Synaxar which Muḥākas had been Patriarch and financial controller of Egypt.
M. J. de Geoze and J. v. Karabacek have laid special stress on this side of the activity of Muṣawwās and identified the prefect George mentioned in John of Nikia (p. 550), whom de Geoze regards as prefect of Lower Egypt and Karabacek (p. 8) as pagarch of Babylon, with Muṣawwās who is called in the sources George son of Menas. A. J. Butler (note 4 to Abū Sālih, p. 81), Milhe and Lane-Poole have followed de Geoze while Amelineau (Fragments coptes, p. 404: Samuel de Qalaman, p. 24 and Résumé de l'Histoire de l'Égypte, p. 243) wished to identify Muṣawwās with the Patriarch George who was appointed by the emperor Heraclius as successor or deputy to Cyrus during the period of the latter's stay in Constantinople (cf. John of Nikia, p. 174).

In contrast to these attempts at identification, which are in more than one respect in contradiction to the sources, the most probable solution of the Muṣawwās problem is the identification of Muṣawwās with the Patriarch and governor Cyrus of Phasis, who was sent in the year 631 A. D. by Heraclius to Alexandria where he died on March 21, 632. While Zonksen (in his edition of John of Nikia, p. 576, note 2) had already pointed out that the main features of the activity of Cyrus are found in the Arabic stories of Muṣawwās, although no doubt the legend mixes up the activities of several individuals under this name, F. M. Estevés Perellà, (Vida de Aba Samuel, p. 41—53) completely proved the identity of the two. Independently J. Krall in an unpublished article for the Mitteilungen aus der Saumlands des Papirus Erhardus Kainer, on the authority of three new fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel, had come to the same conclusion. The full study of the whole problem by A. J. Butler, the main result of which, the identity of Muṣawwās with the Patriarch Cyrus, has been adopted by R. Evetts (Patrologia Orientalis, i. 491, note 1), by M. Guidi in his doctoral thesis, C. H. Becker and O. Braun in his article Cyrus in the Kirchlichen Handlexicon, iii., col. 536 and others, has been critically examined by L. Caetani (Annales dell' Islam, iv, 86 sqq.) The decisive evidence for the identity of the two individuals is found in the History of the Patriarchs of Severus of Ashmunein (ed. Evetts, p. 490 sqq.) and (ed. Seybold, p. 106 sqq.) in which there are references to the Patriarch and governor of Heraclius in connection with the flight of the Patriarch Benjamin once as Cyrus (قيرس), then a few lines later as al-Muṣawwās or al-Muṣawwās: the synaxars in this connection also give the name al-Muṣawwās (cf. E. Amelineau, Fragments coptes, S. 397, note 1; p. 398, note 1; p. 406, note 1 and the edition by R. Basse, Patrologia Orientalis, xi. 562), and the Arabic Vita of Benjamin (Amelineau, p. 400, note 1); of peculiar importance is the text edited in R.O.C., xx, 393, where the combined names Cyrus al-Muṣawwās appear. There is the additional fact that the period of ten years which, according to the history of the Patriarchs, lay between the flight and return of the Patriarch Benjamin coincides within a year with the period of office of Cyrus (631—642) in Egypt, whom the Christian sources describe as an "unbeliever" (πατερήμα, Amelineau, Fragments coptes, p. 364, 366; ṭāfīr in Severus of Ashmunein, p. 495 [108]), godless and sinful Kauchios (πατερήμα πατερήμα απαραδήμα, Vienna Coptic fragments of the Vita of Apa Samuel in Krall, Kauchios frequently in Amelineau), decent Antichrist (πατερήμα πατερήμα ομαδικός in Amelineau, p. 366 sqq.) and Pseudoarchiepiskopos (ibid., p. 365). The double position of Cyrus or Muṣawwās as supreme head of the administration and archbishop of which have ample evidence (cf. G. Rouillard, p. 230, note 2) and it remains quite certain from the testimony of Severus (p. 490, 495 [106—108]) and the Arabic and Ethiopic synaxar (Amelineau, p. 406, note 1: وَرُزَتُ مَنْجِرُ, p. 399) and also by the Vita of Samuel (Amelineau, p. 367), was quite unknown to the Muslim Arabic sources. Noldke has already called attention to this remarkable fact when he referred to it in a crux for the identification of the two figures. There was however no necessity for the Arabs to refer to his position in the church. He was only of importance to them as head of the administration. If one wants to, one can see an indication of his ecclesiastical dignity in the wish expressed by Muṣawwās during the negotiations with Ṭāmr regarding the capitulation of Alexandria (in Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, ed. Torrey, p. 72) that he might be buried in the Church of St. John (cf. theion Amelineau, p. 400 sqq.). How much the Christian sources differ in their ideas of the personality and position of Muṣawwās may be gathered from the description of the death of Muṣawwās. According to Severus of Ashmunein (ed. Evetts, p. 495; Seybold p. 108), the governor and Patriarch of Alexandria poisoned himself after the occupation of Alexandria lest he should be put to death by Ṭāmr, while John of Nikia (p. 335—378) says that Cyrus weakened by vexation at the faithlessness of Ṭāmr caught dysentery and died. According to Caetani, the contradictions and obscurities on the part of the Arab historians show that they did not consider who Muṣawwās exactly was, but simply used the name as the family name of the chief personage in Egypt at the time of the Muslim conquest. Evidently all who negotiated with Ṭāmr in the name of the Copts are included in one individual. The unanimator with which Muṣawwās is described as a Copt and the different names given him suggests that Muṣawwās conceals not only Cyrus but also other Egyptian negotiators, e.g. perhaps the commander of Babylon, George, and the bishop of the same town, Menas. The Arabs must have made one out of these two negotiators and given him like Cyrus the name Muṣawwās. Of the attempts to explain this name. Karabacek's (p. 8) مَنْجِيَس is as little probable as Amelineau's explanation (p. 407—409) which makes Kauchios "the man from Kaukkhan". We would rather think with Butler and Guidi of a connection with καυκάσιος, which indicates the home of Cyrus. But even this explanation is by no means certain and the connection of Muṣawwās with Cyrus has again (in Canterelli) given rise to serious doubts. Nau, p. 11 has compared Muṣawwās with μακασ. His name survived in the form el-Muṣawwās in the area of old Cairo (Ibn Duḥayk, iv, 53).


MUKHADRAM (A.), the term applied to an individual whose life fell within the periods of both paganism and Islam. Various explanations are given of the origin of the name. The term was coined from adel mukhadram (“cropped ear and say the meaning is that these people were cut off from the Dījihiliya by Islam (cf. nāṣa al-mukhadram “a she-camel with cropped ears”). It is said that the tribes who adopted Islam cropped the ears of their camels differently from what they had done in the pagan period. A man who had therefore seen both the pagan and Muslim styles was called mukhadram. Others derive the word from a’īd ṣaṣ’a “a well” which contains much water” and explain that a man who has lived in both Dījihiliya and Islam was called mukhadram, since he was fully acquainted with both periods. The term mukhadram is occasionally found with the same explanation and the application given is that the individuals had mixed paganism and Islam. Some commentators describe as mukhadama only those who adopted Islam after the death of Muhammad.

The word mukhadram is particularly used to describe one of the four classes into which the Arab philologists divided the poets, one of whose school was begun in the period of the Dījihiliya, but who lived to see Muhammad and his mission and some even adopted Islam. Among these for example were Lābit, al-ʾAṣḥāb and Kaʾb b. Zuhāir. These poets are still completely immersed in the poetic tradition of the Dījihiliya. The new outlook was late in finding its way into poetry so that the change is not yet reflected in the poets who were Muhammad’s contemporaries. The scheme of the kaṣīda of the pagan poetry with its fixed themes and stereotyped images also holds for the mukhadram and in their poems one can hardly find the slightest hint that they were contemporary with the great religious change in Arabia. The only exception is the kaṣīdas composed in honour of Muhammad like the kaṣīda of Kaʾb b. Zuhāir called after its opening words Rābat Sāḥib and the panegyric on the Prophet by al-ʾAṣḥāb. While these still follow the scheme of the kaṣīda as regards form they reflect Muhammadan points of view and legal ordinances and also use Kur’ānic phrases.


[HANS LICHTENSTADTER]

MUKHLIS AL-DAWLA. [See AL-MUKHALLAD.] AL-MUKHTAR b. Abū ’l-Ṣaad al-Ṭaḥafi, a Shīʿa agitator who seized possession of Kāfa b. Abū Ṭālib (684—685). The clan or Tribe to which he belonged was the same as that of the poet Umayya b. Abū l-Ṣalt [q.v.] and another poet, Abū
Mihdjan, was his second cousin (al-Mukhtār’s grandfather father Mas’ud being the son of Amr b. ‘Umar b. ‘Awf; cf. Wustenfeld, *Gew. Tab.*, G. 19). He is said to have been born in 662 (Tabari, i. 1264) as a statement which has perhaps no real foundation (cf. Taghibi, ii. 2: in 40, he was a “young man”, *zhālim ṣūdāb*) and based on the fact that his adversary ʿAbd Allah b. al-Zubair was born in the same year. His father having died the death of a hero at the battle of the Bridge in 13 against the Persians, the orphan was brought up by his uncle Sa’d b. Mas’ud who became governor of al-Mada’in under the caliph ʿAli. Al-Mukhtār was his deputy when Sa’d left al-Mada’in to go after the Khaṭirjīs who had left ‘Ali’s camp in 37 (Tabari i. 3366; al-Dinawari, p. 218). His early life and his family traditions therefore made him a partisan of ‘Ali: al-Tabari (I 2) however says that when ‘Ali’s son al-Husain took refuge with al-Mukhtār’s uncle when fleeing from Mu’awiyah in 40, the nephew proposed to surrender him to his rival and he was reproached with this disloyal act 25 years afterwards by the Shi’is. This is all we know of the early days of one who was destined to become the champion of the extreme Shi’is: his refusal to bear witness before Ziyād b. Abihi against Ḥudayn b. ‘Adī who was accused of having attempted an anti-Umayyad rising at Kufa in 51 (Tabari, i. 134), shows however that his feelings were already pro-ʿAlid. It is only when, after the death of Mu’awiyah, the hopes of the partisans of ‘Ali’s family began to rise again, that al-Mukhtār emerges from obscurity; he took part in the rising of Musilim b. Ḥakim in 61, imprisoned by the governor ʿAbd Allah b. Ziyād, he was only released after the failure of al-Husain’s attempt and returned to Mecca, where ʿAbd Allah b. al-Zubair was secretly engaged in preparing the movement which was to take him to the head of the anti-Umayyad rising. It is alleged that al-Mukhtār, after vainly trying to compromise Ibn al-Zubair prematurely, disappeared from Mecca for a whole year which he spent in his native town of al-Ṭif. It was no doubt in this period that the ideas ripened in him which made him the initiator and leader in a new political and religious phase of the Shi’a movement: but of the way in which his ideas came to him, their immediate origin and the influences which went to form them, history unfortunately knows nothing.

In any case, al-Mukhtār returned to al-Zubair, who had in the meanwhile been publicly recognised as caliph, and fought bravely at the first siege of Mecca in 64. But his adhesion to the cause of Ibn al-Zubair had no other object than to enable him to return to Kufa which was then under the anti-Umayyad caliph. According to one source which is in contradiction to Tabari, al-Mukhtār was sent by al-Zubair himself to the capital of the ‘Iraq to take charge of its administration, having promised him the support of the ʿAlid party (al-Masʿūd, *Murād*, v. 70); it seems more probable that, as Tabari says, he went there of his own accord to carry out his plans.

The Shi’is of Kufa were at this time (Ramanlī, 64) under the influence of Sulaimān b ʿIṣār (q.v.). Al-Mukhtār did not wish to join his party and began propaganda of his own, saying that he was the emissary of Muhammad, son of ‘Ali called Ibn al-Ḥanafīya from the name of his mother’s tribe

[cf. MUHAMMAD b. AL-ḤANAFĪYA]. The motive—which gave al-Mukhtār the idea that he could pass off as the legitimate successor to the right-of-ʿAli, this son, who was not born of Fatimah, the daughter of the Prophet, have not been fully explained: but as the other children of ʿAli who had escaped the massacre of Kerbelā were quite incapable, al-Mukhtār’s choice was limited. In any case, his fiery and peculiar eloquence (he pronounced his discourses in *sudūr* with obscure phrases and expressions which recalled the Ḥurān, without being a slavish imitation of it; he also said or allowed it to be said of him that he was inspired by the angel Gabriel) was able to gain partisans for the idea of the Mahdi whose imminent coming would restore the rule of the true religion. Without being yet openly hostile to the rule of Ibn al-Zubair, al-Mukhtār’s attitude was suspected. He was therefore imprisoned by the Zubairid governor ʿAbd Allah b. ʿYazid al-Anṣārī but his captivity was not rigorous and enabled him to remain in contact with the people of Kufa. After the defeat and death of Sulaimān b. ʿUthayb, which he had predicted, he was set at liberty on guaranteeing he would not fight against the Zubairid government. Al-Mukhtār took advantage of the liberty restored to him to secure the cooperation of Ibn b. al-Ashtar, son of ʿAli’s famous general, who kept up his father’s traditions. The latter hesitated long before accepting al-Mukhtār’s proposals and only agreed on receiving a letter, undoubtedly a forgery, in which Ibn al-Ḥanafīya introduced al-Mukhtār to him as his plenipotentiary (ʿawālī) and minister (ʿaṣir). The rising then began (14 Rabi‘ I 667): the resistance of the chiefs of the tribes (the *āṣrāf*), who while opposed to the Umayyads and former fighters by the side of ʿAli, had long lost their enthusiasm for the cause of his family, was overcome by the onslaught of the troops, composed for the most part of adventurers and *maṣūlī* led by Ibn al-Ashtar, a most capable warrior. The Zubairid governor fled (he was at this time ʿAbd Allah b. Mu‘āwīya al-Kurāshī), the Aṣṣārīs capitulated and al-Mukhtār, undisputed lord of Kufa, rapidly extended his power over Mesopotamia and the eastern provinces, to which he at once appointed governors: the south alone, with Bāṣra, remained to Ibn al-Zubair. Al-Mukhtār had naturally to give the Aṣṣārīs positions of authority in his organisation but he could not completely gain their confidence. Although old, partisans of ʿAli, or sons of partisans, they were moderate who distrusted al-Mukhtār as an extremist and demagogue: indeed, the favour which the latter showed to the *maṣūlī*, who formed his real support, threatened to overthrow the system on which the political and economic supremacy of the Arabs over the native population was based, for not even the conversion of the latter to Islam had made them equal to their conquerors. Al-Mukhtār therefore was faced with the necessity of deciding for one or other. He preferred the *maṣūlī* party, probably more from genuine conviction than for political reasons: he must have believed that the triumph of the Mahdi whom he had foretold would make all believers equal without distinction of race. During the camps of the army which had gone under Ibn al-Ashtar to fight ʿAbd al-Malik’s troops, the Aṣṣārīs made an attempt to overthrow al-Mukhtār who was forced to temporise with them; but succeeding in informing Ibn al-
Mukhtar of his difficulty, the latter returned to Kufa and completely routed the enemies of Mukhtar. This was the signal for putting into execution the latter's full Shi'a programme; all those who had taken part in the murder of al-Jussain, or had neglected to defend him, were put to death. This bloody deed seemed to have divine approval, for two days later the Syrian army which had set out for the Iraqi was completely routed on the banks of the Khabur by Ibn al-Mukhtar, and its leader 'Ubayd Allah b. Ziyad, who had defeated and killed al-Jussain, was killed in the battle (Muhamara 67). In the fanatical enthusiasm of these days in which the Shi'a cause seemed to have won a definite success, there took place episodes of great religious interest although unfortunately not yet clearly explained, notably the worship of the empty chair (Tabari, ii. 702—706; cf. al-Mubarrad, al-Kamal, ed. Wright, p. 597-600).

But in spite of his successes at home and abroad, al-Mukhtar was threatened by the presence in Iranshahr of the brother of 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair, Mu'ayyab, whose army, organised by al-Muhallab b. Abi Sufra, hardened in the war with the Kharijs and strengthened by the accession of the Kufan Ashraf who had left the town, was one to be feared. Indeed, it was these forces which mentioned to al-Madjar on the Tigris: 'A little later at Harura', they suffered a complete rout, mainly because of the absence of Ibn al-Mukhtar who was in the north at al-Nawami and whom al-Mukhtar either through distrust of him or through excess of confidence in himself had neglected to recall. Al-Mukhtar who had taken refuge in the citadel of Kufa held out there valiantly for four months. Finally abandoned by most of his men, he was slain in a desperate sortie (Kamadan 14, 67). His body was mutilated, his hand suspended at the gate of the great mosque and it was only taken down many years later by al-Haqqi; one of his wives, who would not disown him, was executed in brutal fashion, although she was the daughter of al-Nu'man b. Bashir al-Ansari, who had been governor of Kufa under Mu'awiyah. A great many of al-Mukhtar's followers were also massacred.

The nature of the movement led by al-Mukhtar has been variously judged by modern historians. The historical tradition which grew up in Kufa, especially in the milieu of the Ashraf, is naturally hostile and regards him as an adventurer and false prophet. His conduct was undoubtedly somewhat crooked occasionally; the way in which he exploited the name of Ibn al-Hanafiya (who never wished to be completely compromised in the business of the Mahdi) was not quite fair. But neither these doings nor his double dealing with regard to the Ashraf (they paid him back however only too well) are sufficient to convict him of bad faith. They were tactical expedients which every one who wants to stir the masses is justified in employing for the triumph of his cause. It seems certain that al-Mukhtar sincerely believed in his mission, and his equilibrating ideas about the mawali, although premature, were, as the future was to show, the only ones which could secure to Islam its later expansion and transform it from the exclusively Arab movement it was at first into a world-wide civilization. What is still and will remain mysterious in the personality of al-Mukhtar (Wellhausen rightly observes that "demonic" natures like his are always problematic), is the manner in which he arrived (no doubt through a crisis within himself) at the religious and eschatological conception of the Shi'a of which he was the creator and which is infinitely greater than the expiatory sacrifice of the tasawwur of Sulaiman b. Suraq. It is owing to this conception that the importance of the movement started by al-Mukhtar is far greater than the ephemeral political success which he enjoyed; in the popular enthusiasm which welcomed his propaganda we see the germ of the ideas which transformed the Shi'a from a political movement to a religious doctrine. In what measure these ideas were in existence before al-Mukhtar, in what relation they stood to that enigmatic personage "Abd Allah b. Saba' and his disciples are points that are still obscure. But if he was not the inventor of the doctrine of the Mahdi, it was undoubtedly he who in locating in a real person, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya, the mystical figure of the Messiah, the restorer of the true religion, gave it the stamp which was henceforth typical of Imami doctrines.

The name Mukhtar is borne by one of the many Shi'a subdivisions given in the lists of the writers on heresies; but it is doubtful if it ever had a real existence as an organised sect, especially as the various sources which mention it (Kufan Ashraf; Khaibariya [q.v.]; the Kašāniya [q.v.]) seem very likely to be the legitimate successors of the teachings of al-Mukhtar.

Bibliography: The principal and almost the only source for the history of al-Mukhtar is al-Tabari (ed. de Goeje), ii. 530—532 and passim, which is based for the most part on the statements of eye-witnesses of the events. The secondary sources add practically nothing new; they are quoted in Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, a. 64 §§ 13, 65 §§ 6, 66 §§ 5—7, 9—12, 67 §§ 2, 4, 42 (a few details also in the biography of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya in Ibn Sa'd, v. 71—77); H. D. van Gelder, Mu'awija de valtige Profeet, Leyden 1885; J. Wellhausen, Die religiösen Oppositionsparteien im Islam (W. Gitt, N. S., v. 2, 1901), p. 74—89. Cf. also the bibliography given in the articles Kashiya and Khaibariya (add al-Nawakhibi, Firaq al-Shi’a, ed. Ritter [Gibil Islamica, iv. 1931], p. 20—30). (G. Levi Della Vida) Mukhtar Pasha, Chāhāz Ahmād, a Turkish general and statesman, was born in Sept. 1832, the son of a high official in Brussa, and received a military training there and in Constantinople (officer in 1854). He took part in the Crimean War, from 1860 taught in the Mektebi Harbiye as professor of the art of war and in 1865 was tutor to the prince Yusuf 'ezz al-Din. After holding a command in Albania (1867—1870) he distinguished himself under Reşid Pasha in the Vayam campaign, the conduct of which he took over in 1871 as General of Division and Pasha. On his return he was given the title of mukhtar. In the Herzegovina he was defeated in 1876 at the Duga Pass. After the declaration of war by Russia (April 24, 1877) he was given the supreme command on the Caucasus front, where after at first having to retire to Kopruko, he counterattacked at Daesar (June 21) and Zinzin (June 25) and forced the Russians under the Armenian generals Loris-Melikoff and Ter-Hugassoff, to evacuate Ottoman territory and occupied Sukhum.
Successes in August on the Yaghni Dagh and at Kifl-Tepe (near Bash Gidikler) earned him the title of honour of Gazi [q. v.] but did not prevent the collapse of the army in Oct.—Nov. [cf. DERE BOUYS, KARS AND ERZURUM]. Appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Artillery, he restored peace in Crete in 1878; in 1879—1885 he served as commissioner on the Greek frontier. As a result of the Anglo-Turkish agreement of Oct. 24, 1885, he became the first High Commissioner of the Porte in Egypt. He held the post till 1906 and playing a part in the Taba affair. In this period he busied himself with the question of reforming the calendar; he advocated a uniform Hijri solar year for all Muslims (see BAH).

From Dec. 1908 Vice-President of the Ottoman Senate, he proposed in the National Assembly of April 27, 1909 to give prince Reshid the name Muhamed V in memory of the first conqueror (Fatih) of Constantinople [see MUHAMMAD II] (communication of Abd al-Rahman Shafeef to Martin Hartmann); he himself led the deputation which announced his accession as Sultan-Caliph and brought him to the War Ministry to receive the traditional allegiance [cf. BAH]. On Oct. 14, 1911 he succeeded Said Pasha as President of the Senate and on July 22, 1912 as grand-vizier in the cabinet of the “Great Ones” (Bayilik). Under pressure from the association of old-Turkish officers (Kislakchiler) he persuaded the Senate on Aug. 4 by a bold interpretation of the constitution to declare the session of Parliament closed. He endeavoured to free the army and civil service from politics, obtained an amnesty for Arabia, recalled Ahmad Iszet Pasha from the Yaman, instituted the Naval Medal and Medal of the Red Cresent, obtained favourable terms in the treaty of peace with Italy (Oct. 18, 1912) but could not avert the catastrophe in the Balkan War. On Oct. 29, 1912 he retired in favour of Kaim Pasha, but remained a member of the Senate till 1918, in which on Feb. 12, 1917 he advocated the adoption of the Gregorian calendar and rejection of the Christian reckoning for the financial year. He died on Jan. 21, 1919. Muhamed Muktar Pasha is his son.


MUKHTAR I, SIRKI AL-DIN UMHAN B MUHAMMAD AL-MUKHTAR AL-GHAYNAWI, COURT POET OF THE LATER GHANNAWIDS IBRAHIM II, MADUDD II (1059—1099) AND MADUDD III, IBRAHIM (1099—1114). He lived for a considerable period in Kirman, where he wrote panegyrics on the Saljuk Arsalan-Shah b. Kirmanshah (1101—1141). The great poet Mugd al-Din Sanai showed him the greatest reverence and celebrated him in a long 12ads as the best poet of his time. He could not have been Sanai’s teacher, as the Bankiipo Catalogue (13) says, since he must have been only a year or two older than Sanai. His influence however is quite marked in many of Sanai’s works. One of Muktar’s philosophical 12ads may be regarded as the one of the finest examples of the old Persian school of poetry since mazra on it were written by the best poets such as Khajani, Amir Khusrav, Ahi-i Afsakan, Abd al-Rahman Damai and Nawati. His chief work is a large Divan of lyrics, the majority of which are panegyrics in the style of the old Ghaznawi poets like ‘Unyar and Farrukhi, and dedicated to Ar-Ras-Subh, Bahram-Shah, Mudal-Dawla Bahrum, Tamlagh-Shah and a number of viziers. Besides these 12ads there were in the Divan a few short mumtadads, one of which of an astronomical nature seems to have had a great influence on later poetry. We should probably also ascribe to our poet the authorship of the Shahriyar-Nawa, an imitation of the Shahriyar-Nawa, the hero of which is Shahriyar; son of Barzan of Suhrab, i.e. a great-grandson of Rustam, and the action of which is laid in India. The poem is dedicated to Mas‘ud III; in the preface the poet says that he has worked at it for three years and hoped for a present worthy of his labour. If he does not receive this gift however, he will not write a satire this seems to be a direct reference to Firdawsi. The year of Muktar’s death is not exactly known, 590 (1193), 544 (1149) and 554 (1153) are mentioned. The last date seems to be the right one. Bibliography: H. Ethé, Noursese Literatur (Gr. I. P., ii. 234, 250—257); Dastvah, p. 93; Madina al-Farsakhi, i. 598—607. A manuscript of the Shahriyar-Nawa in Rieu, ii. 342. (E. BERTHELS)

AL-MUKHTAR. [See ALI, II.]

MUKRA, A DISTRICT AND VILLAGE IN THE YAMAN, A DAY’S JOURNEY SOUTH OF SAN‘. The Arab geographers mention a cornelian mine here. The name is also given to a mountain in the Yaman Sarif According to Sprenger, we cannot connect the Hunyad tribe of this name with the Mycrina of Ptolemy.


MUQTA’ADAB, NAME OF THE THIRTEENTH METRE IN ARABIC PROSODY, VERY LITTLE USED: in theory it consists of three feet, with two successive mustafidun, in each hemistich; but in practice it has only two.

There is one arad and one darb: mas’afidun mustafidun: mas’afidun mustafidun. However, mas’afidun should lose its f (mas’afidun = falsadun) or change its s to l, which is very frequent (mas’afidun = falsadun).

Mustafidun can never retain its f (mustafidun = mustafidun).

(Mohl. Benchmark)

AL-MUKTA’I B. ALI, ‘Ali, ABBASID CALIPH. His father was a son of the caliph al-Kahim and his mother an Armenian slave girl named ‘Urdujan. After the death of his grandfather al-Kahim in Shahban 467 (April 1075), al-Mukta’i succeeded him as caliph. The real ruler was the Saljuk Sultan Malikshah [q. v.] to whose daughter al-Mukta’i was married in 480 (1087). By 482 (1089) however, she had returned to her father because
she was neglected by the caliph. Malikshāh, who wished to prevent the caliph interfering in affairs of state, endeavoured to induce him to leave Baghdad and take up his residence in another town. This plan however came to nothing when he left the city of Salahuddin in 485 (Nov. 1092) and al-Mukātī was left in peace in the capital. About this time the power of the Saljuqids reached its greatest height and in all the lands conquered by them the spiritual supremacy of the caliph was recognised. Al-Mukātī died suddenly on 15th or 19th Muḥarram 487 (4th or 8th Feb. 1094) at the age of 38. He was perhaps poisoned by Malikshāh's son and successor, Barkiyotkūt [q.v.] whom he had offended by confirming the selection of his minor brother Muḥammad as sultan.


K. V. ZETTERSTEN

AL-MUKTĀDIR. [See ALLAH, II.]

AL-MUKTĀDIR, B. ʿABBĀSĪD caliph, son of al-Muʿtādī and a slave named Shaghāb. After the death of his brother al-Muktafi in Dhu ʿl-Kaʿda 295 (Aug. 908), al-Muktafi was only 13 at the time was proclaimed caliph. Many however preferred Abū Allāh, son of the caliph al-Mutazz, and after the murder of the vizier Abū-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥasan b. Abū ʿAbbās [q.v.], al-Muktafi was declared to be deposed and Ibn al-Mutazz elected caliph. The emir Muʿnis [q.v.] came forward to save al-Muktafi; Ibn al-Mutazz was slain and al-Muktafi retained the caliphate. He showed very little independence however and allowed himself to be guided, sometimes by the personnel of the harem and sometimes by the viziers among whom special mention may be made of the intriguing Ibn al-Furāṭ [q.v.] and the brave Ibn al-Dārraj [q.v.]. Al-Muktafi's caliphate was therefore marked by a gradual decline. In his reign the dynasties of the Fāṭimids [q.v.] and Ḥāmidīs [q.v.] became independent. The Karmājains also rebelled once more. In the years 307 (919–920) and 311 (923) Baṣra was plundered by the Karmājain chief Abū Ţahir Sulaimān [cf. AL-ĪJĀNĀHĪ] and at the end of the year 311 (924) he fell upon the pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca. In Dhu ʿl-Kaʿda of the following year (925) he attacked the caravan which was going on pilgrimage to Mecca from Baghda and put it to flight. He next plundered al-Kaʿba and then returned to Baḥrān. An army sent against the Karmājains under the command of Muʿnis arrived only after they had retired. In 314 (926–927) Yūsuf b. Abū ʿl-Sādī was summoned from Abharbadādīn to help, but Sulaimān defeated him in Shawwāl of the following year (Dec. 927) and took him prisoner. The caliph's troops did not dare to give battle and in Muḥarram 316 (March 928) Sulaimān seized the town of al-Ḥabba. After an unsuccessful attack on al-Raʾka he retired; in 317 (929–930), or, according to others, in 316, he plundered Mecca and carried off the Black Stone.

On the Byzantine frontier both sides continued their raids with varying fortunes. In 305 (917) the Byzantines made an offer of peace and after two years peace was definitely concluded, but hostilities very soon broke out again. In 314 (926–927) the Byzantines ravaged the district of Malaya and in the following year they crossed a considerable part of Armenia. After taking several Armenian cities which belonged to the Arabs (316 = 928–929) and occupying northern Mesopotamia (317 = 929–930) they lost all their gains in 319–320 (= 931–932) In Muḥarram 317 (Feb. 929) a rebellion broke out in the capital. Al-Muktafi was forced to abdicate but was brought to a place of safety by Muʿnis, while the soldiery plundered the palace. His brother Muḥammad was summoned to be Commander of the Faithful in his stead with the style al-Kāhir; but since the chief leader of the rebels, the head of police Nūzuk, could not satisfy the demands of the troops for higher pay, al-Kāhir was deposed after a few days and al-Muktafi placed on the throne once more. In Baghdad the confusion increased and in 320 (932) the catastrophe came. The enemies of Muʿnis took advantage of his absence to persuade the caliph that Muʿnis intended to dethrone him and when Muʿnis approached at the head of his army, al-Muktafi was persuaded with great reluctance to take the field against him; he fell at the beginning of the encounter (27th Shawwāl 320 = Oct. 31, 932). See also the article MUḤAMMAD B. YĀKŪT.


K. V. ZETTERSTEN

AL-MUKTĀFĪ LI-ʾAMIʾ "LĀH, ABUʾʾABBĀSĪD AL-.MMUḤAMMAD, ʿABBĀSĪD caliph, born on 12th Rabiʿ II 489 (April 9, 1096), son of al-Muṣṭaḥir and a slave girl. After the deposition of his nephew al-Rashīd, al-Muktafi was acknowledged as caliph on the 8th Dhu ʿl-Hijja 530 (Sept. 17, 1136). While the Saljuqids were fighting among themselves, he did his best not only to maintain his independence, but also to extend his rule over the troops after the other in the Ṭrāk fell into his hands. In 543 (1148) a number of emirs announced their allegiance to Sultan Masʿūd and marched on Baghda but dispersed after several encounters with the caliph's troops. According to some sources, the same thing took place again next year. In Rajab 547 (Oct. 1152) Masʿūd died, and was succeeded by his nephew Malikshāh who was deposed in a few months and succeeded by his brother Muḥammad. In the meanwhile the caliph seized the two towns of al-Hilla and Wāṣit. In the following year Sultan Sandjar who lived in Khurāsān was attacked and taken prisoner by the rebel Ghuzz [q.v.] whereupon his emirs proclaimed Masʿūd's
brother Sulaimān b. Sulṭān. In Muḥarram 551 (Feb.–March 1156) the latter was recognised by the caliph on condition that he did not interfere in the affairs of the Trig. Although al-Muqtatī supported him he was defeated in Djiindād I (June–July) of the same year by his nephew Muḥammad and the latter’s auxiliary. In Dhu l-Ḥijāda (Jan.–Feb. 1157) Sulṭān Muḥammad advanced on Baghdaḍ to take vengeance on the caliph. The latter had to retire to the eastern part of the town and was besieged there for several months. In Rabī‘ I 552 (May 1151) however, the Sulṭān suddenly raised the siege because Muḥakān was advancing on Hamdān. As the latter therefore retired, hostilities automati- cally ceased and Sulṭān Muḥammad in any case had made his peace with al-Muqtatī. The latter twice besieged Takrit in vain; on the other hand, he succeeded in taking Līfī. The Crusaders continued their hostilities in al-Muqtatī’s caliphate. The most powerful pillar of Islam was the Atabeg al-Mawṣil, ‘Imād al-Dīn Zangi, and his son Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad in Syria. Al-Muqtatī died on 2nd Rabī‘ I 553 (March 12, 1160).


(K. V. Zetterstéen)

Al-Muqtatī b. l'Imām, Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Āḥmad. Aḥṣāfī, the caliph, son of al-Muṭṭādīd and a Turkish slave girl named Čećek (Arabic Džiđak). In 281 (894–895) he was appointed by his father governor of al-Rayy and several towns in the neighbourhood, and five years later he was made governor of Mesopotamia and took up his quarters in al-Rakka. After the death of al-Muṭṭādīd on 22nd Rabī‘ II, 289 (April 5, 902), he ascended the throne and at once won the good-will of the people by his liberality and by destroying the subterranean dungeons in the capital. He proved a brave and fearless leader who fought with success against the many enemies of the caliphate. The Karminians were ravaging Syria; one town after another fell into their hands and Damascenes itself was plundered. On the 6th Muḥarram 291 (Nov. 29, 903) the general Muḥammad b. Sulaīmān finally succeeded in inflicting a crushing defeat on them and they scattered in all directions. Muḥammad then turned his attention to Egypt where he put an end to the rival of the Tāliūnīd. Many of their followers joined him and after the Tāliūnīd Hārūn b. Kūmāraḵwān had been slain, the capital had to surrender (Ṣafār 292 = Jan. 905) and ʿĪsā al-Nuḥārī was appointed governor of Egypt. An attempt to restore the Tāliūnīd was easily crushed (298 = 905–906). About this time the Karminians again began to be troublesome and at the beginning of the year 294 (Oct.–Nov. 906) they attacked the great pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca, massacred the men and carried off the women and children. In Rabī‘ I of the same year (Dec. 906–Jan. 907) they were defeated near al-Kadisa by the caliph’s troop under Waṣṣū ḫaṣaṭ. The war with the Byzantines was also vigorously pursued. In 291 (903–904) a Greek named Leo who had adopted Islam undertook a number of raids on the Greek coasts with his fleet of 54 ships. The Byzantines however had the advantage by land. In 292 (904–905) Waṣṣū ḫaṣaṭ, al-Maṣṣāṣ and Ṭarāṣṣūb were taken by the Greek general Andronicus and in the following year the Byzantines advanced as far as Ḥalab. Then the Muslims gained the upper hand and Andronicus went over to them. Al-Muqtatī died in Dhu l-Ka‘da 295 (Aug. 908) at the age of 31. cf. also the article Al-ʿAbbās b. al-Ḥasān b. Āḥmad.


(K. V. Zetterstéen)

Al-Muqtatān, Bahāʾ, Abū Dīn, a Druze missionary and author, with his teacher Ḥama (b. ʿAlt; q. v.) founder of the theological system of the Druzes [q. v.], the fifth minister of the Druze theogony, with several titles of honour, in addition to the above two: al-Djanāb, al-Asār, al-Tālī, al-Khayāl, al-Mukāsir etc. His "secular" name was Abu l-Ḥasān Ali b. Āḥmad al-Samīsī. Of his life practically nothing is known. As Arab historians are silent about him (Silvestre de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druzes, i, 320), his own writings are almost the only source. According to Druze tradition, he was killed in Arabia in al-Hākim’s time [q. v.]. (M. v. Oppenheim, Von Mittelmor zum Persischen Golf, i, Berlin 1839, p. 135). As his works reveal quite a good knowledge (not without misunderstandings) of Christian religion and literature, he may have been born a Christian, probably in Syria. Only for the period of his teaching do we have chronological exactness.

His ṭabīḥ of inveviture is dated on the 13th Shab‘an of the third year of ʿAmza’s mission i.e. 411 (1020). (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i, 474–475: ii, 309, 313; transl., ibid., ii, 297–309). The earliest of his known writings is of the tenth year of ʿAmza, 418 A.H. (ibid., ii, 326). In consequence one must assume that he came to the front after the disappearance of al-Hākim and ʿAmza. His activity was not a continuous one and he had even a time in concealment (about the year 17–18 of ʿAmza; see S. de Sacy, op. cit., ii, 364), whether in Egypt or Syria is not certain (H. Guy, La nation druze, p. 114). The latest date known in his writings is the 28th year of ʿAmza, i.e. 433–434 (1042). (S. de Sacy, op. cit., i, 496; ii, 379). His farewell epistle dates from this year; according to it he had retired into conceal- ment (ibid., i, 514–515; ii, 328) nothing more is known of him. The "Druze theogony" does not agree with these dates; it gives 17 years as the period of his activity (H. Guis, op. cit., p. 107). Ph. Hitti’s assertion (The Origins of the Druze People, p. 11) that he died in 1031 is due to a misunderstanding.

Druze tradition not unjustly ranks him with ʿAmza and regards him as the greatest theological writer, to whom four of the sacred books are ascribed (M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., i, 135–137). These are not books
in the proper sense but collections of separate tracts, usually in the form of epistles, directed to followers of the Druse teaching or of other creeds in various lands (Byzantium, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, India). They are to this day frequently read by the Druses in their khalawāt; commentaries were written on some of them by the last independent Druse theologian 'Abd Allāh al-Tanūkhī (d. 1480; on him see Ph. Hitti, op. cit., p. 53, 71; M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., i. 137). Of the some 110 Druse treatises so far known in Europe, 70 are ascribed by S. de Sacy to al-Mukțānā (op. cit., i. 484 and 496). Except for a few short texts published by S. de Sacy along with other writings of Hamburgher and few have been printed, namely the Kitāb al-Baḍ' by Chr. Seybold (s. Bibl.) and al-Risālat al-Mukṭānātīyya, sent in 1025 to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VIII., by J. Khalil and L. Ronzevalle (s. Bibl. and extracts in Hitti, op. cit., p. 64—67). Others are accessible only in translations and extracts (espec. in Silvestre de Sacy; al-Risālat al-Mashīja, a synopsis in Hitti, op. cit., p. 68—70). As with other Druse writers, the style is very obscure and artificial, frequently embellished with rhymed prose.

Silvestre de Sacy, whose book still is the most important collection of material, regards al-Mukțānā as "un enthousiaste de bonne foi" (op. cit., i. 508). It is highly desirable that some one should devote a special study to his life and work, paying particular attention to the authenticity of his works and to a critical edition of them.


**MULAJ.** [See Mawlā.]

**MULK **(A.), royal power, is used in the Kurān with reference to God and to certain pre-Islamic personages, who all appear in the Old Testament, and in the former case is synonymous with malakūt; the latter word however occurs only four times in the Kurān and always with a dependent genitive (*kull shā' or as-samawāt wa-l-ard*) while mulk is often used absolutely. To God alone belongs mulk. He has no associate therein; to Him belongs mulk over heaven and earth as well as over the judgment. He gives mulk to whom He will; the unbelievers have no share in it. Shaiṭān promised Adam imperishable mulk and tempted him with this promise to eat of the šajārat al-khulīd (Sūra xx. 118). Nimrud endeavours to claim for himself God's mulk against Ibrahim (ii. 260) but God gives mulk to the family of Ibrahim (iv. 57). Yūsuf thanks God in prayer for the mulk which He has given him (xxi. 102). Fir'awān boasts of his right to the mulk Miyr (xiii. 50); God wills to give Tālūt mulk over the recalcitrant Israelites and to send the tābir as a sign (ii. 248 sqq.). Dwīdā's mulk is mentioned in 252 and xxviii. 19 and Sulaimān's ii. 96; the latter prays for it (xxviii. 34).

That the conception of mulk was not carried over into Muslim law generally has been explained in the article MALK; an exception is Egypt during the Ayyūbīd period and in quite modern times. Cf. also the article TAṬIY and G. Richter, *Studien zur Geschichte der älteren arab. Fürstenpfigel* (Leipz. Sem. Studien, N. F., iii., 1932), esp. p. 6. (M. PLESSNER)

**MULTAN** is an ancient town of the Pandīb situated in 30° 13' N. and 71° 31' E., and has been known at various times as Khaṣṭpur, Hanspūr, Bāqpur, Sābūr or Sanābūr, and finally Multāshān, of which Multān is a corruption. This name is derived from that of the idol and temple of the sun, a shrine of vast wealth, which the Arabs, who plundered it, named dār al-ḥabāb, or the house of gold. It remained the Arab capital, and the outpost of Islam in India, for three centuries but by A.D. 900 its rulers had become independent of Baghdad. At this time it was seized by 'Abd Allāh the Kirmānī, and became a stronghold of the Kirmānī heretics, who were crushed and expelled by the orthodox Ṭahmās of Ghazān. The town and province remained nominally subject to his descendants until Khusrwā Malik, the last of the Khurasan, was carried into captivity by Mullāz al-Dīn Muḥāmmad b. Sām, when it became a province of his Indian empire. On his death the governor, Nāṣīr al-Dīn Kābāc, attempted to establish his independence of Dihlī, but Kaṭāb al-Dīn Aibak reduced him to obedience, and the province remained nominally subject to Dihlī from 1206 to 1438 when Shaikh Yūsuf Kūrašī became independent ruler of Multān and was followed by the kings of the Langāt tribe, who reigned until 1527. The town was occupied both by Timūr in 1397 and by Bābur in 1528.

The province was one of the jūbas of Akbar's empire, and remained nominally subject to his successors until 1752, when its allegiance was transferred to Kābul. It was threatened by the Sikhs as early as 1771, but was not annexed by them until 1818, when Ranjīt Singh took the city by storm. It was not affected by the first Sikh war, but the murder of two British officers by Mūlādī led to the second Sikh war, and the city was captured on January 3, 1849. Its fortifications were dismantled in 1854 and its garrison was disarmed in the mutiny of 1857.


(T. W. HAIG)

**MUMIN, title of sūr al-xve.** See also ALLĀH, II and IMĀM.

**AL-MUMINUN, title of sūr xxiii.**

**AL-MUMIT.** [See ALLĀH, II.]

**MUMKIN.** [See Makkā]

**AL-MUMTAHINA, title of sūr ix.**

**MUMTAZ, BAKRIBWUDAR B. MAHMUD TURKMAN FARĀHĪ, a Persian writer, a contemporary of the Ṣafawīd Sultan Ḥusain (1694—1722).** At an early age he left his native town of Farāh

The *Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.*
and went to Marw where he entered the service of the governor Aṣḥān Khān. After two years however, he left this post and became munshi with Hāvān Khān Khān Shāhī is Khāvbāsh in 1074. Aṣḥān Khān had asked him to his master’s house here he heard a story which attracted him exceedingly. He wrote it down and it became the foundation of a great collection, al-Maḥāsil, which contained about 400 stories and consisted of a maḥāsilama, eight bāb and a khitama. Soon afterwards he returned to Faṣāh, spent some time in Herāt and Meshhed and then entered the service of the emir Minūār Khān b. Karīmshāhī whose duty it was to defend ʿUmar and Khābūshān against raids by the wild nomad tribes. His stay there was disastrous for Mumtāz, since he lost all his goods and chattels and the valuable manuscript of his Maḥāsil Ādār during a nomad raid; he did not have another copy of it. He resolved however to restore the book and wrote all the stories that he could remember a second time thus arose the second version of the Maḥāsil, which consists of a maḥāsilama, five bāb and a khitama and has come down to us under the title Ḥālike al-Khitā. The book is written in an extravanegib artificial style. The khitāma is the best part; it contains the celebrated story of ʿAbī and Kanā, which is very common in Persia in a simplified form in many editions from the popular press.


MUMTĀZ MAHALL, wife of Shāh Ijāhān, and the lady for whom the Taz̢ Mahal [q.v.] was built. She was the daughter of Alam-Ḥasan Aṣ̢ Khān, who was Nār Ijāhān's brother. Her name was Aṣ̢umandān Bāītā, the name Mumtāz Mahall being conferred on her after Shāh Ijāhān's accession. She was his favourite wife and bore him fourteen children, seven of whom grew up. She was born in 1593, married in 1612, and died, at Burhanpur in the Deccan, very shortly after the birth of a daughter in 1631. She was beautiful and amiable, and Shāh Ijāhān loved her tenderly.

Bibliography: Khāāil Khān, Munawādī al-Labīb, i. 459; ʿAbī al-Ḥamīd ʿAbīrī, Badshāhānā, i. 384; Manucci, Storia de Mogor, translated by W. Irvine; Elhot-Dowson, vii. 27; Indian Magazine for December 1913, p. 316.

MUNADIJDM. [See Astrology.]

MUNADIJDM BASHI is the name by which the author of the most important general historical work written in Turkey is known. His real name was ʿAbd al-Rahmān, son of Lutf Allāh, a native of Ereğli near Konya. He was born in Selântik, in the first half of the xvith century, received a scholarly education and served in his youth for fifteen years in the Mewlewīkhâne of Kâsim Pasha under Shāhī Khalil Dele (Shāhī Khalil-dele, ii. 287). Afterwards he studied astronomy and astrology and became court astrologer (munadijdam bāshī) in 1075 (1667–1668). In 1086 (1675–1676) he was admitted to the intimate circle of Sultan Muhammad IV as naqāsh-pāshāsh. He was dismissed in Muharram 1099 (November 1687) and banished to Egypt. From here he went some years later to Mecca, where he became shākh of the Mewlewīkhâne. In 1105 (1693–1694) he was obliged to move to Medîna, where he lived for seven years. Soon after his return to Mecca he died there on the 29th of Ramdān 1113 (February 27th 1702) and was buried near the tomb of Khudājī.

Besides writing his historical work, Munadijdam Bashi displayed a considerable literary activity. Of his works are mentioned a tājīya on the Qur'an commentary of Bādawī, a commentary on the ʿAṣīd al-Aquīyā of al-Ḥanī, a Lūṭān-nama, a translation of the anecdotes of ʿUbadī Zākān, and a number of treatises on geometry, mysticism and music. His Turkish dizām also gives him a place in the ranks of Turkish mystical poets; his tājīyal was Ashābī.

The general history was written in Arabic under the title Dīnār al-Dustār, but although manuscript of the Arabic original exist (the Saymāt Khān Esat' of Ali Enver mentions two MSS, not mentioned by Bainger, vii. one in the library of the mosque of Selim II in Adrianople and the other in the imperial palace, in the library of Alādīl III), it is much better known in the Turkish translation made by the poet Nedin [q.v.] in the xvith century under the title Shāhī al-Kāmkār (printed in three volumes in Constantinople in 1285). It is a world history, arranged, after the fashion of similar Arabic works, according to dynasties, with a main division into three parts: the first treating of the history of Muhammad, the second the non-Muslim dynasties and the third the Muslim dynasties.

In the introductory chapters the author cites numerous sources, not a few of which are lost in the original. Therefore the work has a special value for the knowledge of many smaller dynasties and for this reason it has been especially used by E. Sachau for Ein Verzeichnis musulmankanischen Parnastikus, in St. Pr. Ak. W., Berlin 1925 (cf. the introduction). The last dynasty treated is that of the Ottoman Sultan; it is proportionately longer and more detailed than the history of the other Muslim dynasties and based on several imperfectly known sources; the last part, which ends in 1089 (1678), gives contemporary history. The Turkish translation of Nedin is very readable and not composed in the high-flown literary style that prevailed in his period. For this reason it is especially praised and represented in Ehrziyya Tewfik's Nöümence Edebiyati Ünümnesi, Constantinople 1330.

Bibliography: F. Bainger, O. G. H., and the sources mentioned there.

MUNADIJDM BASHI (J. H. KRAMERS)

AL-MUNAFIKUN (n.), the term applied in the Kurān to those Medīnine upon whose fidelity and zeal Muḥammad could not absolutely rely. The Arabs (e.g. Muḥarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 153) derive the word from mānafika ("one of the entrances to the hole of a fieldmouse"), but it is certainly the borrowed Ethiopic manīfek, "heretic" from naṣafa (= "split", naṣafa "to be divided, irresolute"). The meaning "waverer", "doubter" quite fits the usual use of the word in the Kurān, while the usual translation, "hypocrite" only suits a few passages. Another description of the same people in the Kurān is: "those in whose hearts there is sickness (weakness, doubt)", again in contrast to the unshakably firm believers. Sometimes (Is. 68
sp.; xxxii. 73; xviii. 6; lvii. 13) there are references to women of this type (muṣāfīkūn) in addition to the male muṣāfīkūn. A closer consideration of the passages in question shows we have not to think of a regular, rigidly defined party; sometimes the reference is to such Medinees as had only joined the Prophet under compulsion or reluctantly, and sometimes to those who had quite honestly joined him but had not been able to retain their belief and enthusiasm (ix. 67; lium. 3). Muhammad also on one occasion speaks of muṣāfīkūn among the Beduins. The first group found their leader in 'Abd Allah b. Ubaīy (4, v.) who would have been the chosen head of the Kala tribe, if a new and superior force, which he could not meet, had not opposed him in Muhammad. Nevertheless these grumblers, joined by other unreliable elements, were strong enough to cause the greatest embarrassment to the Prophet in critical moments e.g. before the battle of 'Uṣyad (iii. 160 sq.), in the War of the Ditch (xixi. 1, 12-14, 60, 73) and before the march on Tabāk (ix. 65-69, 74, 78), as he had always to be careful not to drive them over into the enemy's camp. It is no wonder then that his utterances about them are always made in a tone of great irritation. He describes them as hypocrites, who say something different from what they mean in their hearts (iii. 161; xiii. 1), in their irresolution they join, according to their view of the future, sometimes the Muslims and sometimes the enemy (iv. 137-142; v. 57); if it goes badly with the believers, they think that their religion has deceived them (viii. 51). When they are together among themselves they revenge themselves for the restraint which they must put upon themselves by malicious remarks about the Prophet and his revelations, but are in great anxiety, lest Allah may communicate their secret conversations (ix. 65 sqq.; x. 79, 125 sqq.). They are indolent at prayer (iv. 141), refuse to take part in the lighting or to contribute from their means (xvii. 22, 31; lvii. 1 sq.; lium. 71; cf. iv. 40 sqq.); they grow for a weakening of his power so that the more worthy may exel the meaner (ix. 8). As representatives of the true Meccan aristocracy, their attitude and eloquence made a certain impression on the Prophet but on closer examination they are nothing but "propped timber" (lium. 4). In a word, they are no better than the unbelievers. God makes them err (iv. 50 sqq.) and their abode shall be hellfire (ix. 74; lvii. 13 sqq.). We cannot help feeling in some ways a certain sympathy for these men who were deprived of their rights; but in the end they deserved their fate for their complete lack of ideas and courage at decisive moments and their conduct with regard to the Jews in Medina, whom they incited to resist Muhammad and then left in the lurch (cf. lv. 11), makes a very unfavourable impression. With the death of 'Abd Allah they lost their leader and their opposition was forced to be still stronger before the great successes of Muhammad's last years.

The word muṣāfīkīn remained however and like other Qur'anic terms was used in the fighting between the various parties as a term of abuse; cf. e.g. its application to Ibn Zubair (Tabari, ii. 467, 3) and his party (Ahwardi, Anonymous arab. Chronik, p. 73, 4).

In the Qur'an Sūra ixii. is called after the Muṣāfīkūn; it is connected by most commentators with the campaign against the Banū Muṣṭalik. Bibliography: Wellhausen, Röte arabischen Heidentums, p. 232; Noldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, p. 48 sq.; Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qur'āns, p. 58 sq., 167 sq., 209; Ibn Iḥṣān, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 411-413, 540 sq., 558-560, 651, 670, 688, 726, 734, 894. ('A. BuHl)

AL-MUNDIRI b. MUHAMMAD. [See UMAIYADS II.]

AL-MUNDIYAH, title of vāra livii, which is also called al-mudhli and al-mulīyya.

MUNGIR (MONGHY), the head-quarters of the Mungir District in Bihar and Oria in India, situated in 25° 25' N. and 86° 28' E. on the south bank of the Ganges. The population of the district in 1911 was 2,732,803, of whom 200,339 were Muhammadans. Muhammadan historians state that Balghitiyār Khālid was the first Muhammadan who conquered Mungir during his subjugation of Bihar about 595 (1198). Henceforth it became a place of military importance. In 1177 (1705) Nawwāb Mir Khāsim, the Nawwāb Šāhidār of Bengal, when he proposed to fight against the British made Mungir his military head-quarters. He founded here an arsenal under Gungīn (Gregory) Khāsin, his Armenian general. The gun-making industry for which the town is famous is said to date from the establishment of this arsenal.

Bibliography: Imperial Gazetteer of India, xvii. 401-403; J. Malley, Bengal District Gazetteers, Monghy, Calcutta 1909, xvii.

(M. ḤudaYIYAH HOSSAIN)

MŪNIS DEDE or DERVISH M İNE, OTTOMAN POET OF ADRIANOPEL. He belonged to the Mecnawi Order. He received his education from the famous Enis Dede (d. 1147 = 1734). He died in 1145 (1732) in Adrianopele, where he is buried.


(T. Z. MENZEL)

MŪNIS AL-MUZAFFAR, ABD-EL-lässAN, principal Abbāsid general from 906 to 931 (906-933), and latterly virtual dictator (usual attribution to him of muṣira al-kušērī seems to rest on passage — p. 347 — in Hûl al-'abī's Kitāb al-Muṣāfār [ed. Amedroz], where Nasr should be read for Muṣnīs), a eunuch (passage of Ibn Miskawah [ed. Amedroz and Margoulouth, i. 160] shows that Ḥādīm in this case does not mean merely freedman, as suggested by Massigaon, al-Ḥallaj, p. 205, No. 2), said to be al-Dhahabi, Tūrīkh al-islām (followed by Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Įuyboll, ii. 255) to have been 90 years old at death (though this age would seem incredibly great for a recently active commander), i.e., to have been born in 231 (845—846), and to have held the rank of amir for 60 years.

Muñis first appears (if passage of al-Ṭabarī, in. 1913, refers to him) as a ḡādīm of al-Muṣṭadīd (not yet caliph) in Zaādij [q. v.] campaign of 267 (880—881); and is mentioned as Chief of Police in caliph's camp in 287 (900). Al-Dhahabi (also Ibn Taghribirdi, loc. cit.) states, again, that he was banished to Mecca by al-Muṣṭadīd, to be recalled on accession of al-Muṣṭadīr [q. v.], and as Muñis is nowhere referred to during intervening reign of al-Muṣṭafii, the statement may be true. (If so, in al-Mas'ūdi's description, Muñis
al-Dhahab, ed. B. de Meynard, viii. 212, of al-Mu'tadid's death, for ābdūn read ābdūz, as in 'Arb, ed. de Goeje, p. 29).

Mu'nis owed his later eminence mainly to his leading the defence, in 296 (968), of the Hasant palace at Baghdād for al-Mu'āktār against the partisans of the latter's cousin, the pretender Ibn al-Mu'tazz [q. v.]. During the caliph's youth his gratitude and that of his powerful mother for this service assured Mu'nis's position; and though later al-Mu'āktār's favour turned to enmity, by that time Mu'nis's authority was hardly in need of support, owing chiefly to his almost invariably successful generalship. For though he undertook no very important campaigns, except perhaps the repulse of the Fātimid al-Mahdi [q. v.], in 207 (919–920) (for which he received the šaddāl al-Mu'āzẓf;fī; and the defence of Baghdād from the Karmaṭjīns [q. v.], in 215 (927–928), he was only once defeated — in 306 (918).

Mu'nis early fell out with the wazir Ibn al-Furāt [q. v.], repeatedly opposing him, till in 312 (924), on Ibn al-Furāt's third term of office, Mu'nis played a prominent part in securing his dismissal and execution. He now became all-powerful, being invariously consulted on the appointment of viziers and so controlling the government. Hence the change of al-Mu'āktār's affection to dislike, first signaled (315 = 927) in an abortive plot of the caliph's to murder him. In 316 Mu'nis lent himself to al-Mu'āktār's deposition in favour of his half-brother al-Kāhir [q. v.]. He almost immediately restored him, however, thereby becoming more absolutely his master than ever. Al-Mu'āktār eventually deposed Mu'nis (319 = 931), who thereupon left Baghdād. Next year, however, having meanwhile collected a strong force, he marched on the capital intending to reimpose his authority. He duly defeated the caliph's army outside the walls, but al-Mu'āktār himself was killed on the field.

Mu'nis now restored al-Kāhir. But by resuming his dictatorial ways he soon so alienated him that he was obliged in self-defence to keep the new caliph a prisoner in the palace. He even contemplated deposing him. Al-Kāhir, however, succeeded in urging Mu'nis, together with his chief supporters, into the palace, where he shortly had them executed in Shābān 321 (August 933).

Mu'nis's influence was on the whole exerted for good: but he was neither strong nor intelligent enough to prevent the decline of the caliphate. His example of depriving the caliph of real power was pernicious. It was to be followed all too soon by the series of adventurers, who, with the style of amīr al-amārā' [q. v.], were to dominate al-Kāhir's successors.


MUNKAR WA-NAKĪR (the forms with the article are also found), the names of the two angels who examine and if necessary punish the dead in their tombs. To the examination in the tomb the infidels and the faithful — the righteous as well as the sinners — are liable. They are set upright in their tombs and must state their opinion regarding Muḥammad. The righteous faithful will answer, that he is the Apostle of Allah; thereupon they will be left alone till the Day of Resurrection. The sinners and the infidels, on the other hand, will have no satisfactory answer at hand. In consequence of this the angels will beat them severely, as long as it will please Allah, according to some authorities till the Day of Resurrection, except on Fridays.

In some sources a distinction is made between the punishment and the pressure (jaūdha) in the tomb, the righteous faithful being exempt from the former, not from the latter, whereas the infidels and the sinners suffer punishment as well as pressure (Abu 'l-Mu'in Maimūn b. Muḥammad al-Nasafi), as cited in the commentary on the Waṣyīyat Abī Ḥanīfah, Haidarābād 1321, p. 22).

The punishment in the tomb is not plainly mentioned in the Kur'ān. Allusions to the idea can be found in several passages, e.g. sūra xviii. 29: "But when the angels, causing them to die, shall smite them on their faces and backs"; sūra vi. 93: "But what you see of them will be in the showers of fire, and the angels reach forth their hands, saying, Vindict your souls: this day shall ye be recompensed with a humiliating punishment"; sūra viii. 52: "And if thou wert to see when the angels take the life of the unbelievers; they smite their faces and their backs, and taste ye the torture of burning" (cf. further sūra ix. 102; xxiii. 21; lii. 47).

The punishment of the tomb is very frequently mentioned in Tradition (see Bibliography), often, however, without the mention of angels. In the latter group of traditions it is simply said, that the dead are punished in their tombs, or why, e.g. on account of special sins they have committed, or on account of the wailing of the living.

The names of Munkar and Nakir do not appear in the Kur'ān, and, so far as I can see, only in canonical Tradition (Tirmidī, Bānū 'Abd Allāh, bāb 70). Apparently these names do not belong to the old stock of traditions. Moreover, in some traditions one anonymous angel only is mentioned as the angel who interrogates and punishes the dead (Muslim, Imām, trad. 163; Abū Dawūd, Sunna, bāb 39b; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 233; 346; iv. 150; Tāyālīsī, No. 753).

So there seem to be four stages in the traditions regarding this subject: the first without any angel being mentioned, the second mentioning "the" angel, the third two angels, the fourth being acquainted with the names Munkar and Nakir.

This state of things as reflected in hadīth finds a similar reflex in the early forms of the creed. In the Fīh Akhārī, which may date from the middle of the viiiith century A.D., the punishment of the tomb appears as the only eschatological representation (art. 10). In the Waṣyīyat Abī Ḥanīfah, which may represent the orthodox views of the middle of the viiith century, we find, apart from an elaborate eschatology, the two following articles (arts. 18, 19): .We confess, that the punishment in the tomb shall without fail take place. We confess, that the view of the traditions on the subject, the interrogation by Munkar and Nakir is a reality". The term "reality" is apparently intended to oppose the
allegorical interpretation of eschatological representations as taught by the Mu'tazili.

The *Fiṣḥ Abkar* it., which may represent the new orthodoxy of the middle of the 6th century A. D., is still more elaborate on this point (art. 237):

"The interregnum of the dead in the tomb by Munkar and Nākîr is a reality and the reunion of the body with the spirit in the tomb is a reality. The pressure and the punishment in the tomb are a reality that will take place in the case of all the infidels, and a reality that may take place in the case of some sinners to the faithful".

In the later credos and works on dogmatism the punishment and the interrogation in the tomb by Munkar and Nākîr are expressed in simular ways. The Karramiya [q. v.] taught the identity of Munkar and Nākîr with the two guardian angels who accompany man (Abd al-Kair al-Baghda'di, Qâ'id al-Din, Stamboul 1258, p. 246). Ghazâli admits the idea that eschatological representations are a reality that takes place in the malakî, the soul.

The origin of the names is uncertain; the meaning "disliked" seems doubtful. The order of the examination and the punishment of the dead in their tombs is found among other peoples also. The details to be found in Jewish sources (̣ihbît ḥak-khîb) are strikingly parallel to the Muslim ones.


(A. J. Wensinck)

**Munsarîh**, the name of the tenth metre in Arabic prosody; it has three feet to the hemistich. It has three ʿarûd and four ḏâr:

1st ʿarûd:

\[
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûtna mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûtna mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûtna mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûtna} \\
\]

2nd ʿarûd:

\[
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn} \\
\]

3rd ʿarûd:

\[
\text{mustafâlûn mafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn mustafâlûn} \\
\text{mustafâlûn} \\
\]

We rarely find *mustafâlûn* in the ḏâr of the first ʿarûd. The second ḏâr of the first ʿarûd is not indicated by al-Khalili b. Ahmad but Ibn Barn notes it was much used by the muwâllid poets, among them Ibn al-Ramî. It may be noted that the second and third ʿarûd are regarded as belonging to the ṭafṣr metre.

*Mustafâlûn* may lose: 1. its ʾ and four ʿarûd except when used as the first ḏâr in the first ʿarûd; 2. its ʾ and the foot becomes (mustafâlûn = mafâlûn); 3. its ʾ and ʿarûd at the same time (which is very bad) and the foot becomes (mustafâlûn = fâlîtna). This last change could not be undergone by the first ʿarûd.

*Mafâlûtna* loses 1. its ʾ, which is very bad and the foot becomes (mâfâlûtna = mafâlûn); 2. its ʾ and the foot becomes (mâfâlûtna = fâlîtna).

3. its ʾ and ʿarûd at the same time which is very bad and we have (mâfâlûtna = fâlîtna). Mafâlûtna and mafâlûtna may lose their ʾ and become (mâfâlûtna = fâlûtna) and (mâfâlûtna = fâlûtna). (Moh. Ben Chezir)

**Munshî.** [See *Inshâ*]

**Munṣîf.** (A., part. active iv. of *nufr*, "to be just, to act with justice"); the title of a native judge of the lowest grade in India.


**Al-Muntâfik**, a section of the Arabic tribe of the Baṇî ʿUkail, which in turn is a subdivision of the great group of the ʿAmir b. ʿSaʿîda [q. v.]. Genealogy: al-Muntâfik b. ʿAmir b. ʿUkail (Wustenfeld, *Gen. Tab.*, D. 19). The very scanty information in Wustenfeld can be supplemented by the notice which Ibn al-Kalbi gives of the Banu ʿl-Muntâfik (Djarmarat al-Inshâ, MS. Brit. Mus., fol. 130*-131*); but this little clan nowhere appears to play a great part in early history. The territory inhabited by the Banu ʿl-Muntâfik is the same as that of the other divisions of the Banu ʿUkail, in the southwest of Yamnâ; some places belonging to them are quoted by al-Bakri (Muqâjam, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 567). Yâkût (Muqâjam, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 793-794; iv. 712, l. 78: we may note that in these two passages al-Muntâfik is said to be the surname of Muʿawiyah b. ʿUkail while the usual genealogy makes this Muʿawiyah a son of al-Muntâfik), al-Hamdâni (*Qâira*, ed. D. H. Miller, p. 177, l. 12-15: note the mention of gold mines in their territory). The Banu ʿl-Muntâfik numbered among their clients the Banu Taḥr (Wustenfeld, *Gen. Tab.*, C. 13) whose eponym was said to have been made a prisoner by them (Kitâb al-Aǵhâni, vii. 110); one of the few episodes of the pre-Islamic period in which this clan is mentioned is the battle of Shîb Djâbala where Kaš b. al-Muntâfik distinguished himself (ʿAhdâni, x. 44; Nuqād, ed. Bevan, p. 671 l. 12-672, l. 14, where Ibn Ṭufail should be deleted). In the history of the origins of Islâm, several of them appear as ambassadors of the Banu ʿUkail to the Prophet: such were Anas b. Kaš b. al-Muntâfik and Ṭaḥîr b. ʿAmir b. al-Muntâfik (Ibn Saʿîd, i. 45 et sq.; on the latter the biographical collections have long discussions as to whether he is to be identified with this or that nuḥaḏdîth: cf. among others Ibn Ḥadjar, *Tahdîb al-Tahâdîb*, vii. 456). In the period of the conquests, the Banu ʿl-Muntâfik settled in the marshy region between Kâfa and Baṣra (al-KalâjashANTI, *Nihâyat al-ʿArâb*, p. 65-66). All that we know of them after this period is the names of a few individuals who held public offices: a certain ʿAmir b. Muʿawiyah al-Muntâfik, mentioned by Ẓabari, i. 3284 a. b., as fighting at ʾAṣīf, is said by Ibn al-Kalbi to have been governor of Armenia and Aḥdarḥâdiyân under Muʿawiyah; according to Ibn al-Kalbi, ʿAbd Allah b. Muʿawiyah b. Ṭuḥba b. ʿAmir b. al-Muntâfik was governor of Marw and Ṭawâṣ, also under Muʿawiyah, and ʿAbd b. Kaš b. al-Muntâfik of Armenia, under Yazid I. These men are not mentioned elsewhere: the same is true of the poet ʾAlâ al-Dîjm b. ʿAw b. al-Ḥusain b. al-Muntâfik (Ibn Ḥadjar, *Isâba*, ed. Sharâfîya, Cairo 1325), v. 124 follows Ibn al-Kalbi.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(G. Levi Della Vida)

**Al-Muntâkîm.** [See Allâh II.]
AL-MUNTAŞIR (also called Mustansir) 8FL. 'Abd Ḥaṣṣār, Muhammad b. Ḥaṣṣār, ʿAbd b. al-ʿAffar, a son of al-Mutawakkil by a Greek slave. After his father had been murdered by the Samaritans in 240 (855) (Deb 6) by conspirators, among whom was al-Muntasir, the latter ascended the throne aged 25 according to the usual statement. As a ruler he was only a tool in the hands of the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khāṣib and the Turkish generals. His brothers al-Muṣṭafāz and al-Muṣayyaf were forced to renounce their claims to the throne and Waṣīf, the commander of the bodyguard, was sent to the Byzantine frontier. Unlike his father, he treated the ʿAlids with great consideration: nothing else remarkable is recorded of him. Al-Muntasir died in Rabīʿ I 248 (June 862) or, according to a less trustworthy report, end of Rabīʿ I in 861, in Samarra after a reign of six months.


MURĀD. [See Al-Moravids.]

MURĀD, the name of an Arab tribe, belonging to the great southern group of the Maḥdījīd [q.v.]; genealogical tradition (Ibn al-Kalbi, Bidawarat al-Murād, Escorial MS., fol. 114—117) was followed by Ibrāhīm al-Durādī, Kībīb al-Ṭabākī (cf. Lehmus), ed. Westenfeld, p. 233; P. 496; cf. also Rūm al-Murād, iv. 409) regards Murād as a nickname, for this tribe was said to have been the first to rebel (tamaʾūrata) in the Yemen: an etymology which is not convincing. Murād's own name is said to have been Yūḥāb b. Maḥdījīd and he was therefore a brother of the Āḥsī and the Saḍīl al-ʿAṣrī (Westenfeld, Genal, Tabellen, p. 7, 11). Although they were neighbours of the South Arabian civilization, the Murād have always retained a typically Beduin character: their country (usually called al-Ṭarāb and placed to the east of Nadjran and Maḥri) is bare and sterile (cf. the picturesque description given of it by the Kībīb al-ʿAthirī, xvii. 115 and the mountains of the Murād" mentioned by Yaḥyā, Muḥṣaf, ii. 78) and its inhabitants are nomadic as brigands (cf. Ibrāhīm; cf. Kībīb al-ʿAthirī, x. 147). The land inhabited by the Murād and by their neighbours, the Hamdān (q.v.), had once belonged to the Tāʾi'ī (Yūḥāb, Muḥṣaf, i. 129), who had left it to settle in the north of the Arabian peninsula: it is probable that this was from the old masters of the country that the Murād and the Hamdān inherited the cult of the god Yagūth. (cf. below).

The Murād appear for the first time in history in connection with an epizode, not however at all clear, on the last days of the dynasty of the Lakhmid of al-Hijāz: as the arm b. al-Munṣhir (III) b. Ma ṣ al-Sawārī escaped his half-brother Amr, a son of Uṣāma, sister of Hind mother of the first-named Amr, from a share in the kingdom, the latter sought refuge with the Murād, who recognised him as their chief but when he began to rule tyrannically, they killed him, which gave Amr b. Hind a pretext for invading the land of the Murād and putting to death the murderer of Amr b. Uṣāma (al-Muṣṭafāz al-Dubābī, Anvīl al-ʿArab, Constantinople 1300, p. 68—69), who gives a more satisfactory account than the historian that he procures his release by G. Rostotkin, Die Dyn. der Lakhmid, p. 90 in which Yaḥyā, iv. 130 should be read for i. 130) Amr is said to have been killed by a certain Ibn al-Duʿādī (of the same story is given by Ibn al-Kalbi, Dīmūt, ii. 107—108) according to Yaḥyā on the other hand by Hubayra b. ʿAbd Yaqūth b. al-Makhrūj, the latter's son Kāisas seems to have been one of the most powerful chiefs of the Murād at the time of the rise of Islam.

The Murād had just then suffered a disastrous defeat, which had considerably weakened them at the hands of the Hamdān, as the result of a quarter which had arisen in connection with the control of the worship of the god Yagūth (cf. Wellhausen, Rote arab. Heidentum, p. 10—12 and the sources mentioned by him). It is probably this defeat (Yawm al-ʿAzīm), which tradition places in the same year as the battle of Badr, which made a section of the Murād think it advisable to seek an alliance with Muhammad; but Kāisas, b. al-Makhrūj, refused to join in it. It was therefore another Murād chief, Farwa b. Musulik, who went to al-Madina in the year 10 H. and concluded a treaty there with the Prophet (cf. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, ii. 332). To what extent tradition is right in saying that Farwa was given authority to levy zakāt on all the tribes of the Yemen, is very difficult to ascertain. In any case, the policy of the Murād was not oriented towards Muhammad under the leadership of Kāisas b. al-Makhrūj, in the great rising of al-ʿAṣrī against Tarsian hegemony in the Yemen, the Murād were against him. But if, as tradition has it, Muhammad used his connections with some chiefs of the Yemen to prevent al-ʿAṣrī's success, after the death of the Prophet these same chiefs refused obedience to Abū Bakr and resolutely threw themselves into the struggle against Islam. It is again Kāisas, b. al-Makhrūj, who plays the chief part in these events. Taken prisoner, Abū Bakr granted him his life and henceforth the chief of the Murād and his tribe played their part bravely in the conquests. We find them sometimes in Syria, sometimes in the ʿIrāq, and Kāisas himself, everywhere distinguishing himself by his exploits. He lost an ore at the battle of Yarmūk (cf. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, i.—v., index s. v. Ṭayy b. Hubayrayh). But the account of his death in the civil war between 'Alī and Muṭawiya at the battle of Siffin is based on confusion with another man of the same name of the tribe of Ḍajīla (this fact which is clearly indicated by Ibn al-Kalbi, Dīmūt and Tabari, i. 3301—3302, has already been noted by Ibn Ḥadīr, Ṭabī, ed. Sharafāya, v. 281; Annali dell' Islam, i. 638 should be corrected). We also find the Murād in the conquest of Egypt (Annali, iv. 573. 21 A.H.; § 101 b 26) but it was at al-Kafa that they settled in the largest numbers. It was there that one of them, ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm b. Malūd, assassinated the caliph 'Abd al-Malik, but it was there also that in 60 (679) (Ḥṣ. 41) the ʿTurīb al-Murād was executed by ordeers of the governor ʿUbayd Allah b. Ziyād after being found guilty of conspiring with Muslim b. ʿĀkīl in favour of al-Husain (Tabari, ii. 227 sq.). He was a descendant of the poet Amr b. Kīrās (R. S. O., xii. 58, 327f.), one of the very few poets
of this tribe, which does not seem to have produced many individuals of note either during the Djehshy or under Islam. We may however mention Uwaïs al-Kahani (of the Banu Kahani b. Rukmâm b. Nâdiyya b. Murâd; Wustenfeld, Gesetz. Tal. p. 7, 280) one of the prototypes of Muslim asceticism.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(M. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

MURAD I, according to the common tradition the third ruler of the Ottoman state, was a son of Orkhan and the Byzantine lady Nilüfer. Although some Ottoman sources profess to know the year of his birth (Süfîlî-i evlânî, i. 74 gives the year 726 = 1326), this date, like all dates given by Turkish sources relating to this period, is far from certain. The name Murâd (Greeck sources such as Phrantzes have Açavârçî, from which later Latin sources make Amurat, while contemporary Latin sources from Italy have Moratubeli) must have originated in mystical circles and hardly occurs in earlier times. Abâd Murâd lived in Orkhan's time (cf. Süfîlî-i evlânî, iv. 354; 'Ashîk Pasha Zâde, ed. Giese, p. 200: photographs of his tomb in R. Hartmann, Im neuen Anatolien, Leipzig 1928, plates 9 and 10). The ancient Turkish chronicles often call Murâd Hâzî Khân Kûnikâr, later Turkish historians Khudâwendikâr [q. v.].

During his father's lifetime Murâd had already been entrusted with the governorship of In Ohu and later of Brusa. His brother Sulaimân Pasha had held the more important sânjaks and was destined to become Orkhan's successor. Sulaimân's untimely death, shortly before that of Orkhan himself, placed Murâd unexpectedly at the head of the Ottoman principality. This happened about 1360; the date of Orkhan's death is uncertain.

Murâd I became the first great Ottoman conqueror on European soil. In this he followed the footsteps of his brother Sulaimân Pasha and of other Turkish emirs before him.

It is not yet possible to gain a clear idea of the succession of the military achievements by which the Ottomans succeeded in establishing themselves firmly on the Balkan Peninsula. Even the outstanding victories are confounded with each other in the Ottoman and Western sources, and the exact dating of even important events is subject to great difficulties. The Byzantine sources, the most reliable of all, are mainly concerned with the tortuous policy of the Byzantine rulers. On the other hand, many tales of a legendary character have entered the historical accounts of later times.

The impetus on the whole, that the Ottoman successes were mainly due to the mutual rivalry between the then existing Balkan states, Byzantium, and the Bulgarian and Serbian kingdoms, complicated by the struggle of Venice and Genoa for an advantageous position in the Levant, and the zeal of the popes for bringing the Greek church back to Rome. This secured the Ottomans at all times allies in the Christian camp itself. Nor is it possible to ascertain which Ottoman expeditions were really planned by Murâd and his councillors and which were merely successful raids by Turkish bands. All this makes it extremely difficult to form an adequate judgment of Murâd's personality as a warrior and as a statesman.

Provisionally three periods can be distinguished. The first begins shortly after Murâd's accession with the conquest of Western Thrace, in which were taken Čorîn, Demotika (if this town had not already been taken under Orkhan), Gümul-ğina, Adrianople (about 1362; cf. EDIRNE and Philippopolis, mainly through the activity of the beglerbeg Lala Shâhi and Erenos Beg). These conquests provoked a coalition of Servians, Bosnians and Hungarians, who were beaten on the river Maritsa by Hâdjidji Iblek. The western part of Bulgaria was raised up to the Balkan Mountains and the Byzantine Emperor John Palaeologus made his first submission as vassal to Murâd. Murâd himself had been on a campaign in Anatolia, which brought him as far as Tokat [q. v.] during which he consolidated the Ottoman hold on Angora (already taken by Sulaimân Pasha in 1354; cf. Wittek, Festchrift Jâco, 1932, p. 347, 351 sqq.). He then came to Râm-îli and took up his residence in Demotika, to change this town in 1366 for Adrianople, from this time on the European capital of the Ottomans. The story about a treaty between Ragusa and Murâd concluded in 1365 has a legendary character (cf. Giese, Festchrift Jâco, 1932, p. 42, after Jiriček). In the meantime the hostility between Byzantines and Bulgarians gave Murâd the opportunity of taking Iâhebol (Sosopolis) near Burgas, and the same hostility led to the failure, about 1366, of a crusade undertaken at the instigation of Pope Urban V by count Amadèo of Savoy in order to come to the rescue of the Byzantine Emperor; the expedition only drove the Turks from Gallipoli for a short time.

A second period of Murâd's reign may be said to begin with the crushing of a Serbian advance on the Maritsa near Cirmen, probably in 1371. This Serbian defeat is known to the Turkish sources [girîgî] and gave the Turks during the following years the important Macedonian towns of Seres, Drama and Kavalla, and at the same time the possibility of advancing west of the Vardar. These conquests were made by Erenos and Djandîl Khalîl Pasha, while Lala Shâhi obtained about the same time successes in eastern Bulgaria (battle of Samakow). Then followed again some years of comparative tranquillity, in which the newly won regions were partly colonized with Ottomans; the still unsubdued northern parts of Serbia and Bulgaria were governed by the local rulers as vassals of Murâd. The latter had more than once to interfere with the dynastic affairs of the Palaeologoi. After John Palaeologus had sold in 1375 the island of Tenedos to Venice, this led to an action of Genoa in combination with the Turks, in course of which John lost his throne and was imprisoned, until, by the favour of Murâd, he became Emperor again in 1379; his dependency went so far as to help the Turks, together with his son Manuel, in the conquest of Philadelphia (Aü Shehir), the only remaining Greek fortress in Asia Minor. The end of this second period is marked by an increased activity in Anatolia. A part of the territory of the Germiyân-Oghlu [q.v.] was acquired as a wedding gift to Prince Bâyazid when he married the daughter of that ruler (probably in 1381); this territorial accession was followed by the sale of the greater part of the lands of the Hamd-Oghlu to Murâd, and by the conquest of a part of the principality of Tekke.

About 1385 there followed new conquests in Europe. Turkish troops intervened in Epirus and Albania (under Khalîl Pasha), but decisive for the establishment of Ottoman power in the Balkans...
was the taking of Sofia (1385?) and Nish (1386?). About the same time, the Italian republics, Genoa and Venice, obtained by treaties with Murad, concluded respectively in 1385 and 1388, commercial privileges in Turkish territory. Immediately after the successes in Serbia, probably also in 1386, Murad went to war with the Karaman-Oghlu 'Ali al-Din, his son-in-law; this conflict had long been threatening [cf. Karaman-Oghlu]; now the Ottoman power had grown so far as to destroy the political equilibrium in Anatolia. Murad was victorious in the battle of Könya, but left 'Ali al-Din in his possessions and set the example, henceforward traditional, of leniency in dealing with the Anatolian population. This caused a lively discontent amongst the Serbian troops who had taken part in the battle of Könya. These Serbians are said to have contributed to the anti-Turkish feeling among the Serbians in general, who, under the leadership of Lazar Greslanjowsich, and with the Bosnian king Tvrtko as a powerful ally, were preparing a last effort to free themselves from Turkish vassalage. They succeeded in defeating an Ottoman army at Plochnik (1385). The results were meagre, however, for at the same time the Turks made new conquests in Bulgaria (Shumla and Tarnovo) and even raided Morea. In 1389 Murad himself marched against the Serbians and their allies and fought the famous battle of Kossovo Polje (Turkish: Kosaova), where he himself lost his life, although the Serbians, partly owing to treachery in their own ranks, were defeated. The most probable date is June 20, 1389 (Gibbons, cf. also Giese, in Ephemerides Orientales, N. S. Apr. 1928, p. 2 sq.). The way in which Murad was killed, during or after the battle, is not clear from the early sources; the later Serbian epic tradition has the well-known tale that Murad i. was murdered by Miloš Obrenovitch, Lazar's son-in-law, who, claiming to be a deserter, had obtained an audience with Murad after the battle, was admitted to his presence and killed him with a dagger. Murad's body was transported to Brusa and buried in a muck near the mosque which he had built at Çekirge in Brusa (cf. Ahmed Tewfik in T. O. E. M., vol. V., il.).

Murad i. was the first ruler under whom the state founded by 'Oguzin rose to be more than one of the existing Turkoman principalities in Asia Minor. This development is symbolised in the successive change of titles given to him in different building inscriptions dated in his reign (cf. Taeschner, in Id., xx., 131 sqq.). While the oldest inscription calls him simply bey, like his father 'Orkhan, and gives him a title ('Shihih al-Dunya wa l-Tdin) after the Seldjuk fashion, he is already called Sultan [v. 6 in] in 1385 (1387), while in the inscription from 790 (1388) on the Timar built by him in Iznik, we find the style which afterwards became a tradition with the Ottoman sultans (al-melik al-mustasam al-hajdan al-mustasam al-sultan ibn al-sultan). It was a time when both the Seldjuk traditional institutions, no longer held and new forms of government and administration were being to which the example of Byzantine institutions, and also those of Mamluk Egypt may have contributed. Even if it is not true that Djandarli Khair al-Din Khalil Pasha — who was appointed Murad's vizier at the beginning of his reign and died about 789 (1387) — was the first Ottoman grand vizier, it cannot be denied that the activity of this man — who by his origin belonged to a higher culture than the Ottoman — as Murad's councillor as well as his military deputy and administrator in Macedonia, makes him a true prototype of the grand viziers of the empire (cf. Taeschner and Wiet, in Id., xviii. 66 sqq.). His son 'Ali Pasha began also to play an important military part during the later years of Murad's reign. It is also with Khalil Pasha that the old Turkish sources connect the institution of the Janissaries as troops formed from converted Christian prisoners of war. In the administration of the timars [v. 7] a Khania of Murad i. is said to have brought improvements. Some of these measures were closely connected with the problem of acquiring a quiet and loyal population in the newly conquered Christian territories; this was not possible by Turkish colonisation only but succeeded mainly through a humane treatment of the original inhabitants, after the region had once been conquered.*

The more important buildings of Murad i. are all in Asa Minor. The best known are the Khuda evendiklar Djami in Çekirge, near Brusa, where Murad himself is buried, and the Ulu Djami in Brusa; further a mosque in Bilecik, the Nilufer Imaret in Iznik (recently described by Taeschner, in Id., xx., 127 sqq.). There is also a mosque of Murad in Serres. The old Ottoman chronicles enumerate his foundations. — On Murad i.'s coins cf. 'Ali, in T. E. M., xiv. 224.

Bibliography: The information given by the old Turkish chronicles (Ashik Pascha Zade, Anonymus, ed. Giese, Urdj, the translations of Lenselautus, also Doctur-namii Einverli, ed. Mukrime, Khalil, Istanbul 1928 and the Mededel, Istanbul 1930) is sometimes supplemented by the later historiographers (Sa'd al-Din, 'Ali, Munedijdin-Bask). The Byzantine historians (Phrantzes, Ducas, Chalceodones), however, give a far clearer survey of this period so far as it came under their attention, while documents from Venice, Genoa and Rome throw light on the diplomatic activities provoked by the advance of the Turks in Europe. Ibn Haidar al-'Askalani, Ibn al-Ghum fi Anba'al'um, contains also a biography of Murad i. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga, and H. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 110 sqq., C. Jirecek, Geschichte der Seldschuc, Gotha 1918, (J. H. Kramers)

MURAD II, sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was born in 806 (1403-1404) and ascended the throne in May 1421, when he arrived in Adrianople some days after his father Muhammed I's death; his decease had been kept secret on the advice of the vizier 'Ismail Pasha until the new sultan's arrival. As crown prince he had resided at Baghni. Acha, and he had taken part in the suppression of the revolt of Simawga Oghlu Badi al-Din. Immediately after his accession he had to face the pretender known in Turkish history as the Iskender of Mustafa [v. 8] and his ally Djunaid [v. 8]. Both were supported by the Byzantine emperor Manuel and at first were successful in the European part of the empire. Bayazid Pasha, sent from Brusa, was defeated and killed in the battle of Shaff Dure (between Seres and Adrianople) and the allied Greek forces took Gallipoli. Then Murad himself had to face them in Asia; he suc-
ceeded in sowing discord between Musafà and Djnain and defeated the first in the battle of the bridge of Ulubad. Then Murad went over, with the help of ships from the Genoese colony of New Phoca (Yeni Foça), recovered Gallipoli, after which he entered Adrianople and killed the pretender. In 1422 he became a siege of Constantinople; this siege was raised, either by the effect of Byzantine gold (through the intermediary of the graceophil vizier İbrahim Paşa) or as a result of the rise of a new pretender in İznik in the person of Murad's younger brother Musafà. The latter was at last betrayed by his former supporter İlyas Paşa and killed. Then followed a struggle with Djnain, who had established himself again at Aidin, but surrendered at last in 1425, after which he was killed. Murad was now at peace with all his European neighbours and vassals; the Emperor Manuel had died in 1424 and was followed by John Palaeologos, with whom peace was concluded. Several towns had been taken in the meantime in Morea, and Wallachia paid tribute. In Anatolia the Turks had taken the Thebes in 1423, and the whole of Sinılı, ending with the acquisition of a part of his territory by Murad; after 1425 the Ottoman power was confirmed in Teke and Menteşe and the Karahan Oghul İbrahim, who tried to take the already Ottoman Adalia, had to retire and make peace. In eastern Anatolia Turkeş Paşa subdued the Turkomans round Tokat and Amasia and of the region of Djamik. In 1428 there began difficulties on the Hungarian frontier. The most noteworthy exploit of this period was however the capture of Saloniki (Selanik; q.v.) in March 1430: after the Greeks had sold this town to Venice in 1427; Murad had never given up the plan of avenging that transaction. Peace with Venice soon followed.

Occasionally the Turks had taken several fortresses in Epirus and Albania, but their interest began more and more to concentrate on the north-western regions, where George Brankovitch ruled as vassal over Serbia. With the latter peace was renewed in 1432 and his daughter Mara was given to Murad, but the Turkish raids continued in Serbia as well as far into Hungarian territory. In 1438 the Turks made, together with Serbians and Wallachians, incursions in Hungary (capture of Semendra); in 1440 they beleaguered Belgrad in vain and in 1442 Turkish troops under Meşid Bey laid siege to Hermannstadt. Here they suffered a heavy defeat by John Hunyadi, who in the coming years was to act as champion of Hungary and Christian Europe. He was the leader, in 1443, of a big crusading army including Serbians, Polob and Garamotes. The Turks were thrown back at Nish, after which Sofo was taken. The campaign ended with a heavy defeat of the Turks at Jalowaz, between Sofia and Philippopolis. In the same year Murad had to oppose again the Karahan Oghlu, who supported the Christian allies. But the peace with Hungary, concluded in July 1444 at Szeged, though advantageous to Hungary, maintained the former frontiers of the Ottoman political influence; only Wallachia became tributary to Hungary.

After this peace, which was to last ten years and seemed to Murad a guarantee for the future, he abdicated in favour of his son Muhammad, leaving with him Khalil Paşa, son of İbrahim Paşa (who had died of the plague in 1429) and Khosraw Molla (q.v.) as councillors. He retired himself to Maghisa, but had to come back when, in September of the same year, the Hungarians, flouting the peace treaty, were preparing a new crusade. They marched south of the Danube to Varna; here the army of Murad inflicted on them a crushing defeat, in which King Ladislav of Hungary was killed. Again Murad II went back to Maghisa, but in the following year a Janissary revolt broke out in Adrianople and it was the vizier Khalil who invited Murad to return a second time, as the young Muhammad did not seem to be able to face the situation.

During the last six years of his reign Murad led again several campaigns in the Balkan peninsula. In 1446 an action was undertaken against the Palaeologoi in the Morea (destruction of the Hexamillion, capture of Corinth and Patras); in 1447 against Albania, where the activity of Skander Beg [q. v.] had begun in 1443; in 1448 he faced again a Hungarian invading army, which was beaten on the plain of Kossoway; and in 1450 he was again in Albania (siege of Croja). In that year, because of the peace of Murad II, the last Byzantine Emperor, after the death of John. Shortly afterwards, in the first days of February 1451, Murad died at Adrianople. He was buried in Brusa at the side of his mosque (cf. Ahmad Tewhid, in TOE M., iii. 1856).

His reign was of extraordinary importance for the future political and cultural development of the Ottoman Empire. After the first critical years he continued his father's work of consolidation. His aim was mainly to live on peaceful terms with the vassal princes, of whom the ruler of Sinılı and the despot of Serbia gave their daughters to Murad. This peaceful policy was in concordance with his character; the Byzantine historians and other Christian sources describe him as a truthful, mild and humane ruler. His most influential viziers were not yet the renegades of later times; they belonged to the old families that had supported the cause of Murad's forefathers and were becoming a kind of hereditary nobility: İbrahim Paşa and Khauli Paşa of the Djandarli Oghullari (F. Taeschner and P. Witte, in ISL. xviii. 92 sqq., Hadijdi Iwuad Paşa (Taeschner, in ISL. xx. 154 sqq.), the sons of Tumurtash, of Evrenos and others.

The mystical tradition was strong in his surroundings, as is proved by the great influence of a man like the Şafak Amir Bağşah; other scholars came to his court from Persia and Mesopotamia. This determined also the direction which the classical Ottoman literature was to take in following centuries. Murad II was the first Ottoman prince whose court became a brilliant centre of poets, literary men and Muslim scholars (see TüRKs, B. iii.). But also to non-Islamic envoys and visitors Murad's court seemed a centre of culture (cf. Jorga, i. 464 sqq., which description applies principally to Murad II). Amongst the sultan's buildings a mosque in Brusa (cf. H. Willco, Brusa, p. 54) and one in Adrianople (the Cē Sherifli Djamî), are notable and some large bridges. His army organisation is well known from a full description by Chalcondylas.

Bibliography: The older Turkish sources: Neżhri (Haniwaldanus), Aslıq Paşa Zade, Uşuj, Kuḫu, Anonymus Giese, are completed by the Byzantine historians樊贤苑 (who himself played a part in the diplomatic history of the time), Ducus and Chalcondylas, and also by
the later Ottoman authors Sa’d al-Din, ‘Alî and Muneşbudbaşı Bahşî. A curious contemporary
description is that of an unknown captive from Mahlenbach in Transylvania (captured 1438) in
his Tractatus de molibus conditionis et negotiis
(Tractatus (cf. K. Poy, in M.S.C.S., iv. v.).
General later descriptions of Murâd II’s reign in the works of von Hammer, G. O. R., i: 1: 
Ziakensien, i. and Jorga, i.

(J. H. KRAMER)

MURÂD III, twelfth ruler of the Ottoman
Empire, was born on the 5th of Dümâda I
955 (4th July 1546: Siqîîlî Şevâîânî, i. 76) as
son of the later sultan Selim II and the
Khânî Bâbî. He arrived at Constantinople on
Dec. 21st, 1574, after Selim II’s death and reigned
until his death on January 16, 1595 or a few days
later. His reign is not characterized by great con-
quests in Europe. The peaceful relations with
Austria were officially maintained; peace was
sometimes confirmed (1575 and 1584) by a new
peace and by extraordinary Austrian embassies.
Nevertheless, there were Turkish raids into
Austrian territory, especially in Croatia in
1578 — where even a new sandjak was formed —
followed by triumphal processions in the capital,
which the Austrian envoys were forced to witness.
It was only in 1593 that a formal war broke out,
in which the then grand vizier Sinân Paşa took
the town of Raab (1594). The relations with Venice
were of the same kind as with Austria: notwith-
standing several serious naval collisions peace
was maintained, mainly through the influence of Murâd’s
Khânî Şafîye (of the family of Baffa) and
the Kapudan Pašas, who were Italian renegades.
In the Danube principalities the never ending dy-
nastic disputes went on; this was also the case in
Transylvania. Even Poland was considered more or
less as an Ottoman tributary vassal state; the
Polish king, Stephen Bathory, owed his crown to the
sultan’s protection and after his death (1587)
the new king Sigismund began to reign by
the grace of Murâd. The Forte had to intervene several
times in the disturbances caused by Polish cossacks
in Moldavia and the Tatar Khânate and by Tatar
incursions in Poland. In the Crimea the Ottoman
intervention was even stronger, because the Persian
war necessitated in 1581 and 1583 expeditions by
the way of Kaffa and the Crimea against Dîghîstan
and Transcaucasia.

The most outstanding military exploit of the
Ottoman Empire during Murâd III’s reign was the
war with Persia, which lasted from 1577 to
1590. Persia passed, after Şîh Tahmâs’p’s death in
1576, through serious inner troubles. This gave the
Turks a favourable opportunity of enlarging their
territory. Between 1577 and 1583 the chief
theatre of the war was Georgia: Tala Muştafa
Paşa won the battle of Lake Caldir (August 9,
1578), after which the princes of the small Geor-
gian kingdoms became nominally Ottoman vassals,
while several towns, like Tellis and Shaki, came
under direct military occupation. In 1579 the town
of Kastoria was fortified. That same year Sinân Paşa
became sersashker on the Georgian front. The
completion of the conquests confronted the Ottoman
armies with serious difficulties, especially after Simarî, the
former king of Kârtli, had come back from exile in
Persia. They made necessary the already mentioned expedition by the way of
the Crimea in 1581 under Osman Paşa
who was joined in 1583, by the same way, by
Dîjafer Paşa; they came back to Constantinople
again via the Crimea and 'Othmân Paşa was
received with great honour by the sultan after
his return, although it would seem that the real
aim of this expedition — prolonged junction with the
Turkish forces of the south — was not reached,
owing to the combined efforts of the people of
Georgia and Shirvan (cf. W. E. D. Allen, A
History of the Georgian People, London 1932,
p. 157). The second phase of the Persian war
began with the taking of Tabriz in 1585 by
Othmân Paşa, followed by other successes on
Persian territory (Gandja in Transcaucasia and
Nîâsând). In 1587 Şîh Abdâbîllah ascended the
throne: soon afterwards there began peace
negotiations, ending in a peace treaty (March 21,
1590) which left Georgia, Shirvan, Karabagh,
Tabriz and Luristan to the Ottoman Empire. One
of the peace conditions was that the Persians
should give up most of their anti-Sunnîte
religious practices.

During Murâd III’s first years Muhammad Paşa
Sokollu [q.v.] had continued to administer the
huge Empire as grand vizier, but his once
unquestioned authority began to wane under the
influence of the sultan’s courtiers like Şems Paşa
and the defterdîr Uweis; an influential personality
also was the Khâdja Sa’d al-Din — the historian —
and the counsellor Ghasanfer Agha. Home and foreign
politics were influenced also by Murâd’s mother
Nur Bâbî and the already mentioned Khânî Şafîye (Baffa), who used as a powerful agent outside
the palace the Jewess Kira (Chierazaar in the
Italian sources). Sokollu’s confidants were relegated
from the capital (as the nizîngîî फरदिन) or executed
(like Michael Cantacuzenus). But he was still grand
vizier, when he was murdered on October 11, 1579.
After him the grand vizierate was changed no less
than ten times under Murâd III. Sinân Paşa,
already mentioned, held the office three times:
‘Othmân Paşa, appointed in 1585, after his return
from Dîghîstan, died eight months afterwards.
As the sultan, though well-intentioned, was too weak
himself to direct a consistent policy, — as he
acknowledged himself according to ‘Alî (cf. Hammer,
G. O. R., ii, 567) — all kinds of abuses gradu-
ally began in this epoch, especially in the admin-
istration of the fiefs [cf. تخت] and the enrolment of
the Janissaries; they are summed up in Kocî Bey’s
Risâla. This sultan’s reign witnessed for the first
time revolts of the Janissaries directed against the
imperial diwan itself. The first mutiny, in April
1559, was caused by deprivation of the coinage
and could be appeased only — as so often after-
wars — by the sacrifice of the lives of high
officials. In 1502 there was a similar Sipahî
revolt. More than one provincial rebellion had
to be subdued by force: the most celebrated expedi-
tion was that of Ibrahim Paşa, the later Şîh
and favourite of Muhammad III, to Egypt and Syria
in 1585; in Syria he persecuted severely the Banû
Ma‘ân, the leaders of the Druses, but very soon
afterwards the successful career of Fakhr al-Din
[q.v.] began.

Murâd’s reign can be characterized as the be-
ginning of the internal weakening of the Ottoman
power. The sultan did not possess the strong
personality of his grand father; his amorous tenen-
cies were much encouraged by his mother and his
wife Şafîye, and he had far more than a hundred
forced him to surrender, after which Abaza played a part as governor of Bosnia and of Silistria. In the meantime several vain efforts were made to recover Baghdad, by Hafiz Ahmad Pasha in 1626, and by Khoresew Pasha [q. v.] in 1629.

From 1632 Murad IV's position was even more precarious, for with incredible energy the mobilisation of all the country's resources for the war against Persia, where Shah 'Abbas I had died in 1627. He suppressed with great cruelty the rebellious movements among the Janissaries and reduced their number by not applying the dekhi-me for twelve years. New and more reliable troops were formed from the glicedjis, bestandjis and especially the segbans (seymens). The necessary funds were procured by drastic financial measures. Amongst them the confiscation of large fortunes. Every attempt at opposition was cruelly suppressed; in 1633 even the Shaikh al-Islam Aghi-Zade Husein was executed. In October 1635 an army under the grand vizier Taban Yu:b Muhammad Pasha left Constantinople, and that year and the following year no important military operations took place. The Kapudan Pasha Djasfar, however, was successful in suppressing the power of the Druze Amir Fakhr al-Din [q. v.] and bringing him alive to Constantinople. In 1635 Murad himself left the capital, joined the grand vizier's army in Erzerum and conquered Erivan (August 1635). Then the undefended Tabriz was taken and destroyed, after which the sultan returned. In the following year the Persians recaptured Erivan. Finally, in 1638, Murad took the field for the second time with the grand vizier Talyar Muhammad Pasha; Baghdad was taken by them in December 1638, and thousands of Sufis were massacred. This was the end of the Persian war; in 1639 a peace was concluded, which left Baghdad to Turkey and Erivan to Persia.

In comparison with the events in Asia, European affairs were of secondary importance. The peace with Austria was several times renewed (1625 at Gyarmath and 1627 at Szon) although predatory raids from both sides never ceased. Serious trouble was caused in 1624 by the appearance of Corsack ships in the Bosporus; they were defeated only in 1626. Another hothed of unrest was the Crimea, where from 1624 till 1628 the Porte had to suffer against its will the Khan Muhammad Giray and his brother Sighin Giray, who even took Kaffa for a time. After 1628 the Tatai Murad Kanteem (or Kanteem), chief of the Nogays, became the most powerful man in the khante; his continual incursions caused serious conflicts with Poland (peace restored in 1634) and in Moldavia. At last Kanteem was executed at Constantinople in 1637.

The peaceful relations with Venice and the western sea powers continued; in 1624 the capitulation had been renewed, but as the Porte was without authority over the Barbary states of Algiers and Tunis. England, Holland and France concluded separate treaties with their rulers in order to avert as much as possible the damage done to their trade by the ships of the corsairs. In 1638 a more serious battle took place that the Adriatic between the Venetian fleet and Barbary corsairs; at first Murad ordered the massacre of all Venetians in his Empire, but in 1639 peace was restored. In Constantinople the ministers of Holland (Haga) and England (Roe) intervened successfully in the
troubles between the Porte and the Greek Patriarchate.

Murad IV died on February 9, 1640 and was buried in the turbe of the mosque of his father Ahmed; he was the last Murad with a suffix of the Karaman by his energy he restored for some time its military authority, but his reforms did not last after him. Still a separate khanın-nâme bears Murad IV's name. He was a man of considerable physical strength and of high personal erudition and he liked the company of poets. His attachment to the poet Tîst [Q. v.] is famous in literary tradition. The poet Nefît [Q. v.] on the other hand was executed by his order. On verses written by Murad cf. Glibb, H. O. P., iii. 248 sqq.

He had four sons, all of whom died young; at his death there was only his brother Ibrahim to take the succession. His brothers Bâyazid and Sulaimân were killed by his order during the Erivan campaign, and later also his brother Kâsim. In course of time Murad had become ever more ferocious, and he is said to have sworn in 1639 that he would subdue all his Christian neighbours (Jorga, iv. 1).

Bibliography: The chief Turkish sources are Naṣîma, Pecwî and Kara Čelebi Zâde's Rawdat al-Abhr. Further the continuation of Āṭüsi's biographical work by Čâshki-Zâde (G. O. W., p. 239); Eşviyâ Čelebi's Sivâhat-nâme is also particularly rich in information about the reign of Murad IV. Of Western contemporaneous sources must be mentioned the Venetian Relazioni and the correspondence of Sir Thomas Roe and Cornelius Haga (Rijks geschiedkundige Publicaties, x.; Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantse Handel, 1590—1660, ii, 39 Abreu 111). Later treatments of this period in the general works of von Hammer (v.), Zinkeisen (iv.) and Jorga (iii.).

(M. J. KAMERS)

MURAD V, Ottoman Sultan from May 31 till Sept. 7, 1876. He was born on Sept. 21, 1840 as son of Sultan 'Abd al-Madjid and was deprived of all influence on public affairs during the reign of his elder brother 'Abd al-'Aziz, who had the plan of altering the succession in favour of his own de-cendants, so as to deprive Murad of his rights. Murad was called to the throne by the coup d'état of the recently established cabinet, of which Midhat Pasha [Q. v.], Muhammad Rashed and Hüsam 'Awni were the leading members. By deposing Sultan 'Abd al-'Aziz they hoped to eliminate the influence of reactionary elements who were opposed to their schemes of reform and they expected to find an ally in Murad. In the night from 30th to 31st May 1876 Murad was induced with some difficulty to proceed to the Seraskerate in Constantinople, where he received the homage of the troops and the high dignitaries. He confirmed the cabinet in office. Very soon afterwards he received the suicide of the deposed sultan (June 5) and the murder of the ministers Husain 'Awni and Rashid Pasha during a cabinet meeting in Midhat's house (June 15). These events seem to have been fatal to the mental equilibrium of the new sultan, who, already in the night of his accession, had shown signs of abnormal nervous excitement. He was unable to appear before his people at the selemâlık, nor could the sword-girding ceremony (kilîgh a'âşaf) be applied to him. Midhat Pasha and his friends, although fearing that a new change of ruler might endanger their plans, had to arrange another deposition; they had the sultan's health examined by a number of physicians and, on their report, obtained a fetâwâ from the Shaikh-î Isâm Hasan Khair Allah Efendi, authorising Murad's deposition (September 1). His younger brother 'Abd al-Hamid II became sultan and Murad went to live in the Ciraghan Palace, where he died on August 29, 1904. His confinement during 'Abd al-Hamid's reign continued to excite speculation as a yet unsolved mystery and was occasionally represented as one of the crimes of the Hamidian regime.

Bibliography: Keraty, Murad V, prince, sultan, prisonnier d'état 1850—1876, Paris 1878; Djemaeddin Bey, Sultan Murad V, the Turkish Dynasty Mystery 1876—1903, London 1895; Tevfik Nur al-Din, Sultan 'Abdulmejid II (we-iintihar), Constantinople 1842; Ahmed Şâh, Türk-i Sultan Muhammad Râmiz, Cairo 1836; Husain Hifiz, Sultan Murad Râmiz ve-Sen-i intihar, Constantinople 1846; Khun, 'Abd al-Hamid Thânî ve-Devri-i Selçukî, Constantinople 1881, i. 30 sq., 91 sq.; Ali Haydar Midhat, Life of Midhat Pasha, London 1903.

(J. H. KAMERS)

MURAD PASHA, Turkish grand vizier under Ahmed I, was a Croatian by birth and was born about 1520. He served the empire as military commander and later as wâli in different provinces (Egypt, Yaman, Anatolia) and was made prisoner by the Persians in the battle of Tabriz (Sept. 1585), where Chîhâl's army was defeated. In 1601 he was pasha of Budin and in 1603 commander-in-chief on the Hungarian front. In these posts he repeatedly conducted for the Porte peace negotiations with Austria. He was the chief negotiator of the peace of Zsitvatorok (Nov. 11, 1606). A month afterwards (Dec. 11, 1666) after the execution of Derwish Pasha in Constantinople, he was appointed grand vizier, being then already about 80 years of age.

As grand vizier Murad Pasha became particularly famous by his relentless persecution and repression of the many rebellions in the Asiatic provinces. In 1607 he defeated the Kurd Dânubîlîd [Q. v.] in North Syria (battle of Urdj Owasi in Oct. 1607). After having passed the winter in Aleppo, he succeeded in crushing the forces of the arch-rebel Kalenderoghlu at the pass of Goksun in Cappadocia (July 1908), where he decided the battle by his personal courage. Then he pursued from Siwas the rebel Maimûn and defeated him near Baiburt. His habit of throwing the captured rebels into pris de dôg for that purpose brought him the name of Koyucu Murad Pasha. Notwithstanding the sultan's order — provoked by his enemies in the capital — that he should proceed immediately against Persia, he returned in December to Constantinople, where he was received with great honours. Poets celebrated his achievements against the rebels. In 1609 Murad Pasha went to Scutari for the Persian campaign, but he went no further that year, because he wished first to deal with two remaining dangerous rebels: Muselli-Cauchî in Iî İli and Yüsuf Pasha in Adîn. By false propositions of reconciliation these two were at last induced to surrender and afterwards killed. Murad Pasha had to make use more than once of his personal influence with the sultan to restrain the latter's impatience before his plans had succeeded.
On the other hand, the sultan had to protect several dignitaries against the personal hatred of the terrible old man. In 1610 the grand vizier at last marched to Persia and destroyed Tabriz; then he went to Erzerum, from where he began long and extended negotiations with Şâh Šźābīs. Before the following year's campaign had begun, he died (August 5, 1611). He was buried in a türbe near the mevlevi he had founded in the quarter Zemnedjer in Constantinople.

By his successes in restoring the internal order of the empire Murâd Paşa is considered as one of the most able grand viziers; the historians give ample proofs of his sound judgment of persons and situations. To his initiative is due a compilation of the kanûns regulating the timăr administration (G. O. W., p. 141).

**Bibliography:** Əthmān Zāde, Ḥadjîbât al-\-Wuṣarād, p. 55; the historians Našmā, Peçevi, Ḥajdījî Kâhîfî (Fedheke) and Hasan Beg Zāde. Mostly after them von Hammer, G. O. Ks., iv.; Zitkâse, in; J. H. Kramers, Murâd Sū. [See al-\-Askāt.]

MURÂDABAĐ. [See MOKÂDABAĐ.]

MURÂDÎ, takallūh of Murâd III [q. v.] and Murâd IV [q. v.].

MURCIA (Ar. Mursiya), a town in the S.E. of Spain, 140 feet above sea level in the centre of the famous huerta de Murcia ("gardens of Murcia") watered by the river Segura (Ar. Wâdî Shuqârā [q. v.], or Wâdî al-\-ahwâd, "the white river"). The area of Murcia has a large population; over 150,000, although the town in the strict sense has barely 30,000. Murcia is the capital of the province of the same name and the see of a bishop; it has also a university. Its port, 40 miles to the south on the Mediterranean coast, is Cartagena, the Karfağganma or Karfağganmânt al-\-Khulaṣât of the Arabs.

The situation of Murcia in the centre of very fertile gardens, forming an island of vegetation in a bare country poorly endowed by nature, had been noticed already by the Arab geographers who give more or less long accounts of it. Abu 'l-Fidā', for example, says that it was like Seville for the number of its groves and parks (munzâbasîr), among which he mentions the famous al-Rusâhâ.

Murcia in the Umayyad period was the capital of a province or kîra which bore the name of Todmir [q. v., iv. 805]. This name which is connected with the name of Theodemir, a Visigothic chief of the region at the time of the Muslim conquest, was also applied to the town of Murcia itself, from the time it supplanted Orihuela [q. v.] as the chief town of the region. Indeed almost all the Arab authors who speak of Murcia agree in saying that it was a comparatively recent foundation; it was built by order of the Umayyad emir 'Abd al-Râhmân II al-Hâkam about the year 210 (825), according to the al-\-Râwâl al-mîrâj in 216 by the governor Dzâhir b. Malik b. Labîd.

The land of Todmir and with it of course Murcia was most involved in the civil wars provoked by the rivalry of the Yamanis and the Muwafis of Spain in the period of the independent emirs of Cordova. In the reign of 'Abd Allah (275-300 = 885-912), a rebel, the renegade Dâisam b. Işâb, rose there with the connivance of the famous agitator Ibn Hâfsûn [cf. UMAYYADS II]. He ruled independently all the province of Todmir until the emir of Cordova sent to suppress him in 283 (896) an army led by his uncle Hishâm b. 'Abd al-Râkhmân b. al-Hâkam and the general Aḥmâd b. Muhammad Ibn Abî Abda. Dâisam was defeated between Aledo and Lorca and the latter town besieged. The country was only definitely pacified and restored to the central power in Cordova in the reign of the caliph 'Abd al-Râkhmân III and his successor al-\-Hâkam II.

During the events which ended in the break up of Umayyad Spain, Murcia became, like the majority of the great towns of the Peninsula, the capital of a little independent state. At first in the hands of the "Slavs" [cf. ŠAKÂLÎBA] Khârîrîn and Zuhairîn, along with Almeria and Jaen, the principality of Murcia was then for some time attached to the kingdom of Valencia, in the reigns of 'Abd al-\-Azîz al-\-Manṣûr Ibn Abî 'Amir and his son 'Abd al-\-Malik al-\-Muqâflar. The governor who then ruled Murcia was Abû Bakr Aḥmâd b. Ishaq Ibn Tâhir; when he died in 455 (1063) after amassing a considerable fortune, he was succeeded by his son Abû 'Abd al-Râkhmân Muhammad who soon proclaimed himself independent and repudiated the authority of the Valencian dynasty.

The principality of Ibn Tâhir soon aroused the covetousness of the minister of al-\-Mu'tamid [q. v.] Ibn 'Abîbâd, king of Seville, and an expedition was sent against Murcia with the help of an independent lord of the district, Ibn Rashîk. Ibn Tâhir was taken a prisoner and shut up in Montegudo, but escaping, he reached Valencia where after acting as adviser to al-\-Kâdîr Ibn Uthîl-\-Nun [q. v.] and having almost succeeded him, he finally died in 508 (1119). The conquest of the kingdom of Murcia by Ibn 'Ammâr in the name of the 'Abâdîs took place in 471 (1078), but it was only nominal and it was Ibn Rashîk who exercised the real power instead of Ibn Tâhir.

The kingdom of Murcia was one of the first districts of the Peninsula to be conquered by the Almoravids. Murcia was taken for Yusuf b. Tashîfîn [q. v.] in Shawwal 484 (Nov.-Dec. 1091) by the Lautamitân general Ibn 'Asha who next took Dênia and Jáîtiva. Ibn 'Asha remained governor of Murcia; he was replaced later by Abû Bakr b. Ibrâhîm Ibn Tihîlît, then by a brother of the sultan 'Ali b. Yusuf, Abû 'Ishaq Ibrâhîm.

A general rising against the Almoravids took place in Spain in the beginning of the 11th century and gave rise to the formation of a new series of kingdoms of "taifs". Murcia therefore between 1145 and 1147 was in the hands of two rival leaders, 'Abd Allah b. Iyâd and 'Abd Allah b. Farâdî, until the Valencian ruler Muhammad b. Aḥmâd b. Sa'dî Ibn Mardâniús seized it and took up his residence there. This individual, who was of Spanish origin (cf. above, ii., p. 403), soon became the powerful ruler of all S. E. Spain, between Valencia and Almeria, and instituted a series of fruitful alliances with the Christian rulers of Catalonia, Aragon and Castile. He was for long able to resist the attacks of the first Almohads 'Abd al-\-Mu'tamid [q. v.] and Yusuf [q. v.], and it was only after his death in 567 (1173) during the siege of his capital Murcia that his kingdom passed finally to the Mu'âmidît sovereigns.

From the fall of the Almohad empire in Spain until its conquest by the Christians Murcia had
a very troubled existence. It was in turn the residence (from the beginning of the 8th century) of princes of the family of the Banū Hiṣād of Saragossa: Muhammad b. Yusuf al-Mutawakkilī, the latter's uncle, Muhammad, Abū Bakr Muhammad al-Walikhi, then it passed to the Nasrids of Granada to 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Ikhshidī. For details of the obscure history of this period see the monograph by Gaspar Remiro quoted below. According to Ibn al-Abbār (cf. M. Benchenchi, Notes chonomématiques sur la conquête de l'Espagne, in Mélanges René Basset, Paris 1923, n. 73), Murcia was surrendered to the Christians by 'Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad b. Hiṣād, son of the governor, on Thursday 10th Shawwal 640 (April 2, 1243). But if we may believe the Chronicle it was in February 1266 that Don Jaime of Aragon took definite possession of Murcia.

belonged neither to the adherents of the doctrine of free will nor to those of predetermination; the latter group belonged the followers of Vānas pa 'Awn, Ghassān, Abū Thawā ibn Abū Murdī j.努 Tel (q.v.). The followers of Ghassān reckoned Abū Hanīfa as one of their friends, not, however, quite rightly, according to al-Baghdādī. That Abū Hanīfa shared the general views of the Murdījī, appears from his (unedited) letter to al-Battī, which is preserved in a MS. in the library of Cairo.

Although al-Baghdādī mentions a hadīth in which the Murdījī are cursed, the high esteem in which Abū Hanīfa stood as a doctor and as a doctor of the law would be in itself sufficient proof of the fact that the sect was too eccentric. As a matter of fact, their political quietism was largely practised by orthodoxy itself. As regards ecclesiastical punishment, the Fikh Akbar, ii. (art. 14) rejects the Murdījī doctrine of our good deeds being accepted and of our sins being forgiven, Allah being free to punish the sinner or to grant him forgiveness. The same hadīth, however, shares the Murdījī doctrine of the confluence of faith (art. 15).


A. J. WENSINCK

MURGHĀB. See MERW AL-MAHDIJAN.

MURID, novice, the term applied during his period of preparation to one who wishes to enter a derwaish order [TARIKA; q. v.]; cf. also DERWISH or a guild [SIND; q. v.]. The task of the murid and his obligations to his master (shakīk, pir) and to his ideal and their mystic and erotic foundations have been often and fully discussed, so that it is here sufficient to give a reference to the most important literature of modern times, which will guide one to the sources themselves. In the wider application of the word murid has become a term for mystic in general.

**Bibliography:** the articles mentioned and SADDI, H. Thorming, Die islamische Vereinigung (Turk. Bibl., xxvii, 1913); R. Hartmann, Al-Khurasanische Darstellung der Sufismus (Turk. Bibl., xviii, 1914); Dict. of Tech, Terms, ed. Sprenger, s. v.; Asin Palacios, El Islam cristianizado, 1931, esp. p. 145-158.

M. PLESSNER

AL-MURIYYĀNĪ, ABU AYŪB SULAIMĀN AL-MAṢṣĪR, vizier of the caliph al-Mansūr. When the governor of Fars Sulaiman b. Ḩabib al-Muhammad in the Umayyad period had the future caliph al-Mansūr, who was accused of embezzling state funds, fuged and intended to treat him with still greater indignity, the latter was saved by Abu Ayūb al-Murriyānī who was Sulaiman's secretary. According to another story, al-Mansūr purchased him as a young boy and sent him in some capacity to his brother, the caliph al-Saffāh, who was so pleased with him that he at once took him into his service and later appointed him vizier. After his manumission, Al-Murriyānī was in any case appointed vizier by al-Mansūr in succession to Khaul ibn Barmak. He had a great influence over the caliph in 153 (770); however, he was arrested with his brother and the latter's sons and deprived of all his property. According to some, his crime was that he had embezzled a large sum received from al-Mansūr to make a district in Khuzistān arable and deceived the caliph when he came to inspect it by making the place look as if it were cultivated. According to others, he had a son of al-Mansūr murdered. He died in prison in 154 (770), the title al-Murriyānī comes from Murriyān, a town in Khuzistān.


K. V. ZETTER-FLEX

MURSALAT, title of a sura lxxviii, after the first verse: "By those which are sent by Allah, following one another in a continual series." According to some interpreters a certain group of angels is meant here; according to others, however, the mursalalat are the verses of the Korān. See the commentaries on the Korān on sura lxviii i.

MURSHIDABAD, district in the Division of Bengal; area 145 sq. m.; pop. 1,372,274, of whom 710,152 are Muslims. The public offices are at Bahāmpāt, but the old capital is at Murshidābād, which before Murshid Kuli's appointment was known as Malhābād or Maḥshidābād. The district is mainly agricultural, and produces much rice, jute, etc., and is famous for its mangoes. The silk industry was formerly of great importance, but has now much declined. The district played a very prominent part in the history of Bengal, and is full of historical sites though Passey is now outside its borders. The history of Calcutta and the English in Bengal is intimately connected with Murshidābād. But the Nawabs are no longer of political importance.


(H. BEVERIDGE)


While the authorship of the Nahīj al–Balāgha must remain open the anthology Ta‘īf al–Khāṣṣā is to be ascribed to our author and not with Denkovich, Cat. Estor., ii, No. 348 to his brother, as in the preface he quotes his own work mentioned under No. 7. He and not his brother as in the article SHARĪF PASHA is to be credited with the Maṣūṣat al–Khurān, which Ḥādījī Khātīfā No. 11377 ascribes to al–Masā’il al–Raḍī and he is probably also the author of the Kitāb al–Muṣṣīr al–Nabūṣyā, also ascribed to al–Raḍī and extant in a manuscript in the British Museum (s. Oriental Studies, p. 137, No. 2) and was printed at Baghdād in 1328. This also holds of the Kitāb Mu‘āmī al–Khurān, in that quote but now lost. The Turkish commentary on the Dīwān ascribed to ‘Alī also credits him with the authorship.


MURTADDDD (A.), “one who turns back”, especially from Iṣlam, an apostate. Apostasy is calledītābī or riddīa; it may be committed verbally by denying a principle of belief or by an action, for example treating a copy of the Kur’ān with disrespect.

1. In the Kur’ān the apostate is threatened with punishment in the next world only; the “wrath of God” will fall upon him according to a Sūra of the latest Meccan period (xvi. 108 sq.) and severe punishment (ṣālaḥ) “except he did it under compulsion and his heart is steadfast in belief”. Similarly it is written in the Medina Sūra iii. So sqq.: “... This is the punishment for them, that the curse of Allah, the Angels and of men is upon them for all time (82); the punishment shall not be lightened for them and they shall not be granted allevation, (83) except for those who later repent and make good their fault, for Allah is forgiving and merciful. (84) Those who disbelieve after believing and increase in unbelief, shall not have their repentance accepted; they are the erring ones. (85) Those who are unbelievers and die as unbelievers, from none of them shall they be accepted the earth-fall of gold even if he should wish to ransom himself with it; this is a painful punishment for them and there will be no helpers for them” (cf. also iv. 136; v. 59; ix. 67). Sūra ii. 214 is to be interpreted in the same way although it is adduced by Shāfī as the main evidence for the death penalty: “... He among you who falls away from his belief and dies an unbeliever—these, their works are fruitless in this world and ever afterwards in the next, and they are the companions for the fire ever after”.

2. There is little echo of these punishments in the next world in the Traditions (cf. Ibn Mādja, Ḥudūdī, bāb 2; Ibn Hanbal, i. 409, 430, 404 sq.; v. 4, 5). Instead we have in many traditions a new element, the death penalty. Thus Ibn ‘Abbās transmits an utterance of the Prophet: “Slay him, who changes his religion” or “behead him” (Ibn Mādja, Ḥudūdī, bāb 2; Nasīrī, Tahārim al–Din,
báb 14; Ṭayālīṣ, N. 2689; Mālik, Ahṣāra, tr. 15; cf. also Ḳubhārī, Ḳirṭīṣānāt al-Murattadīn, báb 2; Tirmīḏī, Ḥudūd, báb 25; Ābū Dāwūd, Ḥudūd, báb 1; Ibn Ḥanbal, i. 217, 282, 322). According to another tradition of Ibn Ḳubhārī, Ḳirṭīṣānāt al-Murattadīn, báb 2; Tirmīḏī, Ḥudūd, báb 25; Ābū Dāwūd, Ḥudūd, báb 1; Ibn Ḥanbal, i. 217; according to a variant the reference is to Zīnīḏās or Zūqī who served idols; (Nasā’ī, Tāhīm al-Dām, báb 14; Ibn Ḥanbal, i. 282, 322). According to a tradition of Aḥṣārī’s apostates to be slain, crucified or hanged (Nasā’ī, Tāhīm al-Dām, báb 15; Kāfī, Ḥudūd, báb 1; Ibn Ḥanbal, v. 231). In the same tradition in Ābū Dāwūd however, it is added that they had tried in vain for 20 nights to convert the apostate. The caliph Ṭūrān is also represented as disapproving of this proceeding with the words: “Did you then not shut him up for three days and give him a round loaf (ragāf) daily and try to induce him to repent? Perhaps repentance was then suggested and returned to obedience to God. O God! I was not there, I did not order it and I do not approve; see, it was thus reported to me” (Mālik, Ahṣāra, tr. 15). There are also traditions according to which God does not accept the repentance of an apostate (Ibn Ḥanbal, v. 2 sqq.) and others according to which even the Prophet forgave apostates (Nasā’ī, Tāhīm al-Dām, báb 14, 15; Ābū Dāwūd, Ḥudūd, báb 1; Ibn Ḥanbal, i. 247; Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, iii. 223).

3. a. In the Fīkh there is unanimity that the male apostate must be put to death, but only if he is grown up (ḥāṣmī) and composes mentis (ṣāḥīf) and has not acted under compulsion (mustahfīr).

A woman on the other hand is imprisoned, according to Ḥanafī and Ṭūrānī teaching. Until she again adopts Islam, while according to Aḥṣārī’s, Ibn Ḥanbal (Tirmīḏī, Ḥudūd, báb 25), the Ṣāḥīfīs and .scrollTop 3.3333333333333335; Šī‘īs (cf. ʿUmm, i. 131, where Šī‘īs vigorously attack Abū Yūsuf who is not mentioned by name) she also is put to death. Although this punishment is not properly ḥadd (cf. thereon Šī‘ī, ʿUmm, vii. 330, 30–8) it is regarded as such by some jurists, as it is a question of a ḥāṣm al-Aḥlāf (cf. e.g. Sarakhsī, Siyās, ir. 162); therefore the execution of the punishment lies with the imām; in the case of a slave however, the mawālī can carry it out, as with any other ḥadd punishment. Execution should be by the sword. According to the above traditions, apostates must sometimes have been tortured to death. The caliph Ṭūrān had them tied to a post and a lance thrust into their hearts (Abū Yūsuf, Ḳurāyq, p. 112). BāḏĀrī expressly forbids any form of torture, like burning, drowning, strangling, impaling, flaying; according to him, Sūltān Bālibār (708–709, 1367–9) was the first to introduce torture to Snick (Hudūd, Tahr. Gesch., ii. 198). Lane (Manners and Customs, ch. iii., near the end) records the case of a woman who had apostatised and was led through the streets of Cairo on an ass, then strangled in a boat in the middle of the Nile and thrown into the river. [The throwing of the corpse into the Nile was already usual in Cairo in the Fāṭimid period; cf. Mez, Renaissance d. Isl., p. 29]. In quite recent times followers of the ʿAlīyān or Ahmādiyā sect in Afghanistan were stoned to death (O. M., v. [1925], 138). In former Turkish territory and Egypt as well as in Muslim lands under European rule since the middle of the sixteenth century, under European influence the execution of an apostate on a ʿābd’s sentence has been abolished; but we still have imprisonment and deportation (cf. Isabel Burton, The Inner Life of Syria, London 1875, i. 180 sqq.); but nevertheless renegades are not sure of their lives as their Muslim relatives endeavour secretly to dispose of them by poison or otherwise. Occasionally modern Islamic writers (Ahmādiyā movement) endeavour to prove that Islam knows no death penalty for apostasy; the Indian apologist Muḥammad ʿAlī lays great stress on the fact there is not once an indication of the death penalty in the Qurān (Zwemer, The Law of Apostasy, in Islam, p. 17, 37 sqq., London 1924; O. M., v. [1925], 262).

I should like here to call attention to an agreement which is probably not accidental. As in Islam, in addition to apostasy, unchastity and unnatural vice (even by stoning are punished by death) according to both Šī‘ī and Mālikīs, as well as by al-Mawgūl of God or a prophet and magic, we find in Islam all crimes punished by death which in the Mitha (Sniedoer, vii. 4) are threatened with stoning.

b. Whether attempts at conversion must be made is a question of Ḳubhāf. A number of jurists of the first and second (viiith and viiith centuries) dissent this (as do the Zāhirīs) or like ʿĀṣa (d. 115 = 733) make a distinction between the apostate born in Islam and one converted to Islam; the former is to be put to death at once (so also the Ṣāḥīfs). Others insist on three attempts at conversion (relying on Sūra iv. 136; cf. Šī‘ī, Tafsīr, v. 193 sq.) or have them in the first place imprisoned for those days (cf. above 2). According to others again one should wait the round of the five times of prayer and ask him to perform the ṣalāt at each; only when he has refused at each is the death punishment to be enforced. If however he repents and professes Islam once more, he is released (cf. thereon Šī‘ī, ʿUmm, i. 228; Abū Yūsuf, Ḳurāyq, p. 109). In later times Ḳurāyq was always applied.

c. Apart from the fact that apostasy deprives the murtadh of burial with Muslim rites it has certain civil consequences. The property of the murtadh is fitāḥ according to Šī‘ī and the Mālikīs; if the fugitive murtadh returns penitent, he is given back what remains (cf. ʿUmm, i. 231 sqq., where Šī‘ī opposes the contrary Ḥanafī view). Others, especially later Šī‘īs, regard the rights
of ownership of the apostate as suspended (mawzū'ā) and regard him as one who is under guardianship (madhīr); only if the fugitive apostate dies in the dār al-ḥarb, does his property become faiḍ (Shurārī, Mukhātulbāb, Cairo 1345, ii. 240; cf. Shāfi‘ī, Umm, vii. 355). Among the Hanafis and Shāfi‘ī the estate is allotted by the kādā to the legal heirs (cf. above the preamble in Dārūmī, Fūrū‘, kāb 40). The madhīr and umm wālīd are set free, even when the apostate escapes into the dār al-ḥarb, for this is equivalent to his death. If he comes back penitent, however, he receives of his property what still exists; the heirs however are not liable for compensation. — The marriage of the murtadd is void (ḥāfīl). Of his legal undertakings the istilā‘ is effective (nāfšū‘), i.e. the umm wālīd becomes free; the kīla‘ also continues. Other legal activities, like manumission, endowment, testament, sale are suspended (mawzū‘) according to Abū ʿUmar; according to Abū Yusuf they are effective as in the case of a person in good health, according to Muhammad al-Shafī‘ī however only as in the case of an invalid, i.e. they cannot deal with more than one third of the estate. In the case of the female apostate however they are always effective. If the apostate makes such legal arrangements after his flight into the dār al-ḥarb, they are invalid (Sarakhsh, Siyāh, iv. 153; cf. also Abū Yusuf, Kulliyāt, p. 111). But since according to Shāfi‘ī and Malik his whole estate becomes faiḍ, such legal arrangements are invalid; only the manumission of a slave remains suspended until his possible return penitent; in the case of his death also this slave becomes faiḍ (cf. however above the view of later Shafī‘ī).

He is punished for crimes committed before apostasy, if he returns penitent: for crimes committed during ṭalā‘a, no notice is taken of the ṭalā‘a Allāh (i.e. no hadd) but only of the ṭalā‘a al-ḥarb, and he must for example pay the diya (Sarakhsh, Siyāh, iv. 163, 208 sq.; cf. Shāfi‘ī, Umm, i. 237).


(Helfen)
says that Kornh found a hidden Egyptian treasure; 300 mules carried the keys of his treasury (Per-
achin, 119; Sankinorin, 1109; Pal. Sank., x. 279;
Gimzerg, Legendr, vi. 99, 566). — The Kuranic story
believed at the court of Pharaoh which he says to
save Mūsā is not quite clear (xl. 29). Ought we to compare Jethro in the Haggada who
advises clemency at Pharaoh’s court? (Sīfa, 112;
Sankinorin, 1069; Gimzerg, v. 392, 21; v. 412,
101).

The story of Mūsā accompanying a wise man on a journey seems without parallel (xxviii.
59–61). The attempt is often made to distinguish this Mūsā of Kādir as Mūsā b. Manasse from
Mūsā b. Idris [cf. the article Kūdir].

2. Mūsā in post-Kūranic legend. The histories of the prophet (especially Thalibi’s) sup-
plement the Kuranic story with much from the
Bible, Haggada and folklore.

Much is added from Haggada. Pharaoh’s sick
daurers are cured as soon as they touch Moses’
cradle, Exodus Rabba, 1. 23, male: Pharah’s daughter
cured of leprosy. — The infant Mūsā
scratches Pharaoh’s chin. Pharaoh wants to slay
him. On the intercession of Asiya he tests him by
putting gold and jewels on one side and
burning coals on the other. Mūsā reaches for the
gold but Gabriel directs his hand to the burning
coal. Mūsā puts his burned hand on his tongue
and therefore becomes a stammerer (Gimzerg, v.
402, 65); Hamilton, Zeitschr. für romanische Philo-
sophie, xxxvi. 125–159).

Elements of other legends are woven into the
legend of Mūsā. The Ibrāhim-Namūsī legend sup-
plies the following features: Pharaoh frightened
by dreams persecutes the infants; Mūsā is hidden
from the assassins in the burning oven but the
fire becomes hot and does him no harm. Pharaoh
orders prayers to be offered to himself as to a
god, has a tower built, shoots an arrow against
heaven; the arrow comes back blood-stained and
Pharaoh boasts he has slain God (Tabari, i. 469).
— From the story of Jacob and Laban come the
following: Mūsā serves 8–10 years for his wife
(xxvii. 27). His father-in-law offers him the spotted
lamb born in his flock and the ewes for the
watertroughs bear spotted lambs (Thalibi, p.
112). There are frequent references to a pious
Egyptian woman who is martyred by Pharaoh
with her seven children, the younger of whom is
still at its mother’s breast (in Thalibi, p. 118,
139); this is of course modelled on the
martyr mother of the Maccabees.

There are many fanciful embellishments, e.g.
the miracle of the snakes, the plague of the scene
on the Red Sea; Moses’ rod in particular plays a
fairy part. It came from Paradise; Adam, Hābīl,
Shīth, Idris, Nūh, Hūd, Sālih, Ibrāhim, Ismā’īl,
Isḥāk and Ya’qūb had previously used it (Kādir.
p. 208). In Tabari (p. 460 sq.) an angel brought
the rod; Mūsā obtained it from his wife; his
father-in-law quarrels with him about its ownership and
an angel decides in favour of Mūsā. It is a
miraculous rod and Thalibi (p. 111–116) in
particular relates the wonders it performs. It shines
in the darkness; it gives water in a drought, and
placed in the ground it becomes a tree bearing
fruit; it produces milk and honey and fragrant
scent; against an enemy it becomes a double
dragon. It pierces mountains and rocks; it heads
over rivers and sea; it is also a shepherd’s staff
and keeps beasts of prey from the herds of Moses.
When Mūsā was asleep on one occasion the rod
swallowed a dragon, on another occasion seven of
Pharaoh’s assassins.

The varied Biblicall, Haggadic, legendary and
fairy tale features in the Islamic legend of Mūsā
are thus blended into a very full picture and in
Thalibi form a regular romance.

Bibliography: Sūra ii. 48–130; vii. 109–
160; x. 76–88; xx. 8–93; xxvi. 9–65; xxviii.
2–76; xli. 24–56 and the commentaries thereon;
Tabari, ed. Leyden, i. 414–449; Thalibi, Kītāb
al-’Abīya, Cairo 1325, p. 105–156; Kādir,
Kītāb al-’Abīya ed. Eisenberg, p. 194–240;
Ibn al-Maḥrī, al-Kāmil, Bālík, i. 61–78; Abr.
Geiger, Was hat Mohammed..., 1902, p. 149–
177; M. Grünbaum, Neuere Beiträge, p. 153–
185; J. Horovitz, Kosnische Untersuchungen, p.
141–143; R. Basset, 1001 Contes, Réits et
Légendes arabes, i. 67, 85; D. Silbersky, Les
Origines de Légendes Musulmanes dans le Coran
et dans la Vie des Prophètes, Paris 1932, p. 73–
103; J. Walker, Bible Characters in the Koran,
p. 84–111.

BERNHARD HELLER

al-Lākūmī (or al-Bakrī) was ’Abd al-Rahmān,
Arab governor, conqueror of the western
Maghrīb and of Spain. He was born in 19
(649); his father had been in the immediate
etouage of Mu’āwiya [q. v.]. Mūsā was at first
appointed by the caliph ’Abd al-Malik to collect the
’Abūṣ at-al-Baqr, but having been suspected of
embezzlement, he fled and took refuge with the
caliph’s brother, the governor of Egypt ’Abd
al-’Azīz b. Marwān; the latter took Mūsā to Syria
to the caliph who fined him 100,000 dinars. ’Abd
al-’Azīz provided half of this sum for Mūsā and
brought him to Egypt where he gave him the
governorship of Ifriqiya which had been previously
held by Ḥasan b. al-Nuṣair. The various chron-
iclers are not agreed as to the date of his ap-
nointment to the office but it possibly took place
in 79 (698) or the following year.

Mūsā and his troops theetupon entered on a
career of successfull conquest which ended in
the consolidation of Arab power in Ifriqiya and in
the conquest of the rest of north Africa and of Spain.
Here we give only the most essential details.
Assisted by his son ’Abd Allāh al-Marwān he
sent successful expeditions against Zaghwan and
Suljama and reduced the Hawwara, the Za’atā
and the Kutāma. The Berbers taking refuge in
the west of the Maghrib, Mūsā decided to bring them
to subjection; confirmed in his office by ’Abd
al-Malik’s successor al-Walid, he continued his
advance to Tangier and Sīs [q. v.] and returned to
Ifriqiya leaving as his deputy in the Maghrib
his freedman Tārīq [q. v.]. The latter in 92
(710–711) invaded Spain and Mūsā anxious about
and at the same time jealous of the progress made
by his lieutenant crossed himself in the following
year leaving his son ’Abd Allāh as governor of
Ifriqiya. Landing at Algeciras in Ramzān 93
(June–July 712) with his other son ’Abd al-’Azīz,
he refused to take the same route as Tārīq and
taking the towns of Sidon (Shāfi’in; q. v.), Car-
mona, Sevilla and Merida, he was on his way
to Toledo when Tārīq came up with him and was
bitterly reproached by his master. Mūsā b. Nuṣair
then continued his march and completely subja-
guted the north of Spain from Sangossa to Na-
varre. In 95, he left Spain with immense booty, leaving his son 'Abd al-'Aziz as governor; he reached Kairouân at the end of the year, and continued by land to Syria in a triumphal procession of Arab chiefs and Berber and Spanish prisoners. The caliph al-Walid then near his end urged him to hurry while his brother and heir presumptive Sulaimân, eager to appropriate the vast wealth brought by Mūsā, tried to delay him. He arrived in Damascas shortly before the death of al-Walid and when Sulaimân assumed power he at once displayed his hatred of the conqueror. Regarding Mūsā b. Nuṣair's stay in Syria before his death in 98 (710–717), the Arab historians give a number of details which are obviously of quite a legendary character.


MŪSĀ CELEBI, one of the younger sons of the Ottoman sultan Bāyāzīd. According to some sources he was younger than his brother Muhammad I [q.v.], who is generally considered as the youngest. Mūsā had been taken prisoner in the battle of Angora (1402) and was left by Timūr in custody with the Gümîyân Oğlu Yağkû Beg. The latter sent him afterwards to his brother Muhammad in Amassia, and for some time he became Muhammad's helper in the re-establishment of Ottoman power in Anatolia; he is even said to have driven their brother İsa from Brusa, though the current opinion is that Muhammad went there himself. When, in 1404, their eldest brother Sulaimân Celebi appeared in his turn in Brusa, Mūsā first opposed him in the name of Muhammad and went afterwards, with the latter's consent, to Europe, where he hoped to make an end of Sulaimân's reign with the aid of Mirce of Walachia and Stephen of Serbia. At first this enterprise failed through a defeat inflicted on Mūsā near the walls of Constantinople. Sulaimân resided in Adrianople. Here Mūsā appeared suddenly in 1411 (or 1410); Sulaimân had to flee and was killed on his way to Constantinople, after which Mūsā took his place as ruler of the Ottoman territory in Europe, surrounded by the military and political councilors of Sulaimân, as Ewrēnos Beg and the Djandarîf Oğlu İrâsîm Paşa. Mūsā began his short reign with great energy, recovering nearly all the Ottoman possessions in Serbia and Thessaly, and sending raiding expeditions as far as Carinthia. At the same time he adopted a despotic attitude which displeased his entourage and prepared the final victory of his brother Muhammed. İbrahim Paşa, sent to Constantinople to exact tribute, went from there to Muhammed's court (cf. Taeschner and Wittek, in Ist., xviii. 94) and, when Mūsā soon afterwards began a siege of Constantinople, Muhammed came to the rescue of the emperor. In this he failed for the moment and he was obliged to return to Anatolia. But in 1413 Muhammed appeared again in Europe, having found allies in the Serbians. Meanwhile, the Turkish commanders in Serbia and Thessaly were drawn to Muhammed's side and even the old Ewen prepared to leave Mūsā's cause; his son and other military chiefs went over openly to Muhammed. The latter approached Adrianople from the north and followed from here Mūsā's army beyond Philippi; then he joined his allies in Serbia and met Mūsā's army on the plain of Camurlu, east of Sofia. Mūsā's army was defeated (July 1413), and Mūsā himself perished in the flight. His corpse was found and buried in the Burke of Mūsā I in Brusa.

**Bibliography:** The ancient Ottoman chronicles of Aşık Pasha Zade, Neshri, Utedeg Beg and Tuvârik-i Sâ'î Otomâni (Anonymously, ed. Giese), besides the Byzantine historians Phrantzes, Duçans and Chalcondylas. Further all general Ottoman histories since the Thâq al-Tuwârikih and the modern works of von Hammer (G. O. K., 1), Zinkeisen and Jorga; Mehmed Zeki, Mağrib Şehzadeleri, Constantinople 1832, p. 11 sqq. (J. H. KRAMERS)

MŪSĀ, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-HĀDI, an Abū Bakr caliph. After the death of his father on Mehemmed 22, 169 (Aug. 4, 785) al-Hādi ascended the throne and at once put an end to the influence of his mother al-Khażairūn, by forbidding her to interfere in the slightest in matters of state. When he was supposed to exclude her from the succession in favour of his son Djiyar, he met with vigorous opposition from the Barmağid Yahya b. Khâlid [q.v.]. When the latter boldly persisted in his opposition, he was arrested; but the caliph's plan came to nothing for he died suddenly in Rabî' I 170 (Sept. 786) in Tâshkend near Baghdad. According to the usual but not at all certain story, he was poisoned or stabbed by his mother's orders. Al-Hādi who was only 26 when he died is described as brave, just, liberal and full of joie-de-vivre. The most important event of his brief reign was an 'Alid rising in Mecca and Medina. Omar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, the governor of Medina, had punished an 'Alid along with some other citizens of the town for drinking wine. As a result the 'Alids rebelled and denounced their allegiance to the caliph. After several days fighting the ringleader of the movements, a descendant of Ali called al-Husain b. 'Ali, marched on Mecca where he obtained a number of additional followers. Soon afterwards the pilgrims arrived; at Fâkhkhir near Mecca, a battle took place and al-Husain was killed (Ubu 'l-Hildija 169 = June 786). As regards the fighting with the Byzantines, the Muslims under Ma'ârif b. Yahya invaded Asia Minor where they took much booty.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Kutaiba, Kitâb al-Ma'ârif (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 193; Yağkûbî (ed. Houtsma), ii. 476, 487–491, 515; Baîdurt
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(ed. de Goeje), p. 190 sq., 233, 297, 323; Tabari, iii. 457 sqq., 533–599; Mas‘üd, Mu-
bourg), p. 254–263; Ibn Khalidin, al-Tabar., ii. 208 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, ii. 194, 112, 118–121; Müller, Der Islam im Morgen-
und Abendland, i. 477 sqq.; Muir, The Cali-
phate, its Rise, Decline, and Fall, i. 465–
477; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 193 sqq. (K. Zetterstën)

MUSÄ AL-KÄŻİM the seventh Imâm of the Twelver Shi‘a, son of Dâjâr b. Muham-
mad al-Sâdik [q. v.], was born about 128 (745) at al-Abbîr [q. v.], the traditional burial-place of Āmîna, mother of the Prophet. He grew to manhood in his father’s house in Medina and remained there as Imâm after the latter’s death in 148 (765) without playing any part in politics. In par-
ticular he took no share in the great rising of the Ḥashedî ‘Alîs which collapsed at Fâshkhî in 169 (786). Nevertheless the caliph was suspicious of him. He was perhaps already imprisoned by al-Mahdi. In 179 (795) Hârûn had him brought first to Basra and then to Baghdad; he is said to have been released for a time but he died in prison in Baghdât, according to the usual story in Ra’dîb 183 (Aug.–Sept. 799).

Little attention was paid to Mûsä outside the Shi‘a, but we find him occasionally, as the Shi‘a point out, quoted as an authority, for example for a strongly pro-ʿAlî tradition in Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, l. 77 infra (cf. al-Dhabhî, Mûsâ al-Sâdîq, NP. 1835). The Shi‘a records are more voluminous. He is said to have had the honorific al-Kâţam “he who restrains his anger” because he returned kindness for injury to an opponent so that the latter came over to him. As evidence of his fitness for the imâmate he is reputed to have had a great knowledge of šîkh and is thus brought into connection with Âbû Ḥanîfè. The chapters on miracles, usual in all biographies of the imâms, credit him with being born with a knowledge of languages, e.g. Ethiopic and the language of birds, in later stories also of “Frankish” to fit a story, modelled on a later Kerbelâ’ motif, that Hârûn could not find a Muslim to assassinate him and therefore brought Franks, who were so impressed by his nobility that they refused to kill him. Prayers by Mûsä have been handed down; a letter of warning to al-Husain b. ʿAlî b. al-Hassan, the leader of the Fâshkhî rising; letters from prison; a statement of his claims to the imâmate against Hârûn through relationship with the Prophet, not through ‘Alî like the ‘Abbasîs through ‘Abbas but through Fâṭîma, whom he compares with the mother of Jesus. Considerable portions of the bi-
ography are the result of the disputes within the Shi‘a, even the account of his conception and birth. That his mother was bought from a slave dealer is not disputed; but great pains are devoted to proving she was a virgin. When at the death of his father a group of the Nâwusiya “remained” steadfast to him, the Ismâ‘iliya [q. v.] and the Fâṭîya branched off, the claims of Mûsä had to be based on a will of Dâjâr, the authenticity of which is as doubtful as that of Mûsä in favour of his son ʿAlî al-Rida; this was used against the followers of another son Ahmad, as well as against the Mâmûra who “remained” by Mûsä himself and a similar party in the Mûsawiya (Mûsâ‘iyya; for details see the writers on heresy, especially al-Āshšîn, Maḥâlik, ed. Ritter, Constantinople 1930, p. 25 sqq.). The dispute with the latter groups also explains the very detailed stories of witnesses who had seen Mûsä’s corpse. Bitter differ-
ces of opinion within the family are revealed by the fact that even Mûsä’s son ʿIbrâhem for a long time denied his father’s death, and also by the fact that Mûsä’s brother ʿIbrâhim or a nephew ʿAlî b. Ismâ‘îl played the traitor with Hârûn, in-
citing him by pointing out the great sums which were given to Mûsä as the true caliph by his followers; on the other hand, the incautious acknow-
ledgment of Mûsä’s imâmate by the theologian Hîshâm b. al-Ḥakâm is made responsible for his capture. — The kunya of Mûsä is Âbû ʿIbâhím or Abu ‘l-Ḥasan, also Âbû ʿAlî; the statements regarding the number of his children vary between 30 and 60; 37 is the usual figure. Besides his successor ʿAlî al-Rida some prominence was attained by the partial imâm Ahmad, but more by Zaid, who at the time of the great rising of Abu ʿl-Sarâḥî in Basra, by burning the houses and followers of the ‘Abbasîs acquired the name Zaid al-Nâr, “Zaid of the fire” (Tabari, ii. 986), and ʿIbrâhem, who on account of similar activities in Sarâh was called al-Djazzâr, “the butcher” (Tabari, ii. 987); his daughter Fâṭîma, who died in Kâmîn, has given to this city in her tomb its most important sanctuary. Mûsä himself was buried in the cemetery of the Kûrâshî in Baghdât, where his grandson, the ninth imâm Muḥammad al-Djâwâd [q. v.], was in time intersed beside him: thus arose the twin sanctuaries al-Kâ‘imân [q. v.]

Biography: Mufîd, al-ʾIrâhâd (Teheran without date or pagination arranged in the order of the imâms); Ibn Bâbîya, ʾLi’ân al-ʾAbîbîr al-ʾRida (MS. Berl. NP. 9663), esp. fol. 103b–104a; comprehensive collection of Shi‘i accounts with references to the sources in Muḥammad Bâkîr al-Mudallîs, Bîhâr al-ʾInwâr, xi. (Teheran 1329, p. 230–317; Abu ʿl-Faraj al-Iṣbâhâni, Maḥâlik al-Tâhkîm, Teheran 1307, p. 172–176; Ibn Khîlîkîn. Wâṣfât, Bûlût 1299, ii. 172 sqq. (cf. al-Khâtîb, Tāʾirîkh Baghdât); Mas‘üdî, Manâfi‘î (ed. Barbier de Meynard), vi. 309 sqq., 329 sqq.; E. de Zambräu, Manuel de géologie et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, table D. —

As the importance of imâm like Mûsä lies less in their own personality than in the views of the dogmaticians upon them, their vitae should also be compared: cf. in Kashshâ, Muḥâfîz Abîbûr al-Ridâl, Bombay 1317, section Abûbûr Mûsä b. Dâjâr wa-ʿAlî b. Mûsâ, p. 344 sqq. and the vitae of Hîshâm b. al-Ḥakâm, Highân b. al-Dhâwâlîkî, Ammâr b. Mûsâ al-Sâbîtî, etc.; and the same names in the alphabetically arranged works of Nadîbî, al-ʾIrâhâd, Bombay 1917; Tûsî, Fihrist, Calcutta 1853–1855; Astarbâdî, Maḥâlik al-ʾAbîbîr, Teheran 1306.

(R. STROTHEMANN)

BANÜ MÜSÄ, more precisely BANÜ MÜSÄ f. SHAKIR, the usual name for the three brothers Abu ʾl-Kâṣîm Ahmad and al-Ḥasan b. Mûsâ b. Šâkir, who made a reputation under the ‘Abbasîs from al-Ma‘mûn to al-Mutawakkil as mathematicians, astronomers and technicians and also at times played a part in politics. The father is said
to have begun life as a bandit in Khūrāsān, then to have become an astronomer and geometer. We have no means of testing such stories or learning how a bandit could become an astronomer. If we assume however that Mūsā b. Shākir like Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmi joined al-Ma'mūn's train in Khūrāsān as astronomer and astrologist and then came with him to Baghdad, we can understand that al-Ma'mūn took his three sons, still young, into his service on Mūsā's death, and had them educated in medical sciences by the astronomer Yalqūz b. Abī Manṣūr. The Band Mūsā thus had a comparatively favorable age were admitted to that circle of scholars who, by their thorough and expert translations, introduced Greek science to Islam and by their own researches laid the foundation for the glorious development of the sciences in the 9th (ixth) and 10th (xth) centuries. Attaining fame and fortune, they used their wealth to purchase Greek manuscripts and sent agents into the Byzantine provinces to seek for and purchase books. Of Muhammad b. Mūsā it is related that he met Thūbit b. Kūra in Harrān while on a journey and induced him to settle at the caliph's court. It may be assumed they these scientific expeditions to seek books and scholars did not take place without the caliph's support.

History also records political and literary feuds. A particular enmity is said to have existed between al-Kindī and the three brothers, because the caliph al-Mu'tašāin did not entrust them but al-Kindī with the education of his son Alīmād. The feud went so far that the Band Mūsā are later said to have intrigued against the choice of Alīmād as caliph. This story can only be understood in connection with court intrigues, in which the ambitions of the brothers and the jealousy of the courtiers played the same parts as elsewhere. If all is true that is recorded of the malevolent attitude of the brothers to recognised scholars, little praise can be bestowed on their character. The stories of the huge incomes, especially that of Muhammad b. Mūsā — his is said to have had for a time an annual income of £300,000 — exceed all that even the most liberal caliph could hope to pay a scholar.

The works of the Band Mūsā include translations and original works on geometry, astronomy and mechanics. Many of their works are written jointly by two or three brothers, others only by one. Muhammad b. Mūsā is regarded as the most versatile, al-Ḥasan the best mathematician, Alīmād especially interested in mechanical and technical problems. The astronomical and meteological observations of the brothers were probably made mainly in Sāmarra; their tables of observations of the sun are mentioned by Ibn Yanūs, M. Curzur, E. Wiedemann and F. Hauser have devoted special attention to the editing and elucidation of these works that have survived in Arabic or Latin.

ment which bordered on barbarity. He began his military career at the beginning of the caliphate of Marwân I by a badly planned invasion of Palestine. Later, as governor to Basra by his brother Abd Allah, he soon found himself called to the help of the people of Kūfah, tired of the yoke of Muhkṭār b. Abī 'Uqāid [q. v.]. He began by putting the army brought against him by the redoubtable Thaqāfī agitator and then besieged him for four months in the citadel of Kūfah. On the death of Muhkṭār, Muḥṣab ordered several thousands of his followers to be executed and by this savage act made as many enemies as he had relatives. He was less successful against 'Uqāid Allāh b. al-Ḥurr [q. v.] who had been sent into the Ḳurāṣ to stir up a counter-revolution in favour of the Marwānīs. A similar attempt at Basra by the Umayyad Khalīl b. Asid failed. But by proceeding with great severity against Khālid's followers Muḥṣab alienated the most influential personages in the city.

Soon he found he had to defend the Ḳurāṣ which was directly threatened by the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik; troops were massed at Būdajmāra. Muḥṣab awaited the Syrian army here and then retired to Dair al-Djāthīlīk [q. v.]. His position soon became critical for the Basran troops refused to follow him. The best troops of the province were far away with Muhāllāh, engaged in an inextricable campaign against the Khāridjīs. The Zubairī's troops displayed only moderate enthusiasm. His officers tired of his iron hand were prepared to betray him and entered into negotiations with 'Abd al-Malik. The Marwānī was not stingy in his promises. He also tried to negotiate with Muḥṣab, who learning of the perfidy of his followers rejected all offers and decided to die like a brave man. Among his followers Ibrāhīm b. al-Aṣhtar alone fought vigorously in the battle; the others folded their arms during the fighting or went over to the Syrian ranks. 'Abd al-Malik offered Muḥṣab his life for the last time with the government of the Ḳurāṣ, but in vain. Taking flight from his horse, the Zubairī received the coup-de-grâce which was dealing to him by Abī 'Uqāid b. al-Ḫubayrī a blade called by family name Muhkṭār. This took place about the middle of Djuḥādā I (October) of 72 (691). 'Abd al-Malik wept for him and ordered his poets to commemorate his heroic end. Muḥṣab's great generosity earned him numerous eulogies from poets. He is also famous for the fact that he had in his harem the two most independent and haughtiest women of the time, belonging to the most undoubted aristocracy of Islam, Zaypha bint Tanha [q. v.], the second hū.§āri of the Prophet, and Sukaina, granddaughter of 'Alī; feminine types, remarkable in spitting their frivolity for having bravely tried to fight against the degeneration of their sex in Muslim society.

Bibliography: Tabari (ed. de Goeje), i. 1330; ii. 59, 60, 118, 346—349, 481, 576, 592—593, 602—603, 662—678, 668, 716—727, 531—533, 740—745, 748—753, 764—766, 769—769, 783—802, 830—831, 1063—1072, 812, 1260, 1266, 196; Kīṭāb al-Aṣḥābī, i. 138, 139; iii. 103—104, 122; viii. 85, 138, 178; x. 34—57; xi. 33, 38, 42; xiv. 84, 166—172; xvii. 262—265; xix. 10; Ballādhurī, Anisūl Anṣārīl (ed. Alīwardad), p. 3—4, 3—4, 10, 16—19, 23—24; Muḥṣab, 'Āṣjarī, (ed. Barther de Meynard), v. 210—142, 217; Ibn al-Aswāf, Kāmil (Cairo), iv. 123—124, 137, 139; H. H. van Gelder, Muhṣar al-ṣalṭa al-wafī, Leyden 1888, p. 125 sq. (H. LAMMENS)

AL-MUSABBĪḤAT, name of stūra's lvit, līx, lxi, lxxvi, as a group, after the first word of each of them, zabbaḥa or yasabbūḥa. The name is old, cf. Muslim. Zakāt, trad. 119.

MUSĀFĪRĪS (Kangari or Sālabīs), a dynasty of Dalīlamī origin which came from Tārom [q. v.] and reigned in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Hijriya in Aḥzārānd, Arrān and Armenia. Its coming to power was one of the manifestations of the great movement of Iranian liberation which formed a kind of interlude between the end of Arab domination and the first Turkish invasions. While in Khurasān and Transoxania this movement culminated in the rule of the Sāmānīds [q. v.], in western Persia and Mesopotamia its standard-bearers were the Dalīlamīs and to a smaller extent the Kurds (cf. V. Minorsky, La domination des Dailamites, Paris 1932).

The Musāfīrīs and the Djūstānīs. According to a genuine document quoted in Yākīt (iii. 148—50), the Kangari family only comes into history after seizing the famous stronghold of Shamrūn in the district of Tārom [q. v.] which was under Kāzīm. The Kangarīs have therefore to be distinguished from the ruling family of Dalīlam, i.e. the Djūstānīs of Kūffād, of whom seven are known from between 319 and 316 (907—920), while members of the family can be traced till 434 (1042). We know that Mūhammad, son of Muṣīr, the eponym of the dynasty (whose real Iranian name must have been Aswār; cf. Mūṣulm, Qurān, ix. 16), had married Khaṭṭāṣyūn, daughter of the Djūstānī Djūstān III (from 250 until after 300). From such alliances the names peculiar to the ruling family of Dalīlam (Djūstān, Wāḥsādān, Mūṣulmān) became popular among the Musāfīrīs. In 307 (919) Mūhammad killed his wife's uncle 'Āli b. Wāḥsādān to avenge the death of his father-in-law Djūstān b. Wāḥsādān. Henceforth there was a breach between the two families. The last Djūstānī took refuge with the Dalīlamī chief Aswār (lord of Ray and Kāzīm) who sent the Ziyārīd Mūwāwījah against Mūhammad but instead of fighting they joined forces and Mūwāwījah slew Aswār. Mūhammad was an important ruler and Muṣīr b. Mūhāllāh speaks with praise of his buildings at Shamrūn (1500 houses) on which 500 workmen were employed (the ruins of Shamrūn have been described in Brugsch, Reise d. pers. Gesellschaft, 1862, ii. 471—472) but he was a difficult character and did not agree even with the members of his own family.

The two branches of Musāfīrīs. In 330 (941) his sons Marzūbān and Wāḥsādān by arrangement with Khaṭṭāṣyūn, seized Shamrūn and shut their father up in a fortress, after which the dynasty broke up into two branches: Wāḥsādān remained in the hereditary fief of Tārom, while Marzūbān extended his power over Aḥzārānd, eastern Transcaucasia and some districts of Armenia. The fourth generation of the Musāfīrīs consisted of the sons of Marzūbān: Djūstān, Ibrāhīm, Nāṣīr and Kay Khusraw, and of the sons of Wāḥsādān (330—355): Ismā'īl, Nāḥ and Ḫaydar (?). Marzūbān. This ruler (330—346 = 941—957) is the most important figure which came into the dynasty. After the death in 314 (926) of the Sādādī [q. v.] Yūsuf, Aḥzārānd became the scene of the struggle between the Khāridjī Kurd Daisam b. Ibrāhīm and Lāshkari b. Mardi, a native of Gilān, whom the Ziyārīd Wūṣhānīr supported alternately.
Laškari died in Armenia and Daisam was betrayed by his vizier Abu 'l-Kāsim 'Alī b. Dja'far who had come to an arrangement with Marzubān for both were būtinī ( Ibn Miskawayh, ii. 32). Marzubān occupied Ardabil and Tabriz and finally Daisam surrendered to Marzubān and received from him a castle in Tārōm. Marzubān extended his territory northward as far as Darband. In 332 (943-944) the Russians (Arbī) came by the Caspian and the river Kur and took the capital of Arān [q. v.], Bārdā' [q. v.] in spite of the resistance of the subjects of Marzubān. At the same time, the Hamānids of Mawsīl had observed designs on Ādharbājījīn and Marzubān had to deal with a force under Abū 'Abd Allah Husain b. Sa'd b. Ibrāhīm and the Hadīthānī Kurdi Dja'far b. Shāhīyūn which had reached Salmās [q. v.] but was soon recalled to Mawsīl by Nāṣīr al-Dawla. On the other hand, the Russians, defeated by the Muslims, beat a retreat (cf. the sources on the Russian invasion including the Armenian historian of the tenth century, Moses Kahanakvatzli, in Dōr, Capit. St. Peters burg 1876; the text of Ibn Miskawayh, ii. 62-67, was translated with commentary by Yakubowski in the Tājīt. Frenenmād, Leningrad 1926, xxiv., p. 63-92).

A new danger arose in the south-east of the lands of Marzubān when in 335 (946) the Būyid Rukn al-Dawla occupied Rāy (disputed by the Sāmānids and Ziyāfrīds). Marzubān filled with wrath at the Būyids decided to attack them in 336. But Rukn had time to get reinforcements from his brothers. In 338 (949) Marzubān, defeated near Kāzwin, was besieged in the castle of Sunnamir (in Fārs).

The fugitives from his army gathered round his father Muḥammad and occupied Ardabil while Wahsūdān remained in Tārōm. Muḥammad even gave dissatisfaction to his captains and was shown up by Wahsūdān in his castle at Shisāgān (?). Rukn al-Dawla sent to Ādharbājījīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Razzāk, the former governor of Tūs [q. v.], who had deserted the Sāmānids, Wahsūdān released Daisam in the hope that he would be able to organize resistance. Daisam who had time to take Ardabil, was defeated by Ibn 'Abd al-Razzāk but the latter dispersed by the intrigues around him returned to Rāy in 339 (950). Daisam recaptured Ardabil but the advance of 'Ali b. Mīshkī, a supporter of Marzubān, forced him to seek shelter with the Artūrsads of Waṣṣārun (cf. wān).

In the meanwhile by an ingeniously planned coup Marzubān escaped from Sunnamir and recovered all his strongholds and treasuries (in 342). After a long series of adventures which brought him to Maw-jil, Baghdād and Aleppo, Daisam in 344 (955) collected a force and read the Khutba at Salmās in the name of the Hamānīd of Aleppo, Saif al-Dawla, Marzubān quickly put down a rising in Darband and later drove Daisam back, who once again sought refuge with the Artūrsads who handed him over to Marzubān under threats from the latter.

In an important passage, Ibn Hawkal, p. 251-255, gives the list of the tributaries of Marzubān compiled by his minister Abu 'l-Kāsim (in 344). The names include those of the lords of Shirwān, Abkāh (i uncertain name of a district north of Shirwān; cf. Marqāt, Streifzüge, p. 174: "Abkāh"), of Shakkī [q. v.], of Dujarrān wa-Saghiyān (Guzrīwān and Saghiyān to the west of Shirwān), of Vayots-dzor (district of Siunie), of Ahar and Warzakān (N. E. of Tabriz), of Khorāsān (N. of Bakū), as well as the Artūrsads, Baghdād, and the princes of Khaṭān (west of Bārdā'ā).

Wahsūdān and his nephews Marzubān died in Ramādān 346 (Dec. 957) and while bequeathing the power to his brother Wahsūdān forgot to cancel his first will by which his sons Djuṭān, Ibrāhīm and Nāṣīr were to succeed him in succession.

The commanderies of the fortresses would not surrender them to Wahsūdān who returned to Tārōm in disgust. Djuṭān b. Marzubān was recognised by his brothers but was only interested in his harems. Marzubān's old general Djuṭān b. Sharmazān set up in Urmīya [q. v.] and won to his side Ibrāhīm, with whom he occupied Maragha. In 349 (960) the grandson of the caliph Muḥammad Ishāk b. Ibrāhīm rebelled in Gīlān and took the name of Mustādīj bi 'l-lāh. Djuṭān and Ibrāhīm became reconciled and defeated the rebels at Mākān [q. v.].

Wahsūdān began intriguing against the Kūrds and detached Nāṣīr from Djuṭān but the quarrel was of short duration. Under assurances from Wahsūdān, Djuṭān with his mother and Nāṣīr came to Tārōm but were thrown into prison. Wahsūdān sent his son Ismā'īl to Ādharbājījīn, Ibrāhīm who was ruling Armenia (Dvīn) made a move in 349 or 350 which gave Wahsūdān an excuse to massacre his prisoners. Ismā'īl soon afterwards died at Ardabil after which Ibrāhīm reoccupied Ādharbājījīn and laid Tārōm waste while Wahsūdān sought refuge in Daisam. Meanwhile Wahsūdān's general Sharmazān b. Mīshkī, however, succeeded in defeating Ibrāhīm and the latter, abandoned by all his soldiers, sought refuge with his brother-in-law Rukn al-Dawla, who had married a daughter of Marzubān (355 = 966).

Rukn al-Dawla, with his usual chivalry heaped favours on Ibrāhīm and sent to Ādharbājījīn his famous minister Ibn al-'Āmid (Usṭād Ra'is) who reinstated Ibrāhīm and subjected Djuṭān and Djuṭān b. Sharmazān to him. Ibn al-'Āmid who was much impressed by the wealth of Ādharbājījīn proposed to Rukn al-Dawla to annex this province but his master recalled him to Rāy, saying that he did not wish to be accused of coveting the inheritance of one who had sought his protection. After the return of Ibn al-'Āmid matters went badly and from the illusions in Ibn Miskawayh we know only that Ibrāhīm was deposed and imprisoned (probably about 369 = 979, the year in which the Taqīyīrī al-Imām stops).

The end of the Musafīrīdīs. In the Muslim sources the situation in Ādharbājījīn till 420 is obscure but the statements of the Armenian historian Sargis Asotik, Hist. Universelle, part ii, book iii, travel by Macler, Paris 1917, ch. 11, 12, 18, 19, 29, 38 and 41, enable us to fill the gaps. According to Kasrawi, in 369 (979) Ibrāhīm b. Marzubān was dispossessed of his lands in Ādharbājījīn by the Rawāsdād family (on which see the articles MARĀKHĪN, MARĀKHĪN, TAREZĪ and Kasrawi, op. cit., ii.). The son of Ibrāhīm Abu 'l-Haḍījīya (the "Alhādjel Delmestania" of Asotik) retained Dvīn [q. v.] and on the invitation of king Mūshel of Kars in 982-983 made an expedition into Armenia where he desecrated the churches. This Alhādjel later lost all his lands to his neighbour Abū al-Shāhīd of Gobān (i.e. Abū Dulfā Shāhīd, lord of Ordūbd). He later wandered in Georgia and Armenia and even visited the Byzantine emperor
Basil II; he was killed by his servants at Uqdatikb (Olti). Finally another Ablahadd, son of Rovd, amir of Atrapatakan (Abu l-Haidja b. Rawwad of Adhar-balaqin), took from Abu Dulaf the towns of Salar and after seeking Godwin marched on Dvin, seized this town and demanded from the Armenians the annuities of tribute (Asolik, ch. xxvi). King Subat II hastened to accede to the demand. This VArawiids thus gained possession of the remainder of the possessions of the Musafrids of whom they claimed to be the successors. There is no reason to connect the Arab-Kurd Rawwids with the Musafrids, who were of Dailami origin, although there may have been intermarriage between the two families. The Tarom branch. After the disappearance of the descendants of Marzuban, Tarom, the original see of the dynasty, alone remained in their hands. Wahsudan had extended his power over the adjacent districts of Zanjja, Abhar and Suhraward (the latter name is usually mutilated in the sources). A hajja of Mutanabbi (Kasrawi, op. cit., i 45) dated probably in 807 (July 14) drove Wahsudan from Tarom for a time, but his family had remained there, for from Vakht, iii. 148–150 we learn that in 379 (989) the layyid Fakhr al-Dawla took Shamirian from the young son of Nuh b. Wahsudan, whose mother he married. The child's name was probably Djusitan; cf. Vakht, Shirkat al-Ash, ii. 308.

In 387 (997) after the death of Fakhr al-Dawla, Ibrahim b. Marzuban b. Isma'il b. Wahsudan seized the fortress of Sardjihan and Tarom. In 411 (1020) even Kazwin was in his hands (cf. Nasiri al-Mulk, in G. M. S., p. 58). When Mahmod of Qazwin, taken by lands, sent him against the Dailami Khurran, Ibrahim, overpowered by Mahmod, determined to make a new effort, and this latter the Dailami Khurran (420), his son Mas'ud attacked Ibrahim but only captured him by stratagem. Sardjihan, however, remained in the hands of Ibrahim's son. In 427 (1037) we find the "salat of Tarom" in his fief again.

Nasiri Khusraw who was in this region in 437 (1045), speaks in high terms of the lord of Shamirin Djusitan (b.) Ibrahim whose title was "Marzuban al-Dailam Djiti al-Djitan Abu Salihi, Mawli Amir al-Muminin." Under 454 (1062) Ibn al-Athir records the visit of Tughri to Tarom, where he imposed a tribute of 100,000 dirhams on Musafrir, who is the last Musafrid known. From Vakht's words we may conclude that the Isma'ilis of Alamut put an end to the rule of the family when they dismantled Shamirin.


colouring. According to Saif's account, he must have been considerably influenced by Christianity for he speaks of the kingdom of heaven and of him who will come from heaven. Like several other men of the time in Arabia of deep religious feelings he favoured asceticism. He forbade wine and marital intercourse after the birth of a son. It is interesting that Falgrava, a large number of sayings still current under Musailima's name; unfortunately he did not trouble to record them so that we cannot compare them with what is recorded of his utterances in literature. This rival community in the heart of Arabia meant a serious danger to the young faith of Islam. Therefore when the first attempts to repress it had failed, Abu Bakr sent his ablest leader Khaled b. al-Walid against Musailima and the Banu Hanifa. A battle was fought at 'Akbara' [q.v.] in 12 A.H. which at first went against the Muslims, but Khaled's superior strategy finally prevailed and Musailima and many of his followers fell martyrs for their faith. The battle was unusually fierce and the Muslims also suffered heavily, among the fallen being a number of the best authorities on the revelations of Muhammad.


MUSSALLA (A.), part. pass. II of salat, place where the salat is performed on certain occasions. When Muhammad had fixed his abode in Madina, he performed the ordinary salat in his dīr, which was also his masjid (not in the sense of temple). The extraordinary salat, however, were performed on a place situated south-west of the city in the territory of the Banu Salima, out-side the wall, northeast of the bridge on the way, where at present the street from the suburb al-Anbariya reaches the market-place Ban al-Masjida (cf. Burton, Personal Narrative, plan opp. i. 256; picture of the musalla as well as of the gate of Ban) situated on the place, opp. ii. 129; al-Bakri, al-Rihla al-Hijaziya, 2nd ed., plan of Madina opp. p. 252; part of the Ban al-Masjida, ibid., opp. p. 264; Caetani, Annali, vol. ii. 6, opp. p. 72).

On this spot the salat was performed on the 1st Shawwāl and on the 10th Dhu'l-Hijja (Tabari, i. 1281, 1362). On the latter day the salat was combined with the slaughter of two spotted rams (Bukhari, Asaf, b. b. 6). On the two days of festival Muhammad and his followers on their way to the musalla were preceded by Bilal who bore the spear (Tanweer, q.v.).

It is also said that the salat for rain was held on the musalla (copious data in Tradition, cf. Wensinck, Handbook, s. v. Rain; and do., Moham.
MUSH — MUSHAF

(as spelled by Yâ-kit, iv. 534) is sometimes used for the town itself as in Tabari, iii. 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, Süd-Armenien und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mùsh with Mésheh Manikonean, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Manikoneans, who lived in the 6th century A.D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible; on the is situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mùsh". During the first centuries, after the Muslim conquest, Mùsh remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825-851 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abduction of this prince to Baghdad in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muslim governor Yâsuf b. Abi Safîd al-Marwanî (Tabari, iii. 1408 sg.). Later on it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally it was occupied by Muslim till the 6th century (Ibn al-Arthî, v. 408) in 533 (966). Al-Muqaddasi, who the name of Mùsh appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Muqaddasi, p. 150). In Saljuq times the influence of Islam became stronger; the atabegs of the Artsamanid dynasty disputed the territory of Khîlah and Mùsh with the Shûkîs, and even the Ayyubid Nadîm al-Dîn laid siege to Mùsh in 604 (1207) (Ibn al-Arthî, xii. 169, 170), and in 625 (1228) Djalîl al-Dîn Khwârimshâh was master of the country; in that year a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mùsh against the Saljuq ruler of Erzurum (Ibn al-Arthî, xii. 314; Djawwâl, Târîkh-i Djîhân-i-qâbî, ii. 151). This account for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the 6th century (Hamd Allah Mustawî). After the Mongol period Mùsh was ruined by Timur in 1396, when he invaded the possessions of the Kara Koyunlu (Skaaf al-Dîn, lix. 419). In 1473 the power of the Agh Koyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan was definitely broken in Armenia and from that time on Mùsh belonged to the Ottoman Empire. At that time the population of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Turcomans. The direct authority was exercised by Kurdish local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subdivided, as sandjak beghs, either to the shâha of Bîtûs or to that of Van. At the beginning of the 19th century the Kurdish wîmân (Emîn Paşa), who was deposed in 1828-1829 (Ritter, s. 676 and Siyâsî-ê Şehnûrî, i. 426). In the middle of that century, Mùsh became the chief town in the merkez: mazâ Mùsh, in the sandjak Mùsh in the wilîyêt of Bîtûs, and in the Turkish republic it is a mazâ in the wilîyêt of Bîtûs. The population of the town (some 5,000 inhabitants) was, until the Great War, half Armenian and half Muslim; one of the Armenian churches had been converted in 979 (1571) into a mosque, according to the inscription (Ritter). The exact registration of the population had also been a problem; where, however, ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Surb Karapet, called by the Turks Çeşîf Kilise and described by Ewliya Celebi.

During the Armenian troubles in the last years of Abîl-Hamîd the's reign, in 1905, there began in Mùsh a revolutionary movement of Armenian tashnakists, which brought about an intervention of the Kurds and a suppression by government troops, in which the population suffered much. In the Great War the Russian advance in Armenia had gone as far as Mùsh, when, in accordance with the treaty of Brest-Litovsk (1917), the Russian troops retired in 1918, leaving this part of Armenia again in Turkish possession.


AL-MUSHABBÎHA. [see TASHIN]

MUSHAF (m.), Ethiopic loanword (cf. Nobdeke, New Beiträg., p. 49 sg); the forms mîshaf and mas'îf occur also; according to some grammarians they are less correct, especially the latter), c. o. e., or, according to the definition of Arabic lexicographers, leaves (mâshîf, plural of mashaîf). When they are bound together, they form the tradition on the reduct of the Kur'an [v. y. v.] by Hujjâfa b. Ya'âbîn during 'Uthmân's caliphate, it is said indeed, that the collection of leaves that had been made by Zâd b. 'Abîtâbî at 'Umar's instigation, was copied and arranged into mas'îf. These were sent to all regions (as standard copies); the mashaîf were restored to 'Umar's daughter Hafsâ, in whose possession they had been ever since her father's death. Other mashaîf were annihiliated as often as occasion offered itself (Bukhârî, Faso'ul al-Kur'ân, bâb 3: "Abîl-Hâmid b. Qur'ân, bâb 12; Tâfshîr, sûra 9, bâb 20, Ahlîf, bâb 37; Tirmidhî, Tâfshîr, sûra 9, trad. 19).

From the time of the reduct of the Kur'an under 'Uthmân mas'îf are frequently mentioned in Arabic literature. In a tradition on 'Amr b. Abî'âzî's well-known stratagem during the battle of Siyam it is said that a huge mashaîf from Damascus was tied to the points of three lances (al-Dinawî, Khûtâb al-'Akbâr al-tâbîî, ed. Girgass, p. 201 sg.; Naşr b. Muzâhid, Wâ'fât al Siyam, Bairût 1921, p. 350; cf. p. 353) in other traditions "copies of the Kur'an" in several numbers are mentioned (e. g. Tabari, i. 3329).

In a tradition on the siyam it is assumed that in the mosque of Madina the mashaîf had a fixed place (Bukhârî, Siyam, bâb 95: Muslim, Sinât, trad. 263, 264); nowadays this place is by the siyâm (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, chap Religion and Laws; and supra, art. MASHAF, i. D. f. j.).

It is said that 'Abî'a had a mashaîf copied for her private use by her mawla Abû Yûnus (Tirmidhî, Tâfshîr, sûra 2, trad. 29: cf. Bukhârî, Faso'ul al-Kur'ân, bâb 6).

Mashaîf were taken into the field by Muslim soldiers (cf. Tirmidhî, Hadîthî, bâb 281; Abû Dâwa'id, Dhâ'im, bâb 133: this practice met, however, with objections (cf. Bukhârî, Dhâ'im, bâb 129; Muslim, Imãm, trad. 92, 93), founded on the fear that they might come into impure hands. For a similar reason persons impure in a ritual sense were prohibited from touching mashaîf, save in a special cover (alâlîs; Bukhârî, Hâid, bâb 3).

Bibliography: The lexicons, s. v.

(A. J. WENSINK)
MUSHRIR (A.), councelor, Turkish pronunciation mushir and mishur (modern orthography müşir) with meaning "Marshall". "Mishur literally means "one who points out, advises". Cf. also the article MUSHRIR.

According to some authorities, mushir was at first (before the Abbâdsids) the title of the mini-tens (later wasir; q.v.) or secretaries of state (Êstêh). So at least we are told by Ibn al-Tîkârî (ed. Derenbourg, p. 206; transl. Amar, p. 244). Khâllî al-Zâhirî (ed. Ravaisse, p. 106 and 114) says that "formerly an official to whom he gives fourth rank in the hierarchy, which shows he clearly distinguishes him from the wasir, bore the title of mushir. We seem however to have very little other information about this dignity. On the other hand, the word mushir in a non-technical sense is often found along with wasir of which it sometimes seems to be a doublet or synonym (cf. Maqżaf, ed. Wiet, i., fasc. i., p. 20 and 74; Noldeke, Die Erzählungen von Meinckmond und seinen Ministern, Göttingen 1879, p. 53: mushir mûșîr, wasir mûșîr)."

We may note however that this older and broader conception did not survive. According to Ibn Khaldûn, the wasir is, it is true, an "assistant" to the sovereign, but to his predecessor Mûwârîd (Lis statuts gouvernements, transl. Fagnan, p. 43 sqq.) the wasir is not the adviser of the imâm but his delegate.

If Ibn al-Tîkârî's statement is correct we must see a survival of this older state of affairs in the usage of the Mamlûk chancellery where we find among the honorific lehâb of the wasir that of mushir al-dacca (or al-sâlihâna or al-mulûk wa l-sâlihâna). Cf. Kalkashandi, vi, 70.

The same usage, which perhaps came from the Sâlîdîs, is still more clearly established in the Ottoman chancellery. We actually find the word mushir among the alâb of the Turkish wasir (wasir) and almost at the head of the formula, which shows its importance: dûstîr-i mûsîrûn, mûshir-i mûsîrûn, mûsîr-i êlî, etc. Whence in the epitaphic style the epithets mûshir and mûshirî are used along with dûstûn and dûstûnî or êlîcî and êlîcî to designate all that belongs to an official of the rank of wasir.

Mahmûd II in creating the principal ministries naturally thought of again giving a real value to this title of mushir, which he gave to the principal ministers, and in the reign of his successor 'Abd al-Madîd "the privy council (musfîr-i hîzât, a regular council of ministers) consisted of the grand vizier, the bâb-i al-sâlih, eleven mushir and three officials of the first rank" (Bianchi, Le premier annaire impérial de l'Empire ottoman, Paris 1848, p. 7; Bianchi translates mushir by "counselor or under-secretary of state" and has been followed by Darbier de Meynard in his Supplement, the references in which should be taken with this reservation). In 1250 (1834–1835) the title of mushir was given to the new mûshir of the Interior (mûshir-i hîzât = the former kîhîlî) and of Foreign Affairs (khârîjî, hîzât-i mûshir = the former rîsê al-khattâb); cf. Lutfî, v. 209. The sâlihî mushirîyi was created in 1262 (1846) (Lutfî, viii, 87).

Mahmûd II also created the post of beylerbîy wasir or chief of the imperial guard, who bore the title mushir-i ûsîkî-i bâbîs (pasha), an officer who took rank after the ser'asker or War Minister (Hammer, Hist. de l'Emp. Ott., xvii. 188 and 189). This title was soon to be contrasted with that of mûshir-i ûsîkî-i sâlihâna by the other troops (Lutfî, v. 28).

The ministers did not long bear the title of mushir which gave place to nîzîr, but the former of these titles, perhaps under the influence of the word "marshall", which it more or less resembles, became a special military title. It became the highest rank in the army, corresponding to vizier in the civil service and of ûsîker in the religious hierarchy. At first the title redîf-i mûshirî was given (cf. Lutfî, v. 68, 74) to the ûsîker of certain provinces, or simply mushir of such and such a province (ibid., p. 165 sqq.; vi. 102, 103; vii. 70). This corresponded to the demarcation of the army corps.

The number of ûsîker or "marshals" soon increased and in the reign of 'Abd al-Hamîd II, there were 39 in 1890 and in 1895, 31 (see the Sâlihâna-i ûsîkerî of the years 1306 and 1311). Those who had the right to this title were the ser'asker, the abdulhâmî-i ûsîkerî or "grand master of artillery", the ûsîkerî or "grand master of the Palace" (replacing the old ca].bahâ, according to Âhmed Râsim, Tarîkhî, i. 156 and 186), the ûsîkerî mûshirî (as under Mahmûd II), the commanders of the seven army corps (âzîndeh), the heads of the army services, the aides de camp to the sultân (jâfer-i êtemî). The only duty of five of the ûsîkerîs was to superintend the ceremony of the Selâmîk (selâmîk-râmî ûsîkerî me'mûrî). The officer in charge of the police station (mûşkâz) of Beshkesh, near the Vilîz Kiosk, was also a ûsîkerî (M.S.O.S., vii., 1908, part 2, p. 40). Instead of ûsîkerî the more usual phrase was mûshirî-ye ûsîkerî (Lutfî, vii. 62).

The honorific form of address for a ûsîkerî was devletî (devletî) efendim hazretleri. In the plural the Persian form mûshirîn or with epithet mûshirîn-î ûsîkerî. The name of the office is mûshirîyet or mûshirîkî, more rarely mûshirî (Lutfî, v. 91).

The title of ûsîkerî, which has been borne by Mu'âd'lâ Kâmil Pâsha himself, has survived in the Turkish republic but there is at present only one ûsîkerî in office, the Chief of the General Staff, Fawzi Pâsha.

In Khedivial Egypt they stopped at a stage where the influence of the reforms of Mahmûd II was still felt. The ûsîkerî was there down to the present reign exclusively the highest grade of officers but without distinction between military and civil offices. It was also in theory a civil rank (ruthûa mûshîrî) to which all the princes of the khedivial house had a claim.

In Persia the title ûsîkerî has been rarely used. Cf. however the case of the ûsîkerî-êd-dowle (cf. the similar title above) borne by an aide-de-camp of Naṣr al-Dîn Shâh (Feuvierr, Trois ans à la Cour de Perse, p. 135–136).


(M. DEH. DENY)

MUSHRIR. [See SHIRK.]
The Arab astronomers, like Pythagoras and Ptolemy, put Jupiter in the sixth sphere (jālak) from within the third without. On the interior it joins the outer surface of the sphere of Mars and on the exterior the inner surface of the sphere of Saturn. The following table gives the least, mean and greatest distances of Jupiter from the centre of the earth, expressed in radii of the earth, as given by al-Battâni (Opus astronomiacum, ed. Nallino, ch. 50), al-Farghani (Compendio, ch. 21), Ibn Rustâ (Kitâb al-Astrâk, ed. de Goeje, p. 18-20) and Abû Râhâm bar Hîyâ (Sphaere mundi, ch. 9), as well as the Hindu values given by al-Birûnî from the compilation by Yaḳûb b. Ṭârik of the year 161 A.H., and the modern figures for these distances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least Distance (perigee)</th>
<th>Mean Distance</th>
<th>Greatest Distance (apogee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Battâni</td>
<td>8,022 rad. of the earth</td>
<td>10,473 rad. of the earth</td>
<td>12,924 rad. of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Farghani</td>
<td>8,776</td>
<td>11,640(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>14,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rustâ</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>11,503(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>14,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Hîyâ</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al-Birûnî)</td>
<td>8,019(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>10,866(\frac{2}{3})</td>
<td>13,714(\frac{1}{7})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>122,250</td>
<td>152,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The radius of the earth is here estimated at 3,450 (al-Battâni, al-Farghani and Bar Hîyâ) and 3,818 Arab miles respectively (Ibn Rustâ) while, according to al-Birûnî, the Hindus give it as 4,850 faršâh = 3,310 Arab miles (1 Ar. m. = 1,477.3 metres; cf. Nallino, Il valore metrico del grado di meridiano). The true geocentric distances of the planet Jupiter are actually about 11\(\frac{1}{2}\) times greater than given by al-Battâni for example. It should however be pointed out that the relation of 37:23 \(\approx 11\frac{1}{2}\) for the greatest and least observed apparent diameter taken by this scholar, with the help of which the distance of the apogee was calculated from the estimated distance of the perigee at 8,022 radii of the earth agrees remarkably well with the modern estimate. The apparent diameter of Jupiter at its mean distance is given by Al-Battâni as 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) of the diameter of the sun. From this and the mean distance he calculates the true diameter of Jupiter at 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) diameters of the earth \(= 82\frac{1}{2}\) radii), and its volume at 81 times that of the earth (i.e. \(4\frac{1}{3}\) ).

The true values are 2.56 \(\times 170\) times larger: diameter of Jupiter = 11.14 diameters of the earth, volume = 1,380 times the volume of the earth.

Following Ptolemy (Almagest) al-Battâni gives the greatest observed northern (geocentric) latitude as 2° 4', the greatest southern as 2° 8'. On the other hand, he points out (ch. 31 and 45) that he found the length of the apogee of the eccentric circle from his observations to be about 8° smaller (in 879 A.D., 164° 28') than was to be expected from the Almagest, taking into account the precession.

The movement of Jupiter is as in the Almagest represented to be through four circles ("spheres", γύροι) (cf. al-Battâni, Op. astr., ch. 31). The astronomical tables take for its mean daily sidereal motion the value of 5'. Its period of sidereal revolution is given by al-Kazwînî (Abû al-Rayḥân, ed. Wüstefeld, i. 26) at 11 years, 10 months, 15 days.

Al-Mushtari in astrology. Al-Mushtari is the ruler (rabî) of the Buṣayî al-Ḫâmi (Sagittarius, night-house) and al-Ḫîṣî (Pisces, day-house), also night-ruler of the 1. Mithâlaththâ (Triquetrum), which consist of al-Ḫuṣmal (Aries), al-Ḫasad (Leo) and al-Ḫâmi (Sagittarius), whose ruler by day is the sun, and finally companion (raṣīf) of the 3. Mithâlaththâ. It has its Šarâf (exaltation) in the 15th of al-Saṣâfîn (Cancer), its Ḥabîb in the 15th of al-Ḫwâs (Capricornus). According to al-Kazwînî (i. 22), "the astrologers call al-Mushtari the greater star of fortune", al-Sâlîd al-râbîbar, because its good influence surpasses that of Venus; they attribute to it numerous happy states and the greatest good fortune. The idea that the planet Jupiter is a star of good fortune is general among other peoples also; we also find it in Babylonia, India and China. For further details of the part played by Jupiter in Arab astrology see the works of Abû Ḫâsr.

Bibliography: See that of the articles Ǧuršâd and Miḥrâb (W. Hartner).

The modern title Mûsîkî or موسیقی or Ṭaṣâfîkî, as it was written in the West (al-Fâbî, Ṭāfî al-Khîlâm; Schiaparelli, Vocalistica in Arabico = Latin musica), is the name given to the science of music. It is a post-classical word derived from the Greek μουσική, and was already current at the time of Ḥabîb al-Mawṣûlî (d. 236 = 580 g. v.). In the Mûsîkî al-Khîlâm (ivth = xth century) mûsîkî is one of the four mathematical sciences. Its author says: "As for mûsîkî, its meaning is the science of the composing of melodies (alḥām). It is a Greek word, and it is named the mûsîkî. And the composer of the melodies is the mûsîkî or ūlũfâr (p. 239)." The contemporary Ḥâwâlîn al-Šâfiî say (i. 87): "Mûṣîkî is the ghānî, and the mûṣîkî is the muḵẖanî, and the mûṣûḏî (mûṣûḏîyâ in Dieterici) is the instrument of music (ghānî)." *'Ibm al-mûṣûḏî was the name given by the Arabs to the Greek or mathematical theory of music as distinct from ilm al-ghānî which was the Arabian practical theory, as we know from the Kitâb al-Aṣâhîn and Yaḥyâ b. 'Ali b. Yahyâ b. Abî Maṣûrî (d. 500 = 912). The latter tells us (Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 236v, fol. 236v) of the "disagreement between the masters of Arabian ghânî and the masters of [Greek] mûṣûḏî." Of course, the Arabs and Persians possessed a theory of music long before they became influenced by the translations made from the Greek.
The Pre-Islamic System. The source of both Persian and Arabian theory of music was an
older Semitic one which had influenced, if it had not been the actual foundation of Greek
teaory (for Farm, Hist. Part., p. 123). No Persian or
Arabic technical nomenclature of a theory of mukki (i.e. speculative theory) has come down to us
from pre-Islamic times, although it must have existed.

Al-Fazāb (d. 339 = 950) describes a musical instru-
mment, still used in his day, called the tambur al-lahzādī or al-mukki (the frets (تاریک), a
Persian word) of which gave a "pre-Islamic scale"
(Kosegarten, Lib. cont., p. 80; Musāfīr al-Ṣūrīn).
It was a quarter-tone scale which was arrived at
by dividing a string into forty equal parts. The
idea could be traced to Eratosthenes (Plutemmy,
Harm., ed. Wallis, ii. 14) but probably was for
greater antiquity (Farmer, Influence of Music,
Although al-Fazāb’s instrument did not actually
give the following scale, yet the theoretical division
mentioned above would produce a scale which,
expressed in cyclic cents, would register:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. P. N. Land was of opinion that the later
Pythagorean lute scale of the Old Arabian School
was derived from the system of the faṣār al-
lahzādī. It is more likely however, that there
was an earlier lute scale than that of the Old
Arabian School. As has been hinted elsewhere
(Farmer, Hist. of Arabian Music, p. 70). This
was a one-octave scale fixed by the accordance
(tarkiya) CD-Ga, the frets of which gave the
following scale:

Cents 0 204 408 498 702 906 1100 1200

For a discussion of this scale see Farmer, An
Old Mornish Lute Tutor, p. 27; id., Hist. Facts, ...

p. 310.

The Old Arabian System. In the eleventh century
we get definite glimpses of a theory in
the music of the Arabs and Persians. We read of a
certain Ibn Mis'ah (q.v.) (d. ca. 97 = 715) who
had learned Persian music (ṣiṣwā) and accomplishments
in playing (ṣarb), and had received instruction from
Lyziantine (ṣūr) barilin players (ṣarbijīa) and
theorists (ṣarbijīyya = šīrjabīn). These
borrowings from abroad he incorporated into a
system which came to be recognized throughout the
peninsula (Kitāb al-Ṣūrīn, iii. 84). We are told
however, that Ibn Mis'ah rejected from Persian and
Lyziantine methods but what he found to be "alien
to Arabic music" (ṣiṣwā). This would appear to show,
that when a student pointed out (Remarks, p. 156),
that these foreign introductions "did not supplant
the national music, but were grafted upon an Arabic
root with a character of its own". We know that
about the same time, or perhaps slightly later (Kitāb
al-Ṣūrīn, i. 98), that the Arabs adopted the Persian
lute in the place of their own instrument. This latter,
as we have seen, gave a one-octave scale based
on the accoduttura C-D-G-a, whilst the Persian
lute was tuned in fourths thus: A-D-G-c, which
enabled the performer to attain (with a shift) the
doable octave. Yet only the highest and the lowest
strings of their old lute needed to be altered, and
these were given the Persian names of ẓū and
himm, whilst the second and third strings retained
their old Arabic names of muṣīrī and maṭāḥā.
The new accoduttura of the lute brought about a
change in the scale (ṣabātīrī) as the following
distribution of the frets shows (Brit. Mus. MS.,
Or. 2546, fol. 237). The lute with the Arabs was
the basis of all "theory"; just as the lyre was
with the Greeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, this scale did not satisfy everyone,
and we find that the Persians introduced a new
ṣawātī fret at 393 cents, whilst later a famous
musician at Hārūn’s court named Zalzal (q. v.)
(d. 175 = 791) adopted a fret at 355 cents, half-way
between the new Persian ṣawātī fret and the ānāfī
fret. By the time of Ishāq al-Mawsili (d. 236 = 850)
these Persian and Zalzalian frets seem to have
created such confusion that this musician attempted
to recast the lute scale in its old Pythagorean
mould, which, we are told, he did without recourse
to Euclid or a solitary book of the "Ancients" as
the Greeks of old were called (Kitāb al-Aghānī, v.
52–53; Ḥudā al-farīd, ii. 188). His reform appears
to have been successful in Ṭirm and lasted there
until the sixteenth century (Kitāb al-Aghānī, v. 2:
Mansūr ibn Ḥasan al-Ṣufī, i. 98). Elsewhere however,
the Persian and Zalzalian notes continued in favour,
as we know from al-Fazāb (Kosegarten, Lib. cont.,
p. 85) and the Musāfīr al-Ṣūrīn, p. 239. A century
later, whilst the Persian note of 393 cents
had disappeared, that of Zalzal was still popular
(Ṭarn Sinā, Shīfā, India Office MS., fol. 173).

There is but little preserved of the writings
of the theorists of the Old Arabian School. Whether
the books of Yūnās al-Kītīb (d. ca. 148 = 765) [q. v.]
and the more famous al-Khālid (d. 175 = 791) [q. v.]
on music (ṣawātī and ūqū) dealt with these theories
we know not since they have perished (Fikrist, p.
43; 143). A similar fate appears to have overtaken
the music-books of al-Balāb Allah b. Abd Allah b.
Ṭahr (d. ca. 300 = 912), Alt b. Ḥārūn b. Alt b.
Yahyā b. Alt Mansūr (d. 352 = 962) and
13); Fikrist, p. 144; 145). Beyond the sparse
information given in the Kitāb al-Aghānī and the
Mushāf of al-Mas'ādī (viii. 89 sq.), we have only the
Kitāb al-Lawwār wa 'l-Muṣīrī of Ibn Khur-
dājābih (d. ca. 300 = 912) [q. v.], in private
hands (Hilāl, xxvii. 204).

Although we read that Ishāq al-Mawsili made
his calculations by ṣhāb (Yahyā b. Alt, fol. 237),
yet the Old Arabian School, so far as we know
from Yahyā b., Alt b. Yahyā, did not adjust the
frets of the lute (χύτος) or pandore (πανδώριον) by this method. Their rule for fixing the frets
was based on tuning a note with its octave or, as they termed it, its σύμφωνον or δισθό, although the
taller term shows that they recognized the interval ratio 1:2. When the Greek scholars came
to deal with the theory of music all this was changed.

The Greek music at the time of the middle of the
19th century, the effects of the writings of the
ancient Greeks on music, which had been translated
into Arabic, began to be felt. Among these treatises
were Aristotle’s Proclus and De Anima, the,
comparatives of Themistius and Alexander
diæisis of the latter, two works by Aristoxenus—
including the στοιχεῖα it would seem, the two
books on music attributed to Euclid, a treatise
by Nicomachus, presumably the lost book, and the
Harmonika of Ptolemy, all or most of which had
been translated by the first half of the 19th
century at least, as we know from al-
Fārābī (Fihrist, p. 266, 269, 270; Ibn al-
Kūṭṭī, s.v. al-Maṣūṣ, maṣūṣ, n. 186; B. G. A., vi. 128; ‘Abd al-
Bārī al-
Ṣafā, i. 102; and Farmer, Greek Theory of Music
in Arabic Transmission, in Isit., iii., p. 325).

The ʿilm al-maṣūṣ now became one of the
courses of the ʿilm al-niyāḥ or quṣādir, and
was studied by most savants at this period although
later a few sought the subject primarily, as
in Western Europe (Farmer, Hist. Facts..., p. 184), because it was too abstruse (Ibn Khallikan,
ii. 471). The early scholars dealt with the theory
of sound (qawṣ), intervals (al-adāb), genres (al-nuṣr),
species (al-kāyāb), systems (qumās, qumāṣ),
motion (al-taṣawwur), and)&quot; composition (al-
ṣawāṣ), after the manner of the Greeks, and from the above out
we see that Euclid influenced them in this respect.

To this was added rhythm (iqdā). All this was
of immense value to Arab theorists and their later
copists, the Persians and Turks. Instead of the
old method of describing intervals according to
to their frets they were now given definite names
and recognized by ratios. The octave became al-
kull (“the whole”), whilst the fifth, fourth, and
ditone were given identical names in Arabic.
The tone was variously known as the faṣūḥ, al-
waṣṭ, or madda. The semitone or waṣṭ faṣūḥ was recognized
in its various forms, the ḥaṣāl orapses, and
the baḥaṣa or faṣūḥ. In modern notation
the quarter-tone was the ḥaṣāl. In some way
the Scholastics were slavish and diffuse in what they
borrowed, although in others they were eclectic.

On the question of the physical bases of sound
however. and their treatment of musical instruments.

The first to take advantage of the newly founded
of the “Ancients” was al-Kīnādi (d. 260 =
874) (q.v.). Seven treatises on music theory appear
under his name (Fihrist, p. 255—257; Ibn al-
Kīnādi, p. 570; Ibn Abī Uṣābīa, i. 210) and
four of them would seem to have survived (Farmer.
Hist. of Arab. Mus., p. 127, 45). Some musical
MSs. identified (Ibn Khallikan, ii. 441).

Three of them are at Berlin (Allwardt, Vers., Nrs. 5503, 5530, 5531): Riḍāla fi ṭaḥaṣa ḫākariya al-
Maṣūṣi, Riḍāla fi l-
Lūḥān, and another without title. The fourth,
Riḍāla fi ʿaṣāṣa Taʿăf al-
Alḥān, is in the British Museum (Or. 2361), and is probably later than the
others. In the latter we see the author’s indebtedness
to Euclid and Ptolemy. He had written a Riḍāla
fi ḫaṣṣar al-
Kūṭṭī, presumably Euclid’s Sched

 canonisi. He uses a one-acte alphabetie (abjad)
notation which was an improvement on Greek
methods, but his pointing the way to a reform
of the scale was probably of greater import to the

Arabs. By introducing a fifth string on the lute,
so as to reach the double octave without recourse
to the shift, he obtained the Complete System
(ṣaḥāfa al-
Ṭūmān: Ptolemy’s στρογγυλή τείχος).
To accomplish this a fret called the muqaddamāt had
to be introduced at 114 cents between the muqaddam
and the ṭabbība fret, which in itself created another
problem, and eventually led to frets being tried
between the ṭabbība and the above muqaddamāt.
At 90 cents and between the ṭabbība and ṭaṣāṣa frets
at 354 cents. Here was the germ of the ṭaṣāṣa,
the comma scale of the later ṭaṣāṣa al-
Lūḥān-
āt, the forerunner of the Systematist scale.

After al-
Kīnādi, we have a gap of a century in actual
documents. There are names of theorists in
abundance but their works have not survived.

Al-
Kīnādi’s two disciples, Abūn b. Muhammad
al-
Faraqāśī (d. 285, 896) and Muṣṭafā b. Ṣaḥiḥ b.
Tāhir, contributed works on the theory of music,
the former writing six (Fihrist, p. 117, 149, 261).

More important perhaps, were the three books of
Thālab b. Ṣhiḥ (d. 288 = 901) (q.v.), as well
as those of Muḥammad b. Ṣakānīya al-
Kūṭī (d. 320 = 932) (q.v.) and Ṣaḥib b. Lākūd (d.
c. 320 = 932) (q.v.) (Fihrist, p. 270, 295; Ibn Abī
Usābīa, i. 509; Ṣaḥib al-
Nawawī, vii. 54; Hāshimi
Khallakan, v. 161). The greatest of all the scholars
however was al-
Fārābī (d. 339 = 950) (q.v.) (Ibn
al-
Kūṭī, p. 277; Ibn Abī Uṣābīa, i. 234; Stein-
seünder, al-
Faraqāśī). Although he had books on music,
Kāmil al-
Lūḥān and the Ṣaḥib fi ṭaṣāṣa al-
Ṭūmān, yet his greatest work, the Ṣaḥib al-
Maṣūṣi al-
Lūḥān, has been preserved.

This treatise, so he tells us, was written because
he found an “incompleteness” in what had been
drowned down from the Greeks. It has been called
“the most important treatise on the theory of
Oriental music” (cf. vol. ii. 54), but it probably
deserved to rank as one of the greatest works
that had been written on music. His treatment of
the physical and physiological principles of
sound and mū-sīc is certainly an advance on the
Greeks, whilst he was the first to devote a detailed
study to musical instruments, a subject in which
nothing has come down to us from the Greeks.

Al-
Fārābī was a good mathematician and physicist,
and that enabled him to do justice to what the
Arabs called the ʿilm al-
naṣāri or speculative
theory, even to not repeating the errors of the
Greeks (Farmer, Hist. Facts..., p. 292—293). Yet
he was something more. He was a practical musician
and could appreciate the art as well as the science,
which was more than Themistius could do, as
al-
Fārābī himself mentions. As a performer with
a reputation (Ibn Khallikan, iii. 309; Rāzī al-
Bārī al-
Ṣafā, i. 85) he could bring the ʿilm al-
Maṣūṣ
or practical art to bear upon the discussions.

So whilst he was more thorough than the Greeks in
handling the physical bases of sound, he could
also make valuable contributions to physiological
acoustics, i.e. the sensations of tone, a question
which the Greeks left practically untouched.

By the time of al-
Fārābī further additions had
been made to the scale. The principle by which
the Persian and Zaldjalian ṭaṣāṣa frets
at 303 and 355 cents had been determined, was also
applied to the insertion of corresponding muqaddamāt frets,
between the muʕāb and the rabbāh, at 145 and 168 cents, with the result that there were now three muʕajarrāb frets known respectively as the Ancient, Persian and Zalzalian, whilst the one at 114 cents had disappeared. Here is the fretting of the late in Al-Fārābī's day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frets</th>
<th>Strings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muʕāb</td>
<td>Lamman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
<td>Mithābak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
<td>Majbūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
<td>Jisr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
<td>Ḥadd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalzalian</td>
<td>Muʕajarrāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Al-Fārābī also noted the scale of the ḫūddar al-khuṣaṣṣi proceeding by a lāmmam, lāmmam, lāmmam, which doubtless was prompted by al-Kindī's speculations. It became the patent of the later century of the Systematist School. In describing the scales of the rabbāh or rēbi, he shows one of the just minor third (316) and just major third (356).

The next great writer after al-Fārābī was Abū 'l-Wafā' al-Buzjānī (d. 388 = 998) [q.v.], the most eminent of the Arabic writers on mathematics. His book on rhythm (ḫūd) has unfortunately disappeared, although its importance has been testified to (Pibl. Ind., 1849, p. 93). The contemporary encyclopedists, the Ikhwān al-Safā' in their Rasīs' al-Maḥmūd b. Ahmad al-Khwārizimi in his Maṣāḥeth al-tūn, also deal with the theory of music. The latter does not break fresh ground although his work is helpful in controlling others. The former, however, are of considerable import because of their able and lucid treatment of acoustics. Here is an instance. According to Helmholz (op. cit., p. 10), musical tones are distinguished by their force, pitch and quality, and the force of a musical tone, he says, increases and diminishes with the extent or so-called amplitude of the oscillations of the particles of the sounding body. Preece and Stroh refused to accept this definition and pointed out that loudness does not depend upon amplitude of vibration only, but upon the quantity of air put in vibration (P. R. S., xxviii., p. 356). The Ikhwān al-Safā' had already enunciated this opinion. "Hollow bodies" they say, "like vessels, will resound for a long time after they are struck, because the air within them reverberates time after time until it becomes still. Consequently, the wider the vessels are, the greater the sound, because more air is put in vibration" (i. 89). They also recognized the spherical propagation of sound (i. 88), which was an improvement on the Aristotelian De aërialibus (802, a) which said that "the direction of sound follows a straight line" (cf. Vitruvius, De arch., v. 3).

The next writers whose works have been spared were Abū Sinā (d. 428 = 1037) [q.v.] and Ibn Zaila (d. 440 = 1048). Two treatises on music stand to the credit of Avicenna, as he was known in Europe, and they are contained in the Shīfā (India Office MS., 1811) and the Naǧāt (Bodleian MS. Marsh., 521) (Ibn al-Kīfī, p. 415; Ibn Abī Čaṣībī, ii. 2; cf. Casiri, i. 271). Unlike al-Fārābī, the Ḫūšar al-ẓāri is not a practical musician, yet his biographers claim that he dealt with the question on the theory of music which were neglected by the Greeks. He is scientific and philosophic in his approach, and even critical at times, but he displays little of that originality that is so apparent in his other writings. Ibn Zaila was his disciple and echoed his opinions, although some fresh details emerge when dealing with the practical art. He quotes from al-Kindī on the question of rhythm, and is useful on that account.

Egypt also contributed its quota of music theorists, two outstanding writers being Ibn al-Haṭīyah (d. 430 = 1039) [q.v.] and Abū 'l-Sālih Umayr (d. 528 = 1134). Ibn al-Haṭīyah appears however to have written commentaries on both the Ḫūṣar and the Ḫūṣar al-ẓāri. The Kitāb al-Ṭūn of Euclid (Ibn al-Kīfī, p. 168; Ibn Abī Čaṣībī, ii. 90). Although there were several Arabic commentaries on Euclid's Cavern, not one appears to have survived. Yet we have two at least in Hebrew whose authors-probably depended on Arabic works. One of these was Moses N. Levy (Haaley) who quotes Şhâb Qon Tob b. Isaac Shafrūštū and the other was Isḥāq b. Isaac (Bede erq bazyb Ŧīrū, Year i., xxix. xcm). The Kitāb al-Ṭūn of Abū 'l-Sālih was probably of some importance since it is quoted by Jewish writers (Ibn Abī Čaṣībī, ii. 52; Alkhwāz, Fers., No. 5536 [5]; P. Duran, Gram., Vienna, 1863, p. 37). In Syria we have Ibn al-Nakṣāzī (d. 574 = 1178), Abū 'l-Hakam al-Bahlī and his son Abū 'l-Maḏāj Muḥammad (d. 576 = 1180), and Abī Amān al-Dīn Kāzīr (d. 649 = 1251), all of whom were interested in the theory of music (Ibn Abī Čaṣībī, i. 144, 155, 162, 164, 181; Ibn Khallīkān, iii. 477), whilst further East we have such names as Ibn Ma'ān (d. 551 = 1156), Abī al-Mu'tamin b. Şafi al-Dīn (with thirteenth century); Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606 = 1209) [q.v.], and Nasīr al-Dīn al-Tūnī (d. 673 = 1274) [q.v.] (Ibn Khallīkān, iii. 467; Bodleian MS. Ouseley, No. 117: Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2972; Paris Bibli. Nat. MS. Arabe No. 2466). In the West, the two theorists of consequence are Ibn Bābījīya (d. 532 = 1138) [q.v.] whose book on music enjoyed the same reputation in the West as that of al-Fārābī in the East (al-Maṣṣārī, Anāfī, i. 125); and Ibn Ruṣūḍ (d. 594 = 1198) [q.v.] whose commentary on Aristotle's De anima reveals that lucidity of treatment in the section dealing with the phenomena of sound that made him so famous on other questions.

The Systematist School. After Ibn Sinā and Ibn Zaila, the most thorough exposition of the theory of music, so far as existing documents show, was made by a musician in the service of the last Caliph of Baghdaḏ, named Şafī al-Dīn Abī al-Mu'min b. Fākhrī (d. 692 = 1294) [q.v.], the author of two estimable works, the Kitāb al-Shu'rafiya and the Kitāb al-Adwar, which almost every subsequent writer in music uses as his principal authorities. A later theorist, Abī al-Kādir b. Ġabīlī, frankly admitted that Şafī al-Dīn was the fountain head in music theory, whilst a modern has called him "the Zalzino of the Orient" (Kiesewetter, p. 13), and many commentaries have been penned on his theories. Şafī al-Dīn was no mean physicist, and he attacks both al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā when
he finds that their terms and definitions are inexact. Much of it may be mere quibbling over verbal niceties, but it redounds to his credit that he realized that in a science we must start off with terminological exactitudes. Like al-Fārábī, he was a practical musician, and the reform of the scale, which must be attributed to him (cf. Helmholz, p. 286), was possibly due to this fact. The Greek scholars had done much to stabilize Arabian music theory, yet anomalies still existed. The most notable was the Zalzalian wusūfī note at 355 cents together with its attendant sixth at 533 cents. These did not conform to the scholastic scale which produced a succession of fourths (cf. Helmholz, p. 281). It was to remedy this defect, it would seem, that Saḥī al-Dīn laid down a new theory of the scale in which the octave was divided into seventeen intervals in the succession of ḥamma, ḥanna and ḥonna, which enabled him to embrace the fractional Zalzalian notes of 355 and 533 cents by close approximations which worked out at 384 and 882 cents. This scale, which has been considered “the most perfect ever devised” (PARRY, ART OF MUSIC, 1st ed., p. 29), gave consonances purer than our scale of equal temperament an affront (RIEMANN, CATECHISM OF MUSICAL HISTORY, p. 63). It is no wonder therefore that Helmholz has considered the theory of the Systematist School so “noteworthy in the history of the development of music” (p. 283). Here is the scale of Saḥī al-Dīn:

---

**Frets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>String/Note</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>498</th>
<th>992</th>
<th>294</th>
<th>792</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dōnna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melūdhiyān</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melūhalten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Strings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>String/Note</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>498</th>
<th>996</th>
<th>294</th>
<th>792</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musāḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zāh</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbāh</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian wusūfī</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalzalian wusūfī</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binjīr</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānūr</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

After the fall of Baghdad (654 = 1256), the hub of culture moved farther East, and the writings of the Systematist School have to be sought as much in Persian as in Arabic. Most of this literature has been preserved. Kūṭ al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d. 710 = 1310) [q. v.], who devoted a valuable treatise to the “science of music” in his Dōrrat al-Tadh (Brit. Mus., MS. Add. 7694), was the first of these writers in Persian. He was followed by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-ʿAlī (viith = xith century), whose Nūfāṣ al-Funūn also has a section on music (Brit. Mus., MS. Add. 16827). Another xith century Persian work deserving of mention is the Ḥanūs al-Thāqaf (Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 2361). More important were the four works of ʿAbd al-Kādir b. Ghābī (d. 839 = 1435) [q. v.], entitled the Dāmī ṣalt al-ʿĀkīn, with its two epitomes the Dāmīṣ al-ʿĀkīn and the Dāmīṣ al-ʿĀkīn, the most famous of all since it contained noted music, has disappeared. Ibn Ghābī depends on al-Fārābī, Ibn Sinā, and Saḥī al-Dīn, but is by no means servile. What he adds to our knowledge of the music of his day concerns the practical art. Both his son and his grandson were theorists, and their works still exist, the Naḥwāt al-Azhwār and the Mikhāṣ al-Aḥwāl (Nūrī ʿUṭmānīyā Library, Nrs. 3646, 3649). They were in the service of the Turkish sultāns, who were now patronizing this class of savants, and we find two theorists, Khādir b. ʿAbd Allāh and Ahmad Uḥūl Shukrullāh, writing in Turkish, the latter transcribing the Kitāb al-Azhwār of Saḥī al-Dīn (LAVESCA, No. 2978). They were eclipsed, however, by two Arabic writers, the author (f. 855 = 1431) of the Muḥammad b. Murād Treatise (BRIT. MUS., MS. OR. 2361), and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Lāḏīkī (f. 886 = 918 – 1431 = 1512), the author of the Rīḍāt al-Futūḥīya (BRIT. MUS., MS. OR. 6629). Al-Lāḏīkī is the last writer to deal in an appreciable way with the speculative theory of music which had been suscitiated by the Scholastics (cf. KIESWETTER, p. 88). As for the author of the Muḥammad b. Murād Treatise, we have in him an able mathematician who places the Arīqīnsī of Nicomachus and Ibn Sinā under contribution. He is replete with argument and carefully examines the statements of his predecessors on questions of acoustics. We find him saying that he had put certain theories to practical test and found them wanting. He gives divisions of the string other than those laid down by Saḥī al-Dīn.

The contemporary encyclopaedias also contain a section on music, the most noteworthy being the Dāʾer al-Naẓīm (Vienna MS., NF., No. 4) or Ḥirāz al-Raʿīzī (BIBL. IND., 1839) of Muḥammad b. Ibrahim al-Ḫafṣ (d. 749 = 1348), the Māḥād al-Qanūn (BRIT. MUS., MS. OR. 3143) attributed to Ṭālib b. Muḥammad al-Djurdjānī (d. 871 = 1431), and the Qanūn al-Qanūn (Vienna MS., NF., No. 7) of Muḥammad Shāh Ṣanībān b. Muḥammad al-Ṣanībān (d. 839 = 1435). To al-Djurdjānī may also be ascribed the Shāfiʿī ʿAbās b. Ḥusayn, the most thorough and illuminating commentary on the theories of Saḥī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʿīn, and the most strikingly original treatment of the physical and physiological rudiments of sound (BRIT. MUS., MS. OR. 2861). After the close of the xith (xith) century, treatises on the ʿilm al-maḥfūzī are rare. Writers abound who profess to deal with it, but actually they are only concerned with the practical art. If any ʿilm is displayed in these later books it is the ʿilm al-maḥfūzī, and authors fill their pages with astrological tables linking up the twelve ḥanūs of the heavens with the twelve musāḥā, and so forth. Many treatises are written in verse, a form which, however much it may attract the pure aṣbāb lover, is scarcely suitable in dealing with a science. The author of one of these however, Shams al-ʿIm al-Saʿdī, al-Dhāshābī (or al-Dinshābī), is worthy of attention by reason of his use of a device for the purpose of a musical notation, a device which may be traced to the year 1200 at least (BODELEAN MS., MARSH., NO. 82; PARIS BIBL. NAT. MS., ARABE, NO. 2480). In the West, treatises on the theory of music are scarcer still. Ibn Khaldūn (d. 809 = 1406) [q. v.] gives a glimpse of what was taught under this heading in his day (FRAT SC., IV, 410), but actual works are rare. A certain ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Fāṣī wrote a treatise in 1650 entitled the Kitāb al-Ḍāmīṣ fi ʿilm al-Maḥfūz bi-L-Qanūn (AHLWART, FERN., NO. 5521), but its author borrows his theory from older authorities (FARMER, AN OLD MOROCCAN TUTE TUTE, p. 14).
The Modern School. The chief feature of this school is the so-called quarter-tone system, which is the most important theorist is Mishk close to Shugārān. (d. 888) [q.v.]. The system was not invented or introduced by him as Parrot supposed (Rappert, p. 21) because Shugārān himself tells us that it existed before his day (M. F. O. W. 52, 165). Nor can we say that the xiiith century was the period of its origin (cf. Lachmann, *Greek Dict. of Music*, i. 576), since we know that it was practiced in the xviith century as Baron de Tott (La Borde, l. 439-439), Todeschini (l. 243) and Murat (Festis, ii. 365) have shown. Nor can it be traced in a MS. mentioned by Vitielloe, as Land suggested (*Recherches*, p. 77-78), because this work can be identified with a MS. entitled *Shafrar* *d*ār Al-Abnam (Brit. Mus., MS Or. 1535) in which there is no mention of the quarter-tone system. How did the system originate? Dr. Lachmann holds that it was due to the needs of transposition (*Greek Dict. of Music*, i. 576). On the other hand, Collanettes avers that in actual practice (for the lute is no longer fisted) it is simply the Systematist scale to which several smaller intervals have been added (p. 449). Some of the technical terms used in the system are of Persian origin; such as those for the quarter-tone, three quarter-tone, and tone, *nim wa'at, tik wa'at*, and *baras*. Further, as early as the xiiith century, as we know from Ibn Shāhi, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Adāmī, and the author of the Muhammad b. Murād Treatise, intervals finer even than those of the Systematist School were being used in the newly-adopted *‘alabs* on modal extensions, which were not used in the time of Šāfi al-Dīn *‘Abd al-Mumīn, although they are part of the earlier* (2) Persian system as reflected in the *Rahqat al-Rūḥ* by *‘Abd al-Mumīn b. Šāfi al-Dīn (Boelean MS., Ouseley, No. 117). A Persian origin of the quarter-tone system is, therefore, not unlikely, although Mahmūd Rāghīb, a well-known writer on Turkish music, argues in favour of a Greek origin (see the Turkish journal *Mīlī Mūzīmā*; May-Oct., 1927, and the *Turkische Zeit.*, June and Aug., 1928). In the xvith century we have evidence (La Borde, l. 436) that the octave was divided into twenty-four equal parts of 50 cents each producing a scale comprising three major tones of 200 cents, each divided into four quarter-tones, and four minor tones of 150 cents, each divided into three quarter-tones:

| CENTS | 200 | 150 | 150 | 200 | 150 | 150 | 150 | Total 1200 |

Mūshā’kā ātells us that he was dissatisfied with the theories of his day in regard to their division of the octave (cf. Murat’s division of the octave into 55 commas). There was certainly a difference so far as Egypt was concerned, since one theorist divided even the minor tones into four parts as well as the major tones, thus giving twenty-eight intervals to the octave (Muhammad b. ʿīnāl Shihāb al-Dīn). At any rate, Mūshā’kā attempted to lay down a principle that would establish the quarter-tone system on a proper basis. His method is by no means clear (Land, *Recherches*, p. 75; Collanettes, p. 447, 418), but Ellis (J. S. A., p. 497) and Parrot (*Mus. orient*, p. 15-16) believe that he was aiming at a quarter-tone system of equal temperament, twenty-four to the octave, which was actually the scale (see La Borde, p. 132) that he found in use (cf. Collanettes, p. 419).

This is the same scale as the preceding with the exception that the base has been given a lower note in the system, i.e. *‘akāb* instead of *raa*. The system of the quarter-tone scale generally accepted to-day throughout the Islamic Near East (Collanettes, p. 415), and even in Middle East (Ali Naqā Khan Wazir).

Although in the Maghribi poetry little is written about the theory of music nowadays, yet in Egypt, Persia, and Turkey, there is no lack of books on the subject, as the *Bibliography* shows, although many of the treatises are only manuals for practitioners. Even in Turkestan, where the half-epochs of the Soviet works are being published, during the last decade a great fillip has been given to the study of the theory of music by the establishment of conservatories of music in the great Omer capital and chief cities, notably the Dār al-‘Ilm at Constantinople and the Nād al-Mu‘āthn at Cairo.

*Bibliography: General works quoted:*  
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MUSIKI — MUSLIM


(H. G. Farmer)

MUSLIM (A.), part. IV of S-LM), denotes the adherent of Islam [i.e.]. The term has become current in some European languages (also in the forms musulm, muslime), as a noun or as an

General works on Arabic, Persian, and Turkish music theory. Laborde, Essai sur la Musique ancienne et moderne, Paris 1780; Toderini, Letteratura Turchese, Venice 1787; Villoteau, Description de l'Egypte, Egypt moderne, Paris 1809—1826; Kiesewetter, Die Musik der Araber, Leipzig 1842; Kosegarten, Alli ēsphahani ēs Libar četarum magnus... 1842—1843; Soriano-Fuertes, Musique Arabo-Espagnole..., Barcelona 1853; do., Historia de la música Española..., Madrid 1855; Morat, Einige... über die orientalischen, inbegriffen über das dominierende persisch-turkische Tonsystem (in Ästhetische Rundschau, 1867), Vienna 1867; Fétis, Histoire générale de la Musique, Paris 1869—1876; Mendel, Musikalisch-Österreichisches Exposition, Berlin 1870—1879. [All the afore-mentioned must be used with caution, and reliance can only be placed on Kosegarten, and, in some respects, on Kiesewetter.] — Causin de Perceval, Notices... sur les principaux musiciens arabes..., in J. A., 1873; Barliour de Meynard, Ibrahim fili de Mehdie, in J. A., 1869; Land, Recherches sur l'histoire de...
adjective as well as both, side by side with Muslim, m (in different forms). It has replaced Musulmān (in different forms), except in French, where the latter term is used as a noun and as an adjective. The origin of musulmān is probably muslim with the ending ʿan of the adjective in Persian. In some countries, e.g. Germany and the Netherlands, popular etymology has taken man for the vernacular “Mann, man,” whence the plural forms Musulman, Musulmān etc. These forms have, however, become antiquated — in Arabic literature the term Muslim is and has always been used to denote the adherents of Islam. See further the art. IMĀM, AMIR AL-MUSLIMIN.


MUSLIM b. 'A ṬIL, cousin of 'Usain b. Abi. The latter, taking refuge in Mecca after the death of Muʿāwiyah I, sent him to study the situation in Kūfa where the partisans of 'Abi were meeting to come and proclaim himself caliph. Muslim there made peace with the descendants of Shīʿa. He went to Nejran and joined them there and took command of the movement in person. In the meanwhile, the energetic 'Utaīd Allāh b. Ziyād had replaced the irresolve Nuʿmān b. Baghīṣ [q.v.]. Realising the seriousness of this change Muslim took refuge with Hani b. 'Uzwa [q.v.]. A stratagem devised by the new governor soon revealed his hiding place. Hani having been captured, Muslim, abandoned by all his followers, wandered from one place to concealment to another. The descendants of Asjāḥ b. Kais [q.v.] revealed the secret of his last hiding-place — a deed which earned the family the hatred of the Shīʿa. The unfortunate 'Abi when discovered surrendered to the Shīʿa and was killed with the rest of the descendants of 'Utaīd Allāh. His head was sent to the caliph Yazid I.


(M. LAMMENS)

MUSLIM b. AL-HADJJDĀ'A b. 'UḥSAIN AL-KUṢAI`I AL-NABARĀ'I was born at Nisābūr in 202 (875) or in 206 (881). He died in 261 (875) and was buried at Nayarābād, a suburb of Nisābūr. An anecdote regarding the cause of his death is related by Ibn Ḥadjas (see Bibliography). His fame is based upon his Shāfīʿī, which, along with Bukhārī's book of the same name, enjoys the highest fame among the collections of traditions. Muslim travelled widely to collect traditions, in Arabia, Egypt, Syria and 'Iraq, where he heard famous authorities such as 'Abd al-Basir al-Hanbal, Haraḥ, a pupil of Shafiʿī, and Isḥāq b. Kāhitya. His Shafiʿī is said to have been composed out of 300,000 traditions collected by himself. He wrote a large number of other books, on Shafiʿī, traditions and biography, none of which seems to have survived.

The Shafiʿī differs from the other collections of canonical hadith in that the books are not sub-divided into chapters, whereas in Bukhārī's work the traditions act as examples of the tarāqama. Still, it is not difficult to trace in the order of the traditions in Muslim's Shafiʿī a close connection with corresponding ideas of Ḥārām. As a matter of fact the groups of traditions have been provided with superscriptions which may be compared with Bukhārī's tarāqama; this was not, however, done by Muslim himself, as appears from the fact that the headings are not uniform in the different sections of the Shafiʿī.

A second difference between Muslim and the other collections consists in the fact that he has peculiar attention to the 'isnad's, to such an extent that a tradition in his work is often followed by several different 'isnad's which serve as an introduction to either the same or to a slightly different tradition. Such a new 'isnad is indicated in the text by ʿ (taḥili or ḥuwa ila “change”). Muslim is praised for his accuracy regarding this point: in other respects, however, Bukhārī is superior to him, as is even recognised by a man so devoted to him as al-Nawawi, who wrote upon the Shafiʿī a commentary, which in itself is a work of immense value for our knowledge of Muslim theology and Ḥārām.

Muslim has prefixed to his work an introduction to the science of tradition. The work itself consists of 52 books which deal with the common subjects of hadith: the five pillars, marriage, slavery, banner, hereditary law, war, sacrifice, manners and customs, the Prophets and the Companions, proscription and other theological and eschatological subjects. The book closes with a chapter on the Kūfa (Ṭaḥṣīl), the shortness of which is several times outweighed by the value of the ʿIstād al-Imām, which opens the work, and which is a complete survey of the early theology of Islam.


MUSLIM b. KUṢAI`I, b. MAKARIM OF THE ARAB FAMILY OF THE ČAHLĪS [See ʿORFĪH] was the most important ruler of the last great Arab dynasty in the Naher East; during his reign the struggle between Fāṭimids and 'Abbāsids for supremacy in Syria and Mesopotamia was decided in favour of the latter. In the year 432 (1042) the 20 year old Muslim was chosen chief of the tribe after the death of his father Kuṣai`i b. Badrān and succeeded him as ruler of Mūsul. Like most Arab rulers of the lands of the Euphrates he recognised the Fāṭimid caliph in Cairo as his suzerain partly because he was himself a Shiʿite. Quite early in his reign he began to cherish the ambitious plan of gradually extending the rule of his tribe over Mesopotamia. Every means of extending his power was taken by him. The first opportunity occurred
when in 458 (1066) the Saldjik Suljan Alp Arslan [q.v.] after conquering the Khazarimans was proceeding to establish his supremacy in Syria. For this he had to entice the Arab chiefs from the sphere of influence of the Fatimid caliph and win them over to an alliance with him and to a recognition of the Abbassid caliph. He therefore concluded an alliance with Malik Shab, he turned in 477 (1084) against a Saldjik prince of Asia Minor, Sulaiman b. Kutalmish, who had taken Antioch from the Byzantines and demanded from him the same tribute as the Byzantines had paid. When Sulaiman refused to pay, he advanced against him with a force of Arabs and Turkomans. In the neighbourhood of Antioch in Safr 478 (May 1085) the forces met, unexpectedly for Sharaf al-Daula; his troops, who hated Malik, went over to Sulaiman. Malik was defeated and slain along with 400 of his Arabs (cf. Ibn al-Adim, fol. 68b). With his death the power of the Uqaisids was at an end. They lost Aleppo on Muslim's death and only survived a few years longer (till 489 = 1090) as governors of Mopsul [see Organi].

Muslim is described as an able and just man and his tolerance of Christians was remarkable. His rule is said to have been able and orderly and indeed he did bring the finances of Aleppo into order in a very short time after taking it. In any case he had wide vision and successfully endeavoured to maintain the power of the Arab tribes in Syria and Mesopotamia. It ceased with him; Turkish generals became the rulers of Syria and Mesopotamia.


Muslim b. U'kba of the tribe of the band Murra, a famous leader in the armies of the Sufyanid caliphs. We know very little about the early stages of his career. We find him early established in Syria to which he probably came with the first conquerors. Completely devoted to the Umayyads and of great personal value, he led a division of Syrian infantry at the battle of Si'lim. But he failed in an attempt to take the oasis of Dumat al-Djamal [q.v.] from 'All. The caliph Mu'awiyah appointed him to take charge of the khurajj, the finances, of Palestine, a lucrative office in which he refused to enrich himself. Muslim was prominent at the death-bed of Mu'awiyah. The caliph had charged him and Daghheb b. Kais [q.v.] with the regency until the return of Yazid who was in Anatolia at the head of his troops. The confidence which the great Sufyanid had in his loyalty is seen in his advice to his heir. "If you ever have trouble with the Hi'djat, just send the one-eyed man of the tribe of Murra there" (Muslim had only one eye). This time had now come.

Muslim had been a member of the embassy sent to Medina to bring the Aṣ'ar back to obedience. All other efforts at conciliation having failed, Yazid I decided to resort to force. In spite of Muslim's age and infirmities, Yazid felt he was the man to command the expedition. He was obliged to travel in a litter so infirm was he. At Wadi l'Kurain, Muslim met some Umayyads who had been driven out of Medina; these exiles informed him of the military situation of the town. When he reached the oasis of Medina, Muslim encouraged on the barra of Wäkim and for three days awaited the result of the negotiations begun with the rebels, Anšar and descendants of the muhajirun of the Kuraih. On the fourth day, all veterans
having been rejected, he made his plans for battle. It was a Wednesday, the third last day of Dha 'l-Hijja 63 (Aug. 26, 27, 683). After a slight initial advantage for the Anṣār, the battle ended at midday in the complete rout of the rebels. The Syrians followed them into Medina and began to plunder the city. Anti-Umayyad legend has much exaggerated the horrors and the duration of this pillaging which it extends to three days. On the day after the battle, Muslim's intervention restored order and he used the next few days in drawing up the case against and trying the principal leaders of the rebellion who had fallen into his power.

Having established order in the town, which he left in charge of Rawḥ b. Zimāḥ, in spite of the aggravation of his malady, he resumed his march on Mecca to deal with 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubair [q.v.] who had rebelled against the Umayyads. Arriving at Mushqalāl [q.v.] he became so ill that he had to stop. In obedience to the caliph Yazid's instructions, he appointed him in command of the army Husain b. al-Numair [q.v.], his second in command. He died at Mushqalāl, where his tomb long continued to be stoned by the passers-by. Writers with Shi'a sympathies are fond of twisting the name Muslim into Mūsirf (criminal: an allusion to Īrān, v. 36: vīt 79: nl. 24, 26, 36 and passim). One statement which must be a ridiculous exaggeration puts his age at 90. Every thing, however, points to his having been born before the Hijra. He died a poor man. This disinterestedness is not the only feature in his character which makes us take him as one of the most representative of the types of this generation of soldiers and statesmen, whose talents contributed so much to establish the power of the Umayyads. Duyi described him as "un Hé-min d'indifférente". Muslim, it is true, retained all the proverbial uncouthness (qīfūf) of the Banū Murra. But his whole career reveals the Murri general as a convinced Muslim of a rectitude rare in this period of unsettlement, which saw so many extraordinary vicissitudes of fortune and wavering loyalties.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 338; ii. 198, 409-425, 427. Other references are given in the writer's *Califat de Yazid lère*, p. 223 sqq., reprint from M.F.O.B., v. 225 sqq., and in his *Etude sur le règne du calife omeyyade M/ḥāsir lère, in M.F.O.B., l. sqq., p. 19, 45, 265, 373.

**MUSLIM B. AL-WALĪD AL-ANŚARI (called Sādir al-Ghājūnī = "he who is laid low by the fair ones", as was al-Kūthāmi [q.v.] before him), an Arabian poet of the early 'Abbasid period, born in Kufa c. 130-140 (747-757), d. 208 (823) in Dijrādān. His father, a weaver [q.v.] of the Anṣār [q.v.], was a weaver. Nothing is known of the poet's education. He probably got his literary training not from particular teachers or from books but in the busy life of the Mesopotamian cities, the intellectual life of which had risen to a still higher level with the advent of the 'Abbasids. Like most of his contemporaries he earned his living as a poet by writing panegyrics and was acquainted with many statesmen and emirs. Among the former were the general Yazīd b. Maz yard al-Šaybānī (see Dīwān, No. 1, 60, 16, 49), Dāwūd b. Yazīd al-Muhallabī (No. 20), Ma'ṣūr b. Yazīd al-Ḥimārī (No. 31) and many others. He gradually

won the favour of the influential Barmakids (cf. No. 17, 40, 45) and of the caliph Harūn al-Rašīd (No. 14, 41, 57); according to one story, he received his nickname from the latter on account of a verse of his (No. 3, 35; cf. also No. 23, 39). He even mentions the caliph's sister Aḥṣā in an ode (No. 57, 10). The fall of the Barmakids about 803 (803) did not affect his career; he dedicated some of his odes to al-Amin (No. 7, 28, 30) but his principal patron in later times was al-Ma'mūn. His most famous work was written to the order of Caliph 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.]. Through his intervention he received from al-Ma'mūn an official post (probably gāḥub al-burād) in Dijrādān. He remained faithful to Faḍl b. Sahl until his death in 802 (818), and out of grief for him he wrote no more. There is a story told by his rawi according to which he destroyed a considerable part of his poems before his death.

As regards the matter and style of his poems he was on quite traditional ground. In addition to his old-fashioned odes and elegies his satires are particularly interesting in this respect; in his polities with the otherwise little known p. 155 al-Ḵanbar on the merits of the Anṣār and Karājah. His second work revived the polities of al-Farāḍāz [q.v.] or an al-Tirmidh [q.v.] on a similar subject. The two hundred years of development of Arabic poetry were naturally not without influence on him; in his nasīhs we frequently find the style of an Ummah b. Abī Rāfī or al-Abbas b. al-Aḥsan [see Dīwān al-Aḥsan], Muslim's contemporaries. His drinking songs deserve special mention. Although Nodkheš only very rarely finds in them "the natural effusion of Bacchantic joy as so frequently in Abū Naṣr [q.v.}", Arab critics are of another opinion. These two poets are to them practically the same in this respect and we must confess they are right.

His drinking-songs are not only of great value for the descriptions of society and social life in the cities but from the point of view of poetry they are among the best of Muslim's work. If we must, as regards subject matter, number Muslim among the imitators of the old poets, in style he belongs to the more modern period. The historian of Arabic literature frequently mentions him as the first to introduce the "new style", al-khafīf, with its tropes and figures. This is however not quite such a simple point; the "new style" arose only gradually in Arabic poetry, although Muslim with his contemporaries, Baḥšābūr b. Burd [q.v.], Abī Naṣr et al., was one of the first who definitely struck out on the new path. The younger generation, especially Abū Tammān [q.v.], drove this new style to banality.

Muslim was on terms of friendliness or enmity with many contemporary poets, e.g. Abū Naṣr, Abū ʿAṭāyya [q.v.], al-Abbas b. al-Aḥsan (who maliciously called him Sādir al-Ghājūnī or Sādir al-Kāfī; see Dīwān, No. 44), Abū ʿIṣr [q.v.], al-Husain al-Khāli [q.v.]. His literary influence was however considerable: Dīwān [q.v.] was his pupil (which did not prevent him exchanging satire in the manner of the Abū Tammān) and al-Tammān was particularly fond of studying his poems. His Dīwān has been transmitted in very unsatisfactory fashion; it was collected in alphabetical order by al-Suh [q.v.], but this edition has not come down to us there are a few traces of it in the Kullāṭ al-Ǧāmi`); another story speaks of the collection made by the philologist al-Mubarrad. The only known European manuscript (Leyden)
on which de Goeje's edition is based, contains a portion of his poems (including a few sonnets); see Barber de Meyers, op. cit., p. 117 sq.). It represents an unknown edition and is of little importance for the criticism of the text.

**Bibliography:** Deacon Poetae Arabo-Malab. Milit. Libri, Al-Walid Al-Malab, ed. C. C. Bartoli, de Goeje, Leyden 1875 (unfortunately without an index of rhymes); the Cairo edition of 1325 (Matha'at Madrasat Wahdat Abūs-Salāw, 8, p. 97) although called 'Taḥdīth al-Maṣūma, repeats de Goeje's text in an alphabetical arrangement; the Bombay lithograph of 1503 (1856) is not accessible to me (see Recoser, op. cit.; it claims to give a better text than the Leyden edition; see Sarkis, op. cit.). Most of the sources are given by de Goeje in his edition (p. 225–310); the most important is of course the Kitāb al-Āqāmî (p. 225–271).


IGN. KRATSKOVSKY

**MUSNAD.** [See HADITH, IV.]

**AL-MUSTAṬFĀ IBN AMR AL-SIYĀS.** Abu Muḥamnad Al-Hasan, 'Abbās b. 'Alā', born on 23rd Sha'bān 536 (March 23, 1142), son of al-Mustaṭfā and an Armenian slave named Ghadda. After his father's death on 9th Rabi' II 566 (Dec. 20, 1170) al-Mustaṭfā succeeded him and at the beginning of the following year was formally recognised as caliph in Egypt also, which passed into the hands of the Ayyūbids at this time [see the article FAṬMĪS, ii, 96]. The assassins of al-Mustaṭfā soon quarrelled among themselves. 'Aṣṣāl al-Dīn [q. v.] whom al-Mustaṭfā had been forced to make vizier was dismissed by 567 (1171–1172) at the instigation of the emir Kaimaz. In Dhu 'l-Ka'ba, 568 (May 1175) the latter was about to attack the treasurer Zahir al-Dīn b. al-'Aṭār, but the latter fled to the caliph whereupon Kaimaz began to besiege the palace of the latter. Al-Mustaṭfā appealed to the people to help him; the house of Kaimaz was pillaged and he himself fled but died soon afterwards and 'Aṣṣāl al-Dīn again became vizier. Al-Mustaṭfā already had quarrelled with Shīmūr, lord of Khūṭātān. In 569 (1173–1174) a war broke out between the latter's nephew Ibn Shānḳā and al-Mustaṭfā; Ibn Shānḳā was soon taken prisoner and put to death. The insignificant al-Mustaṭfā died on the 2nd Dhu 'l-Ka'ba or, according to another statement, at the end of Shawwāl 575 (end of March 1180).


(KE. V. ZETTERSTEEN)

**MUSTADJĀB-KHĀN BAHĀDŪR (NĀWĀB),** thirteenth son of the celebrated Rohilla leader Ḥāfiz al-Mulk Ḥāfiz Rahmat-Khān (1707–1774) and author of a biography of his father, which he wrote in Persian under the title Gūšistān-i Raḥmat. Ḥāfiz Rahmat-Khān, who was an Afgāni of the tribe of Yūsufzān by descent, had been since 1748 a chief in Rohilkhand (Kateh) and throughout his life waged a bitter warfare with the Māhīūrān. He fell in 1774 in a fight at Mīrānpir Kūta where he was fighting against the combined forces of the Nāwāb of Oudh Shajī al-Mulk and the English. Warren Hastings in supporting the Nāwāb with English troops became the subject of a judicial investigat ion. Mustadjāb-Khān's book describes Ḥāfiz Rahmat-Khān as a fine representative of Afgāni chivalry and contains much of value for studying the relations between the individual Afgāni tribes.


(E. BERTHELS)

**MUṢṬAFĀ I.** the fifteenth Ottoman Sultan, was born in the year 1000 (1591) as son of Muḥammad III. He owed his life to the relaxation of the.=fānī= authorising the killing of all the brothers of a new sultan and was called to succeed his brother Ahmad I at the latter's death on November 22, 1617. But his weak-mindedness—which is said to have made him escape from account of superstitious fear of Ahmad—made him absolutely incapable of ruling. Ahmad's son Othmān, who felt himself entitled to the succession, had little difficulty in procuring Muṣṭafā's deposition in a meeting of the Imperial Divan, by the Ḵālīṣah, the muftis and the kāfīmāḥān, the grand-vizier Ẕālī Pāsha [q. v.] being absent. This happened on February 26, 1618. Unexpectedly Muṣṭafā I was again called to the throne when, on May 19, 1622, the rebellion of the Janissaries broke out against Othmān II. He was taken by force from his seclusion in the hareem and the Janissaries forced the =alāmī= to acknowledge him as sultan. The next day Othmān was killed and until June the grand-vizier Ẕālī Pāsha, the man responsible for the murder, remained in power. Then he was deposed by the caliphate. The real masters were the Janissaries and Sipahî's; several grand-viziers were nominated and deposed again at their pleasure. The Sipahî
party began, after some time, to exact vengeance for Oğmân and in January 1623, when Guruji Muhammad Pasha [q. v.] was grand-vizier, Dəniẓ Pasha was killed. Soon the Janissary party came again to influence under the grand-vizier Meḥammad Pasha (Feb. 3). The latter succeeded in maintaining himself until August 20; then the general feeling amongst the 'ulama' and the people, combined with the steadily growing opposition in the provinces against the tyranny of the militar in the capital, as manifested by the action of Saif al-Dîn 'Oğlî in Tripolis and still more by the revolt of Abâzeh Pasha [q. v.] in Erzurûm, brought about Meḥammad's deposition. The new grand-vizier, Kemâneş Kâli Pasha, together with the muftî, deposed the sultan on Sept. 10, 1623 and called Alîmdâr's son Murâd to the throne.

During all his reign Muṣṭafâ continued to give signs of his complete mental aberration; he died in 1635 and was buried in the Aya Sofâ. The only important international act that took place during his reign was the peace concluded with Poland in February 1623.

Bibliography: The Turkish sources for this period are the historical works of Na'imî, Hâddîrî Khâla'î (Fetaleh), Pecêweh, Ḥasan Bey Zâde and Tüçî. Contemporary reports in in the Memoirs of the English envoy Sir Thomas Roe. Further the general historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeln and Jorga. (J. H. Kramer)

MUŞTAFÂ II, the twenty-second Ottoman sultan, was a son of Muḥammad IV. Born in 1604, he succeeded to his uncle Ahmad II on February 6, 1695, at a time when the empire was at war with Austria, Poland, Russia and Venice. The new sultan in a remarkable khalîfî cheirîf proclaimed a Holy War and carried out, against the decision of the Divân, his desire to take part in the campaign against Austria. Before his departure a mutiny of the Janissaries had cost the grand vizier Defterdar 'Ali Pasha his life (April 24, 1693) and the campaign was led by the new grand vizier Elīmâs Muḥammad Pasha [q. v.]. The Turkish army operated not without success in the region of Temesvár, taking Lâmpa, Lugov and Seljes. The Venetians had been beaten in February near Chios and were beaten again in September. In October Azof was delivered from the Russian siege next year the sultan and his army were again successful in raising the siege of Temesvár, but no part of the lost territory could be recovered from the Austrian. That year, however, the Russians took Azof. The campaign of 1696 is memorable for the heavy defeat inflicted on the Turks near Zenia on the Therîs (Sept. 11), where Elnmâs Muḥammad lost his life, while the sultan, who had already crossed the river, had to fly to Temesvár. The imperial seal fell into the hands of the Austrians. From Temesvár Muṣṭafâ nominated 'Amâdâ Jâde Hûsain [q. v.], of the Kopru family, his grand vizier. Under this very able statesman peace was at last concluded. In 1698 the grand vizier went to the frontier, while the sultan stayed at Adrianople, but the peace negotiations were pursued more earnestly than the war. In October of that year began the peace negotiations at Karlovitz (Turk. Karlova, see Karlovitz) on the Danube, where on February 26, 1699 peace was concluded with Austria, Poland and Venice. With Russia only an armistice was concluded to be followed in 1700 by a definite peace. The English and Dutch ministers took part in the negotiations as intermediaries. The peace treaty meant the loss of Hungary and Transylvania, with the exception of the district of Temesvár; Poland recovered Kamianets, while Venice had to cede Lepanto and some other towns in Morea. With Russia the Dniepr became the frontier.

The peace enabled the grand vizier to bring order into the affairs of state, which had suffered by the long and disastrous war. The Keïs Eferî Kâmi and the muftî Feizullah, who had great influence with the sultan, were his collaborators. Some interior troubles were easily appeased; only in 1701 a campaign in 'Irak was needed to take Baṣra from the hands of a local party that had submitted to Persia. Fortresses were put in a better state of defence and a new âmilân-nâmeh was issued for the next. Ḥusain Pasha resigned his office in Sept. 1702 and died soon afterwards. His deposition was partly the work of the muftî Feizullah, who made the sultan appoint in his place Dâlcbâtan Muḥammad Pasha. When the latter showed himself of too warlike a disposition and caused at the same time unrest in the capital by flattering the claims of the Tatar Khân, the influence of the muftî caused his deposition and execution (Jan. 1703). Râmi [q. v.] became grand-vizier. Râmi's measures to enforce the authority of the central government were salutary but made him many enemies: moreover the Janissaries were not contented with a grand-vizier who was not a military man. The general unrest was increased by the permanent residence of sultan Muṣṭafâ in Adrianople. All these circumstances brought about in July 1703 a Janissary revolt in Constantinople, directed at first against Râmi Pasha and against the muftî. The latter's deposition was obtained without much difficulty, but the rebellion continued under the leadership and organisation of a certain Ḥasan Aghâ. A deputation of the rebels to Adrianople was imprisoned and treated in an insolent way. Too late the sultan promised to come himself to Constantinople; the 'ulama were constrained to give a fatwâ authorising the sultan's deposition. In August 1703 a rebel army went on its way to Adrianople, after having agreed on Muṣṭafâ's brother Ahmad as successor to the throne. When Muṣṭafâ saw himself at last abandoned by his own Janissaries he resigned on August 21. He died soon afterwards on Dec. 31, 1703 and was buried in the Aya Sofâ. He is rightly considered as wise and good ruler, as is proved by the successful choice of able statesmen. He wrote poems under the tâsilât of Meftûbî and Ikbâlî. Under him the imperial tâshân appeared for the first time on the Ottoman coins.

Bibliography: The chief source is the Ta'rîkh of Kâşiî, besides an anonymous historical work, used by von Hammer and only mentioned in a note by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 247 and 248. Useful information also in the history of the Crimea by Mehmed Gûlî (G. O. W., p. 255) and Sayîdî Muḥemed Rîdî (G. O. W., p. 281). Theîbâğa of the grand-vizier Râmi Pasha (not mentioned in G. O. W.) has importance as containing contemporary documents. Further the general histories of von Hammer, Zinkeln and Jorga. (J. H. Kramer)
MUŞTAFA III, the twenty-sixth ruler of the Ottoman Empire, was one of the younger sons of Ahmed III and was born on Sultan 1129 = January 28, 1717 (Subat-i Qa‘idah 1, 80). When he succeeded to the throne, after 'Othman III’s death on October 30, 1737, his much more popular brother and heir to the throne, Muhammad, had recently died, in December 1736. Turkey enjoyed at that time, since the peace of Belgrad of 1739, a period of peace with her neighbours. Since December 1756 the very able Râghib Pasha [q. v.] was grand vizier and remained the real administrator of the empire until his death in 1763. Râghib had removed from the capital all those who might have counteracted his influence, taking at the same time wise financial measures and endeavouring to keep the military forces in good condition. The sultan meanwhile, who was of a vivid and active temperament, busied himself, like his predecessor, with regulations concerning the clothes of his non-Muslim subjects and the appearance in public of Muhammadan women; at this time there was also taken up again the never-realised plan of linking the gulf of Iznik with the Black Sea [see ŞABANDJA]. The Seven Years’ War in Europe (1756—1763) had not remained without influence on the policy of the Porte; after long hesitation Turkey agreed at last to conclude a treaty of friendship with Prussia (March 20, 1761). Râghib himself was inclined to conclude even an alliance, but the sultan and the influential ‘alamâ’ were peacefully minded.

After Râghib’s death Muṣṭafâ began to reign himself and different grand viziers succeeded one another at short intervals. From 1765 to 1768 the grand vizierate was held by Muhammad Pasha, under whom the disastrous war with Russia broke out. Difficulties with Russia had already commenced in 1762, when Russia had supported the ruler of Georgia against the Turkish Pasha of Akhî-kha (Çaldîr); here, as well as in Montenegro, Russian emissaries worked in secret against the Turkish rule. Moreover the Khân of the Crimea repeatedly complained about Russian military measures on his northern frontier, while the party of the Confederates in Poland urgently appealed for the intervention of the Porte against the aggression of Catherine’s government on Polish liberty. In these circumstances the Porte had no more interest in seeking the alliance of Prussia, whose, in 1764, Ahyud Rasmi Efendi had gone as envoy, which embassy he afterwards wrote his well-known Sefâret-râmâ’ı. The sultan himself was decidedly anti-Russian, but the diplomacy of the Russian minister Obreskov and the pacifism of the ‘alamâ’ delayed the war, until, in August 1768, Muṣṭafâ obtained from the then mufti Wâli al-Din a fatwa authorising the war with Russia. War was declared only on October 6, after the dismissal of the grand vizier Muḥsin Zâde, who had advised delay until the spring. Obreskov was imprisoned in Yedî Kule.

The war began in January with destructive raids of the Crimean Tatars in southern Russia under their newly appointed Khân Khûrîn Girây; at that time de Tott was an eye-witness with the Tatar army. In March 1769 the then grand-vizier Muhammad Efendi Pasha left Constantinople with the Holy Banner; on this occasion there was an outbreak of Muhammadan fanaticism against the Austrian internuncio and his party, who had come to witness the procession. While the grand vizier went to the Dobruja, the Russians made an attack on Chotin (Turk. Khoêin), which they were able to take only in August. In the meantime the grand-vizier had been deposed and executed; his place was taken by Moldowandji ‘Ali Pasha, who had encounters with the Russians on both sides of the Dniestr. Other Russian armies took Jassy and Bucarest and advanced into Transcaucasia. The year 1770 was still more disastrous for Turkey. The Russians reached, through Rumania, the Danube and in the autumn they took Kilia, Bender and Braila, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Turkish general headquarters in Baba Dagh. In the same year a Russian fleet appeared in the Mediterranean; several towns in Morea were conquered and evacuated again, but the heaviest blow was the burning of the Turkish fleet in the bay of Çeşme (July 1770) Moldowandji ‘Ali — already dispossessed of his grand vizierate — was sent to strengthen, with de Tott, the defences of the Dardanelles. But the Russian fleet had ceased to be a danger and the Danube campaign of the following spring also was rather favourable for the Turks. In the beginning of 1771 the military organisation had been improved. That year, however, the Russians forced the isthmus of Perekop and conquered the entire Crimea. This was a definite loss for Turkey, and a great majority of the Tatars declared their allegiance to the Russian empress. The Turks were able, however, to remain in Otkabow and Kilburna. In Constantinople meanwhile laborious diplomatic negotiations went on with the envoys of the European powers who offered to mediate, notably Austria and Prussia. With Abshin Zâde de Tott and the Porte concluded in July 1771 a secret treaty of subsidy for diplomatic services, while the Porte disinterested herself completely in Polish affairs, going so far as to propose a partition of Poland. The result was an armistice, concluded in June 1772 at Giurgevo, followed by the peace congress of Potâni (August 1772), where Turkey’s chief representative was the arrogant nizâm-i ‘Othman Efendi. After the failure of the negotiations the armistice was prolonged and a new conference began at Bucarest in November. These negotiations were again broken off in March 1773, mainly from lack of agreement on the subject of the Turkish fortresses on the Black Sea; as to the Crimea, Turkey had already agreed to a formula such as was later adopted in the peace of Kusk Kairâb. In Constantinople it was chiefly the ‘alamâ’ who had opposed the Russian peace conditions. The war in 1773 was not very eventful; the general headquarters had been transferred to Şûmen after Muḥsin Zâde had become grand vizier a second time (Dec. 1771). The Russians won a victory at Karaçu in the Dobruja, but attacked Silîtra and Warna in vain. Bârût was bombarded by Russian ships in connection with the rebellion of the Mamlûk ‘Ali Bey [q. v.] in Egypt, who was supported by them. In the summer of 1773 Sultan Muṣṭafâ made known his desire to accompany the army against the Russians, but he was prevented from doing so by his illness and by his pregnancy. He succumbed on December 24, 1773, to be succeeded by his brother ‘Abd al-Ḥamîd I. Muṣṭafâ was buried in his own turbe, connected with the Lâleli Dîâmî-i, which he had begun to build in 1759 (Hadîthat al-Dîvarânî, i. 23).
MUŞTAFA III — MUŞTAFA

Muştafa III is praised in the Turkish sources as a good ruler. He had a special liking for religious disputations in his presence and was particularly interested in astrological calculations. He took an interest in the least important affairs and this prevented him from such a real statesmanlike insight as was much wanted in the later years of his reign. In his way he was an "enlightened despot". But even a more able ruler would probably have failed to save Turkey from her military inferiority against the Russian armies; measures of military organisation were taken with the aid of de Toit, but this could not prevent the desertion of the troops from assuming disastrous dimensions during certain episodes of the war. Besides the Lâleli Dânişâ, Muştafa built the Ayazma Dânişâ at Scurtari for his mother; he caused a new suburb of Istanbul to be built outside the Yeşil Kapu. His reign is further marked by the extremely severe earthquake that laid large parts of the capital in ruins in 1766.

Bibliography: The Tarih of Wâsiâ [q.v.] is the chief historical source for Muştafa's reign. Wâsiâ himself played a prominent part as secretary during the long-drawn-out peace negotiations with Russia. It is completed by the Tarih of Enveri. The Yâkub Efendi of Diyar, son of Haşim Oğlu 'Ali Pasha, seems not to be preserved (G. O. W., p. 300). The well-known Ahmad Kasım Efendi wrote a history of the war with Russia under the title Kâhîyes-i âl-i-tîbar (G. O. W., p. 310). The Talîhsât of the learned grand vizier Râgib Pasha (G. O. W., p. 285) gives documents from the beginning of Muştafa's reign. A contemporary western source is the Mémoires sur les Tours et les Tartares de Baron Fr. de Toit, Maastricht 1785. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

(J. H. Kramers)

MUŞTAFA IV, twenty-ninth sultan of the Ottoman Empire, was a son of Abd al-Hamîd I and was born on Şebîn 26, 1193 = Sept. 19, 1778 (Meşhed Thrileli, Seyidjîlis-ü 'ısmân, i. 81). When the anti-reform party, headed by the kâhin-mahsûn Musa Pasha and the mufti, and supported by the Janissaries and the auxiliary troops of the Yamaks had dethroned Selim III [q.v.] on May 29, 1807, Muştafa was proclaimed sultan. Immediately afterwards, the unpopular nişan-i jîrdîl corps was dissolved and Kâhîyes-i âl-i-tîbar, the leader of the Yamaks, was made commander of the Bosporus fortresses. Turkey was at that time at war with Russia and England, but peace negotiations had already begun and, moreover, the foreign affairs of the empire were really governed by general European politics. A secret article annexed to the peace treaty of Tilsit (July 7, 1807) had in view — already at that time — a conditional partition of Turkey. Turkey's ally, France, tried to urge a peace with Russia and obtained a Russo-Turkish armistice at Slohio-îa (near Giresun), by the terms of which the Danube principalities were to be evacuated. When in the end Russia was unwilling to put into effect the terms of the armistice, relations with France became strained (departure of Sebastain in April 1808) and new preparations for war followed, while overtures were made to England; the English admiral Codrington had already entered into negotiations with 'Ali Pasha of Vanina.

Meanwhile the kâhin-mahsûn and the mufti were the real rulers in Constantinople; the grand vizier Celebi Muştafa Pasha remained with the army in Adrianople and had no influence. The Janissaries and Yamaks, however, continued to be rebellious; measures had to be taken against them and the sultan himself went so far as to favour secret plans for restoring the nişan-i jîrdîl under another name. In December 1807 Musa Pasha was dismissed from the office of kâhin-mahsûn — on account of dissension with the mufti — and was succeeded by Tayyâr Pasha. The latter, dismissed in his turn, fled to Bâirâdhur Muştafa Pasha [q.v.], an acknowledged friend of the reform party, in Rusçuf. From there began the action against the regime in the capital. Bâirâdhur went first to Adrianople and joined forces with the grand vizier in June 1808. They arrived in July before the gates of Constantinople at Dâwîd Pasha. Sultan Muştafa came there on July 23 to accept their terms, which, for the moment were only the destruction of the ruling party and of the Yamaks. On July 25 Bâirâdhur, after having seized the Sultan's seal from the grand vizier, began to act on his own account. He went with his troops to the palace, where the sultan — who had left shortly before for an excursion — returned in haste. He had only the time to order the execution of Selim III but was deposed immediately afterwards by the intruders, who put his younger brother Mahmûd on the throne. After having passed some months in confinement, he was killed by order of the new sultan on November 16, in the days of the general revolt against Bâirâdhur's régime, when the existence of the former sultan had become a real danger for Mahmîd's position. Muştafa was buried in the turbe of his father 'Abd al-Hamîd I near the Yeşil Dânişâ.


(J. H. Kramers)

MUŞTAFA, name of several princes belonging to the Ottoman dynasty:

1. Muştafa Celebi, eldest son of Bâyazid I; the date of his birth is not recorded. He disappeared in the battle of Angora (July 1402). This Muştafa is the first Ottoman prince to bear this name, which, like such other names as Hâyazid and Murâd, originated in mystical circles in Asia Minor in the fourteenth century. According to the Byzantine sources, this Muştafa is the same as the person called by the majority of the Turkish sources:

Dozme Muştafâ, who came forward in 1419 as pretender to the Ottoman throne against Muhammed I. He was supported by Mirce of Wallachia and by the Imam Oghlu Džiuna [q.v.]. Near Selânik they were beaten by Mahommed and Muştafa took refuge in the town together with Džiuna; the Byzantine commander refused to give them up to the sultan and sent them to Constantinople. In a treaty concluded with the emperor Manuel, the sultan promised to pay a yearly subsidy to provide for the maintenance of the prisoners, while the emperor undertook to keep them in custody. This treaty was observed until Muhammed's
death; Muṣṭafā was relegated to a monastery on the island of Lemnos. After Muḥammad’s death, however, he was released and the emperor supported him against Murād II [q.v.]. In a short time he was master of the Ottoman territories in Europe; the army sent against him by Bāyazīd II went over to his side at Sarfī Deresi between Sivas and Adrianople. He was joined likewise by great feudal lords like the sons of Ewrenos. He soon felt strong enough to break his alliance with the Greeks and expelled them from the recently taken Gallipoli. After having resided some time in Adrianople, he went together with Djnānid to Asia Minor, where they met Murād’s army in a battle near the bridge of Clupad. By the treacherous retreat of Djnānid, Muṣṭafā was beaten and fled to Gallipoli and Adrianople; from there he tried to reach Wallachia, but was taken by Murād’s troops and executed at Adrianople. All this happened in the first year of Murād II’s reign (1412–1413).

**Biography**: Duca and Chalcondylas relate the events before Muḥammad’s death; so does the chronicle of Nestēr, but the other early Turkish chronicles know only of what happened in the beginning of Murād’s reign. On coins struck by Muṣṭafā: T. O. E. J., xv. 387; von Hammer, G.O.R., i.; Mehdī Zeki, Muhīṭ Şehzâde, Constantinople 1332, p. 45 sqq.

2. Muṣṭafā, son of Muḥammad I and younger brother of Murād II, was supported as pretender against the latter in 1423, while Murād besieged Constantinople. This Muṣṭafā was about 13 years of age; he had fled to the Karaman Oghlu with his father Isḥâq. From there they took Izik and marched against Brusa. Muṣṭafā even went for some time to Constantinople, but Murād, raising the siege, returned to Brusa, where Muṣṭafā was delivered to him by the treachery of Isḥâq; he was executed by the sultan’s orders.

**Biography**: The Byzantine writers Duca and Chalcondylas; the old Turkish chronicles and after them the later historians; von Hammer, G.O.R., i.; Mehdī Zeki, Muḥīţ Şehzâde, p. 53 sqq.

3. Muṣṭafā, son of Sulaymān the Magnificent, was born in 921 (1515) (Mehdī Thureya, Sīdīqī Dustūrān, i. 79). He had been made, in 1533, governor of Sarukhānī in Mahnis; later he became governor of Konay, while Sulaymān’s favourite son Muḥammad was given Sarukhān. When Muḥammad died in 1545, Sarukhānī was given to Muṣṭafā’s younger half-brother Selim and he himself was placed in Amasia. This setting aside of the elder, more talented and more brilliant son was the work of Khurrām Sulṭān (Roxelane), mother of Selim, and of her son-in-law, the grand vizier Rastam Pāsha. Already some years before there had been signs of Sulṭān Sulaymān’s lack of confidence in Muṣṭafā’s loyalty. When, in 1553, a new campaign had been planned against Persia, of which Rastam was to be the commander, Sulaymān decided at the last moment to accompany the army himself, being warned again against Muṣṭafā through the intermediary of Selim’s favourite Shamsî Agha. Selim joined him on the way and, when at Esphah near Konay, prince Muṣṭafā came to pay homage to his father, he was killed by order of Sulaymān on October 6, 1553. His corpse was conveyed to Brusa and buried in the turbe of Murād II. This execution of an Ottoman prince is one of those events that made the deepest impression in the empire. It caused immediately the threatening of a Janissary revolt, which could only be appeased by the dismissal of the grand vizier Rastam Pāsha. It is said that his brother Djiḥāṅgir died soon after him of grief; a minor son of his was killed in Brusa shortly after his execution. Muṣṭafā had also made himself beloved as a patron of poets and scholars, amongst whom Sūrī is to be mentioned in the first place. Several poets lamented his death in elegies, in which Rastam and others were openly accused of having caused the murder; best known is the morphil of the poet Yâhîyâ Bey. Muṣṭafā wrote poetry under the takhallus Muḥkilîs. There is further strong evidence for the probability that Muṣṭafā wrote a history of his father’s reign, a Sulaymān-nâme, under the pseudonym Feređ (cf. G.O.W., p. 83).


**Muṣṭafâ Kâmil Pâsha, leader of the second national movement in Egypt** (on the first, see the articles ‘Arâbî Pâsha and Khedive).

The son of an Egyptian engineer, he was born in Cairo on 1st Radjâb 1291 (Aug. 14, 1874), studied at the Khedivial school of law there and after taking his examination went to study in Toulouse where in 1894 he took his “licence en droit”. While still a student of 18 he began his political activity and entered into personal relations with the Khedive ‘Abdul Ilhaq [q.v.]. On his return from France he founded in 1894 the second Egyptian national party (al-Hizb al-asfanî) with the object of inducing England by appeals to justice to abandon the occupation and restore the complete independence of Egypt. Later he also aimed at getting the Sūdân handed back to Egypt and tried to prepare the Egyptians by modern education for parliamentary government. As the representative of his party he spent each year a considerable time in Europe, especially France where he consulted with politicians and journalists and conducted a vigorous propaganda for his object. All his life he was very friendly with the journalist Julîette Adam; he had dealings with Rochefort, Drumont, Col. Marchand, Pierre Loti and in 1896 had a correspondence with Gladstone. Later he visited Berlin, London, Vienna, Budapest, Geneva and Constantinople where he was highly thought of because he insisted on the Sūdân’s suzerainty over Egypt; Sūdân ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II [q.v.] gave him in 1901 the title of Pāsha. In Cairo he founded in 1898 a school for training the youth in nationalist ideas, and in 1899 started the newspaper al-Lîwâ (The Banner), which appeared early in 1900, had a great success and from 1901 onwards was published in English and French editions. From 1902 he published the nationalist quarterly Ḥāzīlât al-Lîwâ. In his speeches and articles he emphasised his aims with fiery eloquence; at the same time he expressed his approval of the building of the Turkish strategic Hidjar railway and his sympathy with the Japanese.
in their war with Russia (1904–1905). Mustafa Kamil also regularly emphasised the privileged position of Muslims as belonging to the state religion and recognising the sultan as caliph and head of Islam and thus contributed to the pan-Islamic movement which began early in the twentieth century.

The "Entente Cordiale" concluded on April 8, 1904 between England and France was a severe blow to him and the nationalist party; by it France, in return for a free hand in Morocco, dropped its objections to the English occupation of Egypt. The Egyptian nationalists thus lost all hope of open or secret support from the French government and were thrown upon their own resources. This situation caused Mustafa Kamil to redouble his energy and in vigorous speeches and writings against France and England, in travelling and negotiating with statesmen of different lands, he endeavoured to make Egypt's point of view clear. As a result of the intensity of his agitation there was a breach between him and the Khedive Abbas II (Oct. 1904); on the other hand, his influence in Egypt rapidly increased and began to be troublesome to Lord Cromer who had so far treated the new nationalism created by Mustafa Kamil as a "quaint but negligible". The Dishawari (a village near Tanis in the Delta) affair gave the nationalists a great stimulus; on June 13, 1906, some English officers out shooting were said to have wounded an Egyptian woman and were attacked by felahin with clubs and one of the officers was killed. A special court set up by the English government sentenced four felahin to death and 17 to prison or flogging and the sentence was carried out next day. The indignation in Egypt and Europe rose to great heights and even in the House of Commons the authorities were critisised. Mustafa Kamil hurried to London and discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, whom he endeavoured to convince of the necessity of recalling Lord Cromer and giving greater freedom to Egyptians. On this occasion he mentioned as suitable representatives in a parliamentary system of government all those Egyptians who in the later political movement after the war played important parts. On his return to Egypt, through the press and mass meetings in which he urged Egyptians to unite against England, he gave a great stimulus to the national movement and soon had the satisfaction of seeing Lord Cromer recalled — although he was not at all the only cause of this — and replaced by Sir Eldon Gorst. The latter adopted a milder tone with the Egyptians, was on good terms with the Khedive and endeavoured to support him with a newly founded party. Mustafa Pasha attacked this representative of England vigorously also, in Oct. 1907 put his national party on a broader basis and summoned it a "national congress", which met on Dec. 7 of the same year in Cairo; 1,017 delegates from all over Egypt appeared and after a speech by Mustafa Kamil which carried them away the latter was elected Life-President of the party. This was however his swan-song — he had been ill since the summer of 1906; he died on Feb. 10, 1908 (8th Muharram 1326) at the age of 34 of a slow internal trouble (intestinal tuberculosis). The rumour spread that he had been poisoned at English instigation. His funeral was an impressive expression of the national grief.

Mustafa's creations did not long survive him and his party, which produced no leader to equal him and was broken up by dissensions, gradually sank into insignificance. Although he obtained no positive results by his agitation, he opened the way for the third and greatest nationalist movement (under Sa'd Zaghlul Pasha from Nov. 13, 1918). It is to his credit that he conducted his whole campaign without any appeal to force, which would have been quite useless against the British Empire, and without bloodshed.

Of his numerous writings only the more important can be mentionend; many of them were only printed after his death, some in the great (never completed) biography by his brother 'Ali Bey Fahmi Kamil al-Mas'ala' l-badriyya (1898 and 1909); Mi'r-r al-l-balili al-mi'ajjaf (collection of speeches and essays, Cairo 1313); Difa' al-Misr' 'an Biladis, Cairo 1324 (1906); al-Sama' al-muslihhah (Cairo 1904, on the Russo-Japanese war); Lettres françoises-égyptiennes (Cairo 1909; also in Arabic and English transl. His letters to Juliette Adam); Egyptiens et Anglois, Paris 1906 (speech of July 4, 1895 in Toulouse); Le péril anglais, Paris 1899; What the National Party wants (Cairo 1907, speech of Oct. 22, 1907).


(Max Meyerhoefer)

AL-MUSTAFA LI-DIN ALLAH. [See Nizar]

MASTAFÁ PASHA BAIRAKDÁR, Turkish grand vizier in 1808, was the son of a wealthy Janissary at Rusçuk, born about 1750. He distinguished himself in the war with Russia under Mustafa III, and acquired in these years the surname of Bairakdar. After the war he lived on his estates near Rusçuk, and acquired the semi-official position of ayân of Hızârgrad and later of Rusçuk. With other ayan he took part in an action against the government at Adrianople, but became finally a reliable supporter of the govern-
MUŞTAFA PASHA BAIKAĐAR — MUŞTAFA PASHA LALA

ment. Having already received the honorary offices of kâbiş-i bashı and of mir ağa, he was, in 1806, promoted to the rank of Paşaa of Silistra and at the same time was appointed sefsâker on the Danube frontier against the advancing Russian army. This made him one of the most influential men in Rûm-îli. He had become a redoubt supporter of Selim III’s reform policy and, after that султан’s deposition, it was to him that the enemies of the new reactionary government turned. In June 1808 he was joined by the dismission fa‘iim-ineşti of the grand vizierate in Constantinople, Тафйр Paşaa; from Rus-скъ they went to Adrianople, where they joined forces with the grand vizier Celebi Muştafa Paşa. So the entire Rumelian army marched against the capital, where they dictated their will to султан Muştafa IV (July 23). On July 26 Bailârâdar (or ‘Alemdâr as he was called officially) was appointed commander-in-chief and on July 28, after having taken by force the султан’s seal from the weak grand vizier, he marched with his troops to the palace of the султан, under the pretext of bringing back the holy standard of the prophet. At first he was allowed only to enter the first court of the serây, while султан Muştafa — who had been absent during the summer retreat — returned in haste from the seaside. As Bailârâdar had made known his intention of restoring Selim III to the throne, Muştafa had just time to take his predecessor. But immediately afterwards he was himself deposed and Bailârâdar now recognized Mahmûd II [g.v.] as султан.

After this began the short personal regime of Bailârâdar Muştafa Paşa as grand vizier. He had a number of the supporters of the former султан executed, arranged a magnificent funeral for Selim III and began to form a corps of troops called this time fa‘ıim-taşker. At the same time he summoned a great imperial conference in the capital, to which all the high-placed officials of the empire were invited. Many of them answered the appeal and subscribed to the extensive programme of reforms which the grand vizier laid before them in a solemn meeting in the first days of October and which was also approved of by a faţvā of the muftis. But the precipitation with which the new measures were taken in hand and the tactless procedure in the abolition of long established abuses, made him ever more unpopular. The influential ‘ulama were also alienated by the exaggerated reforming zeal. His only support were his Rumelian troops and a small number of friends, such as Begdij Efendi and Kâmil Paşa, together with Kâdî Paşa of Karaman who had remained in the capital. Matters came to a head on November 14, 1808, in the last days of Ramađan 1222, by a rebellion of the Janissaries. The night following that day they surrounded the grand vizier’s residence and set the quarter on fire. Bailârâdar, surprised by the fire, saw no way of escape; he hid himself in a tower of his palace, where his body was found three days afterwards, after the fire was quenched. The rumour had been spread that Bailârâdar had escaped, which had caused much uncertainty.

The grand vizier was buried in the fortress of Yeşil Kale, where his bones were dug up in 1911 during railway works; they were transported to the mosque of Zeinab султан.

Bibliography: Ğewdet Paşa, Тафйркă,


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MUŞTAFA PASHA BUSHTALI, the last hereditary wazir of Scutari (hence often called ‘Işıkkurt), the son of the celebrated Kara Mahmu’d Paşa Bushati [g.v.], succeeded his son Ibrahim Paşa about 1810 and received the rank of wazir in 1812. In 1820 the sandjak of Berat and in 1824 those of Ohrd and Elbasan were put under his government and he received the title of Serfesker. Nevertheless, like his father he aimed at greater independence and when Mahmu’d II’s reforms threatened to deprive him of his hereditary rights and privileges, he became strongly hostile to the султан and maintained friendly relations with the Serbian prince Miloš, the discontented Bosnians (cf. i., p. 757) and the Egyptian Muhamad ‘Ali (cf. J. Deny, Sommaire des archite turques du Caire, p. 264 and 553). He therefore maintained quite a passive attitude in the Turkish war (1837), and did not turn backwards the end of it, in May 1829, did he appear with his Albanians on the Danube (Vidin, Rahovo), then went on to Sofia and Philippopolis, but without taking any active part in the fighting.

On the conclusion of peace the Porte (ieg. of 1831) demanded of Muştafa Paşa that he should hand over the districts previously held by him (Dukakin, Debar, Elbasan, Ohrd and Trgoviste) to the grand vizier Reshid Mehmed Paşa (on cf. Сăджî-i ‘öthmâni, ii. 391) and carry through certain reforms in Scutari itself Muştafa Paşa resisted and with the financial and moral support of prince Miloš, led an army in the middle of March 1831 against the grand vizier. He was joined by the other Pashas of northern Albania and old Serbia who objected to reforms. The rebels had at first certain successes including the occupation of Sofia but they were completely routed at Prilep by the regular troops led by the grand-vizier (beginning of May). Muştafa Paşa hurried back to Scutari via Skopje and Prizen and shut himself up in the fortress. When he surrendered on Nov. 10, 1831 after six months’ siege, he was pardoned on Metternich’s intercession and taken to Constantinople.

Fifteen years later he again held various governorships, chiefly in Anatolia (from 1846), then in the Herzegovina (1853) and lastly in Medîna where he died on May 27, 1860.


(FEĐIN BAIRAKTAŠEVIĆ)

MUŞTAFA PASHA KOPRULU. [See KOPRULU.]
same Bosnian locality from which came the grand vizier Sokollı [q.v.], and began his service in the imperial army. He rose in rank under the grand vizier Ahmad (1553–1555), but was not in favour with the latter's successor Rustam Pasha, who made him in 1556 zafer to Prince Selim with the object of running him. The outcome of this nomination was the contrary of what was expected; Mustafa became the chief of the intrigues by which Selim came into conflict with his brother Bayazid and which ended with Bayazid's execution in Persia [cf. p. 63]. After these events Rustam Pasha managed to reconcile the intriguer in administrative function to different parts of the empire; for eight years he was wakil in Damascus. Nor was the grand vizier Sokollı favourably disposed to Mustafa, but in the beginning of 1569 Sultan Selim II called back his former vezir as wakil excisivi in the capital. Very soon afterwards Sokollı appointed him vezü’ü‘ l-

', 'kastır in the Yaman; Mustafa went to Cairo to take charge of his command, but here he became involved in serious disputes with the wakil Sinan Pasha on the equipment of his army. The end was that Sinan was appointed in Mustafa's stead and the latter had to return to Constantinople. Sultan Selim's protection saved him from death and in the beginning of the following year he was appointed again vezü’ü‘ l-


\textit{Cat.,} No. 355; and Elliot-Dawson, \textit{History of India,} viii. 181. (M. Hidâyet Hüsûn, \textit{al-Mustafâ-i Rû’l-‘alâ’,} M. A. Mûhammed, an \textit{Abbâsî d caliph. His father was a son of the caliph al-Mu’tasim, his mother a slave-girl named Mûsharîf of Slav origin. After the death in Kabîr II 248 (June 862) of al-Mun
tasir the pretorian-appointed his cousin Ahmad caliph under the name al-Mustâin. The choice aroused discontent in Sâmârâra and unrest broke out among those who supported al-Mu’tazz [1 v.] which was only put down after much bloodshed by the Turkish soldiers. When al-Mustâin was recognised as caliph he confirmed the governor of Baghdad, Muhammad b. Abd Allah b. Tâ’în [1 v.], in office. He bought all the property of al-Mu’tazz and his brother al-Mu’ayyad and then had them arrested. The Turks wanted to put them to death but they were protected by the vizier Ahmad b. al-Khâsî who soon afterwards fell into disgrace and was banished to Crete. In 249 (865) trouble broke out as a result of a defeat of the army by the Byzantines; the rebels were however scattered by the vizier Usâmid and the two Turkish generals Usâfî and Boghâ Jânrâî. Usâmid was soon afterwards murdered at the instigation of the latter. As the caliph no longer felt safe in Sâmârâra he went to Baghzâd in Muharram 251 (Feb. 865). Al-Mu’tazz was then taken by his supporters out of his prison in Sâmârâra and a war broke out which ended in Dhu’l-Hijja 252 (Jan. 866) in the abduction of al-Mustâin [cf. Baghzâb]. By the arrangement made the latter was to live in Medina in future; but he was detained in Wâsiît and murdered in Shawwâl 252 (Oct. 866) at the age of 35. See also the article MUHAMMAD b. ABD ALLAH B. TÀHÎR.

\textit{Bibliography:} Ibn Kutaiba, Kitâb al-
\textit{Mârîfî,} ed. Wûstenfeld, p. 200; Ya’âqûb, ed. Houssama, ii. 603–610; Fâbarî, iii. 150 sq.;
AL-MUSTA’IN — AL-MUSTANDJID


Abjad* (ed. Denberouq, i. 68 sqq.; Ibn Khaldún, *Al-thār*, m. 232, ch. 8, *Al-thār bi-Al-

Al-Adhdhāl, i. 528: Le Strange, Baghdad and the Abbasid Caliphate, see index.

(K. V. Zettersten)

AL-MUSTAKFI BI L’TĀLĪAH, Abū ‘l-Kāsim Ahmad b. Al-Mustakfi, caliph, son of al-Mustakfi. His wife, 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Abī Shujā‘, was killed by the caliph al-Muttaq. He chose al-Mustakfi's son, Ahmad, as his successor on the same day in *Safr* 334 (Aug. 1034). The new caliph was only a tool in the hands of the Abbasid caliph, and his successor Abū Lāzar šarif, another caliph, Baghdaḏ, began to suffer from a chronic famine and neither food nor money could be raised for the troops. When the Bāyda Thān B. Abī Shujā‘ approached (cf. Mīr al-

Al-tal‘ah), the caliph had to declare himself ready to recognize the Bāyda as the legitimate ruler, in all the provinces conquered by them, and in *Qumād* 534 (Dec. 949) Ahmad entered Baghdaḏ and was given the caliph the title of honour Muẓz al-Dawla and the fullest power in all secular matters. But the new ruler suspected that the caliph was in communication with the enemies of the Bāyda so he had him blinded (on 22nd *Lūlūbi* 2 or *Suhba* 334 = Jan 29 or March 490) and deposed. Al-Mustakfi died in Rabi’ I 538 (Sept–Oct. 949).


AL-MUSTA’LI BI L’ĀLĪAH ABU ‘L-KĀSIM AHMAD b. Al-Mustanṣir, ninth Fātimid Caliph, born 20th Muhaaram, 467 (Sept. 16, 1074) (so in all the best sources and in the Al-Mustanṣir’s letter to Ahmad b. ‘Ali al-Salāhi, quoted in Idīs, viii. 152), the youngest son of his father. At this time it was generally assumed in the Ismā‘ili organization that the eldest son, Nizar (born 437), would, in accordance with custom, succeed his father in the imamate, although no formal investiture with the *alīhyat al-nāfi‘* appears to have been made. The influence of the all-powerful wāzir Badr al-Dīmmālī, however, and of his son al-Afḍal, was thrown into the scale in favour of Abu ‘l-Ḵāsim and al-Mustanṣir’s consent obtained to the marriage of Abu ‘l-Ḵāsim with Sitt al-Mulk, the daughter of Badr (the statement in al-Fārīqī [ap. Ibn al-Kalānī, ed. Amedroz, p. 128] that he was the son of Badr’s daughter is evidently a misunderstanding). According to the tradition of the Mustulān Ismā‘ilīs (see n. 16), Abu ‘l-Ḵāsim was invested with the succession at the time of this marriage in another version Ibn Muyassar, p. 66 sqq.) al-

Mustanṣir confirmed his nomination of Abu ‘l-Ḵāsim to his own sister, who divulged it after his death. On the death of al-Mustanṣir on 18th Dhu ‘l-Hijja,

487 (Jan. 16, 1094), the Šī‘ite *Id al-Ghadr*, al-

Afḍal secured the accession of al-Mustanṣir without serious difficulty. The subsequent revolt of Nizar (see n. 23) at Alexandria failed owing to the opposition of the army, and al-Mustanṣir’s succession was generally recognized, except by the Ismā‘ilīs of Persia (see n. 27). Throughout his reign the actual power was entirely in the hands of al-Afḍal [g.v.]. At first some sucesse were gained in Syria; Fāmīya (Aphanza) made a voluntary submission in 459, and Tyre was recovered from a rebel governor in 490. A project of alliance with the Sāḥib al-Rūyān of Aleppo against Damascus in the same year fell through. On the appearance of the Crusaders in Syria (490–491) an Egyptian embassy was sent to open negotiations with them, and in 491 (July-Aug. 1098) Jerusalem was recaptured from the Orthoḵāk Sūkān and Hī-Ḵārī. The advance of the Crusaders in the following year took al-Afḍal by surprise: Jerusalem was again lost, and the defeat of the Egyptian army near ‘Askalān (14th Ramaḍān, 492 = Aug. 5, 1099) definitely established them in possession. Two years later (17th *Safr*, 495 = Dec. 12, 1101) al-Mustanṣir died and was succeeded by his son al-Manṣūr (Al-Amīr bi-Aḥkām Allāh). The personal character of al-Mustanṣir is highly praised by his Sumī contemporary Ibn al-Kalānī; later writers speak of him as a fanatical Šī‘ite, and it would seem that the Fātimid organization and propaganda was intensified in his reign. Idīs refers especially to his close relations with the *da‘wa* in the Yaman, represented by al-Malik al-Hurra and her da‘ī Yahyā b. Lamāk b. Malik al-Hamadānī. In the capable hands of al-Afḍal, order and good government were maintained, and Egypt continued to enjoy prosperity, except for a famine in 492 or 493, due to the influx of Syrian refugees.

Bibliography: The fullest sources are Ibn al-Kalānī (ed. Amedroz), p. 128–141, and Ibn Taghribirdi (ed. Popper), ii. part 2, p. 298–325; the chronology of the latter is defective; Ibn al-Thān (x. 161–224), Dīmmāl al-Dīn al-

Halabī (Brit. Mus. Or. 3058, foll. 74°–77°), Ibn Muyassar (ed. Māṣē), p. 34–49, and the other sources mentioned under the article al-

Afḍal add little of importance. The Mustulān Ismā‘ili tradition is given in *Qīyā‘ al- politically 1382* of the *al∗ Inīs b. al-Hasan [d. 872] (MS. in possession of H. F. al-Hamadānī), vii. 151–

175. — For relations with the Crusaders: *Descriptio Francorum* (ed. Breher), p. 86, 96, 208–216; *Notker Carontensis*, i. 19; ii. 10–12; Hagen-

mayer, *Epistulae et Chartae*, Innsbruck 1901, p. 151, 286. The general European literature is given in the articles *Fātimīds* and *Al-

Mustanṣir* (H. A. E. G. B.)

AL-MUSTANDJID BI L’ĀLĪAH, ABU ‘L-MUṬAFAR YEṢUT, *Abhāṣiḏ al-}

Caliph, born on 1st Rabi‘ II 510 (Aug. 13, 1116), son of al-Muṭtaḏa and a

Greek slave-girl named Nāṣirī or Tāṣū. After his father’s death on 1st Rabi‘ II 555 (March 12, 1160) al-Mustandjid succeeded him as caliph. While al-Muṭtaḏa was dying and hope of his recovery had been abandoned, the mother of his son Abū ‘Ali endeavoured to dispose of the future caliph who had already been selected heir-apparent in 542 (1147). After winning over several emirs for her plot, she armed her slave-girls with daggers
to murder the heir-apparent when he entered his father's apartment. Al-Mustanṣirī however heard of the plot and had the instigator and his son arrested. A few years after his accession the Mamluks were expelled [q.v.]. The sons of the ʿAbbāsids also fell within his reign although the ʿAbbāsids were only officially recognised as caliphs of Egypt under his successor al-Mustaṣifī. In 562 (1165—1167), Shimal, lord of Khīṣīnān, invaded the Ṭūlā and demanded from the caliph the grant of a portion of the lower Euphrates territory as a fee. The caliph however sent an army against him. Shimal's nephew, ʿAbd Allāh, was routed and Shimal returned home. Al-Mustanṣirī died on 9th Rabī‘ II 560 (Dec. 20, 1170). When he was very ill, his phyician-arranged with his chamberlain Ajud al-Brūnī [q.v.] and the emir ʿAbd al-Brūnī Kainax to give him a bath to hasten his end. The caliph refused to agree; he was nevertheless shut up in the bath until he died.


(K. V. Zettersten)

al-Mustanṣirī bi ʿl-Lāhī, Abu Qayyār al-Maʿmūn bi al-ʿAzhārī, ʿAbbāsī dīlārī: like his father whom he succeeded on the 14th Rājdāb 623 (July 11, 1226), he is described as a just and devout man and was generally liked although he played no great part in politics. He acquired ʿIṣbāl by a legacy in 630 (1233—1234) and eight years later his lands were increased by the acquisition of the town of ʿAnā which he bought from its previous owner. About this time the Mongols began to threaten the lands of ʿĪsāmīn. Shindār Kān [q.v.] had died in Rājdān 624 (Aug. 1227) but his sons continued his campaigns of conquest. In 635 (1237—1238) the Mongols were defeated by the caliph's troops; the strongest defender of ʿĪsāmīn however was Dīlārī al-Dīn, Shihāb al-Khāzīm [q.v.]. Al-Mustanṣirī died on 20th Jumādā I or 10th Jumādā II 640 (Nov. 15 or Dec. 5, 1242). According to Ibn Khaldūn however, he did not die till the following year. The al-Mustanṣirīyya movement was founded by him in Baghdād bears his name.


(A. V. Zettersten)

al-Mustanṣirī bi ʿl-Lāhī, Abu Tamīm Māʿādī b. ʿAlī al-ʿAzhārī, eight Faṭimid Caliph, born 16th Rājdān 420 (July 2, 1029) (according to 13th, on 16th Rājdān — Sept. 29), succeeded his father al-ʿAzhārī [q.v.] in 15th Shābān, 427 (June 13, 1036), and died 12th Rājdān 487 (Jan. 10, 1094), after the longest recorded reign of any Muslim ruler and one which, besides being marked by the most violent fluctuations of fortune, was of critical importance in the history of the Fāṭimid Ismāʿīlī movement.

Internal History. During the childhood of al-Mustanṣirī the authority remained at first in the strong hands of his father's wazir Abu al-ʿAzm al-Dīrājī. On his death (7th Rājdān 430 — March 28, 1035), it fell by the evil genius of al-Mustanṣirī's reign, his mother, who was a Sūmānī slave, and her former master, the Jewish merchant Abū ʿSaʿd al-Tustārī. When Abū ʿSaʿd was assassinated in 439 (1047), after an outbreak of rioting between the Turkish and Berber troops, his place as the queen-mother's agent was taken by his brother Abū Najār Hārūn (see however the documents published by Mann [Bihr]), and the ʿAzm Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-Yāzūrī, who eventually accepted also the wazirate (7th Muḥarram 442 = June 1, 1050) and held it for eight years [cf. al-Yāzūrī]. Meanwhile there was considerable unrest and perhaps also economic unsettlement in the country. If a statement in al-Muḥarrarīn 82 [99]; ed. Wiet, ii, 4 [67]) is to be believed, the ʿIṣbāl of the Egyptian provinces amounted only to one million dinārs in the time of al-Yāzūrī, but this may have been exceptional, though it is plain from other sources that the government had already been forced to the familiar expedient of confiscations and indemnities. The Delta was disturbed by Arab risings, the most serious of which, that of the Banū Kurra, was put down only with great difficulty by Nāṣīr al-Dawla (see below) with the help of the Ṭūlā and other Arab troops of Kūmr al-Shārīk in 443 (1051) (cf. Ibn al-Ṣairāfī, p. 42 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿArīf, ix, 396 sqq. and for the date Ibn al-Kalānī, p. 85). At the capital there was an increasing state of tension between the Turkish and Berber troops and the enormous bodies of Sūmānī slaves raised by the Caliph's mother (cf. Muḥarrarī, i, 94 [ed. Wiet, ii, 45]); and p. 335; detailed but probably unverifiable figures also in Nāṣīr Khusrāw, ed. Kaviani, p. 66). In striking contrast to this is the success of the court and prosperity of Maḥrūf-Fusṭāṭ as described by Nāṣīr al-Khusrāw [q.v.]. There can be little doubt that the source of much of this prosperity, apart from the manufacture and supply of luxuries to the court, is already to be seen in the commercial relations between Egypt and the Indian Ocean on the one hand (cf. Nāṣīr al-Khusrāw's account of ʿĪsāmīn) and Constantinople on the other. The general insecurity deepened after the execution of al-Yāzūrī, who was the last wazir to attempt to control the situation. He was followed by a rapid succession of pashas in office, many of whom, despite the pompous titles duly recorded by Ibn al-Ṣairāfī, held the position for no more than a few days at a time.

The Fāṭimid Caliphate was now destined to pass in a few shattering years through the same agony as the ʿAbbāsī dīlārī of Baghdād had suffered in the early part of the previous century. The breakdown of the civil administration and subsequent exhaustion of the treasury gave a free hand to the military, and the sinister policy of the Caliph's mother brought matters speedily to a head. In a pitched battle at Kūmr al-Shārīk (close to Cairo) in 454 (1062) (sometimes confused with the previous battle at Kūmr al-Shārīk the Turkish and Berber troops led by Nāṣīr al-Dawla Ibn Ḥamāda, a descendant of the Ḥamādīn of Mustanṣirī, defeated and drove the Sūmānīs into the Sūmān but the struggle continued for some years and the blacks were not finally routed and driven out until 459 (1067); thereafter they were confined to the ʿAwaṣ,
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p. 701, l. 66. To be added: Signature was something of a privilege. Of the surviving engravers of Istanbul two only possessed it: Yiannes, the son of a famous father of that name, and 'Ashif. The personal seals in Latin characters, made up to this day (1933), are, with a few exceptions, barbarous.

The ethnographic museum at Ankara possesses a curious collection of metal seals provenient from the shrines of the now dissolved tarika of the Bektashis.
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which suffered severely from their plundering and devastations. Nāṣīr al-Dawla in turn quarreled with the Turks, and, defeated in battle by a force commanded by al-Mustaṉṣir in person (461 = 1068–1069), appealed to the Sāljuqids Ḍirḡi-Ārslān [q.v.]. Without waiting for his help, however, he regained control of Cairo and the Delta with the aid of the Ayyubids and of the Berbers and took al-Mustaṉṣir (it is said) to the state of a pensioner on a hundred dinārs a month, assumed the title of Sultan al-Dawla, and attempted, but unsuccessfully, to restore his Abābasid ḫumāt. In Rādjas 465 (March 1073) he and all his house were killed by the rival Turkish faction, led by Iḏhuqa, under whom the Caliph fared little better. Meanwhile the constant anarchy and remorseless plundering of the country by the troops brought agriculture to a standstill (although the Nile floods seem to have been uniformly good). The result was a famine which lasted from 459 to 464 (1067–1072) and became progressively more severe. During these years the country was a prey to the utmost misery; the royal city and palaces were looted, and Fustāt was twice plundered and even burned by Nāṣīr al-Dawla. Large numbers of the population, including even the Abābasid officials, sought refuge in Syria and the Iraŷ (for the depopulation and shrinkage of Fustāt cf. Maṭraḥ, i. 5; ed. Witt, i. 12; on the fate of the royal library see also Olga Pinto, Le Biblioteca degli Arabi, Rome 1928, p. 25–26). The Sunni historians dwell on this famine with some complacency, regarding it as the retribution for the impious attack of al-Bassātīr on the Abābasid Caliphate (see below), and circumstantial stories related to the extreme destitution to which al-Mustaṉṣir himself was reduced. That these must be accepted with some reserve is clear from such passages as Ibn Taghri-bardi, II, 186, 18–19.

At length in 465 (1073) al-Mustaṉṣir, taking courage of despair, secretly invited the governor of Ṭakkā, the Armenian general Badr al-Djamālī, to assume supreme control in Egypt. Badr accepted the commission, by conscripting his own troops with him, and sailing from Ṭakkā in the winter, reached Cairo on 29th Djamād I, 466 (Jan. 29, 1074). His rapid and energetic movements took the Turks by surprise, and he put to death the whole body of their leaders, together with a large number of Egyptian notables and officials. For his further military and administrative measures, by which he restored order and relative prosperity in Egypt (the total revenue of Egypt and its remaining Syrian possessions, which in 466 had amounted to 2,800,000 dinārs, rose by 483 to 3,100,000 dinārs: Majrīṭ, i. 100; ed. Witt, ii. 68; cf. Abū Šayh, fol. 7b–9r) see the article BADR AL-DJAMAİLİ. The alliance between general and caliph was cemented by the marriage of Badr’s daughter to al-Mustaṉṣir’s youngest son Ahmad, the future Caliph al-Mustaṭīr [q.v.]. The Fātimid Caliphate was saved but, like its Abābasid rival, at the cost of abandoning its temporal authority to a series of military commanders, entitled ḫaṭār al-djāymanī, from whose control it never afterwards succeeded in emancipating itself.

al-Mustaṉṣir is described in contemporary sources as upright and amiable in character, and just and equitable in his dealings, but as a ruler his personality is entirely obscured. By the successive wazirs and generals who kept him virtually a prisoner. The statements of the later anti-Fātimid writers must, of course, be entirely discounted; the Fātimid sources, on the other hand, praise his sagacity and infallibility (ṣiyār) as Imam.

External relations. The empire to which al-Mustaṉṣir must succeed was the most powerful Muslim state of its time. It extended from Ḥirṣiyā in Syria to Mecca and Central Syria, and maintained an active propagandist organization in Ḫirṣiyā, Persia and Kūrāsān (see the following section). Within a few years of his accession its territories were still further expanded by Anbāḏgān’s conquest of Aleppo in Shaban 429 (May 1038) (cf. the articles FĀTIMIDS and HALĀH) and extension of his authority across the Euphrates, on the one hand, and on the other by the conquests of ʿAlī al-Sulahī in the Yanan, after establishing himself at Masār in the same year (cf. Sulahī; also H. F. al-Hamādānī, in Journal of the Royal Central-Asian Society, 1931 p. 505 sqq., and in J. Res. A.S., 1932, p. 126 sqq.). After the deaths of Anbāḏgān and the wazīr al-Djamālī, who in spite of their rivalry zealously maintained the interests of the dynasty, the power and prestige of the Egyptian court steadily declined. The Arab tribes in Syria, though defeated in the field, remained unsubdued, and the Caliph had to be content with the little more than nominal allegiance of the Mirdāsids [q.v.] at Aleppo. At Damascus, the rivalries between the Berber and Turkish troops and the hostility of the citizens reduced the governors to impotence. The disturbed state of Syria was the more disastrous as it made it impossible for the Fātimid government to give effective support to the amr al-Bassātīr [q.v.; see the list of war material and subventions sent from Egypt: Ibn Taghri-bardi, p. 177] in his attempt to oppose the advancing Sāljuq power, with the result that his occupation of Baghhdād and proclamation of al-Mustaṉṣir in 459 (1058–1059) was speedily brought to an end. The subsequent military and economic disorders in Egypt allowed a free hand to the Turkmen (Ghazz) bands, who had appeared in Northern Syria as early as 447 (1055), though it was not until 463 (1071) that the first Sāljuq armies entered Northern Syria and the Ghazz bands under Atsiz [q.v.] occupied Palestine and began to harass Damascus. In many of the other towns and districts of Syria the authority was seized by local chiefs, such as the kīdīs Ibn Ḧammar [q.v.]; also G. Witt, in Min. Henri Buet, p. 279 sqq.) at Ta ṣbulus and Ibn Abī Ṭakkīl at Tyre, though both of these acknowledged the spiritual authority of the Fātimid Caliph (cf. also the account of the foundation of the castle of Șarkhad by Ḥassān b. Mu’nār al-Kalbi in 466 [1073–1074], quoted from Sibīb al-Djawa in Ibn Taghri-bardi, p. 253). The menace of the Sāljuqs became most substantial after the arrival of Ṭutūsh [q.v.] in 470 (1077–1078), but the latter never actually organized a full campaign against the Fātimids. On the contrary, the offensive was taken by Badr, who succeeded in restoring Egyptian control on the coast as far as Tyre, Sidon and Tībah in 482 (1089), but not in recovering the interior of Palestine and Damascus (lost in 468), in spite of a certain revival of feeling in Syria in favour of the Fātimids. It is difficult to know how much weight to lay on the story (Ibn Taghri-bardi,

---
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p. 272—273) that Tutush at one time proposed to ally himself in marriage with Badr.

The success of the Saljuqids also affected the position of the Fatimids in Arabia. In 462 (1070) the 'Abbâsid Caliph was acknowledged in the Holy Cities, and after a brief return to the Fatimid obedience between 467 and 473 the Hisâj passed definitely to the 'Abbâsid cause. In the Yaman, the 'ülâis in the interior and the Zârâ'ids in the important commercial centre of 'Aden maintained the suzerainty of the Fatimids, the latter until the Al-Abbâd conquest by Türazîshâh in 569 (1173) [cf. the art. SALAMÂN].

Meanwhile the Fatimid empire had been similarly shorn of its possessions in the West. About 435 (1043–1044) al-Mu'izz b. Bâdis [q. v.], the Zirid lieutenant of the Fatimid Caliph in Kaitawan, began a series of repressive measures against the Shî'ites of Ifriqiya; in 440 he seems to have made the first overt gesture of independence, and in 441 superseded the Fatimid coinage; but it was not until 445 (1051) that he formally renounced the Fatimid suzerainty and obtained an investiture from the 'Abbâsid Caliph. According to the traditional account (already fully developed in Isâq al-Sa'darî), the wazir al-Yâzîrî in revenge launched against him the nomad bands of the Banû Hilâl [q. v.]; the tribes mentioned in the Egyptian sources are Zubîqa, Rîyâh, al-Athbâji, and 'Adîyî, who had been a cause of much trouble to the government in the Sa'îd and were now given a free hand to plunder the territories of the Zirids [cf. TUNISIA, vol. iv. 851]. As Wustenfeld has already indicated (p. 234 n.), the story as it stands is open to serious objections, and there can be little doubt that it has been amplified by popular legend. The westward movement of the Hilâl tribes began as early as 440, and there is no reason to reject the account of Ibn 'Idhârî that it was al-Mu'izz himself who invited the Arab tribes, then in Barka, to enter Ifriqiya as his 'amîdî [since he was not on good terms with the 'Ashâdjâ, and that they, having set out in response to his invitation, began to plunder on their own account and already before the close of 443 had inflicted a severe defeat on his troops. The two traditions are not, however, mutually exclusive and may be reconciled by supposing that the Banû Hilâl were transported in the first instance to Barka (the governor of which had thrown in his lot with al-Mu'izz), and that their advance into Ifriqiya was facilitated, for opposite reasons, by both al-Mu'izz and the wazîr [cf. also Ibn al-Athîr, i. 387—388]. During the first years of his reign, the son and successor of al-Mu'izz, Tamûm (453–501 = 1061—1107), temporarily returned to the Fatimid allegiance (Lan-Pâez, 138 n. 1), but with the conquest of Sicily by the Normans in 463 (1070) Barka became the western limit of the Fatimid state.

The diplomatic relations of al-Mustanîr with non-Muslim states covered a wide field. In 429 (1038) the existing treaty with the Byzantine Emperor was renewed and relatively cordial relations established. If Naşir-i Khurasn (ed. Kaviani, p. 67) is to be trusted, the Egyptian government was in communication in 439 (1047) also with the Georgians, the Daumites, the Kha'îân of Turkhistan and even the râjî of Dîlîh, all of whom shared with Egypt a common hostility to the Saljuqids and the Qânevîs. The friendly relations with Constantiople, however, were broken off in 446 (1054), when the Empress Theodora demanded an offensive alliance against the Saljuqids. Egyptian troops were despatched on an unsuccessful expedition against al-Lâdîkîyûa, the Empress retaliated by opening negotiations with the Saljuqids, and al-Mustanîr seized the treasures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (al-Kâmûmâ). This breach with Constantinople had important consequences for the future of Egypt, since it to may perhaps be ascribed the opening up of direct commercial relations with the Italian trading cities, though documentary evidence on the point is lacking (cf. Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 105, 124).

Religious Conditions. The wide expansion of the Fatimid power under al-Mustanîr is reflected also in the religious situation. Propaganda on behalf of the Fatimids is synonymous with the dissemination of the official state religion of the Fatimids, the Islâmî-Shâ'î faith. Not only in Egypt and other lands in actual submission to the Fatimid authority, but in all quarters of the Islamic world, we learn of missionaries (dâ'î), who during the long reign of al-Mustanîr struggled, in part in vain, to secure recognition of their claim to be the religious Imâm. In the East, in Persia, and especially in Shiraz, at the court of the Buyid prince Abû Kâlidî [q. v.], we can trace the activities at least since 429 (1037—1038) of the dâ'î Abû Naşr Hibât Allâh b. Músâ al-Mu'ayyad fi Dun Allâh [see AL-MU'AYYAD], doubtless the most prominent personality of his time in the Islâmî al-dawa. He endeavoured to win over the court and the Daumite troops to the Fatimid cause, but was forced to leave his post in 439 (1047—1048) as the result of pro-'Abbâsid intrigue. In the first part of his autobiography (see Bâbi), al-Mu'ayyad gives a detailed account of his activity, and in particular publishes his correspondence with an unnamed Sunnî from Khurasân, in which he explains the religious and political principles of his mission. To what an extent the power of the Fatimids and the success of their emissaries in Iran and Persia was feared at Baghâd is shown by the fact that several times and latterly in 444 (1052) there was published a document, to which the 'Alîs also subscribed, with the object of declaring false the claim of the Fatimids to descend from 'Ali. At the same time the Fatimid cause gained also new ground in the Yaman. After the political power of the Fatimids had been reduced to a minimum in the course of the fourth century, it now acquired in the Sulâijî Allî b. Muhammad a powerful supporter. He and his successors regarded themselves not only as political but also as religious representatives of the Fatimid Imâm in the Yaman. The voluminous correspondence between the Sulâijî rulers and al-Mustanîr, which is still preserved, collected in a separate work (Kitâb al-Sidjâ'il wa 'l-Tamâwûs wa 'l-'Anâb li-Musânâ al-Mustanjîr bi 'lîb, MS. Sch. Ot. St.; many of these letters are reproduced in Idrîsî, vol. vii. [see Bâbi]), deals, along with political questions, in the first place with the position of the dâ'îwa in the Yaman and in the Fatimid state.

In Egypt itself, soon after the accession of al-Mustanîr, the doctrines of the moderate official Ismâlîya were threatened by the appearance of extremists related to the Drues [q. v.]. A pretender, al-Sikkînî, together with his associate al-Ânu, gave himself out as the returned Caliph al-Hâkim, but
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was promptly unmasked (Idris, vi. 296) Al-
Ma'ayyad, who came to Cairo in 439 and won
the goodwill of Mustansir, was entrusted with
the leadership of the religious mission as Dā'ī l-Dināt (it
should be remarked, however, that al-Yazīdī
during his wazīrat was known as Dā'ī l-dīnāt; cf. Ibn al-Safarī, p. 40). In the reopened seminary in Cairo, where the Dā'ī of the various
countries received instruction, he gave his lectures and gathered into his hands the strings of the whole Dā'ī's. He appears to have exercised a
special influence over the development of the Dā'ī's in the Yaman, as the future Yamanite Dā'ī Lamak b. Malik was numbered among his pupils.
From Persia the newly-converted Ismā'īlīs Nāṣīrī
Khāsrav [q. v.] came to Egypt, to find his master in
him. At the same time al-Mustansir seems to have
played an important political role. In his autobiography he quotes numerous letters which
he wrote to al-Bāṣrī and other generals of the Fāṭimids in Syria and Mesopotamia. In particular
it was at his instigation that the Khutba for the
Fāṭimid was introduced into the prayer at Bāṣirāt
in 450 (cf. Ibn Mayyās, p. 8, 10–6–7). In his poems he eulogizes the Imām al-Mustansir in a similar manner to Nāṣīrī Khāsrav. Other Ismā'īlīs
authored bythis period include (Husayn b. Mahbūb, the Dā'ī Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Nahhār,
and the author of the Kifā al-Mağāzī al-
Mustansiriya (lectures in which the Imāmate of
al-Mustansir is demonstrated with the aid of the Ismā'īli ta'wil), which are ascribed by the Fāṭimid
tradition to Badr al-Dīnālī. — For the Fāṭimid propa-
ganda in Transoxiana see also Barthold, Turke-
stan?, G. M. S., p. 304–305.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Safarī, al-Shāfī'i
ilā man nūh l-Nisā'ī, ed. A. Mūkhīs, Cairo
1921, p. 400; Ibn al-Mustansir bi l-Durūk
Dimāzīgh, ed. Amedroz, p. 84–128; Nāṣīrī
Khāsrav, Safar-Yāna, ed. Kaviani, Berlin 1344,
p. 54–82; transl. Schere, Paris 1881, p. 110–
162; Abū ʿAlī, ed. Evets, fol. 94b–104a; 33b,
51a; Dīnālī al-Dīn al-Halābī, Turākī al-Dawāl
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68v–70b; Gotth. No. 1555, fol. 152b–153b; Ibn
al-ʿAlī, al-Kūmilī, ed. Tornberg, ib. 304–x, 161;
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Balūk, i. 99–100, 335–336, and other passages;
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Ibn al-Mustansir, al-Durūk Dimāzīgh (Auto-
bibliography) (the latter two in MSS. in the
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dealing with religious conditions is also based
on other unpublished MSS. in the same collection.

— F. Wustenfeld, Gesch. der Fat. Caliphen,
p. 227–271; S. Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt in
the Middle Ages, p. 136–161; J. Mav. The
Jews in Egypt and Palestine under the Fatimid
Caliphs, Oxford 1920–1922, p. 75–83; ii. 79–
80, 370–371 and other passages quoted above.

(H. A. R. Gibb and P. Kraus)

MUSTARIB(A) (A.), "arabicised", the name of one of the groups into which the Arab
genealogists divide the population of Arabia. The first is the "arab arība, the original Arabs of pure stock; they numbered nine (some say seven) tribes which are regarded as the descendants of Aram b. Sūm b. Nīl [q. v.] and the first settlers in Arabia: Al-Ṭabānī, Umayyim, ʿAbd b. Tasm, ʿAbdallāh, Ismāʿīl, Dāʿī, Ḥabīb and ʿAbdallāh. These are
exempt except for a few remnants incorporated in other tribes. The second group comprises the
munṣūrībā (q. v.) who are not pure blooded Arabs. They are regarded as descendants of Kaffān (the Vokțan of the list of nations in Gen. x. 25 sq.) and live in southern Arabia. The third group is called mustarīb; this name is also applied to tribes who were not originally Arabs; they trace their descent from Māʾadd b. ʿAdnān, a descendant of Ismāʿīl [q. v.]; all the so-called Arabian tribes are included among the mustarībā, so that the Banū Kuraysh to which Muʿāwaṣṣāda belonged is one of them; his genealogy is in this way traced back to Abūrahah and he thus thought he could prove his connection with the Biblical prophets. The old term mustarīb, for tribes not originally of Arab descent, obtained a new meaning after the conquest of Spain. It was applied to the Christian Spaniards who adopted Islam; the word mustarīb was corrupted to Musaara [q. v.].

Bibliography: Caen, Annales de l'Islam, i., 433; do., Studi di Storia Orientale, i. 306, sq.; Cousin de Perceval, Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes, i. 6 sqq.; C. Ritter, Arabien, i. 57; al-Suyūṭī, Muḥiri, 1st Nav.; Tādī al-Arāf, ii. 371; cf. Lane, Lex., i. 348.

(ILE HICHETSSTADTER

AL-MUSTARSHID BI 'LLĀH, ABU MAṢṢAR AL-FAYŪT, ʿAbbāsīd caliph, born in 486 (1003–1004), son of al-Mustazhir and a slave-girl. Al-Mustarshid, who was proclaimed his father's successor after the latter's death on 16th Rabi' II
512 (Aug. 6, 1118), was the first caliph since the occupation of Bagdad by the Byzans, who was not content with spiritual supremacy but also endeavoured to revive the caliph's authority in temporal matters. The Šādīk sultan had died before al-Mustazhir (Dhu l-Ḥijja 511 = April 1118) and his son Māḥmūd [q. v.] was appointed his successor. His uncle Šanḍar and his brother Māḥmūd both rebelled against the new sultan and the turbulent Māḥmūd Dalbāsī, b. Sulakā [q. v.], raised trouble in the ʿIrāk and had also quarrelled with the latter. The caliph defeated him in 517 (1123) and after al-Mustarshid had repelled a regular attack on the capital he was able to adopt a more independent attitude to the Šādīk. But as his increasing power aroused the misgivings of the governor of Bagdad, the latter in Kāḏib 520
(July–Aug. 1126) went to Sūlān Māḥmūd and asked him to put an end to the caliph's power. Māḥmūd agreed and attacked the capital, while al-Mustarshid sent an army against Wāṣīt in order to secure this town. The attempt failed however; towards the end of the year Māḥmūd entered Bagdad and al-Mustarshid could not hold out indefinetely but had to make peace, wherein the sultan appointed ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī governor of Bagdad and all the ʿIrāk. But in Dīnālī II 521 (July 1127) the latter was given the governorship of Mawāṣil and after Māḥmūd's death (525 =
1131) the succession was again disputed. In 526 Dalbāsī and Zangī undertook a campaign against Bagdad but were defeated by the caliph at the
end of Radjab (June 1132) and in the same year Masūd [q. v.] had to give him complete control of Baghdād and the surrounding country. At some time he attacked the sūfān but was taken prisoner in Kīmaḍīn 529 (Jan. 1155) and murdered in Dhu‘l-Ka‘da of the same year (Aug. 1155) (cf. the art. DURAS B. SADIK). Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, x.—xii., see index; Ibn al-Tīkākā, al-Faqqārī, ed. Derenburg, p. 406—415; Muhammad b. Shākir, Fawā'id al-Waṣayyārī, ii. 124 sqq.; Ibn Khalūdūn, al-Thārī, iii. 495 sqq.; Hamd Allāh Mustawfī-Kazwīni, Tārīḵī-Guzhā, ed. Browne, i. 361 sqq.; Well, Gesch. d. Chalifen, ii. 212—253; Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, ii. 127 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline, and Fall, new ed., p. 583 sqq.; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljuques, ii. 104, 120, 152, 160, 174—178; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 105, 250, 275. (K. V. ZETTERSTEN) MUSTAṢHĀR (A.), cōuncillor, Turkish pronunciation mustaṭhār, meaning “general secretary to a ministry” or “under-secretary of state”. The word which means literally “one who is consulted” comes from the same root as muṣṭār [q. v.] which properly means “he who gives advice”. Sāmī Bay regards the word mustaṭhār as a synonym of the old Turkish istār. The office was called mustaṭhār or more simply mustaṭhārlik.

Like the title muṣṭār, that of mustaṭhār was created by Maḥmūd II. There were at first two mustaṭhārs in the grand-vizierate, one for foreign and the other for home affairs. The latter was later replaced by a Minister of the Interior who had in his turn a mustaṭhār. The number of mustaṭhārs gradually increased but some less important departments had muṭṭāwī “assistant, deputy” (in 1296 for example there were muṭṭāwī in the finance and police departments). The office has been retained under the present republic and each ministry or vakilāt has its mustaṭhār, that of national defence has three (for army, navy and air force).

The chief judge of Istanbul used to have a mustaṭhār. According to Luṭfi Efendi, the post of mustaṭhār of the Navy was created in 1253 (v., p. 91) and that of mustaṭhār of the zdūrūn or of the two katāqer in 1262 (viii., p. 127). On the honorary grades of mustaṭhār cf. the same author, vi., p. 66; cf. also p. 103, line 8 from below. Mustaṭhār is also the name given to the “councillor” of Turkish or foreign embassies or legations. The title of mustaṭhār al-wadā‘īr was borne by the ambassador himself, sent by the Sulṭān of Marākoc to Stambul in 1197, is inexplicable to us (cf. Dżewdet Pasha, ed. Recueil de Mémories Orientaux de l’Es. des Langues Orientales à Paris, 1905, p. 6).

As to the term muḥšāwir, a synonym of the preceding and from the same root, it is applied to technical advisers, whether foreigners or not: ǧlāḥ muḥšāwir “legal adviser”.

Bibliography: Cf. the various Ottoman calendars. The historians Ahmed Dżewdet and Luṭfi, following their predecessors, give no details of the administrative organisation. (J. DINVY)

AL-MUSTA‘ṢIM BI’LLĀH, ABD AL-MMĀDĪ.- AL-MUSTAWFĪ, THE LAST ʿABBĀSĪ caliph of Baghdād, born in 609 (1212/3). After the death of his father in Ḥijmādī I and II 640 (Nov./Dec. 1242) he was raised to the caliph’s throne but he had neither the talent nor the strength to avert the catastrophe threatening from the Mongols; he allowed himself to be guided by bad councillors who were not agreed among themselves but working against one another. In 685 (1255/6) the Mongol Khân Hūlgū [q. v.] demanded that the Mongols be allowed to participate in the war on the Ismā‘īlīs. The caliph did not trouble about this and in 686 (March/April 1257) a Mongol embassy came to Baghdād and demanded that al-Mustaṣim should raise the defences of the city for further negotiations or send a deputy. As the caliph refused to meet these demands, Hūlgū threatened him with war. After another message in which al-Mustaṣim tried to intimidate Hūlgū, the latter set out against the ancient city of the caliphs. On the way he met another embassy, offering him an annual tribute but this effort to appease the cruel foe was useless and by Muḥarrār 656 (Jan. 1258) the Mongols were at the gates of Baghdād. Preparations for the siege advanced rapidly and after all attempts to resume negotiations had failed against the relentless Hūlgū, al-Mustaṣim had to surrender on 4th Safar (10th Feb.) and the city was sacked. Ten days later Hūlgū had the caliph with some of his relations put to death [cf. the art. BHĀGHĀDĀD]. Bibliography: Ibn al-Tīkākā, al-Faqqārī (ed. Derenburg), p. 448—458; Muhammad b. Shākir, Fawā'id al-Waṣayyārī, i. 237—239; Ibn Khalūdūn, al-Thārī, iii. 536 sqq.; Râshīd al-Dīn (ed. Quattrêmère), i. 228 sqq.; Hamd Allāh Mustawfī-Kazwīni, Tārīḵī-Guzhā (ed. Browne), i. 371—373; Well, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iii. 470—478; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, see index; A. Müller, Der Islam, i. 640; ii. 228 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, new ed., p. 590 sqq. (K. V. ZETTERSTEN) MUSTAWFĪ, an official in charge of government accounts. Under the Turkish system, e.g. under the Ghaznavids and Suldāqā, the title was borne by a functionary of high rank who was at the head of the diwan concerned with keeping the tally of public income and expenditure. Under the Nīẓām al-Mulk the office of the mustawfī was second only to that of the vizier (Bandārī, ed. Houtsma, p. 100) and appears to have corresponded to the diwān al-zamār or diwan al-azāmima, the “Bureau of (Financial) Control” of the ‘Abbāsīs (Tabart, i. 532), although the Suldāqā also had a diwan of this name teatable by the mustawfī himself (Bandārī, p. 58). The qualities requisite in him were such as those fit him for the vizierate itself (ibid., p. 96), and indeed there were duties which were common to the two offices so that the same man could act as both (ibid., p. 129, last line). The vizierate might be refused by a powerful mustawfī holding all the reins of government in his hands and reluctant to expose himself to the dangers inherent in the normally more exalted office (ibid., p. 136, 141). But no officer was safe from a capricious or greedy monarch and the mustawfī Saif al-Dīn suffered death and the confiscation of a large part of his property at the hands of Sultan al-Mūsawī (ibid., p. 171). It is probable that the actual title of the State mustawfī was musṭawfī 'l-nāmaṭīrā or something similar (ibid., p. 31), the ordinary mustawfī, or accountant, holding a subordinate position (ibid., p. 31, 3).
Under the Mongols the title was given to the superintendents of provincial finances (e.g. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī and his great-grandfather; cf. E. G. Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, iii. 87), and under the Æmмонs, Ṣâḥib had and Kīḍjarā, the mastawfī filled the office of a secretary of state in charge of the public treasury accounts while the ordinary mastawfī was one of the lesser officers of the court (R. du Mans, Estat de la Perse en 1660, ed. Schefer, Paris 1890, p. 26, 178 sq.: A. Oleasrius, Voyages et Travels, London 1669, p. 274: Sir J. Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1815, ii. 437: G. W. Watson, History of Persia, London 1866, p. 16 sq.). Mustawfī ‘l-‘amalī might however, under the latter Kīḍjarā, be a title personal to a particular individual, who might be the Minister of the Interior (as in 1890) or even Prime Minister (as in 1910).

In Egypt, under the Fātimids and Mamluks, the mastawfī might be the head of a ḍīwān (as of the ḍīwān al-‘adā‘ī) or hold a less exalted, but still important, position as financial controller in such matters as the kāfīrāt, or military fiefs (cf. Makrizī, Kāfīrāt, Bulaq 1270, i. 193, middle and p. 227, under nāμr al-‘adā‘ī). The ordinary mastawfī was a minor official of the status of a clerk employed under a qā'id, or over seer in land-survey or crop-estimation or else in a government office such as the depot of the government grain monopoly (op. cit., ed. Wiet, ii., ch. 32, p. 23–25).

Bibliography: In addition to works cited in the article, see Quatremerre, Hist. des Sultans mamelouks de Makki in, i., p. 202 sq.; Mirza Muḥammad Kamārī, Muḥammadina do Ḍu‘l waṣūl, Tūristikī Qaḥān-gūzāh (in G M S), i/xii. (2).

(Rev.)

MUSTAWFĪ [see ḤAMD ALLĀH, ABU ‘L-‘ABBĀS AHMAD B. AL-MUṬTAQI, ‘ABBĀSĪD CALIPH. After the death of his father in Muḥarram 487 (Feb. 1094) the young al-Mustawfī succeeded him; about this time the power of the Sāmāyids was beginning to be weakened by internal dissensions (cf. Sāmāyids). The Assassins, who had already appeared on the scene in al-Muṭtadi’s reign, were able to take advantage of the situation and fighting this dangerous sect soon became one of the most important tasks of the sultāns and caliphs. The Crusades also began at this time. In Ẓāhīrī 492 (July 1099) Jerusalem was taken and in the following years numerous fugitives reached Baghhdād who urged Sulṭān Muḥammad to take part in the struggle. He therefore sent an army under the emir Mawdūd against the Crusaders in 505 (1111/12). Al-Mustawfī, who is hardly ever mentioned in the political history of this period, died on 16 Rabī‘ II 512 (Aug. 6, 1118) at the age of 41.


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)
to be a copyist's error for Ma‘āb, while Musil, op. cit., p. 153, identifies it with Kharibat al-Majma, which lies in a broad depression, in order to fall upon the Arabs on a feastday (μάρτυς τῶν εὐδοκο-σίσσων αδiators, which seems to indicate a heathen rather than a Christian population) but the narratives Theodoros there learned of their plans and rapidly collecting the garrisons of the fortresses, fell upon the Muslims at Mu‘āta and defeated them. Three of the leaders and most of the force were killed and Chaledos who was called the “sword of God”, alone escaped. In escaping, the tombs of the martyrs who fell there were requisitioned out at Mu‘āta, where a mausoleum was built over them.


**MUTA (A.), temporary marriage (according to the Arab lexico- graphers “marriage of pleasure”), a marriage which is contracted for a fixed period on rewarding the woman.**

I. Before Islām. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, iv. 4, 4, temporary marriage was in use among the Arabs already in the fourth century A.D., but this can hardly be a reference to muṭa‘a as the woman brings a lance and tent to the man and can leave him if she likes, after the period has elapsed. It is also doubtful if there is a distinct muṭa‘a character in the marriage of 1168HM with Salma bint ‘Amr, whom he married during a temporary stay in Yathrib and left with her family there after the birth of her child (Caetani, i. 111, § 92). From the passage Algānī, xvi. 63 (mati‘i‘ul biha ‘l-‘itala) as well as from Muslim traditions it may be concluded that muṭa‘a was known in the Dāhilīya. If we remember that the same kind of temporary marriage as the muṭa‘a was known in Erythraea (Conti Rossini, Principii di diritto con- stitutionario, Rome 1916, p. 186, 249) it seems to me certain that muṭa‘a is an old Arabian institution. (Temporary marriage is also found among other peoples. cf. Wilken, p. 21 sqq.; Westermark, History of Human Marriage, London 1925, ii. 267 sqq.; cf. also the 234 sa‘ad yā‘ase in Egypt, to which Grifflin, p. 327 calls attention: in a demotic document there is a reference to such a marriage for five months: cf. Mitter-Wilcken, Grundzüge der Papyrologie, i. 11, p. 203 sqq.).

II. In the Kur‘ān there is undoubtedly a reference to this form of marriage in the Medina sūra iv. 28, although the orthodox explanation of this passage as early as the first century refers it to the ordinary nikāḥ, after giving a list of the classes of women with whom marriage is forbidden, it goes on: “and further you are permitted to seek out wives with your wealth, in modest conduct but not in fornication: be给他们 their reward (aldir‘) for what you have enjoyed of them (istamta‘um) in keeping with your promise.” After istamta‘um, Uba‘ b. Ka‘b and Ibn ‘Abbas read the words ilā adil‘in mutamām min for a definite period!” (Tabari, Ta‘afir, v. 9), a reading which naturally has not found its way into Sunni circles but is often added in Shī‘a books.

III. The traditions are contradictory on the question of muṭa‘a. According to some, it was in use in the time of the Prophet and he was even said to have practised it (mattat‘ul‘ab: Tabari, An- nales, i. 1775, 1776; cf. Caetani, ii. 478, No. 17 and 19). In return for a robe or a handful of dates one could take an unmarried woman (nayyām) for a period of cohabitation (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 13, 177; Ta‘lisi, No. 1627). Especially when a man came to a strange town he could marry a woman there for the period of his stay so that she could look after him (Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28).

On the other hand, according to one tradition related by ‘Ali, it was forbidden by the Prophet on the day (or in the year) of Khaibar (Bukhārī, Ma‘marī, bāb 38; Ḍalā‘īlī, bāb 28; Nikāḥ, bāb 31; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 31–34; Naṣā‘ī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71 [“on the day of Hunain” must here be a mistake for Khaibar]: Said, bāb 51: Ibn Mā‘ṣṣa, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28; A‘īma, bāb 6; Mālik, Nikāḥ, tr. 41; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 79, 103, 142; Ta‘lisi, No. 111; Zaid, Ma‘marī, No. 718).

According to other traditions, he is said to have permitted it for a short time on particular occasions. In this connection we have a group of traditions which goes back to Sabra b. Mab‘ād; the various accounts of this, some long, some short, which supplement one another, are in part given without date (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 20, 26; Nasā‘ī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71; Abū Dāwūd, Nikāḥ, bāb 13; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 404), in part referred to the conquest of Mecca (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 21, 24, 25, 27, 28; Dārimi, Nikāḥ, bāb 16; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 404, 405), and in part to the farewell pilgrimage (Ibn Mā‘ṣṣa, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; Dārimi, Nikāḥ, bāb 15; Abū Dāwūd, Nikāḥ, bāb 13; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 404 sq). Their substance is as follows: The Prophet permitted muṭa‘a: Sabra therefore went with a companion to a woman and each offered her his cloak. She chose the younger with the shabbier cloak and slept three nights with him; thereafter the Prophet forbade it. According to the stories associated with the farewell pilgrimage, the woman wished muṭa‘a only for a fixed period so that ten days or nights was agreed upon, but the Prophet forbade it after the first night, saying: “Whoever of you has married a woman for a period, shall give her what he promised and ask nothing of it back and he shall separate from her; for God has forbidden this up to the day of resurrection”. (For the conclusion cf. also the fragments of this in Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 23, 30).

According to a second group of traditions, which goes back to Gābir b. ‘Abd Allāh and Salama b. al-Akwa‘, the Prophet permitted muṭa‘a for three days on a campaign (Bukhārī, Nikāḥ, bāb 71; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 14, 15; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 47, 51; according to Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 19 and Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 55, this was in the year of Awtāt, i.e. shortly after the capture of Mecca). In Bukhārī we have at the end: “The partnership of the two parties lasted three nights; and if they agreed to extend it, they did so; and if they wished to separate, they did so”. A prohibition is given only in two versions in the group.
According to other traditions, mut'a was first forbidden by the caliph ʿOmar at the end of his caliphate (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 16–18; Aljad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 304, 380 and iii. 325, 356, 363, where there is allusion to the two kinds of muta', i.e. tamatta' on the pilgrimage and muwa'at or nissā'). ʿOmar threatened the punishment of stoning so that he regarded mut'a as fornication (Ibn Majā‘, Nikāḥ, bāb 44; Mālik, Nikāḥ, tr. 42; Tāyālīsī, No. 1792). Cf. the angry exclamation of Ibn ʿOmar when he was asked about mut'ā: "By Allah, we were not immodest in the time of the Prophet of Allah nor fornicators" (ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥanbal, ii. 95, 104).

What then is at the bottom of these contradictory traditions? While Wallis, regards mut'a as simply prostitution and not an old Arabian custom, Caetani points out that the traditions agree in connecting mut'a with an entrance of the Prophet into Mecca and sometimes even with the ḍaʿābī and that a three days' duration is a feature of the mut'a; taking account of other considerations, he concludes that mut'a in the pagan period was religious prostitution on the occasion of the Meccan festival. However, tempting this explanation may be, there is a complete lack of evidence for any religious prostitution in Meccan times. With Wilken and Robertson Smith, we must rather regard mut'a as the survival into Islam of an old Arabian custom. The Prophet gives this custom sanction in the Kūrān and also practised it himself. The traditions, if examined carefully, only mention two cases of prohibition by the Prophet: Khaibar and Mecca. As both these are later than the above Kūrānic passage (years 3–5, according to Noldeke-Schwally, i. 198) this prohibition would be quite possible. But since on the other hand the caliph ʿOmar prohibited mut'a, which there is no reason to doubt, we might regard the tradition of prohibition as representing later views, which, as is often the case, are put back to the time of the Prophet.

IV. Attitude of the ʿulamāʾ. ʿIbn Abbās (d. 68) was an aident champion of mut'a (Buḥārī, Nikāḥ, bāb 31; Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 18; Tāyālīsī, No. 1792; Rāzī, Mafāštāt al-Qabīb, Cairo 1324, ii. 105). In Mecca and the Yemen, according to Ibn Ḥaḍī (Bidūyā, Cairo 1339, ii. 54), he also had followers; but before his death he seems to have converted to the opposite view (Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28; Rāzī, loc. cit.). In later times, people spoke desisively of a marriage by a fetūdh of Ibn ʿAbbās. In the second century of Mecca, fetūdh were still given permitting mut'a (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 29). The Kūrān commentators Madāghīd (d. 100), Saʿīd b. Ḍabair (d. 95), and ʿAlī al-Saddī (d. 127) also referred the above verse of the Kūrān to mut'a. Saddī says that it is a marriage for a fixed period and that it should be concluded with the permission of the wali and with two witnesses; that after the expiry of this period the man has no longer any claim on the woman and that the two parties cannot inherit from one another (Tabārī, Taṣfiṣ, v. 8). With the second century, the contrary view begins to predominate; although individuals like ʿĀmir b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḍanīr (d. 126), Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 150) and the Zaidi sect of the Ḍārūridiya permit mut'a (Ibn Ḥaḍī, loc. cit.;van Andelen, Qiyāṣ, Leyden 1919, p. 72, note 9), al-Thawrī (d. 161), Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181) (Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28) and all the Sunni schools of law as well as the Zaidīs (al-Naṣīḥī b. Ḥaqqī, Taṣfiṣ, Berlin MS., Glaser 74, fol. 53b) consider mut'a forbidden. Its recognition was now limited to the Ṣaḥ. And if the caliph Maʿmūn tried to introduce mut'a again, this was certainly due to his Shi'i tendencies (Ibn Khaṭṭābih, Waṣf, ii. 218).

At the same time, we still have in the second century the opinions of a period of transition. According to ʿAbdu (d. 158), the marriage concluded under the form of mut'a was valid as a marriage but its limitation in time was invalid (Sarākhīsī, Mabāʾīt, v. 153; cf. also Buḥārī, Ḥṣab, bāb 4). According to al-Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Ṭuhārī (d. 204), the mut'a was valid if the partners could not survive the time fixed, e.g. 100 years or more (Sarākhīsī, loc. cit.).

But in spite of their refusal to recognise mut'a, the Sunnis made concessions by which mut'a gained a footing in another form. It became the practice not to insert a definite period in the contract; any agreement made outside the contract was not affected by the law. Al-Ṣādiqī (C. m., v. 71) for example, declared a marriage valid when it was concluded with the unuttered resolution (niyya) to observe it only for the period of stay in a place or for a few days only, so long as this was not expressly stipulated in the contract. Similarly if agreement to this effect (mawāṣaqa) had been previously made and even if made on oath; he describes such an agreement as mabrūk. There are also traces in later literature of a decision by Mālik by which he permitted mut'a (Sarākhīsī, v. 152; Buḥrānī, Munawwār al-Tawżīrīkh, ed. Lees, ii. 208 sqq.) although only the contrary is recorded in the Mawiwatī and Mudawwawīn (iv. 46).

A good exposition of the two opposite points of view is given from the Sunni side by Kāsīnī (d. 587), Bādīʾī al-Salāfī, Cairo 1337, ii. 272–274 and in Rāzī, q. cit., iii. 193–195 and from the Shi'i side by ʿAlī al-Hudā al-Maṭbūṭā, Intifār, Teheran 1315, p. 60–65. The Sunnis refer the verse above mentioned from the Kūrān to regular marriage and declare the ʿayr to be mahr, while the Shi'is base their view on this verse and consider the traditions of prohibition not to be abrogatory and do not consider 'Omar authoritative for a prohibition. The Imāmīs even go so far as to say: "The holy letter is said to have been converted to the opposite view (Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28; Rāzī, loc. cit.). In later times, people spoke desisively of a marriage by a fetūdh of Ibn ʿAbbās. In the second century of Mecca, fetūdh were still given permitting mut'a (Muslim, Nikāḥ, tr. 29). The Kūrān commentators Madāghīd (d. 100), Saʿīd b. Ḍabair (d. 95), and ʿAlī al-Saddī (d. 127) also referred the above verse of the Kūrān to mut'a. Saddī says that it is a marriage for a fixed period and that it should be concluded with the permission of the wali and with two witnesses; that after the expiry of this period the man has no longer any claim on the woman and that the two parties cannot inherit from one another (Tabārī, Taṣfiṣ, v. 8). With the second century, the contrary view begins to predominate; although individuals like ʿĀmir b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḍanīr (d. 126), Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 150) and the Zaidi sect of the Ḍārūridiya permit mut'a (Ibn Ḥaḍī, loc. cit.;van Andelen, Qiyāṣ, Leyden 1919, p. 72, note 9), al-Thawrī (d. 161), Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181) (Tirmidhī, Nikāḥ, bāb 28)
and chaste ('āṣfa) and if possible ought to know about muth'a, i.e. be a Shi'i, and can only contract a temporary marriage with a Muslim. According to Ibn Hisham (d. 785) and al-Mufid (d. 443), muth'a with an unbeliever is forbidden, even with a member of the possessors of a scripture (ši'ā'yah). The nāyāfī (extreme Khāridji) are included among the unbelievers. According to most Imāmīs (and Tālī also) however, mut'a with a Christian or Jewish woman is permitted but nāyāfī with a māqūfīya. Mut'a with a slave-girl is only permitted with the consent of her master. Usually the woman contracts the marriage without a wāli; only a virgin (bikr), according to some, requires her father’s consent (Abu l-Salāḥ, d. 82; Ibn Ḥabīb, d. 381; Ibn al-Baγarādāj, d. 481; cf. Hihl, iii. 93). The man and in this way take other wives in addition to his four legal wives, especially on journeys. He must not, however, take two sisters at the same time, not even during the 'idda.

3. The muth'a ends on the expiry of the period agreed upon. It cannot be prolonged by arrangement between the two parties: a new temporary marriage with a new māzur must rather be contracted at the end of the period. Divorce is impossible; according to some, however, lī'ān and zīhār are permitted.

4. There is no obligation on the man to provide food and home for the woman. The two partners cannot inherit from one another; but according to some, inheritance may be provided for in the contract. The 'idda after the expiry of the muth'a is two periods or 45 days, i.e. the 'idda of a slave-girl. There is, however, disagreement whether, on the man’s death the period of waiting is the usual one for a wife or that for a slave. The children go with the father.

VI. Modern practice. Although these Shi'ite views have a certain amount of moral support, the muth'a in many cases can only be described as legalized prostitution. It is true that in Persia such marriages are made for very long periods, e.g. 99 years, but the Persian, when on a journey, temporarily marries in any place where he is stopping for some time and in the towns and caravanserais mollahs and other brokers offer a wife to each new arrival. To make this business more profitable, the 'idda period is evaded by concluding a second temporary marriage with the same man after the first, for in the case of such a marriage the 'idda is not necessary. This marriage and a woman of this kind is called in Persia fāhe (lit. "form" i.e. of the contract). Cf. Olearvs [1637], Muscavit. u. pers. Reise, Schlesswig 1856, p. 609; Chardin [1673], Voyages, Paris 1814, 222-223, 225-227; Polak, Persien, Leipzig 1865, i. 207 sq.; E. G. Bouvme, A year amongst the Persians, Cambridge 1827, p. 305 sq.; H. Norden, Persien, Leipzig 1829, p. 148, 167; and the romance of the traveller James Morier, The adventures of Hijzi Baba of Isphahan, 1824, part iii., chap. 6-8.

The constantly quoted story (first in Wilken, p. 19) of Alex. Hamilton (A new account of the East Indies, Edinburgh 1827, i. 51) that at the beginning of the xviith century temporary marriages were publicly negotiated in Souan (= San'a) in South Arabia and concluded before the kāfī, is a very improbable one: for Hamilton knew only the coast-towns from his own observation and wrote his account of his travels later from memory. He seems to be confusing them with conditions in Persian towns, and he makes mistakes on other matters.

In Mecca, in modern as well as ancient times (for the middle ages cf. Liḍān al-ʿArabī; or muth'a al-tawād bi-Makka minh), temporary marriages were concluded among the Sunnīs but nothing is said of this in the marriage contract or this would make it invalid; everything necessary is arranged previously by word of mouth. On the conclusion of the contract, the man utters the qalā'ah formula with a time limit. Such agreements are as a rule kept (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 156; do., Verz. Gesch. W. 150). The same artifice is used in such cases as ʿAṣa'ī indicated long ago (cf. above).


MUTA’ALL. [See Also, II., H.]

MUTA’ARRĪB (A) "made averse", the term applied to the descendants of Kātān (the Biblical Yakūn) who were regarded by the genealogists as "having become Arabs" in contract to the supposed native "pure" Arab tribes like ʿAd, Thamūd, etc. They settled in South Arabia and adopted Arabic from the "pure" Arabs. The latter had learned it through Ḥajar, the only man who spoke Arabic in Noah's ark (all the rest spoke Syriac), and his son-in-law Aḥām b. ʿĀsh b. Nāḥ was the ancestor of the ʿAd and Thamūd etc. From South Arabia, their main centre, tribes of the Banū Kātān migrated to the north, so that there are in Northern Arabia also tribes whose genealogy make them belong to the Banū Kātān (cf. the article Muta’ārib[A] where the literature is given).

MUTADĀRĪK, name of the sixteenth metre in Arabic prosody, added to al-khalīl b. Ahmad’s list by al-Akhfash al-Awṣat [= A]. It is also called nukhṭarī, nukhṭath, khabab, shabik, muntawīl, dāb al-khālī, raqʿ al-khālī, sūr al-nāṣîn. It does not seem to have been used by the poets before Islām or of the first century A.H.
It has four feet to the hemistich and two 'arūd and four darb:

1st 'arūd

Fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn

2nd 'arūd

fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn
fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn fā'ilūn

Fā'ilūn may change to fā'ilūn (fā'ilūn ≡ fā'ilūn).

(Moh. Ben Cheker)

AL-MUṬAḌID B‘ILLĀH, Aḥū ’l-Aṣṣās Aḥmād b. Ta‘lim, Aḥḥāsid caliph, son of al-Muwaṣṣak, co-regent with the caliph al-Muṭaḍid [q.v.], and a Greek slave named Dārār. Al-Muṭaḍid was already the real ruler in the two last years of al-Muwaṣṣak’s life and after the death of al-Muṭaṣid in Rājdāb 279 (Oct. 592) he ascended the throne. The new caliph who had inherited his father’s gifts as a ruler and was distinguished alike for his economy and military ability is one of the greatest of the Aḥḥāsid in spite of his strictness and cruelty. On the accession of al-Muṭaḍid the Ṭulūnids Khûnārāwah [q.v.], wearied of the long war, concluded peace and gave the caliph his daughter in marriage. While the Khâridjīs in Mesopotamia were weakened by internal dissensions, al-Muṭaḍid in 280 (893–894) undertook an expedition against the rebel Banū Ṣa‘ībān and brought them to obedience. In the next two years the allies of the Khâridjī chief Hârūn b. ʿAbd Allāh were defeated and in 283 (696) the latter fell into the hands of Husain b. Hamdān, and was sent to Baghdad where the caliph had him crucified. The influence of the Ḥamānids now began to increase in Baghdat. The Dulfānids [q.v.] who had given the caliphs much trouble were soon finally conquered. After al-Hârūn b. ʿAbd al-Azza' called Abū Lailik had been defeated and slain in Dhu ’l-Hijjah 284 (Jan. 898) near Isfahān, al-Muṭaḍid had the other Dulfānids imprisoned and the family now disappears from history. The Šāmānids increased their power at the expense of the Ṣaffārīds and the Aṣlid. In 287 (900) the Šaffārī ʿAmr b. al-Laith [q.v.] was captured and brought to Baghdat. In the same year the Šālīd Muḥammad b. Zayd, lord of Ṭabaristan, occupied Dūjdīr marched against Ṣa‘ībān but defeated by the Šāfārīs. The latter then drew towards the Ḥurūnī b. Ḥarūn and died of his wounds while Ibn Ḥarūn took possession of Dūjdīr and Ṭabaristan in the name of the Šāmānids. About the same time the governor of Armenia and Aḥḥārābidnād Muḥammad b. Abī ʾl-Sāda endeavoured in combination with his freedman Wāṣīf to conquer Egypt. The latter however was taken prisoner by the caliph’s troops and as the most influential men in Tarsus had promised their help, al-Muṭaḍid had them arrested and the fleet there burned. Muḥammad was however allowed to retain his post but died soon afterwards of the plague. The Karmājīn [q.v.] now appeared on the scene and in the same year the Karmājīn leader al-Djamāḥī [q.v.], inquired a complete defeat on the caliph’s troops. Al-Muṭaḍid died in Baghdat on 22 Rābi’ II, 289 (April 5, 902) at the age of 40 or 47. According to some he was poisoned. — Cf. also the art. ʾIRĀB, B. BULŪL.

Bibliography: Ṭabar (ed. de Goeje), ii. 2151 sqq.; ʿArīb (ed. de Goeje), see Index; Masūdī, Maqāmī (ed. Paris), viii. 112–215; ix. 47, 52; Kitāb al-ʾAgāhī, see Guidi, Tables alphabétiques; Ibn al-ʾAtīr (ed. Tomburg), vii. 234 sqq.; Ibn Ṭūḥāṣ (ed. Doré), p. 48–350; Muḥammad b. Ṣahīk, Fāṣād al-Waṣṣāfī, i. 45 sqq.; Ibn Khaldūn, al-Iʿārāb, iii. 346 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, ii. 433, 460, 476 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, its Règne, Decline, and Fall, new ed., index; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbāsid Caliphate, see index: A. Muller, Der Islam, i. 531. (K. V. Zetterstēen)

AL-MUṬAḌID B‘ILLĀH, Aḥū ’l-Aṣṣās Aḥmād b. Muḥammad b. ʾAbī ʾl-Aṣṣās, the most important and most powerful sovereign of the Abbāsid dynasty [q.v.] who reigned over the little kingdom formed by his father Abuʾl-Kāsim Muḥammad b. ʾAbībād, with Seville [q.v.] as his capital, at the time of the break up of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain and the rise of the rey es de taifas (muṭābīk al-faṭwāf); in the course of a reign of nearly 30 years (433–460 a.H. = 1042–1069 a.d.), he very considerably increased his territory by making himself the champion of the Spanish Arabs against the Berbers in Spain whose numbers, already very large in the tenth century, had been much increased since the period of the Ša‘īdīs. When he succeeded his father, the new king of Seville, who was then 26, following the usual practice of the period, assumed the title of ṣaḥīb, and a little later the taḥāb of al-Muṭaḍid b‘Ilāh by which he is best known. Gifted with real political ability, he was not long in revealing his character, that of an autocratic ruler, ambitious and cruel and little scrupulous in the means which he used to achieve his ends. As soon as he came to the throne he continued the war begun by his father against the petty Berber ruler of Carmona [q.v.], Muḥammad b. ʾAbī ʾl-Bīrzālī, who, with the help of Seville and successor ʾĪsā b. ʾĪsā. At the same time, al-Muṭaḍid was extending his kingdom in the west between Seville and the Atlantic Ocean. It was with this object that he attacked and defeated successively Ibn ʾṬa‘īf, lord (ṣaḥīb) of Mertola, and Muḥammad b. ʾAbī ʾl-Ŷābīna b. ʾAbī ʾl-Ŷābīna b. ʾAbī ʾl-Ŷābīna, lord of Niebla (Ar. Laḥāḍa) [q.v.] who in spite of his Arab descent had had the audacity to ally himself with the Berber chiefs. In face of these successes of the king of Seville, the other muṭābīk al-faṭwāf who distrusted him formed a kind of league into which entered the princes of Badajos [q.v.], Algeciras [q.v.], Granada [q.v.] and Malaga [q.v.]. This soon became a war between the Abbāsid of Seville and the Aḥḥāsid [q.v.] of Badajos al-Muẓaffar [q.v.]; it was to last for many years in spite of the efforts at mediation by the Djahward ruler of Cordova which only achieved their end in 1051. Down to this year, while harassing the frontiers of the kingdom of Seville, al-Muṭaḍid displayed other activities: in succession he defeated Muḥammad b. Ṣa‘īb al-Bakrī, lord of Huelva [q.v.] and of Saltes [q.v.] (whose son was the famous geographer), the Banū Muzain, lords of Silves [q.v.], and Muḥammad b. ʾĀṣāb ʾĪb n Ḥarūn, lord of Santa María de Algarve [q.v.], and annexed their territories. To justify these annexations, al-Muṭaḍid used a very crude pretext: he alleged that he had found the unfortunate ʾĪbīn ʿĪsā, who had really died in obscurity a few hours before, and would go on till he had restored to him his former empire subdued and
pacified in its integrity. In order not to be exposed to the cruelty of the king of Seville, the majority of the petty Berber chiefs settled in the mountains of the south of Andalusia acquired in this make-believe and paid homage to the 'Abbâdíd and to the Commander of the Faithful miraculously restored to aid the cause of al-Mu'tâjîd but at the same time got his name concealed by him. It was laboriously lost for them. One day the 'Abbâdíd invited to his palace in Seville all these petty chiefs with their suites and put them to death by asphyxiating them in baths the openings of which he walled up. In this way he took Arcos [q. v.], the capital of the principality of the Banû Khîzûrûn, Moron [q. v.] defended by the Banû Dâmmâr, and Ronda [q. v.], capital of the Banû Ifran (1053).

This aroused the wrath of the most powerful Berber ruler in Spain, Bûdîs b. Ḥabâbûs the Zirid [q. v.], who ruled in Granada and who alone seemed able to resist al-Mu'tâjîd. The latter however found that fortune favoured him in this war and a little later took Algeciras from the Ḥamûdîd al-Kâsim b. Ḥamûdû, he next tried to seize Cordova and sent an expedition against it in charge of his son Ismâ'îl; the latter tried to profit by the occasion to rebel and create for himself a kingdom with Algeciras as capital. This rash plan cost him his life, which his father took with his own hand, just as before him 'Abd al-Rahmân III and al-Mansûr b. Abû Amîr had inflicted the supreme penalty on their unworthy sons. This was the beginning of the political career of al-Mu'tâjîd's other son Muḥammad al-Mu'tâmâd [q. v.] who was to succeed him on his death: by his father’s orders he went with an army to support the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tyrannical ruler of Bûdîs, the despotic Berber of Granada. But the latter routed the Sevillian army and al-Mu'tâmâd in sorrow state reached Ronda from which he sought and received the pardon of his terrible father. The latter had long before repudiated the fiction of the pseudo-Ḥâlîm which he no longer needed. He was now by far the most redoubtable and the most feared of the Spanish rulers. He had no enemies but the Berbers, Muslims like himself but much further removed from his social ideal of a Spaniard than his Christian neighbours in the north. In another land he might have been called “Berberoktones”. But the bitterness of his hatred cast a shadow over his last days: it was not without fear that he followed events in the western Maghrib, hitherto the fief of Muslim Spain; at least in the sub-Mediterranean zone. The irresistible advance of the Almoravids [q. v.] following Yûnûb b. Tâṣîhîr through all Morocco would not find the straits of Gibraltar an insurmountable obstacle for long. Al-Mu'tâjîd realised this very well. Death at least prevented him from seeing his kingdom, entirely built up by his own energy and bold initiative, pass in a few weeks into the hands of invaders, brethren of the Berbers of Spain whom he had detested and in part destroyed.


**MUTAFARRIKA (A.), name of a corps of guards**, who were especially attached to the person of the Ottoman Sultan in the ancient Turkish court. The name is also applied to a member of the guard. Their occupations were similar to those of the Cârâîm [q. v.], not of military character, nor for court service only, but they were used for more or less important public or political missions. Like the Cârâîm, the Mutafarrîka were a mounted guard. In later times there were two classes, the gêkûl or zîmâtîl Mutafarrîka, and the fileless. Their chief was the Mutafarrîka Aghâî. In course of time their number constantly increased; at the end of the xvth century the maximum was fixed at 120 (G.O.R. 3, ii. 890, after Râşîdîd), but in the beginning of the xvith century von Hammer gives the number 500 for the total. The Porte needed sometimes to lay stress on the importance of the office to make them acceptable as extraordinary envoys by foreign governments (G.O.R. 3, ii. 929, after Râşîhîd).

Among those who have occupied this rank was the well-known first Turkish printer İbrahim Mutafarrîka. Although different explanations of the title mutafarrîka are given, the most probable interpretation is, that these functionaries were not given a special duty but formed originally a corps used for “different matters”. This is still the use of the word in modern Turkish.


**AL-MUTAKABBIR. [See AL-HÀLI.]**

**MUTAKALLIM. [See KÂLÎM.]**

**MUTAKÂRIB, name of the fifteenth metric in Arabic prosody:** it contains four feet to the hemistich. There are two 'arîd and six ārîb:

| 1st 'arîd | tā'âl-fâl-un | fâl-un | fâl-un | fâl-un |
| 2nd 'arîd | fâl-un | fâl-un | fâl-un |

Outside of the ārîb, the foot fâl-un often loses its t and becomes fâl-un; used as the first 'arîd, it further undergoes the following changes: fâl-un and (fâl-un) fâl-un. According to al-Khallî, the foot which precedes the ārîb cannot suffer any change. The first foot of the first hemistich of the first line of a piece of verse may become (fâl-un) fâl-un and (fâl-un) fâl-un. (Moh. Ben Chenêb)

**MUTAKÂWIS, term in prosody; cf. the art. KÂFIYA.
MU'TAMAD KHAN, Muhammad Sharīf, was born in an obscure family in Persia, but coming to India, he attained high honours in the reigns of Dījāhāngīr and Shāh Dījāhān. He received in the third year of Dījāhāngīr a military command and the title of Mu'tamad Khān (the trustworthy Lord). Subsequently he joined prince Shāh Dījāhān in his campaign in the Deccau as a bakhšī (paymaster). On his return to court, in the 17th year of Dījāhāngīr's reign, he was entrusted with the duty of writing the Emperor's memoirs. He attained a higher rank in the service of Shāh Dījāhān and was appointed as bakhšī (adjutant-general) in the 10th year of the new reign. He died in 1049 (1639). He is the author of a history called Ikhāl Nūna'd Dījāhāngīrī, in three volumes: 1. the history of Akbar's ancestors; 2. Akbar's reign (MSS. in the India Office Library and in the Bankruptcy Library); 3. the reign of Dījāhāngīr (printed in the Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1865 and in Lucknow, A. II. 1286).

Bibliography: Mu'tāhir al-Umarī, iii. 431; Tawākki Dījāhāngīrī, p. 352; J. R. A. S., N. S., iii. 459; Elliot and Cowen, History of India, vol. iii. 1857, l. 255; Emery, Cat. of the India Office Library, p. 121 and Morley, Catalogue, p. 120.

(M. Hidayet Hosain)

AL-MU'TAMID ʿAlāʾ al-Islām, Abū l-ʿAbbas Ahmad b. Dījāf, Abūl-Bābāsīl, caliph, son of al-Mutawakkil and a slave-girl named Fīṭān from Kūfa. He ascended the throne on the deposition of al-Muhtad in Rabīʿ II (670). He had no ability as a ruler, but relied on the vizier Ṭūla ʿAllāh b. Vahy b. Khēkān and left most of the affairs of government in the hands of his brother Abū Ahmad al-Muwaṣṣal in Shawwal 261 (July 875) he designated his son Dījāf al-Mufawwād as his successor and governor of the western provinces and al-Muwaffaḵ as his successor and governor of the east. The able al-Muwaffaḵ soon became the real ruler and gradually restored order in the empire again while the caliph himself exercised no influence. Already in the reign of al-Muhtadī a dangerous rising had broken out among the Zanjī, the negro slaves in the lower Euphrates valley, but it was not till 270 (882) that its leader ʿAbbās b. Muhammad [q.v.] was overthrown by al-Muwaffaḵ. Some time after the accession of al-Mu'tamīd, according to the usual statement in 259 (873) — the dynasty of the Tahirīds was overthrown by Yaqūb b. al-Layth [q.v.] and soon afterwards the Sāmānīs appeared in Transoxania. On the death of Yaqūb in 265 (879) his brother ʿAmr [q.v.] submitted to the caliph and received the eastern provinces as a fief. About the same time Ahmad b. Ṭūlūn [q.v.] made himself independent in Egypt and after his death (270 = 884) his son Khwārāwsh waged a desperate struggle against the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate. In al-Mawṣil and the surrounding country the Khārījīs continued their destructive career, but were finally subdued. Peace was also often disturbed by ʿAlīd rebels and there was also the war with the Byzantines. The Punicans who had stood by the Muslims faithfully were repeatedly defeated by the emperor Basilius and in 263 (876) the latter retook the fortress of Luṭu' near Tarsus which al-Mu'tamīd had taken. It was not till 270 (883) that the Muslims were able to inflict a complete defeat on the Byzantines. The war was however continued. After the death of al-Muwaffaḵ in 278 (891) the caliph had to proclaim the latter's son al-Mu'tamīd [q.v.] as his successor instead of Dījāf al-Mufawwād. In the following year al-Mu'tamīd left Sāmānī and moved the capital to Baghdaḏ again. Here he died in Rajab 279 (Oct. 892) at the age of 48 or 50. According to some he was poisoned by al-Mu'tamīd. Bibliography: Ibn ʿAbdaḫ, Kitāb al-Muṭarif (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 200; Yaqūbī (ed. Houtsma), ii. 619—624; Tabari, ii., see Index; Masʿūdī, Muruḏī (ed. Paris), viii. 38—112; ix. 47, 52; Kitāb al-Aghānī, see Guidi, Tabāsh بررسیکه نگارهای, Ibn al-Aṯīr (ed. Tornberg), vii. 136 sqq.; Ibn ʿĪṣa, al-Farābī (ed. Derenbourg), p. 341—348; Ibn Khaldūn, al-Tawākki, iii. 303 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifat, ii. 422 sqq.; Muir, The caliphate, its rise, decline, and fall, new ed., p. 544 sqq.; Muller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, i. 531, 539; Le Strange, Baghdaḏ during the Abbasid Caliphate, p. 193, 195, 229, 247—249; do., The Landos of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 36, 55.

(K. V. Zetterstæen)

AL-MU'TAMID ʿAlāʾ al-Islām, the leader of the dynasty of the ʿAbābādīs [q.v.] of Seville in the 11th century is best known; his real name was MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABĀRĀD AL-MUṬAMĪD [q.v.]. B. MUḤAMMAD B. ISMĀʿĪL IBN ʿABĀRĀD. While still a boy — barely 13, having been born in 431 (1039) — he was placed by his father in nominal command of an expedition against Silves (Ar., ʿĪṣāb [q.v.]), then in the possession of Ibn Muzain, and this town was taken as assault as was Santa Maria d'Algarve soon after (Ar., ʿAbūtamarīyat al-ḡārī, now Faro [q.v.]) which was held by Muhammad b. Saʿīd Ibn Ḥarām [q.v.] (444 = 1053). Young ʿAbābādī prince was then appointed by his father governor of these two towns. His elder brother Ismāʿīl having been executed in punishment for his rebellion (455 = 1063; cf. AL-MUṬAMĪD). Muhammad al-Mu'tamīd became heir-presumptive to the throne of Seville. A little later, the army which he was leading to the help of the Arabs of Malaga, who had rebelled against the tyranny of Bāṭūs b. Ḥabhūs, the Berber ruler of Granada of the Zirid [q.v.] dynasty, was routed by the latter and al-Mu'tamīd had to take refuge in Rock, on which his father, at first very angry at his failure, finally sent him his forgiveness. When the powerful ruler of Seville died in 461 (1069), his son succeeded to a considerably extended kingdom which included the greater part of the southwest of the Iberian peninsula.

A whole series of more or less romantic episodes is associated with the reign and life of al-Mu'tamīd. If we may believe several authors of the Muslim west, an individual called Ibn ʿAmrār, vizier and poet, exerted a very considerable influence during the greater part of the career of this prince from his governance of Silves. Al-Mu'tamīd's relations with a young slave girl al-Ruʾmāʾiyya, gifted with considerable poetic talent, has also been the subject of much literary embellishment. It was from the name of this young woman ʿUmāma, that al-Mu'tamīd is said to have adopted his which comes from the same root. She became his favourite wife and presented him with several sons. As to Ibn ʿAmrār, exiled by al-Mu'tamīd, he was recalled on the accession of his patron to Seville from which he went at his own request
to be governor of Silves before being appointed grand vizier.

In the second year of his reign, al-Mutamid was able to annex to his kingdom the principality of Cordova [q.v.], over which the Dhaharids had been ruling, in spite of the efforts of the king of Toledo, al-Ma'mun [q.v.]. The young prince 'Abd al-Malik was appointed governor of the old capital of the Umayyads. But at the instigation of the king of Toledo, an adventurer named Ibn 'Ukasha was able in 468 (1075) to take Cordova by surprise and put to death the young 'Abd al-Malik prince and his general Muhammad b. Martin. Al-Ma'mun took to flight in the town of the same name. Five months later, al-Mutamid whose paternal affection had been wounded and pride insulted tried for three years vainly to reconquer Cordova. He was not successful until 471 (1078); Ibn 'Ukasha was put to death and the part of the kingdom of Toledo between the Guadalquivir and the Guadarrama conquered by the armies of Seville. Nevertheless at this time it took all the skill of the vizier Ibn 'Ammar to conclude peace by paying double tribute with Alfonso VI of Castile when he sent an expedition against Seville.

This was just the time when through the energy and tenacity of the Christian princes taking advantage of the feuds which were setting the Muslim rulers of the taifas against one another, the reconquista, which had received a check and then a setback from the last Umayyads, resumed its advance on the south of the Peninsula. In spite of their successes, of which the Muslim chroniclers make a great deal, it must not be forgotten that by the middle of the 11th century, many Muslim dynasties of Spain were being forced to seek on payment of heavy tribute the temporary neutrality of their Christian neighbors. Shortly before the taking of Toledo, which had far-reaching effects, by Alfonso VI in 478 (1085), al-Mutamid began to be involved in serious difficulties. On the imprudent advice of his vizier Ibn 'Ammar, al-Mutamid tried to add to his kingdom, after the principality of Cordova, that of Murcia [q.v.], which was ruled by a prince of Arab origin, Muhammad b. Ahmad Ibn Tahir. In 471 (1078), Ibn 'Ammar went to the Count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II, and asked him for assistance to conquer Murcia in return for a payment of 10,000 dinars; until this sum was paid al-Kasim, a son of al-Mutamid, was to remain his hostage. After animated negotiations which ended in the payment of a sum three times as large to the Count of Barcelona, Ibn 'Ammar resumed his plan of conquering Murcia and soon succeeded in doing so with the help of the lord of the castle of Bilbil (now Vilches), Ibn Kasim. In Murcia however, Ibn 'Ammar soon rendered himself obnoxious to his master by assuming the attitude of an independent ruler and in al-Mutamid's reproaching him he replied by insults to the king of Seville, his wife and his sons. Betrayed by Ibn Kasim, he had to take refuge in Murcia and then successively in Leon, Saragossa and Lereda. Returning to Saragossa, he endeavored to assist its ruler Al-Ma'mun Ibn Hud [cf. Saragossa] on his expedition against over to al-Mutamid, who in spite of the bonds which had so long linked them together, slew him with his own hand.

In the meanwhile, Alfonso VI was no longer

concealing his designs on Toledo, the siege of which he began in 473 (1080). Two years later, when he sent a mission to enforce payment of the annual tribute due to him from al-Mutamid, its members were insulted and the Jewish treasurer Ibn Shalib who accompanied it was put to death because he had refused to accept debased money. He therefore invaded the kingdom of Seville, sacked the flourishing towns of Aljarrafa (Al-ar-ran [q.v.] advanced through the district of Sidonia (Ar. Shadhduna; q.v.) as far as Tarifa [q.v.] where he uttered his celebrated remark expressing his pride at having reached the utmost limits of Spain, where he died some months later. Al-Mutamid whose paternal affection had been wounded and pride insulted tried for three years vainly to reconquer Cordova. He was not successful until 471 (1078); Ibn 'Ukasha was put to death and the part of the kingdom of Toledo between the Guadalquivir and the Guadarrama conquered by the armies of Seville. Nevertheless at this time it took all the skill of the vizier Ibn 'Ammar to conclude peace by paying double tribute with Alfonso VI of Castile when he sent an expedition against Seville.

This was just the time when through the energy and tenacity of the Christian princes taking advantage of the feuds which were setting the Muslim rulers of the taifas against one another, the reconquista, which had received a check and then a setback from the last Umayyads, resumed its advance on the south of the Peninsula. In spite of their successes, of which the Muslim chroniclers make a great deal, it must not be forgotten that by the middle of the 11th century, many Muslim dynasties of Spain were being forced to seek on payment of heavy tribute the temporary neutrality of their Christian neighbors. Shortly before the taking of Toledo, which had far-reaching effects, by Alfonso VI in 478 (1085), al-Mutamid began to be involved in serious difficulties. On the imprudent advice of his vizier Ibn 'Ammar, al-Mutamid tried to add to his kingdom, after the principality of Cordova, that of Murcia [q.v.], which was ruled by a prince of Arab origin, Muhammad b. Ahmad Ibn Tahir. In 471 (1078), Ibn 'Ammar went to the Count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II, and asked him for assistance to conquer Murcia in return for a payment of 10,000 dinars; until this sum was paid al-Kasim, a son of al-Mutamid, was to remain his hostage. After animated negotiations which ended in the payment of a sum three times as large to the Count of Barcelona, Ibn 'Ammar resumed his plan of conquering Murcia and soon succeeded in doing so with the help of the lord of the castle of Bilbil (now Vilches), Ibn Kasim. In Murcia however, Ibn 'Ammar soon rendered himself obnoxious to his master by assuming the attitude of an independent ruler and in al-Mutamid's reproaching him he replied by insults to the king of Seville, his wife and his sons. Betrayed by Ibn Kasim, he had to take refuge in Murcia and then successively in Leon, Saragossa and Lereda. Returning to Saragossa, he endeavored to assist its ruler Al-Ma'mun Ibn Hud [cf. Saragossa] on his expedition against over to al-Mutamid, who in spite of the bonds which had so long linked them together, slew him with his own hand.

In the meanwhile, Alfonso VI was no longer
and scholarship, liberal and tolerant, but living in an atmosphere of luxury and ease little compatible with the care of a kingdom with frontiers open to envious neighbours on all sides. Not so great a ruler as his father al-Mu'tadid, al-Mutamid is however a much more attractive figure, perhaps just on account of his misfortunes. He is entitled to a place among the great figures of Spanish Islam, alongside of Abd al-Rahman III, al-Hakam II, al-Ma'nûri b. Abi 'Amir and at a later date Liûân al-Dîn b. al-Qa'ithîb.


E. Lévi-Provençal

MUTAMMIM b. NUWAIRA, a poet, contemporary with the Prophet. He was the brother of Malik b. Nuwaira [q. v.], chief of the Banû 'Yarbî, a large clan of the Banû Tamâm. Mutamim owes his fame to the elegies in which he lamented the tragic death of his brother Malik and these poems have made the latter's name immortal. The Arabs said there was nothing comparable to these elegies, overflowing with animation. They regarded their author as the type of brotherly devotion.

Mutamim does not seem to have played any prominent part before the Hijra. He was eclipsed by the striking personality of his brother, to whose qualities he never hesitated to pay homage. He is represented as having been of unprepossessing appearance, one-eyed and short in stature. The Bakrî chief al-Hashâfin eulogized the humanity with which he treated his captives during his months of captivity. Falling in his turn into the hands of the Banû Taghlib, Mutamim was delivered by a stratagem devised by his brother. He seems to have adopted 'Isâm al the same time as his brother. Like the latter, he is numbered among the "Companions" although we never find him in direct relations with the Prophet. He escaped from the disaster in which Malik was overwhelmed; a few fragments of other poems suggest he did not write elegies exclusively.

But after the death of Malik he devoted himself to celebrating his memory and demanding vengeance for his death. Refused by the Caliph Abu Bakr, he thought he might have more success on the accession of 'Omar. He hurried to Madina where he was very well received by 'Omar. The latter listened with delight to his elegies, regretted that he himself had not the gift of poetry so that he might worthily celebrate his brother Zaid who had fallen in the wars of al-Yamâmâ, but he refused to reverse Abu Bakr's decision and limited himself to dismissing Kulli'd b. al-Walid, a step which probably owed something to the poetical exortations of Mutamim.

After this, tradition says that the poet became almost blind through weeping, and that he wandered over the many routes of Arabia, uttering his complaints everywhere. He found himself abandoned by his wife who became tired of his incurable sadness and wandering life. He left two sons, 'Adî and Ibrâhîm, also poets. He survived 'Omar if, as Ibn Khallîkân says (ed. Wustenfeld, No. 792), he is really the author of an elegy on the death of this caliph.


(H. L. M.)

AL-MUTANABBI, "he who professes to be a prophet", the surname by which the Arab poet Abu 'l-Tayyib Aymâd b. al-Husain al-Dirî is usually known (cf. in Ibn Khallîkân, Hâfîzîyât [Cairo 1310], i. 36, two genealogies, which do not agree, going back to his great-grandfather). Abu 'l-Tayyib was born in Kûfâ in 303 (915) in the Kinda quarter whence the ethnic al-Kâdiri sometimes gave him. His family in very humble circumstances claimed descent from the Yamani clan of the Dâ'î and he himself all his life was convinced of the superiority of the Arabs of the south over those of the north (cf. al-Wâhidî, Murâth Dîvân al-Mutanabbi, i. 49; al-Yâzîdî, al-'Urûf al-tayyibîyî, p. 29 [these two works will be quoted as Wâhî and Yâzî]). The boy received his early education in his native town and soon distinguished himself by his intelligence, his prodigious memory and his precocity as a poet. He now passed under Shî' influences, perhaps Zâdi (cf. 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Iraghdâdî, Kâmîmâ, i. 382, 12) which affected the development of his philosophy, a subject to which we shall return. Circumstances were however too accursed to accelerate the speed of Abu 'l-Tayyib's religious development. Towards the end of 312 (924), undoubtedly under pressure from the Kârma'îans [q.v.] who had just taken and sacked Kûfâ, Abu 'l-Tayyib and his family made a first stay of two years (cf. al-Sâmâni, Ausûb, 506 b244; al-Bâdî, al-Sâbî al-mu'mînî, i. 6) in Samâwî, the region lying between the Sawâd of Kûfâ in the east and Palmirene in the west. The Benû Kalb who led a nomadic life in these desert steppes had been more cultivated by the Kârma'îans dâ'îs. It is possible that the young poet at this time came into contact with some of these heretics. It is however not very probable,
in view of his youth, that this first contact had any definite effect upon him. On the other hand, this stay among the Beduins certainly gave Abu 'l-Taiyib that profound knowledge of the Arabic language of which he was later so very proud.

On returning to Kufa, at the beginning of 315 (927), Abu 'l-Taiyib seems to have decided to devote himself entirely to poetry. At this time he most admired the great panegyристs of the preceding century, Abu Tammam and al-Buhturi [q. v.]. Like them and like the majority of his contemporaries, he sees in poetry a sure means of attaining wealth and power. He at once attached himself to a certain 'Abd al-Karim, a leader of the well-known family who had dedicated a short piece (Wahh., p. 17—21; Yaza, p. 10—11). Perhaps a convert to Karmānṣah, in any case a complete agnostic — the praises which he allows to be offered him show this —, this individual seems to have exercised a considerable influence on the religious and philosophical development of al-Mutanabbi (cf. also Khāṣṣa, i. 352 below). Prepared by the Shi'a atmosphere in which he had passed his childhood and by the relations he had had with the Karmānṣah in Samawa, Abu 'l-Taiyib, in a certain patron cast off religious dogmas which he regarded as spiritual instruments of oppression. He then adopted a stoic and pessimistic philosophy, echoes of which are found throughout his work. The world is made up of seductions which death destroys (cf. Wahh., p. 39, l. 8—13; p. 162, l. 12—13; Yaza, p. 23 and 97); stupidity and evil alone triumph there (cf. Wahh., p. 104, l. 8—10; Yaza, p. 97); the Arabs — representatives of a superior race in his eyes — are overwhelmed in it by cowardly and barbarous foreigners (cf. Wahh., p. 148, l. 1—51; p. 160, l. 2—5; Yaza, p. 87 and 92). His contact with the world, with which he was out of harmony, the consciousness of his talent, which Abu 'l-Taiyib had, developed rapidly; his vanity increased to a degree which is almost inconceivable (cf. Wahh., p. 60; Yaza., p. 34). His Arab particularism, as with all anti-Shu'ūbīs (cf. Muhba,): incited him to attack foreign oppressors (Wahh., p. 58, l. 30—31; Yaza, p. 33).

This is why, by a contradiction from which he is only ever free, al-Mutanabbi coveted all his life those riches and power which he scorned in his heart, while he stands out from the mass of his contemporaries by his rigid morality and austerity (cf. al-Badi', op. cit., l. 78—81).

At first however, Abu 'l-Taiyib thought only of conquering the world by his poetic gifts, and to find a more favourable field for his activity he left Kufa towards the end of 316 (928), probably as a result of the town being again sacked by the Karmānṣahs. He was naturally attracted to Bagdad (cf. al-Badi', op. cit., l. 82—85) and thus became the panegyrist of the protege of a companion of his, Muhammad b. 'Ubad Allah al-Mawli (cf. Wahh., p. 6—7; Yaza, p. 3—4). From there he went to Syria. For two years he led the life of a wandering troubadour of the period (cf. Mza, Renaisserce des Islams, p. 256). It is impossible to follow him in his wanderings for his Divān, our only guide, does not present his poems in a satisfactory chronological order. Some pieces of the period are addressed to Beduin chiefs of the region of Mawālid [q. v.] (cf. Wahh., p. 24—25, 38—39, 66—67; Yaza, p. 12—13, 22—23, 29—30); others are dedicated to men of letters of Tripolis (Wahh., p. 88—89; Yaza, p. 19—20), al-Ladhkiya (Latakia) (cf. Wahh., p. 116—135; Yaza, p. 66—78). The poems of this period are hurriedly written and mediocre in quality, but traces of his real genius are already apparent. With the exception of a marthīya (lament) and some impromptu pieces they are all hājilim on neo-classical lines. The influence of Abu Tammam and al-Buhturi preponderates.

In the course of this period of experiment, Abu 'l-Taiyib was irritated at not finding his merit recognised. Gradually he looks forward to his dreams of domination being realised by violence (cf. Wahh., p. 138, l. 3—7; Yaza, p. 79). Finally he abandoned the work of a paid panegyrist and, on returning to Baghdad, led a revolutionary propaganda, the nature of which has long been misunderstood. According to Oriental writers (al-Badi', op. cit., l. 25—30; Ibn al-Anbari, Nushah al-Allābi, p. 369), Abu 'l-Taiyib proclaimed himself a prophet in al-Sanawa, was taken prisoner by al-Hāthīd [q. v.] troops and then received his epistle of al-Mutanabbi. Kratschewsky (Mutanabbi i Abu l-Abu, St. Petersburg 1909, p. 9—11) does justice to these traditions, without however taking full account of some clear allusions in the Divān. The latter contains pieces of all possible types that a rebellion was led by al-Mutanabbi (cf. Wahh., p. 49—58, 86; Yaza, p. 28—33, 50). This rising, as usual at this period, must have been political as well as religious. The rising began in al-Ladhkiya and then extended to the western borders of Samawa where the Banū Kalb constituted an element always ready to rebel. Without adhering to Karmānṣah, al-Mutanabbi exploited its principles which found only too ready an echo among the marauding Beduins (cf. Wahh., p. 57, l. 22—23; Yaza, p. 32; allusion to the massacre of priests in Syria by Aḥmad b. Tur during 317 = 930). The ambiguity of the utterances of the rebel, the opportunism of his doctrines and his conception of the Imāmate on Karmānṣah lines, may have caused some misunderstanding of his preaching, since at this time any agitator was regarded as a Karmānṣah. After some initial successes, al-Mutanabbi and his Beduins were defeated; he was captured and imprisoned at Ḥims (towards the end of 322 = 933). After a trial and appeal to the governor in Bagdad (Divān, Paris MS. No. 3092, fol. 16a), Abu 'l-Taiyib was condemned to retract his errors and set free. From this adventure he gained only the epithet of al-Mutanabbi and the conviction that poetry alone would lead him to the realisation of his ambitious dreams.

The poems composed by Abu 'l-Taiyib immediately before and during his rebellion are distinguished by spontaneity of inspiration, by the liberty which the poet takes with poetic forms, by the vigour of the style, which has a much more personal character than in his first manner.

As soon as al-Mutanabbi had returned to his profession of panegyrist, he naturally resumed his wandering life (beginning of 325 = 937). For several years he led a precarious existence and had to be content to sing the praises of citizens and minor officials of Antioch, Damascus, Aleppo etc. who paid him very badly (cf. Wahh., p. 93—206; Yaza, p. 51—131; Yaruh, Irgād, v. 203). Little by little however, his fame grew. At the beginning of 328 (939), we find him becoming court poet to the emir Badr al-Khārisi (the Badr b. 'Amir of the Divān), governor of Damascus for the ex-emir al-ummar' Ibn Ka'īk [q. v.,
who had just taken possession of Syria. Of Arab origin, Badr was regarded by al-Mutanabbi as the Maecenas for whom he had been waiting so long. The panegyrics and occasional poems which are dedicated to this emir reveal a sincere admiration for him and possess a sustained inspiration (cf. Wāḥ., p. 206–245; Yāz., p. 132–163). These pieces and those that precede them, after Abu l-'Tayyib's return to literature, constitute what might be called the third manner of the poet. With the exception of a poem on hunting in the style of Abū Nuwarāq [q. v.] (cf. Wāḥ., p. 201–202; Yāz., p. 128–129) and a number of impromptu poems of no particular interest, al-Mutanabbi wrote only ḍāštās during this period. He would seem then to have returned to his first manner, if the work of this period did not show considerable progress in form.

The friendship between Badr and al-Mutanabbi lasted only about a year and a half and as a result of intrigues of jealous rivals (cf. Wāḥ., p. 253; lines 13–16; Yāz., p. 169), Abu l-'Tayyib feeling no longer safe took refuge in the Byzantine desert (cf. Wāḥ., p. 251–252; Yāz., p. 168–169). There the idea of rebelling again took possession of him (cf. Wāḥ., p. 253–254; Yāz., p. 170–171). Fortunately the departure of Badr for the Ḥirāq enabled him to leave his hiding-place and resume his profession of panegyrist. He now sang the praises of several individuals of second rank (cf. Wāḥ., p. 107–108, 208–248; Yāz., p. 60–61, 194–241). Lastly he succeeded in establishing himself at the Ḥamdānī court in Aleppo where he became the official poet of the emir Saif al-Dawla [q. v.] at the beginning of 337 (948).

Not to be missed is the literary point of view; the work of this period which ran from the middle of 329 (940), date of the quarrel with Badr, to the beginning of 337 (948), marks his fourth manner, to which he remained faithful till his death. It is characterized by a compromise between the pure neo-classical tradition and a freer form which the poet had adopted in the poems of the period of his rebellion. Without rejecting the framework of the neo-classical ḍāštā, he reduces the erotic prologue to a minimum, sometimes even replacing it by a philosophical and lyrical opening which breathes his dreams, disillusionments and angers.

Al-Mutanabbi stayed nine years with Saif al-Dawla. He was genuinely attached to this patron, who was in his eyes the personification of the ideal Arab chief, brave, magnanimous and generous. Saif al-Dawla in his turn recognized the worth of his panegyrist whom he overawed with gifts and never treated with arrogance Al-Mutanabbi accompanied him on his expeditions and on returning to Aleppo sang of his exploits against the Byzantines and the Beduins of the desert. In the brief intervals of leisure between the campaigns of the Ḥamdānī, the poet shared in the leisure of the court of Aleppo, devoting himself to improvement and writing panegyrics as occasion arose (cf. Wāḥ., p. 522–537; Yāz., p. 376–395) or lampoons (marāzīn) on the wise.' Saif al-Dawla [cf. Wāḥ., p. 388–389, 408–409, 577–578; Yāz., p. 271–272, 286–287, 427–428].

The difficult character of al-Mutanabbi and the repute which he enjoyed did not fail to gain him implacable enemies. A few devoted friends like the poet al-Balḥagāhā (q. v.) tried, it is true, to defend him but their zeal could do nothing against the enmity of the hostile group led by the famous Abū Firās [q. v.]. Saif al-Dawla at first paid no attention to the attacks made upon his favourite. When he grew weary and his protection ceased, Abu l-'Tayyib no longer felt his life safe, fled secretly from Aleppo with all his family and sought refuge in Damascus (end of 346 = 957).

Eastern critics generally agree that the poems composed by al-Mutanabbi during his stay with Saif al-Dawla mark the highest point in his work. Although there is a certain degree of exaggeration in this, it is certain that the poet, while continuing his fourth manner, reveals in the highest degree the mastery which he had acquired in this part of his art. Much more than Abū Firās, with whom he is often contrasted, he was able to depict the glories of Saif al-Dawla's campaigns against the Byzantines. His verse, it is true, has not the charm of that of Abū Firās but it is fuller and more epic in style.

From Damascus, Abu l-'Tayyib went to Egypt to al-Fusārī [q. v.] where he obtained the patronage of the Ikhshīdī l-Kāfūr [q. v.]. Al-Mutanabbi's career now reveals the necessities to which poets in the fourth (tenth) century had to submit. Deprived of moral and material independence Abu l-'Tayyib was forced to sing the praises of a patron for whom in his heart he felt only contempt. The panegyrics which he devoted to him barely conceal his regret at losing the favour of Saif al-Dawla. They are somewhat forced and contain points against Kāfūr (cf. al-Badi', op. cit., i. 125–126). The poet perhaps only agreed to celebrate this patron because the latter had promised him the governorship of Sūdān (Sudan) (cf. ibid., i. 115). When he saw that these promises were not fulfilled, he tried to regain the favour of another Ikhshīdī general Abū Sulqāfā Fātīk (ibid., i. 131–132), but the latter dying in 350 (960) and relations with Kāfūr still being strained, al-Mutanabbi had once more to decide to fly. On the day of the feast of sacrifice of this year, after writing a satire on Kāfūr, he left al-Fusārī secretly and crossing Arabia after great trials (cf. al-Badi', op. cit., i. 139–140), he reached the Ḥirāq, spent some time in Kūf, then settled in Baghdad. He perhaps thought of attaching himself to the famous Būyid vizier al-Muḥallabī who had gathered a very brilliant court around him. He had however to abandon hope of this in face of the hostility to him evinced by poets and scholars established at the court of al-Muḥallabī, such as Ibn al-Haddāĝā (q. v.) and Abu l-Farajī al-Isfahānī, author of the Kāfū al-ʾAṣāḥīnī. During his stay here, as he had already begun to do in Egypt (cf. Ibn al-Faraj, Tarīkh al-Anfūsīs, No. 453), al-Mutanabbi gave lectures in which he expounded to a group of friends the work he had done till that date (cf. Dhibāh, Tarīkh al-Islām, Paris, No. 1581, fol. 265v).

The year 353 (964) was spent in this fashion. The poet perhaps also visited Kūf about this time (cf. F. Gabrieli, Vita di al-Mutanabbi, p. 60, note 4). At the beginning of 354 (965) in any case, he left the Ḥirāq and went to visit Arrādān [q. v.] in Susiana where he received the patronage of the Būyid vizier Ibn al-ʾAṣīm [q. v.]. Al-Mutanabbi devoted some panegyrics to him (cf. Wāḥ., p. 740–741; Yāz., p. 564–565), then he left him to go to Shiraz in Fārs where he rejoined the Būyid Sulṭān ʿAdud al-Dawla [q. v.] who had expressed a desire to have him at his court. After
addressing to the Būyid Ṣulṭān several panegyrics which are among his best work, Abu l-Tayyib left Shīrāz for reasons not clearly known, perhaps simply out of nostalgia (cf. Wāḥ, p. 7,66, line 1–3; Yez., p. 5,89). He was returning by short stages from Persia to Baghādār when he was attacked by marauding Beduins near Dair al-‘Aqilī [q. v.] at the end of Ramadān 554 (Aug. 955) and his son were killed in the fighting and all his baggage, including the autograph MSS. of his Divān, was scattered (cf. al-Baḍī‘, op. cit., p. 227–239).

Even in his lifetime, al-Mutanabbi had been sustainability by ardent admirers who defended his work in its entirety against the attacks of detractors no less eager to run him down. Among the latter however, the majority only criticised him as a poet because they objected to his character as a man. The criticism was therefore not distinguished by impartiality and only reflects the opinions of a coteries. It required the death of Abu l-Tayyib to produce a third class of admirers who were more clear-sighted than the first and sufficiently impartial not to fall into the exaggerations of the second (cf. al-Djadrānī, al-Wadīṣa, p. 11–12, 45–46). It was the opinion of this new category that prevailed and when Abu l-Tayyib’s death had all died down, the literary public remained decidedly favourable to Saif al-Dawla’s bard (except al-‘Askari [q. v.] and Ibn Khaldūn). From the fifth (eleventh) century the name of al-Mutanabbi became a synonym for “great poet”. His literary influence became one of the most considerable ever exercised on Arabic poetry. Annotated by Ibn Djinni [q. v.] and later by Abu l-Alā‘ [q. v.], by al-Wāḥidi, al-Ṭabrīzī, al-Ukbarī and Ibn Sīdā [q. v.], to mention only the most eminent, the Divān of Abu l-Tayyib throughout the middle ages and in modern times has been made accessible to scholars and literary men from Persia to Spain by learned men, often more zealous than intelligent. Space does not permit us to estimate what later poetry owes to al-Mutanabbi. We are content to point out that in different ways all Arab panegyристs have been influenced by Abu l-Tayyib. At the present day he is still one of the most read in North Africa; Syria and Egypt also hold him in very high esteem and many critics have devoted studies full of praise to him. It seems however that in the last named country al-Mutanabbi attracts at least as much by the boldness of his philosophy and the ardour of his pro-islam feelings as by his purely literary qualities.

Bibliography: Numerous biographies of al-Mutanabbi have been written by eastern authors; only five of these contain original matter. These are: 1. Abd Allah al-Iṣṭā‘, Tāhī al-Munītītī l-Ṣāḥī al-Mutanabbi, in the Khāṣāṣet al-Alab of Abd al-Kādir al-Baghdādi (Cairo 1299), i. 358–398; 2. al-Thalāšī, Sīrat al-Dāhir (Damascus 1304), i. 75–162, passim; 3. al-Khitīb al-Baghdādi, Tarīkh Baghdādi (Paris MS., No. 2129), fol. 105–106, reproduced in the Nihāt al-Aḥbāb of Ibn al-Anbārī (Cairo 1924), p. 366–374 and in the Abbāb of al-Samī‘ī (Leiden 1912), fol. 506; 4. Ibn Khālidīn, Wafāt al-Dāhir (Cairo 1310), i. 36–8; 5. al-Baḍī‘, al-Sīhī al-mu‘āšī ‘an Ḥabībatī al-Mutanabbi (on the margin of the commentary of al-Ukbarī on the Divān of al-Mutanabbi, Cairo 1308), i. 5–245. — Al-Mutanabbi’s work has been studied in the east, in addition to


MUTARADIF, term in prosody; cf. the art. Kāfiya.

MUTARAKIB, term in prosody; cf. the art. Kāfiya.

MUṬʿARIZĪ, Abu ʾl-Faṭḥ Ṣaḥīr b. Abī al-Sa‘īdī b. ʾAṭlī al-Muṭʿarizī, grammaticus, a dei a iuris, was born in Khwārizm in Kairāb 538 (1144). He was a pupil of Mawīκ b. Ahmad known as Alḥāb Khwārizmī. As he was born in the same province and in the year in which al-Zamakhshāri died, he was called Khaṣaf al-Zamakhshāri; al-Suyūtī’s assumption that he was a pupil of Zamakhshāri was deduced from this epithet and is of course wrong. Al-Muṭʿarizī was an adherent of the Mu’tazila. As a jurist of the Ḥanafī school he enjoyed particular prestige and his work al-Muẓāhir fī l-ILMAYHA, a dictionary, arranged alphabetically, of terms used in tradition and of the legal terms of the jurists of the Ḥanafī school, was regarded by the scholars of the madhhab with the same respect as the Gāzīb al-Fīfī of al-Azhārī by the Shāfī’īs. For his son he compiled a lexicon of synonyms entitled al-Thayār l-Awnaṭt al-Khind, which the latter was to study after he had learned the Kūfān by heart. It is a kind of text-book giving a comprehensive survey of the subject. In al-Muṭʿarizī’s opinion the existing works on this subject were either too big or not full enough. The work deals only with “good and usual” words, omitting the “bad and unusual” ones. Modern and ancient linguistic usage are distinguished and verses often quoted in illustration. His al-Muḥāfīz fī al-Nahw, which deals with the grammar of the Arabic language, was also written for his son. It was much used by students and often commented upon. Super-commentaries were added to the commentaries; one of the latter was even translated into Turkish. Al-Muṭʿarizī was also an expositor and prepared a commentary on the Masūmat of Ḥarrī. He also was a poet, among his efforts being a poem in which he set himself to use nothing but synonyms. In 601 (1204) he was in Baghādār where he had
disputations with the scholars of that city. In Djumâda I of 610 (1215) he died in his native town.


Mutâṣârī [See Sanâjî]

Al-Mu'tāṣīm al-Înâm, Abî Ísâkh Muhammad, an 'Abîbîsîd caliph, born in 793-796 or 790-793, the son of Farîd al-Kalâbî and a slave-girl named Mârida, in the reign of his brother al-Ma'mûn [q.v.] he took part in the fighting against the Byzantines in Asia Minor and received the governorship of Egypt. After the death of al-Ma'mûn in Rajab 218 (Aug. 833) he ascended the throne and was soon afterwards acknowledged even by his nephew al-'Abbâs b. al-Ma'mûn [q.v.] whom the troops had proclaimed caliph and the army also then paid him homage. An 'Ahd pretend, Muhammad b. al-Êsânî, was disposed of by the governor of Korâshân Abî 'Allâh b. Tâhir [q.v.]. After concluding a truce with the Byzantine emperor Theophilius, al-Mu'tâṣīm sent an army commanded by the Arab general Élisîf b. Bashâr against the Zenîs [q.v.] who had migrated from India in the second half and settled in the swamps between Başâ and Wâsî. They had been frequently used in their wars by the Muslims. After the death of al-Ma'mûn however, they began to ravage and lay waste the country round as if it were hostile territory. They submitted after seven months fighting at the turn of the year 210-220 (854-855) and in Muharram 220 (Jan. 855) they were brought in ships to Baghîdâd and banished by al-Mu'tâṣīm to 'Ain Zarba [q.v.]. In the same year he appointed Hâdîr b. Kâ'ûs, usually called al-Êlîshîn [q.v.], commander-in-chief in the war against Babêk [q.v.], but it was only after two years that he was victorious. The insubordination of the caliph against all those who would not share crack of the Mu'tazîla made him unpopular with the people and in addition there was the dissatisfaction of the citizens of the capital with the undisciplined Berber and Turkish mercenaries whom al-Mu'tâṣim took into his service. At the end of 220 (855) he therefore resolved to move his residence to a smaller place. While his son Írân al-Wâhîk remained in Baghîdâd as governor, the caliph established himself first on the al-Kâtîl canal and then in Sûmâmra three days journey up the river. Here in the course of the year 221 (856) there arose a palace with numerous buildings for the troops [cf. the art. Baghîdâd]. Very soon afterwards the war with the Byzantines blazed up again. The emperor Theophilius invaded Muslim territory on the Upper Tigris, captured Zibâtrâ and wrought tremendous havoc in northern Syria and Mesopotamia. In Djumâda I 223 (April 858) al-Mu'tâṣim himself took the field, accompanied by his ablest generals. The huge force advanced in three columns: the eastern army was commanded by al-Êlîshîn, the two divisions of the western one by al-Mu'tâṣim and Írânshâh. Al-Êlîshîn very soon put the emperor to flight and in Shawwâl (Sept.) of the same year Amorium after 55 days siege passed through treachery into the hands of the caliph who had the town destroyed. But the victory had no permanent results. As winter was coming on, al-Mu'tâṣim had to retire, particularly as a conspiracy in favour of his nephew al-'Abbâs b. al-Ma'mûn [q.v.] demanded urgent measures. About the same time the ispahbad of Tabaristan Mârijyân b. Kârim rebelled, but the rising was suppressed by 'Abî Ísâkh b. Tâhir [q.v.]. In 226 (850-851) or 227 troubles again broke out in Palestine where the 'Umayyads still had many supporters. The leader, Abî Írân al-Mu'âbaraštâ', claimed to be a descendant of the 'Umayyads and everywhere preached rebellion against the caliph until Rajab b. Ayâyb al-Êlîshîn, whom al-Mu'tâṣim sent against him, took him prisoner and brought him to Sûmâmra. Al-Mu'tâṣim died on 18th Kadhî I 227 (Jan. 5 842) in Sûmâmra. By favouring the Turks and suppressing the Arab element he hastened the decline of the 'Abîbîsîd empire. Unlike al-Ma'mûn, he was comparatively uneducated. That learning was not allowed to fall into oblivion in his reign is rather due to the chief kâdi Ahûmad b. Abî Írân [q.v.].


Al-Mu'tâṣâm, Muhammad, R. Ma'nî, Muhammad Ibn Êümâm al-Fûghiyan, second ruler of the dynasty of Fudhîbids [q.v.] of the kingdom of Almeria [q.v.], reigned from 443 to 484 (1051-1091). Gifted like his contemporary Al-Mu'tamid [q.v.] of Sevilla with a certain amount of poetic talent, he made his capital during his long reign one of the great centres of culture in the Peninsula. But like the other mu'dâk al-Êisâkh of Spain, he was for the most of his time at war with one or other of his neighbours. He was without doubt influenced by the Jews Êisâf against his master Badis, king of Granada [cf. ibid.]. Later his forces took part with those of Êisâf b. Êasîn in the famous battle of Zallâka [q.v.]. Like the other Muslim rulers of Spain he felt in the following year the weight of the Almoravids suñan's arm. After unsuccessfully besieging the fortress ofledo and meeting Êisâf to act harshly against Al-Mu'tamid, whom he hated personally, he realised on his death-bed that his capital would be besieged by the Almoravids as Sevilla had been. This is why he advised his son and successor Êumam Mu'izz al-Dawla to seek an asylum with the lords of
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AL-MUTA'AWKIL AL-AI LĀGH, ABD AL-FAḌL IBN ISLĀM B. MUHAMMAD, an abū bāṣrād al-Ḥāfiẓ, born in Shawrūl 206 (Feb.–March 522), son of the caliph al-Mutawakkil and slav-ugul from Khandān named Shūfātī. He ascended the throne in Dhu l-Hijja 123 (Aug. 847) on the death of his brother al-Walīkh. His old opponent, the vizier Ibn al-Zayyāt, soon fell a victim to the cruelty of the new caliph and a similar fate befell the Turkish general Ṭāṣīr, although the latter along with Wāṣif had helped him to the throne. The caliph dreaded his influence and had him thrown into prison where he died of thirst: (Iltīsāl 235 = Dec. 849–Jan. 850). From the religious point of view al-Mutawakkil was thoroughly orthodox. Soon after his accession he forbade any discussion about the Qūrānic. Those who had been arrested because they would not recognise the teachings of the Mu'tazilī were released and in 235 (849–850) he released and intensified the regulations for special dress for Jews and Christians which went back to the caliph Ṭāṣīr. The synagogues and churches recently built in Baghda were taken down and the Mu'tazilī chief Āḥmad b. Abū Dārād [q. v.] with his sons dismissed and the office of chief Āḥmad given to the Sunni Umayyad b. Āktham. The Ālīs also fell under his ban. In 236 (850–851) he had the ma'ūl-ume of al-Husain in Kishīfī de-troyed and pilgrimage to this place forbidden. The provinces were frequently ravaged by rebels and foreign foes. In Adhārābād in 234 (848–849) Muhammad b. al-Bāthī reticulated; he had earlier been taken prisoner and brought to Samara but had escaped; he established himself in the strong town of Marand. The caliph's troops could do nothing against him until Boghā al-Sharābī [q. v.] took command. After a long siege the latter offered him a pardon; but when Ibn al-Bāthī tried to escape he was seized and brought to Samara. In 237 (851–852), which was suppressed in the following year, but only with difficulty, by Boghā al-Katār. About the same time (238), the Byzantines landed in Egypt and plundered Damiq in Asia Minor the war went on in the traditional fashion against the Byzantines. When the Paulician sect was persecuted by the emperor Theodoros they went over to the Muslims in masses. The Byzantines, however, succeeded in taking many prisoners. Those who would not become converted were massacred; but when al-Mutawakkil who had moved his residence in 244 (May–June 858) to Damascus but left it after only two months, sent Boghā with the Turkish cavalry against the Almoravids, the Byzantines, the fortune of war turned. Boghā fought with success against the enemy and in the following year the emperor Michael himself was defeated at Samosata. In 246 (860–861) the Muslim generals took a considerable number of prisoners; but no permanent change in the situation was produced. In Syria also trouble broke out. Two governors in succession were driven out of Ḥims and only with the help of the troops from Damascus and al-Qalamān it was restored (241 = 855–856). About the same time al-Mutawakkil sent an army under command of Muhammad b. Abī Allāh al-Ku Religion the rebel Boghā. The latter were completely defeated but their leader Abī Bāṣrād was pardoned. In the reign of al-Mutawakkil the dynasty of the Ma'āfīs [q. v.] was established in Baghda. To keep the people of Baghda in check, he sent for the governor of Kufa, Muhammad b. Abī Allāh b. Tāhir [q. v.], and when the turbulent province made trouble he built a new residence at Ḥālīfī in 245 (859–860) outside of Samara, which swallowed up enormous sums. Poets and scholars were rewarded with princely munificence by the caliph. The extravagance, capriciousness and cruelty of the caliph, however, made him hated, and finally he quarrelled with the commander of the Turkish bodyguard. In Dhu l-Ḥijja 235 (July 859) he had arranged that his eldest son Muhammad al-Munṣūr should succeed him and the two other sons Abī Abī Allāh al-Muṭazz and Bihāt al-Mu'tayyad were each to receive a governorship with a claim to the throne after al-Munṣūr. He began to favour al-Mu'tazz however, and thus aroused al-Munṣūr's discontent. The latter contrived with a few others of the same sentiments and in Shawrūl 247 (861) al-Mutawakkil was murdered [see al-'Arabī B. Khādījah].


K. V. Zellweger

MUTAWĀṬIR (A.), part. act. vi. from māwātārih, that becomes successively'. It is used as a technical term in two senses:

a. In the theory of cognition it is applied to historical knowledge (qāḥar), if the latter is generally acknowledged: e.g. the knowledge that there is a city called Makka and that there existed a king called Alexander.

Definitions of the term show slight differences: According to al-Ṭabarī the knowledge is mutawāṭir if it is supplied by so many persons that either their number or their trustworthiness excludes doubt of its truth (Zulffīdī, ed. Flugel, p. 210. cf. Springer, Dictionary of Technical Terms, p. 1471).

According to Abī Hāf, 'Umar al-Nasaff (f 537 = 1142) reports are mutawāṭir when handed down without deviation by persons who cannot be supposed to have plotted a lie. Taftāzānī in his
commentary (p. 33 sq.) mentions two objections. The first is, that Jews and Christians accept as mutawwi reports that are rejected by Muslims. To this Tafsīr al-Manzil replies that the possibility that these reports should be mutawwi is excluded. The second objection is, that the reports of every single reporter (āḥad, q. v.) represent an opinion only and that an accumulation of opinions cannot be said to afford certainty. To this Tafsīr al-Manzil replies that often plurality has a power of which singleness is devoid, e.g. a cord made of hair.

For the place of this source of knowledge within the theory of cognition, cf. the Supplement, s.v. "ilm.

b. In prosody the term is applied to the rhyme in which one moving letter intervenes between the quiescents.


The word literally means one who leads the āṣāf (q.v.). The task of the muṭawwiṣ is however by no means limited to assisting pilgrims from foreign lands, who entrust themselves to their guidance, to go through the ceremonies required at the circumambulation of the Ka'ba. On the contrary they act as guides at the āṣāf also and at all other ceremonies which are prescribed or only recommended for the āṣāf or 'umra (q.v.). The muṭawwiṣ also cater very completely for the physical welfare of the pilgrims. As soon as the pilgrims arrive in Ḥijād, their agents are ready on the arrival of the steamers to provide all the services they require from disembarkment to departure for Mecca. In Mecca the muṭawwiṣ or members of their families and servants take charge of the pilgrims. During the whole of their stay they provide the pilgrims with lodging, service, food, purchases (necessary and unnecessary), attend them, if they fall ill and in case of death take charge of what is left behind them.

The muṭawwiṣ of course do not all do this for nothing. They are appropriately paid for their trouble and see, that if the pilgrim is rich, their friends and relations also make something out of him. Of the money which they themselves receive, they have to hand over a considerable part in the form of fees, presents etc. to the shāhīl of the gild and to the treasury, another reason for getting as much as possible out of those entrusted to their care. It is therefore no wonder that many pilgrims have complained bitterly about the profligacy of these particularly prominent representatives of the Meccan pilgrim industry. Recently the fees for guidance have been fixed by a legal enactment of the Hijāz government (O. M., xii. [1932], 249).

Reference has already been made to the fact that the muṭawwiṣ are organised in gilds; they are divided up into separate groups who sometimes have the right to exploit the pilgrims from a definite area only (e.g. Lower Egypt). All these groups together form the gild with a chief, shāhīl officially recognised at their head. The gild is also very extensive. "Wild" (i.e. independent) guides (jarrūr) have to be content with the scanty pickings left over for them by the organised muṭawwiṣ.


(R. Paret)

AL-MUTA'ZILA is the name of the great theological school which created the speculative dogmatics of Islam. The meaning of the name is clear from al-Maṣūdi, Murūj, vi. 22: the Mu'tazilis are those who profess the doctrine of 'Išārāt, i.e. the doctrine of the mutasilla bāna 'lamanzillātu or the state intermediate between belief and scepticism, the fundamental doctrine of the school (see below). A tradition which emanates from the abū al-hāshim derives the name Mu'tazila from a slumber which took place in the circle of abū Anas al-Baṣrī after laying down their doctrine of the mutasilla bāna 'lamanzillātu, Wāṣīl b. 'Abbās and 'Amr b. 'Ubayd are said to have separated (Ṣawā'ila) from al-'Hasan's circle to found an independent school or rather to have been expelled from it by the latter. These traditions are not entirely without historical foundation but the interpretation of the name deduced from them is certainly wrong. The Mu'tazilis were proud of their name, which they certainly would not have been if it had been a nickname invented by their enemies. We have here, as the variety of versions also shows, a tendentious invention of the abū al-'urūn wa al-ḥawāfi'ī an-Nabūsī to rehabilitate al-'Hasan and brand the Mu'tazilis as heretics.

Origin and Political History. There are quite definite indications that the Mu'tazila was of political origin and that it arose under the same constellation as the Shī'īs and Khārijis movements. The accession of al-Ḥāfaṣ (Dhū l-Hijja 35) is the great watershed in the currents of the history of Islam. It is well known that several notable Companions of the Prophet refused to pay 'Ali the homage which he demanded or offered it reluctantly. The most frequently mentioned were Bāḥiṣa and al-Zubair but the names of many others have been preserved: Sa'd b. Abī Ṭallāh, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Omar, Muhammad b. Maslama, Usama b. Zaid, Sa'd b. al-Mārī and Zaid b. Thabit (al-Ṭabarī, i. 3072). Of these Tāhira and al-Zubair openly rebelled against 'Ali but the majority remained neutral. The Medine in general followed the example of the latter and in Baṣra al-A'inī b. Kaṣṣ with 6,000 Tamīmīs and a group of Azdīs under Šubra b. Sha'mān also stood aside from the quarrel (al-Ṭabarī, i. 3169, 3178). In
speaking of the latter the text uses the verb ṭūṣaṭa, which still has its proper sense of "to separate from", but which is already on the way to become a political term meaning "to take up a neutral attitude in the quarrel between 'Ali and his adversaries". Now al-Nawawī mentions (Kitāb Fī ḥaq al-ṣāliḥ, ed. 'Amr, p. 5) a parallel emphasis on the accession of 'Ali separated and followed Sa'd b. Abi Waqqās, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Omar, Muḥammad b. Maslama and Uṣāma b. Zaid. These separated (ḍīṭašāla) from 'Ali and refused either to fight against him or to take his side although they had paid homage to him and had received him favourably; they were called al-Muṭāzila and are the ancestors of all the later Muṭāzila'. The Muṭāzila as a theological school must therefore have been preceded by a political Muṭāzila, which determined its structure.

This hypothesis seems to be confirmed if we analyze carefully what is recorded of the founders of the theological school. According to a unanimous tradition, this school originated with two natives of Baṣra, Wāṣil b. 'Abī [q.v.] and 'Amr b. 'Ubayd [q.v.]. The period of their activity covers practically the reign of the caliph Ḥiṣam and his Umayyad successors, i.e. the years 105-131 (723-48). We have a good deal of quite early information about them, not always free from lacunae, but sufficient to enable us to grasp the leading ideas in their theological work (see Bibl.). It is clear from all these traditions that the doctrine of ṭīzāz formed the starting point for the creation of the school, that Wāṣil was the first to formulate it and that he later won over 'Amr to his cause. Thus is how al-Khayrīyyāt reports the origin of the idea of ṭīzāz. Muslims were agreed that he who committed a grave sin deserved the name of ṭīzāz and of ṭādūr, but opinions varied as to the character of the individual who received these epithets. Khāridjīs said he was an infidel. The Murjdīs said he was a believer in spite of his fīṣık and his ṭādūr; al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and his circle described him as a hypocrite (mānašīḥ). Wāṣil demonstrates that the description given in the Ḥurān of a believer and an infidel cannot be applied to a believer who has committed a grave sin. The latter is therefore neither believer nor infidel. Now it is impossible to regard him as a hypocrite as al-Ḥasan wants to do, for a hypocrite must pass as a believer until his hypocrisy is brought to light. The only possible course then is to put the ṭādūr in a special category of those who are in an intermediate state (mantsa biša 'l-munṣišilatāt). These same ideas are found in the conversation by which Wāṣil is said to have won 'Amr over to the doctrine of ṭīzāz (al-Sayyid al-Murtuẓā, Amāli, i. 114 sq. = Ibn al-Murtuẓā, al-Muṭāzila, p. 22 sq.; source probably al-Khayrīyyāt).

There are political problems concealed behind these speculations. The doctrine of mantsa biša 'l-munṣišilatāt is not the result of interest in pure speculation, but arose out of an clearly defined opinion on the individuals who took part in the quarrels that raged round the caliphate of 'Ali. It is striking how much space is occupied by the question of 'Ali, of Ṭāhla, of al-Zubair and of Ṭa'īṣa in the rather scanty information which we possess regarding the theology of Wāṣil and 'Amr; we cannot doubt that here they were dealing with a central problem. Wāṣil and 'Amr took neither side in the dispute (Kitāb al-Imtiṣār, p. 97-98). According to them, 'Ali, Ṭāhla, al-Zubair and Ṭa'īṣa were originally true and pious believers. But the war which broke out among them divided them into two parties who could not both be right; one of these parties committed a sin but we do not know what. 'Amr therefore leaves his cause to Him who knows it but in their relations with one another we cannot regard them as true believers in the strict sense of the word. As a result if one of these individuals bears witness against another of the opposite party, we cannot accept this evidence; relatively to the one, the other is ṭādūr and vice-versa (cf. also Baghdādī, Kitāb al-Farh, p. 100). If we may believe the aḥl al-baḥrīyyīn, 'Amr showed himself more severe than Wāṣil; he is said to have refused to accept the deposition made by any member of these parties against any member of the community on any matter whatever (Ṭārīkh Baghdādī, xii. 178; al-Baghdaḍī, Kitāb al-Farh, p. 100); for he declared guilty (ḍūḥātā) for sc both the parties engaged in the battle of the Camel. It is therefore not surprising that Wāṣil and 'Amr have sometimes been confused with the Khāridjīs (verse of İṣāḥā b. Suwaid al-Adwān, al-Iṣāḥā, Bayān, i. 13).

However, the opinion of the leaders of the Muṭāzila on 'Ali is based on quite a different foundation. To understand the position correctly it is important to note that 1. Wāṣil and the whole Muṭāzila were definitely enemies of the Umayyads and that 2. Wāṣil adopted a somewhat ambiguous attitude regarding 'Othāmān and his murderers. In his creed (Ṭīzīzī) this tacitly implies a declaration in favour of the 'Abdīs, the first actors in the drama played at Mecca in the year 35. Indeed Wāṣil was on somewhat intimate terms with the 'Abdīs of Medina ( Ibn al-Murtuẓā, al-Muṭāzila, p. 20); the Zaidīya revere him as one of their leaders, and Zaidī theology is essentially based on that of Wāṣil. This is true not only of the speculative theology; there is agreement also on political doctrines. The Zaidīs do not say that the first caliphs Abī Bakr and 'Omar were usurpers as the extreme Shi'īs do; Wāṣil treated the caliphate of Abī Bakr as legitimate (commentary of Ibn Abī Ḥadīd on Nabdī al-Balūqā, Caro 1329, i. 3); he left undecided the question of knowing who had the superior claim, Abī Bakr, 'Omar or 'Ali, but he credited 'Ali with a superior claim to 'Othāmān. This attitude, a little complicated as regards 'Ali, and therefore prudent towards the extreme Shi'īs, at the same time unreservedly hostile to the Umayyads, can in my opinion only be interpreted in one way. All these apparently dissimilar lines converge on a common centre: the 'Abbasīd movement. It is precisely Wāṣil's attitude which we must regard as characteristic of the partisans of the 'Abbasīs. The latter regarding themselves as the true aḥl al-baḥrī, it was evidently in their interest to lower somewhat the preponderating position attributed to 'Ali by the extreme Shi'īs in order themselves to profit by the prestige enjoyed by the family of the Prophet; but on the other hand, they had every reason not to cut the links with the Shi'īs who were indispensable as allies to them. It is obvious that in these circumstances it was particularly important for them to win over the relatively moderate Zaidī faction to their cause. In a general
The teaching of Wāṣil on al-mansūla can only be perfectly understood if we see in it the theoretical crystallisation of the political programme of the 'Abbāsids before their accession to power. Everything leads us to believe that the theology of Wāṣil and of the early Mutazila represents the official theology of the 'Abbāsids movement. This gives an unforced explanation of the fact that it was the official doctrine of the 'Abbāsids court for at least a century. It seems even probable that Wāṣil and his disciples took direct part in the 'Abbāsids propaganda. In his farā'is, mentioned below, Safwān al-Anṣārī tells us that Wāṣil had emissaries (qarāt) in all parts of the Muslim world. Safwān describes the chief agents of the 'Abbāsids as typecasters (wāṣil) who were distinguished from other men in physiognomy and dress; they were the supporters (ṣiṣyāt) of God in all lands and centres in which his commandments were made manifest and in which the art of dispute (with the enemies of the faith) flourished. The period of this activity coincides exactly with that of the most intense 'Abbāsids propaganda, in which all the forces working for the ruin of the Umayyads were operating; it is impossible not to believe there was a connection between the two. That Wāṣil did actually extend his propaganda very far to the west is proved by the fact that there existed long after him, as agents of the 'Umayyad dynasty, a Wāṣili community at Tāhert (Yākūt, i. 815) numbering about 3,000 members who had allied themselves with the 'Abbasīs. They had rebelled against Mansūr under 'Abd Allāh al-Hāsani (al-Shahristānī, p. 311; on these happenings see Tabari, iii. 561); they were therefore reckoned among the enemies of the first 'Abbāsids caliphs. It is interesting to note that the connection between Wāṣil and the Khāridjīs, supposed by Ishaq b. Suwaid al-Adawī to exist (see above) was here an actuality.

The quarrels of Wāṣil and his followers with Dāhīm b. Safwān (q.v.) form a difficult problem which has not yet been solved. On the one hand, Dāhīm's theology left distinct traces on that of the Mu'tazila; the doctrine of the necessity of God, which was later to become a fundamental Mu'tazila thesis was probably formulated by Dāhīm and in the doctrine of the divine attributes there are coincidences on both sides which cannot be accidental. On the other hand, there are many serious differences which are practically and political in their nature. Dāhīm professed in the most extreme form of the doctrine of predestination (djab). All the actions of man are involuntary; Wāṣil maintained the opposite thesis of free will. Now once again we have political problems hidden behind these theological controversies; the Umayyads in general preferred the dogma of predestination while the opposition accepted the dogma of free will in its widest interpretation; in Damascus, Ghailān al-Dināshī, who figures among the fathers of the Mu'tazila (Ibn al-Murtaḍā, al-Mu'tazilāt, p. 15—17), was put to death by the caliph Hishām for holding the doctrine of free will (al-Tabari, iii. 1733).

Once the hypothesis of a definite connection between the Mu'tazila and the 'Abbāsids is admitted, the question of the relations between the Mu'tazila founded by Wāṣil and the early Mu'tazila of the period of 'Ali presents itself in a new aspect. It will be admitted that there is a striking resemblance

between the attitude of these former companions of the Prophet and that of the 'Abbāsids. It is true that 'Abbās b. al-'Abbās entered the service of 'Ali after the death of ʿOthmān but his true sentiments were somewhat ambiguous; he was a great friend of 'Othmān but a rather lukewarm partisan of 'Ali and after the latter's death he placed himself at the service of the Umayyads. His descendants did not remain at Medina, probably because the 'Alids were their rivals there; after a stay in Damascus, his son went to Hama and here a formal rapprochement took place in 98 between the 'Abbāsids and the 'Alids (Wellhausen, Das arabisch-keil, p. 312 sqq.). Before this event, we may regard the 'Abbāsids as a kind of Mu'tazila in the old sense of the word. With 'Amr b. ʿAbdī a new element enters the Mu'tazila as founded by Wāṣil. 'Amr originally was one of the al-ḥalādīs; brought up in the circle of al-Hasan al-ʿBaṣrī, he transmitted a large number of hadiths from his master and he is remembered as one of the mubāḥadātān. His conversion to the doctrine of fitāḥi brought about a rupture between him and these circles; but with him a considerable section of the Kādāris of the al-ḥalādīs joined the Mu'tazila, thus reinforcing the more politically inclined Kādāriya, of which Wāṣil was the champion. Kādāri and mutazilī were soon to become synonymous terms. 'Amr seems to have been decidedly anti-ʿAlī (see above), in any case he called Abū Bakr ʿAli (Ibn Abī Ḥārām on Naḥj al-Balaghā, i. 3). This attitude implies a certain predilection for ʿOthmān, which is foreign to Wāṣil; indeed, a section of the old Baṣrīs, among them al-Djāhīs, is said to have belonged to the party called al-ʿOthmānīya. 'Amr's point of view was of great importance for the development of the Mu'tazila. After their final triumph, the 'Abbāsids immediately dissolved the alliance with the Shīʿa, which had only been a political instrument for them. As regards the extreme Shīʿa, the Rawāfīd, the Mu'tazila unhesitatingly followed the direction of their new masters; but it is fairly evident that some of them did not decide to break so abruptly with the moderate Shīʿa. It resulted in a schism. One section remained faithful to the alliance with the moderate Shīʿa; this section was later to form a special Mu'tazila school in Baghdād. But the Mu'tazila of Baṣra with 'Amr at their head seem to have attached themselves without protest to the 'Abbāsids cause. 'Amr even became the intimate friend of Mansūr and so to speak his spiritual father. In the west, the Mu'tazilīs allied with the Khāridjīs before the 'Abbāsids (see above). Let us sum up the characteristic features of the Mu'tazila at the beginning of the 'Abbāsids period. The Mu'tazila was no longer a political party, the cause of the 'Abbāsids caliphs, only a faction being opposed to them; 2 decidedly hostile to the extreme Shīʿa, the Rāfīḍa; 3 hostile to the Djahmiya, by which however it was a little influenced; 4. Kādāri in repeating severely of the old factions of this name: 5. In serious disagreement with the al-ḥalādīs who soon declared it heretical. This position had a decisive influence in determining the structure of the Mu'tazila theology. The beginnings of this theology go back to Wāṣil and 'Amr and are connected with the fight against the Rāfīḍa. The extreme Shīʿa had quite early assimilated a good number of
non-Muslim beliefs; we need not doubt that Manichaism played a part in them; in any case certain gnostic and dualistic ideas had found a way into Islam through the intermediary of these Shi'i. These tendencies, very marked in Kûfa, were also represented at Baṣra; in the house of an Azdî who was a samani or Buddhist, Wâsil and Amr had frequent meetings with Abu al-Kamil b. Abû 'I-l-Awâdî and Sâlih b. Abâ al-Kadhîm, who pro-

posed dualist doctrines (al-thawriyya; we should probably understand by this Manichean views) and the poet Bashshâr b. Hurî (q. v., Kitâb al-âlamîn, iii. 24). A serious schism broke up this curious mudd'â. This event decided the whole future of the Mu'tazila. Henceforth the fight against savaqa and thawriyya is a cardinal point in the programme of the Mu'tazila. Wâsil himself composed a refutation of Manicheanism which al-Bûhîlî (c. 300 A. H.) was still able to peruse (al-Mu'ta-
zilih, p. 21). But they also found themselves compelled to combat these heresies in a positive fashion; to the doctrine of fire professed by Bashshâr they offered a theology of earth, so to speak, a theology based on the natural philosophy of the time. The poems of Sa'îdân an-Ansârî (al-Dhâhîc, Kitâb al-Bâyânîn, i. 16—19) afford us a specimen of this theology; here we have one of the funda-
damental documents for the history of Mu'tazila dogmatics. It is not yet clear whence came the philosophy put at the service of theology but its general character is apparent; it is the philosophy of the alchemists, physicists of late antiquity, a kind of summa of the scientific principles which seem to have been accepted everywhere in Asiatic Hellenism. Sa'îdân perhaps gives us a hint as to the circles from which it came to the Mu'tazila, when he tells us that Bashshâr called Wâsil and his friends Da'iqâsîs: this is in any case worth noting. In a general way those who handed on this natural philosophy seem to have been the school called daqiriyâ by Muslims. The Mu'tazila fought these Dahiris with a vigour which reveals the dependence on this heretical philosophy of which they were conscious. The true founder of the dogmatic system of the Mu'tazila was Abu 'I-l-Hudhâ'îl Mu'âammad b. al-Hudhâ'îl al-

'Allâf (q. v.). Abu 'I-l-Hudhâ'îl, his friends and pupils, continued on a large scale the polemic against Manicheism, a polemic which is certainly not unconnected with the persecution begun by the Abâshâds against the open or secret adherents of this religion. On the other hand, he fought the Râfîdî most vigorously, then represented by the very remarkable theologian Hisâ'mân b. al-Ha-
kâm (q. v.), and it was through his disputes with the latter that he was led to study the books of the philosophers, which furnished him with a system of dogmatics, a little bold, but full of fertile new ideas. Alongside of him there was a crowd of important theologians at Baṣra: Mu'âmmar, an independent mind whose ideas have not yet been sufficiently analysed; Hisâ'mân b. Amr al-Fawâqî and al-Asâmm, adversaries of Abu 'I-l-Hudhâ'îl and several others. Among the pupils of Abu 'I-l-Hudhâ'îl mention must first be made of Ibrahim b. Saiyâr al-Nâzîm (q. v.). These theologians gave Mu'tazila dogmatics its essential character. This theology is: 1. apologetic: it aims at defending the revelation of the Prophet; as a result it is 2. strictly Kur'ânî: the sacred book is the only source of the theological denomina-
tions (asma'û) and of the precepts of religion (aâhâm); it is 3. polemical: it vigorously invaded the domains of other religions and other Muslim parties to fight them on their own ground; it is 4. speculative: it has recourse to philosophical means to refute its adversaries and formulate its dogmas; consequently it is 5. intellectualist: it envisages the problem of religion under the purely intellectual aspect. Nothing could then be less justifiable than to regard the Mu'tazila as philo-

sophers, free thinkers or liberals. On the contrary, they are theologians of the strictest school; their ideal is dogmatic orthodoxy; philosophy for them is only an ancilla fide; they are nothing less than tolerant. What they created was Muslim scholasticism.

Parallel to the school of Baṣra, a Mu'tazila school was founded in Baghâd by Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir (q. v.; d. 210 = 825—826). This school was pro-'Alîd ('Alî preferable to Abû Bakr), and Bishr was persecuted by Hârûn al-Rashîd. But under Mâ'mûn (q. v.; 198—218 = 813—833), a decidedly pro-'Alîd caliph, the school of Bishr gained a preponderating influence mainly through the theologians Thumâma b. Ashâras (d. 210 = 825—826) and Ibn Abû Du'dâ (d. in 230 = 854—

855). This school particularly attacked those who held the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'ân (q. v.). This attack however had disastrous consequences for the Mu'tazila. Abandoned by the caliph al-

Mutawakkil (232—247) who adopted the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'ân, it rapidly fell from its influential position and soon found itself surrounded by implacable enemies. In the second half of the third century, Ibn al-Rawandî, a partisan of the Baghâd school, made a stir when he left the Mu'tazila for the most advanced Râfîdî; a man of violent temperament, he criticised the Mu'tazila in a scathing way which did it much damage. Towards the end of the third century, the Kar-

mânîan movement came on the scene, reinforcing the extreme Râfîdî and causing trouble in every secular and spiritual sphere. In the struggle against the Karmaîn it is no longer the Mu'tazila who appear at the head of the defenders of orthodoxy but the abî al-hudâ'îh. In the year 300, al-Asbâ'î broke with the Mu'tazila of Baṣra, of which he had been a convinced supporter, to introduce speculative dogmatics among the abî al-hudâ'îh, who were soon to give its character to Sunni theology.

Among the Mu'tazila theologians of the third century we may mention the following. At Baṣra the tradition of Abu 'I-l-Hudhâ'îl al-'Allâf was pro-

pagated by a flouri-ling school represented by Yâsuf b. 'Abd Allâh al-Shâhîh, Abû 'Alî al-

Aswâ'î and others. Abû b. Su-

laimân was the pupil of Hisâ'mân al-Fawâqî. Ibrâhîm b. Ismâ'il known as Ibn Ulaya (d. 218) was the pupil of al-Asâmm. The school of al-Nâzîm developed certain special doctrines which the later Mu'tazila rejected (Fadl al-Hadâ'îh and Ahmad b. Hâjî; Kitâb al-lattîsâr, p. 222—

223); and among the disciples of al-Nâzîm, we also find al-Dîjâhîz (q. v.). In the second half of the century, the most important Baṣra theologian was undoubtedly Abû 'Alî Mu'mâmad b. Abû al-Walâhâb al-Dîjâhîz (q. v.). In Baghâd we find in addition to the theologians already mentioned Tâ b. Su'hî al-Murîdî, contemporary of Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir; then "the two Dijâ'ars": Dijâ'ar b. Mubashshîr (d. 234) and Dijâ'ar
formed the subject of Mu'tazila activity. Their part in the history of the exegesis of the Qur'an is a very considerable one: it was they who introduced the strictly grammatical method. There is a very close connection between them and the philological school of Basan, the representatives of which in general taught Mu'tazila doctrines (e.g. al-Asma'i). The exegetical works of the Mu'tazila, for the most part now lost, were utilized to a large extent by their adversaries, e.g. Fakhr al-Din al-Razi. — All questions of ُال is vigorously discussed in the Mu'tazila schools; the influence of the Mu'tazila on the ُال is still to be examined. — Lastly the science of ُا certainty received various stimuli in the Mu'tazila criticism of the ُا ُا ُا.

M. : Mu'tazila theology is summed up under five principles (ُا) or fundamental doctrines which one must accept in their integrity to be recognized as a Mu'tazili (al-Mas'udi, ُا، वि. 22). As these were probably in origin the principal points in the programme of Mu'tazili propaganda, these ُا later became a kind of framework of speculative dogmatics.

1. ُا: the strictest profession of monothelism (against any kind of dualism); denial of all resemblance between Allāh and his creatures (against the anthropomorphisms of the ُا ُا on the one hand and those of the Rāifa and Manichaens on the other); the divine attributes recognized (against the Dāhiyya) but deprived of their real existence: they are not entities added to the divine being (this would be ُا: against the ُا among the ُا ُا but identical with the being (ُا, Abū 'l-Hudhai); allegorical interpretation of the anthropomorphisms of the Qur'an; denial of the beatific vision; vigorous affirmation of a personal God and creator (against the Dāhiyya); integral affirmation of the Revelation of the Prophet but distinction between a natural theology and a revealed theology. Problems discussed here: 1. The nature of God and his attributes: a. omnipresence: God is in all places, in the sense that he directs everything (Abū 'l-Hudhai); he is not in any place (general thesis); b. perceptibility: he is not perceived by the senses (thesis generally adopted) — he is perceived by the heart (Abū 'l-Hudhai) — he has a hidden ُا which will be perceived in another world with the help of a sixth sense which God will then create (Hāf al-Fard and others; thesis declared heretical); c. the attributes (eternal; names of the essence): identical with the essence (Abū 'l-Hudhai; thesis generally adopted) — inherent in the essence through ُا (Mu'ammār) — through ُا (Abū 'l-Hudhai); expressing positive aspects (Abū 'l-Hudhai and generally) — negative (knowledge: negation of ignorance etc.); 2. The structure of the created world: a. starting-point anthropology treated in a positive way (exact definition of religious duties) and negative (refutation of ُा ُा ُा ُा) man is the empirical phenomenon which we see, the body (ُا) which is composed of a certain number of indivisible entities (atoms) and which supports the accidents: life, the senses, colours etc.; ُا is ُा and distinct from ُا (Abū 'l-Hudhai) — man is composed of body (ُا) and ُا (identical with ُا) which are mutually interpenetrant (ُا ُا); the colours, senses, sensations, forms and spirits form different categories of ُا.
accidents; not atoms); all that is living forms a single category (muğdżanà) — man is an indivisible entity (gürvar) characterised by ḍawā, ḍam, ḍuṣra; the body is the instrument of this gürvar; the accidents (movement, rest, colours etc.) are inherent in it through muṣānî which are inherent in other muṣānî etc. in infinitum (Mu'âmr) — man is bâhî (Abûd b. Sulaiman) — the mîs is an instrument which the body uses; the râh is an accident (Dâ'far b. Hârîb) — the râh is a body and distinct from the life which is an accident (Dâ'far b. Hârîb); b. the physical world: dead nature is distinct from that which is living in as much as nature acts through ḍârâra while living beings act through their free will (iğhtîyaq); for the rest, the one and the other category are of the same structure, the problems of physics being those of anthropology (substance, accidents, bodies, atoms etc.); theory of suḥûr and kurnûn formulated by al-Nâzâmî and which correspond to his theory of penetration (mugdżahala); things are hidden one in the other, physical development consists in the hidden things becoming manifest (e.g. the fire hidden in the stone). 3. The relation between God and the created world: a. la'âla kâmuḏâgh bâhî: a rigorous distinction between bâhî and mugdżahî (no kurnû); b. the activities of God, the powers of his attributes, have for their objects the things of the created world. If these activities are eternal, the things ought to be so also; now these things are created i.e. put into existence after having been non-existent; several solutions of the problem: “thing” is only what exists and before the reaction the thing was not thing which implies that divine knowledge is born with the things (Dâ'far's thesis adopted by Hâshî al-Fuwâfî) — before the creation things were posited (iğhtîyaq) as non-existent in God’s eternal knowledge but without the accidents which characterise them in existence (al-kâmuḏâgh and others) — with these accidents (al-Kâluḏ, al-Kâluž and several theologians of Baghâtî [school of mugdżahî-miyyâ]), God created all things at one time, one in the other and these things are manifested in the created world one after the other (al-Nâzâmî); c. are the objects of divine knowledge and power limited? Yes (Abû 'l-Hudhairî) — no (the others); d. divine power does not extend to the accidents (Mu'âmr) — to the phenomena resulting spontaneously from human action (tawâlîdîd, see under asl al-âlî). 4. Revelation: prophecy: a prophet is muṣâmî, i.e. free from grave sins; b. the Kûlât; created; God creates the word in a substratum (la'âla al-umur al-fâzil; the Prophet; the hush etc.). The Kûlân is miraculous in composition and style — denied by al-Nâzâmî; distinction (which goes back to Wâsîl) between mugdżahî, the precepts of the Kûlân which are clear and without ambiguity and mugdżahî, the precepts which are not immediately clear and evident; distinction between mishîh and manisîh. 11. Aṣl al-âlî: God is just; all that he does aims at what is best for his creation (āṣlây); he does not desire evil and does not ordain it (umr and irřa identical). He has nothing to do with man’s evil deeds; all human actions result from man’s free will; man has a kâdiya and an istî')â kâba 'l-ḥâfiz; man will be rewarded for his good deeds and punished for his evil ones. Problems discussed here: 1. Divine power: a. can God commit an injustice? No: al-Nâzâmî — yes, but he does not: general thesis; b. theology: could God prevent evil? Yes, for he possesses a store of hidden grace (lîf) which would be sufficient to destroy evil completely at once: Bîhâr b. Al-Mu'âmrî and several Baghâtî theologians — no, for he always does what is best and wisest for his creation: general thesis. 2. Human power: created by God: physical evils, diseases etc. are not subject to the human will; man’s actions are movements; distinction between al-'âlî al-kâluḏî and al-'âlî al-gâsti; problem of tawâlîd stated by Abû 'l-Hudhairî and particularly discussed in the school of Baghâtî: the effects of an action are attributed to him who performs it, and even after his death he remains responsible for it. 3. Aṣl al-âlî wa 'l-tawâlîd (or al-rahîm wa 'l-râhîm): practical theology. Problems here discussed: a. belief and unbeliever: belief consists in all the acts of obedience, obligatory or supererogatory: sins (muṣâmî) are divided into grave (kâluḏî) and petty (mugdżahî); the following are kâluḏî: ṭâzâhî bî ṭâlêhî; taqâwun bî fi šūrûhû and taqâwun bî fi šūrûhû, ra'dâl al-adwa' al-umar al-rahîm; God of his grace may forgive (mugdżahî); he who is not a Muslim obeys God if he does something which God has commanded in the Kûlân (la'âla la yurāda 'l-nâhî bâhî); Abû 'l-Hudhairî’s thesis rejected by his school (al-adwa' or al-kâmuḏâgh school); distinction between among 'l-nâhî and imân it 'l-nâhî from Hâshî al-Fuwâfî onwards; belief consists in avoiding (kâluḏî) i.e. acts regarding which God has laid down a threat (tawâlîd); al-Nâzâmî; b. al-rahîm wa 'l-râhîm: the good (al-hâzanî) is what God has ordained in the Kûlân, evil (al-kâluḏî) what he has forbidden. Questions of fâkîh in general; c. Tradition: the authenticity of a tradition is only guaranteed by 20 believers one of whom is destined to Paradise; there are in each generation 20 believers who are free from grave sins (muṣâmî): Abû 'l-Hudhairî and Hâshî al-Fuwâfî: the tawâlîd does not necessarily presuppose believers: the Muslim community can agree upon what is an error or a mistake: al-Nâzâmî and others. 4. Aṣl al-manzila bâhî: 'l-manzilatîl;i. Problems of theocracy: a. the caliphate of Abû Bakr was legitimate but not based on a divine revelation: general thesis; b. superiority of Abû Bakr over 'Ali (Abû Bakr superior to O'mar, the latter to O'mâna, the latter to 'Ali): the old Başris and Thumâma; superiority of 'Ali to Abû Bakr: the Baghâtîs and some later Başris (al-Dâ'far) towards the end of his life; Abû Dâ'far; neutral attitude (tawaqîfî) on all that concerns the question of knowing who was entitled to the supremacy: Abû Bakr, O'mar or 'Ali: 'Ali superior to O'mâna: Wâsîl, Abû 'l-Hudhairî, Abû Hâshîm. 2. The problems of fâsîk: the old problem being no longer a live one, petty sins (al-nâhî bâhî) were discussed under this head. V. Aṣl al-âlî bî 'l-nâhî bâhî bî 'l-nâhî bâhî: programme of Mu'tazila activity before the coming of the 'Abbasids; the faith must be spread by the tongue, the hand and the sword; later this al-âlî is little discussed: al-Asâmî denies its obligatory character. Bibliography: Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten oder die Freidenker im Islam, Leipzig 1865; v. Kremer, Gesch. d. herrschenden Ideen des Islams, Leipzig 1868: Hotzma, De stridu over het dogma etc. Leyden 1875; Duncan B. Mac- donald, Development of Muslim Theology etc.

**AL-MUTAZILA** bi ‘Ilâm, ‘Abî ‘Abd al-Muhammad bi ‘Ilâm, (or al-Zubair) b. Di‘far, a ‘Abbâsid caliph, son of al-Mutawakkil and a slave-girl named Khâbi‘a. After al-Mustâ‘îb had been forced to abdicate, al-Mu‘az was proclaimed caliph on 4th Mu‘arram 252 (Jan. 25, 866). When he wanted to get rid of the two Turkish generals Waṣîf and Bâqî the younger, they got wind of his intentions and went back to Sîmarra. On the other hand, he succeeded in putting his brother and successor designate al-Mu‘ayyad to death and throwing the third brother Abd ‘Abd al-Muhammad into prison. In the following year Waṣîf was killed by the troops when they mutinied for their pay and he attempted to suppress them. After the death in Dhu ‘l-Kâdâ of 253 (Nov. 867) of the governor Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘izz (q.v.), troubles broke out in Baghda and in the following year Baghî was murdered at the caliph’s instigation. As the latter could not pay the troops they mutinied. Al-Mu‘az applied to his mother who possessed immense wealth, but she refused to help him and at the end of Radjab 255 (July 869) the cruel and faithless caliph was deposed. He was put in a subterranean dungeon where he died of starvation in 3 days at the age of 24. In his reign the dynasty of the Tâhîlîs was founded and Ya‘qûb b. Lâ‘î (q.v.) was recognised as governor of Siqîlî. The Khârijis were defeated by the Byzantines. Cf. also the article **AL-MUTAWAKKIL**. [Bibliography: Ibn Ktaba, Kitâb al-Ma‘ârîf, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 200; Ya‘qûbî, ed. Houtsm, ii. 593, 595, 605, 610–616; Tubart, ed. de Goede, iii. 1388 sqq.; Mas‘ûdî, Murîbî, ed. Paris, vii. 103, 273, 304, 346 sqq.; ix. 46, 52; Kitâb al-Ashârî, see Guidi, Tables alphabétiques; Ibn al-Ashîrî, ed. Tornberg, vii. 32 sqq.; Ibn al-Tikâkî, al-‘Askîrî, ed. Derenbourg, p. 312–335; Muhammad b. Shâkîr, Fatâ‘î al-Wasâyîr, ii. 185; Ibn Khâlîdî, al-Tâbîrî, iii. 287 sqq.; Weil, Gesch. d. Chasîfi, ii. 355, 374, 385 sqq.; Mur., al-Charîfî, its Rise, Decline, and Fall, p. 529 sqq.; Muller, Der Islam im Mesopotamien und Irland, i. 528 sqq.; Le Strange, Baghda during the ‘Abbâsid Caliphate, p. 177, 247, 311–313.]


In the equilateral triangle the base is called al-khâlî, the apex ad-dâ‘î, the sides al-dîlîn (see above), in the right-angled triangle the hypotenuse is called al-khîrî, i.e. “diameter” because the hypotenuse represents the diameter of the circle described around the right-angled triangle; for the two sides the term al-dîlîn is generally used. Muwadha‘alhâd al-muthallathât as a technical term
means trigonometry (cf. Dozy, Supplement, i. 163). 

MUTHALLATH (always with the feminine ending) is a technical term in astrology. Astrology divides the zodiacal circle (만주역 [q. v.]) into four muthallat (Gr. ἡ τρίγωνα, Lat. trigonon, trîgônon), each of which includes three signs 120° apart. These “are situated together in the trigonal plane” (tathlit, Gr. τριγωνικός, Lat. aspectus trirris); the word tathlit itself is frequently found as a synonym of muthallat, which comes from the same root (θη-θη) (cf. Dozy, op. cit., p. 162). 

In star nomenclature Krokobahal-muthallath is the constellation of the (northern) Triangle (in Estothenes Δεσμιά, in Ptolemy Τρίγωνον) which is adjoined in the east by Perseus, in the north by Andromeda. In the west by Pisces and in the south by Aries. According to Ptolemy (Almagest) and al-Saffi (ed. Schjellerup, p. 123 sq.), it consists of three stars of the third magnitude and one of the fifth. The star at the apex (a Trianguli) is an asteroidal star and is called Râ's al-muthallath. The latter name is found in Libros del sabedor de astronomia svo y D. Alfonso X de Castilla in the corrupted form a-selaedal. 


AL-MUṬI. [See ALLKH, ii.]

AL-MUṬI is the caliph, son of al-Mukhdhir (q. v.), brother of al-Râdi and of al-Muttaqi (q. v.). Al-Muṭi wrote a bitter enmity of al-Mustafâ (q. v.), and therefore went into hiding on the latter’s accession and after Mu’tuzz al-Dawla (q. v.) had become the real ruler, al-Muṭi is said to have taken refuge with him and incited him against al-Mustafâ. After the deposition of the latter in Djiinâd II or Shâhâdan 334 (Jan. or March 946) al-Muṭi was recognised as caliph. His reign marks a very unfortunate period in the history of the ’Abbasids. The caliph himself had not the slightest authority; the power was in the hands of Mu’tuzz al-Dawla and after his death (356 = 967) in those of his son Bahktyâr. The Fâtimids were growing more and more powerful and the Sâmânis also declined to recognise al-Muṭi as the legitimate suzerain. The Hamdânis were weakened by their wars with the Bâyids and the Fâtimids. In Bahgâd the Sumânis and Shîfs were fighting one another, and several Shia usages were introduced by the Bâyids who had ’Alid sympathies. At last the weak and sickly caliph was forced by the Turks to abdicate in favour of his son Abd al-Karim al-Târî (13th Dhu ’l-Ka‘b 363 = August 5, 974). Al-Muṭi died in Muharram 364 (September–October 974) in Darî al-Ṣâlit. 


MUTLAK (a.), pāt. pass. IV from l-lk, “to loose the bond (liad) of an animal, so as to let it free” (e.g. Muslim, Dhîhâd, trad. 46; Abû Dawûd, Dhîhâd, bâb 100). The term is also applied to the loosening of the bowstring (Bukhrî, Dhîhâd, b. 170), of the garments, the hair etc. Thence the common meaning absolute, as opposed to restricted (muktafiyad), and further the accusative muktâlah “absolutely”. The use of the term is so widely diffused, that a few examples only can be given. 

In grammar the term muktafî al-muṭâlak denotes the absolute object (cognate accusative), i.e. the objectivized verb of the sentence, such as a sitting in the sentence: he sat a sitting. 

In dogmatics the term is applied to existence. So al-muktafî al-muṭâlak denotes Allah, as opposed to His creation, which does not possess existence in the deepest sense. 

In ontology the term is also applied to existence (muktafî) in connection with the question of the nature of the latter. Here al-muktafî al-muṭâlak is opposed to al-muktafî al-muṣâlâh li-l-muṣâlâh. See the art. MANTIK, supra p. 259. 

In other surrounding terms the term has the meaning “general” as opposed to khâtî (cf. the definition in Aljârân’s Tûrûfî: Muṭâlak denotes the one without specification. Cf. further the Dictionary of the Technical Terms. 


AL-MUTTAKI is the caliph, son of al-Mukhdhir (q. v.) and a slave-girl named Khâlîbû. In Rabî‘ I 329 (Dec. 940) he succeeded his brother al-Râdi (q. v.); by this time the caliphate had sunk so low that five days passed after the death of al-Râdi before steps were taken to choose his successor. Al-Muttaqi at once confirmed the Amir al-Umarî Bîdjeck (q. v.) in office; after his death however, the Turks and Duluam in the army began to quarrel with one another. Abu ‘Abd Allâh al-Bardî (see AL-BARDI) seized the capital but could only hold it a few weeks. He was driven out by the Duluam chief Kûrtgein who however was soon overthrown by Ibn Râkî (q. v.). When Abu ‘Abd Allâh sent his brother, Abu ‘Husam with an army against Bahgâd, the caliph and Ibn Râkî escaped to al-Mawsîl to the Hamdânis (Djiinâd II 330 = Feb.—March 942). After the assassination of Ibn Râkî the Hamdânis Abu Muhammad al-Hasan was appointed Amir al-Umarî and received the honorific title of Nâsîr al-Dawla. The occu-
pation of Baghdad offered him no difficulty; the Turkish general Tuzun rebelled a little later and Nasir al-Dawla had to evacuate the capital which was entered by Tuzun in Ramadán 331 (June 943) as Amīr al-Umnā. Al-Muttaqi soon found himself forced to seek the protection of the Ḥanjūlūn again and at the beginning of the following year (autumn 943) he fled to al-Mawsil. Then he settled in al-Rakka but when Tuzun made peace with Nasir al-Dawla, al-Muttaqi appealed for help to the Ishshīdī of Egypt; the latter came to al-Rakka in Rashīb 332 (March 944); the negotiations however were unsuccessful and finally the caliph put his trust in Tuzun, who after a few days of his loyalty by the most sacred oaths had him blinded (Ṣafar 333 = Oct. 944). Al-Muttaqi was then declared to have been deposed. He died in Shādhān 357 (July 696).

Bibliography: Masūdī, Murayjī, ed. Paris, viii. 344–376; ix. 48. 52; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, viii. 275 sq.; Ibn al-Tiktašī, al-Fahštī, ed. Dermen, p. 385–388; Ibn Ḥalūdīn, al-Fahštī, i. 349 sqq.; Well, Gesch. d. Chasitan, ii. 680 sqq.; Muller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, i. 566 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate in its Rise, Decline, and Fall, II, p. 575 sqq.; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abasid Caliphate, p. 263 in the series of Muslims only paid a tenth of the yield. The muwalladin were of special importance in Muslim Spain, especially from the time of Abd al-Rahmān II, when conversions to Islam became more and more numerous. Some even retained their old family names (Banū Angelino, Banū Sabancio). This section of the population among whom were often crypto-christians (Christiani occulti) played the largest part in the frequent revolutions against Muslim authority in Spain.

The post-classical poets were called muwalladin in contrast to the Isalmīn, their language was no longer considered a model of grammar, lexicography and prosody. The boundary between the two lies about the end of the first century. Among the best known muwalladin were al-Buṭāri, al-Mutnabhait and, according to some, also al-Farazdak and Djiyari.


MUWASHSHAḤ, Muwaṣṣiḥa or Tawshih, an ode or poem intended to be sung, is so called by comparison with the ṣāḥibī, which is a double belt ornamented with pearls and rubies or a band of leather studded with pearls which a woman wears across her body from the shoulder to the opposite hip, thus going round the body. The muwaṣṣiḥa is composed of two parts one of which contains complete lines and the other hemistiches.

The muwaṣṣiḥa, which belongs to the “seven kinds or branches” (ja‘alin) considered to be post-classical, is composed according to the rules of the purest syntax.

The muwaṣṣiḥa is divided into “stanzas”, the technical name of which is not exactly settled; they are usually called ḥusn or hatt. In its most perfect form, it usually begins with one or two lines, a sort of prelude to the actual poem; this prelude is called muwaṣṣiḥ, ḥusn or muflā;
also sometimes find the taqfi', if it is a distich, the first hemistiches of each verse rhyme together and the two second hemistiches also. If A be the rhyme of the first hemistich and B that of the second, the madḥhab or ḡunṣn is of the following form:

2 lines
A   A   B
A   A   B

1 line
A   A   B

After the madḥhab or ḡunṣn come the stanzas proper called: ḏū' or ḥāṣt.

The ḏū' or ḥāṣt contains two parts: the first consisting of a varying number of hemistiches with the same or alternate rhymes, which however are never those of the madḥhab or ḡunṣn. This first part is called dawr or simṭ. The second part which is exactly like the madḥhab or ḡunṣn, both as regards number of lines and rhymes, is called ḵāfa or ḥūṣṭ. The stanza therefore presents the following form:

First type
C   C
C   C
A   B

Second type
C   D
C   C
D   D
C   D
A   B
A   B

The rhyme or rhymes of the dawr or simṭ vary from one stanza to another; but those of the ḵāfa are always as those of the madḥhab or ḡunṣn. The ḵāfa is a sort of refrain which does not fail to make an impression on the listeners by the repetition of the same sounds and rhythms.

These are the most usual models of the muwaṣṣelah, but the poets, not being bound by hard and inflexible rules, have, each according to his temperament, exercised their imagination considerably in this genre.

Thus Ibn Sanā’ al-Mulk composed a poem in which the first foot of each hemistich is ʃūlūn and has the same rhyme as the hemistich of which it forms part. This is the scheme:

madḥhab
or ḡunṣn
A   A   A
A   A   A

dawr
or simṭ
B   B   B
B   B   B

ḵāfa
A   A   A
C   C   C
C   C   C
A   A   A

etc.

The blind poet of Tūdelā shortened the hemistiches which gives a more lively rhythm:

A   A   B
A   C   B
A   A   B
A   C   B

It would be wearisome to give all the forms of stanzas which are found in the muwaṣṣelah. From the point of view of metre, very great variety is found. Martin Hartmann recognised 146 which may go back to the 16 classical metres. Three other types which are found do not seem to be derived from any well defined form:

muṣarrat new type
muṣarrat new type approaching the ḵhalab
muṣarrat new type approaching ʿal-faṣnad
a type which might be connected with ḍū'at.

From the historical point of view, Freytag thinks that the muwaṣṣelah belongs to an old type which has now disappeared. There is certainly no doubt that the pre-Islamic poets composed poems similar to the muwaṣṣelah; these are known as muṣarrat; we find here again the word simṭ applied to the longest part of the stanza or couplet of the muwaṣṣelah.

The muṣarrat began with an opening line with taqfi’; then came four hemistiches rhyming together on a different rhyme from the first line; next came a fifth hemistich rhyming with the first and completing the stanza. A new stanza followed with four hemistiches not rhyming with those of the first stanza; it ended with a hemistich rhyming with the opening line. Here is the scheme:

A   A   A
B   B   B
C   C   C
C   C   C
A

Imrū ʿl-Ḵais is said to have composed a piece of this nature but it does not seem to be genuine. The inventor of the muwaṣṣelah is said to have been Muḥammad b. Muʿāṣar, a poet at the court of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Mawṣūm who ruled in Spain (275–300 = 888–913). He was followed by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīḥī, author of al-ʿlād al-ṣawīn. Their muwaṣṣelah are however believed to be lost.

The first to shine in this genre was ʿUḥdāt al-Karzāz, a poet of al-Muṭāz-im b. ʿṢumāḥ, prince of Almeria. Al-ʿAṣam al-Ḫataywāsī records that he heard Abū Bakr b. Zuhri say: "All the composers of muwaṣṣelah are simply children beside ʿUḥdāt al-Karzāz". In the opinion of all men of letters no contemporary writer could rival ʿUḥdāt al-Karzāz in the days of the muwaṣṣelah al-faṣnad.

After him comes Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ibrāhīm Ṣaṣāh, the court poet of al-Maʿmūn b. Ḍhūʾ l-ʿNān, prince of Toledo. In the time of the Almoravid dynasty there flourished a group of poets among whom may be mentioned the blind poet of Tūdelā, Ibn Baṣṭī, Abū Bakr b. al-Abyād, Abū Bakr b. Bāḥja.

In the time of the Almohads the most famous
composers of muwashshah were Muhammad b. Abu l-Fadl and Ibn Ha'if. At a later period we have Ibrahim b. Salih al-Isra'ili, a poet of Seville and of Cordoba, Ibn Khalaf al-Djazaerti (of Algiers), Ibn Khazar of Bougie, the viceroy and celebrated man of letters, Lisân al-Dîn b. al-Khâtib.

Eastern poets have followed those of Spain. One of them, Ibn Sanâ' al-Mulk al-Miṣrî (525–608 = 1156–1212), acquired a reputation in both east and west.

As to the subjects of the muwashshah they are the same as those of the traditional ḥâfīzāt: but as they are composed with the definite object of being sung to the accompaniment of stringed instruments they are usually love-poems.

On the musical origins of the muwashshah see the article TIK.


(MOI: BENNET)

AL-MUZAFFAR, the honorific laṣūbi by which the second of the ʿAmirid dictators of Muslim Spain is best known, was the son of the celebrated al-Maṣāfair and the grandson of the famous Al-Maṣâfair. He was invested with the office of ḥâfîz by the caliph Hishâm II, on the death of his father, on 25th Ramadan 392 (Aug. 10, 1002) and ruled as absolute master of the territory of al-Andalus until his death of angina as he was setting out on an expedition against Castile on 16th Safar 399 (Oct. 20, 1008).

The relatively short period of the ḥâfīzate of ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muṣaffar was untill quite recently almost unknown for lack of documents and in his

History, Dory had to pass it over almost in silence in spite of its importance in the history of the early xith century in Spain. I have been able in the course of recent years to fill this gap, thanks to the discovery of accounts of the ḥâfīzate of al-Muṣaffar in the Dhakhîra of Ibn Bassûm and the Bayân of Ibn ʿIdhârī and the unpublished chapter devoted to him by Ibn al-Khâṭib in his Fâmil al-Islâm. The result is the discovery that the septennial of ʿAbd al-Malik was for Muslim Spain a period of peace and prosperity, a regular golden age, just on the eve of the first upheavals which preceded the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate; the chroniclers compare this period to the first week of a marriage (ṣâbî al-ʿawârî; cf. Dory, Suppl. Dict. Ar., i. 629–627).

Al-Muṣaffar had actually left his son and successor an empire not only completely pacified and solidly organised but also enjoying an economic prosperity hitherto unprecedented. ʿAbd al-Malik aimed at following scrupulously the line of conduct laid down for him in father's last wishes: to preserve and justify the popularity of the ʿAmirid regime by peace at home and the continual harassing of the Christian foe beyond the marches (layâkîr). Every year of Muṣaffar's rule was therefore marked by a summer expedition (ṣâfâa) or a winter one (ṣâfîya); in 393 (1003) he led his armies against Catalonia (Bidâd al-Ifrâqîyà), laid waste the country round Barcelona and destroyed 35 strongholds before returning to Cordova; in 395 (1005) an expedition was led against Castile by the ḥâfīz; in the following year his objective was the town of Pampeluna [q. v.], which he seems to have approached but not reached; in 397 (1007) took place, against Catalonia, the expedition known as the "victorious" (qāṣīt al-ṣāyār): ʿAbd al-Malik forced his way into Clunia and carried off a vast booty. This triumph earned for him from the nominal sovereign the title of "Victrix" (al-Muṣaffar) which henceforth replaced his previous laṣûbe of Saff al-Dawla. In the course of the winter of 398 (1007–1008) there was an expedition which ended in the capture of a castle of San Martin which has not been identified. The last expedition undertaken by him as mentioned above came to nothing and at least enabled him to judge his father on the way to wage war on the infidel.

At home al-Muṣaffar maintained intact the strong administrative organisation which dated from the reign of ʿAbd al-Râhmân III [cf. UMAYYADS, ii.] which al-Muṣâbî had maintained intact, while removing from it the representatives of the Arab aristocracy. On his accession to office, he won the good graces of the Cordovans by reducing taxes by a sixth. He was easily able to dispose of several conspiracies against him. He left to his brother ʿAbd al-Râhmân Sancho a heritage which the latter might easily have preserved if he had not at once exacerbated his subjects against him by displaying a hateful partiality and attempting to arrogate to himself the caliphate completely.

MUZAFFAR B. 'ALI. [See 'IMRÂN B. SHIHAB.]

MUZAFFAR AL-DIN, fifth Sháh of Persia of the Kádjar [q.v.] dynasty, was born on March 25, 1853. He was Sháh Náṣir Al-Din's second son, the eldest son Zul al-Sultán being of lower birth by his mother. As crown prince Muẓaffar al-Din had been some time governor of Ardabil, and (a description of him as crown prince in Coat of Persia and the Persian Question, l. 413). After his father's assassination Muẓaffar al-Din was enthroned on June 5, 1896. With this new reign the rivalry between England and Russia for commercial and political influence in Persia became ever more apparent. The sympathy of the high officials, which was divided between the two powers, and the economic and military strength of the country was since long too weak to enable Persia to follow an independent policy. Under the relatively strong rule of Náṣir Al-Din popular discontent with the increasing misery had been suppressed; the new Sháh, however, though well-intentioned, did not possess the character of a strong ruler and, besides, did nothing to check the extravagancy of the court. His financial difficulties made Persia the debtor of Russia; in 1898, 1900 and 1901 considerable loans were given by Russia, guaranteed by large parts of the custom receipts, the collecting of the custom duties being administered by Belgian officials. A good deal of the borrowed money was used for the expensive journeys to Europe undertaken by the Sháh in 1900, 1902 and 1905. In the meantime, the condition of the people became more and more miserable; headed by some influential merchants and some high ecclesiastics they protested against the heavy taxes and the tariffs as fixed in the commercial agreements with Russia and England of 1893. The growing discontent took several forms; some wished to call in the Turkish Sultan as Caliph and at other times there were outbreaks against the Brits in Yazd and Iyābāh. Besides there were special grievances against several high officials, amongst them the chief Belgian inspector of taxes. In December 1905 a popular movement took place in Ìrān Al-Dawla (since 1903). An ever increasing number of merchants, mulla's and citizens took refuge (harr) in the shrine of Sháh 'Abd al-'Azm. At last the Sháh promised 'Ain al-Dawla's dismissal and some reforms, but in the course of the following year none of these promises were fulfilled. So in 1906 the discontentment reached again a culminating point, directed this time by some more or less secret patriotic associations. In July large crowds of the people of the capital went with the mullahs to Ìrmán, to take refuge in the sanctuary there; at the same time the British Legation accorded asylum to a considerable number of merchants and citizens. The results were that on July 30 'Ain al-Dawla was dismissed and that on August 5, all the demands of the protesting people were granted, including a constitution. The ecclesiastical leaders returned from Ìrmán. There followed some friction with the government about the elections and other matters, but at last, on October 7, 1906, the first Persian Majles or National Assembly was opened by the Sháh. The new Majles had to face immediately some difficult problems and showed from the beginning its determination not to be a mere toy in the hands of the court party. Progress was hampered, however, by dissensions amongst clerical and non-clerical members of the popular party, while there were disturbances, in Tabrīz, owing to the tyranny of the crown prince Muḥammad 'Ali. The Constitution (Kānānā-ı Âbâ; q.v.) was ratified by the Sháh only on December 30, 1906. Muẓaffar al-Din himself died on January 8, 1907 after a long illness, leaving his country to the eventual reign of Muḥammad 'Ali Sháh.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

MUZAFFARIDS, a Persian dynasty. Their ancestors came from Araba and had settled in Khurásán at the time of the Muslim conquest, where they lived for several centuries. On the approach of the Mongols, the emir Ghiyáth al-Din Hāджdji, with his three sons 'Abd Bârî Muhammad and Manṣūr, retired to Yazd. The two first named entered the service of the Atabeg of Yazd, 'Alâ al-Dawla, and when Hulâgū [q.v.] marched on Baghdad, 'Abd Bârî followed him with 300 horse. After the capture of Baghdad he was sent with an army to the Egyptian frontier. Here he fell in an encounter with the Arab tribe of Khafadja whereupon his brother Muhammad succeeded him as a vassal of the Atabeg of Yazd while Manṣūr remained with his father in the little town of Ma'bûdî near Yazd. Manṣūr had three sons, Ma'bûrî al-Din Muhammad, Zain al-Din 'Ali and Shâraf al-Din Muẓaffar, the latter of whom became the ancestor of the dynasty of the Muẓaffarids. Appointed governor of Ma'bûdî by Yüsuf Sháh, 'Alâ al-Dawla's son and successor, he cleared the hills of the robber bands from Shirāz and when Yüsuf Sháh, who had put to death the envoys of the Ikhân Arghûd had to take to flight and went to Sīstân, Muhammad followed him but left him on the way and went on to Kirmân where he was kindly received by Sultan Djalâl al-Din Sûrgâhatshîn Kâra Khâdî (685 = 1285—1287). After some time he returned to Yazd and was presented to Arghûn who took him into his service. He was also on good terms with Arghûn's successors Gaikhihound and 4îshâh. The latter appointed him amûr-ı hâzâra "commander of a thousand", and after the accession of Ulujjâli (703 = 1303—1304) he was given custody of the roads from Ardistan to Kirmân-shâh and from Herât and Marw to Aâbakûh. Ma'bûzaffar died on 13th Dhu l-Ka'b 713 (March 1, 1314). He was succeeded by his 13 year old son Ma'bûriz al-Din Muhammad who is described as brave and devout but at the same time cruel, bloodthirsty and treacherous. He continued to live at the court of Ulujjâli; opened the latter's death in Shiwal 716 (Dec. 3136) and the accession of his son 'Abî Sâ'îd he returned to Ma'bûdî. Along with the lord of the southern coast of Persia, the emir Kâhihsar b. Maḥmûd Shâh Indîj, he very soon fell upon the Atabeg of Yazd, Hâджdji Shâh, and succeeded in taking
the town from him (718 or 719 = 1318 or 1319). A short time after this event the people of Si-tan, the Nikádars, arose in rebellion; Muhammad attacked them and their leader Nawroz was defeated and slain. The rebels however gathered together again and Muhammad had to fight no less than 21 battles before they were finally suppressed. After the death of Abu Sa`id (730 = 1335-1336), complete chaos began and pretenders arose in different parts of the wide empire. The emir Abú Isfahán b. Muhammad Sháh Ilyásh endeavored to take the town of Yazd but was driven back. After some time Muhammad took this province from the Mongol governor in Kirmán, Malik Kuthb al-Din. In the end however, Abú Isfahán succeeded in taking Shiraz and had the khánqah read and coins struck in his name. In Sárat 748 (May—June 1347) he set out to subjugate Kirmán and laid waste Singán, but returned when he heard that Muhammad was ready to offer vigorous resistance to his advance. One of the wipers of Abú Isfahán then undertook a campaign against Kirmán but was defeated, whereupon Abú Isfahán put himself at the head of a new army and marched on Kirmán to take vengeance on Muhammad. But this effort also failed; Abú Isfahán was completely defeated and had to take to flight. In 751 (1350—1351) he went to Yazd and began to besiege the town but, returned, having achieved nothing. In spite of all his failures however, Abú Isfahán never lost heart. In the following year he sent a new army under the emir Beg Dálatz to Kirmán and when the latter met Muhammed on the plain of Pandj Angusht in Dálamát 753 (June—July 1352) a battle resulted. Dálatz was defeated. Muhammad followed up his victory, went to Shiraz and laid siege to it. On the 3rd Shawwal 754 (Nov. 1, 1353), the governor had to surrender and Abú Isfahán fled to Isfahán. In the following year Muhammad took the oath of homage to the Abbásíd caliph in Egypt. Isfahán was now besieged. But as Muhammad had also to deal with other rebels, the siege was somewhat prolonged. Resistance was in the end overcome and the town had to surrender. At the same time Abú Isfahán fell into his hands and was at once executed (21st Dálamát 757 or 758 = May 22, 1356 or May II, 1357). After Muhammad had defeated all his enemies and become undisputed lord of Fárs and the ʻIrák, an envoy appeared from the ruler of the Golden Horde, Dájján Beg Khán b. Uzbek Khán, who announced that the Khán had taken Tabriz and wanted Muhammad to send a representative to the ʻIrák. Muhammad therefore sent Abú Dálatz to Tabriz and he decided to take the town. Soon afterwards the news of Dájján Beg’s death arrived; Muhammad at once set out and met Abú Dálatz at Muşána in Ablharbadán. The latter was defeated and Muhammed entered Tabriz. But as a large army was approaching from Baghdad he dared not remain but decided to begin to retreat. In Kamal 759 (Aug. 1359) he was surprised and taken prisoner by his own son Sháh Shuljá, who believed he was supported and ill-treated by his father, in concert with some other relatives. Muhammad was blinded and kept in prison for several years until his death at the end of Kabr 765 (Jan. 1364) at the age of 65. He was succeeded, by Sháh Shuljá, who shortly before his death appointed his son Zain al-ʻÁbidín ʻAli his successor in Shirāz and gave his brother ʻImád al-Dín Aḥmad b. Muḥammad the governorship of Kirmán. As soon as Zain al-ʻÁbidín had begun to reign his cousin Sháh Yáhýá b. Sháraf al-Din Muṣafar set out from Isfahán to attack him. Fortunately however, the threatened war was averted by a friendly agreement; but Sháh Yáhýá could not stay long in Isfahán; he was driven out by the turbulent andickle inhabitants and fled to Yazd whereupon Zain al-ʻÁbidín appointed his paternal uncle Muṣafar-i Káshi governor of Isfahán. In 789 (1385-1386) an envoy from Timúr arrived in Kirmán bringing assurances of his peaceful and friendly intentions and Sultan Aḥmad hastened to offer his humble homage to the powerful conqueror. In Shawwal 789 (Oct.—Nov. 1387) it was reported that Timúr had invaded the ʻIrák and that Muṣafar-i Káshi had given him the keys of the towns and fortresses whereupon Zain al-ʻÁbidín left Shirāz and went to Baghdad while Sháh Yáhýá endeavoured to procure suitable gifts to pacify Timúr and ordered that a sufficient sum should be paid out to maintain his army. But when Timúr’s officials appeared in Isfahán to take the money, they were attacked and killed by the citizens. In consequence the Mongols carried out a dreadful massacre among the people of ʻIsfahán, in which 200,000 were said to have perished. Timúr then went to Fârs and confirmed Sultan Aḥmad as lord of Fârs, the ʻIrák and Kirmán, whereupon he returned to Samarkand. When Zain al-ʻÁbidín had left Shirāz, he met his cousin Sháh Manṣúr b. Sháraf al-Din Muṣafar at Shâstâ and was at first welcomed, then suddenly attacked and imprisoned. Sháh Manṣúr was now able to occupy Shirāz without opposition, while Sháh Yáhýá retired to Yazd. After the former had established himself securely in Shirāz Zain al-ʻÁbidín was released by his jâles and brought to Isfahán. The people welcomed him. In the meanwhile he had been persuaded by Sháh Yáhýá to combine with Sultan Aḥmad to take vengeance on Sháh Manṣúr. The plan failed however, the allies were defeated and Sháh Manṣúr seized the whole of the ʻIrák. When Zain al-ʻÁbidín wanted to escape to Khorāsán, he was treacherously seized by the governor of al-Kayr and brought to Shâstâ of which at once he had himself blinded. The latter then tried to form a coalition against Timúr. In 795 (1392) however, Timúr left his winter quarters in Mazendaran and marched on Shâstâ. After storming Kâlār Sefid which was considered impregnable he marched on Shâh Manṣúr’s capital and a battle was fought near Shirāz. Although Sháh Manṣúr’s chief emir abandoned him with most of his troops, the battle lasted till far into the night. The undismayed Mongolf had fought with desperate courage, but finally fell in the melee, after fighting his way to Timúr and giving him two cuts with his sword which however the strong helmet of the Mongol leader averted; nevertheless Timúr a week later (Rajab 795 = May 1393) had all the Mongolards executed.

MUZÀWADJÀ, a term in rhetoric (bàşî) which means the association of two things in the relation of condition (çarkî) and result (çâzî) and then employing the same combination for two things in the same conditions. Here is an example from the Dîwân of al-Buḫṭûrî (Cairo 1329, p. 317):

Ilti ' hazırâb yâcuman ja-fâjût dinûbuta taqâkkâbr al-turâb fâ-jâfût damât alâh.

"When they (the horsemen) are one day fighting and their blood flows in profusion, they remember then bonds of kinship and their tears flow abundantly". The poet associates fighting with recalling bonds of kinship in the two parts of the conditional statement, then he completes the first by adding their blood flows in profusion and the second by saying their tears flow abundantly.


(Al-MuHDînî)

MUZÀDÎFîA, a place roughly halfway between Mi'nâ and Arafât where the pilgrims returning from Arafât spend the night between the 9th and 10th of the Hajj, after performing the two evening salâts. On the next morning they set off before sunrise and climb up through the valley of Muḥassar to Mi'nâ. Other names for this place are al-Mâṣîâr al-kârâmîn, from Sûra ii. 194 and Dâ'ân' (cf. Lâlît Dâ'ân: Ibn Sâd, ii. 129, 6); but Dâ'ân', according to another statement, comprises the whole stretch between Arafât and Mi'nâ, both included, so that Yawm Dâ'ân (Kühânîn al-Ṭâlîbîn, vi. 30, 11) is explained as the day of Arafât and Yawm Dâ'ân as the days of Mi'nâ. The rites associated with the night of Muždîfîa go back to the old pagan period, which the Arabs themselves recognise when they introduce the kindling of the sacred fire in this night and say that guiding of the departure for Mi'nâ is a privilege of the family of Adâwîn.

The sacred place in Muždîfîa was the hill of Kûzâ [q.v.]. Even after Muḥammad in deliberate contrast to the pagan practice had declared all Muždîfîa to be muwafîq [cf. ʾâqî, ʾi., ʾa.], this hill retained its ancient sanctity. According to Azaḳî, there was a thick round tower upon it on which the Muždîfîa fire was kindled; in the time of Hârûn al-Rashîd it was a fire of wood; later it was illuminated with wax-candles. In the Muṣlîm period a mosque was built about 400 yards from the tower, of which Azaḳî gives a detailed description while Muḥkaddas speaks of a place of prayer, a public fountain and a minaret. Burton also mentions a high isolated tower at Muždîfîa but the illumination in the night of Muždîfîa now takes place on the mosque.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hûdîjât, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 77; Ibn Sâd, ed. Sachau, i/1. 41; ii/1. 125, 129; Taβârî, ed. de Goeje, i. 1105, 1755:


(Al-MuHDînî)

MUZÀDÎFÎ means among philologists the use of two terms in which the form of one is changed to make it resemble that of the other. For example in this hadîth (Ibn Madâja, Sunan, Cairo 1313, ii. 240): inâ'îna muṣâârat âshir muṣâârat, "return home laden with sin and not with rewards", the word muṣâârat from the root wa-w-r has been changed into muṣâârat to give it the same form as muṣâârat.

It is similar in the phrases (cf. Lišûn, xiii. 353):女性朋友 wa-aš'îyâh, khâlîdayînât wa-'aš'îyâhânt, bi-šâ'ârâyâ wa-'aš'îyâh "mornings and evenings" in which the form of the first word has been adapted to that of the second.

The Muždîfî, among rhetoricians, consists in establishing a kind of alliteration between two adjacent words having the same form, the same metrical quantity and the same rhyme (rasûs); e.g. in this verse of the Kurâ' (xxvi. 22): wâjûtuka min Sâbîn bi-naba'ta'T "I have brought thee news from Sabâ' where we have the resemblance between Sâbîn and naba'ta'. We may give as another example this hadîth (Ibn al-İbrâhîm al-Nabîyû, Cairo 1111, iv. 291 under 'a.-y.): al-muninnînâ hâlinâna laînînâ "Believers are peaceable and mild in character" and the phrase (cf. Lišûn, xvii. 280, 331): ha'mân laînà, hâyînîn laîyînà.

The object of the muždîfî among poets is to make the hemistichs of a poem rhyme together two by two. As a rule, it is only used in didactic urðîsas (like the Alfiya of Ibn Mâlik); al-'Amîlî, however, in his Kâfîkîl (Cairo 1302) has used it with the waqîf and ramâl metres (p. 76, 78, 83). In Persian and Turkish, it is called maṭbûwâni (maṭbou), and composed in the metres ramâl, hâjasî and muta-kârîb. In this kind of composition, it is necessary that the last foot of the two hemistichs should be alike. Among the Arabs there is a kind of poem in the waqîf metre (and sometimes some verses follow strictly the sârî metre) called muždîfîyyât (a collection of them was published in Cairo in 1299); they consist of strophes of five hemistichs in which the first four hemistichs rhyme together and the fifth have a common rhyme. Sometimes the strophes have only four hemistichs, the first three rhyming together and the fourth rhyming jointly as in al-Fîlâm bi-Muṣâârât al-Kâlûm of Ibn Mâlik (Cairo 1329) and Nâlî al-'Arab fi Muṣâârât al-arab of Ḥasan Kowâdir al-Khâtîbî (Bâbâk 1301).


(Al-MuHDînî)
AL-MUZZAMMIL, title of sūra lxviii., taken from the first verse: “O thou wrapped up,” viz. Muḥammad, who wrapped himself up in his garment or was wrapped up by others. For explanations of the allusion cf. Sale’s note as well as the commentaries on the Qurān. Variants of al-muzzamīl, which stands for al-muttaṣamīl, are al-muzzamīl, al-muzzamīl (Baidawi).


NABATAEANS, an Arab people who lived in ancient times in Arabia Petraea. — As early as the seventh century B. C. the Nabataeans are mentioned by Assurbanipal (Keiltreue, Bibl., ii. 216 sqq.). Whether the Nebayoth of the Old Testament are to be identified with them is uncertain (against the identification: Noldeke in Schenkel’s Bibellexicon, s. v. Nabatae; for it amongst others: Musil, Arabia Deserta, New York 1927, p. 492). The Nabataeans were never completely subjected either by the Assyrians, or by the Medes, Persians or the Macedonian kings (Diodor. ii. 48). In 312 B.C. Antigonus sent two expeditions against them without success. They were then a nomadic people of shepherds and traders, with a few natural fortresses like Petra, Boṣra, Salkhad, al-Hijr which served as depots for their arms and riches. Living round the Dead Sea they exploited from time to time the remunerative asphalt deposits on its eastern shore. They were often on friendly terms with their neighbours; e.g. with the Jews under the Maccabees and especially with the Salamians (Arab. Salaim, cf. Yaqṣīt, Mālḫum, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 594, s. v. Birma), with whom according to Stephanus Byzantios and the testimony of the Nabataean inscriptions, they were in close alliance (cf. Sulaim b. Mansur and B. Moiher, Salamit, in Pauly-Wissowa’s Realencyk., vol. i. A. col. 1524 sqq.). The capital of the kingdom, called Nabāṭa in the inscriptions, was Petra on the Draṣáh (Hāram, according to Noldeke (Z. D. M. G. xxv. 259 sq.) Hebrew Selā, Arab. Ḥan Salā in the Wadi Māṣā in the hills of al-Shārā (Yaṣīt, Mālḫum, iii. 117; 13; Mughṭarik, p. 525 sq.,) while Musil (Arabia Petraea, ii/i. 337, note 2, on p. 318) identifies this with Ḳāṣir es-Selā. The ruins reveal a peculiar mixture of Nabataean and Hellenistic architecture while they have yielded remarkably few Nabataean inscriptions (on these see Dalman, Petra und seine Nachbarn, 1908; do., Neue Petra-Forschungen, 1912; Bachmann, Watzinger, Wiegand, Petra, 1921; A. B. W. Kennedy, Petra, its History and Monuments, 1925).

The Nabataean kingdom comprised the lands of southern and eastern Palestine as well as Idumaea and Petraea, from 88 B.C. also Ḥawārā; twice (85 B.C. and c. 34—62 A.D., perhaps also in the interval, cf. Mommsen, Rom. Gesch., v. 476, note 3), Damascus also belonged to it [cf. i., p. 903]. In the southwest it stretched over the ancient Median as far as the coast of the Red Sea where Ḫobodat I founded the town of Ḥawārā (Steph. Byz., s. v. Ḫawārā, probably = Ḫawārā, now perhaps al-Ḥawārā), in the interior as far as al-Ula (Dedan) and al-Hijr [q. v.] on the frontier of the Ḫijāz. The Nabataeans also penetrated into the nome of Arabia in the eastern Nile delta as an inscription from Tell el-Sughāfītā in the Wādī Tūmīlāt shows (Clermont-Ganneau, Les Nababtains en Egypte, in Recueil d’Arch. Or., viii. [1924], p. 229—257). A number of their kings can be dated with approximate exactness: Ḥārīḥat (Aretas) I 169 b.c., Ḥārīḥat II c. 110—96, Ḫobodat (Obodas) I c. 90, Ṭababbal (Rabilos) I c. 57, Ḥārīḥat III (Māḥruṣ [Philellus]) c. 86—62, Ḫobodat II (110—67), Malḵu (Mālku) c. 17—70, 106 A.D.; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil, viii. 247). The real founder of their power is said to have been king Erotimos, who is probably the same as Ḥārīḥat III whose reign fell in the period of decline of the Seleucid empire (E. Taubler, in Klio, x. 251—253). As “allies,” the Nabataeans were able to maintain to some extent their independence of the Romans. At a very early date, like the Palmyrans, they attained through their trade the position of monopolists in Neaer Asia. At the beginning of the Roman empire they dropped their nomadic life and became peacefully settled. Just as in the east they have left their inscriptions particularly on the trade-routes followed by their caravans, e.g. from Petra to Damascus and Tadmor, to Forat at the mouth of the Euphrates, to Gerga (Arab. al-Djarīṭa near al-Katīf), to the Sinai peninsula and Egypt and to Gaza, so we find in the Roman empire epigraphic traces of Nabataean merchants as far as Upper Egypt (Dendera), in Mileitus, Rome and Puteoli. In 106 A.D. the emperor Trajan conquered Petra and made the most important part of the Nabataean kingdom the Roman Provincia Arabia. The remainder of the territory left to the Nabataeans in the desert suffered economic ruin about 200 A.D. when the Palmyrans gradually obtained control of the remunerative carrying trade.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
The king, who was assisted by a vizier, the highest official (Greek ἱεράτης), with the title "brother" had under him a number of shāhks (σαχάκια) of the separate tribes (κοιλά). We also find the titles eparchs and strategos. The high social position of women is noteworthy; they could possess property independently and dispose of it as they liked (Noldeke in Euting, Nabat. Inschr., p. 79 sq.); the coins often bear portraits of the queens (Kammerer, Petra et la Nabatène, Paris 1929, p. 377; Brit. Mus. Cat. of Greek Coins: Arabia etc., London 1922, Plates I and II).

Our only source for Nabataean la w is their epitaphs, the threats of punishment in which are based on a formula of the Greek law of property and contract which elsewhere is only found in tomb-inscriptions in Asia Minor (B. Keil, Hermes, xiii. [1898], p. 507-514).

As nomads, simple in their customs and rarely owning slaves, the Nabataeans, as a trading people, had a great respect for wealth. The mention in inscriptions of physicians, wise men and poets, shows a certain level of intellectual culture. Whether circumcision was practiced among them is uncertain (Kammerer, op. cit., p. 375 sq.).

The Nabataean pantheon is known to us mainly from tomb and votive inscriptions. The principal god was Dīshār [cf. Ḍiḥra ʾ-l-šarḥā], the principal goddess Allāt [cf. Altāt]; the goddesses Manāṭhha (= Aram. Ma'nawata; cf. Manātā), Kāțā, Mutabā and Hubal [q.v.] are also mentioned. Their kings were perhaps worshipped as gods after their deaths (cf. C. I. S., ill. 334).

As Noldeke was the first to emphasize, the Nabataeans were pure Arabs as their names show; but in written intercourse they used Aramaic, the usual written and business language of Nearer Asia. Many aramaisms thus entered their language in the north of the country (like ʾabārā, nāfshā, arnā). Arab writers therefore even used the term "Nabataean" for "Aramaic"; in the southern Ḥīrā (al-Hilāj) on the other hand, the Nabataean Arabic retained its greatest purity; the Arabic script developed out of the Nabataean cursive at the close of the ancient period (cf. Arabia, d.).

In the Muslim period the Arabs called those inhabitants of Syria and of the Ḥraj, who were neither shepherds nor soldiers, "Nabataeans" (ibn al-Kaṭib in Wāṣṭ, Muẓaffar, i. 534), a term also applied in a somewhat contemptuous tone to the Aramaic-speaking peasants (Noldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxv. 124). When then we find "Nabataeans" (Nabīt, Nabāt etc.) mentioned in Malaya as well as on the Ḥilāj, in Syria, on the Ḥaṣār and in the Ḥraj, in Ḫūmān and Ḫafārah, the name is not to be taken in the etymological sense (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 123). As the grammarians of the Ḥraj paid special attention to the "Nabataean" language of the Aramaiic country people, by "Nabataeans" was frequently meant the inhabitants of the Ḥraj and especially of the Baṭānī (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 127).

The inhabitants of the district of Ḫiṣmā in the most northern part of the Ḥilāj, once the Dūṣhmān [q.v.], now known as the Ḥuṣayt [q.v.], are regarded as the descendants of the Nabataeans (cf. Arabia, a.).


NABĪ (אֲבִי), a prophet, borrowed from Hebr. נָבִי or Aram. نَبِيّاً, is found in the Kurān from the second Meccan period in the singular and plural nabiyyin; in the Medina period we find also the broken plural anbiyya'. Lists of the nabiyyin are given in Sūr vi. 83 sqq.; iii. 34; iv. 161 sqq.; further information about them is given in several passages of Sūr xix. and xvi. 57. The list consists exclusively of names from the Old and New Testaments (if we leave out Idris in Sūr xix. 57, whose name Muḥammad had however also learned from a Christian source; see above ii., p. 442-450; Horovitz, Korān. Citeri., p. 88 sq.); while messengers of God (rāṣūl [q.v.]; plur. raṣūla; mansūla) had also been sent to other peoples of the past — e.g. Hīd or Sālih — according to the Kurānic idea "prophets" had appeared only among the Aḥl al-Kītāb [q.v.]. Only a minority of the individuals called prophets in the Kurān are so described in the Bible, and Vānūs b. Mattai [q.v.] is the only one of the anbiyya' of the Kurān who appears among the literary prophets of the Bible. Muḥammad himself did not claim the name nabi until he was in Medina when he was addressed as the Prophet (yā ayyukha l-ḥādiqā' and, as finally closing the series of prophets, is called their "seal" (ēḥādiqā'). When Muḥammad in Sūr vii. 156 and 158 is called al-nabi al-ummi, this is to distinguish him as the prophet who has arisen among the heathen; the Jews called the heathen ummiyy hā-šām ("peoples of the world") and also recognised prophets who had arisen among them; among these they included e.g. Balāam. This Jewish name for the heathen became the al-ummiyin of the Kurān (Sūr lxii. 2; iii. 19, 69); that
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unnīyyūn refers to the heathen is quite clear from Sūra iii. 19, where they are contrasted with those who have received the scripture. When Sūra ii. 73 refers to the unnīyyūn min Allâ al-Kamīl, the reference is most probably (with Wellhausen, Sīratun, iv. 13, note 2) to originally pagan Arabs who had adopted Judaism. The derivation of unnīyāt from Hebrew ummāt hā-Ṣawm therefore fits all the Qur'ānic passages, while that most generally adopted from Hebrew 'ummāt hā-ṣawm "people of the country", a term for Jews who did not know the Jewish law, would at best fit only Sūra ii. 73, but even for this passage is not absolutely essential.

The post-Qur'ānic ideas about the prophethood of Muḥammad are discussed in the article Muḥammād (cf. also Tor Andréa, Die Person Muḥammads in Lehre und Glaube seiner Gemeinde, Stockholm 1918). The accounts of the other prophets which found a way into Islam in the post-Qur'ānic period are collected in the works of the Kifās al-ʿAbīyīn. These, however, are not confined to the prophets proper who appear in the Qur'ān by name or anonymously, and to other figures of Jewish and Christian Biblical and post-Biblical tradition, but deal also with the history of such personalities as Dīnjūs and Bulaqīyā to whom there is not the slightest reference in the Qur'ān.


(J. Horovitz)

NĀBĪ, YESUF, an Ottoman poet; Vasut Nābī came from Urfa (Rûhā, hence Rûhā, not Rûhān as one often finds). From there he came in the reign of Muḥammad IV to Stambul and became a favourite of the grand vizier Kârâ Muṣṭafâ. He held a post as kaya, made the pilgrimage after Kârâ Muṣṭafâ's death and later settled in Aleppo. When the governor there, Muḥammad Baṭṭādī [q. v.], became grand vizier, he took Nābī to Stambul and gave him the post of superintendent of the department of the Anatolian chief accountant (Amaṭan muḥāżabešt). Later he gave him this office for another and died aged ninety on 3rd Rabi‘ I 1124 (April 10, 1712). He was buried in Stambul in the Kârâbaṣh cemetery near the Muḥtār mosque. His inscription on his tombstone is given by Sa‘d al-Dīn Nūḥet, Meṣâr Kātibešī, Stambul 1932, p. 11.

Nābī wrote several historical works in a florid style which was considered classical in his time and even later, such as an account of the conquest of Kameneic in Podolia (1053 = 1672) called Ta’rikhī Wāḥ/script. Kâmna, Mateen Kâμma or simply Ta’rikhī Kâmna. He also wrote in prose and verse a description of his pilgrimage to the holy places (1089 = 1678; the work was written only in 1093 = 1682) entitled Ta’ṣífāt al-Harāmah. His very popular Dīwān with supplement earned him the title of "king of poets". In his Khaṣṣāt-nâmeh, in the same book, he gives his son Abu l-Khaṭīr moral admonitions and advice. His letters (Munša‘āt) were at one time highly esteemed and are of some historical value. He continued Waṣī’s Sīyār in a Dīwān Sīyār al-Wâṣi. Printed works: Dīwān, Bulāk 1257 and Stambul 1292; Dīwān Sīyār al-Wâṣi, Bulāk 1248; Khāṣṣāt in: Consuls de Nābī Esfinj à son fils Abû l-Khaṭīr, publiés en turc avec la traduction française et des notes par M. Pavet de Courteille, Paris 1857; Ta’rikhī Kâmna, Stambul 1281; Sīyār al-Huḍāiat i Tawārīx, s.l. (= Stambul, about 1870), deals with questions of pedagogics; Taḥfīz, Stambul 1288; Taḥfīz al-Harāmah, s.l. [Stambul] 1205. For further information see F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 237—239.


NABIY YUNUS. [See NESAWK.]

NABIDH (n.), a comprehensive designation for intoxicating drinks, several kinds of which were produced in early Arabia, such as mir (from barley), bit (from honey: Bukhārī, Maṣāhīr, bāb 60; Aṣḥībā, bāb 4; Aḥad, bāb 80; or from spelt: Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iv. 402), fidāq (from different kinds of dates: Bukhārī, Aṣḥībā, bāb 3, 21).

Grapes being scarce in Arabia, it is said that in al-Madina “wine” was usually prepared from kinds of grapes, exceptionally from grapes (Bukhārī, Aṣḥībā, bāb 21, 3; Muslim, Aṣḥībā, trad. 3, 6).

This may be true. Yet even then there is a tendency connected with the question whether the prohibition of wine included that of intoxicating drinks. Generally speaking baṭṭāt favours the affirmative answer and is consequently anxious to point out that the khamr which was prohibited by Muḥammad included nabidh.

The question was difficult, so far as these kinds of drinks were intoxicating to degrees which partly depended upon the duration of the process of fermentation. This appears e.g. from the copious traditions in which ʿAisha relates how nabidh was prepared for Muḥammad and at what time the beverage was made away with [cf. Khamr], as well as from the traditions in which the previous prohibition of certain vessels (qināṭ, musqalat, etc.) was abrogated and all kinds of vessels declared allowed, provided the drinks prepared in them were not intoxicating (Muslim, Dīqān, trad. 106; Aṣḥībā, trad. 63—65, 67—75 etc.).

A series of traditions which could be added by the Ĥanafites in favour of their view, according to which nabidh is not included in the prohibition of wine, is to be found in al-Nasāʾi’s collection, Aṣḥībā, bāb 48. Cf. further the art. KHAMR.

Side by side with milk and honey nabidh was also the beverage that was offered to the pilgrims in Makka. The institution, abāsāt (also the name of the building, close to Zamzam, where the distribution took place), was an office held by the Āḥāsids (Aḥmad b. Hanbal, Muṣnad, i. 372; Muslim, Maḥṣūṣ, trad. 347; Abū Dāwūd, Manāshik, bāb 90). The descriptions by Ibn Saʿd († 230 = 845) and al-Azraqi († 244 = 858) give the impression of referring to the present state of things; in the time of al-Muṣṭaddîs († about 1000 A. D.) the institution had already passed into desuetude. For details, cf. the work of Gaudeyrem-Dembombyes.
NABİDH — NÂBİGHÂ AL-DHUBYÂNÎ


NÂBİGHÂ AL-DHUBYÂNÎ, a famous poet of the pre-Muhammadan period. His real name was Ziyâd b. Mu‘awiyâ and he belonged to the tribe of Dhubyân. He probably flourished in the second half of the century which preceded Muhammad and died shortly before the beginning of Islam. Caussin de Perceval (Histoire des Arabes, 2nd ed., ii, 502) puts the date of his birth in 535 A.D. and Father Cheikho (Poêtes arabes chrétiens, p. 640) dates his death in 604 A.D. These dates however can only be conjectural.

The surname Nâbîgha has been variously interpreted by Arab writers. According to some, our poet was so called because in one of his verses he uses the verb nābâga: “She stopped among the Banû Ka‘bin and they felt the edge of our attacks”. But this verse is apocryphal and the process recalls that used to justify the etymologies of Muḥâṣibî and of Muṭalammîn (q.v.). According to others, he was so called because he did not write poetry until he reached manhood or more simply because in Nâbîgha poetry “flows from the spring”.

We know nothing about his family; his noble birth asserted by the Kitâb al-Aṣgârî (ix, 162a) and Ibn ‘Utâiba (ed. de Goeye, p. 74) is doubtful and we know nothing definite about his childhood and youth.

At some date which it is impossible to ascertain definitely, Nâbîgha was admitted to the court of the Lakhmîd princes [cf. LAKHM] of al-Ḥira, vassals of Persia; in the reigns of the kings al-Mundhir III and al-Mundhir IV in particular this Christian semi-Persian, semi-Arab city had become an important literary centre and the focus of a brilliant culture. Our poet sang the praises of these two sovereigns and received gifts from them but his fortunes reached their zenith in the reign of Nu‘mân Abû Kaḥîl’s whose boon companion and favourite singer he became. The poet lived on intimate terms with the king in the lap of luxury and opulence. Such favours could not fail to excite the envy and jealousy of the other courtiers: hence his enemies, notably Murra b. Samîl, who plotted to break the king’s attachment to him. The trick attempted by his enemies was a crude one and the king was not deceived by it: the attack on the poet failed.

Far from being discouraged, Murra patiently awaited another opportunity to avenge himself: this soon appeared. According to the Kitâb al-Aṣgârî, Nâbîgha, who had free access to the palace of Nu‘mân, one day unexpectedly entered the apartments of queen Mutadjirî, famous for her beauty. Taken by surprise, she dropped her veil, showing to the delighted eyes of the poet “a part of her statue-like body”. By the time she could replace it, it was too late. Struck to the heart, Nâbîgha composed in honour of this “beauty” his famous poem which begins with the line “soothe and leave Maiya in all haste...”. (Derenbourg, ii, 402 sqq.; ‘Umarî, Litt., xiv, 222 sqq.) It was imprudent enough to recite it to his enemy Murra who hastened to report it to Nu‘mân. The latter in his anger decided on the poet’s ruin.

According to another tradition, one evening when Nâbîgha was seated beside the queen in company of the king and another poet, Munâkkhâl al-Yaṣqūrî, Nu‘mân asked Nâbîgha to describe Mutadjirî to him. Nâbîgha at once obeyed and recited the poem which he had composed shortly before. Munâkkhâl, who was said to be the queen’s lover, exclaimed: “Sir, this description is that of an eye-witness”; and the poet’s days were now numbered. Warned by his friend, the chamberlain Ḥisham, the poet hurriedly fled and sought refuge with the princes of Ghassân.

These stories, on the whole little probable, seem to have been invented to explain Nâbîgha’s disgrace. In his book Fi ‘l-‘Ādâb al-dîjâlî (Cairo 1927, p. 332), Tâhâ Ḥusayn disputes their authenticity and acutely points out that nothing in poem vii.: “It has reached me, mayest thou avoid the censure etc.” supports these stories. He supposes on the other hand, relying on this qaṣīda, that the princes of Ghassân won the good graces of Nâbîgha at a time by their largesse and the poet showed his gratitude by singing their praises; this having come to the ears of Nu‘mân, the latter took umbrage and decided on the ruin of his favourite.

Nâbîgha was by no means unknown to the Ghassânîs, phylarchs of Byzantium and rivals of al-Ḥira. He had been very well received by the princes al-Ḥârîth b. Abî Šâmârî and al-Ḥârîth al-Asgharî. The former at the poet’s request had released a large number of the Banû Asad taken prisoner at the battle of Ḥašma; the latter, also at Nâbîgha’s request, had released a number of the Banû Asad and Banû Ḥazârî after the battle of ‘Ain Ubâgh. This leads us to say a word about Nâbîgha’s political activities.

The poet in the course of his wars the tribe never lost interest in his fellow tribesmen and their allies; we have mentioned his interventions on their behalf with the Ghassânîs; during the celebrated war of Dâbihs between ‘Abs and Dhubyân, it was his constant care to maintain the alliances contracted with the Banû Asad and Banû Tanîm. In the reign of the Ghassânî Nu‘mân b. Ḥârîth Abî Karîb, he had once more to intercede on behalf of the Banû Dhubyân defeated in the battle of Dhu ‘Ukâr; later, in view of his devotion to his patron and his love for his poet, he appeased Nu‘mân to abandon his war on the Banû Dhubyân allied with the Banû Ḥumā. As a result of refusing to listen to him, the king was defeated.

At the court of Ghassân, Nâbîgha was overwhelmed with favours by ‘Amr b. Ḥârîth and later by his successor Nu‘mân. He celebrates the former’s generosity in a qaṣīda full of gratitude (Derenbourg, iii, 297) and his elegy on the death of Nu‘mân (Derenbourg, xxiv), is characterized by deep emotion.
In spite of his luxurious life, Nābigha felt his heart and his thoughts turning towards al-Hira and its king. Therefore on the death of Nu'man b. Ḥārīṯ Abū Karīb he decided to return to al-Hira to attempt to regain the favour of the son of al-Mundhir.

Learning that Nu'man was ill, he set out accompanied by two Fazāris, Manṭhir b. Zābta and Sāyār b. 'Amr, friends of the prince; when they arrived at al-Hira, Nu'man had recovered. Hearing of the arrival of his two friends, he had a tent of leather pitched for them and sent them a woman singer to entertain them. He himself often came to visit them. One evening at a party the singer sang Nābigha's poem “O abode of Malay” (Dīwān, I); the prince delighted exclaimed: “That is an excellent poem”. The Fazāris thereupon seized the opportunity to intercede on behalf of Nābigha and the generous prince forgave the poet. A little later Nu'man was put to death by order of the Sāsānian king Khusraw Parviz for having refused to give him one of his relatives as a wife. Nābigha lamented his patron and retired to his tribe. We do not know when he died.

Before giving an estimate of Nābigha as a poet, we have still to discuss his religion. Derenbourg makes him a monotheist, and in support of his opinion quotes a number of verses in which the poet speaks of God, of the feast of palms, of the cross of Zawār. On the other hand, Cheikho thinks he was a Christian. We find, he says (Christianisme Arabe avant l'Islam, Bairût 1923, p. 420—439) in the poems of Nābigha evidence of his belief in God, of his religious piètre, but the arguments are not numerous or of great cogency: a vague mention of God, of David and his son Solomon, of priests present at the obsequies of Mundhir, of the cross of Zawār. As a matter of fact, Nābigha was a pagan and there is nothing Christian in his poems. The allusions in his poems, even if we accept them as authentic, are in reality only rather faded memories of the Christian ceremonies which the poet had witnessed at al-Hira, and Ghassan and a distant echo of the religious ideas current in the peninsula at this period. As to the word Allāh, it is undoubtedly the result of a substitution for al-Lāt [q.v.] made at a later date by some Muslim poet. Nābigha al-Dhubbāni holds a high position among the poets of ancient Arabia; he is unanimously placed “in the first rank of poets”.

In our opinion he possesses in a high degree the two qualities which make a great poet: sensitiveness and imagination. To sincerity of feeling, he adds splendour of imagery and freshness of expression. In him ideas and words, feeling and turn of phrase, matter and form are in perfect harmony. His satires are often bitter, ironical and scathing.

He is also an artist who skilfully uses all resources, all effects and all artifices. His verse is compact, solid and uniform and readily impresses itself on the memory with the idea which it expresses. Of course it is not without its faults: we find a few weaknesses and examples of lack of care.

Ṭāḥih Husain (al-Sh'r al-Ghūḥil, Cairo 1926) has recently raised the question once more of the authenticity of the poems of Nābigha and other pre-Islamic poets. Rejecting all that has been handed down about it he regards the old poetry as apocryphal. The discussion of this question however, as can readily be understood, lies outside the scope of this article.


Maurice CHEMOLU

NABOB. [See XXvi.]

NABULUS, A TOWA IN CENTRAL PALESTINE, the name of which is derived from that of Flavia Neapolis built in honour of Vespasian. Its Old Testament predecessor was Shechem, which however lay more to the east, on the site of the present village of Ballān (the name is explained by S. Klein, in Z. D. P. V., xxxv. 38 sq.; cf. R. Hartmann, ibid., xxxiii. 175 sq., as “palatum”, from the evidence of the pilgrimage of Bordeaux and the Mithraic Gen. rb., c. 81, § 3). According to Eusebius, the place where the old town stood was pointed out in a suburb of Neapolis. The correctness of this identification of the site of Shechem has now been completely proved by Sellin's excavations; and this also explains how the old name did not as usual drive out the late Greek one. In the time of the Arab writers, the name Shechem was long forgotten and what they tell us refers to Neapolis-Nabulus.

Nabulus is in a long valley (running from east to west) formed by two chains of hills, on the south side Garizim, Arabic Djabal al-Tur or al-Kibīl (2,900 feet high), on the north side Ebal, Arabic Djabal Eslemiyah or al-Samālī (3,140 feet high). G. Holscher (Z. D. P. V., xxxii. 98) refers the older name of Neapolis: Mabartha (Mamortha) in Pliny and Josephus (i.e. “crossing”, mabharta) to the low saddle running right across the valley. The town with its 22 springs is unusually rich in water, which is heard running everywhere and produces a very luxuriant vegetation. Where the road from the south turns westwards into the valley there is a well with the old unanimous tradition since the fourth century A.D. locates here Jacob's well and it is undoubtedly the same as is mentioned in John iv. 5. About a thousand yards to the north is a building where tradition locates Joseph's grave.

In the post-exilic period Shechem belonged to the territory of the mixed people of the Samaritans whose capital it became after they had built on the hill of Garizim (the Samaritan text of Deut. xxvii. 5 has this name instead of Ebal) a temple as a rival to that of Jerusalem. They were continually at strife with the Jews and in the end John Hycanus
in 129 B.C. destroyed Shechem and its temple. At a later date this always turbulent people was equally hostile to the Romans, which caused Vespasian to attack them on Garizim when a large number were slain. Christianity gradually spread in the country and Nazareth became a bishopric. The result was that the Samaritans now turned their arms against the Christians and treated them with great cruelty. After a deadly raid by them, the Byzantine emperor Zeno (474–491) had them driven from Garizim and built a church there. They wrought still greater havoc in the time of Justinian who punished them with great severity and destroyed their synagogues while he rebuilt the churches. This finally broke their spirit; many of them fled to Persia while others became Christians. Their part had been played by the time when Nabisul with many other towns fell into the hands of the Muslims.

The notices of the Arab authors about the town are very scanty. They knew that it was inhabited by Samaritans [cf. AL-SAMIR] and some add that, according to the Jews, they are found nowhere else, but it should be noted that Baladhuri (ed. de Goeje, p. 158) speaks of Samaritans in Filasfn and Urdum. Yakut mentions (p. 328), Nabisul a town near two sacred hills with a population of Jews, foreigners and Samaritans. Below the town is a subterranean city, hewn out of the rock. Muhaddasi says "Nabisul lies in a valley between two hills, is rich in olive-trees and a stream flows through it. The houses are of stone and there are mills there; the mosque in the centre has a beautiful paved courtyard". In the Crusading period Nabisul is mentioned as unfortified. On Jan. 23, 1120, an earthquake occurred and a datestone and several houses was destroyed by the object of improving the morals of the Christians. Idrisi mentions the well of Jacob where Christ had the conversation with the woman of Samaria; a fine church had then been built on the spot. The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela (1160–1173) records that there were no Jews in Nabisul, but about 100 Kutaeans (Samaritans) who offered burned offerings on the altar on Garizim at the passover and on other feast-days. His contemporary 'Ali al-Harawi says the Samaritans are very numerous. He, as does Yakut, always writes Garizim as Kazirin, a corruption which we already have in the "Agazaren" of the pilgrim of Bordeaux. A terrible earthquake in 1202 added to the miseries inflicted on the town; by the continual wars between Franks and Muslims. Under the great Mamluk Sulthan Baibars (q.v.) it finally passed into possession of the Muslims. Yakut remarks on the wealth of water and fertility of the district; here he says, is the hill on which according to the Jews, Abraham wanted to sacrifice Isaac (not Ismael as the Muslims say). When praying, the Samaritans turn towards Garizim. Dimashki says that Nabisul is like a palace surrounded by gardens; he mentions the pilgrimages of the Samaritans to Garizim where they sacrificed lambs. The Muslims had a fine mosque in the town; while the Kufrn was recited day and night. According to Khalil al-Zahrari (d. 872 = 1467), the area included 300 villages.

The people of Nabisul retained their unfriendly character and fondness for rebellion so that the town was less visited by pilgrims. Only the modern period has brought order and greater security, but even now the dislike of the Samaritans to strangers as spectators during their passover sacrifices may give rise to trouble.


NABULUSI. [See 'ABD AL-GHANI.]

NADHR, plural nadhur; Sura lxxv. 57, used as a noun agentis from m-adh-r, with the meaning of warner; sometimes also as an infinitive, e.g. Sura lxxvi. 17. The plural nadhur is also found in the sense of an infinitive, e.g. Sura lxxvii. 6. The term occurs frequently in the Kur'an; it is even said to be synonymous with rasid; its opposite is basdir, mulabahsir. Nadhr as well as basdir are applied to the prophets, the former when they are represented as warlers, the latter as announcers of good tidings (cf. Sura xvii. 106; xxxv. 58; xxxvii. 44; xlviii. 8; mubadhahin wa-nadhirun). As an epithet it is used especially in connection with Noah, the great warner before the Deluge. Nadhr, the Warner, who thereby receives the stamp of a second Noah (cf. Sura xxvi. 115; l. 51; lxxvi. 2 with Sura xxiii. 49; xxxv. 21; xxxvii. 70; lxxvi. 26). Sometimes Muhammed emphasizes his being only a warner (Sura xlvii. 8), or his being the first warner who was sent to his people (Sura xxviii. 46; xxxiv. 43).

The term is found in hadith apart from the common use, known from the Kur'an, in the curious expression nadhir 'urjan (Bukhari, Nisai, bab 26; Tirmidhi, bab 2; Muslim, Fadail, trad. 16) with which Muhammad denotes himself. The tradition runs as follows: "Myself and my mission are like a man who went to some people saying: I have seen the army (of the enemy) with my eyes and I am the naked warner". Several anecdote stories are told by the commentators in explanation of this expression. It is also said by some of them, that in early Arabia a man who saw an approaching danger, stripped himself of his clothes and wound them around his head in order to warn his tribespeople. — The meaning Nazrite which in several dictionaries is given to the term nadhir in the first place does not occur in the Kur'an, nor in hadith, nor in Li'an al-'Arab nor in Tady al-'Arab; it is, however, used in translations of the Bible.

Bibliography: Li'an al-'Arab, vii. 54 sqq.; Tady al-'Arab, iii. 561 sqq.; Ibn al-Athir, Nihaya, iv. 136; Kasallani, ix. 305; Navawi's commentary on Muslim's Sahih, Cairo 1283, v. 71. (A. J. Wensinck).

NADHR, v.o., was taken over into Islam from the pre-Muhammadan Arabs and underwent modification by the new religion. The idea of dedication is associated with the root n-d-hr which is also found in South Arabic, Hebrew and Aramaic and to some extent in Assyrian. An animal could
be the object of dedication among the Arabs. For example, they dedicated by nahr a certain of their sheep etc., for the 'idda feast in Ka'bah (La'nah al-Mā'Arab and Dhawār, s.v.): the dedication which was expressed in solemn formulae signified that the animals were removed from the mundane sphere and placed in the sacred one. As a rule, a sacrifice was dedicated in order to obtain good fortune in a particular respect. The promise to dedicate an animal when the herd had reached the number of a hundred (op. cit.) had an effect on the prosperity of the animals because the word anticipated the fact. According to the story, 'Abd al-Muttaqīb similarly dedicated a son to be slain beside the Ka'bah if he should have ten sons and they grew up. Ibn Hishām, p. 97 sqq.) but for his nahr 100 camels were substituted. — A childless woman could also vow if she had a son to dedicate him to the sanctuary (ib. ib., p. 76; perhaps this story is a literary borrowing). According to the Kābulīh of Ma'mūna bint Khalīl, her father had resolved to sacrifice 50 sheep if he had a son. (YāBD, vii, 754, bāb 19; Ibn Mas'ūd, Kābulīh, bāb 18.) If a child was sick, its mother could dedicate it by a vow as 'omān (from ḫann) if it recovered (Aṣa'ī, p. 123, sqq.). Escape from every difficulty was sought by a nahrū. During a battle a camel used to be dedicated as a sacrifice (Wāḍū'l-Wellhausen, p. 59). The traveller in the desert used to make a vow on account of the danger (see the verse in Lane and Lišān al-'Arab, s.v.). In distress at sea one promised offerings to God or a saint or vowed to do something oneself, such as fasting (Sūra x. 243; xxix. 65; Abū Dāwūd, Aṣa'ī, bāb 20; see also Goldziher, Mah. Stu., i, 311). During a drought 'Omar vowed to taste neither samarn nor milk nor meat till the rain fell (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 2573, sqq.).

Even if a sacrifice were promised, the vow also affected the person concerned, as we see from the fact that he had his hair shorn not only on the ḫādīj but also, for example, when sacrificing after a journey (ib. ib., p. 15, 749; Wāḍū'l-Wellhausen, p. 324, 351, 429 sqq.; Bukhārī, ḫādīj, bāb 125); for the cutting of the hair ended, as in the case of the Israelite Nazirite, the state of consecration. The vow therefore had always more or less the character of a self-dedication. This aspect was often quite prominent. Ordinary sacred duties such as participation in the ḫādīj were assumed as a consecration by nahrū (Sūra xxii. 39) at which special obligations were assumed e.g. to go to the sanctuary on foot, or barefooted (Bukhārī, Q-dir al-Sanā', bāb 27; Tirmidhī, al-Nūdūr wa'l-Aimān, bāb 17). The sacred condition of ṣīkāf was assumed as a nahrū: thus before his conversion 'Omar vowed to make a nightly ṣīkāf in the Meccan sanctuary (Bukhārī, Ma'āmī, bāb 54; Aṣa'ī, bāb 29). Such a vow to separate oneself from everyday life in some special way was very frequent among the ancient Arabs; for Labīl (p. 17, 18) compares an antelope buck alone among the bushes to one fulfilling his vow (ḥašīl 'la-nahrū').

This isolation had the definite object of spiritual consecration and strengthening the soul and thereby influencing the deity. Abstinence was therefore also practised in preparation for great deeds, especially in war. The Arabs "touched no perfume, married no woman, drank no wine and avoided all pleasures when they were seeking vengeance, until they attained it" (Hamāsī, p. 447; v. 5 schol.); avoidance of wine (Hamāsī, p. 237, v. 4 sqq.) and women (Kasāb al-Jahān, xv. 161: 2nd ed., p. 154) is specially mentioned. These abstentions like the ḫādīj rites and the ṣīkāf are also the objects of a naḥrū. The form of this vow is for example "wine and women naḥrū to me until I have slain 100 Aidences" (Aṣa'ī, viii. 68; 2nd ed., p. 65). A definite term may be fixed, such as drinking no wine for 30 days in order to obtain vengeance (Kais b. al-Khaṭṭām, ed. Kowalski, iv. 28). Forms of abstinence are not to eat meat, not to wash the head, so that the ḥamā is not removed (Aṣa'ī, i. 149; 2nd ed., p. 141: xii. 69; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Hishām, p. 543, 980: Ḥusayn ibn Ahmad, ed. Wellhausen, N°. 159), not to anoint oneself (Wāḍū'l-Wellhausen, p. 201). Refraining from meat, wine, ointment, washing and sexual intercourse are mentioned together (Aṣa'ī, vii. 99: 2nd ed., p. 97; viii. 68; 2nd ed., p. 66; Ibn Hishām, p. 543; Wāḍū'l-Wellhausen, p. 75, 94). There is also evidence of complete fasting (Wāḍū'l-Wellhausen, p. 105, 102). The abstentions, the offering and the deed to be done form the content of the naḥrū. It is said: naḥrūn nā man nāfūt maṣaṣṣ (Aṣa'ī, ed. de Goeje, p. 257, 3 sqq.), "After a wish has been fulfilled a vow of gratitude may also be taken (Wāḍū'd, p. 290).

The consecration placed the person making the vow in connection with the divine powers, the naḥrū was an ḫādīj (Sūra ix. 76; xxii. 27: xviii. 10), whereby he pledged himself. A neglect of the Ḫādīj was a sin against the deity (Inna al-Ka's, p. 51, 10). The sacred obligation of living made this a naḥrū (or synonymous) naḥrū, which one should fulfill (ṣīkāf), instead of wandering aimlessly (Sūra xxxiii. 25; Wāḍū'd, p. 120; Labīl, p. 41, 1; Kumait, Ḥusayn, ed. Horovitz, p. 4, 48). The importance of the binding pledge gradually becomes more prominent (cf. Lišān al-'Arab, where naḥrū is explained by ṣīkāf, or synonymously naḥrū, which one should fulfill); instead of wandering aimlessly (Sūra xxxiii. 25; Wāḍū'd, p. 120; Labīl, p. 41, 1; Kumait, Ḥusayn, ed. Horovitz, p. 4, 48). The emphasis on the material dedication gradually became less. The abstentions mentioned receive their importance on the one hand from works meritorious to the deity, on the other from the unpleasant deprivations, by which the person taking the vow disciplines himself. Both points of view are seen in the examples quoted. The releasing of slaves or divorcing of wives often form the subject of a kind of vow by which a man pledges himself under certain conditions. A man may also vow to sacrifice all his camels if he is not living (Hamāsī, p. 667, v. 3). The strict obligation inherent in the naḥrū makes it closely related to the oath [see ḪAṣA'M].

One can also bind one's family by a vow. A mother swears not to comb her hair or to seek shade until her son or daughter fulfills her wish (Aṣa'ī, xviii. 205; 2nd ed., p. 205; Ibn Hishām, p. 319; ii. 90). The strength of this kind of "conjunction" is based on the relationship between the two partners. If a dying man vows that his tribe shall slay 50 to avenge him, this binds the tribe (Hamāsī, p. 442 sqq.). Thus a vow in the problem of horse-robbery of two unfulfilled vows had to be fulfilled by the descendants (Muslim, Naḥār, trad. i.; Bukhārī, Wāḍū'd, bāb 19; cf. Goldziher, Zāhirīten, p. 50).
In Islam the vow and the oath are treated together. In the Qur'an it is prescribed that unconscious expressions (zakhuw) in an oath may be broken and acquitted (Sura ii. 226; v. 94). The context shows that the reference is to vows of abstinence, especially relating to food and women. Sura ii. 226-227 in continuation says that those who bind themselves by 'id' not to touch a woman should either break the vow after 4 months or pronounce the formula of divorce. The breach of the oath then requires the kaffara. The zāhūr formula is absolutely forbidden (Sura liv. 1-5; cf. xxi. 4); it is a great sin in the eyes of the law, while the 'id' is not a sin (see Juyuboll, "Handbuch", p. 284 sqq.; Sachau, "Muh. Recht", p. 13, 68 sqg.). The "release from the oath" promised in Sura lixi. 2 refers to a vow of continence. The same kaffara holds for a broken vow as for an oath. It is probable in this case that we have Jewish influence (cf. Mishna, Nid'urim) but the principle of releasing oneself from a vow by doing something else is certainly also originally Arab. But with Islam comes the view that malā' in are useless because they cannot influence God (Ikhkhar, A'mūn, bāb 26; Kisdār, bāb 6; Muslim, Nadār, trad. 2). Thus we find hadiths which urge the fulfillment of vows as well as those that forbid them. Following hints in the hadiths, we find a systematic division into vows of piety (nadhar al-tabarrur), which are intended to acquire merit by a pious deed (pā'a), and vows by oaths which, since they are conditioned, serve to incite, prevent or strengthen. The latter are called nadhar al-la'jdāl wa-l-ghadāb. They are deprecated but must be treated like oaths. Their matter must not be sin, and according to some a vow of this kind is valid, according to others, it is valid but must be broken. Their matter must not already be an individual duty (wādā'ī a'mūn). The person taking the vow must, like him taking an oath, be mukalaf and be acting of his own free-will.


JOHNS. PEDERSEN.

AL-NADIM, ABU'L-FARAJ MUHAMMAD B. ABI Y'A'KUB ISH'AK AL-WARRAQ AL-NADIM AL-BAGHDADE, Arabic bibliographer, compiled the Fihrist in 377 (987-988). Little is known about his life. According to a statement which goes back to Ibn al-Nadīmid (d. 643 = 1245) Dhā'ī Turīkh Baghdādī (see Flügel's edition, p. xii, note 2), he died in 385; according to another statement (see Ibn Ḥadjar al-Asqalānī, Liʾām al-Misām, v. 72) probably 388 (the figure is damaged in the Haidarābād edition). Both dates are in contradiction to the fact that in the Fihrist events of 392 (p. 87, 6) and "after 400" (p. 169, 11) are mentioned, unless these are additions by another hand. A clue to the date of his birth is given from his account (p. 237, 6) of a meeting with a learned man in the year 340; this suggests 325 as the latest date for his birth. Nothing is known of his family. There is no reason to connect him with Ibn b. Ibrāhīm al-Mas'ūdī al-Nadim (d. 235 = 849) or with Yahyā b. al-Nadim, a pupil of Al-Baladhuri (d. 279 = 892). His father was a bookseller (warrāq) (p. 303, 24, 318, 6, 351, 14). Whether the epithet al-Nadīmid "table companion", i.e. member of the circle of a caliph or other great man, refers to the father or to a remoter ancestor is unknown. It is not impossible that it refers to the author of the Fihrist himself; against this however is the fact that he is usually addressed as Ibn al-Nadim. That Baghdād, if not his birthplace, was at least his place of abode is evident from passages, like p. 337, 26, 349,irst (see below) and the frequent mention of Baghdādī in his acquaintances (p. 132, 6, 219, 253, 12, 260, 2). He several times mentions a stay in Mōsul (p. 86, 12, 160, 21, 190, 21, 265, 25; cf. also p. 285, 9). We know nothing of other journeys of al-Nadim (Dār al-Rūm, p. 349, 23, the name of the Latin quarter in Baghdād as V. v. Rosen has shown it). His teachers and authorities also point to Baghdād. He most frequently quotes the authority of the grammarian al-Sirāfī (d. 368) (all the quotations can be found in the latter's Aʿdāb al-Maʿnīyīn al-Baṣrīyīn). Personal relations are indicated by p. 56, 13 and the mention of his sons (p. 31, 45, 61, 22, 3). Al-Nadīmid also studied under Ibn al-Munādīlīm (p. 144, 11). He gives traditions heard from Muḥammad b. Yusuf al-Nāṣīkh (p. 24, 14, 25, 27). He also gives traditions from Abu al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī (p. 141, 17, 21, 25, 4), i. e. from Abu al-Faraj 'Abd al-Samad al-Khārijī (p. 145, 3); he is celebrated for the reliability of his tradition (p. 145, 25). He also mentions his teacher Abu Sulaimān al-Maṇīkī (p. 241, 14) whom we know from Abū Ḥayyān's Muḥāṣṣīl. He was friendly also with the logician Ibn al-Dajārī (p. 244, 6, 245, 12) and with the Christian philosopher Ibn al-Khāmmār (p. 245, 19) and with Yahyā b. 'Adī (p. 264, 2). This circle of friends is very much in keeping with al-Nadīmid's friendly nature, the breadth of his intellectual interests, his intelligent interest in other religions and his tolerance, which finds expression in Maḥāfaḍa's 5 and 9 of his work. That he was a Shift and Muʿarrid did not escape his biographers (cf. Golzieder, in Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 278 sqq.); thus he uses ʿaṣaṣī and ṣuna in the sense of Shift and Sunni respectively, calls the Sunni traditionalists al-Ḥadīthiyīn (p. 231, 23), claims many of their leaders for the Zaidīya (p. 178, 9, 22), says that al-Shift was a man of deeply Shift outlook (p. 209, 22), and praises al-Shift (p. 168, 28) as a Shift. Shifts were numerous among his friends (p. 139, 27 and p. 154, 25) and acquaintances (p. 178, 6, 190, 21, 197, 119, 198, 4). Al-Nadīmid like his father was a bookseller. This is nowhere expressly stated but is evident from the whole plan of his work in which he faithfully records not only scientific literature but also the numerous diwāns of contemporary poets and the vast mass of anonymous light literature, love stories, fairy tales and books of adventure, indeed even works of a popular nature neglected alike by scholars and bibliophiles, books on good manners, cookery books, books on poison, books dealing with hunting and sport, down to collections of fables, books on magic and on prophecy, in brief everything that was on the Baghdād book market in the fourth
(tenth) century. That he was a bookseller is also indicated by the frequent particulars about the size of the books dealt with (cf. especially, p. 159, 19), about copies in the hand of famous scholars, about the demand for books (p. 70, 5; 77; 14; 79, 29) and about the book trade (p. 271, 5; 359, 29). He several times mentions other booksellers (p. 204, 299; 4; 355; 13).

The Fihrist exists in two recensions (on the manuscripts, see Z.D.M.G., lxxiv. 111 sqq. and the literature there given; this may now be added a fragment in Tonk and a private manuscript in Medina). Both were made in the year 377 (987). The longer recension contains ten maṣāḥif, of which the first six deal with the literature of Islam (1. ḳuṭān, 2. grammar, 3. history etc., 4. poetry, 5. dogmatics, 6. law), while the last four deal with non-Islamic literature (7. philosophy and ‘ancient science’, 8. light literature, 9. history of religion, 10. alchemy). The shorter version contains only the four last maṣāḥif of the longer one, i.e. the Arabic translations from the Greek, Syriac, Persian and Sanskrit and the other literature based on these models. It is mentioned by Ḥāḏijī Qhalīfa (Stambul, ii. 211) under the title Fīwā zu al-‘Utrīm. The two recensions have in common an introductory section on the various forms of writing. —

A survey of the contents of the Fihrist follows the preface (see also Flügel, in Z. D. M. G., xiii. 190 sqq.). The arrangement there given is strictly adhered to in the book. The special quality of the book and its value lies in the fact that it gives the Arabic literature of the first four centuries in a bibliographical arrangement while the biographical method is the only one used in other contemporary sources. Al-Nādim, it is true, hasindexOf his subjects in biographical sketches but it is the list of works of the author that is the main thing. Sometimes a branch of literature is treated purely bibliographically under its various branches (e.g. the literature of Kūtān exegesis, P. 33; 20—37; 111; also p. 87, 88, 170, 171). This arrangement was necessary with the anonymous literature, especially in the eighth maṣāḥif (p. 395 sqq.). A further step towards treatment from the point of view of the literary historian is found in the brief introductions and surveys (e.g. on the pre-ʿOthmānic recensions of the Kūṭān, p. 26 sqq., on the beginnings of Arabic grammar, p. 40 sqq.). In the last four maṣāḥif, such sections (e.g. on the origins of philosophy, of medicine, of alchemy, the beginning of the translated literature, the origin of the #1000 tales) are so extensive that they have the character of a regular history of literature to a much greater degree than the more bibliographical first six maṣāḥif. The ninth maṣāḥif occupies a special position: it is a treatise on the history of religion in which the bibliographical element is not at all prominent. — The sources used by al-Nādim are mainly of a literary nature. He prefers to use works in copies from the hand of reliable copyists. He comparatively rarely quotes personal authority. — Although a younger contemporary of al-Nādim’s, al-Wazīr al-Maghribī (d. 418 = 1027), prepared an improved edition of the work, it seems at first to have had only slight influence. The earliest author to make considerable use of the first four maṣāḥif (in al-Maghribī’s edition) was Yākūt (d. 626 = 1225) (see Bergsträsser, in Z.S., ii. 185). He claims to have consulted a copy in al-Nādim’s own hand, as does the lexicographer

al-Saghānī, d. 650 (1252) (see Khāṭān al-Adab, iii. 83 pu). Ibn al-Kīsīf (d. 624 = 1226) and Ibn Abī Ṭalḥa (d. 668 = 1269) copied much from the Fihrist. In later times it is only occasionally quoted, e.g. by al-Dhahabī (d. 748 = 1347) and Ibn Ḥāḍir al-ʿAṣkalānī (d. 852 = 1484) and lastly by Ḥāḏijī Qhalīfa (d. 1067 = 1656) and al-Khāḍījī (d. 960 = 1561). — Al-Nādim also wrote a Kitāb al-Aṣwāf wa l-Taqāṣīm (Fihrist, p. 12), which has not come down to us.


NADIM, Ağmaid, an Ottoman poet, born in Stambul, the son of a judge named Muḥammad Bey who had come from Merzifun. His grandfather (according to Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 30) was a military judge named Muṣṭaṣa. Ağmaid Rāfīḳ mentions as his great-grandfather Kara-Celebi-xâde [q. v.] Muḥammad Efendi who also was a military judge. The genealogy given by Ağmaid Rafig is however wrong because he confuse Karaman Muḥammad Pašha [q. v.] with Kūm Muḥammad Paša. The statement that Ağmaid Nadim is descended from Dājāl al-Dīn is therefore simply the result of confusion. Little is known of his life. He was a nidérūr, later on intimate terms with Ağmaid III and his grandvizier Dāmād İbrahim Paša [q. v.]. He probably got his laḳāb al-Nādim from his friendship. Latterly he held the office of librarian in the library founded by his patron Dāmād İbrahim Paša. On hearing of the end of İbrahim Paša and the deposition of the sultān, Nadim lost his life at the beginning of October 1730 (Rabi‘ I, 1143) in a horrible way; while escaping from the mob leaving the grandvizier’s palace he fell from the roof and was killed. He was buried in Ayâs Paša in Perä beside the historian Fndīlülf Silâhâr Muḥammad Agha.

 Ağmaid Nadim is regarded as one of the greatest of Ottoman poets, who is still appreciated for his pure language, free from foreign additions. Many literary historians have discussed his merits as a poet (cf. the specimens collected by Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 30 sqq.). His collected poems (Pisâr; printed Bâlûk, n. d.; a more recent critical edition with introductions by Ağmaid Rāfīḳ Bey and Muḥammad Fu‘ād Bey appeared in 1338—1340 in Stambul; there are manuscripts of the
NADIR SHAH, king of Persia (1417-1602 = 1736-1747).

Origins. Nadir b. Imām-kuli b. Nadhir-kuli belonged to the Kīrākū clan of the Turkoman tribe of the Afghāns, of which a section had settled in northern Khurāsān, and was born on the 28th Muḥarram 1100 (Oct. 22, 1688) at Kīrkān. Entering the service of Tahmāsp II, he was called Tahmāsp-kuli Khān but after his coronation his original name was improved to Nādir, “the rare one”. At an early date Nādir distinguished himself in the incessant fighting with the Turkomans of Naṣī, the Čamīhḡazā Kurt of Khábūshān (Kūṭān), the Özbek, the Tatars of Marv and even against his Afghān fellow tribesmen. The little nucleus around Nādir, the nucleus of his Afghan relatives, some Kurds of Daragāz and Abīward, and 300-400 families of Džayyr Turkomans with their chief Tahmāsp-kuli Waklī.

Fighting in Khurāsān. During the Afghān invasion of Persia, Mashhad was occupied by Malik Maḥmūd, a scion of the Sīstān family. Nādir fought against Malik Maḥmūd at first on his own initiative. When the Ṣafawīd Tahmāsp II, driven from his other lands, arrived in Khurāsān, Nādir very cleverly supplanted the commander-in-chief Fath ʿAli Khān Kādlār and on 16th Rabīʿ I (Dec. 22) captured Mashhad with the help of treachery. Henceforth it became his headquarters. There were already signs of a breach between Nādir and Tahmāsp II at this time.

The Shah urged Nādir to set out against his enemies the Ghilzāi Afghāns but Nādir wished first of all to dispose of the nearest enemy, the Abdāl Afghāns of Herāt, but the campaigns of 1728 (against the Abdāl and the Turkomans) had no success. Nādir however was able to extend the sphere of his activities; he ousted from Astarābād and Māzandarān the governors appointed by Tahmāsp and came into conflict with the Russians and the Ghilzāi Afghāns.

The Abdāl. In the meanwhile trouble had broken out in Herāt between Ālī-yār Khān and Dūr ʿl-Fikār Khān. Nādir re-established Ālī-yār Khān but transplanted many tribes to Khurāsān (1141 = 1747).

The Ghilzāi. At this time Ashraf Ghilzāi signed peace with Simnān while his general Saydāh had gone to Bistān. On the 8th Rabīʿ I (Nov. 27, 1729), Nādir defeated the Ghilzāi on the banks of the river Mīhmāndūst. This victory he followed up by others.

Nādir in S.W. Persia. Tahmāsp appealed to Nādir to complete the deliverance of the country. Leaving Ṣafavīz and crossing Ṣūrīstān, Nādir arrived in Burūdārā where the Shah sent him a crown set with precious stones and a commission (ṣūrūm) as vassal of all Khurāsān along with Māzandarān, Yazd, Kirmān and Sīstān (cf. also ʿAlī Ḥazīn, p. 189). Tahmāsp also gave his sister Gahwārshād to Nādir and betrothed his other sister Fāṭimah-sultan to Rūs-kuli Mirzā.

The Ottomans who then occupied the whole of western Persia and the greater part of Transcaucasia were reluctant to leave Persia. Nādir occupied Nihaḵwād, defeated the Turks at Mālīḵīy, took Hamadān and on the 27th Muḥarram 1143 (Aug. 13, 1730) Tabriz was retaken.

Nādir returns to the east. Nādir learned in Tabriz that Dūr ʿl-Fikār Abdūlī having driven Ālī-yār Khān from Herāt was fighting Nādir’s brother ʿAbdullāh Khān under the walls of Mashhad. Nādir at once set out for Khurāsān, crossing the tribe of the Yomut Turkomans and towards the end of Rabīʿ II (Nov. 1730) was at Mashhad where he received 56,000 families of the tribes transplanted from other provinces.

On the 4th Shawwāl (April 12, 1731) Nādir was 3 farsakhs from Herāt. In the month of August the Abdāl restored Nādir’s candidate Ālī-yār Khān but the latter regaining contact with his tribe now rebelled. It was not till Ramaḍān 1, 1144 (Feb. 27, 1732) that Herāt was taken.

Failure of Tahmāsp II. Taking advantage of the absence of his commander-in-chief, the Shah resumed the initiative in the military operations and in Djamādā II 1143 (end of Dec. 1730) set out against Māzandarān where the return of Nādir the Ottomans on Jan. 10, 1732 signed a preliminary treaty at Baghdād by which the Persians retained only the lands south of the Araxes. Later on Jan. 21-Feb. 1, 1732 the Shah’s representatives signed at Raṣht a treaty with the Russians by which the latter bound themselves to evacuate the lands south of Sāliyān (on the Kur) while the return of Bākū and Darband was made dependent on the reconquest of Transcaucasia by the Persians.

Deposition of Tahmāsp II. Nādir was indignant at the peace with the Turks signed after a defeat. Setting aside the Shah’s authority, Nādir Shah denounced the treaty and appointed his own governors everywhere. Tahmāsp was deported to Khurāsān and his son ʿAbbas III, an infant in the cradle, proclaimed king on the 17th Rabīʿ I 1145 (July 7, 1732).

First campaign against the Ottomans. Having punished the Bakhtiyarīs and the Kurds, Nādir occupied Zahbāb and besieged Baghdad (Jan. 1733). Āqabād Pāšā made the negotiations drag on until the army commanded by Topal ʿOthmān Pāšā had time to come to Mesopotamia. On 6th Safar 1146 (July 19, 1733) Nādir Shah lost the battle fought on the Tigris and returned to Hamadān via Bāzīr and Mandaljīn (Mandali).

Arriving there on 22nd Safar (Aug. 4) Nādir set out again for Zahbāb on the 22nd Rabīʿ II (Oct. 2) and then attacked Memiş Pāšā who had occupied the pass of Aqghdarbānd (1st Djamādā II = Nov. 9, 1733). Then Topal ʿOthmān Pāšā with the bulk of his army intervened in the battle but lost it and had his head cut off. The Ottomans hastened to abandon Aqghdarbānd. By the 15th Rabīʿ (Dec. 22) Nādir was already on his way.
to Persia via Baghsay (B-a-kusay), Rajay, Rayan and Shaghsha.

Mahmyd Bally. The reason of this hurried move was the rebellion raised by Mahmyd Khan Bahadu in S. W. Persia. Mahmyd Khan was quickly driven from the pass of Shihl-tan and on 27th Shabran (Feb. 1, 1734) Nader reoccupied Shiraz.

Campaign in Transcaucasia. In Isfahan Nader received the Turkish ambassador Abd al-Karim Efendi and informed him that the retrocession of Transcaucasia was a sine qua non of peace. On the other hand, prince S. D. Golistsine was received at Isfahan on May 20-31, 1734 and thereafter by Nader's order accompanied him everywhere (his itinerary in Leich-Schmene). On the 12th Maharram 1147 (June 17, 1734) Nader left Isfahan for Ashkar-Bahadu and as the Turks did not reply, Nader began by attacking the Daghestan chief (Khaja Khamid) Surchay whom the Porte had appointed governor of Shirvan. Tahmuss Kali Djiltayr defeated the Daghestanins near Dava-Batan (in the district of Kabala) while Nader cut off the retreat penetrated into the heart of the extremely difficult region of Ghazi-Kumut. In spite of the exploits of the Abdali the success gained in Daghestan was only partial for Surchay had escaped to the north.

On 6th Diumaadd II (Nov. 3, 1734) Nader was before the walls of Gandja, which was defended by Zitessa. The siege necessitated considerable works and prince Golistsine procured Russian engineers for Nader. On March 21, 1735 a treaty was signed at Gandja by which Russia and Persia became practically allies.

On 1st Maharram 1148 (May 26, 1735) Nader went to Kars but the encounter with Abd Allah Pashu Kopruzade took place near Erewan on the plain of Baghshadwad. On 26th Maharram (June 18, 1735) the Ottomans were defeated. Gandja therefore capitulated on the 17th Safar (July 8) and Tiflis on 22nd Rabii I (Aug. 13).

Nader returns to Daghestan. Via Tiflis (q.v.), from which 6,000 families were transferred to Khorasan, Nader attacked the Legzi of Djer and Tala (north of the Alazan) The Khan of the Crimean Kapun Giray, who had in the meanwhile advanced as far as Darlant and had placed his nominees everywhere, withdrew to the Crimea and Nader endeavoured to pacify Daghestan but Surchay still evaded capture.

Nader proclaimed king. On 13th Ramadhan (Jan. 27, 1736) Nader came to Mughan (q.v.) where in the meanwhile the governors and notables of the province had assembled. It was explained to them that Nader having liberated Persia wished to retire to Khurasan and that the delegates were free to put the government in the hands of Tahmasp II or Abdullah III "who were alive". Nader finally accepted the crown but on condition that the Persians abandoned the Shah's practices introduced by Isma'il I which were "contrary to the beliefs of Nader's ancestors". The Persians were to form a fifth orthodox madhab, placed under the patronage of the Imam Djafar Sadik. A document to this effect was sealed by the assembly. The five clauses of the treaty to be proposed to Turkey were next drawn up: 1. the Turks were to recognise the new Dafarite rite; 2. the latter was to be given a place of prayer (tnk) at Mecca; 3. Persia was to send an amir al-lajtdidj every year through Syria; 4. prisoners should be exchanged and 5. ambassadors were to be exchanged after mutual approval of the appointments. The formal coronation of Nader took place on Thursday, 24th Shawwal 1148.

Kandahar. This principality in which Husain Khan, brother of Mahmyd, still asserted himself remained the only black spot on the horizon. Leaving Isfahan on 22nd Shawwal (Feb. 3, 1737), Nader was before Kandahar before Nawroz 1149 (March 1737) and had a new town built on the site of his camp (Surtka-Shur) which was called Nairabad.

Kandahar capitulated on the 2nd Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1150 (March 23, 1738). The citadel was dismantled. Expedition into India. So far Nader's military expeditions had been dictated by a desire to rec establish the old frontiers of the Safavid empire. The expedition to India was provoked solely by the attraction of ill-guarded provinces and by the desire to replenish the treasury exhausted by repeated campaigns. Ghazni was occupied on the 22nd Safar 1151 (June 11, 1738), Kabul on 12th Rabii I (June 30), Djalilabad on 8th Djuumada II (Sept. 17). From the neighbourhood of the latter town, the prince Kala-Kali was sent back to Persia to act as regent; he and his brother Na'ir Allah were given crowns.

Going via Sarvola Nader avoided the Khabar Pass and took prisoner Na'ir Khan, governor of Fashawar. On 15th Ramadhan (Dec. 27) Nader left this town. He next took Lahore and reappointed the local governor Zakariya Khan (a Khurasanian). (Na'ir Khan was restored to his post). Leaving Lahore on 26th Shawwal (Feb. 6, 1739) Nader learned that Muhammad Shah had reached Kandahar and was in a place between the jungle and the river. He succeeded in getting Muhammad Shah off from his capital and hastened to attack the reinforcements which Sa'adat Khan (a Khurasanian) was bringing from the province of Oudh. Thus began the decisive battle of 15th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1151 (Feb. 24, 1739) in which the commander-in-chief Khan Davaani was mortally wounded and Sa'adat Khan captured. Nader and Muhammad Shah entered the capital where Nader's name was inserted in the Khntba and coins struck in his name. On the 15th Dhu 'l-Hijja (March 26, 1739) a rumour spread that Nader had been assassinated and the populace massacred 3,000-7,000 of his soldiers. Next morning Nader went to the mosque and gave the signal for the massacre of the inhabitants. On 26th Dhu 'l-Hijja (April 6) Na'ir Allah Mirza was married to a Mughal princess. On 3rd Safar 1152 (May 12, 1739) a grand council was held in Dhihi in the course of which Nader replaced the crown on the head of Muhammad Shah but the latter had in return to cede to Nader all the provinces north of the Indus. The amount levied by Nader cannot be estimated. According to Anandram, who was attached to the vizier's office, it amounted to 6,000,000 rupees in specie and 500,000,000 in jewels and precious stones, including the Koh-i Nurr diamond and the Peacock throne. Large sums were distributed among the soldiers and the people of Persia exempted from taxation for three years.

Nader left Dhihi and reached Kabul on 1st Ramadhan (Dec. 12). Now took place one of the most important of his expeditions. He suddenly turned back to reduce the land of Sind Khuday-yar Khan 'Ubaidi (a native of Siwi, cf. Malcolm, op. cit., liii, 89) and going via Bangash, Larkana and Shaheedpurn penetrated into the desert south of
the Indus and took Khuday-yar prisoner; he had shut himself up in ‘Umār, (north of Thar and Pukar in the province of Bombay). Having organised his Indian possessions in three provinces Nādir returned to Nādir-abād (via Swati and Shāh) on 7th Safar (May 5, 1740).

Nādir in Turkestan. Nādir returned to Herat on 10th Rabi‘ II (June 5) and after a fortnight devoted to festivities set out for Balkh which he reached on 7th Djamādā I (July 31). Arriving before Bukhāra on 10th Djamādā II (Sept. 22), Nādir treated Khān Abū l-Fādil kindly and renewed his investiture by crowning him with his own hands. The Oxus was proclaimed the frontier and the Khān had to supply Nādir with 20,000 Ozbeqs and Turkomans, which indirectly left in the hands of the conqueror the control of the internal affairs of Bukhāra.

On the 16th Rādjab (Oct. 7), Nādir had set out for Khwārizm. The fleet followed the army. The Khān II-Bars of Hazārāsp retired to his fortress of Khankhel which surrendered on 24th Shab‘ān after bombardment. Finally Khiva, the capital of the kingdom, also capitulated. By 4th Shawwāl (Dec. 23) Nādir had returned to Čārdzjī and entered Mahabad at the end of Shawwāl.

Nādir sets out again for Transcaucasia. While in India, Nādir had learned of the death of his brother Ibārahīm Khān who had been killed by the Lāzī rebels of Džār and Tala. To punish them, Nādir left Mahabad and on his way learned that the Abdālī troops who had been sent in advance had already ravaged Dżār, Dżawwāl (7) and Akhūzir, but the pacification of Daghestān was by no means complete.

An incident that followed marks the turning-point in the career of Nādir Shāh. On the 28th Šafar (May 15, 1741) near Kaft-i Awdād (Māzandarān) an unknown man concealed in the brush wood shot at Nādir, wounding him slightly. Connecting this with events in Daghestān Mahdī Khān says that the crime was committed by a slave of the son of Džawar Khān Tātimānī [q. v.] but suspicion very soon turned upon the prince Ribāt-Kuli who had besides not behaved well during his regency. He was sent for the time to Tihrān while Nādir continued his march via Kašwīn, Kaft-i Awdād and Kaft-i Darā and Khudāyat.

In June 1741, for the third time, Nādir entered Daghestān and remained there a year and a half. The shahkhal of Tarkhā, the nāmī of the Karakaytak and Surkhāy Khān of the Ghāzi Kamūk came over to Nādir but new difficulties kept cropping up. Relations with Russia became somewhat strained for the Russian representatives suspected Nādir of designs on the northern Caucasus. As a precaution the Russians in May 1742 concentrated 42,000 men at Čīzlar (s. Butbow, i. 220). Cares were undermining the health and character of Nādir. At the beginning of Dec. 1742 when the camp was at Bāshlu the heir to the throne Ribāt-Kuli, denounced by the author of the attempt on Nādir in Māzandarān, was blinded after form of trial. Nādir himself was thoroughly upset by this incident. Rebellion was now threatening everywhere (in Khwārizm and in Balkh).

Third Campaign against the Turks. In Dhu l-Ka‘da I 1742, the Turkish ambassador brought from Constantinople a letter from the Sultan refusing to recognise the fifth madkhāb. Nādir then reminded the Sultan that the whole of Persian territory had not been regained from Turkey and added that he soon would take the field to make his own terms.

Nādir left Daghestān on the 16th Dhu l-Hijja (Feb. 7, 1742) and came to Kirkūk (14th Djamādā II = Aug. 5, 1742) which capitulated as did Irahill. On the 26th Rādjab (Oct. 5) Nādir arrived near Mawsil but the siege of this fortress was unsuccessful and on 2nd Ramaḍān (Oct. 20) he retreated to Kirkūk and Khānaqānī. Friendly relations were established with Ahmad Pasha of Baghdad. Nādir with his wives made the pilgrimage the Shāfī and Sunnite sanctuaries of Mesopotamia and on the 24th Shawwāl 1156 (Dec. 12, 1743) summoned a great assembly of ecclesiastics at Nadjafl. The document drawn up by Mahdī Khān summing up the discussions confirmed the renunciation by the Persians of the ‘heresy of Shīh Isma’il’, while the ‘ulama’ of Mesopotamia and Transcaucasia recognised the claims of Dja‘far al-Sadiq and declared the special features (furū‘ār) of the Persian beliefs compatible with Islam. The Sunnite theologian Abd Allāh b. Husain al-Suwaydī, Kitāb al-Mu‘jam al-‘asbusa li-l-Muhammad bn-Muhammad bn-Ilī, (Istanbul, Cairo, 1324), also gives a very interesting summary of this dispute; cf. Ritter, Isl., xv, 1926, i. 106 and the detailed account by Prof. A. E. Schmidt, Istoria minunsko-sihištščikh otnešeniiy v ‘Ile al-Djumān (Barthold Festschrift, Tashkent 1927, p. 69–107).

Rebellions. The strange abandonment of the campaign in Mesopotamia is to be explained by the new risings in the east. Much more important was the rising in Fārs led by the beglerbegi Taṭā Khān, a great favourite of Nādir. He was ultimately captured and castrated. In Astarābād the Kādżārs rose against the oppression of the governor’s son (Ianway, Hist. Account, i. 192). Nādir had to send his nephew ‘Ali Kuli to Khwārizm. Finally the Ottomans of Kars disseminated in Aḏharbāḏjān letters from the new pretender Şāft Mirzā (Muḥammad ‘Ali Rāsfandjānī) and then refused to begin an exchange of prisoners.

Fourth Campaign against the Turks. In the meanwhile the Porte equipped a new army (150,000 horse and 40,000 janissaries) which advanced on Erzerum and Kars under the command of the former viceroy Yegīn Muḥammad Pasha while ‘Abd Allāh Pasha of Edirne’s army went via Dijārakur and Mawsil. On the 21st Rādjab (Aug. 20) came the news of the victory won by Naṣr Allāh Mirzā over ‘Abd Allāh Pasha’s army (near Mawsil) and at the same time Yegīn Muḥammad Pasha died leaving his army in complete disorder. Nādir again won a brilliant victory (on the very scene of his first victory in 1735) but then, quite unexpectedly, wrote to the Sultan saying he was abandoning the first two clauses of Mughān. Personal fatigue may explain why Nādir could not exploit his success.

On Sept. 4, 1746, peace was signed with the Turkish envoys and on 10th Muḥarram 1160 (Jan. 22, 1747) the Shāh’s representatives (Muṣṭaфа Khān Shamī and the historian Mahdī Khān) set out for Constantinople with the şalāt-nāma. Nādir denounced his famous religious clauses in favour of the Sultan, “the Khalifa of the people of Islam and the glory of the Turkoman race”. By the treaty the frontier was restored to that of the time of Mūrād IV (cf. Tārīkh) but in a platonical fashion, Nādir expressed the wish to receive one
of the provinces which had belonged to the "Turkoman Sultanate".

On the 10th Muharram, Nadir left for Kirman marking his route by piles of skulls erected everywhere. After the Nawruz, Nadir returned to Mashhad and devoted himself to "spilling the blood of the innocents". His conduct was now clearly abnormal. In an epilogue to his history written after the death of Nadir, Mahdi Khan records the denunciations, executions and extortions carried out by the agents of the treasury and the ruin of the country, which had however begun before the Indian expedition (Otter, Réseaux russes, Hanway, i. 230). The Shi'ite opposition must also have been intensified in view of the frankly Sunni turn which Nadir's "Khurra-Aanian" policy had taken. The rising in Sistan, which brought matters to a head was provoked by the activities of the tax collectors who were demanding a contribution of 300,000 tumans from the province. Ali Kuli Mirza, nephew of Nadir, put himself at the head of the rebels. Even Tahmasp Kuli Khan Djalayeri, the most faithful support of the throne, wanted to proclaim one of Nadir's sons as king. The troubles spread to Khorasan and the Kurds of Khabushan raided the royal stables at Rrudkan. Nadir marched on them but on the eve of 11th Djamad II 1160 (June 20, 1147) he was assassinated in his camp near Fathabad by the Kajjar and Asfahni chiefs in conspiracy with the bodyguard. Father Bazin was a witness of the disorder which broke out in the camp after the assassination. On the 27th Djamad II (July 5, 1152) Ali Kuli Mirza came from Herat and was proclaimed king. All the royal princes were massacred.

The treasure amassed by Nadir was soon scattered to the winds; the country, utterly exhausted, was in the throes of crisis. Nadir's attempts to compose religious difficulties had failed completely; but Persian territory and its periphery were cleared of enemies. But for Nadir Shah, Persia would probably not exist, even in its present bounds.
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General surveys: Sir J. Malcolm, History of Persia, 1815, p. 33 - 108; C. R. Markham, A general Sketch of the History of Persia, L. 1874, p. 298 - 318; Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande, 1887, ii. 379 - 382; C. Horn in the Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie, ii. 587 - 592; Sir P. Sykes, A History of Persia, 1915, ii. 331 - 369; E. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, iv. 132 - 138 (following Hanway). All these are obsolete or defective. A thesis on Nadir for a doctorate of London is in preparation by J. Lockhart. Cf. also R. Stuart Poole, The Coins of the Shahs of Persia, Brit. Mus., 1887, p. xix, ixix, 73 - 84 (60 pieces described); R. B. Whitehead, The Coins of the Durrani and of Nādīr Shāh, Oxford 1933; General Kishmushye, Pokhodi Nadir Shāh v Herat, Kandschar, Indijsy sobitya v Persii posle yego smerti, Tislis 1889 (Nadir's campaigns from the soldier's point of view; cf. Zaf, vii., 1892, p. 351); Sir Mortimer Durand, Nadir Shah, London 1908 (a novel, with several contemporary illustrations); do., Nādir Shāh, in J. R. A. S., 1908, i. 286 - 298 (general sketch); Sa'id Nafisi, Ashirin yaddār-i Nādir-shāh, Tihran, Madjalla-yi Sharq, 1300, 31 pages (story in dramatic form). The career of Nādir Shāh impressed the imaginations of the peoples whom he conquered. In addition to Indian and Persian panegyrics there is a poem in the Gheit dialect (spoken in Kurdistan); on Nūrān Shāh and Topāl Ōtāhmān Pāshā and a Daghstānī song collected in the district of Ghibūn: on the highlanders' fight against Nādir (cf. Daghstānīskī qorob, Makhāḵ-Kal’ā, 1927, iii. p. 51 - 53). In Europe of the xviiith century it was seriously discussed whether Nādir Shāh was a European adventurer: there are also several contemporary works in French, German and Portuguese, the subjects of which are the deeds real or imaginary of Nādir Shāh like L'expédition de Thamos Koulī Khan dans les cours de l'Europe by the Abbé Rochelbrun, Cologne 1746 etc.

(V. MINORSKY)

NADIR (NAẒIR AL-SAṬIY ʿAL-NAẒĪR MĀʾ, .translatesAutoresizingMaskIntoConstraints), the bottom, the pole of the horizon (invisible) under the observer in the direction of the vertical, also the deepest (lowest) point in the sphere of heaven. The nadir is the opposite pole to the zenith [q. v.].

The word 'nadīr (from nāpārā, "to see", "to observe") originally (and generally) means the
of their maintenance: part of it the Prophet kept for himself.

Sūrat al-Hāshā (lxix.) was revealed upon the expulsion of the Banu 'l-Nadīr.

From Khairāb the exiles planned to occupy the Kurashii the siege of Madīna in Dhub l-Kaḍa'a 3 A.H. The treasure of the Banu 'l-Nadīr was captured by Muḥammad in Khairāb in 7 A.H.


AL-NADĪR (Masūdī 'Alli), an area and place of pilgrimage in the 'Irāq 6 miles west of al-Kūfa. It lies on the edge of the desert on a flat barren eminence from which the name al-Nadīr has been transferred to it (A. Musil, The Middle Ephramites, p. 35).

According to the usual tradition, the Imām al-Mu'āmmīn ʿAllī b. Abd Tālib [q. v.] was buried near Kūfa, not far from the dam which protected the city from flooding by the Ephramites at the place where the town of al-Nadīr later arose (Vāḳīt, Muḥṣam, ed. Wustenfeld, iv. 760), also called Nadīr al-Kūfa (Zamakhshari, Lexicon geographicum, ed. Salverda de Grae, p. 153). Under ʿUmayyad the site of the grave near al-Kūfa had to be concealed. As a result it was later sought in different places, by many in al-Kūfa itself in a corner above the hidda of the mosque, by others again 2 farsakhs from al-Kūfa (al-Ṭāhārī, ed. de Goeje, B.G.A., i. 82 et.; Ibn Ḥawkal, ibid., ii. 163). According to a third story, ʿAli was buried in al-Madīna near Fāṭima's grave (al-Masūdī, Muḥṣam al-Dhahab, ed. Barbier de Meynard, vii. 289), according to a fourth, at Kaṣr al-Imāra (Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, x. 1926, p. 967 sqq.; A. H. 40, § 99). Perhaps the sanctuary of al-Nadīr is not the real burial-place but a tomb held in reverence in the pre-Islamic period. especially as the graves of Adam and Noah were also shown there (Ibn Batṭūta, Tuhfa, ed. Defrémery and Sanguineti, i. 416; G. Jacob in A. Noldke, Das Heiligum al-Husayn zu Kerbila, Berlin 1909, p. 38, note 1). It was not till the time of the Hamālīn of al-Masūdī ʿAbd 'l-Hādī [see also ALLAH B. HAMĀDI] that a large ẓiyāra was built by him over ʿAli's grave, adorned with precious carpets and curtains and a citadel built there (Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 165). The Shīʿī Büyūd Ḥad-Dawla [q. v.] in 369 (979–980) built a mausoleum, which was still in existence in the time of Ḥamāl Allāh Mustawfī, and was buried there, as were his sons Sharīf and Bahāʾ al-Dawla. Al-Nadīr was already a small town with a circumference of 2,500 paces (Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, viii. 518; Ḥamāl Allāh Mustawfī, Niežat al-Kullīb, ed. Le Strange, p. 32: in the year 356 = 976–977). Ḥasan b. al-Faḍlī, who died about 414 (1023–24) built the defensive walls of Masihhīd ʿAllī (Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 154). The Māhād was burned in 443 (1051–52) by the fanatical populace of Baghdaḍ but must have been soon rebuilt. The Sālājūt sulṭān Malikshāh and his vizier Nīẓām al-Mulk who were in Baghdaḍ in 479 (1086–87) visited the sanctuaries of ʿAllī and Ḥusayn (Ibn al-Athīr, x. 103). The Ikhčān Gharābīn (1295–1304),

NADIR — AL-NADJAF

point diametrically opposite a point on the circumference of a circle or the surface of a sphere; we find mukābal as a synonym of naẓīr in this general meaning [cf. also Muqābalā].

(Willy Harinner)

NADIR (Banu 'l-), one of the two main Jewish tribes of Madīna, settled in Yathrib from Palestine at an unknown date, as a consequence of Roman pressure after the Jewish wars. Al-Yaḍīq (i. 49) says they were a section of the Qāshān Arabs, converted to Judaism and first settled on Mount al-Nadīr, whence their name: according to the Sira Haddāy (Cairo, i. 2) they were a truly Jewish tribe, connected with the Jews of Khairāb. This seems the more probable, but a certain admixture of Arab blood is possible: they were the other Jews of Madīna they bore Arabic names, but kept aloof from the Arabs, spoke a peculiar dialect, and had enriched themselves with agriculture, money-lending, business in armours and jewels.

They were clients of the Aws, siding with them in their conflicts with the Khazzardj, and entering with them into the compact with Muḥammad known as the Constitution of Madīna in 1 A.H. Their most important chief at this time was Ḥuyayy bi. Akhṭāb, whose daughter Sāfiya became Muḥammad's wife in 7 A.H. For a list of Muḥammad's worst enemies among the Banu 'l-Nadīr see Ibn Ḥ臂ṣam, Sīra, p. 351–352.

Their forresses were half a day's march from Madīna, and they owned land in Wālī Buṭḥān and Buwaira; their dwelling places were south of the city.

The Banu 'l-Nadīr seem to have been in (commercial?) relations with Abū Sufyān before the battle of Uhud. In 4 A.H., in Rabī I, owing to difficulties about the Banu 'l-Nadīr's contribution to certain blood-money which was being collected from the whole Muslim community in Madīna, Muḥammad, who had personally negotiated the matter with their chiefs, became convinced of their enmity towards himself and suspected them of intending to kill him. He decided to get rid of such dangerous neighbours, and ordered them through Muḥammad b. Maslama al-Awsi to leave the city within ten days, under penalty of death, allowing them to take with them all their movable goods, and to return each year to gather the produce of their palm-groves.

The tribe, having no hope of help from the Aws, agreed to leave, but ʿAbd Allāh b. Ūbāy al-Khazzardj, chief of the mukābal, persuaded them to resist in their forresses, promising to send 2,000 men to their aid. Ḥuyayy bi. Akhṭāb, hoping the Banū Kurayja would also help them, prepared to resist, in the face of opposition from moderate elements in the tribe.

The siege lasted about a fortnight, help from the mukābal was not forthcoming, and when the Muslims began to cut down their palms the Banu 'l-Nadīr surrendered. Muḥammad's conditions were much harder than formerly; their immovable property was forfeited, and nothing left them but what they could take away on camels, arms alone excepted. After two days' bargaining the tribe departed with a caravan of 600 camels; some went to Syria, others to Khairāb.

The Banu 'l-Nadīr's booty Muḥammad did not divide in the usual manner; the land was distributed among the mukābalīr, so as to relieve the Anjūr
according to Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, built in al-
Nadaf a Dār al-Siyāda and a dervish monastery (khanāqāh). The Mongol governor of Baghdād in 1263 led a canal from the Euphrates to al-Nadaf but it soon became silted up and was only cleared out again in 1508 by order of Shāh Ismā‘īl. This canal was originally called Nahr al-Shāh (now al-Ḳabā‘) (Lūghat al-‘Arab, Baghdād, ii., 1930–
1931, p. 458). This Shī‘a Šafawī himself made a pilgrimage to the masjid al-Ṣan‘ā of Kerbela‘ al-
Nadaf. Sulaimān the Magnificent visited the holy places in 941 (1534–1535). A new canal made in 1793 also soon became silted up, as did the Ţerī al-Shāhī and al-Ḥajāndīrīya canals, the latter of which was made by order of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd II.
In 1912 iron pipes were laid to bring water from the Euphrates to al-Nadaf (Lūghat al-‘Arab, ii., 458 sq.; 491). A considerable part of the ‘irāq with al-Nadaf and Kerbela‘ was temporarily conquered by the Persians in 1624.
Nadaf, while Musil (The Middle Euphrates, p. 35, note 26) places the centre of the ruins of al-Ḥira S. E. of the tell of Knēdēr which lies halfway between al-Kīla and al-Khawanāk. Ibn Batūṭa entered Maḥdāf ‘Alī which he visited in 726 (1326) through the Bāb al-Ḥadra gate which led straight to the Maḥdāf. He describes the town and sanctuary very fully. According to al-Ya‘ḳūbī (loc. cit.), the ridge on which al-Nadaf stands once formed the shore of the sea which in ancient times came up to here. For the number of its inhabitants and its architectural beauty, Ibn Batūṭa reckoned the town among the most important in the ‘Irāq. It has now about 20,000 inhabitants (Persians and Arabs), has a Shī‘a college and celebrated cemetery in the Wādī al-Salām. Near al-Nadaf were the monasteries of Dair Mār Fāṭihyūn (Ya‘ḳūt, Mu‘īdīm, ii. 691) and Dair Hind al-Kubrā‘ (Ya‘ḳūt, ii. 709), also al-Rūba‘a (5 hours S. W. of the town; Ya‘ḳūt, ii. 762; Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 110, note 61) and Kāsh Gā‘ (Ya‘ḳūt, iv. 107). The lake of al-Nadaf marked on many older maps has long since completely dried up (Nolde, Reise nach Innerasien, p. 105).

Bibliography:
Ibn al-Athir, Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, index, vol. ii., p. 808 (Maḥdāf ‘Alī), 817 (al-Nadaf); al-Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, Indicae, p. 784; Abu l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, Kitāb al-

BAND NADJAF, A DYNASTY OF ABYSSINIAN MANLÜKS AT ZABİĐ [q.v.] FROM 412 TO 553 (1022–1158). When the last Ziyādī [q.v.] had been put to death in the vizierate of the Abyssinian Manlūk by one of his Manlūk governors Naftis, the other Nadja‘ī came forward to avenge him. After desperate fighting, Naftis was slain and Nadja‘ī in Dhu ‘l-‘Qa‘da 412 (Feb. 1022) entered Zabīd where he had the vizier built alive into a wall in exact revenge for the Ziyādī. As his rival Naftis had already done, Nadja‘ī assumed the insignia of royalty, struck his own coins and inserted his own name in the knāfī after that of the ‘Abbāsid caliph. The latter had himself forced to recognise him under the title of al-Mu‘āfiyad Nāṣīr al-Dīn. His kingdom extended over al-Tihāma, while the highlands beyond remained divided up among petty chiefs. When among the latter the Sulaiḥī [q.v.] came to considerable power, their relationships with the Banū Nadja‘ī decisively affected the history of the latter. The first Sulaiḥī ‘Alī is said to have had this first Nadja‘ī poisoned about 452 (1060) through a slave girl sent him as a present. In the confusion that followed, ‘Alī occupied Zabīd itself and Nadja‘ī’s sons fled to the island of Dahlak [q.v.]. While the eldest Mu‘āfiq committed suicide, the other two resolved to regain their lands: Sa‘īd al-Aḥwāl and Abu l-Tāmī Djiyiṣ, whose lost work al-Maṣfī‘ fi Akhbar Zabīd was the foundation for ʿUmāra’s work (in Kay, see Bibli.) Sa‘īd made his preparations in a place of concealment in Zabīd and had Djiyiṣ come later the two then came out openly, fell upon and killed ‘Alī al-Sulaiḥī, who was on a campaign against Mecca, probably in 473 (1081). Zabīd at once recognised Sa‘īd as its lord; he had appealed less to the Sunnis against the Shī‘a than to the racial feeling of the numerous Abyssinian soldier-slaves (anā ṣa‘ālun mínka wa l‘izzuna laṣṣakum: Djiyiṣ in ʿUmāra, p. 63, sq.); but Asmā‘, the widow of ‘Alī al-Sulaiḥī who was kept a prisoner in Zabīd, persuaded her son al-Mukarramm to relieve the town (475 = 1082–1083). The Nadja‘ī again escaped to Dahlak. In 479 (1086) Sa‘īd again returned as ruler but in 481 (1088) was put to death at the instigation of the Sulaiḥi queen al-Saiyida, the wife of al-Mukarramm. Djiyiṣ escaped to India with his vizier Khafāl b. Thāhir, said to have been an Umayyad, returned to Zabīd disguised as an Indian, plotted with his compatriots and easily
regained power in 482 (1089). With his death in 498 or 500 (1105-1106) disputation set in. He himself had had domestic difficulties. He executed the šāliḥ Ibn Abī Akāma who-e ancestor had come to the country with the first Ziyādī; his former helper Khalaf had to seek refuge in flight. A certain degree of strain in his relations with his brother Saʿīd is already evident from Fātīkh's account and there were fierce family feuds among his descendants. His son Fātīk I, the son of a girl brought in India, had to defend himself against his half-brothers Ibnīshīm and ʿAbd al-Walīd and died young in 503 (1109-1110). The latter's infant son al-Manṣūr was set aside by his uncles, who were quarrelling with one another, and fled to Saʿīdīya, whose favourite al-Maṣṭar bar. Abī ʿl-Barakāt brought him back in 504 (1110-1111) as vassal of the ʿUthūlīs.

On account of the new ruler's minority, events repeated their course under the Ziyādīs. The Mamlūk Ants was Manṣūr's vizier and he even assumed royal honours. When he attained his majority Manṣūr disposed of him by murdering him with his own hand in 517 (1123) and inviting him to the palace. Manṣūr however was at once poisoned at the instigation of the next vizier Mann Allāh. In the following year, the latter defeated under the walls of Zabīd Nadījā al-Dawlā, whom the Fātimīs had sent as the ʿUthūlīs power was weakening to restore their suzerainty in the land. Mann Allāh had made the boy Fātīk II nominal king, the son of Manṣūr and a slave girl singer ʿAlām who had been purchased from Anis's estate. This woman (id. 545 = 1150) endeavoured with great skill to preserve the rights of her house against the encroachments of the viziers and played among the Nadījā a part similar to that of Saʿīdīya among the ʿUthūlīs. In particular she equipped and led regular caravans of pilgrims and thus unconsciously furthered the rise of ʿAlī b. Mahdī who was finally to drive her own family from power. Mann Allāh in 524 (1130) was killed in his hareem through a plot of ʿAlām's. His successors were the Mamlūk Ruzāī and then al-Muḥammad. Against the latter the vizier Surūr and Ikhāl, who were however not on good terms. In their quarrels the various parties several times brought the petty Arab princes who lived around it against Zabīd. Ikhāl had Fātīk II poisoned (531 = 1137). As he had no heirs, he was followed by his cousin Fātīk III b. Muḥammad b. Fātīk I b. Dajjāsh. The government had been in the hands of Surūr since 529 (1135). His career of indefatigable activity was ended in a mosque in Zabīd on the 12th Rajjab 531 (Sept. I, 1136) by an assassin, a "Khwārishī"; envoy of "Alī b. Mahdī. When the Zabīd Imām Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil Aḥmad b. Sulaymān was summoned to help them by the Abyssinians, he made it a first condition that Fātīk should be deposed and he himself recognised as lord of Zabīd. The troops agreed to this but the victory lay with "Alī b. Mahdī [q.v. and the article MAHDĪ]. On 14th Rajjab 534 (Aug. 2, 1139) he entered Zabīd.

The Banū Ziyād and the Banū Nadījā continually brought over shiploads of Abyssinian slaves to recruit their troops and thus continued that mixture of races, which already existed before Islam and is still very marked in the Yaman plains. These Mamlūks however became a great danger for the Ziyādīs and also for the Nadījā themselves. Dajjāsh had attempted to counteract them with a bodyguard of Turkī-ḵ Oguz [cf. GHIZI]. But they were not suited to the climate: in particular it was impossible to establish a colony of them there permanently as their children, if they did not die, remained weaklings. The Abyssinian admixture was still further increased by the many slave-girls, who, particularly when they became mothers, exerted some political influence. The enormous harem s of the notables created the most complicated family relationships. For example the settlement of the estate of the vizier Ruzāī became a notoriously difficult case in the law of inheritance which occupied the ablest faqāḥs for years until finally a very aged ʿAḍālamawī found a solution in accordance with the Sharīʿa.

*Bibliography:* S. the article ZAVID, esp. Kay; also: Ibn Khallikān, Wajayyār al-ṣāyān, Dūlākh 1299, i. 153; Husain F. Hamdāni, The Life and Times of Queen Sajīda, Arabs the ʿUthūlīs of the Yemen (J. C. A. S., xvi., 1931, p. 505-517); E. de Lumbrard, Manuel de géogra. et de chronologie, Hanover 1927, p. 118. (R. STROTMANN)

**Al-NADĪJĀH, designation in Arabic of the king of Abyssinia. It is a loanword from Aethiopic Ḥawla "king, prince" etc. In Arabic it is sometimes used as a proper noun, sometimes as a nomen appellativum. The word is also genuine Arabic, but as such it has the meaning of driver of game. It does not occur in the Ḥaḍīth. In Ḥaḍīth it is the designation of the king of Abyssinia, just as Kaisar [q.v.], Kisrā [q.v.] and al-Muḥākās [q.v.] are the designations of the rulers of Rūm, Fāris and Miṣr. In their totality they represent the Great Powers which in the time of Muḥammad surrounded the territory of Islam. On the fresco in the hall of the castle of Kūsair ʿAmra [cf. AMRA], dating from the middle of the viith century A.D., al-Nadījāh appears as the fourth of these Powers, the place of the Muḥākās being taken by Roderick the Visigoth. In the Sirā the Nadījāh occupies a place of some importance, his relations in coming to two bidrās to Abyssinia, with Muḥammad's letter persuading him to embrace Islam, with his conversion from Christianity to Islam and with his equipping two ships in behalf of the return of the emigrants to Arabia, amongst whom was Umm Ḥabīb, who was to marry Muḥammad (A.H. 7).

These traditions have been critically examined by Grimm, Caetani and Mrs. Vaceca. Grimm denied the historical foundation of the traditions concerning Muḥammad's letters to the Great Powers. Caetani submitted the question to an elaborate enquiry. Mrs. Vaceca reduces the traditions to the following historical facts: a. the return of Ḥaṣaf b. Abī Ťalib from Abyssinia in 7 a.h., when Muḥammad was besieging Ḥaḥib; b. the expedition of Ṭmar b. ʿUmayya in A.H. 6 in order to reconduct the emigrants from Abyssinia to al-Madinah; c. vague traditions concerning the emigration from Makka to Abyssinia. To these groups several episodes agglomerated, viz. to a. the story that Umm Ḥabīb, Abī Sufyān's daughter and widow of ʿUthayb b. ʿUmayya, was asked in marriage by Muḥammad and provided with a marriage-gift of 400 dinars by the Nadījāh; to b. the story of Muḥammad's letter to the Nadījāh; his embracing Islam and his becoming
the intermediary of the conversion of 'Amr b. al-\'A\'.

In Ḥadīth the Nadājštī is also mentioned in connection with the story that his death in 9 a. h. was proclaimed, without previous intimation, by Muḥammad, who held on the musalla [q.v.] a funeral service in behalf of this fellow Muslim. As his proper name is given Aḍšama or Aḍšama b. Abībar.

The title al-Nadājštī is also given in Arabic literature to later kings of Abyssinia, as may be seen from this article.


(Chain. J. Wensinck)

AL-NADĀJŠTĪ, KĀSĪ B. ʿAMR AL-ḤABĪB, an Arab poet of the seventh century a. d., lived at first in Nadājštī [q.v.] and quarrelled with ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, son of Ḥaṭīb [q.v.], because the latter had addressed in song a married female relative of Nadājštī in Medina. After an exchange of lampoons with his opponent from his nativity place, he met him at the annual fair in Ḫuṭ ʿAbdul-Jāzīz and again in Mecca when ʿAbd al-Raḥmān not only proved inferior to a poet but suffered bodily injury, so that his aged father had to interfere on his behalf. Nadājštī had a second conflict with Ibn Muḥīlī, the poet of the Banū ʿAddān; he was so unbridled in his defence that the caliph ʿOmar punished him with imprisonment after procuring an opinion on his verses from Ḥaṣān and al-Ḥujara. After ʿOmar's assassination, al-Nadājštī appeared in Kīfa as one of the leading political lampoonists in Muʿāwiya's poet's at the battle of Siffin. But his disorderly life lost him the favour of ʿAḥ and after a drinking-bout in Ḫaṣān he was thrown thrashing prescribed by law and put in the pillory. After a conflict with Kīfān notables, in which he expressed his wrath at this punishment in satirical verses, he was expelled by ʿAḥ and went over to Muʿāwiya. He then went back to his native county Yaman and died in Lābdīj in the year 49 (669), in which year he wrote a lament on the death of Ḥaṣān.


(C. Brockelmann)

MIR ʿABD AL-ʿAṬ, NADĀJŠTĪ, a Persian poet, born about 1046 (1636–1637), the son of a Husain Sāiyid Muḥammad Muṣmin of Ḩaṣānī. He is known of his life. Only much is certain, that he, like many other Persian poets of this time, worked in the offices of different Persian dignitaries. For example he was a mustawfi [q.v.] with Sādi Mīrzā Ḥabīb Allāh, later occupied the same office in Astārābād and ended his career in 1126 (1714) after being for many years mustāfi with the Ṣafawī princes Shāh Sulaimān (1667–1694) and Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusain (1694–1722). He owes his fame mainly to a long poem Gul u-Khānīr ("Wrestling") which he finished in 1112 (1700–1701) and which deals with the theme of the ẓūrāmān [q.v.] still very popular in Persia. As the Persian athletes still form a special closed corporation they use a special language (a kind of slang) which is full of the technical terms of their art and is not intelligible to the outsider.

Nadājštī used these technical terms very skilfully in his poem which makes it very difficult for laymen to understand. This produced several commentaries on his work, of which those of ʿArūz, Rātnī Ṣahkhī (printed Lucknow 1258) and Gobind-rān (lith. Morādābād 1884) are the best known. Of Nadājštī's contemporaries some did not approve of his peculiar style and thought his poem degraded the poet's art with its vulgar expressions and low humour. As a matter of fact, Nadājštī's tone differs considerably from the traditional lofty style of Persian court poetry and approaches the language of the Persian middle classes; this makes his work of considerable importance for the history of the Persian language. Besides the poem, we only know of a collection of lyrics by Nadājštī of which there are manuscripts in several libraries (see below).


(E. BERTHELIS)

NADĀJŠTĪ BEY, properly ʿAṬ (Nūh, also given, is not certain), the first great Turkish lyric poet of the pre-classical period, one of the founders of the classical Ottoman poetry. Born in Adrianople (Amasia and ʿAṭāmān are also given), the son of a slave, obviously a Christian prisoner of war for which reason he is called ʿAbd Allāh, the name given to every one, he was adopted by a well-to-do lady of Adrianople, received a good education and was trained by the poet Sālī. In spite of the fact that his non-Turkish origin was generally known, he was regarded as their equal in every way by the Turks in keeping with their democratic attitude.

He early came to ʿAṭāmān and there began his literary career and soon gained a great reputation. His poems are said here and there to bear traces of the ʿAṭāmān dialect. Coming to Constantinople, he at once gained the favour of Sultan Mehmed II by a şārīda on winter; in 886 (1481)
he celebrated the accession of Bāyazīd II in a ḵaṣṣa and was rewarded by an appointment as secretary in the Diwan. He gained such favour with the Sultan that he was appointed secretary to his eldest son 'Abd Allāh and was given the title of ḥāfiz when the prince went to Karahana as governor (mevkine). After the prince’s early death (888 = 1483) Nadjātī returned to Constantinople with an elegance on the death of the prince which showed deep emotion. After a long interval in which he wrote a great deal but was in continual need, through the influence of Ma’ayyad-Zade [q. v.] he became Ṽikandarī to Bāyazīd’s younger son Mahmūd when the latter went to Šārūkhān in 910 (1504). Nadjātī wrote his finest verse while on the staff of this prince; this was the happiest period of his life. Mahmūd also died; prematurely in 913 (1507) in Manissa, the capital of Šārūkhān, and Nadjātī again lost his patron. He returned with a beautiful elegy to Constantinople and finally retired from the service of the court on a modest pension. He took a house on the Wefā Maidenlari where many friends gathered round him, especially his pupils, the poet and texerезда Edirne Sebi and the poet Sun‘ī. Nadjātī died on the 25th Dhu ‘l-Ḵaṣṣa 914 (March 17, 1509). He was buried near his own house, at the monastery of Şahük Wefā and a tombstone was put up by Sebi for him.

He left a Diwan which he had collected on the advice of Ma’ayyad-Zade and dedicated to prince Mahmūd. There is also attributed to him a mesnevi, which is not otherwise known, entitled Ma‘mūr-i Ǧalā‘-ullāh, also quoted as Laila u-Majdūn and Mīr u-Maḥ. Even more uncertain seems to be the existence of the mesnevi mentioned by Sebi: Ǧalā‘ u-Sabā‘. Nadjātī is also mentioned as a translater of Persian works but his pupil Sebi says nothing of this. He is said to have translated for prince Mahmūd the Kiamyā-i Se‘ādet of Imām Ghażālī (the Persian version of the Arabic Ifyā) and the Ḫāyānat of Imām Ghażālī (the Persian version of the Arabic Ḫayānat and the Ḫayānat al-Ḫayāyat (properly Ḫayānat al-Ḫayāyat wa-Lawātān al-Rivāyāt) from the Persian of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afwa‘ī.

His Diwan which is still unprinted, gives Nadjātī a very prominent place in Ottoman literature; the Diwan was regarded as a model for all Ottoman poets. Nadjātī, whom İdris Bišīsī in his Ḥaṣṣ Bīḵtīrī calls khosrow-i Şī‘ār-i Rūm and others Malik al-Şī‘ār and Tā‘ī-i Rūm (= the mådawi of Asia Minor), was regarded as the best poet of Rūm. He does not, it is true, reach the heights that Nesimi does but he surpasses all his predecessors, of whom Aḥmad Pasha and Zātī were the greatest, in originality and creative power. Only Bāşi and Fuzūlī have surpassed him. The problem to be solved by Aḥmad Pasha, Nadjātī and Zātī was to incorporate completely into Turkish the matter borrowed and translated from Persian literature, which was still felt to be foreign, to adapt Turkish to Perso-Arabic metres and to domesticate fully the Arabic and Persian vocabulary. This was a great achievement for the time. Nadjātī brought about a great change in the literature as regards outlook, feeling and language. In him the age of Sultan Bāyazīd was most clearly reflected. Although he is not to be claimed as a very great poet, he was the king of the gild of poets of his time, who started a great literary movement. Nadjātī combined a thorough knowledge of Persian with a masterly command of Turkish. In the use of his ghazals he far surpasses Bāşi. His work as a poet of ḵaṣṣas was original and stimulating. He was specially celebrated for his skill in the use of the proper nouns.


(Thx. Menzel)

Nadjī. [See Ṭukba.] Nadjī, B. ʿAmir. [See Kharadijtes.] al-Nadjījār, al-Husain b. Muḥammad Abu ‘Abd Allāh, a Murūji and Dżabari theologian of the period of al-Ma‘mūn, a pupil of Bīghr al-Marīfī whose views were combated by Abu ʿl-Hadhā’ll al-ʿAllīf and al-Naẓmām. He probably lived in Bamm where he was a weaver. According to him, the divine attributes are identical with the essence and express its negative aspects. Vision of God is only possible through a divine act which transforms the eye into the heart by giving it the power of recognition. The word of God is created, accident when it is read, body when it is written. God who knows from all eternity all worldly things, wills them all, good as well as evil, faith as well as unbelief. God has a hidden essence (theory of ma‘ṣīya); there is in him a hidden fund of grace (ṣa‘īf) which would suffice to bring all the inadels back to their problem. Problems of the body and accidents: atom = accident; the body then consists of a conglomerate of accidents (= Dīnār) which are in juxtaposition without interfering with each other (against the mu‘ārabal of al-Naẓmām); momentariness of the accidents. This orientation of the problem is due to the theocentric tendencies of al-Nadjījār. All that takes place in the world comes from the incessant and unrestrained activity of God beside whom there is neither reality nor agent. God creates the actions of man. He gives his assistance to every good action and shows his desertion of every bad one; this assistance and desertion constitute the faculty of doing which accompanies the action (al-issīša al-ma‘lif against the Mu‘tazila). The activity of man consists in his appropriation of the divine will (ṣa‘īf). Man carries out one action only by one ʿissīša: the secondary effects (al-muvaṣṣalat) do not depend on man but on God (against the Mu‘tazila theory of tawallud). Faith consists in the knowledge of God, of his apostles and his commandments and in the profession of this knowledge by the mouth. Faith consists of several qualities (khišf) each of which
is an act of obedience (\textit{illa}); complete faith is the sum of all \textit{illa}. Faith may increase but not diminish: it can be completely lost only through unbelief. He who commits a heinous sin and dies impenitent is doomed to hell from which he will emerge however, unlike the complete infidel. Al-Nadjidjär denied the punishment of the tomb (\textit{ki\={a}b\={a} al\={a}\={c}h\={a}b\={a}}), probably as a result of his determinism. — Al-Nadjidjär like his master Bishr represents the reformed and modified Djahmiyya. The influence of Mu'tazila theology on this school is manifest; on the other hand, the Mu'tazila itself, especially that of Baghdād, seems to have received certain quite important stimuli from his school in spite of its opposition to it. Several of Al-Nadjidjär's doctrines are found at a later date in al-Aš'ārī. — The Nadjidjariya flourished in Rāy and Gurgān. It was divided into three schools: 1. the Burūghūtiyya, the followers of Muhammād b. 'Isā Burūghū; 2. the Za'farānīya, the followers of a certain Aḥāb 'Abd Allāh b. al-Za'farānī; 3. the Mustadrikā, a reforming party which sought paradoxical doctrines on the divine word.

\textit{Bi\=lography:} a-Fihrist, ed. Flugel, p. 179 (with a list of his writings); al-Mu\={a}ṣṣadārī, \textit{F. G. a.}, iii. 37–38, 126, 265, 394–395, al-Sanā\={a}nī, \textit{Albā\={a}}, fol. 554r; al-Khāṭārī, \textit{Kita\={a} al-Ja\={a}t\={a}r}, ed. Nyberg, s. index; al-Ashārī, \textit{Ma\={a}fīlī al-Fā\={a}manīn}, ed. Kitter, s. index; al-Baghdādī, Kita\={a} al-Fā\={a}nī, Cairo, p. 195–198, 201; al-Shahra\={a}rī, Kita\={a} al-Mīrāl, ed. Cureton, p. 61–63.

(H. S. Nyberg)

Mū\={a}līm Nādīj, properly 'Onur, an important Ottoman author, poet, critic and man of letters, who occupies a special and somewhat hybrid position in the history of the Turkish moderns and has given his name to a whole literary period. Born in 1266 (1850) in Constantinople, the third son of a master saddler 'Alī Agha (not Bey, as some literary historians say), he lost his father at the age of seven. The widow Fatme al-Zehra, who was descended from a mahājīr who had come to Constantinople from Rumi, went to Varna to her brother, the Kalâydhī Ahmad Agha. The latter in spite of his limited means, made it possible for 'Onur to be educated at the Ämâne and 'Onur's elder brother Sâlan gave him considerable assistance. 'Onur devoted himself at first to calligraphy and for his teacher used the makhārī Juhūlī. A certain Khādiy Juhūlī aroused in him a fondness for poetry and he took the makhārī Nadjī for his poems (from a passage in the \textit{Mukhtārat} of 'Ali Giritli). He also tried to obtain the title of hājī. His training in the medrese left a permanent influence on him. It was long before he decided to put off the turban and the \textit{djū\={a}b}. The spirit of the \textit{mela\={a}} and a certain tolerant fanaticism however never left him.

In 1284 (1867) Nadjī received an appointment as second master in the Kudsiye school in Varna. At an inspection the then mu\={a}ṣṣadārî of Varna, Kari̇b Sâl Sal̇hȧşi Pasha (later Foreign Minister, President of the Council of State and several times an ambassador), made the acquaintance of the intelligent young teacher. He took him into his service as secretary, when he was moved to Tulca just before the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877; thence he was moved to Tarsowo and later to Əsmān Pazař. Nadjī accompanied the much travelled Pasha on his moves and journeys. After a brief stay in Constantinople, he went to Veli Şehir Fənər (=- Larissa in Thessaly) where Nadjī made the acquaintance of the poet and Mewlevi Əawī Bey, who had a very good knowledge of Persian. Nadjī who, as acting secretary, went to the court and judge of investigation had here finally to lay aside the turban. When Sâl̇hȧşi Pasha set out on a nine months' tour of inspection in Asia Minor, the Euphrates and Erzurum, Nadjī again accompanied him. He recorded his impressions in the poem \textit{Sāma\={a}r}-\textit{Gharbān}, he had abandoned himself with other congenial wits to a life of dissipation at Tawk Pazař, both earlier and after his return to Constantinople. The transfer of the Pasha as våli of the Aegean islands to Chios, where Nadjī acted as mu\={a}mīlīyā, saved him from this. Here he was able fully to develop his literary leanings. Already in 1292 he had published poems and articles in Varna in the \textit{Tuna} newspaper of which some were even reprinted from the Constantinople paper \textit{Büşire}, such as his \textit{Bi\={a} Mu\={a}līmîn Şaqiq-\={a}t\={a}nîm Akhārî}. From Chios he began his association with Ahmad Midjah Efendi who was then editing the \textit{Terdjumān\={i} Hāşâṣ; from his contributions in poetry and prose, which appeared in the \textit{Terdjumān} over the pseudonym Ahmad Mustā'ıd and Mustā'ıd-i K̇̈ḣ̄zâ, a close friendship arose which proved of decisive influence on his future career. When Sâl̇hȧşi Pasha went as ambassador to Berlin, Nadjī declined to go with him, which was much to be regretted in the interests of his literary development. He therefore resigned his post in the Foreign Ministry and devoted himself entirely to authorship. Midjah gave him the editorship of the newly formed literary section of his paper. At the suggestion of Midjah, whose son-in-law he had become, he learned French although he was now over 30. When he left the \textit{Terdjumān} for literary reasons, he undertook the editorship of the \textit{Şèâdî} newspaper.

By his great literary and critical activity, he gained an influence which can hardly be estimated high enough on the intellectual life of Turkey in his time, not least through his position as lecturer on Turkish literature at the Mektetb-I Şulhānî in Galata Serai and in the law school. He became celebrated under the name Mūlîm (teacher) of which he was particularly proud. In 1307 (1889) he was appointed by imperial \textit{vād}e Turkish historiographer, \textit{Terdjumān\={i} Əli Əsmān}, as a reward for his historical poem \textit{Ertgâr-ı Şahā}. But he did not live to do anything serious in this field except an introduction which survives in MS. He died on 27th Ramadan 1310 (April 14, 1893), at the age of 43 from heart failure and was buried in the garden of the \textit{tubbe} of Sultan Mahmûd.

As a literary figure, Nadjī revealed two aspects. On the one hand, he was a fanatical admirer of the old literature out of which he had developed and for which he endeavoured to revive the taste of his milieu by every means, by his modest poetic talent and considerable skill in versification; on the other hand, he seemed in sympathy with the moderns but in view of his convinced belief in the decadence of western culture he had little real understanding of them.

Nadjī's services to Turkish prose are undeniable. Over 50 years ago he was already writing the prose of the future, a model, clear, simple, style in the
language of a master who could not be surpassed. Two years before Ševčí's celebrated Kūtk Štejler (1309) with its complicated prose, Nádji gave a classic specimen of simple prose, in his Omeri bin Cudžikłąghun (1307) which was only properly appreciated and imitated at a much later date. In it we find the first suggestions of Turkish realism.

The forms not cultivated by the old writer, the story and the drama, he did not, it is true, entirely omit, but apart from autobiographical sketches and a translation from Zola, he wrote no stories and he was a failure as a dramatist. In theory, it seemed sufficient to him and his followers to put French stories of crime into the orta eyamın form in order to produce regular Turkish "dramas". Here also he approximated to the moderns but did not reach their level or ability.

As a poet and artist he is weak. He lacks favour and creative fancy. He lacks that depth of feeling which carries one away; with him everything is trivial and superficial, and he never feels or expresses anything deeply. His prose style is simple and easy, the sentences short, the mode of expression concise and clear.

His main importance lies in his wide influence as a teacher, which he exercised not so much in the actual class-room as through his whole literary activity.

As a critic he confines himself to externals and goes no further.

Nádji's prolific versatility is best shown by a list of his works. He wrote on many subjects and frequently lacked the time for adequate preparation.

Of his poetical works, the most celebrated is the collection Atekh-pärre (1300, 2nd edition 1305), which contains 52 poems in the new western manner. The best in it are: Teshi, Kebiter, Kizzu, Šam-ī Gharibian, Nasibin jöbvograndi bit Wātā, Trasvār, Saghādā, Avečč. — Next come two collections of ghazals in the old style: Şevqār, 1301 and Turklan; then the three historical poems: Hamyey jukduh Mulkāb Ebi l-Gharibian, a description of heroical deeds in Granada in the time of the last king Abū Aball Allah al-Saghīr; Zāt al-Nīfān, the heroic conduct of Esmā', daughter of Abī Bakr, at the siege of Mecca with regard to her son ʿAbd Allah b. Zubair; Gūsī Etefog Hok Be, cf. above, first printed after his death in Khażān-i Fāmān, 1310, ii, No. 10, 12. On the Fākhīr-i Shākānī's œuvres written in conjunction with A. Midhat cf. ʿAlī Emīr, in T. O. E., V., 27, 1330, p. 131; other poetical works are: Teshi Bend or Turkī Bend, an imitation of Şevqī Bin Baghdadī and Ziyā Pasha; Teshi jukduh Arūn Namīensus, Monevār-i Muallīn Nādji and a collection of fugitive pieces edited by Shaikh Wâfi after Nādji's death: Yūsuf-i Nādji, 1314.

Of his prose works the best known and most important is Šumbale (1299 and 1307). The first part contains poems like Kūtk bin Muckhān, which is very important for the development of the Turkish poem, and translations from the French. The second part: Omeri bin Cudžikłąghun, gives in a very artificial style intimate memories of his childhood up to the age of eight and has several times been translated: into German by A. Merx, Aus Muallīn Nādji's Šumbale: Die Geschichte seiner Kindheit, Berlin 1898; into Russian: VI. Gordenlevskij, Dētstvo Omara. Afbeeldingsbijdragen oer, Moscow 1914; and into Czech: Ján Rypka, Oumarové Dětství a do jeho osnut a roku, in Bíbl. Slověců Knihovce, Praž., Memories of his student days were published in the Tedgumān-i Hadīkhudat and entitled Memure Khāñtīrler, 1302; to the same year belongs Şemvenuz Nādji's (Mujāmā-i ʿEin l-Zīyā, No. 41): also Yazmīn būrman, 1301 (lettres and verses in simple language); ʿAhrār Farīn (verses and sayings of Arab and Persian men of letters, 2 parts). — A strongly personal note marks his Dewnyme (the title is chosen in allusion to Ekrem's Zezmeme), a criticism of Memunen-Žade Tahir's Tāfīr-i Eōlān, but it is primarily directed against Ekrem and his pronouncements on the stupidity of writing ghażal: it was so personal that its continuation was officially forbidden.

Equally vigorous is the criticism of the newspaper Mi'ran and its owner Muṣīd Bey in Nādji's Muğfār-i-nâmeh. — Translations and commentaries are found in Miğrāb, 1303 (first published in Mundūl-El-S̱hid; verses of the Persian poet Ṣāḥib-i Tebrizī with commentary); Şinābēt el-Arab (over 1,000 Arabic maxims with notes); Miğrāb el-3ādeem (Persian maxims). — Religious in content are: Ḥaši l-ʿEin, 2nd ed., 1308 (translation of the treatise by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzi on the Fākhīr: Līwā-i ṣekhēne in the Miğrāb el-Ghażl, first appeared in the Teğjumān; Tālim-i Ḥaram, Muḥāmmed-i ʿIškī (on the Ḥaši-ye mutlaqā at the beginning of certain Surā); Khażān-i Ṣidāy, 1304, the commentary on Surà cxxii. (Fēkāh translated from the Tefṣīr-i Ṣadr, Emdār-i ʿAhrār, sayings of the caliph ʿAli (Khitān-šāh-i Ebn l-Zīyā, No. 1); Ḥikem al-Rifāʿi (sayings of Şaytān Aḥmad al-Rifāʿi): Zāvār l-Fākāhr (wise sayings of Muslim celebrities): Usūl-i, 1305 (Persian originals and translations); Mutābākim, 1304: translations from Arabic; Persian and French; Muḥāmmed Muṣ̱īd Miğrāb, 1305: literary essays based on a collected volume in MS. by an otherwise unknown Muṣ̱īd, 1312, 1314, 1317; Nāmāvak-i Bāshān (an able selection from celebrated authors).

— His correspondence: Muṣ̱īd, 1305 and 1311 (with correspondence with friends and pupils); Miğrāb-i ʿAṭā, 1311 (with correspondence with A. Midhat); Ṣalāh buke (with correspondence with Shaikh Wāfi): ʿAhrār, 1304 (with correspondence with ʿAbd Sāle V. Hūgo). — Works on literary criticism: Muğālīn; a collection of expositions of his critical theory which had appeared in the Tedgumān and were regarded in their days as of fundamental importance; Mujāmā-i Muğālīn, 1305–1306; a collection of the literary lectures which he had given in the Sultan and the Law School (58 in number, No. 1–5 even reached a third edition); Iṣṭafa-šāh-i celebī, 1307 and 1314, his celebrated masterpiece on literary history, really only concerned with style; also Mekeṭeb-El-Bek, 1320.

— His important lexicographical works include: Kānā-3awwāl, 1308, only 5 parts; first appeared in the Muwarak: Luğāt-i Nādji = Luğāt-i mensār. — "Nādji in the light of art. Fecres, 1837, the remainder p. 837. 1426 was prepared by his friend Mustedjāf-ṣādē Ismael Bey. — The biographical works: Ovmunṭāğa Şıvârler, 1307, 2 parts (biographies of 13 Ottoman poets): Eṣāmi, 1308, about 850 somewhat arbitrarily chosen biographies in the style of the old Teckere's — His only drama Ḥašim Bey vābād Ḥodā, 1326; Tūre Kukun, the translation of Zola's Thérèse Raquin; a promised
translation of Fénelon: *Terēsii-Benāt* never appeared.

The four parts of his much used *Ta'lim-i Kīr̤āt* (or *Kīr̤āt-i-Shāhīb*) were largely responsible for the development and spread of Naḍījī's style in the widest circles. The first part reached the 31st edition by 1320.

Announced but never published were the following: *Aḥer-i mīlāt*, *Mudhakkār-i Rāghūb* (on Ḍiḍhā, Rāghūb), *Fārābī-i tiriqāyā*, *Terēsii-i-Tendēs*, etc.

Naḍījī was a contributor to a number of papers and magazines: the *Terēsii-i-Hašāt*; the *Šeχāh*, *Wālij*, the periodicals *Afā', Gungūl Suhrā*, *Maqām-e-Qalb*, *Gungūl-e-Bahār*, etc.

With Naḍījī neo-classicism came to an end although his followers, especially Ālī Kermānī, made several attempts to revive it again in the *Iḥlās* against Ḍīḍhā and in the *Ṣafāḥ* against Dānjāb Shāhībāb Dīḍhā. The movement did not yet get beyond these efforts, for his followers were as little able as Naḍījī himself to produce works of permanent value. The present generation has advanced quite out of Naḍījī's world.


(Th. Menzel)

**NAĐIJE** (A.), impure, opp. *fähig*, cf. *Ṭahrār*. According to the *Shafi'i* doctrine, as systematised by al-Nawāri (Minābād, i. 36 sqq.; cf. Ghāzālī, al-Maqām, i. 6 sqq.), the following are the things impure in themselves (*maqūlāt*): wine and other spiritual drinks, dogs, wine, ma'dallim, and excreta; milk of animals whose flesh is not eaten.

Regarding these groups the following may be remarked. On *wine* and other spiritual drinks, cf. the art. *Khandār* and *Xabīr*. — *Dogs* are not declared impure in the *Kurān*; on the contrary, in the description of the sleepers in *Kurān* xvi. 116: *vi. 146; v. 4; ii. 168*. — As to *ma'dallim*, cf. the article. — *Blood* is mentioned in the *Kurān* (Sūra xvi. 116; *vi. 146; v. 4; ii. 168*) as prohibited food. As to the religious background of this prohibition cf. the art. *Ma'dallim*. — *As for excreta* and several kinds of *secretions* of the body, the theory and practice of Jews and Christians sufficiently explain the attitude of *Islam* in this respect. It must also be admitted, though data are very scarce, that in early Arabia religious impurity included some of these things. — Details are to be found in the large legal works of each of the madhhab (cf. *Bibl.*).

Of the differences of the schools regarding this subject the most important only may be mentioned. Spiritual drinks are not impure according to the *Hanafīs* (cf. *Ma'dallim*). Living swine are not impure according to the *Mālikīs*. — The *Ṣafar* adds to the things mentioned above the human corpse and the infeḍāl. The human corpse was one of the chief sources of impurity according to *Jewish* ideas (cf. already *Numbers*, ch. xix.). A current in early *Islam* tending to follow the *Jewish* customs in ceremonial law was very strong; the *Ṣafar* view regarding the human corpse may be a residuum of it. — The impurity of infeḍāls is based upon Sūra ix. 28, where the polytheists are declared to be *filth* (*nāṣur*). The Sunni schools do not follow the *Ṣafar* in the exegesis of this verse.

The *nāṣur* enumerated above cannot be purified, in contradiction to things which are defiled only (*mašwād-fuṭrāt*), with the exception of wine, which becomes pure when made into vinegar, and of hides, which are purified by tanning. On purification cf. the art. *Ṭahrār* *dust*, *wudū*.


**NAJDĪM AL-DIN KURBAK**, the founder of the order of the Kubrawiya or *Dhahabiya*. One of the most striking personalities among the Persian *Sūfis* of the xiliith—xiiith century A.D. A large number of popular legends are associated with his name, many of which are not yet forgotten at the present day in Central Asia. His importance for the development of *Sūfism* is very considerable and in the long series of his pupils we find many distinguished representatives of *Sūf*
teaching. Nadjm al-Din, whose full name was Aḥmad b. ʿUmar Abu l-Diḥānāb Nadjm al-Din al-Kubrā al-Khwāṣṭ al-Khwarīzmi with the honorific title al-Tāmitt al-Ḳubrā (the “greatest visitation”; Sura lxxix. 34) and Shāhīkh Wālī tāʾrāq (the Shāhīkh who prepares saint) was born in the town of Khwāzīr in 540 (1145), spent his youth in travel during which he met in Egypt the famous Shāhīkh Rūzbinān al-Wazzān al-Musīṭ. He became his murād and under the supervision of the Shāhīkh went through a course of most rigid ascetic discipline. The youth won the favour of his teacher who gave him his daughter to wife and adopted him as a son. Nadjm al-Din spent some time in Cairo where he was known to him. One day he heard the lectures on the sunna given by İmām Abū Naṣr Ḥafṣa in Tabriz highly praised. He at once went off to Tabriz and studied there under the direction of this theologian who lived in the Khāṇkhā’ī Ḥadīth in the Sannādī quarter. There Nadjm wrote his first theological treatise, a kind of inaugural dissertation entitled Shīrāz al-Sunnah wa l-Maṣūbī. During a disputation which arose out of this work he made the acquaintance of the Shāhīkh Bābā Fāraḥ Tabrīzī under whose influence he decided to give up the study of theology and devote himself entirely to the contemplative life of the mystic. Bābā Fāraḥ regarded all learning as something superfluous; in his view true knowledge could only be obtained through divine illumination. Nadjm al-Din soon recognised that he could hardly come any nearer his goal by this route. He turned to Shāhīkh Aḥmad b. Yāsīr who advised him to train as a complete Sufī in the school of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Qādir. Nadjm al-Din received his second ḥikma at the hands of the famous Shāhīkh avowedly called Ḫikra-i tabarruk ("ḥikra of blessing"). After his return to his first teacher Shāhīkh Rūzbinān the latter found that he had thoroughly grasped all the depths of Sufism and recommended him to transfer his activities to his native land of Khwarizm. Nadjm al-Din settled there with his family, built a khāṇkhā’ī and founded the order of the Kubriwīya or Ḥabibīya. His teaching met with great success and he soon found himself surrounded by pupils among whom were the most distinguished Sufis of the xth—xiith century such as Māḏḏ al-Din Baqhdāḏī (the Shāhīkh of the famous poet Farīd al-Din ʿAṭār), Saʿd al-Din Ḥamawī, Bābā Kamāl Djanī, Shāhīkh Rādī al-Din ʿAlī Lālī, Saʿd al-Din Baḵtarzī, Nadjm al-Din Rāzī and many others. Bābā al-Din Walad, the father of the great Diḏal al-Din Rūmī, is also said to have been his pupil, but this is hardly possible. Nadjm al-Din met his death on 10th Djamād I 618 (July 13, 1226) at the taking of Khwarizm by the Mongols. All his biographers are agreed that the Shāhīkh had gone out to meet the enemy in the open field and met a martyr’s death, with weapon in hand. The Institute for Oriental Research in Lenningrad possesses a manuscript in Eastern Turki entitled Shāhīkh Nadjm al-Din Kubrā al-Naj Shāhīkh filib Shāhīkh l-Khwarizm-ni Khārāb il-Khānkhā’ī Bāyūn (How Shāhīkh Nadjm al-Din was martyred and the town of Khwarizm destroyed). It is a kind of historical novel dealing with the last days of Khwarizm and its fall. Nadjm al-Din appears in it as the protector of the city against the Mongols. By his power he makes Khwarizm invisible to the enemy and it only falls into the hands of the conquerors after the Shāhīkh decides to surrender it. It is possible that this book is a version of a Persian biography of Nadjm al-Din called Taĥfīṣ al-Fuhrū and mentioned by Hādhdīj Khālīfa (i. 234).

Nadjm al-Din was a prolific writer and left a number of valuable treatises on different questions of Sufism. The greater part of his works are written in Arabic. Hādhdīj Khālīfa gives the following list of his works: 1. al-Tāḥīṣ al-Fuhrū (i. 339) — a brief exposition of the ten fundamental principles of Sufism (printed in transliterations in 1256 with a Turkish commentary); 2. Risāla b. l-Sulahf (ii. 401—411) — or more correctly fi l-Im al-Sulkh, described in Ahward: N. 3546; 3. Risāla al-Taḥīṣ (iii. 418) — in Ahward: N. 3272; 3273; 4. l-Taḥīṣ (possibly only the xth N. 1); 4. Taḥīṣ al-Taḥīṣ (iv. 171) — unknown to me; 5. Fawā’id al-Dimnāl in Persian — a treatise with this title is given in Fliegel, Wörter Katalog, iii. 532, except that the latter is described as in Arabic; 6. Lūmat al-Lām — or with the full title al-Khāṣī al-lūm min Lūmat al-Lām in Ahward: N. 3087; 7. Hikayat al-Tībīn — unknown; 8. Tāfīr — probably the great commentary on the ʿUmar entitled Aḥī al-Dīnābī, whose first volume I discovered in the Public Library in Lenningrad (see Islamica, vol. 1, fasc. 2—3, p. 272). Nadjm al-Din is also known as a composer of Persian quatrains; but it is still very difficult to decide whether the quatrains attributed to him are really his. Twenty-five of these poems were published in the Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Sciences de Russie (1924, p. 36).

The Sufī writings of Nadjm al-Din form a transition from the older Sufism of the first theorists (the Nishapūr school of the 9th—10th centuries) to the later Sufism of Ibn al-ʿArabī and his successors (Sad al-Din Kunāwī, Fakhīr al-Din ʿIrākī). Like the earlier theorists Nadjm al-Din likes to deal especially with the practice of Sufism, the stations on the way to true knowledge. Metaphysical questions however are also considered by him and his works with the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabī form the basis for the further development of philosophical theory in the xith century. This is not the place to go fully into his conception of Sufism; but it is not to be doubted that his teaching can hardly be neglected in a careful investigation of the history of the development of Sufism.


NADJRĀN, a dis trict (Wādi) and town in northern Yemen, according to others (Ibn Khuradābīb, R. G. A., vi. 133, 248) in southern Najd or in the Ḥijāz (Bakrī, Mirjamān, p. 575). The position and course of the Wādi has not been exactly ascertained. It rises on the eastern slopes of the Yemen highlands, probably between 45°
and 44° East Long., and runs, perhaps turning north at first, mainly in a southeasterly direction behind 18° and 17° N. Lat. finally disappearing in the great sand desert. The distance from Satā ṭ [q.v.] is put at 6—7 days’ journey (E. Glaeser, Sçisse der Geschicchte und Geographic Arabiens, ii. 50); according to Philly’s investigations (The Heart of Arabia, ii. 166 sq.), it is seven days’ reasonable caravan journey south of Sulayilī. The older idea that the course of the Wādī Nadīrān ran N. E. (or that there was a more northerly track of Wādī Ḥabūn) arose out of the erroneous idea first finally corrected by Philly (op. cit., p. 165, 222) that the Wādī Da‘wāṣir, with which the Wādī Nadīrān was wrongly thought to be connected, runs from S. W. to N. E. or vice versa.

The Wādī Nadīrān drains a wide area of northern Yaman and ‘Alīr (Hamdān, Sī‘at ‘Arab al-‘Arab, p. 83, 110, 114, 247). It is, if not entirely, in ancient times, cultivated for its fertility. Of European travellers only Joseph Hallevy visited it in the spring of 1870. He describes (Burh. de la Soc. de Gèogr., series vi, vol. xii, p. 478) the valley, some 2 miles broad, as exceedingly fertile and well cultivated with villages concealed in thick palm-groves. Stabo (xvi. 781) calls it a peaceful and rich country. To Muslim writers it is a miracle of fertility and wealth, even more so than the Yemen in general: its cereals, vegetables, and fruits are univalued (Hamdān, p. 109 sqq.); there were also mines there (Baladhā, Kīnā ‘Abbād al-‘Abbād, p. 14) and the staple products of the Yemen, leather and cloth, were also made there. To this day in less favoured parts of Arabia, they talk of the prosperity of this Wādī (Philly, op. cit., ii 220).

The population of the Wādī Nadīrān, according to Philly, is comparatively large; the majority belong to the tribe of Yam. But several unrelated tribes, often at enmity with one another, share in the possession of this rich country. It was so in the early Muslim period. The Banu ‘l-Ḥārīth b. Kāb, who appear in Ḥadīth as lords of Nadīrān, were not really such. They belong to the large group of tribes Madīnī, which was represented by other tribes also. Their rivals were and are Hamdān tribes (Hamdān, p. 115, 9) among them al-Ḥārīth, important at the present day. (subdivisions Yam, etc.) and Bakil (subdivisions al-Shākīr, etc.) and other tribes like al-Azd, al-Afṣā, etc. should also be mentioned. We have no reliable information about places with a settled population. In the eastern part of the Wādī, Hallevy visited a village of Makkah which was afterwards put on the maps at hazard. In the immediate vicinity was another village Riddā, and an hour to the west Madīnat al-Khudūd (see below). The Arab geographers mention villages (zurā) of Nadīrān and the names of some of them are given as well as those of districts, tributary wādīs, hills, springs.

Through Nadīrān runs the very old caravan road from Hadramawt through the Ḥidjāz to the eastern Mediterranean (cf. Makht). Nadīrān was of some importance as the last station in the Yemen on a caravan route from the Yemen to al-Yamāmāh and thence to Bahra‘ and the ‘Irāq. During Persian rule in the Yemen and later in the Abābīd period this road must have been of no less importance than the one just mentioned to Syria, which latter however owing to its importance in the early period of Islam is almost alone mentioned in Muslim literature (A. Moberg, The Book of the Himyarites, p. 1xii.; cf. also M. Hartmann, Die sudarab. Frage, p. 496, 509). On the station on the road see Ibn Khududibb (B. G. A., vi. p. 152 sq. and 193; A. Sprenger, Post- und Reisereisen, p. 134—139). A series of forts served to keep it safe (Sprenger, op. cit., p. 138; Hamadhānī, B. G. A., p. 28; Ya‘qūb, Muṣjam, iv., p. 541 s.v. Māshā’kūsh and thereon Lyall, Mysafāḍiyūn. ii. p. 105). On the present importance of the road and of Nadīrān, see Philly, op. cit., ii. 226. The road in those days probably went several days’ journey across the desert to the Wādī Da‘wāṣir, which was the first station on the other side; at the present day Sulayilī (q.v.) corresponds to this.

This road via Nadīrān was certainly that which connected the Yam at different times with the ancient Babylonia in the east, with Syriac Christianity and as well as with Iranian culture.

Little is known of the town of Nadīrān. Ptolemy mentions it as a metropolis. Aelius Gallus attacked it and destroyed it (Strabo, loc. cit., Pliny, vi. 28 [321]). From this Glaeser (loc. cit., ii. 50; cf. p. 224) concludes that there was no town of Nadīrān after this but the existence of the town is proved in many ways for various later periods (see below). Now however, no town seems to bear the name. Hallevy thought he had found the ruins of the old town in Madīnat al-Khudūd (see below), which he describes as considerable ruins on the south bank of the river bed. Of the city wall roughly built of granite the south and west sides were less destroyed than the others. A mosque, which still stood among the ruins, belonged, according to local tradition, to the early Muslim or even pre-Islamic period (p. 90, 40.). In remarkable agreement with this, Bakir, Muṣjam, p. 80 says: "Al-Ukhudāt, which is mentioned in the Kurān, was in one of the towns of Nadīrān. This city however is now in ruins and nothing is left of it but the mosque which 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb built'.

On the history of Nadīrān we have only scanty and mainly legendary notes. The name occurs several times in the South Arabian inscriptions: there is one (C. I. S. iv., Ñ. 365) reference to the "towns" of Nadīrān (al-khurā N.; cf. above N. 269) to the south of Yaman. In the oldest inscriptions of South Arabia, the Nabataean inscription of the year 328, the name is also found.

In the tradition of the introduction of Christianity into the Yemen, Nadīrān plays a part in keeping with its importance for the communications between Yemen and Mesopotamia (see above). According to one reference (Histories Neronic, ed. Addai Scher, i. 218 sq. = Petrol. Orientis, iv. 330), it was a merchant of Nadīrān who first spread Christianity there after he had been converted in al-Kafūra. Christianity is said to have received a fudder impetus in the time of Justinian from monophysite Christians who, expelled from Byzantine territory, came to al-Nadīrān also via al-Hara (op. cit., i. 51 sq.)

The Christian tradition of later persecutions of the Christians in South Arabia connected with Abyssinian invasions of the Yemen is widely denominated; Nadīrān was the principal scene of these, first perhaps under Shahabūl Vakseke in the last third of the fifth century, notably under Dār Nūwās, who died in 525. On this tradition
which exists in many forms, Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic, see A. Moberg, *The Book of the Himyarites*, p. xxiv.—lxiii., where the sources and other literature to be consulted are given.

Arabic literature has also something to say about these happenings, especially in the annotations of the *Kurānic* exegetists on *Sūra* lxxvi. 4 sqq. on the *Aṣḥāb al-Ŷuḥyd* but what there is of historical value in this Muslim tradition comes from Christian sources; only it is usually so distorted as to be almost unrecognisable. What it records regarding the introduction of Christianity into Nadjrān by a certain Fāmilyr or ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Thāmir is on the other hand a distortion of certain episodes in a Syriac Christian cycle of legends about the Persian martyrs Pethion and Yazdān and has really nothing to do with Nadjrān or Arabia (A. Moberg, *Über einige christliche Legenden in der islamischen Tradition*, p. 50 sqq., 22, 30 and the references given). The latter may, it seems, be much distended from the ancient Nadjrān is of course the result of the localisation of the *Aṣḥāb al-Yuḥyd* in Nadjrān. Hamdānī (op. cit., p. 67, 169) mentions in the same region a Balad or town of al-Yuḥyd; C. van Arendonk mentions a hill Yuḥyd (*De opkomst van het zaïditeïsche Ismaïlisme in Yemen*, p. 168).

It is not till the time of Muhammad and the early Caliphs that we have really historical references to the Yaman and even these have to be critically used. We are told that Khalid was sent with 400 horsemen to the Banu ʿl-Ḥarīrī b. Kaʿb (and the Banū ʿAbd al-Madīn: Ibn Saʿd, ii/1, 112, 3) in Nadjrān and made them adopt Ismaʿil and send an embassy in homage to the Prophet (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 958: Ibn Saʿd, ii/1, 72). Ḍār Ḥamr was appointed ʿamīl in Nadjrān and Ali was ordered to collect the zakāt there (Wāsīlī, Wellhausen, p. 417 sqq.; Ibn Saʿd, ii/1, 122). In addition to pagans and Jews there were many Christians there who from that time onwards constituted a separate community. Muhammad received an embassy from them also and concluded a treaty with them which guaranteed the possession of their property and the free exercise of their religion in return for a fixed contribution on their part (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 401 sqq.); Ibn Saʿd, ii/1, 84 sq., 35 sq.). This treaty was confirmed by Abū Bakr and ʿOmar. ʿOmar however at a later date drove the Christians and Jews out of the Arabian peninsula whereupon the Christians founded a new Nadjrān in the Ḫaḍrat, two days' journey south of Kūfah. The details are variously recorded and it is not quite clear to what extent ʿOmar's orders were actually enforced. Bakr (op. cit.) says that the Jews and Christians in Nadjrān were not at all affected by the measure. In any case, at a much later date (see just below) there were not a few Christians in Nadjrān and there are of course still many Jews in the Yemen.

In the 4th/10th century. Nadjrān was burned by Djahrya, ʿAli's general (Tabari, i, 3452). The scantiness of the historical tradition, fantastic accounts of the wealth of the region and the remarkable liberty enjoyed by Christians in Nadjrān gave rise to legends and inspired poets. The *material* which thus arose is very fully detailed and utilised in H. Lammens, *Le Califat de Yezid l'îer*, p. 327—369.

In the end we find Nadjrān an important fortified town, often simply called al-Ḥadjar (cf. Hamdānī, p. 86), mentioned in the accounts of the fighting which led to the creation of the Zaidī imāmate in the Yemen in the third century A.H. At this period there were still Christians and Jews there, who were obviously still an important element and enjoyed considerable consideration from their Muslim neighbours (van Arendonk, *op. cit.*, p. 128 sqq.). On bishops of the Nadjrānīs or in the Yemen in the 6th and 7th century from Syriac sources see Moberg, *The Book of the Himyarites*, p. 4iv.

The tithe of Nadjrān submitted to Turkish rule as little as those of eastern and northern Yemen generally, Nadjrān now belongs to the kingdom of ʿIbn Saʿūd.


*Biography*: given in the article and in some of the works quoted above; on the history cf. especially Balāḏurī, *Fatḥih*, p. 64—68; Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, ii., p. 312 sqq., 317 sqq., 521 sqq., 549—553; iv. 359—359.

(2) MOBERG)

NAFAKA. [See NIKIŠ Ĭ ĖL.]

AL-NAFĪ. [See AL-ĂLĀH, ii.]

NAFĪ, b. AL-ĂZRAḲ AL-HANAFĪ AL-MALIKI, Abū Kâhid, according to some sources, the son of a freed blacksmith of Greek origin (Balāḏurī, ed. de Goeye, p. 56), chief of the extreme Khāridjīs *[q.v.]*, who after him are called Azraḳīs *[q.v.]*. At first, after his accession to Ahwâz, Nafī joined ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubair *[q.v.]* in Makka. Soon however, he and his followers turned their backs on the holy city and arrived before Bâṣra, where they spread terror among the inhabitants, who left the town in multitudes. Al-Muhallab however, succeeded in driving them back to Persia. They made a halt in Ahwâz, where they practised *ṣinīfād*, in accord with their doctrine. The bloody battle of Dâlab, fought against Muslim b. ʿUbaīs put an end to his life (64 or 65 = 683—684).

His special doctrine comprised the following points: 1. secession (bārūša) from the quietists (al-Ŷarāla); 2. examination (mizṣā) of those who wanted to join his encampment; 3. declaring infidels those who did not perform *ḥidjra* to him; 4. declaring it allowed to kill the wives and children of opponents. This is al-Asḫārī's enumeration, which differs slightly from that of al-Shāhristānī (p. 90).


(1) WENSINK)
NÁFILA (A.), plur. nawāfī’, part. art. fem. I from n-f-f, supererogatory work.

1. The word occurs in the Kur’ān in two places, Sūra xxi. 72 runs: “And we bestowed on him [viz. Ibrāhīm] Isaac and Jacob as additional gift” (nīlāhsa‘). In Sūra xvii. 5 it is used in combination with the vigils, thus: “And perform vigils during a part of the night, reciting the Kur’ān, as a nāfīla for thee.”

In hadith it is frequently used in this sense. “Forgiveness of sins past and future was granted him [Muḥammad] and his works were to him as supererogatory works” (Ahmad b. Ḣanbal, vi. 250). — In another tradition it is said with reference to the month of Ṭaḥa ṭah, that Allah “withdrawing it” wages and its nawāfīl even before [its] beginning” (Ahmad b. Ḣanbal, ii. 524). Of peculiar importance, also in a different respect, is the following hadith kuth: “When My servant seeks to approach Me through supererogatory works, I finally love him. And when I love him I become the hearing through which he heareth, the sight through which he seeth, the hand with which he graspeth, the foot with which he walketh” etc. (al-Bukhārī, Kāfābh, bāb 38).

Finally the following tradition may be translated: “Whoso performs the nawāfīl [q.v.] in this way [viz. in the way described in the foregoing part of the tradition], receives forgiveness of past sins and his salāt and his walking to the mosque are for him as a nāfīla” (Muslim, Ṣahih, trad. 8; Malik, Ṣahih, trad. 30). In the parallel tradition (Muslim, loc. cit., trad. 7), the term is kaffāra “expiation”. — This parallelism is an indication of the effect ascribed to supererogatory works in Muslim theology, viz. the expiation of light sins (cf. al-Nawawi on Muslim, Cairo 1283, i. 308).

Nawāfīl (Fatīmī ‘Alamgiriya, i. 156, Ḥanafī)

Sunan

(Fagman, Additions, p. 23, Maliki)

Further it must be observed that in theological terminology nāfīla is often applied to those works which are supererogatory in the plain sense, in contradistinction to other works which have become a regular practice. The latter are called sunna mu‘akkada, the former nāfīla or sunna nīlāhsa‘ (cf. infra, sub 2).

The place of supererogatory works in theology is further accurately defined in the Waṣṣiyat Abī ʿAbd Allāh, art. 7: “We confess that works are of three kinds, obligatory, supererogatory and sinful. The first category is in accordance with Allāh’s will, desire, good pleasure, decision, decree, creation, judgment, knowledge, guidance and writing on the preserved table. The second category is not in accordance with Allāh’s commandment yet according to His will, desire” etc.

The term for supererogatory works used here is not nāfīla, but fādīla.

2. Nāfīla is used in hadith especially as a designation of the supererogatory salāt (Bukhārī, Ḥasanī, bāb 11; Tāḥādīqud, bāb 5, 27). Sometimes it appears in the combinations salāt al-nawāfīla (Ibn Ṣādir, Ḥassanī, bāb 203) and salāt al-nawāfīl (Bukhārī, Tāḥādīqud, bāb 36).

In fādīla this terminology is often, but not always followed, the other term for the supererogatory salāt being salāt al-taṣawwur (e.g. Abū ʿĪsā al-Shā’rāzī, Kitāb al-Tanbih, ed. A. W. T. Juyboll, p. 26), a term that goes back to the Kur’ān (Sūra ii. 153, 180; ix. 80), and which occurs also in canonical hadith (Abū Dāwūd has a Kitāb al-Taṣawwur in his Sunan). The whole class of supererogatory salāt is called nawāfīl as well as suṣur. Nawāfīl as a general designation of supererogatory salāts, covers three subdivisions. The following juxta-positions may give a survey of the terminology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nawāfīl</th>
<th>Sunna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Khalīf, transl., Gūdī, p. 95, Mālikī)</td>
<td>mu‘akkada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ghazālī, Iḥyā‘, i. 174, Shāfi‘)</td>
<td>mukhtābah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be added that the term rawāṣib is used especially for the supererogatory salāts preceding or following the makbūra; they belong to the first subdivision.

In Shī‘ī ṣaḥr nawāfīl is the widest term; by muṣṭashāḥbā the daily and non-daily supererogatory prayers are designated.


Al-Sayyida NAFTÅSÅ, a mausoleum outside Cairo, south of the Mosque of Abī ʿAlām b. Ṭulūn in the direction of the sepulchral mosque of al-Shā‘rāzī. Among the female saints [cf. waṣṣi] in Cairo next to Sayyida Zarānah bint Muḥammad [q.v.] and “Sīt Sēkima” (Sukainā) “Sīt Nefṣa” takes a very prominent place. In the official recitations of the Kur’ān, al-Sayyida Nafṣa, where the reading is held on Sundays, takes third place among them all, immediately after ʿImām al-Shā‘rāzī and ʿImām al-Ḥusaynī (see Bergsträsser, in L., xxi. (1932), 110 sqq.). The sanctuary is visited by both men and women, especially, in the evening. The door leading to the sarcophagus itself is only opened once a year. The foundation contains a number of other buildings besides a mosque, including a library and Sūfī cells. The land around it is a much sought after place of interment.

Nafṣa was a daughter of al-Ḥasan b. Zaid b. al-Ḥasan [q.v.]. She came to Egypt with her husband ʿĪsā al-Muṭamīn, a son of Diāsār al-Sāṭik [q.v.]. She had a reputation for learning and piety. Shā‘rāzī frequently visited her to collect traditions; on his death, his body was brought to her house so that she might say the prayer for the dead over him. She had children but her descendants soon died out. She herself died in
Rämādān 208 (beg. of 824). Legend credits her with great ṭūrānīa [q.v.]; for example is as is told of several Egyptian, and not only Muslim saints, it is said that her prayers produced a great rising of the Nile in a single night. In contradiction of a story that her husband wanted to take her to the family burial place in the al-Baṣṣirī [q.v.] cemetery in Medina but was prevented by her devotees, is the general opinion that this is her tomb which she built with her own hands and in which she read the Qurān long before her death. — Several rulers took part in the development of the sanctuary, ‘Abbasids and later Fāṭimids and Ottoman governors. The cupola over the grave was restored by the caliph al-Hārūn in 532 (1138) and the mosque in 693–694 (1294–1295) by the Mamlūk al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Kāfīrān.


(R. Strothmann)

NAFS! (A.), soul. Nafs, in the early Arabic poetry, meant the self or person, while ṭūrān meant breath and wind. Beginning with the Qurān nafs also means soul, and ṭūrān means a special angel messenger and a special divine quality. Only in post-Qurānic literature are nafs and ṭūrān equated and both applied to the human spirit, angels and ḥīmakān. I. The Qurānic uses. A. Nafs and its plurals anfas and nafās have five uses: 1. In most cases they mean the human self or person, e.g., iii. 54: “Let us call... ourselves and yourselves”; also xii. 54; li. 20, 21. In six verses nafs refers to Allāh: v. 116b: “Thou [Allāh] dost know what is in me myself [says ‘Īsā], but I do not know what is in Thyself (nafṣikā)”2; also iii. 27, 28; vi. 12, 54 and xx. 43–4. One reference, xx. 4 (cf. xiv. 17), is to gods: “They [thea] do not provide themselves (anfasikām) any harm or benefit at all!” 4 In iv. 150 the plural is used twice to refer to the company of men and ḥīmakān: “We have witnessed against ourselves (anfasinā)”5. It means the human soul: vi. 93: “While the angels stretch forth their hands [saying], Send forth your souls (anfasu)”6; also l. 15; lxiv. 16; lxix. 40, etc. This soul has three characteristics: a. It is amūmira, commanding to evil (xii. 53). Like the Hebrew nēṣeṭ the basal idea is the “physical appetite”, in Pauline usage ṣawṭi, and in the English New Testament flesh”. It whispers (l. 15), and is associated with al-harīṣa, which, in the sense of desire, is always evil. It must be restrained (lxix. 40) and made patient (xvii. 27) and its greed must be feared (lx. 96). b. The nafs is lawwāna, i.e., it upbrādīs (lxv. 27); the souls (anfasu) of deserters are straitened (xv. 103). The soul is addressed as nafsīnā ina, tranquīlī (lxv. 27). These three terms form the basis of much of the later Muslim ethics and psychology. It is noted worthly that nafs is not used in connection with the angels.

B. ṭūrān has five uses: 1. Allāh blew (nafṣākha) of His ṭūrān, u, into Adam, giving life to Adam’s body (xv. 29; xxxviii. 72; xxiii. 8), and b. into Maryam for the conception of ‘Īsā (xxi. 91 and lxvi. 12). Here ṭūrān equates with ṭūrān and means the “breath of life” (cf. Gen. ii. 7), the creation of which belongs to Allāh. 2. Four verses connect ṭūrān with the amr of Allāh, and the meanings of both ṭūrān and amr are disputed. a. In xvii. 87, it is stated: “They ask thee [O Muhammad] about ṭūrān; say: ṭūrān is the name of amr, and ye are brought but little knowledge”. b. In xvi. 2, Allāh sends down the angels with ṭūrān min ‘a‘irīhī upon whosoever He wills of His creatures to say: “Warn that the fact is, There is no God but Me, so fear”. c. In xi. 15, Allāh “cast ṭūrān min ‘a‘irīhī upon whosoever He wills of His creatures to give warning”. d. In xlii. 52: “We revealed (wa‘alainā) to thee [O Muhammad] ṭūrān min ‘a‘irīhī: thou knowest not what the book was, nor the faith, but We made it to be a light by which We guide whosoever We will of Our creatures”. Whatever meanings amr and ṭūrān may have, the contexts connect ṭūrān in a. with knowledge; in b. with angels and creatures, to give warning; in c. with creatures, for warning, and in d. with Muhammad, for knowledge, faith, light and guidance. Therefore this ṭūrān is special equipment from Allāh for prophetic service. It reminds forcibly of Bezdol, who was “filled with the spirit of God in wisdom, in understanding and in knowledge” (Exodus xxxv. 30, 31). In iv. 169, ‘Īsā is called a ṭūrān from Allāh. 4. In xvii. 4; lxviii. 38 and lxx. 4, ṭūrān is an associate of the angels. 5. In xvi. 193, al-ṭūrān al-amīn, the faithful ṭūrān, comes down upon Muhammad’s heart to reveal the Qurān. In xix. 17, Allāh sends to Maryam “Our ṭūrān”, who appears to her as a well-made man. In xvi. 104, ṭūrān al-kudus sent the Qurān to establish believers. Three other passages state that Allāh helps ‘Īsā with ṭūrān al-kudus (lii. 81: ii. 254 and v. 109). This interrelation of service and title imply the identity of this angelic messenger, who may be also the ṭūrān of 4. Thus in the Qurān ṭūrān does not mean angels in general, nor man’s self or person, nor his soul or spirit. The plural does not occur.

C. Nafs, breath and wind, cognate to nafs in root and to ṭūrān in some of its meanings, does not occur in the Qurān, but is used in the early poetry (F. Krenkow, The Poems of Tūslīf and al-Tīrīmādh. London 1927, p. 32). The verb ṭafīlah (Ṣūra lxxxi. 15) is derived from that meaning, while the only other Qurānic forms from the same radicals are fātalāyānā and ṭafīlahānānā (lxviii. 26) and are derived in al-Tabarī, Ḥīmān al-Bayān, Cairo 1921, xxx. 57, probably correctly, from nafsīnā, “the desired”.

II. The Umayyad poetry first uses ṭūrān for the human soul (Kīthār al-Aṣbahānī, ed. 1285, xvi. 126, last line; Cheikho, Le Christianisme, Bârût 1923, p. 338) where the Qurān had used nafs as in No. 5 above.

III. Of the early collections of traditions, Malik’s al-Muwatta, Cairo 1339, i. 126 uses nasama, which does not occur in the Qurān, and nafs (ii. 262) for the soul or spirit, while Ibn Ḥanbal’s Masāmud uses nasam (vi. 424), nafs (i. 297; ii. 364; vi. 140) and ṭūrān (iv. 287, 296).

---

1) For the sake of convenience in this article ṭūrān is treated as well.
Muslim's al-Sabih (Constantinople 1331), viii. 44, 162 sq. and el-Duha's al-Sabih, Cairo 1314, iv. 153; both use rih and arwah for the human spirit.

IV. The Tahd al-‘Arus (v. 260) lists 15 meanings for nafs and adds two others from the Li ‘inan al-‘Arab, as follows: spirit, blood, body, evil eye, presence, specific reality, self, tan, heightness, self-magnification, purpose, disdain, the absent, desire, punishment, brother, man. It states that most of these meanings are metaphorical. The Li ‘inan (viii. 119—126) finds examples of these meanings in the poetry and the Qur’an. Lane’s Arabic Lexicon faithfully reproduces the material (p. 28276).

The lexical treatments of nafs disclose these facts: 1. Any attribution to Allah of nafs as “soul” or “spirit” is avoided. 2. In man, a. nafs and rih are identified, or b. nafs applies to the mind and rih to life, or c. man has nafsi, two souls, one vital and the other discriminative, or d. the discriminative soul is double, sometimes commanding and sometimes forbidding.

V. The influences that affected the post-Qur’anic uses of both nafs and rih were the Christian and Neo-Platonic ideas of rih with human, angelic and divine applications, and the more specifically Aristotelian psychological analysis of nafs. These influences are clearly shown in the records of the religious controversies.

A. Al-Ash‘ari [q. v.] (H. Ritter, Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam von Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali bin Imad’al-Din al-‘Arabi, Istanbul 1929) reports the Rāfidiya doctrines of the incarnation of rih Allāh in Adam and its transmission through the prophets and others (p. 6, 45), as well as the conflicting positions that man is body (tā‘īm) only, body and spirit, and spirit (rīh) only (p. 61, 329 sqq.). His creed of the orthodox (p. 290—297) omits any statement about the nature of man.

B. Al-Baghdadi [q. v.] (al-Fakhr bai al-Firaq, Cairo 1328) records the same heretical doctrines about man’s nature (p. 28, 117 sqq., 241 sqq.), says the transmigration theories were held by Plato and the Jews (p. 254) and describes the incarnation beliefs of the Hulūliya sects [cf. HUL] among whom he includes the Hallādiya (p. 247). His position is “The life of Allāh is without rih and nourishment and all the arwah are created, in opposition to the Christian doctrine of the eternity of the Father, Son and Spirit” (p. 235).

C. Ibn Hazm [q. v.] uses nafs and rih interchangeably of man’s soul (Kitāb al-Fiqāḥ ‘ilā Mila‘ 5 parts, Cairo 1317—1321; v. 66). He excludes from Islam all who hold metempsychos, views, among whom he includes the physician-philosopher Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Kazzi (i. 90 sqq.; iv. 187 sqq.). He rejects absolutely the doctrine of some of the Alauyya of the continual re-creation of the rih (iv. 60). He taught that Allāh created the spirits of all Adam’s progeny before the angels were commanded to prostrate to him (Sūra vii. 171), and that these spirits exist in al-Barrāh [q. v.] in the nearest heaven until the angel blows them into embryos (iv. 70).

D. Al-Shahrastāni [q. v.] (Kitāb al-Milāl wa l-Nihāl, ed. Careton, part i, London 1842) in his description of the belief of the pagan Arabs concerning survival after death does not use the terms nafs or rih, but says the blood becomes a wa‘h, bird that visits the grave every hundred years. One of his most important sections (p. 203—240) deals with the orthodox and heterodox doctrines of rih. Al-Hunaf‘a’, or true believers, debate with al-Sabī‘a [q. v.], who are dualists, emanationists and gnostics. His account of the views of the Sabī‘a faithfully reflects the doctrines of the Ikhwān al-Safā’ (Rasā’il, 4 vols., Bombay 1305), who taught that man is a whole compounded of a corporeal body and a spiritual nafs (i.ii. 14), and that the substance (dawwar) of the nafs descended from the spheres (al-rajā‘). But al-Shahrastāni rejects the Neo-Platonic idea that human souls (nafs) are dependent upon the souls of the superhuman spirit world (al-nafs al-rajā‘iyya) (p. 210, 224 sqq.), and the Hermetic doctrines that the nafs is essentially evil (p. 216) and that salvation consists in the release of the rih from material bodies (p. 226 sqq.). He applies the term rihāni to all spirits, good and evil (p. 213). His description of the nature of man (p. 216 sqq.) with three souls, vegetative, animal and human, each with its own source, need, place and powers, resembles that of the Ikhwān al-Safā’ (Rasā’il, 4, 48 sqq.). Indeed, the nature of the human soul as given in De Anima, and handed on by Alexander of Aphrodisias and Porphyry, had been adopted with little modification by the Muslim philosophers, such as al-Kindi [q. v.], al-Fārābī [q. v.] each of whom wrote a Kitāb al-Nafs, Ibn Sina [q. v.] who wrote two, and Ibn Miskawayh [q. v.], whose Tuhdīb al-Akhbār has the same inmaterial (p. 1) and functional (p. 7) psychology for its ethical basis. Al-Shahrastāni achieved the long needed interpretation of the conflicting usages of nafs and rih in the Greek and Christian heritage, and in the Qur’an and Muslim tradition. But the philosophers, even with his support, were not able to force the Greek psychology upon orthodox Islam. The Mutakallimin [s. art. KALIM] and the great majority of Muslims broadened the Kur’ānic terminology, but retained the traditional views of the nature of the soul as a direct creation of Allāh having various qualities.

VI. Aristotel’s principle of the incorporeal character of spirit had nevertheless found a permanent place in Muslim doctrine through the influence of Islam’s greatest theologian, al-Ghazāli [q. v.]. In al-Tahānawi’s Dictionary of the Technical Terms (ed. Spranger, Calcutta 1862) are extracts of the doctrines of al-Ghazāli on man’s rih and nafs. He defines man as a spiritual substance (dawwar rihāni), not confined in a body, nor imprinted on it, nor joined to it, nor separated from it, just as Allāh is neither without nor within the world, and likewise the angels. It possesses knowledge and perception, and is therefore not an accident (p. 547 at top; cf. Tahānū ‘ilā-Falā’ūniya, Cairo 1302, p. 72). He devotes the second section of al-Risāla al-Laduniyya (Cairo 1327, p. 7—14) to explain the words nafs, rih and ḥād (heart), which are names for this simple substance that is the seat of the intellectual processes. It differs from the animal rih, a refined but mortal body in which reside the senses. He identifies the incorporeal rih with al-nafs al-mu‘āmal ‘alā-rih al-awal of the Kur‘ān. He then uses the term nafs also for the “flesh” or lower nature, which must be disciplined in the interests of ethics.

VII. This position of al-Ghazāli’s was that of the theistic philosophers in general, as well as some of the Mu‘tazila and the Shi‘a, but it has never dominated Islam. The great analytical philosopher
and theologian, Fākhūr al-Dīn al-Rūzī, could not bring himself to accept it. In his Mafāthī al-Qāhīb, v. 435; commenting on Sūra xvii. 85, he quotes as the opinion of al-Ghazālī the statement that is in the latter’s Tashrīf (p. 72; cf. also al-Rūzī’s Muhazzāl, Cairo 1323, p. 164), but on p. 434 (l. 9 and 8 from below) of the Mafāthī he acknowledges the strength of the corporeal doctrine, and in his Ma‘ānī ṣubl al-asbāb, on the margin of the Muhazzāl, 137 sq., he definitely rejects as baseless (ībti) the view of the philosophers that the nafs is a substance (ḏayʾwār) which is not a body (ḏayṃ) and not corporeal.

VIII. Al-Baidāwī’s [q. v.] system of cosmogony and psychology is ed. in his Tawālīl al-Anwār (lithograph ed. with commentary Abu ʿl-Thānā al-Iṣhahānī and gloss by al-Djardjānī, Stambul 1305, p. 285 sqq.; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 418, ii. 111, printed Cairo 1323). He discusses 1. The classes of incorporeal substances, 2. the heavenly intelligences, 3. the souls of the spheres, 4. the incorporeality of human souls, 5. their creation 6. their connection with bodies and 7. their survival. His cosmogony follows: Allāh, because of his unity, created only one Intelligence (ʾalāʾ). This Second Intelligence, that emanated first (al-qādir) from Allāh, is the cause (ʾalāʾ) of all other potentialities and is not body (ʾalāʾ), nor original matter (ḥuṣūṣ) nor form (ṣūrā). It is this Second Cause (ʾalāʾ) of another intelligence with soul (nafs) and sphere (ṣulāt). There emanates from the second a third intelligence and so on to the tenth (p. 288) who is the rūḥ of Sūra lxxviii. 38 (cf. al-Baidāwī’s Antwār al-Tawālīl, ed. Fleischer, ii. 353, l. 4) whose effective influence is in the world of the elements and who is the producer of the spirits (ʾarwāl) of mankind. Below these intelligences are the high or heavenly angels, which the philosophers call al-nafs al-falsafīs and the low nafs, which are in two classes: earthly angels, in control of the simple elements and the earthly souls, such as the reasoning souls (nafsīs nāṭāh) controlling particular persons. In addition (p. 285) there are the incorporeal substances, without effect or control, who are angels, some good (al-kurāʾīyān) and some evil (al-qādirīyān) and the ḥalām, who are ready for both good and evil. This is the first in line he refers to in his comment on Sūra ii. 28 (ed. Fleischer, i. 47, 23). His psychology resembles that of al-Ghazālī, whom he mentions (p. 294). For the incorporeality of the soul (nafṣ al-nafs) he presents five arguments from reason, four Qur’ān verses and one tradition. His commentator remarks (p. 300) that these prove only that the soul differs from the body. He then argues that all nafs are created when their bodies are completed. The nafs (p. 303) is not embodied in and is not close to the body, but is attached as the lover to the beloved. It is connected with that rūḥ which comes from the heart and is generated of the finest nutritive particles. The reasoning nafs produces a force that flows with that rūḥ through the body, producing in every organ its proper functions. These functional powers are perceptive, which are the five external senses, and the five internal faculties of the senses communis, imagination, apprehension, memory and reason, and the active (al-nuḥār ika) which are voluntary (īḥtiyyāʾa) and natural (tābīʿiyya, p. 308).

IX. The dominant Muslim doctrine concerning the origin, nature and future of al-rūḥ and al-

nafs is most fully given in the Kitāb al-Rūḥ of Ibn Kāyīm [q. v.] (Haidarābād, 2nd ed., 1324). Of his 21 chapters Ibn Kāyīm devotes the 19th to the problem of the specific nature of the nafs (p. 279—342). He quotes the summaries given by al-Ḥašrī (op. cit., p. 331—335), and by al-Rūzī (Mafāthī al-Qāhīb, v. 431—434). He denies al-Rūzī’s statement that the Maw眩alims consider the nafs to be simply the sensible body, and says all intelligent people hold man to be both body and spirit. The rūḥ is identified with the nafs, and is itself a body, different in quiddity (al-nafṣ) from this sensible body, of the nature of light, high, light in weight, living, moving, interpenetrating the bodily members as water in the rose. It is created, but everlasting; it departs temporarily from the body in sleep; when the body dies it departs for the first judgement, returns to the body for the questioning of Munkar and Nakīr, and, except in the cases of prophets and martyrs, remains in the grave awaiting bliss or punishment until the Resurrection. He rejects (p. 256) Ibn Ḥaẓrī’s doctrine that Adam’s progeny are in al-Barakāh awaiting their time to be blown into embryos. He presents 116 evidences for the incorporeality of the nafs, 22 refutations of opposing arguments and 22 rebuts of objections. He represents traditional Islam.

X. Earlier Sufis had accepted the materiality of the nafs. Both al-Kujūbī, with commentary of Zakariyya’ al-Anṣārī and gloss of al-Arusī, Būlāl 1290, ii. 105 sqq.) and al-Hudjīwī (op. cit. [q. v.] [Kāshf al-Mahjūb, ed. Nicholson, London 1911, p. 196, 262] call the rūḥ a fine, created substance (ʿūn) or body (ʾalāʾ), placed in the sensible body like sap in green wood. The nafs (al-Risāla, p. 103 sqq.; Kāshf al-Mahjūb, p. 196) is the seat of the blameworthy characteristics. All together make the man.

In addition to the philosophical position of the immateriality of al-rūḥ that all-Ghazālī had made orthodox, another interpretation of spirit developed which is essentially theosophical. Ibn al-ʿArabī [q. v.] (H. S. Nyberg, Kleine Schriften des Ibn al-ʿArabī, Leyden 1919, p. 15, 11, 1 sqq.) divides “spirits” into three classes: Allāh, Who is Absolute Existence and Creation, the world, and an undefinable tertium quid of contingent existence, God in the Eternal Reality, and is the source of the substance and the specific nature of the world. It is the universal and common reality of all realities. Man likewise is an intermediate creation, a barakāh (p. 22, 42) between Allāh and the world, bringing together the Divine Reality and the created world (p. 21, 42) and a vicegerent connecting the eternal names and the originated forms (p. 96). His animal spirit (rūḥ) is from the blowing of the divine breath (p. 95) and his reasoning soul (nafs nāṭāh) is from the universal soul (al-nafs al-kulliyā), while his body is from the earthly elements (p. 95 sqq.). Man’s position as vicegerent (p. 45 sqq.) and his resemblance to the divine presence (p. 21) come from this universal soul, who has various other names, holy spirit (rūḥ al-kulliyā), the first intelligence (p. 51), vicegerent (khalīfa), the perfect man (p. 45) and the rūḥ of the world of command (ʿālam al-amr), which al-Ghazālī held to be Allāh’s direct creation (p. 122, 1). In his Fugāʾ (lithograph ed. with commentary by al-Kashānī, Cairo 1509, p. 12 sqq.) he says that Allāh appears to Himself in a form which thus becomes the place of
manifestation of the Divine essence. This place receives a ṭāḥ, who is Adam, the ḥāšīya and the perfect man. He discusses (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 129 sqq.) the essence and properties of the ṭāḥ, quoting among others the view he says is "attributed" to al-Ḍazāli, which is in al-Taḥāfat (as above). He finds the differences of doctrine harmless since all agree that the ṭāḥ is primordial. In his tractate on the ṭāḥs and ṭāḥs (M. Asim Alpacios, Tratado Acerca del Congruimiento del Alma y del Espíritu, in Actes du XIVe Congrés international des Orientalistes, Paris 1906, iii. 167–191) he describes how men may reach the distinction of "the perfect man" through the cultivation of the qualities of the ṭāḥ and the suppression of the ṭāḥs.

Ibn al-ʿArabi's contemporary, the poet Ibn al-ʿFarāḥ (Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, Cambridge 1921, chap. iii.), at times identifies his own ṭāḥ with that from which all good emanates (al-Taťya al-kubrā, on margin of Divān Ibn al-ʿFarāḥ, Cairo 1319, ii. 4 sq.) and with the "pole" (ṣuḥūd) upon which the heavens revolve (p. 113, 115). Al-Khāshānī, the commentator of al-Taťya, explains that this identity is with the greatest spirit (ṭāḥ al-arwāb) and the greatest "pole". The compiler of the commentaries on the Divān states (i. 196) that incarnation (ṣuḥūd) and union (ṣiḥāb) with Allāh are impossible, but there is real "passing away" (fana) and attainment (waṣīf) of the ṭāḥ and the ṭāḥs of Allāh, for His ṭāḥs is their ṭāḥs.

Abū al-Karim al-Dīlānī carries this position of existential monism on to a more ascetic plane. In al-Inān al-kāmin [q.v.] (Cairo 1343) the terms rūḥ al-kudūs, ṭāḥ al-arwāb and ṭāḥ Allāh stand for a special one of the aspects of the Divine Reality (al-Ḥaqq), not to be embraced under the command "be" nor created. This spirit is the divine aspect in which stand the created spirits of all existences, sensible and intelligible (p. 94). Existence itself subsists in the ṭāḥs of Allāh, and His is the name of the ṭāḥs. More than one thing has a created spirit (rūḥ). One of the aspects of the angel of Sūrā xi. 52, who is named the command (amīr) of Allāh, and who is an aspect of Allāh as above, is given to the ṭāḥ of Muhammad, which is identified as the ṭāḥ mentioned in the verse. That angelic and divine ṭāḥ thereby becomes the Idea (ḥaška) of Muhammad (p. 95 sq.) and he thereby becomes the "perfect man" (p. 96, 131 sqq.). The rūḥ which is the specific nature of the human ṭāḥs has five names: animal, commanding to evil, instinctive (al-mulhamah), reproving, and tranquil. When the divine qualities actually describe the ṭāḥs, then the names, qualities and essences of the gnostic (ʿarīf) are those of the One Known (Maʿrif) (p. 150 sq.).

XI. In geomancy (ʿin al-rain) the first "house" (ṣaḥā) of the ummašaḥ (cf. MADAGASCAR, supra, iii. 73) is called ṭāḥs because it guides to problems concerning soul and spirit of the inquirer, and to the beginning of affairs (Muhammad al-Ẓanātī, Kitāb al-ʿAsk fī ʿin al-rain, Cairo n.d., p. 7; cf. Henr. Corn. Agrippae, Opera, Leyden, n. d., but early xvith cent., p. 412: Nam primum domus personam tentu quadrennii).


E. E. Calverley

AL-NAFUSA, in Berber INFESÂN, name of a Berber tribe. According to the common genealogical scheme (cf. Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-ʿIlār, i. 107–117 of the text), the Nafusa are one of the four branches of the large body of the Botr, whose name derives from their chief Mailgīh al-Abtar. At present the dwelling place of the Nafusa is south-west of Tripoli, on the plateau of the same name which from the frontier between Tunisia and Tripolitania tends eastward, and if taken in the largest sense, comprises the regions of Nalūt, Fassāf and Yefren. The inhabitants of these regions are generally called Nafusa, although, in a genealogical sense, this name can be applied to some groups only. Probably the name Djabal Nafusa (in Berber Drān n Ifesān), which originally belonged to a part of the plateau, was extended to the large area between Wāzen and Yefren on account of the fact that of the tribes inhabiting it, the Nafusa were of prominent importance. This use of the name in its widest sense is also to be found in the book by Ibrāhīm b. Slīman al-Shamākhī "Castles and Ways of the Nafusa plateau" (1302 = 1884–1885), in which all the territories of Yefren, Fassāf and Nalūt are indicated.

The scarce data on the history of the Nafusa, which we possess, are to be found, for the largest part, in Arabic sources. In the Greek and Latin authors of pre-Islamic times there is no single sure allusion to them. The name occurring in Corippus' Johannis (second song, i. 146: Quaeque nefanda colunt tristis montana Navusi), does not refer, in all probability, to a place or a tribe of Tripolitania, but rather of the Auros (Awrās), its plateau or its neighbourhood. The fact that Navus represents a form closely connected with Nafusa, its plateau, proves only that the name was widely spread among the Berbers, that it is old and may be probably connected with such words as cuneus, fem. cuneus "right, to the right hand" in Auglin.

In Islamic times the name is recorded for the first time in connection with the capture of the town of Tripoli by ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ (22 or 23). According to Ibn Ḥadīrī (i. 2 sq., text between the siege the inhabitants called to their aid the Nafusa, who came to their aid. At that time they were residing also in the vast plain of Djarāf, situated between the Djabal and the Sea; one of their chief towns, if not their capital, was Sābāra on the coast (Roman Sabratha, formerly Phoenician), west of Tripoli, which by Ibn Khaldūn (Ilār, i. 181, l. 8, text) is called "the city of the Nafusa". This town was taken
by surprise and plundered by a body of cavalry sent by 'Amar. This raid was probably undertaken not only to continue the conquest farther westward, but also to punish the Nafusa, whose territory 'Amar had invaded in order to conquer it (cf. al-Bakri, p. 9, 10, text), and which he had to abandon by order of the Caliph.

According to some sources, the Nafusa at that time were Christians; according to other reports, however, they were Jews. Our latest local information makes it probable that Christianity had spread widely among them; though the conversion of single groups to Judaism is not excluded. In fact traces of Byzantine basilicas have been found on the plateau, e.g. at Temezda, Iramis etc., which are also mentioned in some sources and which must have been used by large numbers of the indigenous population.

When the Arab had conquered North Africa, the Nafusa of Sabra and of the coastal region retired, according to the common opinion, to the plateau, where they remained hostile towards the conqueror. At first this situation was not very serious, population, however, makes it clear that a part of them must have stayed in their old dwelling-places where they intermarried with other tribes and, in course of time, became arabised. In fact there are tribes in the Western Dafara and in Tripoli, the town and its surroundings (the regions of al-Sâlih, Tagjura, etc.), that, according to the local genealogy, derive from the Nafusa. Apart from this ethnic tradition, there is the fact, recorded in several sources, that after the first case of intervention of the Nafusa in the affairs of the town of Tripoli — which may have been partly due to a Christian opposition to the Muhammadan invasion — they wanted, under successive dominations, to make their presence felt and their influence preponderant in the northwestern region of Tripolitania, so that the outlines of the history of the small, but strong and civilized Berber unit may be summed to be the following. Having its centre in the plateau, it intended to make felt, as often as possible, its dominion in the coastal region and thus keep the control of the main way of communication between Egypt and Ifriqiya, which ran along the coast and which was followed by the various expeditions to the Maghrib. Even at present such aspirations may be stirred in the minds of the most cultivated of these populations, to such an extent that even some of them have reckoned with an eventual reoccupation of their old territories in Western Dafara.

The period in which the Nafusa, according to the sources available to us, vigorous were most active and took a part in the events happening in North Africa, was that of the great Kharijji [q. v.] revolts, which began in 122 (739—740) and did not cease before the 13th (xth) century, i.e. before the era of the Fatimids. When the Wahabi doctrines began to spread among the North African populations in the second century A. H., they embraced them and so joined the rebellious movement of the Berbers against the Arab conquerors, a movement which, prepared by several other causes, found also some support in the Kharijji heterodoxy. The Nafusa embraced the Ibbi, i.e. the more moderate form of the Kharijji doctrine, and remained ever faithful to it with heroic attachment. In alliance with other Berber tribes, either Ibbi or other branches of the sect, they repeatedly made war upon the Arab governors of Ifriqiya.

In 140 (757—758), they elected as their imam, probably with the intention of founding an Ibadite principality — an intention which manifests itself also at other times — an Arab called Abu l-Khaṭṭāb ‘Abd al-Aʿlī b. al-Samḥ al-Munṣīr [q. v.], one of the missionaries of Ibbidism in North Africa. Under his command and in conjunction with other Berber groups, they occupied Tripolis, fought against the Šufite [cf. al-Sufiyya] Wafarjuma, who had sacked Cairo and where they had settled, and against the armies sent by the ‘Abbāsids to reconquer Ifriqiya. Finally, in 144 (761—762), Abu l-Khaṭṭāb and a large number of his followers perished near Taurgha (Tawurgha) in a great battle against the general Muhammad b. al-Ashʿāb al-Khuṭayfī, the governor of Ifriqiya.

Another notorious imam of the Nafusa was a Berber Abū Ḥatim Yaʿkūb [q. v.], whose enterprises survive in oral tradition on the plateau, who speaks of his literary activity, and the wares of the Arabs. He was killed in battle in 155 (771—772).

When the Ibbi dynasty of the Rustamids [cf. Rustam], which had Tahert as its centre, had been founded, the Nafusa did not elect an imam of their own any more, but formed a part of this kingdom under a governor who depended upon it. Some of these governors, e.g. Abū ʿUbayda ‘Abd al-Ḥāmid al-Damāwni (of Ighmāwen), Abū Manṣūr Iyās (of Tenejmura), are often praised by the Berbers of the Djabal, for their importance and ability in maintaining the interests of Ibbidism, and also for their learning and piety.

The Nafusa were a valuable support of the kingdom of the Rustamids, of which they formed the eastern bulwark. Being near the territory of the Aghlabides [q. v.], they shared to some extent the vicissitudes of this state which had arisen in Ifriqiya in the beginning of the 10th century A.D. The town of Tripoli was in the possession of these princes; Western Dafara, on the other hand, till near the Sea, and probably also part of Eastern Dafara, was in the power or under the influence of the Nafusa. When Tripoli was beleaguered in 267 (880—881) by the Tūlūn prince al-ʿAbbās, who, having revolted against his father Ahmad, sought to conquer Ifriqiya at his own risks, the Nafusa were called to aid, and, appearing without delay, they defeated the army of the invaders (according to other sources, their help was invoked by the inhabitants of Lebeda). This fact, which reminds of the first siege of Tripoli by the Muslims, proves clearly the influence the Nafusa possessed in northwestern Tripolitania and it accounts also for the severe blow dealt to them in 283 (996—997) by the Aghlabides, when Ibrahim II b. Ahmad, who led an expedition from Tunis to Egypt, found his passage through the coastal region of Tripolitania barred by the Nafusa. The bloody battle of Mānū, which was followed by acts of terrible cruelty inflicted upon hundreds of Nafusa prisoners, and which is narrated in a more or less anecdotal form in the Sunni as well as in the Ibbi sources, is ascribed, ultimately, to the desire of the Caliph to punish the Nafusa who were the principal support of the heretical state of Tāheṭ; or to the resentment of the Aghlabides at acts of enmity committed
by the Berbers, as well as in the humiliation they had suffered when the expedition of the Tulunid al-Abbas, which was directed against them, had been averted by the Nafusa, to whom this exploit became a point of glory.

In reality, however, taking into account the whole political situation as well as the historical antecedents, it is evident that that battle, which is still mentioned in the oral tradition of the Ibadites as the most terrible disaster they ever suffered, was the inevitable encounter between the Aglabide power and the supremacy of the Nafusa exercised in the former’s immediate vicinity and even in its own territory.

The power of the Aglabides as well as that of the Rustamids had been destroyed by the Fatimidis [q.v.], the Nafusa found themselves face to face with those new masters of Eastern Barbary. There exist reports of an instance of their strenuous opposition to Fatimid power which endeavoured to subdue them in 920 (922—923), and which defeated them in the following year.

There were, however, reports concerning the part taken by the Nafusa, or at least by tribes from the plateau, in the great Kharidj rebellion, which was led by Abi Yazid and which ended with the victory of the Fatimidis. Probably the Ibadite populations of the Djabal, although having given the idea of forming one large autonomous state, endeavour to avoid any dependence upon the various kingdoms and empires which successively held the supremacy in North Africa, while the latter, on the other hand, endeavoured, as far as possible, to obtain a footing also in the mountainous region which forms the strategic key to the plain stretching towards the coast.

When the Almohades [q.v.] undertook the conquest of Eastern Ifriqiya under Abd al-Mumin (554—555 = 1119—1160), the Nafusa were also subdued by his army. Their territory became the scene of violent struggles and massacres, of raids and partial conquests during the long period of the revolt of the Banu Ghaniya who attempted to restore the Almoravid empire and who, from 580 (1184—1185) onwards, for nearly half a century and with varying success, fought chiefly in Oriental Barbary. In these fights Arabs of the tribe of Debbâb (belonging to the Banu Sulaim) took part who had come to Tripolitania during the well-known invasion of the Banu Hilal and Sulaim. Some clans of the Debbâb, especially the Mahâmid and the Djuwâri, settled in the coastal region west of Tripoli, where the Nafusa had exercised their power before. Yet the great mass of the latter must have retired to the plateau not at the time of the conquest, but in consequence of the Arab invasion.

The Nafusa remained in nearly the same attitude of dependence of their independence, during the supremacy in Ifriqiya of the Hafsidis [q.v.], and, afterwards, of the Turks. While other populations in the neighbourhood gave up their Ibadism in order to embrace Sunnism, and consequently became arabised, the Nafusa stuck to their faith and to their Berber vernacular, withdrawing themselves to the rough cists of their mountains, and from time to time taking part in the acts of hostility and in the rebellions which the interior opposed to the efforts of the government of Tripoli to maintain its own authority and, chiefly, to levy taxes.

In the nineteenth century, the Turks, after having retaken in 1251 (1835—1836) the direct administration of Tripoli, had to fight long and bitterly for the conquest of the plateau of the Nafusa also. The struggle lasted, with varying success, till 1274 (1857—1858); in this period the shahk Ghâma b. Khâlifa distinguished himself by courage and endurance; he is usually represented as the hero of Berber independence defended against the Turks. In reality, however, he was an Arab and the Arab tribe of the Mahâmid had the largest share in the wars, while the Berbers, according to all appearance, did not take part in them on a large scale. During the Italian occupation of Tripolitania in 1911, the Nafusa were at first hostile in accordance with their old aspiration to found an independent Ibadite kingdom which should extend up to the Sea and include the region of Sabratha. Defeated in 1913 by the valiant general Lequio near al-Aslûna they offered their submission to the Italian authorities and ever since have proved very faithful subjects. When inner Tripolitania, in consequence of the effects of the Great War, was troubled by rebels, they showed an heroic attachment to Italy, fighting her enemies under great sacrifices. When in 1922 the reconquest of the inland had begun, they voluntarily took part in it, side by side with the regular troops, with perfect loyalty.

Additions and Corrections


p. 692a, l. 29, to be added: He has been buried at the feet of the poet Niyāzī Miṣrī at Kastro (Lemnos), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massignon, Recueil, p. 164).
many other works of Berber Ibâdîtes; yet perhaps parts of it may be recovered by further search in the Mâb, at Gerba and among the Nafûsâ. At any rate, Abû Sahîl has an important place in the literary history of the Berbers, especially the Ibâdîtes, who composed books on theology and law, chronicles, poetry and biographies.

Such a literary movement is usually explained by the need which the heretics felt of making clear their doctrine, especially the points in which it differed from the sunna, to the inhabitants of the interior of the Central and Eastern Maghrib, who did not know Arabic, and who must have been numerous about 1000 A.D. Yet another thing, which can be seen to-day, must not be forgotten, viz. the attachment of these peoples to their own tongue as a symbol of opposition to the Arabic speaking world in general and Muslim orthodoxy in particular. At the end of the nineteenth century, some Berber groups in the neighbourhood of Véren in Tripolitania were led by Sandi propaganda to give up their old Ibâdite faith and embrace orthodoxy. This change in its turn caused the Berber dialect to be less used; as if heresy were bound up with the national language, and the giving up of the heresy removed the last obstacle to complete arabisation. This assumption is confirmed by some religious poems (they deserve to be called literature) in the region of Fassâât, where the love of the national language is still strong. In them the author says explicitly that he uses Berber to uphold and strengthen the Ibâdite faith, which once flourished gloriously, but afterwards decreased, and is now well nigh disappeared. In past times also, the Berber literature of the Ibâdîtes was partly a symbol of non-conformity and nationalism; so when Abû Sahîl, who was rooted in Arabic civilisation by his origin, devoted himself to the study of Berber so as to become the best Berber scholar of his time and to compose in it his works. He must have felt in his deeply religious mind the connection between that language and the faith he professed.


**Nâgpûr**, a city, tahsil, district, and division of the Central Provinces of British India. The modern Central Provinces and Berar, which formed part of the eighteenth century Bhonsâl kingdom of Nâgpûr, lie between 17° 47' and 24° 27' N. and 75° 37' and 84° 24' E., with an area of 113,285 square miles, and an actual population of 17,951,147. Nâgpûr division contains a population of 5,595,578; Nâgpûr district 933,168; and the city 215,003 (1931 Census Report).

The history of this area, which roughly corresponds to Goudwâna, has been profoundly influenced by the long range of the Satpura hills through which the Bâhrânâpur—Asâlgâr gap provided the chief route from Hindustan to the Dakhan. When the Muhammadan invaders first came into contact with Goudwâna, it contained four independent
Gond kingdoms: the northern kingdom of Garha-Mandla; two central kingdoms with their capitals at Deogarh and Khelwa respectively; and a southern state with its capital at Canda. In the reign of Akbar the imperial forces overran the northern kingdom forcing it to pay tribute, despite the heroic efforts of the Dowager Rani Durgavati. After this the political predominance of the Gond chiefs shifted to Deogarh which, in its turn also suffered from the aggressive schemes of the Mughal emperors. Early in the reign of Awrangzib a punitive force under Dilir Khan entered both Canda and Deogarh, with the result that, in 1670, the ruler of Deogarh embraced Islam as the price of the restoration of his kingdom ('Alamgir-nama, p. 1022—27). Both these states paid tribute to the emperor through a Muslim agent stationed at Nagpur. This however is not the earliest reference to Nagpur in the Mughal period, for the 'Padshah-nama of Lihawri describes its capture by Khan Dawain, in 1537 (for a still earlier identification see Hira Lal, p. 16).

The most famous ruler of Deogarh was the converted Gond chief, Bakht Buland, who visited the court of Awrangzib ('A'lamgir, p. 273). Because of his contumacious attitude he was replaced by another Muslim Gond named Dinlar ('ibid., p. 340). For some years after this Bakht Buland remained in imperial service, until, escaping from imperial control, he once more raised the standard of revolt in Deogarh ('Manmakhab al-Lubab of Khaft Khan, p. 461). Although Deogarh was recaptured for a time by Awrangzib's forces, Bakht Buland remained in open rebellion and was never really subdued. Eventually under this able ruler the Deogarh state comprised the modern districts of Chandwara and Betul, together with portions of Nagpur, Seoni, Bhandara and Ballarhat. The last important Gond ruler was Cand Jalban who died in 1739. It was he who fixed the capital at Nagpur which he converted into a walled town.

Internal dissensions led to the intervention of Raghuji Bhonsla, who was governing Berar on behalf of the Maratha Peshwa. Eventually, in 1743, the Maratha leader took over the administration of the country. By granting a nominal authority to the Gond Raja, Burhan Shah, and his descendants, the Bhonsla possessed a useful pretex for disavowing, when expedient, the rights of the Peishwa, but in practice reference was usually made to Pusa on important matters, such as the succession. Burhan Shah's descendants have continued to occupy the position of state pensioners, and the representative of the family resides at Nagpur with the title of Raja or Sanadhan. Raghuji's reign witnessed a great influx of Kunbis and other Marathas into Nagpur. The treacherous attitude of his successor Jangoji led to his defeat by the combined forces of the Nizam and the Peishwa, and to his acknowledgement of the latter's supremacy.

It was under Raghuji II that the Nagpur kingdom attained its greatest extent and included practically the whole of the modern Central Provinces and Berar, together with Orissa and certain of the Cuttack Nagpur states. Unfortunately for the solidarity of his kingdom he joined forces with Simhia against the British, and, in 1803, after the battles of Assaye and Angloon, was compelled to subscribe to the treaty of Deoglan, by which he was deprived of a third of his dominions (Altichison, i. 415—417). He was succeeded in 1816 by his son, Parsodji, an imbecile, who was murdered in the following year by the notorious Appa Sahib. On the outbreak of war between the British and the Nizam in 1817, Appa Sahib attacked the British Residency but his troops were defeated in the brilliant action at Sitabuldi. This resulted in the deposition of Appa Sahib, who was succeeded by Raghuji III, on whose death, in 1853, without heirs, natural or adopted, this dependent principality was declared by Dalhouse to have lapsed to the Paramount Power.

The British administered Nagpur by means of a Commission until the formation of the Central Provinces in 1861. Today, the city of Nagpur supports a flourishing Muhammadan community, in the suburb of Madhabbagh, the members of which are Daudi Bohras of the Shia sect [Brooke 1911]. The members of this community live together in the buildings of the institution, where their children are educated and their women taught suitable accomplishments.

"AL-NAH'I, "the Bee", Sûra xvi. of the Kur'ân. The title is taken from verse 70: "Thy Lord has made this revelation to the Bee". Khâfîn (iii. 155) says that it was also called "Sûra of the Honey" because there are references in several passages to cattle. As to its date, it is reckoned among the later Meccan Sûras and includes several verses of Medinese origin; the commentators however are not agreed on this point.

The Sûra of the "Bee" contains four abrogated verses: verse 69 is annulled by v. 92; verse 84 by ix. 5; verse 108, part 1, annulled by the end of the same verse and by ix. 5.

Bibliography: Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qu'ran, Leipzig 1909–1928, l. 145 sqq.; Sell, The Historical Development of the Qu'ran, London 1923; Montet, le Coran, Paris 1929; al-Nishâbî, Abû b. Ya'qûb, Cairo 1315; Ibn Salama, al-Nadîq wa-t-Mawdûdîh, the margin of the preceding; Suyûtî, l.Sâhîh Cairo 1343; the commentaries on the Kur'ân.

(MAURICE CHEMOLI)

AL-NAHR, the constellation of the River (Eridanus). It corresponds to the Πετάωσα, Flamen, Amnis of the ancients (cf. Aratos, Pharnakos, l. 358; Geminus, Ερημών Tepolemy, Αμανιδός). Aratos observes (l. 360) — probably one of the first to do so — that the river of heaven represents Eridanus (Hîrîâxos, river of the morning; or river of darkness, of the west?) turned into stars, into which Phaëton, son of Helios, fell, struck by the thunderbolt of Zeus, after his unsuccessful attempt to ride to heaven. (The opinions of the Greek authors varied regarding the identity of the earthly Eridanus. It is often identified as the Po (Padus), in later times however sometimes with the Rhone (Rhodanus, probably on account of the similarity of sound with "Eridanus") or even with the Rhine (Rhenus) while Strabo denies there was such a river for he calls it θ'ηολόγος γένειος "the nowhere existing"). According to another view (Eratothenes, c. 37), the constellation of the river represents the Nile since "this alone flows from the south". Just as the river of heaven at the time of its culmination seems to flow from the south point of the horizon to the north; a third group of authors see in it the figure of Oceanos.

While Aratos clearly names only that portion of the river of heaven which lies between Orion and Cetus (the Whale), Eratothenes and Hyginus continue it in a southeasterly direction as far as the neighbourhood of Canopus (α Carinae); on the other hand, Tepolemy, like all later writers, gives it its southwesterly direction and already calls the star of the first magnitude at its southern point (α Eridani, Achernar; cf. below) θηολόγος τοῦ Πεταώσα, the position of which however he gives incorrectly as he could not himself observe it in Alexandria on account of its great southern declination (θ +100 = −67° 25').

AL-Nahr is one of the constellations of the southern heavens. In the north it is joined by the Bull (al-Thauwar), in the east by Orion (al-Dhâbîbîr, the Giant, or al-Dhawwâl, the Bride), the Hare (al-Arnab) and the most western subsidiary stars (khârîd al-sûra) of the Great Dog (al-Kâbîr al-shahar), which are now included in the constellation of the Dove and the Sculptor's Tool, in the west by the Whale (Kittâs or Kâitûs). The constellation of al-Nahr contains, according to Abd al-Ra'âmân al-Sûfî (210 aqqa), primary stars (i.e. those which form the figure, kawâbîn mi‘n al-sûra) — there are no subsidiary stars included in it. It begins with ζ Eridani on the left foot of Orion (β Orionis, Rigil), winds westwards to γ Eridani, then southwards to α Eridani and proceeds via τ Eridani and finally in a southwesterly direction via ι, γ, h Eridani to α Eridani.

The fresco in the dome of Kûsâr Amra shows in the surviving portion the constellation of al-Nahr as a narrow ribbon, which runs directly westwards from the raised foot of Orion, a little below the equator and parallel with the latter in the direction of the Whale.

The Arabs give to the inverted quadrilateral formed by τ Orionis, λ, β and γ Eridani, which appears to support the left foot of Orion (Rigel) the name "fore throne (foot-stool) of Orion", Kursî al-Dhawwâl al-mu’taddâm, in contrast to his "back throne", Kursî al-Dhawwâl al-mu’âbbâkar or A’rah al-Dhawwâl. The stars ζ, ρ, ι and τ Eridani together with ξ and ζ Eridani, which enclose an area with very few stars in it, are called Ushā al-Nâ’sîn, "Ostrich Nest", the numerous small stars surrounding it are called al-Bâdî, "the eggs", or al-Kâlîd, "the egg-shells". The most southerly star in Eridanus, also the brightest (ζ Eridani, first magnitude), is called al-Dhâlîm, the "male ostrich", or Aḥsîr al-Nahr, the "last of the river" (in the Alfonse Tables) whence comes the name still used at the present day Achernar or Acrornar.

Between Achernar and Tophalât (i.e. from [Final Al-Hût, "mouth of the fish", α Pisces Austrini] in the region of the present Phoenix) are a considerable number of stars which the Arabs called al-Riyâd, "the ostrich chucks". Al-Sûfî states that in Shîrûz he observed a series of stars near the horizon which had the shape of a ship (zourâq) (α, β, μ, ν, γ Phoenixis). The brightest among them (α, according to Sûfî, of third, in reality of second magnitude) forms with α Pisces Austrini and β Eridani [Δenc (Dhanâb) Kûlats, "tail of the whale"] an approximately right-angled isosceles triangle with a line from α Pisces Austrini to β Eridani as base, the stream of water, according to al-Sûfî are also to be included in al-Riyâd. The star α Phoenixis is called al-Dirṣâd al-thâذîni "the Second Frog", in contrast to the "First Frog", al-Dirṣâd al-a’awwâl, which is represented by α Piscis.


(W. HARTNER)

NAHIR AL-MALIK. [See Diqâla.]

NAHRAWÂLÎ (NAHRVAHUNI), Arab his- torian. Kûrîn al-Dîn Muhammad b. ‘Alî al- Damn Ahmad b. Shams al-Dîn Muhammad b. Kâfî Khan Mahmûd al-Makrî al- Kâdirî al-Khârjâni al-Hâfîn was born in 917 (1511) in Mecca, to which his father, a member of a scholarly Indian family, had migrated from Nahrawâlî in Gujrat. To complete his studies which had been
begun under his father, he went in 943 (1530) to Cairo, where he was taught by al-Suyūṭī’s pupils, and to Stambul. On his return home he received a teaching appointment in the Madrasa al-Ashrafīya. In 965 (1557) he again went to Stambul via Asia Minor and afterwards was appointed to the Kanbāyatīya in Mecca. When in 975 (1567) the al-Sulīmānyā Madrasa was founded for all four orthodox rites, he went to it and later became Mufti of Mecca. He died in 990 (1582; according to witnesses in 988 or 991).

His first literary effort seems to have been a description of his second journey to Stambul, which has not survived. His other works cannot be chronologically arranged with certainty. These are the poetical anthologies, intended to supply quotations for letter-writers which in the Leyden (Cat. cod. ar., i. 356) MS. is called Timgm al-‘Amalāḥ al-sūrā fi ‘l-‘ābād al-farāza al-rādāsra, in the Cairo (Fihris, iv. 220: ii. 68) al-Timgm wal-‘l-Mudhdhara bi ‘l-‘Abād al-mufrada al-nūdira, and a collection of riddles entitled Kunz al-‘Asmā’ fi Fann al-Mu’amma, which is preserved in Berlin No. 7348, in the Escorial (Cat. Derenburg, No. 555), in Stambul (‘Aṣḥā‘ Ef., iii. 107, 290) and Cairo (Fihris, iv. 307), which is quoted by ‘Abd al-Kādhār al-Baghdādi (Mukaddasat al-Aṣbāb, ii. 115), and on which Mu‘in al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Mu‘in b. ‘Abūl-Muṣā al-Bakrī in 993 (1585) wrote a commentary entitled Ṭawārīkh al-aswāf (MSS. in Upsala, No. 63; Paris, No. 3417, 5; Escorial, op. cit., No. 536, 2; extracts in Leyden, op. cit., No. 522). It is not possible also to date his collection of biographical matter of which there only survives the synopsis Mumtazgab al-Tūrīṣ in Leyden (op. cit., No. 1045).

His two principal historical works date from the last decade of his life. On 10 Ramaḍān 981 (May 4, 1573) he finished his history of Turkish rule in the Yaman entitled al-Burj al-Yamānī fi ‘l-Fath al-Othmāni; it begins with the year 900 (1494), describes the first Turkish conquest under the vizier Sulaimān Pasha, the return of the Zaidids and the second conquest by the grand vizier Sinān Pasha, to whom the work is dedicated; an appendix describes his conquest of Tunis and Goletta. He prepared a second edition after the accession of Sultan Murād III in 982 (1574); cf. S. de Sacy, in N.E., iv. (1787), p. 412—521 and to the MSS., in G.A.L., ii. 382 add Leyden, op. cit., No. 944; Paris (Buchet, Cat. des Miss. Ar. des nouvelles acquisitions, No. 5927), Escorial (Lévi-Provençal, No. 1720), Cairo, Fihris, v. 56), also D. Lopes, Exa myths da historia da conquista da Kampan pelos Othmamos texto ar. trad. e notas, Lisbon 1892. In 985 (1577) he finished his history of Mecca dedicated to Sultan Murad, entitled al-Burj bi‘l-Hamad Balad (‘Aṣzāl) Allāh al-fāriq, which Wustenfeld published in the Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, vol. i., Leipzig 1857, and is printed Cairo 1503, 1505 (on the margin of Ahmad b. Zainal Dālah’s Khuṭbāt al-Kāmil li Bayān Ummār al-Balad al-‘arṣīm), 1516; to the MSS. given in G. A. L., ii. 382 may be added Tübingen, No. 23; Paris, No. 1637—1642, 4924, 5932, 5999; Leyden (Cat. i., i. 926—930); Cambridge (Browne, No. 4—44); Ambrosiana, H., No. 116 (Z. D. M. G., lxix. 777); Vaticana, No. 284; Sulamīnaya, Stambul No. 815; ‘Alā‘ Oğqmāniya, No. 3047; Cairo (Fihris, v. 32); Cat. Bankiopore, xx. 1085; Åṣafya, p. 178. This work was translated into Turkish by the famous poet Bāqī (q. v.) (MSS. in Goa, No. 158; Vienna, No. 895; Or. Ak., Krafti, No. 260; Cambridge, Suppl., No. 72; ed. by Gottwald, Kusan 1286). A synopsis entitled Fīlm al-Camāl al-A‘lam bi-Binā‘ al-Masjid al-Harām, MSS. Leyden, op. cit., No. 931; Cairo, Fihris, v. 32; Bankiopore, xx. 1089. was made by his nephew Bāhā‘ al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥibb al-Dīn b. ‘Alī al-Dīn, b. 29th Shawwāl 961 (Sept. 26, 1554) at Ahmadābād in Gujarāt, brought up in Mecca by his uncle, then teacher in the Madrasa al-Mu‘ādšā, 978 (1575) Mufti of Mecca, 990 (1582) Imām al-Haram, d. 15th Dhu l-Hijjah 1014 (Aug. 14, 1606) (al-Muhibb, Khālidāt al-‘Athār, ill. 8).

His son Muḥammad in 1905 (1596) wrote a history of Mecca and Medina and of the exploits of Hasan Pasha who became vassal of Yaman, entitled līhādāj al-Inān wa-l-Zaman fi l-Baṣīr al-aswāf li l-‘Arman min al-Yaman bi-Mawālīna l-‘Adil al-Baṣīr, which is preserved in Leyden, op. cit., No. 937; Cairo, Fihris, v. 2; v. 3.


(C. Brockelmann)

NAHRAWĀN, or, according to the popular pronunciation, Nahrawān (Yatsī, iv. 846 sqq.), name of a large territory between Bağdād [q. v.] and Wāṣīt [q. v.], known through the battle between ‘Alī and the Khāridjītes [q. v.] in 35 (658).

NAHW (Ar.), lit. direction, path, also intention, but gradually acquired the special meaning of grammar. The Arab philologists divide it into two branches: accidence, ‘ilm al-‘ārāf or tarqif, comprising the theory of verbal stems and their conjugation, the formation of nouns and adjectives, the formation of the plural and of the feminine, etc., i.e. with individual word-forms only, and syntax, ‘ilm al-naḥw in the narrower sense. The fundamental grammatical conceptions of the Arab philologists are taken from Aristotelian logic, which came via S. ruan scholars to the Arabs (on the dependence of the Arabic phonetic system on the Indian, cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 97). As the beginnings of Arabic learning in general are lost in obscurity, so also is the origin of the appellation naḥw uncertain even to the Arabs themselves. The caliph ‘Alī is said to have instructed Abu ‘l-Aswad al-Du‘all, who is regarded as the founder of the ‘ilm al-naḥw, how he should divide up the subject and to have ended by saying: ‘naḥw, “take this path”, whence the new science received the name of naḥw. According to another story, Abu ‘l-Aswad himself laid down the principles of Arabic grammar and said to the people: anākhun, “follow this”, from this name naḥw is said to be derived. The stimulus to deal with the problem of language is said to have come from the caliph ‘Alī; he, the story goes, taught Abu ‘l-Aswad the fundamental principles of naḥw and expounded to him the division of all language into three categories: ism, fi’il and harf. Another explanation as to how Abu ‘l-Aswad came to lay down the principles of Arabic grammar seems to
be nearer the actual facts. Ziyād b. Abühi [q.v.] asked him to put on record the principles of grammar which 'Ālī had taught him; but he was reluctant to do this and asked the governor to excuse him this task. When however on one occasion he heard a Kurān reader make a mistake, which destroyed the sense, in reading the sacred book, he declared himself ready to carry out the task. He therefore had a clerk come to him, to whom he dictated and said: "When you see me in pronouncing a letter open the mouth completely (fataha), put a point above the letter; when I close it completely (damma), put a point in front of it, and when I half close it (hamza), put the point below the letter". In this way the invention of vowel signs is traced back to Abu 'l-Aswad.

Another story, which deals with the same question, tells how a newly converted mawlā made a grammatical error in the hearing of Abu 'l-Aswad; one of the latter's household laughed at this but Abu 'l-Aswad said: "These are mawlās who long for Islam, who accepted it and thereby have become our brethren. How would it do if we were to draw up the laws of language for them? He thereupon prepared the chapter on subject and object". There must certainly be an element of at least probability in these anecdotes. By the accession of non-Arabs to Islam the danger arose that the Arab language might be corrupted by foreign elements; there was further the demand that the sacred text of the Qurān should be read aloud without error and its meaning accurately interpreted; there thus arose the necessity for a systematic investigation of the language of the sacred book and the laying down of the rules of its language, so that those ignorant of the language could guide themselves. Other anecdotes which relate to the problem of the origin of nāfās and all of which, of course, like those already given, are to be regarded as sa'īdī, also describe Abu 'l-Aswad as its founder, so that he may with justice be called the earliest Arabic philologist (nāfāsi). None of his writings has, however, come down to us. He is regarded as the founder of the philological school of Baṣra, the origin of which must therefore go back to a very early period (Abu 'l-Aswad died about the end of the first century A.H.). Only to mention some of the most important, to this school also belonged Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā'ī and his pupils Abū 'Ubayda and al-Aswā'ī, to whom we owe much of our knowledge of the Dhähiliyya, Shbāwā'ī, whose great work on grammar became "the book" par excellence, Khaṭā'ī, who is regarded as the inventor of the system of prosody, and many others. Very early there arose the dispute of the Kutāb al-Akhāribīya, to which the name of Khatā'ī is attached. He is regarded as the founder of the philological school of Baṣra. There also learned men began to deal with linguistic problems. While at first ideas were exchanged between the two schools, and students went from Kūfa to Baṣra to study, and well known Baṣra scholars came to Kūfa; gradually a considerable rivalry arose between the two. The Baṣraans laid greater stress on grammatical principles than the Kūfāns and were in general regarded as more faithful and more accurate transmitters. The questions disputed and the differences between the two schools are dealt with in a work by 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muhammad b. 'Ubayd Allah b. Abī Sa'id b. al-Abhārī. To the time of that work belong al-Kisā'ī and al-Mufadżal b. Dabbī. After the third century the centre of Arab learning was transferred to the capital of the Islamic empire, Baghdad. In the new Baṣra school which arose there the differences in point of view between the Kūfāns and Baṣraans schools gradually disappeared.


**Nābī (Nābī)**, literally "substitute, delegate" (nomen agentis from n-a-bī to take the place of another), the term applied generally to any person appointed as deputy of another in an official position, and more especially, in the Mamlik and Dihli Sulṭānates, to designate a. the deputy or lieutenant of the Sulṭān and b. the governors of the chief provinces (see also the article EGYP, above, vol. ii., p. 165). In the Mamlik system the former, entitled nābī al-salṭana al-mu'aẓẓama wa-khāṣṣ al-mumālik al-gharīfa al-islāmiyya, was the Vice-Sulṭān proper, who administered all the territories and affairs of the empire on behalf of the Sulṭān. This was, however, only an occasional office, and its holder is to be distinguished from the nābī al-Qaitba, the temporary governor of Cairo (or Egypt) during the absence of the Sulṭān or of Damascus during the absence of the nābī al-salṭana. The six nābīs of Syria which replaced the Ayyūbīs mamlikas—Damascus, Ḥalab, Tāripollī, Ḥamā, Ṣafeet and al-Karak (their number was from time to time increased by the erection of Ghaza and other districts into separate provinces)—were each administered by a nābī al-salṭana (also entitled khāṣṣ al-mumālik), who was an "amir of a thousand", the nābīs of Damascus being superior to the others. At the end of the viiiith (xth) century Egypt also was divided into three similar nābīs: Alexandria (from 767), Upper Egypt (al-wadī al-harīb b. al-khiṭbi) and Lower Egypt (al-wadī al-maḥrūbi). The plain title of nābī was held by the commandants of the citadels of Cairo, Damascus, Ḥalab, etc., who were not under the jurisdiction of their respective governors, and by various amirs of lesser rank holding subordinate commands. (For an instance of more recent use, see art. ṢAMHUL.)

In the Dihli Sulṭānate the nābī was the powerful minister who was the deputy of the king himself. The earliest known to the West seems to be the appointment of the Khān of the Coφunj in the 11th century. In November 1225 (1003), the feudal chief was appointed as a special deputy on the accession of Sulṭān Muṣīz al-Din Bāhār Shāh in 637 (1240) (Mīnādī al-Din, *Tābakāt-i Nāţīrī*, in *Bld. Ind.*, p. 191) In fact, the support of the nobles was conditional upon the appointment of this person to the deputyship. Although this was a separate office from that of the wazir, nevertheless under powerful nābīs, like Malik Kafūr in the reign of 'Ālī al-Din Khālidī and Khusraw in the reign of Mūbrāk Shāh, its existence was not conducive to the growth of the powers of the wazir. In its most common acceptance, in Persian and Turkish as well as later Arabic, nābī signified a judge-substitute, or delegate of the kaḍī in the administration of law. In modern Arabic it
 means usually a Parliamentary deputy, while al-nāʾīb al-ʾumūmi is the Public Prosecutor, the head of the Paqret (al-nīyāba al-ʾumūmiya).

Nāʾīb [for nawāb, intensum of nāʾib (but not employed in Arabic), a puristic correction for nawāb, shortened from nawābkh, the Arabic plural of nāʾib, employed as plur. dignitatis], the term used under the Mughal rulers of India to designate a viceroy or governor of a province. It is not known when the title first became current. It is sometimes found in combination with other titles, e.g. the Nawāb-Wazir of Oudh, the Nawāb-Nājm of Bengal. The Nawāb of Arcot (Carnatic) was a governor under the authority of the Nizām of Haidarābād.

Nawāb (Nawāb) is used also in Persia as a title of royal princes, and in India as an honorific, without necessarily having any office attached to it.

Nābob is an English corruption of Nawāb, which was also applied in a derogatory sense to wealthy Anglo-Indians who had returned from the east. It has been suggested that the term first became familiar to Englishmen in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Bibliography: In addition to the standard histories: E. Quatremère, Histoire des sultans mamelouks, Paris 1840, i., p. 93–99; M. van Berchem, Matriaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Paris 1903, i., p. 209–228 (analyses the epigraphic evidence); Gaudefroy-Demobymes, La Syrie à l'Époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923; Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, London 1903, s. v. Nābob; J. Price, The Saddle put on the Right Horse, or an Enquiry into the Reasons why certain Persians have been denominated Nābob, London 1781.

(H. A. R. Gibb) (C. Collin Davies)

Nāʾīla. [See Iṣk.]

Nāʾīli, properly Yeni-Zade Muṣṭafā Čelebi, called after his father Piri Khalifa Piri-Zade, a celebrated Ottoman poet. He is usually described as Nāʾili-Ḵādīm, "old Nāʾili", to distinguish him from Yeni Nāʾili, young Nāʾili, the poet and mawlawi Nāʾili Ṣahīf Efendi of Monastir, author of several Şīfte works who died in 1293 (1876) in Cairo. Nāʾili was one of the greatest Ottoman poets of the post-classical period, of the period of the weak sultāns (Murad IV, Ibrāhīm and Mehmend IV, 1058–1115 = 1648–1703), of rule by women and eunuchs (Kosam Šultān, Bektaš Agha and Murād Agha) and of the grand vizierate of the Köprülü. He is a link between Nefī and Yahiya and Nābi and Nedim. He and Yahiya are the best poets between Nefī and Nābi, the reviver of Ottoman literature.

Born in Constantinople, on the conclusion of his education he became secretary in the divān-i-hamâya and was ultimately a khalifa in the office of the Department of Mines (maḏen kalami). As his Divān shows, he belonged to the Köprülü order. He was a weak, delicate man of feeble constitution, who died in 1177 (1667–1668) in exile, it is said, into which he had been sent by Fazil Aḥmad Pasha Koprula. Bruself Mehmend Tahir's statement that his tomb was in the cemetery of the Sunbuli monastery in Findilğ and that his remains were removed to the cemetery of Pera, when the road was widened, cannot be quite reconciled with the story of his banishment. Nāʾili is one of the most interesting figures in the history of Turkish poetry. He did not, it is true, contribute anything essential to the actual development of Ottoman literature and gave it no new inspiration. He was an innovator but only in the field of style and language. He steadily worked to break down the rigidity and monotony of the post-classical school. His style is extremely artificial. His language is full of Persicisms but not in quite the same way as in the preceding periods. His diction is full of unusual Persian images and expressions with which he enriched the Turkish language in brilliant verses, somewhat exhausting however through the obscurity of their allusions. The fine new phrases and expressions are however not his own but are simply borrowings. Nāʾili succeeded in clearing away the stagnation of the literary language of the time by dropping the trite and hackneyed metaphors and phrases, which had been found in all divans since Bāki and borrowed new phrases and constructions from the Persian.

Although he wrote in Turkish his diction is purely Persian. He follows his Persian models so slavishly that his language is unintelligible to a Turk who does not know Persian. But the Ottoman poets wrote only for themselves and their equals and not for the people whom they ignored.

Nāʾili is the chief representative of the highly developed and marvelously elaborated literary language in which, as Gibb says, a rich and delicate Persian embroidery is harmoniously sewn upon the Turkish background, while the two languages remain sharply distinguished from one another.

Nāʾili's characteristics are a charming freshness of phraseology, sublimity of imagination, an artificial, individual style, gracefulness, clarity and purity of language, succinctness of expression and polished style such as no poet of his time possessed. According to Muʿallim Nāḏij, no Turk can read him without enthusiastically trying to imitate him, which is however hardly possible. His language is so finished and free from all superfluity that the meaning is often obscure and unintelligible. There is however a great deal that charms the reader, especially as his language is most melodious. As a poet he has not the same powers as he has, as a master of language and style. It is his language and not his poetic conception that is his strong point. He did not seek inspiration from his surroundings, like Yahiya, but from his Persian models.

Nāʾili's literary work consists only of a Divān, which was printed in Balḵ in 1253 (1837) (only about a third of the MSS. was printed however). It consists of four very fine hymns in honour of the Prophet (nāʾi), some 20 Ḍuṣṭas the language of which resembles that of Nefī and shows the same exaggeration. The Ḍuṣṭas are dedicated to Murad IV and Mehmend IV, to the grand viziers Kara Muṣṭafā Pasha (1048–1053, Mehmend Pasha (1053–1055), Śāliḥ Pasha (1055–1057), Şafii Mehmend Pasha (1056–1059), to the Shaikhs al-ʿĀl, Behā Efendi, Yahiya Efendi, Hāfṣ Mehmend Efendi, the Defterdar and others. The Divān also contains a touching merkhis (elegy) written in the terdi-bend manner on the death of his brother who died young, which is almost too extravagant with its effective refrain; also a takhlīm, and some mürüdles in the terdi and terki-bend manners and a terki-bend.

His most important and most characteristic work
Náili — Nakhčiwán

is however over 200 ghazels in which he imitates Fuzuli. In them he continually produces new expressions by new ideas and images and brings about new significances of words. Besides a passion kept within natural bounds and a tenderness of feeling, which reminds one of Nedin and makes a deep impression on any lover, there is an undeniable pessimism, reminiscient of Nābi, in his outlook on life, probably as the result of political conditions and his poor health. Occasionally there is something cold and forced about him. One feels that his spirit is ill and troubled.


Nâîma, Mustaṭif, a Turkish historian. Mustaṭif Naʿīm known as Naʿīm was born in 1065 (1655) in Aleppo. After becoming a tekerîrî (halberdier) in 1100 (beg. Oct. 26, 1688) in the imperial palace, he was promoted to be a secretary in the Divān under the grand vizier Kâzâhlûkhoz Ahmed Pasha. On the 28th Dümâdâ 1116 (Nov. 28, 1704) he became chief accountant of Anatolia and in 1121 (1709) was appointed Nîmetî as master of ceremonies and imperial historian (veʾlî fâm-âsî; q.v.). He later filled several other offices (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 245) and during the campaign in the Morea was assistant to the commander-in-chief (veʾlî rešîb). He died at the beginning of 1128 (Jan. 1716) at Old Patras, where he was buried in the outer court of the mosque which has now disappeared. On his tombstone cf. Brusul Mêhemmed Tahir, Osmânlî Muälliffî, iii, 151, and on his death the fârûn of the middle of Shawâl 1128 in Ahmad Râfiq, ḳurîr âlî-i âmîr Istanbul hayâtâ (1100—1200), Istanbul 1930, p. 52 sq. The candid and accurate history of the Ottoman empire, which he wrote in his official capacity and which he based upon earlier histories like the works of Kârâ Cemâl-zâde [q.v.], Wâdiţî [q.v.], Ahmad Şhârîk al-Manâr-zâde, Hâdîdî Khaîfa [q.v.] and the imperial Ottoman history mentioned at the end of his work as begun but not finished by a certain Şiṃî (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., iii, 326), covers the years 1000 (beg. Oct. 9, 1591) to 1070 (beg. Sept. 8, 1659). The full title of this much esteemed and largely used work is Rawdat al-Husayn fi Khudâzîr Akhâbâr al-Khâş-bân, in Hâdîdî Khâfarî, N. 14525 called simply Tarîkh-i Wâliyya.

Mustaṭif Naʿīm also wrote several political treatises (Reṣâlî-ı siyâsî), which have survived in a collected volume. Naʿīm interpreted his duties as a historian very seriously and his incorruptible love of the truth secured his work a superiority over those of all other Ottoman historians of the time. On Naʿīm's view of the "duties of the historian" cf. his own words in A. W. Duda, Türkische Post, year iii, Istanbul 1928, no. 324, p. 2. The original MS. of his Tarîkh is in Istanbul in the collection of the Erivan-Koshk. On the four editions and their variations cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 246; on the third edition see also F. A., 1868, i, 468. A French translation (still in MS.) was prepared by Antoine Galland (Fonds Français, N. 12,197 in the Bibliothèque Nationale); specimens of it were published by N. Jorga in the Actes et fragments à l'histoire des Roumains, i. (Bucharest 1895) p. 55.

Bibliography: Cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 246 and particularly Yení Medjîmû, Istanbul 1918, N. 55, p. 49 sqq.; Ahmad Râfiq, ḳurîr âlî-i Āmîr Istanbul 1924, p. 256 sqq.; Şâlim, Taḥkîrâ, p. 661 sq. (according to whom he also studied chemistry and other arts and sciences and was a carefree jolly boon companion) and Ali Jâlibî, Naʿīm-i Tarîkh, Istanbul 1927.

Nâkhčiwan (Nâkhiwân), a town to the north of the Araxes.

The town Nâkoâva is mentioned in Ptolemy, v., ch. 12. The Armenians explain the name of Nakhchavan (Nakhčuān) by a popular etymology as nakhiwâan ("Noah's first stopping place") although the name is apparently compounded with -awân "place") and locate the town in the province of Waspurakan (cf. Yāḳût, i, 122), or in that of Shiniq. According to Moses of Chorene, l. ch. 30, Nakchewan was in the area peopled by Median prisoners (mar) in whom we should see the ancestors of the Kurds of this region (cf. Babkhan, p. 200; Hâfiz al-ʾAvâd). In the early Arab sources we find the term Nashawâ, Bâlbûrû, p. 105, 200; Ibn Miskawaih, ii, 145; Samâni, p. 560; Nashâwâ. In the Saldjûk and Mongol period the predominant form is Nakdjuwân (as early as Ibn Khurdatibih, p. 122).

The town was conquered under Othmân by Hâbûb b. Maslama It was rebuilt under Muʿawiyâ by ʾAzîz b. ʾHâtim. In 87 (705) the Arabs slashed a large number of Armenian nobles, whereupon the town acquired a Muslim character. For a short time (about 900) the power was in the hands of the Bagratuni, but the town was reconquered by the Saldjûks (q.v.) and belonged henceforth to the domain of their vassal, the amir of Golbâ (Ordûkhan); cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, Vienna 1930, preface, p. 79, 93—101, 115; text, p. 300, 362, 567. It figures in the wars of the Dailami period (Ibn Miskawaih, ii, 148) and in the events of the Saldjûk period (cf. Ibn al-Athir under 514 A.H.).

Nakchewân is more particularly associated with the family of ʾIdrigîz at-ʾAbâs b. ʾAḍârâbâdîjan (531—632 = 1136—1225), cf. Mirzâwând, Rawdat al-Šâbâ, Lucknow 1894, p. 875—876) whose main centre it was, as is shown by the fine buildings a. the tomb (nâshâd) of al-ʿArâs al-ʾAdîjâl Rûhân al-Dîn Dümâl
al-ālam muqaddam al-masākīn Yāsuf b. Kathīr
(1), dated 557 (1162–1163); b. the tomb
built by Shams al-Dīn Nuṣrat al-Īslām Ildīfiz for the matka
Some localities
depending upon N. (Erdjāk) were given in fief to the
Georgian prince Elikum Orbelian by his brother Kīrl Arslan. When the Khwārizmshāh
Djālīl al-Dīn exercised power in Aḥdarbājīan,
N. belonged to the Malikat al-Djālīliya, daughter of Muḥāmmad Palawān, Nasawi, ed. Houdas,
p. 266, 266, 300. Under the Mongols the town
was devastated, as is attested by Rubruck who
visited it in 1253, ed. 1839, p. 358, crude. Howorth,
History of the Mongols, ill., 82. The town suffered
also from the wars between Turkey and Persia (under Murad IV); Ewliya Cebeli, i. 240. Tavernier
(1664), ed. 1713, i. 55–55, and Chardin (1703),
ed. 1872, p. 122, found it in ruins. Nakhchivan was
only rebuilt after 1828 when the khānates of
Erwīn and Nakhchivan were ceded to Russia.
Under the Persians, Nakhchivan (with the district
of Aṣā-Djirān = Ordubād) was directly under
Aḥdarbājīan and not Erwīn. Kāb ʿAlī Khān
of Nakhchivan was blinded by ʿAlī Muḥāmmad,
founder of the ʿĀdīr dynasty. The last chief of
Nakhchivan before the Russian occupation was
Karim Khān Kangārlī. The nūbi appointed by the
Russians were Ilyān Khān and Shāikh ʿAlī Beg.
The mahāl of the khānate were: Nakhchivan,
Alinjā-čay (Armenian Ernił), Mawzā-ḵāṭīn,
Khoj, Daralager, and those of Aṣā-Djirān: Ordubād,
Akuš, Dasta, Bilaw, Cimānāh. Among the
dependencies of Nakhchivan, Džulfa (since 1828) on
the Russian-Persian frontier is very well known (Armenian Djulfā) with the ruins of the old town
and of an old bridge. (Zafar-nāmā, i. 399; puli
āl-Mak and the bridge on the Tabriz-
Džulfa railway (built in 1906).
In 1834, after the Russian occupation (Dubois)
the khānate (the town and 179 villages) numbered
30,325 inhabitants (besides 11,341 inhabitants of
Ordubād and its 52 villages). In 1896 the
town numbered 7,433 inhabitants (4,512 Muslims and
2,376 Armenians) and the district (myed) 86,878.
In 1913 the town had 8946 and the district
121,365. After the Russian revolution of 1917,
the greater part of Nakhchivan was made an
autonomous republic (area 5,988 sq.km with, in
1926, 12,611 urban, 92,345 rural inhabitants). The
republic formed a kind of dependency of the
more important Muslim republic of Aḥdarbājīan (Bāzī), from which it is separated however by
the Armenian lands of the High Karabagh.
Nakhchivan on the Don is the settlement of
Armenian colonists founded in 1780 on the Don
and is at the present day a suburb of Rostov.

Bibliography: J. Morier, A second journey,
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Nachtebuchsen, Bull. scientifique publié par
L'Acad. Impériale, vol. ii. 1837, p. 14–16;
Dubois de Montperreux, Voyage au Caucase,
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nehrende Thiel Gross-Armenen [year?], p. 24;
Engelhardt, Nakhchewan, Kaukaski kalendare
1882, part iii. 347–353; I. Shopen (Chopin),
İstorikii pamiatnik armeyanskoy oblasti, St.
Petersburg 1852, p. 446, 549, 477 (detailed
statistics); J. Dieulafoy, La Perse, 1887, p. 27;
E. Jacobstahl, Mittelalterliche Bausteinbauten
zu Nachtebuchsen, Deutsche Bauzeitung, xxxii,
1899, N°. 82 sq., p. 513–516, 521, 525–
528, 549–551, 569–574 (the inscriptions
discussed by Martin Hartmann); Sarre, Documenti Persici inediti, 1910, p. 8–15 and plates;
the Russian encyclopedic NAKHSHAB, a town in Bakhtrā, also called Nasab by the Arab geographers (cf.
the similar evolution of Nāshāva from Nakhchawan). The town lay in the valley of the Khaskā-Darya, cf. Ibn
Hawkal, p. 376: Kashk-rūd, which runs southwards
parallel to the Zarafshān (river of Samarqand) and runs towards the Amul-Darya [q.v.] but before
joining it disappears in the sands. Nakhshāb lay
on the road joining Bakhtrā to Balkh 4 days' journey from the former and eight from the
latter (cf. Mukdasī, p. 344). In the time of Issākhi
(p. 325) the town consisted only of one quarter
(rabad) and a ruined citadel (bundāndis). The river ran
through the centre of the town (Ibn Hawkal,
p. 378).

The Mongols from the time of Čingis-Khān
(1220) used the region of Nakhshāb for their
summer encampments. The Čaghātāī Kabak (1318–
1326) and Kazān (killed in 1347) had palaces
built there. as a result of which the whole
district was called Karšt (“palace” in Mongol) [q.v.]
Karšt is often mentioned in the time of Timūr
(Zafar-nāmā, i. 111, 244, 259 etc.) but it was
eclipsed by Kish (Shafr-Sabz, q.v.), the birthplace
of Timūr, 3 days' journey above Karšt. The citadel
of Karšt was of considerable strength and valiantly
resisted Shābān Khān (cf. Shafrnāmā, ed.
Meliorans, p. 29) and ‘Abd Allah Khān of Bukhārā
(in 955 = 1558). From the xviiith century onwards
Karšt began to rise at the expense of Kish and
before 1920 was the second town of the khānate of
Bukhārā with a population of 60,000.

The problem of identifying the ruins in the
district of Karšt has been studied on the spot
by L. A. Žimin, who formulates his conclusions
as follows: 1. The ruins of the ancient Nakhshāb
are around the hill of Shulutk-tapa (cf. Mahdi
Khān, Turtški Nadvī on the events of 1149)
which marks the site of the old citadel, already
in ruins in the xth century. 2. As a result of the
erection of the Mongol palaces somewhere to the
south of the river, the town begins to shift southwards,
and at the end of the xivth century when
Timūr built a citadel there it must have occupied
in part the site of the modern Karšt. 3. The
remains of this citadel (which Shābān Khān
and ‘Abd Allah Khān besieged in vain) ought to be
sought near the ruins of Kish’s zalik-i Mūrān (about 2 miles S. W. from Karšt).

Bibliography: Barthold, Turkestān, Engl.
transl. G. M. S., p. 134–142 (mentions about
60 villages dependent on Nakhshāb); do., A
istorii orosenya Turkestana, Petersburg 1912,
p. 126 (valley of Khasha); I. Žimin, Nakhshāb,
Nasaf, Karšt, in ʿAbd al-Djumān (Festschrift
for V. Barthold), Tashkent 1927, p. 197–214.
( V. Mirovsky)
NAKHSHAB, SHAHSH DIVA'D-DIN (d. 751 = 1330), a famous Persian author (not to be confused with the famous Šafi’i Shahsh Abü Turab Nakhshabi, d. 245 = 860) Very little is known of his career.

His nisba suggests that he came from Nakhshab [q.v.] but he went to India where he became a murid of Shahsh Fauril, a descendant of the celebrated Shahsh Hamid al-Din Nujuri. The Aškār al-Adghūr by Abd al-Haqq Dhillawi (Dhilli 1309, p. 104—107) says that he died in Bad’u‘un after a long and contemplative life and that his tomb is there. Nakhshabi was a prolific writer who used his knowledge of Indian languages to translate Indian books into Persian. His best known work is the Tūfī-nāma (“Book of the Parrot”) very popular in India and Central Asia, based on the Sanskrit Çatakapāti (partly translated into Greek by D. Galanos, Athens 1841). In the preface to this book Nakhshabi tells us that one of his patron showed him an old Persian translation of this work and persuaded him to do it again as the language of the old translation was too simple and artless. Nakhshabi set to work and made a book of 52 chapters (called “nights”) replacing some stories which did not seem to him sufficiently interesting by better ones.

The book, completed in 730 (1330), is in the usual form of a framework with inset stories and is characterised by unusually fine language and bold metaphors and similes. Nakhshabi’s language however seems to have been too difficult and precious for later generations as by command of the Emperor Akbar, Abu ‘l-Faqir b. Mubarak rewrote the book in a simplified version (Rieu, p. 753). This version however was completely supplanted by Muhammad Kādiri (18th century) who reduced it to 35 chapters. Kādiri’s version became the foundation of a large number of translations into Hindi (Awi’i and Ghasawā), Bengali (Capdícara Munshi), Turkish (Sa‘id Abd Allah Efendi, pr. Bülak 1524 and Constantinope 1525) and Kazan Tatar. There is also a metrical version in Persian by Hāmid Lāffir (Bland, in J. R. A. S., ix. 163). The same theme is taken by a number of popular versions which were disseminated in Persia in cheap lithographs under the title Cīl (Sihib) Tūfī (“40 parrots”). The text of one of these was published by V. Zhukovski (St. Petersburg 1901).

Nakhshabi’s work was known in Europe as early as 1792 when M. Gerrans published a free English translation of 12 nights. Kādiri’s version was translated into German by C. I. Iken (Stuttgart 1822); this edition contains an essay on Nakhshabi and specimens of his Tūfī-nāma by Kosegarten. The Turkish version was translated into German by L. Rosen (Leipzig 1858). So far no complete translation of the original work of Nakhshabi has been published although there is a French translation in MSS. in Munich. E. Berthels has translated the book into Russian but this version is also still in manuscript. The eighth night was published in original text and German translation by H. Brockhaus (Leipzig 1843 and in Bücher fur literarische Unterhaltung, 1843, No. 242, 243, p. 969 sqq.). Nakhshabi’s other works never attained anything like the popularity of the Tūfī-nāma, but have almost all come down to us. Among these are: Gubūt “Scattered Roses”, a novel dealing with the loves of A‘ṣūm-shah and Nakhshab (pr. by Agha Muhammad Kāzim Shīrāzī and K. F. Asoe, Calcutta 1912, in Bibl. Ind.); Dīwān u-Kullīvār (“Particulars and Generals”) also called Cīl Nujuri (Rieu, p. 740), an alliteration which deals with the descriptions of the various parts of the human body considered as the noblest work of God and as proof of His greatness; Lāghīūt al-Nisā‘, a Persian version of the Kāba-Sīkra, an Indian work on different temperaments and sexual intercourse; Sīrūr al-Salihī, a collection of sayings of celebrated mystics (Ith. Dillî 1895), and Nāsīhī u-Mawā‘iz, a brief treatise of a Sufi nature (Rieu, p. 738). His treatise Aقārā Mu‘azzahira is only known from its mention in the Aškār al-Adghūr (see above). All the prose works of Nakhshabi are embellished with fā‘as scattered through them, which show that he was also an excellent poet.


E. Berthels

NAKIR, [See MUNKAR.]

NAKIRAND, MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD BAHIR, AL-DIN-AL-BUKHARI (717—791 = 1317—1389), founder of the Nakhshandi Order. His name, which signifies “painter” is interpreted as “drawing incomparable pictures of the Divine Science” (J. P. Brown, The Darvishes, 2nd ed., p. 142) or more mystically as “holding the form of real perfection in the heart” (Mī‘īl al-Ma‘wī quoted by Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 2188). The title al-Sīkha which is given him in a dirge cited in the Raghēbat means “spiritual leader”. The nisba al-Cwa‘īl implies that his system resembled that of Uwaais al-Karani. His A‘la were collected by one of his adherents, Sahl b. Mubarak, in a work called Ma‘qīmat Siyāhima al-Sīkha Nakhshand, which furnished material to the author of Raghēbat ‘Am al-Hayāt (893 = 1488), and from which large citations, apparently in the words of Nakhshandi himself, but translated from Persian into Arabic, are given in the modern work al-Hadhī‘ik al-adwa‘iyya fi Ḥabī‘ Adīlī al-Nakhshandīya by Abú al-Madżīl b. Mu‘izz al-Khānī (Cairo 1306). He was born in a village at the distance of one farsakh from Bukhārā, called Kusht Hinduwaín, but afterwards Kusht ‘Arīfāt. At the age of 18 he was sent to Sammās, a village one mile from Ramitān and three from Bukhārā, to learn Sufism from Muhammad Bābā al-Sammāsī. In this person’s system the dārkir was recited aloud; Nakhshandi preferred that of ‘Alī al-Dawla Abdu al-Khāliq al-Gha‘dājāwī (d. 575 A.H.), who recited it to himself: and this led to ill-feeling between him and the other adherents of al-Sammāsī, who however, it is stated, ultimately confessed that Nakhshandi was right, and on his deathbed appointed him his khalīfa. After this person’s death he went to Şamārang, and thence
to Bukhārā, where he married, and whence he returned to his native village; thence he went to Nafāz, where he commenced his studies under a khalīf of al-Samnāsi, Amir Kulāl. He then lived for a time in villages near Bukhārā given as Zewartūn and Ambūla, then studied with a khalīfa of Amir Kulāl named ʿArif al-Dik-kirānī for seven years; after this he spent twelve years in the service of the Sultan Khalil, whose rise to sovereignty is described by Ibn Battūta (iii. 49), and whose capital appears to have been Samarqand. After this monarch’s fall (747 = 1347) he returned to Zewartūn, where he practised philanthropy and the care of animals for seven years, and road-mending for another seven. The last years of his life appear to have been spent in his native village, where according to the Rashaḥītī he was buried. Vāmhery (Travels in Central Asia, 1864) gives Bawcedir, two leagues from Bukhārā, as the name of the village which contains his tomb, ‘whither pilgrimages are made even from the most remote parts of China, while it was the practice in Bukhārā to go thither every week, intercourse with the metropolis being maintained by means of some 300 asses plying for hire’.

The biographies bring him into connection with various places and persons. At Herāt a banquet was given in his honour by the Amir Husain (b. Ghūyāt al-Dīn al-Ghūrī; cf. Ibn Battūta, loc. cit.), in which instance of the Amir’s assertion that the food had been honestly obtained Nākshband refused it, and it had to be given away in charity. He was with this prince also at Sarkhān. Two or three pilgrimages and visits to Baghādār, Nasībūr and along the Ghurābād are mentioned. His sayings were collected by Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Hāfīzī al-Ghurābānerī in 1903, and although the name of ‘Allī al-Dīn ʿAlīšī al-Bukhārī (d. 802 A.H.) (Brit. Mus. Add. 26, 204.) Persian writings by him are mentioned in the Hadīth.

**Bibliography:** Besides those mentioned above: Nafṣūhāt al-Um, No. 442; al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Nuḫüzūliyā, transl. Rescher, p. 165.

(D. S. Margoliouth)

### Nakūs (A.), pl. naqūṣis
A kind of rattle used in some places still used by Christians in the east to summon to divine service. It is a board pierced with holes which is beaten with a rod. The name, which comes from the Syriac naqūṣ, is not infrequently found with the verbs ḍorāba or ṣakka in the old Arabic poets, especially when early morning is to be indicated, e.g. ‘Antara, app.; Labid, No. 19, 6; Z.D.M.G., xxix. 15; Metallam, ed. Voldert, p. 17, &c.; al-Luṭūb, No. 6; al-ʿArūs in Noldeke’s Delectus, p. 26; Kīṭūh al-ʿAqūbī, xix. 92. According to tradition, Muḥammad hesitated between this instrument and the Jewish trumpet before deciding on the call to prayer by the muʿadhjin [s. ṣaḥābān].


(Fr. Buhl.)

### Al-Namāra
A place in Syria. It is situated in the district of al-Saṣāf on an eminence in the Wadi ʿI-Shām, which runs from the Dielb al-Darā (Djebel al-Hawārān) to the plain of Ruḥā, at the spot where it joins the Wadi ʿI-Saṣāf. It corresponds to the Roman military post of Namara (Waddington, Inscriptions, No. 270). Less than a mile S.E. of al-Namara, Dussaud found the Nabatean-Arab tomb inscription of the “King of all the Arabs,” Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr, i.e. the Lakhmīd Imru ʿI-Shārīb. Of the 7th Century 223 of the era of Boṣrā = Dec. 7, 328 A.D. (cf. vol. i. p. 328).


Three other places bore the same name in ancient times:


2. Namara, a village in Bataana, probably the modern Namir al-Hawā, N.E. of Derā.

**Bibliography:** Schumacher, in Z.D.P.V., xii. 291; xx. 211; Dussaud, Topographie, p. 341, 359 sq.

3. Namara, Namurance west of Ṣanām, between al-Hāra (Eṣrā) and Djasim (Gaseima), mentioned on an ancient boundary stone.

**Bibliography:** Clermont-Ganneau, in R. A.O., i. 3–5; Dussaud, Topographie, p. 341 (cf. Namr in Noldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxix. 437).

(E. Hinomann)

### Namik Kamal Bey
[See KEMAL MEHMET NADIR]

### Al-Naml, the Ants, the title of Sūrat xxvii. of the Qūrān, the whole of which was revealed at Mecca. Noldeke puts it among the Sūras of the second period. It contains 95 verses. Its title is taken from verse 18: “When the armies reached the valley of the Ants one of them said: ‘O ye ants, return to your homes lest Solomon and his armies crush you without noticing it’”. It contains one verse that was abrogated (verse 94 annulled by ix. 5).

**Bibliography:** cf. Al-Nahl.

(Maurice Chemoul)

### Namrud, also Namrud, Nimrud, the Nimrod of the Bible, is associated in Muslim legend, as in Haggada, with the story of the childhood of Abraham. The Kurtan, it is true, does not mention him but probably, as in many other cases, only from dislike of mentioning names. That Muḥammad was acquainted with the legend
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of Namrūd is evident from the following verses.

"Do you not see how he disputed with Ibrāhīm about the Lord who had granted him dominion? When Ibrāhīm said: It is my Lord who gives life and death, the other replied: I give life and I slay. When Ibrāhīm said: God makes the sun rise in the east; do you make it rise in the west; then the liar was humbled" (ii. 260). The Kur'ān exegists are probably right when they see Namrūd here disputing with Ibrāhīm and also when they refer to Namrūd the verse: "What did Ibrāhīm's people answer? They only said: Kill him, burn him; but God saved him from the fire" (xxix. 23).

The legend is already richly developed in Tabari, but it is at the beginning of the romance of 'Antar in the Abīdīmāḏ which we find its most luxurious development.

Tabari already numbers Namrūd among the three or (with Nebuchadnezzar) four kings who, like Ibrāhīm b. Dawūd and Ibrāhīm b. Kūsh, ruled the whole world. His astrologers told him that a child would be born who would overthrow his kingdom and destroy his idols. Ibrāhīm thus becomes one of those heroes of legend who are persecuted from the moment of birth by a tyrant, to whom they are destined to prove fatal, like Moses, Gilgamish, Semiramis, Sargon, Karpa (in the Mākāḇāhārāt), Trakhān (King of Gilgit), Cyrus, Perseus, Telephus, Aegisthus, Oedipus, Romulus and Remus, Jesus (see Frrazier, Folklore in the Old Testament, ii. 437—455). Ħṣa, the wife of Azūr or of Tārīṣū (Terakh), is able to deceive Namrūd and his searchers. Ibrāhīm is born in concealment; maturing rapidly, he engages in a religious dispute with Namrūd; Namrūd cannot be God for God gives life and death. Namrūd replies that he can do this also for he can execute or pardon a man condemned to death. Namrūd has Ibrāhīm thrown into the fire; it becomes a cool health-resort. An angel keeps Ibrāhīm cool at which Namrūd marvels like Nebuchadnezzar at the preservation of the three young men in the fiery furnace (Daniel iii. 24 sg.). Namrūd resolves to attack the God of Ibrāhīm in his heaven. He feeds four young eagles on meat and wine till they are of a great size, ties them to the four corners of a chest, fastens a spear at each corner with a piece of meat on the point and sits in the chest; the eagles, trying to reach the meat, fly higher and higher. The mountains appear like anthills and later the whole world looks like a ship in the water. It is in vain however for he falls to earth. Next he builds a tower in order to reach the god of Ibrāhīm, then the tongues are confused; in place of one Syriac tongue, 73 arose. God's angels admonish Namrūd. But he equips his armies against God. God sends an army of giants against him, who eat the flesh and drink the blood of Namrūd's men. A gnat enters Namrūd's brain through his nose. For 400 years he had exercised his tyrannical rule and for 400 years he was tortured by the gnat until he died.

Muslim legend derives the name Namrūd from tamarrada: he who rebelled (against God). But there is another derivation, viz. from namra "tigress" in that version of the Namrūd legend in which Namrūd is suckled by a tigress. This version resembles the Romulus and Remus story (Jean de Pours) and culminates in the Oedipus story for Namrūd, brought up unknown, kills his father and marries his mother. Al-Kisā'ī has preserved this version and it is given at greater length in the introduction to the romance of ' Antar.

Namrūd's father Kāna'ān b. Kūsh has a dream which troubles him; it is interpreted to mean that his son will kill him. The child is born, a snake enters his nose, which is an ominous sign. Kāna'ān wants to kill the child, but his mother Sulka' entrusts him secretly to a herdsman; the latter's flocks scatter at the sight of the black flat-nosed infant. The shepherd's wife throws the child into the water; the waves wash him to the bank where he is suckled by a tigress. Already dangerous when quite a boy, as a young man he becomes a robber leader, attacks Kāna'ān with his band, kills him (without knowing that he is killing his father), marries his own mother and becomes king of the country and last lord of the world. Azār (already in the Kur'ān the father of Ibrāhīm) builds him a marvellous palace flowing with milk, oil and honey, with mechanical singing birds].

The medieval epic the wonderful feature of the Chrysto-triklinium in Byzantium. The lore of astrology, the inheritance of Idrs and Hermes he acquires by force from the pupils of Idrs. Iblīs teaches him magic. He has himself worshipped as a god. Then dreams, voices and omens frighten him. In spite of all Namrūd's cruel orders, Ibrāhīm is born, brought up and soon shatters the belief in Namrūd. Namrūd throws those who believe in God to the wild animals but they do not touch them. He denies them food; the sand of the desert becomes corn for them; on every grain of it is written: "gift of God". Namrūd throws Ibrāhīm into the fire but he is unharmed. Namrūd builds up a pile of fuel, the flames of which burn the birds for miles round — it is impossible to approach it. Iblīs then designs a ballista which hurls Ibrāhīm on to the flaming pile. Ibrāhīm spends the finest time of his life there under blooming trees and amid rippling brooks. Namrūd then decides to attack the God of Ibrāhīm in heaven. Starved eagles fly up with his litter, until he hears a voice saying the first heaven is 500 years in width, it is 500 years between heaven and heaven, then comes infinity. Namrūd shoots an arrow against God; the arrow comes back stained with blood. Namrūd suddenly becomes grey and old and falls to the ground. But he plumes himself on having slain God. Then a gnat puts an end to his life.

The history of the Namrūd legend. Very little can have been taken from the Bible. Kurān expositors and collectors of legends call Namrūd qabbār (tyrant) no doubt after the gīḇōr applied to Namrūd in the Bible (Gen. x. 6); Geiger also sees in qabbēr 'anim (xi. 62) an allusion to Namrūd. Tabari (i. 217) also describes Namrūd as a mutādāḏāhī. Muslim legend and Haggada (Targ. Sheni on Esther i. i.; Midr. Haggadah, ed. Schechter, p. 180—181; Gaster, Exempla of the Rabbis, N. 1) make Namrūd ruler of the world. From Haggada comes the association of Namrūd with the Tower of Babel and in particular with the childhood of Abraham, and with the latter's rescue from the fire (Gen. Rabbah, xlix., 1). The death of Namrūd caused by the gnat is also based on Haggada, which makes Titus, the destroyer of the Temple, die in this way. Nebuchadnezzar comes to a similar end (see Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge, p. 97—99). The flight to heaven especially in the romance of ' Antar with the intervals of 500 years recall the ascent of Nebuchadnezzar in
the Talmud (Chaggiga, p. 139). But the flight has far more resemblance to that of Shāh Kai-Kā'ūs as described by Firdawsī (ed. Mohl, ii. 31-34). The Namrud legend borrows from many directions. Tabari mentions that Namrud had been identified as the Persian Dāhījīk (Annales, i. 253) but he refuses this idea (Annales, i. 323, 324). Bible, Haggada and Persian epic were further developed, the marvels increased, an early history invented, Namrud made an Oedipus, and in the Sirat `Antar he becomes the hero of a romance. The Muslim Namrud legend then found its way into the late Jewish legend of Abraham. Bernard Chapira (see below) has pointed out that for the Middle Ages it was a peculiar case of how a word can become a hero and the hero of an entire country. He is certainly wrong in taking seriously the authorship of Kāb al-Abīb, which is one fiction out of many thousands. But the mutual influence of Haggada and Muslim legend is indisputable. The later Mīdrāzī, as M. Grünbaum has clearly shown, Pirke K. Eliezer, Tanna de bi Eliyahu, Mīdrāzī Haggadot, Sifre haAyyār, Shōket Mūṣār of R. Eliyyah Hakkohen from Smyrna, is influenced in the sections on Abraham and Nimrod by Muslim literature.

Bibliography: The commentaries on Sūra ii. 260; xxix. 25; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 217, 220, 212, 260-265, 319-325; Ibn al-Abīb, Tārīkh al-Ālam, Bīlāk, i. p. 37-40; ibid. al-Kisā, Kīsā al-Abīb, ed. Eisenberg, i. 145-149; Sirat `Antar, Cairo 1291, i. 9-79 (1306, i. 4-34); Damiri, Ḥosayn al-Haywānū, s. v. nāz; Geiger, Was hat Mohammed..., 1902, p. 112 sq., 115 sq., 121; M. Grünbaum, Neue Heitragē, p. 90-99, 125-132; Bernard Chapira, Légendes biligures attribuées à Kāb al-Abīb, in R. E. F., 1919, ixix, p. 86-107; Arabic and Hebrew text 1920, i. 37-44; B. Heller, Die Bestimmung des arabischen `Antar-Romans für die zervl. Literaturwunde, Leipzig 1931, p. 16-21; S. Siderasky, Les origines des légendes musulmanes, Paris 1933, p. 31-35. (Bernard Heiser)

NAMRŪS (A.) is a word of many meanings. In St. John's Gospel xx. 26, the coming of the paraclete is announced. In the preceding verse a passage from the Psalms referring to the haters is quoted and in vābūh ṣālimūn given as source. The verses in the Gospel from 23 on were already known to Ibn Ṣāliḥ in an Arabic version which came from a Syrian one as the reproduction of "paraclete" by al-ṣālimūnānī shows. In the same source the word ṣālimūn was left untranslated: for we find it in Ibn Ḥīṣām in the form nāmūs. Biographical tradition makes Waraka b. Nawfā express assert the identification of Muhammad with the paraclete promised by Jesus mentioned in the passage from the Gospel. The oldest form of the tradition giving this episode represent a combination of the Gospel passage with Sūra lxi. 6. In later developments of the tradition the idea of a paraclete gradually falls into the background till it was finally interpreted as the name of an individual and even received an epiphiet. Thus we read in Ibn Ḥīṣām, p. 153 that Waraka replied as follows to his cousin who asked him about Muhammad's first vision: "If thou hast reported the truth to me then truly the greatest nāmūs has come to him, who used to come to Mūsā, and then he (Muhammad) is the prophet of this umma e". In Tabari the "greatest nāmūs" is in a gloss expressly said to be Dībrīl.

As the personal interpretation is not sufficiently explained by meanings, known to be really old, of the true Arabic word nāmūs (root n-m-ū-s) which exists alongside of the Greek loanword, and meanings like "the trusted one, confidant of a secret" rather to come from the Greek loanword already known in its reference to Dībrīl (against Dozy, Supplement, s. v.), it was natural to look for a specific use of the word nāmūs which admitted of a personal interpretation and could at the same time have been known to the Arabs. Nyberg was reminded by the nāmūs doctrine of the Ḥuwaṣ al-S safer (see below) of the pseudo-Clementine writings. He derives the nāmūs of the Waraka tradition from the nāmūs ānāwīn of the pseudo-Clementines, which according to the book Ḫawṣukan Pētōn was revealed to Adam and afterwards again appeared to all prophets worthy of such an honour, lastly to Moses and to Jesus. However startling the agreement of the conception of nāmūs ānāwīn with the later forms of the Waraka tradition, the question still remains open, by what way a personal conception of nāmūs could have entered Islam. Baumstark quoted a passage from the liturgy of St. James of Jerusalem: ṣālimūn biw nāmūs, ṣālimūn biw nāmūs, ṣālimūn biw nāmūs and observes that the liturgy was the authoritative one in the East. The Bolognans translated it in an Arabic translation. It is really quite natural to understand nāmūs personally here. No explanation of our Waraka tradition can on the other hand be obtained from Mandaean writings as Lidzbarski has already pointed out in his translation of the Gūzā, p. 247 sq.

That there is a true Arabic word nāmūs has already been mentioned. The dictionaries give such varied meanings for it that we can only consider as old and original those that are confirmed by quotations. This holds for the meanings "hiding place, hunter's hut, monk's cell" probably also for "business, midee" as means agentis from n-ū-s to "buzz". On the other hand, not only the meaning "cunning" and its derivatives must be secondary, but also the already mentioned meanings referred to persons, the latter especially because the word so far as we know, is used also in the later literature predominantly in the material sense and the person connected with the idea is called ẓālīb al-nāmūs etc. (counter-example: Dozy, s. v.). Just as the material meanings predominate generally, so also does the meaning of the Greek loanword predominate, apart from course from the old poetry, from which the meaning "midge" and particularly the word nāmūsīya "mosquito net" have survived into the modern vernacular. Below we shall therefore deal only with the development of meaning of the Greek loanword.

The favourite meaning is divine law, with or without the addition of ʿalā. This law is revealed through the prophets, and only men of prophetic spirit can be wāṣīt al-nāmūsīya in this sense. The double character, political and religious, of the Muslim constitution naturally very much favoured this conception. Thus, for example, al-Kalqashandi, ʿulī al-ʿālīh, i., Cairo 1903, p. 280 gives as the first among the ḫuwaṣ al-daʿwīn, ʿulī al-nāmūsīn al-mutāʿallīn bi l-muḥākima. Ibn Sina expressly observes in his encyclopedia Akīma al-ʿulīm al-ʿaṣīya (in Maḏmūʿ al-Rasāʾil, Cairo 1328, p. 230 sq.) in treating of politics that the pertinent works of Plato and Aristotle understand
by νόμιμον not “cunning” and “deceit”, corresponding to the usage of the vernacular, but μανιά, revelation, etc., for the laws of the community are dependent on prophecy and the divine law; similarly Sprenger, Dict. of Technical Terms, i. 40. Abū al-Ḥayān al-Tawhīdī devotes the fourth of his Muḥâbahāt to the nāmīs ilḥāḥī (new ed., Cairo 1929).

Here we may mention Miskawāḥ’s (Ibn Miskawāḥ) definition which is also of literary interest. In connection with his discussion of the function of the dinār as a measure of the equivalence (q̲aṣīdā) of service and reward (tawḥīd) to the maqāla, e.g., Cairo, Kǎfiyya, 1322, p. 38), he quotes an alleged saying of Aristotle according to which the dinār is a just nāmīs. Nāmīs, he adds, in striking contrast to Ibn Sīna, means in Greek, σύνεσις and τάδιρ [q.v.}; Aristotle says in the En. Nic., the greatest nāmīs proceeds from God, the second is the judge, the third the dinār; the first, as a condition for just settlement between the claims of men, is the example which the two others follow. The well-known citation of the Muslim books on Hellenistic ethics has resulted in this explanation finding a place in later derivatives from the angels and the divine al-Dīn (Allāh). Al-Būhārī, X, 2, 7 (e.g. Tabūz 1320, p. 152), also Kāmilīzâde ‘Ali b. ‘Amr Allāh al-Hānī, Al-Būhārī, 1348, i., p. 78) and each more fully than the preceding. As a result of these expositions al-Ṭūsī in the economic part of his book (ii, 2, p. 254) calls briefly the smallest nāmīs (translation in Fleser, Der abnorme des Neuplatonikers Bryson, 1928, p. 63) and Kāmilīzâde also follows him (ii, p. 7).

The nāmīs doctrine of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’ can only be briefly outlined here. In part i., p. 56 (Bombay ed.), the nāmīs is defined as a spiritual kingdom (nāmīs, rūḥānīya) which is upheld by 8 kinds of men. God appears as the wāqī‘ al-nāmīs. Ṣāḥib al-nāmīs is from the context Muhammad, in so far as one can identify from the context any individuals in the pages of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’. A few pages later Muhammad is described as the wāqī‘ al-nāmīs. In part iv., p. 57, the angels appear as teachers of the aṣḥāb al-nawāmīs. Any one who does not guide his life according to the commands and prohibitions of the latter, has no share in divine nāmīs (iv, 47). This spiritual kingdom is the element of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’; they sleep in the cave of their father Adam [q.v.] for a long period until the fore-ordained time (mawṣūd) came under the Lord of the Great of the nāmīs (Muḥammad) and they perceived their spiritual state (muḥāṣṣa) which was raised in the air and from which Adam and his wife had been banished (iv, 107). If the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’ by common effort and uniform self-instruction succeed in building a perfect spiritual state (fāḍilah, cf. al-Fārābī), this state will belong to the kingdom of the Lord of the greatest nāmīs, who has dominion over souls and bodies (iv, 211). The nāmīs thus even becomes a kind of divine being, where there is a discussion of the “philosophic service of God”, which represents the higher stage in comparison with that of the Muslim teaching regarding obligations and duties. This philosophic service of God had been, they say, practised by the ancient Greeks on the first, middle, and last day of the month. The night of the first day was divided into three parts. The first was spent in worship of nāmīs, the second in meditation on the malakāt, the third in humble prostration before the Creator, confession of sins and repetition of prayers by Plato, Idris and Aristotle until the break of day (iv, 273 sqq.). Nevertheless the nāmīs here has not exactly taken the place of God. But in several passages of the encyclopaedia he is represented as giving names. Thus he calls the spirits of the planets angels (ii, 97; cf. iv, 244); he does the same with the natural forces (ii, 102) and (iii, 10) with the nature of origination and decay, Above the spheres (dāwār) of the three kingdoms of nature and of man is the sphere of the divine nāmīs, whose members deal with the affairs of the nasāmīs and the divine revelations and which corresponds to the “surrounding” (ninth) sphere of the astronomers (iv, 251). As the nāmīs and the ability to become creative in him involves a special organisation of man, he has found an allegorical place in the physiology and psychology of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’; here indeed the conception changes from page to page. Thus in the first part of the work (2nd half, p. 48) five kinds of soul are described, two above and two below that of man. The former two are the soul of the angels (fāḍilah) soul of which is the stage of the soul of wisdom, the second that of nāmīs-prophethood. On the very next page the one is the intellectual soul of wisdom and the other the nāmīs-like angel soul. On p. 54 we find the following gradation: nature, soul, intellect, nāmīs. Nature receives through the soul free-will, through the intellect the power of thought and through the nāmīs commands and prohibitions. The parts of the soul are as follows: vegetable, animal, logical (human), intellectual (wise), nāmīs, angelic, which latter serves the nāmīs. Here again there is the tendency to personification. It is in keeping with this when in iv, 119 (cf. also iv, 146) the story of Socrates in prison (in agreement with the Greek tradition and mentioning the Phaedo) it is related that Socrates will not escape from prison for fear of the nāmīs; he justifies his attitude with the words: “He who does not respect the nāmīs is slain by it.” When immediately afterwards the nāmīs is identified with the ghotā’s, it is difficult to say whether this is serious or only done out of caution. It is nevertheless remarkable that the sixth essay of the fourth part which treats of the nature of divine nāmīs (iv, 217) in which the qualifications for prophethood and the qualities of a prophet, does not contain the word nāmīs at all but instead of it always has ghotā’s. The Ikhwān have spiritual powers of their own; these form a series of four stages, the third of which is the kuwās nāmīsā; man attains it at 40 and it is the special characteristic of kings and rulers. Possessors of this power are called the distinguished and noble (fāḍilah, kāri’m) brethren. Above it is only the kuwās malakīya (iv, 134 sqq.).

The origin of the meaning “cunning” cannot be given with certainty; it possibly comes from the Arabic meaning “place of concealment”. That it was particularly common in the spoken language is evident from the quotation given above from Ibn Sīna. In any case this meaning has undergone a remarkable amalgamation with the Greek law in the literature of magic for the word is there used for magical formulae, particularly those which are based on illusions of the senses. The pupil of al-Anṣārī [q.v.] in his
Dhail on the latter's Tadkhira, s.v. simiyā (iii., Cairo 1924, p. 56), gives the nanāsīs as the first section of the science known by this name. But the meaning of the word is not limited to this kind of magic formulae.

Through translations from the Arabic the word entered the Hebrew literature of the middle ages with the meaning “law, religious law (of other peoples), moral, propriety”; in the latter meaning it has survived in the modern Hebrew vernacular. It is interesting to note that in the modern dialect of Mecca a similar change of meaning is found; according to Snouch Hurgonje, Mekkanische Sprichwoerter, N°. 10, nanāsī means the “spotsless, honourable name” which one has among men; its opposite is ʿal, “shame”.

The word nanāsī also plays a considerable part as the title of books. The “greatest nanāsī” also occurs as the title of a book; cf. Ivanow, Catalogue, i. 335 sq.


(M. Pleišner)

NĀR. [See Dahhaman.]

NARSHAKHI, Abu Baka Muhammad b. Djafar (d. 348=959), author of the "History of Bukhara," the original Arabic version of which he presented to the Sāmānids Nār b. Nasr in 332 (943–944). In 522 (1128–1129) the book was translated into Persian by Abu Nasr Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Kubwā who omitted several "tedious" passages. Then in 574 (1178–1179) Muhammad b. Zafar prepared a new abbreviated edition of the book which he presented to ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī b. Burhān al-Din, governor of Bukhāra. Finally an unknown author continued it down to the Mongol conquest. It was in the last form that the book was published by Schefer. The book contains many interesting notes on the situation in Central Asia before Islam and details not found elsewhere of the Arab conquest (from Mādānī). The Persian translator added further details of the works of ʿAbū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Raḥman b. Muhammad al-Nāḥṣūrī and probably from ʿAbū ʿl-Ishāq Ibrāhīm [b. al-ʿAbbās al-Ṣūlī], d. in 243 (857). The information about the townships of the district of Bukhāra, their monuments, their products, their old customs (such as the ceremony of Siyāwush, p. 21) is very interesting.

Bibliography: Description topographique et historique de Boukhara par Muhammad Nermachki suivie de textes relatifs à la Transoxiane, publ. by Ch. Schefer, Paris 1892 (Publ. de l’École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, ii. série, vol. xii., p. 1–97). There is also an edition lithogr. in Bukhāra. The only translation so far is that into Russian by N. Lykoglyin, Tashkent 1897 (ed. by Barthold). Cfr. Lerch, Sur les monnaies des Boukhar-Khwâdah, in the Travaille de la 3ème session du congrès international des orientalistes, St. Petersbourg 1879, ii. 424; Barthold, Turkestân, Eng. transl., G. M.S., p. 14; Marquart, Erânslâr, s. index; Marquart, Werhôt und Arang, [1907], p. 139 and passim.

(V. Minorsky)

NASĀ (often Nasī), the name of several places in Persia: in Khurāsān, Fārs, Kirmān and Hamadān; cf. Yaḵūt, iv. 775. (According to Bartholomaeus, nisya means “settlement”)

1. Nasī in Khurāsān was situated in the cultivated zone which lies north of the range separating Khurāsān from the Turkoman steppes. It corresponds to the Nisā, Nisā in the classical authors, celebrated for its breed of horses (Herodotos, ii. 106; cf. Strabo, xi., ch. xiv., § 7). Alexander the Great is said to have built an Alexandropolis at Nisa. According to Isidore of Charax, ed. W. Schoff, Philadelphia 1914, p. 8, the tombs of the Parthian kings were in the town of Nisā, in the neighborhood of the village of Tārās. In 1839, p. 106, he believed he saw in the stock of Turkoman horses descendents of the Ṭā☑nasi Nisā (Avesta, Vendidāt, i. 7 seems to have a different locality in view).

According to Iṣṭakhri, the town of Nasī was very like Sarakhs (i.e. like the half of Marw) and had much water, many gardens and green places and the country round was very fertile. Muḥaddasi, p. 320, 331–332 says that the ten gates of the town were buried in verdure. He confirms the abundance of springs but says the water was not of good quality. Muhammad Nasawi,Strat Djalâl al-Dīn, ed. Houdas, p. 22, says that the place was very unhealthy on account of its very warm climate and that the Turks could only live a short time there. According to Nasawi, p. 50, the town had a strong citadel. The number of tombs of shaikhs and famous men was so great that the Persians called Nasī “little Damascus”; cf. the biography of Shaḵīd Sa’d (d. 1297) in Badrī’s Zavānī; ed. Žukowsky, p. 45) written in the 13th century.

Yaḵūt, iv. 776–778 places Nasī 5 days’ journey from Marw, one day from Abiward and 6–7 days from Nisāpur. Of its dependencies he mentions: i. 480: Bālūz (≔Fruza); i. 857: Taftāzan; ii. 343: Shahristān; iii. 866: Farāwa (=Kizil-Arwat); iv. 328: Kauk. Dūrān, with the fortress Tak (afterwards Yariz) also belonged to Nasā, cf. Barthold, A istorii orosjenyia Turkestana, p. 37–41. Cf. also the Tarīkh-i Nādirī of Mahdi Khān (Nādir’s study) was at Khuramābād, cf. under the year 1044. The ruins of the capital of Nasā are near the little town of Bagir about 12 miles from Ashkhabād and 8 from the station of Basma on the Transcaspian railway.

2. The Nasā in Hamadān perhaps cor-
responds to the Nisāya placed by the inscription of Darius (Behistun, i. 13) in Media. It is possible that the reference is to the plains of northern Luristan [q. v.] (Alištar, Khāwā) where the well-known bronzes of Luristan were found; cf. Minorsky, in Apollo, London, Feb. 1931.

(V. Minorsky)

**NASĀ** — **AL-NASAFĪ**

**NASAFĪ, nisba** [cf. NASAFI] of several eminent persons of whom the following may be mentioned:

1. jābu 'l-Ma'ānī Mā'mūn b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. 2. 'Abd al-Khār al-Baghdādi [q. v.], who still is endeavouring to find a convenient arrangement and an adequate formulation of the contents of hulām, and the younger mutakallimīn who have at hand the necessary formulæ for ready use. Of his works the following are known to be:

1. Tamhīd li-ḥawā'id al-Tawhīd (Cairo, MS. 2417, fol. i—30; cf. Fīhīr ... Miṣr, ii. 51), a treatise in which the contents of the creed are proved according to the scholastic method. The first chapter consists of an exposition of the doctrine of cognition, the last of the doctrine of the immaterial. The work closes with a summarīya which contains the doctrina de Deo in an abridged form;
2. Tāshīrat al-Adlīya (Cairo, MSS. 2287, 6673; cf. Fīhīr ... Miṣr, ii. 8), an elaborate work on dogmatics of nearly the same scheme as the Tamhīd; 3. Bājr al-Kalām, printed at Cairo 1329 (1911), differs from the two foregoing works in so far as it deals with heresies and is polemical. It is identical with Muḥāfaẓat al-Sunna wa 'l-Dīrāmīa ma' wa 'l-Furūq al-Dallāla wa 'l-Mufradāt (Leyden, cod. or. 862) as well as with 'Aḥā'īt (Berlin, No. 1941; cf. Ahlwardt, Verszeichniss, ii. 409). The work is preserved in several libraries under one of these titles (Broekelmann, G.A.L., i. 426, where the number of five works must be reduced to three).

**Bibliography:** in the art.; cf. also Ḥāḍirī Khālia, ed. Flugel, index, No. 6453.

II. Aḥū Ḥāfiz ʿUmār Nāṣīd al-Dīn (d. 537 = 1142), jurist and theologian. Of his works the only one edited is the 'Aḥā'īt, which has the form of a catechism. It became popular and was much commented, probably because it was the first abridged form of the creed according to the scholastic method of the new orthodoxy. In Europe it became known early as 1843 through the edition by Cureton (The Pillar of the Creed, No. 2). For editions of commentaries on this text as well as for the other works of this scholar that have come down to us, cf. G.A.L., i. 427 sqq.

**Bibliography:** Broekelmann, G.A.L., i. 428 and the references given there.

(A. J. Wensink)

**AL-NASAFĪ, Ḥāfiz al-Dīn Aḥū ʿUmrākāt ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhā b. Maḥmūd, an important Ḥanafī legist and theologian, born in Nasaf in Sogdiana, was a pupil of ʿAllāmā al-Aṣma al-Kardarī (642 = 1244—1245), ʿĀlim al-Dīn al-Fārī (d. 666 = 1267—1268) and Bād al-Dīn Khwāhārādī (d. 651 = 1252). He taught in the Madrasa al-Kūṭīya al-Sulṭānīya in Kirmān came in 710 to Baghdād and died in Rabi I 710 (August 1310); according to ʿUṣūrī and Ibn Ta-ghrībirdī: 701) apparently on his way back to Idād (in Ḥāzīrzān), where he was buried. His pupils were ʿAbd allah al-Dīn Ibn al-Ṣaʿīd, author of the Maʿṣūma al-Burāq (d. 694 = 1294—1295), and Husām al-Dīn al-Signākī, a commentator on the Ḥīdāya (d. 714 = 1314—1315) [cf. AL-MARGHĀNĪ].

The best of his works is thought to be the Kitāb al-Manār fī ʿUṣūl al-Fiqh, a concise account of the foundations of law (Dehī 1270, Constantinople 1326 and often later); there are numerous later commentaries but he himself wrote two, one of which is entitled Kitāb al-ʿAwar (2 vols., Iṣlāq 1316). Out of his original plan of writing a commentary on the Ḥīdāya of al-Marghānī [q. v.] there came the lawbook modelled on it Kitāb al-Wāfī, on which he composed in 684 a special commentary, the Kitāb al-Kāfī (delivered in lectures in Kirmān in 689). He had previously prepared a synopsis of the Wāfī entitled Kunz al-Duṣākī (Cairo 1311, Lucknow 1294, 1312, etc.) which Ibn al-Ṣaʿīd in 685 (this is no doubt the correct reading for 653 in Kaffawi) heard him deliver in Kirmān. This synopsis was used as late as the sixteenth century in Damsacus and at the al-Āzhār in Cairo (v. Kremer, Mittel-Syrien u. Damaskus, Vienna 1853, p. 136; do., Ägypten, Leipzig 1895, p. 51). The best known printed commentary on the Kunz are: a. Ṭabīyīn al-Ḥaṣibik of al-Zanjī (d. 743 = 1342—1343) in 6 vols., Būlāq 1313—1315; b. Kunz al-Ḥaṣibik of ʿAlī ʻAmmī (d. 855 = 1451) in 2 vols. Būlāq 1285 and 1299; c. Ṭabīyīn al-Ḥaṣibik of Mollā Miṣkīn al-Ḥaṣawī (written in 811 = 1408—1409), Cairo 1294, 1303, 1312, d. Tawfīq al-Raḥmānī of al-Tāfī (d. 1192 = 1775), Cairo 1307 etc.; e. the most important: al-Bayhārī al-Raḥīq of Ibn Ḥudāmī (d. 970 = 1562—1563) in 8 vols., Cairo 1334.

He also wrote a series of commentaries, e.g. two on the Kitāb al-Naqīṣ of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Samarkandī (d. 656 = 1258) entitled al-Mustaqfī and al-Manār; on the Maʿṣūma of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Bādi ʿAbū Ḥafīz al-Nasāfi (d. 537 = 1142—1143) on the differences of opinion between ʿAbū ʿAmīr and his two pupils, and al-Saḥārī and Mālik entitled al-Mustaqfī, as well as a synopsis entitled al-Muṣafī (finished on 20th ʿAṣāda 670); cf. Broekelmann, G.A.L., i. 428; also on the Muṣafīkh fī ʿUṣūl al-Dīn of Akhkātī (d. 644 = 1246—1247; Ibn Taḥrībirdī, Ḥāḍirī Khālia, No. 13095). On the other hand, he did not write a commentary on the Ḥīdāya, as Ibn ʿUṭūbīghā and Ḥāḍirī Khālia, vi. 484 say (cf. the story of the origin of his Wāfī according to al-Īkānī [d. 758 = 1357] in Ḥāḍirī Khālia, vi. 191). He wrote a commentary on the Karaḵ, Ṭarīqī al-Tawīl wa-Ḥaṣibik al-Tawīl (printed in 2 vols., Bombay 1279, Cairo 1306, 1326).

His confession of faith al-ʿUṣūr fī ʿUṣūl al-Dīn (apparently also called al-Manār fī ʿUṣūl al-Dīn: ʿUṣūrī, Ibn ʿUṣūrī, became known quite early in Europe from Cureton's edition (Pillar of the Creed, London 1843). In it he closely follows the Aḥūrī of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Nasāfi (see above) and also wrote a special commentary on it: al-ʿUṣūrātāt fī ʿUṣūrāt.

**Bibliography:** The following borrow from the same unknown source: al-ʿUṣūrī, al-Qurāshī ʿAbd al-Naṣīr, Ḥāḍirī Khālia, i. 270; Ibn ʿUṣūrī, Naṣīr al-Dīnānī fī Tabāfīt Aḥāʾī al-Muṣafī, MS. Berlin, Pet, ii. 24, fol.
may be said to begin with the conversion of Qassan [q.v.]; the chief al-Harīth b. Djabala was an ardent monophysite and in A.D. 542 or 543 he persuaded the emperor Theodora to appoint Jacob Baradaeus as bishop of Edessa with a wandering commission, and Theodore as bishop of Buṣra in the monophysite cause. Nestorian Christianity came to Ḥira [q.v.] at an early date. Its bishops are often mentioned from A.D. 410 till c. 1000 and a monastery was built there by 410. Three Nestorian patriarchs were buried there. Al-Mundhir III (d. 554) [cf. LAKMES] was a pagan though he had a Christian wife, who built the Nestorian church at (HAWRAN) (HAWRAN). Al-NASĂ‘I, Abu ‘Arab al-Ra‘imān Ahmad b. Shu‘ayb, ‘Ali b. Bahr b. Sinān, author of one of the six canonical collections of traditions [cf. HADĪTH], d. 303 (915). Very little is known about him. He is said to have made extensive travels in order to hear traditions, to have settled in Egypt, afterwards in Damascus, and to have died in consequence of ill-treatment to which he was exposed at Damascus or, according to others, at Ramla, in consequence of his feelings in favour of ‘Ali and against the Umayyads. On account of this unnatural death he is called a martyr. His tomb is at Ma‘kka. Al-Nasā‘ī’s collection of traditions is divided into 51 chapters, each of which is subdivided into ba‘āb. As to the sources, considerable space is given to traditions dealing with the ceremonial duties (tahāf): the chapters ʿiḥrāb, ṣuḥr, ṣuḥrāb and ṣuḥrāb (forms of bequest, donation etc.) do not occur in any of the other collections, although a part of the materials contained in them appears under different heads. In the other chapters, on eschatology (jihām, ḥiya‘ān, etc.), on hero-worship (manāẓib etc.), on the Kur‘ān are lacking.


NASĀ‘AR. Christians, more especially the adherents of the Oriental churches living under Muslim rule (differentiated from Ḥām ‘Greek Christians’, Ḫrant ‘Western Christians’). The word is derived from the Syriac Nisā‘ar (Horovitz, Koran Untersuchungen, p. 144 sqq.); the Arabic singular is Nisā‘ar.

A. Before Islam.

A complete investigation of the materials for the history of Christianity in Arabia and among the Arabs before the rise of Islam has not yet been made, and only the principal facts can be summarily given here.

Christianity naturally spread into Arabia from Syria and al-Ṭā‘a though no date can be given for the earliest infiltration. Bishops of the encampments are early mentioned but they should probably be assigned to Syria. Arab Christian history was

B. Under Islam (medieval period).

I. History. It is generally recognised that the attitude of Muhammad towards the Christians, which had at first been favourable, changed towards the end of his life: probably when the expanding boundaries of the Muslim state brought him into contact with Christian tribes [cf. art. MUHAMMAD, iii. 735]. The problem of subject Christians scarcely arose during his lifetime, since his relations with Christian tribes and settlements (e.g. Aila, Dūma) were generally regulated by
treaties, the best known of which is that concluded with the Christians of Nadjrān [q.v.]. By the terms of the treaty, the latter had to submit to the Christians their religion and manage their own affairs, if they paid a fixed tribute, entertained the Prophet's representatives for a month, gave certain supplies in the event of a war in the Yemen, and abstained from usury. To the same period belongs the general command given in the Kurān (ix. 29) to fight against those who have received a book until they pay tribute (here called al-dîfizya, q.v.) and are humiliated.

The conquests of Khalid b. al-Walid suddenly made the problem acute. During the reign of 'Umar it was solved, like all the problems of the state, in a hand-to-mouth way, usually by applying the precedent of the Nadjrān treaty. Hirra, the cities of Syria and Mesopotamia made individual treaties with the Muslim commanders; the terms differ in detail, but all include a fixed tribute. Muslim governors were set over the provinces and big towns, but the minor officials were not changed. The people paid much the same taxes as before and there was little interference with their social and religious life. Sometimes a church or part of one was taken and turned into a mosque; more often, probably, churches and monasteries were also left alone, provided the names were changed. On the occupation of al-İrāk there was a movement among the tribes to seize the conquered lands, and it would seem that a district was for a time assigned to the tribe Badījā (cf. Baladhuri, p. 267 sz.; Kitab al-Umm, iv. 192), but in the end 'Umar applied the precedent established by Muḥammad on the conquest of Khaybar and left the conquered lands to their owners, to be administered as a trust for the benefit of the conquerors [see art. Fāt'j]. On the other hand, he exiled the Christians of Nadjrān to al-İrāk so that "there might be but one religion in Arabia", though isolated Christians lived in al-Madina itself. 'Umar had a Christian slave who was set free at his death ( Ibn Sa'īd, vi. 110), and Abū Māṣa had a Christian secretary who accompanied him to al-Madina. 'Umar is represented, even in Christian sources, as friendly towards Christians, and in his last charge he recommended the dhimmitis to the care of his successor as "the support of your families".

During the following decades the treatment and status of Christians shows many contradictions. They were often determined apparently by individual caprice. While new churches were built even in towns founded by the Arabs, such as Fustat and Baṣra, and the caliph even helped to restore the church at Edessa (Corp. Script. Chr. Or., ser. iii., xiv. 288), in many other places churches were destroyed, and both Muʿawiyah and 'Abd al-Malik tried to seize the cathedral at Damascus before al-Walid finally incorporated it in the mosque. Christians continued to hold high offices in the administration: Muʿawiyah had a Christian secretary, Sayfūn, who was succeeded by his son, and 'Abd al-Asiz had as his treasurer a wealthy Christian, Athanasius, though 'Abd al-Malik despooled him of much of his wealth. State accounts in Syria and Egypt were kept in Greek until the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, and local accounts in Egypt were still kept in Greek for long afterwards. There were Christians in the Muslim armies, and some gave military service instead of tribute. When the Dhārādjiya of Mount Lebanon were defeated, a clause in the treaty stipulated that they should wear Arab dress (Baladhuri, p. 163). Yet there was some persecution related to keeping up the Christian version. Jews were settled in some of the conquered towns because they were enemies of the Christians (Baladhuri, p. 127). The Jacobites paid a special tax to Muʿawiyah (Corp. Script. Chr. Or., ser. iii., iv. 70), and the government sometimes prevented the election of a patriarch. The Christian Arabs of Mesopotamia formed a special category; these paid double zakār instead of tribute, but a chief of Tagḥhāb was savagely tortured because he would not renounce his faith. Personal relations between Muslims and Christians were often friendly. It is said of a poet that he "sang a song about the wife of a Muslim or a dhimmī" (Kitab al-Agānī, iii. 294). 'Umayr showed great honour to Abū b. Zuba'id, and the relations of 'Abd al-Malik with the poet al-Athīr are notorious [see art. Al-Athīr].

From this time, however, the condition of the subject Christians began to deteriorate. 'Abd al-Malik changed the system of taxation in Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia (Dionysius of Tell Mahrē, ed. Chabot, p. 10; Abū Yūsuf, p. 23 sz.), and introduced the personal tax on non-Muslims. In many districts the form of receipt was a leaden seal fastened round the neck or wrist. 'Umar II gave orders to dismiss all dhimmitis from government service, but such confusion resulted that the order was soon afterwards ignored. He was also the author of the famous "ordinances", in later times attributed to 'Umar I (cf. Abū Yūsuf, p. 73), which prescribed the restrictions to be placed on dhimmitis and the wearing of the sunnaḳ (q.v.) as their distinctive badge. (According to the Nestorian Chronicle [Patr. Or., xiii. 630], this had earlier been the badge of Christian scholars.)

By the end of the second century, as may be seen from the works of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shāfiʿī, the customs governing the dhimmitis were more or less fixed, but insistence on them depended on the whim of the governor and the temper of the populace. It was now accepted that no new churches might be built in towns where Muslims lived, though the old might be repaired. A governor's fancy or a riot might destroy churches and there was no redress; the cathedral at Ṣanʿa', for example, was destroyed for its wealth. At least six rebellions of dhimmitis took place during this century. Ḥarrūn al-Rashīd reenacted the "ordinances" forbidding Christians to be like Muslims in dress and style of riding; but during the reign of Ma'mūn, the Christian headman of Būra in Egypt wore black on a Friday and rode in state to the door of the mosque, when his deputy entered and led the prayers. Their use of horses and riding saddles began to raise objection, and restrictions were placed on religious processions; crosses were sometimes tolerated though banners were forbidden. Taxation became heavier and cases of extortion are recorded. The caliph kept a careful eye on the Church and a patriarch had to get his approval and do him homage, often at a price. A discontented Christian found it easy to get government help in making trouble for his opponents. At this time Christian doctors became prominent as favourites of the caliph and they did not always use their influence in a Christian manner. Discussions on religion took place; at one, when Ma'mūn was present, the Catholics, the Head...
of the Dispersion, the heads of the Şābians, the chief priest of the fire temple and Muslim theologians took part. Many Christians were in government service or were secretaries to public men, and even the fanatical al-Mutawakkil had a Christian secretary. In 236 (850) this caliph intensified the repressive laws. A Christian had to wear a yellow jallāmūn and the zunnār and a woman had to wear a yellow wrap out of doors. If he rode he must have wooden stirrups and two balls on the back of the saddle. Men (or slaves) had to wear the gāšār [q.v.]. They were to be dismissed from the civil service. All new churches were to be pulled down and the cross might not be displayed at festivals. Their graves had to be flush with the ground. The title was levied on their houses and wooden devils fixed to them. Four years later they were forbidden to ride horses and were told to wear two yellow durūs. These laws are the limit of legal persecution and continued to govern in theory though not always observed in practice.

Christians were always to be found in the civil service; some even were connected with the army. In Egypt it was enacted that they should be present on Fridays when the Muslims were absent (Mašrī, Khatīf, ii. 227). One was called wazir in the time of al-Mu'tamid; it seems, however, that the title had become cheap and he was only a high official (Yaqūt, Irshād, i. 130, 259). The first rulers to promote Christians to the highest rank were the Bu'yids [see 'Aḍud al-Dawla] and the Faṭimid(s). This was quite exceptional, but their strength and influence in the administration at all times can be seen from the constant complaints of the dishonesty of Christian secretaries. Moreover, in the finance department they possessed a quasi-monopoly, which lasted in Egypt down to the nineteenth century.

That Muslim intolerance did grow more bitter is shown by comparing the accounts of al-Aḍḥāl in the Kitāb al-Aḍīmāl with the remarks of Ibn Raḍīkh ('Umda, i. 21). In later times the rulers were often more tolerant or far-sighted than the populace; nevertheless, additional taxes were sometimes laid on the dhimmis. In Egypt an extra dinār was exacted from them between 1260 and 1280, in addition to the poll-tax, which was then called gāšiyā (Mašrī, i. 106). At intervals fresh attempts were made to impose a distinctive dress upon them. Their request to wear white turbans with a badge was refused at the instance of Ibn Tāmiyya [q.v.] and in Egypt blue became their distinctive colour. On the whole, they were worse off than their Muslim fellow-subjects, for, while both suffered from oppression by the ruler, they were liable in addition to be attacked by their fellow citizens. Cases of mass conversion still occurred, but the disappearance of the large Christian population of northern Mesopotamia, which continued down to the late middle ages to be the chief centre of Christianity in the Muslim dominions, is probably to be connected with the general decay of agriculture there.

2. Legal status. Here as elsewhere the facts of history do not fit the systems of the theorists, who condemned the laxity of the people on the one hand and the highhandedness of the rulers on the other. The general legal position and the legal view of taxation are outlined in the articles DHIMMA, DIZAYA and KHARĀB. To this outline some details may be added from the system of Mālik, which is less liberal than that of Abū Hanīfa. Mālik taught that a treaty once made with dhimmis cannot be changed. They may not enter mosques or Mecca and the blood money for them is half that for a Muslim. New churches may not be built in or near the towns of Islam though the old may be repaired. Mālik, when consulted, said that a Christian, who had blasphemed the Prophet, should be put to death, and this was done. A Muslim may not borrow from them, nor become a partner with them in business unless he is present at all transactions. Another opinion would let them be sleeping partners. A Muslim should not rent land from them as a méiayer, but it is not illegal, and one who is part owner of a house with a Muslim has the right of pre-emption. One, who is trading in his own town, pays no tax beyond the general tribute; if he goes to another town and buys goods with money brought with him, he pays the trade tax (tithe), but there is no tax on the sale of these goods. Dhimmis must not kill sacrifices for Muslims; if they do, the sacrifices must be repeated. A Muslim woman should kill a beast rather than ask them to do so. If one marries a Muslim woman with the consent of her guardians, they shall all be punished, but if he pretended to be a Muslim, the marriage is invalid. They may not arrange a marriage for a Muslim woman nor a Muslim that of his dhimmīs sister. Married dhimmis are divorced by the conversion of the woman. Mālik did not approve of dhimmis foster-mothers for Muslim children. If a Muslim commits adultery with a dhimmī, he is punished according to his own law; his co-religionists are to be dealt with according to their law. The evidence of a dhimmī is not accepted. Should he turn Muslim, his evidence is still not accepted (i.e. about things that happened while he was a dhimmī), consequently dhimmīs women cannot give evidence about a birth. If a Christian buys or is given a Muslim slave, the transaction is valid, but the slave must be sold to a Muslim. Muslim law applies to all business dealings between dhimmis, except usury, though they may practise this among themselves. They may not be taught the Qur'ān. A Muslim may not prevent his Christian slave from drinking wine, eating pork and going to church. It may be noted that Māwardī admits the possibility of a dhimmī becoming wazir (wazir al-tanfīdā). One authority says that eight acts put a dhimmī outside the law: an agreement to fight the Muslims, fornication with a Muslim woman, an attempt to marry one, an attempt she is handed over from his religion, robbery of a Muslim on the highway, acting as a spy or guide for unbelievers, or the killing of any Muslim.

3. Social Status. The fact that Christians, like other dhimmis, were citizens as it were at second remove, was of course reflected in their social position. The full consequences of this disability were to some extent mitigated by their numbers and influence in the public administration, and by their monopoly or quasi-monopoly of important professions. Christians were distinguished more especially as doctors (the family of Buḥṭišī, Ibn Buṣlān [q.v.] etc.) and druggists. A Muslim complained that he could get no patients in an unhealthy year because he spoke good Arabic and not the dialect of Dāndīšābār [q.v.] and
were cotton instead of silk (Dāhāzi, Kität al-
Buğlāhī, p. 85) and al-Ghazālī says that in many
towns the only doctor was a dhīmūnī, who was
rich, and it was often their immodest display
which provoked the mob to violence. The pro-
hibition of usury in Muslim law operated in favour
of the dhīmūnīs as merchants and money-changers,
and gave them the monopoly of such trades as
those of goldsmiths and jewellers.

Apart from numerous instances of friendly per-
sonal relations between individuals, the generally
good relations between the Muslims and Christians
is shown by the universal celebration of the great
festivals of the Christian year, and the holidays
and feasts which accompanied the feasts of the
patron saints at the principal monasteries (cf. A.
took part in the intellectual life of the commu-
nity, and the books they wrote are named with
approval by the Muslim historians. The strict letter
of the law regarding non-Muslims was not always
applied. While marriage to a Muslim was always
forbidden, fornication with one was not always
punished with death. At times the Muslim murderer
of a dhīmūn was executed. Even the apostate
sometime found mercy, on the ground that forced
conversions were not valid. Christians kept Muslim
slaves, both male and female, and acted for Muslims
in business.

In spite of all this, the stigma of inferiority
remained. The humiliating regulations, the need
for constant watchfulness, the constant recourse
to intrigue and influence to circumvent the law,
the segregation of dhīmūnīs in many cities, in-
evitably warped their morale. Still more serious
were their legal disabilities; there could be no
true justice for the dhīmūn when his evidence
was excluded from the Muslim courts, even though
kādis were enjoined not to discriminate against
them in other respects, nor could there be any
permanent social relationship in the absence of
intermarriage. It is not surprising therefore that
the Christian communities of the East gradually
dwindled not only in numbers, but also in vitality
and moral tone.
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C. The Ottoman Empire.

Since the period of the Tānūsīnī [q.v.] the Otto-
man Empire has gradually abandoned the govern-
mental traditions of Muhammadan states, and this
change has fundamentally affected the treatment
of its Christian subjects. On the other hand, this
change was actually brought about by the very
problems with which the Ottoman government
became confronted through the existence of a large
Christian population in its territory.

Up to the beginning of the sixteenth century the
optimism of Christians in the Empire was, on the
whole, in accordance with the prescriptions of the
sharī'a after the Ḥanafī madīkhāb as to the
restitution of dhīmūnīs, the chief authority on these
questions being the Multaqa 'l-Āhur of
Ibrahim al-Halabi (cf. the Constantinople edition
of 1309, p. 90). Christians were subject to the
payment of the ḥārāṣa gēbērēn, more often called
ṣarāis in Turkey (cf. these two articles), whence the
expression ṣarāis-gēbērē. This tax was levied in
three classes, according to the financial capacity of
the payers. D'OSSOHN (Tableau, iii. 4 sqq.) says that
in his time (about 1860) each year 1,600,000
tax-forms were issued for the non-Muslims, of
which 60,000 were in the capital. The regulations
as to the building and restoration of Christian
churches were observed in principle; the Ḥanafī
madīkhāb allows the restoration of decayed churches
but not of churches deliberately demolished; SHEIKH
Zāde, however, in his commentary on the Multaqa
(Multaqa 'l-Āhur, quoted Constantinople 1276,
p. 415) complains that this distinction was not duly
observed in his time (1666). From the sixteenth
century indeed the building and rebuilding of churches
was a subject of frequent intervention by the
representatives of foreign Christian powers. The
turning of churches into mosques by the Ottoman
conquerors — such as the case of the Aya Sofya —
was generally in concordance with Islamic laws
of war. Likewise the prescriptions about clothing,
which were observed and from time to time reinforced;
as late as the nineteenth century certain sultans such as
Ottomans III and Musafar III are known to have
given special attention to this point.

We also find in the ḳānūn-nāma — the contents
of which were declared in accordance with the
sharī'a by the Sheikh al-Islām — some special
clauses about non-Muslims (ṣāfīra). A ḳānūn-name
of the time of Süleimān I prescribes that, in the
case of certain crimes that are punished by
fines, the fines of non-Muslims shall amount to
only half the sum inflicted on a Muslim in each
case (cf. the second ḳānūn-nāma, published as
appendix to T.O.E.M., iii. 3, 4, 6). The same
ḳānūn-nāma gives directions with regard to the
inheritance of non-Muslims.

The Christians thus constituted in the Ottoman
Empire, just as in other Muhammadan states, a
section of the population which, so far as their
relations with the Government went, had minor
rights compared to Muhammadans and to which
the high functionaries of the state never belonged.
They were improperly designated by the term
ra'īyā, which word originally means all subjects of
a Muhammadan ruler, in allusion to a well-
known tradition which compares the ruler with a
shepherd and his subjects with a flock (ra'īyā,
cf. al-Bukhārī, Qūn'a, bāb 11). Hence the use
of the term ra'īy in European works when
speaking of the Christian subjects of the sultan.
ḲSense [q.v.] was a more or less contemptuous
expression in the idiom of Muslim circles.

There had been, however, since the coming into
existence of the Ottoman Empire, several circum-
stances that presented the problem of the Christian
subjects in forms quite different from those pre-
vailing in contemporary Muhammadan states. The
begunnings of the Ottoman state itself had been anything but orthodox. Erzurum, according to most sources, was only a converted Muslim and Omeyyad and Orkhân, the founders of the state, had many dealings with the Christian aristocracy of Bithynia, some of whom joined readily the cause and the creed of the new conquerors. Christianity was at that time still widely spread in Asia Minor and was at first adapted to the rather unorthodox mystic form in which the Turcomans of Ruğhad made acquaintance with Islam. Large parts of the population adhered for centuries to a Christian-Islamic mixture of religious convictions, such as appeared in the derwish revolt of Simawa Oghlu Badr al-Din (cf. Babinger, in *İslam*, xi.), and as survived in the beliefs and practices of the Bektâşis and the mixed worship of certain saints by both the Islamic and the Christian population. Survivals of this mixed creed were also observed among the so-called Crypto-Christians of Trebizond (cf. Hasluck, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xli. 199 sqq.). It was only after the restoration of the Empire in the xvth century that the orthodox Islamic attitude prevailed in the government of the sultans, which repeatedly had to take strong measures against the heterodox elements.

During this same period it was of no less importance that the Ottoman Empire came to incorporate more and more territories in Europe exclusively inhabited by Christians. With the exception of eastern Thrace, northern Macedonia, Bosnia and Crete, the new subjects were never Islamized in great numbers; in the Empire they came to form a very considerable minority, which was counterbalanced only by the large Muhammedan population of the Asiatic territories. So long as the government and the Muhammedan ruling class were strong, this did not affect the political system. But this ruling class itself, as well as their powerful military instrument, the Janissaries, were recruited in a large measure from the Greek and Slavonic Christian population of the European provinces and often kept up friendly relations with their non-converts kinsmen (one of the many instances is that of Lysandros Khalil Pascha under Muhammed II). Accordingly much consideration was shown to large parts of the Christian population, and the more so as many Christians served on minor posts in the state chanceries, where they performed important administrative duties (Crassius, *Turco-græcia*, p. 14). Besides, many high-placed persons, including the sultans themselves, had, through their harems, many Christian relations without and within the Empire. So the domestic and foreign policy of the state often brought about measures of toleration, which were not altogether in accordance with the strict demands of Muhammedan law. An outstanding example is the way in which Constantine and its Christian inhabitants were treated after the excesses of the first days of the conquest were over. Muhammed II did all that he could to re-populate his new capital, even with Greeks, when the Muhammedan element proved insufficient; he even had a new Ecumenical Patriarch chosen not long after the conquest (cf. Fr. Giese, *Die Stellung der christlichen Untertanen im Osmanischen Reich*, *İslam*, xix., 1931, p. 264 sqq.). Only afterwards, in the first half of the xvth century, when Muhammedan fanaticism had increased, there was a party which invoking the fact that the town had been taken by force (*'antwār*), claimed the destruction of all churches that were left to the Christians, and only with great difficulty was evidence constructed to prove that Constantinople was really taken by a capitulation (cf. J. H. Mordtmann, *Die Kapitulation von Konstantinopel im Jahre 1453*, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, xxii., 1912, p. 129 sqq.). Other signs of fanaticism in the same period are i. a. the intention attributed to Selim I to convert all Christians to Islam, the wish of Murad III to turn all churches into mosques and the alleged oath of Murad IV to exterminate all Christians. Still, apart from these occasional outbreaks, tolerance prevailed. In the capital a Greek Christian aristocracy and plutocracy was permitted to live in the quarter of Phanar; from their midst came influential persons such as Michael Kantakuzenos, the "pillar of the Christians" (Jorga, iii. 211) in the xvth century, and the well-known Phanariote families who later supplied dragomans to the Porte and the princes of the Danube principalities.

The official attitude towards the Christians was complete abstinence from their domestic religious and secular affairs so long as this did not affect the public order. This explains also the tolerance towards the activities of the Roman Catholic missionaries who were sent from the xviith century onwards to convert the eastern Christians. The government took no interest in the different denominations of Christians, while their internal divisions reinforced its authority. R. Gragger in his article "Türkisch-Ungarische Kulturbeziehungen (Litteraturdenkmaler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit", in Ungarische Bibliothek, i., No. 14 (Berlin 1927) depicts the tolerant attitude and the sometimes amused interest of the Turkish Pashas in Hungary in the religious disputes between Roman Catholics and Protestants. On the other hand, the serious domestic troubles amongst the Greeks belonging to the much decayed Ecumenical Patriarchate, as the result of which the party of the patriarch Cyrilus Lucaris took, in the first half of the xviith century, a definite anti-Roman Catholic attitude, could not be wholly indifferent to the Porte, because from that time on the only political protector of the Greeks was the Ottoman government. Arbitrary measures, such as occasional executions of the patriarch (for the first time in 1657; v. Hammer, *G. O. K.* 2, i. 474) and excesses in war time are not sufficient to refute the statement that the attitude of the government was on the whole tolerant.

What, at length, came to influence most deeply this attitude was the interest shown in the lot of the Christians by the governments of the Christian powers with whom the Porte began to enter into peaceful relations. In the first centuries those foreign Christians who were allowed to reside in the seaport towns fell within the category of *musta'min*. Legal conceptions of that time did not distinguish sharply between religious denomination and nationality, both being designated by the word *millet*; therefore a foreigner who embraced Islam was entirely assimilated to the Muhammedan subjects of the sultan. In course of time *millet* came to be used also for the different "national" denominations of the Christians within the Empire. The first foreign power to be interested in the Christians of Turkey was the Vatican, as was manifested several times by the inevitable participation of the Popes in the preparation of anti-Turkish crusades. The Cardinal Protettore di Levante in Rome exercised, through his vicar, considerable influence
on the Latin Roman Catholic community of Pera, which, since the conquest of Constantinople, had enjoyed, like the other Christian communities, administrative independence. This "religious protection" was not altogether in conformance with the wishes of the Christians themselves (G. Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, Oxford 1905, ii. 244), but at those times the Porte followed a policy of non-intervention and did not seize the opportunity of placing these Christian inhabitants of her territory under her more direct control. The same policy made her accept without difficulty the monstrosities of a second, more powerful, protector, the King of France, who already before the conclusion of the treaty of 1535 had begun to act as intermediary between the Catholics in Jerusalem and other places in the Levant and the Porte. This intervention of France—which, in the eyes of Christian Europe, served her as an excuse for her entering into diplomatic relations with the Porte—was tolerated equally in favour of other than French ecclesiastics and missionaries, and of non-French Christian prisoners. Occasionally France's protection was also invoked by other than Roman Catholics; in 1639, the Oecumenical Patriarch himself asked the French King to declare himself protector of the Eastern Church. The French capitulation of 1673 recognized at last the protectorate of the King of France over the Roman Catholic foreign Christians, though a general protectorate over all the Christians in the Empire had been demanded originally; the famous capitulation of 1740 confirmed the dispositions of that of 1673 (cf. G. Pelissier du Rassas, *Le Régime des Capitulations dans l'Empire Ottoman* [Paris, 1860 sqq.]).

A third powerful protector of Christian interests this time of the Greek Orthodox Christians, arose in the xviiith century in the person of the Russian Czar. Shortly after the fall of Constantinople Ivan the Great had begun to regard himself as successor of the Byzantine Emperors and, as the power of Russia increased, the Greek orthodox Christians in the western and eastern parts of the Empire came to look upon the Czar as their natural protector. Especially the Christian institutions in Jerusalem and the much impoverished patriarchate of that town benefited by the Russian religious interest. On the other hand, Russia learnt to use her influence with the Orthodox Christians as a powerful political instrument. The peace treaty of Kückuck Rainardje (1776) recognized at last the right of the Russian diplomatic representatives to interfere in favour of the Christians in the Empire.

With the weakening of the Empire in the xviiith century the so-called "religious protection" became a heavy burden on Turkey's inner political conditions. Especially after the disastrous happenings under Mahmut II's reign, it became clear that the old Muhammadan conception of the state, which left the Muhammadans entirely to themselves, or to others, could no longer be maintained. It was one of the chief stimuli to the introduction of the Tanzimat. In order to retain as much control as possible over her Christian subjects the Porte now had to apply her governmental activity equally to non-Muslims and Muslims. Accordingly the Khatt-i Sherif of Gül-Khâne (1839) declared that perfect security was guaranteed to all subjects, Muslims or ra'dâqâ, as to their lives, their honour and their possessions. Still in the following years no important administrative measures were taken, while on the other hand the intervention of foreign powers in Christian affairs continued and led amongst other incidents to the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853. An incident of 1843, in the meantime, had made the Porte give a formal assurance to the French and English ambassadors with regard to the non-application of capital punishment to persons who had renounced the Muhammadan creed (Young, op. cit., ii. 11 sqq.).

The law of May 10, 1855 is an important landmark in the history of Ottoman policy towards the Christian subjects; this law abolished the capitation tax for non-Muslims and envisaged the possibility of their service in the army [cf. Djeva and the *Bibliography* of this art.]. This legislative measure was completed by the Khatt-i Humâyûn of February 18, 1856, which may be regarded as the Magna Charta of the rights of the non-Muslim subjects of the Empire; in this memorable edict the rights and privileges of the different religious denominations and their members were proclaimed with more detail; as to their military service the edict laid down the principle that it could be replaced by the payment of an exemption tax, which, under the name of bedel, came to be regularly applied to all non-Muslims. In accordance with the contents of the Khatt-i Humâyûn, the Ottoman legislation now began for the first time to take notice officially of the existence of the great number of Christian communities existing in the Empire. Organic statutes were elaborated for the more important of these communities (called millet): in 1860 for the Armenian Gregorian community and in 1862 for the Greeks and for the Armenians. In 1870 followed the institution, with the cooperation of the Porte, of the Bulgarian Exarchate, while in course of time a host of laws, decrees and regulations were issued, containing more detailed provisions with regard to these and the minor communities: Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, Mount Athos, the Serbian Church, the Nestorians, the Latin communities, and the different churches united with Rome (Armenians, Chaldeans, Maronites, Melkites). This highly complicated legislation aimed at making these Christians Ottoman subjects in the full sense of the word, but met with great difficulties created by the existence of an aged system of autonomy and by the frequent intervention of the foreign powers. The leading principle of the government was to divest the purely religious authorities as much as possible of their power and to reinforce the power of the lay institutions. This policy led to endless troubles in which new regulations continually tried to restore order. In the constitution of Midhat Pasha (1876) İslam was proclaimed as the State religion, but immediately afterwards there follows the declaration that the profession of all recognized religions in the Empire is free and that all privileges granted to the different religious communities shall be maintained (art. 11). Art. 17 guarantees the personal freedom of all Ottoman subjects and art. 17 their complete equality before the law.

All the time during the period of reforms the Turkish government had to reckon with reactionary feelings against the gaunts in large sections of the Muhammadan population, which in many instances made the application of equal treatment, before the law and elsewhere, illusory. This justified to a certain extent the never ending remonstrances
of the European powers, who lost no opportunity of insisting on new reforms in favour of the Christians. Art. 62 of the treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) stipulated again for the equal treatment by the Ottoman government of all non-Muslim subjects, amongst others that every one, without difference of religion, should be admitted as a witness before the law courts.

The effect of the foreign intervention in their favour encouraged on the other hand large sections of the Christian population to disloyal feelings and actions against their legal government. While the latter did what it could do to assimilate the different groups of the population, the factors of dissolution became at the same time ever stronger. Even the peaceful relations that had hitherto characterized on the whole the intercourse between Muhammandans and Christians — especially in the cities — began to make way for religious hatred between group and group, in which the government officials were often unable to observe the required neutral attitude. Amongst many other symptoms the Armenian troubles which began in 1889 in the Armenian vilayets — where a racial antagonism between Muhammadan Kurds and Christian Armenians had existed for centuries — were the most disastrous. They led to repeated Armenian attempts at revolt and to the notorious massacres in Constantinople of 1897.

By this development the treatment of the Christian subjects ceased to be a religious problem; it became a problem of nationality (jillet in the new acceptance of the word) and of race, and at the same time one of the vital problems for the Empire. After the revolution of 1908 and the re-establishment of Midhat's constitution, these facts were not yet fully recognized. The Ottomanization of all subjects of the Empire was seriously attempted; the new representative bodies included a number of Christian members; occasionally there were Christian ministers. Then the world war precipitated the inevitable course of events. This time non-Muslims were for the first time incorporated in the Turkish army, but only for service behind the front. At the same time, the domestic policy of the Young Turks took a pan-Turkish turn, from which religious motives were quite absent. National Turkish feeling prevailed. The measures of deportation of Christian inhabitants from the frontier zones — measures from which the Armenians especially suffered terribly — were inspired by fear of disloyalty towards Turkey, though in their execution remnants of religious fanaticism, notably on the side of the Kurds, certainly played a large part.

The events after the armistice of Mudros have proved that a great part of the Christian population preferred independence or incorporation into a Christian state to remaining with Turkey. And the Turks themselves also were ready to part with their Christian subjects. Under these circumstances were concluded at Lausanne, in 1923, the agreements with Greece for the exchange of the Greek population of the new Turkish state against Turks established in Hellenic territory; only Constantinople and some islands were excluded from this measure. Since by the events of the war the number of Armenians and other Christians in Asiatic Turkey had already been reduced to a very small minority, the result was that the present Turkish republic has only to deal with a Christian population of no numerical importance, most of whom live in Constantinople. The Lausanne treaty of 1923 and its annexes (213 articles 33-45) only the obligation for Turkey to treat the minorities on an equal basis with the Turkish subjects; it provides for their right to live after a personal law statute of their own. Finally the treatment of Christians in Turkey has definitely ceased to be a legal problem in the old sense of the word since, by the alteration of the Constitution on April 5, 1928 the state has been completely secularized (cf. Tarih, Istanbul 1931, iv. 213) by cancelling the article declaring that the state religion is Islam.

J. H. KRAMERS

AL-NASAWI, MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD B. 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD, an Arabic historian, biographer of the last Khwārizmshāh Djālāl al-Dīn Māngulītī (q. v.), was born in Khurāsan (Bakhtiyār, ii. 415), an estate in the district of Nasā (q. v.) in Khurāsan where his family was reputed to have been already settled in the pre-Muhammadan period (Hist., ed. Houdas, p. 53). During his father's lifetime he represented him when the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk, dismissed from office by Sultan Muḥammad, visited the family estates on his journey to Khwārizm and was received by him (ibid., p. 30). He only mentions incidentally that he had stayed in his youth with Inānḵhan in Māzarārān before the latter had risen to power. When the Mongols invaded Khurāsan in 1221 he had already succeeded his father in his ancestral citadel, which he saved from sacking by payment of 10,000 ālīs of cloth. Niẓām al-Dīn al-Samānī was his guest at this time; he enabled him to escape to Khwārizm before the arrival of the enemy and in gratitude Niẓām al-Dīn procured him a rich grant of land from Oẓūlīg Shāh, son of Muḥammad (p. 57 sqq.). When in Nasā, the capital of his district, Nasrāt al-Dīn Ḥamza b. Muhammad, the representative of a local royal family, came to power as successor to his nephew Ikhtiyār al-Dīn (p. 99), he appointed him his nāsīb (p. 104) and in this capacity he took part in a battle fought by Inānḵhan, as governor of Khurāsan, at Nakhdjuwār near Nasā against the Mongols; according to the full story of the battle (p. 66), this was the only occasion on which he personally took part in a battle. When after the death of Sultan Muḥammad (1220) his eldest son Ghiyāth al-Dīn ascended the throne, Nasrāt al-Dīn took the side of his younger brother Djālāl al-Dīn, and for this an expedition was sent against him under Tūlāk, son of Inānḵhan. To save himself he sent Nasawī with 1,000 dinārs to Ghiyāth al-Dīn. After long wanderings and a two months' sojourn in Isfahān, he succeeded in giving the money to Djālāl al-Dīn's minister Sharrāf al-Mulk, who then wrote a despatch to Tūlāk ordering him to abandon the siege of Nasā; but this arrived too late and Nasrāt al-Dīn had already been slain (p. 109). Nasawī did not now dare to return home but went to Djālāl al-Dīn when the latter had entered Marāgā. He was appointed by him Kāthīb al-Iṣṭaḥdār (p. 110) and henceforth accompanied his master on all his campaigns. When Djālāl al-Mulk 'Alā al-Dīn to escape the jealousy of the vizier Sharrāf al-Mulk had himself appointed governor of Nasā he awoke such discontent that the vizier's misgovernment that he was dismissed. Nasawī was appointed in his stead governor of his native town with the title of vizier but had to stay with Djālāl al-Dīn and sent a deputy to his governorship (p. 149).
When Djalal al-Din in 1230 was surrounded by the Mongols at Hant and fought his way out once again, Nasawi became separated from him and was kept a prisoner for two months in Amid but finally made his way to Mayyafarikin where he learned of the sad end of his king who had been murdered by a Kurd on Aug 16, 1231 (p. 245).

Ten years later in 639 (1241), he wrote the history of his sovereign entitled Sirat al-Sultan Djalal al-Din Mankiberti. He opens with a confused and romantic account of the early history of the Mongols and begins his subject with Muhammad’s campaign to the ‘Irak in 614 (1217). He relies for his facts mainly on the stories of high officials of his hero’s court; as a result his interest is mainly in diplomatic documents and administrative measures while military matters, which were his hero’s main occupation, are dealt with rather briefly. His model was apparently the Kitab al-Yamini of al-’Utbi which his master Nasrat al-Din was said to know by heart (p. 104); but he had not al-’Utbi’s sure command of Arabic so that his style is fortunately much simpler and more matter of fact, in spite of all his attempts at rhymed prose and plays upon words. Persian influence on his style, which Houdas claims to notice, is on the other hand nowhere marked.


(C. Brockelmann)

NASHAW B. SA’ID B. NASAWI AL-HIMAYR AL-YAMANI, an Arab philologist. The notices of this individual and his career are exceedingly scanty. In Yaqut’s Irshad and in Suyuti’s Buqayha he is described in laudatory terms in the usual phrases as a great scholar, authority on fah, philology and nask; he was also distinguished as a historian and poet and was equally versed in the other branches of anad. He compiled a dictionary entitled Shama’ al-Ulam wa-Dawad al ’Arab min al-Kulam in eight (according to others eighteen) volumes which his son later revised and condensed into two volumes; he also wrote a treatise on rhyme, Kitab al-Kawashi, and a book of a religious and philosophical nature, Kitab Hur al-In wa-Tanbih al-Samii’. We know neither the year nor the place of his birth, nor with whom he studied nor in what places he lived. Only one story of his life has survived and that sounds improbable. Yaqut says he was a great chief who besieged cities and fortresses and ruled over a hill-tribe in the Sahar range. Al-Suyuti takes this story from Yaqut. According to al-Suyuti, he was a follower of the Mu’tazila. He is said to have died on the 24th Dhu ’l-Hijjah 573 (1117). The importance of Nasawi lies in the fact that he was particularly well acquainted with the South Arabian tradition. He took up the work of his predecessor al-Hamdani [q. v.], the task of rescuing from oblivion the legends of the South Arabian kingdoms. He uses these as the basis of his work and gives long quotations from the writings of his predecessor. His famous so-called Himyarite Kasidah, al-Kasidah al-Himaryah, is based on such traditions of the Himyarite rulers; it celebrates their deeds of the splendid South Arabian kingdom. In the commentary on this poem the annotator gives very full notes, in which he narrates legends of South Arabian princes and their history. Von Kremer supposes, relying on internal evidence, that the author of the Kasidah and the commentator are the same person i.e. that Nasawi himself wrote the commentary on his Kasidah. The commentator, whose name is not given, must at any rate have been very well acquainted with Himyarite tradition. In the already mentioned dictionary Shama’ al-Ulam, Nasawi also uses his knowledge of South Arabian history. Whether all the facts given by him are historical cannot be discussed here; many of them are certainly based on tradition, since Nasawi himself, as his nida shows, was of South Arabian blood. His works played a part in the struggle of the tribes of the south Arabian origin against the northern Arabs for predominance in the Muslim world.

NASHWÂN — NASIB


(ILLE LICHENSTADTER)

NAST (A.), intercalary month, intercalation, or man on whose authority an intercalation is undertaken, a word of uncertain meaning in Sûra ix. 37 and in Muham- mad’s sermon at the farewell pilgrimage (Ibn Hishâm, p. 698; cf. the article Hâdj). Nastî, nasy and nasî are variants and the word is connected with nasi’ to “postpone” or “add” or with nasiya to “forget”. In any case, it is given in Muslim tradition a meaning which brings it into connection with the method of reckoning time among the pagan Arabs. The Qur’ânic verse describes nasi’ as “a further expression of unbelief” and is therefore forbidden to the believers.

For the meaning of the word in the calendar we have the context of the above mentioned passages where sometimes the number of months in the year is put at twelve and sometimes the number of “holy” months at four. Kur’ânic exegesis as a rule connects nasi’ with the “holy” months and explains it sometimes, it is true, as the postponement of the hâdjâ from the month fixed by God for it, but sometimes, and preferably, as “transference of the sanctity of one holy month to another, in itself not holy”. The expositors are also able to give the reasons for such a postponement in full detail. As a rule however, these are pure inceptions in which suggestions and perhaps memories of old traditions are freely expanded. A collection of such expositions in the form of regular hâdiths is given in Tabari, Ta’rif, 2nd ed., x. 91—93.

The critical examination of these explanations reveals however traces of an older conception not quite unknown to Tradition, even in the form in which we have it, according to which nasî means either the intercalation of an intercalary month or the month itself. This interpretation of the word is the only one really acceptable in the circumstances. The association of the pre-Islamic hâdjâ with annual markets made it necessary to fix the hâdjâ in a suitable season of the year. For that purpose a prolongation of the lunar year in some way was necessary and nothing contradicts that older tradition according to which it was obtained by the intercalation of an intercalary month. The lunar month was the only unit of time available for the purpose because it was the only one which the Beduins, the customers at the markets, could observe directly. Thus had only to let them know at the hâdjâ of a year whether they had to reckon to the next hâdjâ twelve or thirteen months.

Definite evidence of this intercalation of a month is found in the astronomer Abû Ma’shar al-Balkhi (d. 272) in his Kitâb al-Ulûtî (see F.A., ser. vol. xi. [1858], p. 168 sqq.) and following him in al-Birûnî who also deals at length with this intercalation in his Chronology (ed. Sachau, p. 11 sq., 62 sqq.). According to him, the Arabs took this intercalation from the Jews. How much in what these scholars tell us is really historical knowledge and how much intelligent reconstruction can hardly be decided. It is remarkable however that al-Birûnî when dealing fully with the Jewish intercalation (op. cit., p. 52, 77) connects the Hebrew word for intercalary year, šabbîr, with mîwâhirâth “pregnant woman” and observes: “they compare the addition of a superfluous month to the year to the woman carrying something which does not belong to her body”. In this connection we may recall that Tabari (op. cit., p. 91, 3) explains the Arabic nasî as nasî “pregnant woman” among other interpretations, saying nasî’at al-mar’a, “on account of the increase which the child in her means”. This agreement in the two explanations, which can hardly be accidental, might really indicate that nasî in the sense of intercalation or intercalary month is modelled on the Jewish šabbîr and thus support al-Birûnî’s statement which is in itself not impossible. Cauassou de Perceval (F.A., ser. iv., vol. i., p. 349) even quotes the Hebrew nasi (prince) as a title of honour of the leader of the Sanhedrin, to whom fell the duty of dealing with the intercalation (cf. Rab. Talmud, Sanhedrin, p. 112: “the intercalation of the year may only be done with the approval of the nasi’”). According to one of the meanings of the Arabic nasî given in Tradition, it was really the “name of a man” (see above), a meaning which is all the more remarkable in this connection, as it does not suit the Kur’ânic passage. There is a definite agreement in the fact that in the Jewish intercalation only the month following Adar was an intercalary month while in the Arab system, as the critical examination of Tradition — contradicting the literal interpretation of its text — shows, only the month following Dhu l-Hijja i.e. the intercalated month in both cases was inserted between the normal last month and the normal first of the year, Nisân or al-Muharram.

Nothing certain is known about the process of intercalation among the Arabs. It can only have been periodic and irregular attempts at correction based on observation of nature, particularly vegetation. The technical part must have been exceedingly simple and primitive. The same is true of the Jewish intercalation in the older period (see Bab. Talmud, op. cit., p. 10b—13b). As the Jewish system served to move the feast of Pesâh to a suitable season of the year, the Arab system only at present seems to be the same for the hâdjâ and the fairs associated with it in the vicinity of Mecca. It was not intended to establish a fixed calendar to be generally observed. The Beduins had never had one and they have no use for one. According to Tradition, the management of the nasî was a prerogative of the Banû Kinânà; and indeed fairs were held on the lands of the Kinânà.

Bibliography: A. Möberg, Ana-nasî in der islamischen Tradition, where the most important references are given. (A. MOBERG)

NASîB (A.), the introductory lines of the Arabic kaṣida [q.v.] which are devoted to recalling the memory of a woman whom the poet loved long years before. The nasîb is, so far as we know, the only kind of love-poem which has survived to us from the Arabic literature of the pre- and early Muhammedan period and is almost the only place where women are the subject in the poetry of the Arabs. The essential feature of the subject of the nasîb is always the lament of a man for a lost beloved. Even in the earliest kaṣidas that have survived the nasîb is already
in the stereotyped form. It treats its subject again and again in the same way with only the slightest variations. We can distinguish three constantly recurring principal motives:

I. A Beduin on his wandering through the desert passes a spot where there are the traces of a tent-trench which has fallen in, dried camel dung, sooty stones, which once formed a cooking place, and tent-pegs. From these things he sees that this spot has been the resting-place of wandering Beduins. After some reflection he recalls that his tribe encamped here long before, jointly with another tribe, during the spring grazing and that he himself spent a happy time with his beloved.

The poet usually then gives a description of the deserted camping place, the affal; it can only be traced with difficulty as the wind and the rain which has fallen upon it have obliterated it and made it almost unrecognizable. The rain has produced a rich vegetation and gazelles and antelopes with their young have found shelter there.

II. The poet recalls the day when the two tribes, his own and that of his beloved, struck camp. There had been various signs of the approaching departure. The camels were brought back from the pastures and loaded; the raven, the bird of ill omen, also foretold the separation to the poet. In his mind he again sees the camels with their litters before him and compares them to ships: the women sit in the litters, among them his beloved. They go off and he follows them in spirit.

III. While grief for his lost beloved is keeping the poet awake, she sends him from far away her khatayil, a vision of herself. He is surprised that his delicate beloved has been able to travel so far, as she was never a good walker. The vision arouses painful memories in him and he weeps copiously as he recalls the beauty of his beloved.

Each of these three themes may be followed by a full description of the personality and journey of his beloved; she is a distinguished and modest lady, one of the noblest of her tribe; she is frequently married and sometimes even has children. Her husband is held up to ridicule. She is coquettish and likes to torment her lover. Her physical charms are described very fully and the various parts of her body celebrated in fine similes (in the style of the wasf, cf. the Song of Solomon and the Alit-ägyptischen Liebeslieder, ed. W. Max Müller). Her dress, her perfume and her jewellery are described in laudatory terms. The feelings of the lover are then detailed. Grief has made him old and grey; he is ill with longing for his beloved and after all these years his tears still flow at the thought of her.

Like all early Arabic poetry the nasib in matter and structure follows with considerable strictness a definite chain of ideas so that there is a certain uniformity about it. We constantly find the same or similar comparisons; the ideas of the different poets do not differ essentially from one another but only the form and method of expressing them. The traces of the affal look like writing made by the kalam on parchment. The girl is like a gazelle or an antelope, a simile which continuously recurs with new variations. The tears of the poet run like water from a leaky skin or fall like pearls from a necklace when the string is broken and so on. In consequence of the wealth of the Arabic language in synonyms these similes have an ever-new charm in spite of the many repetitions. Stereotyped metonymies, such as we find in all branches of Arabic poetry, are also common in the nasib. Thus the beloved, the affal, the showers of rain, and parts of the body etc. are designated by metonymy. The nasib usually begins (in so far as it has survived in its entirety) with formal phrases: li-man al-diyr et c.; frequently it ends with dâ' dâa 'leave this', whereupon the poet turns to the description of the camel.

The nasib had already become fixed in form in the pre-Muhammadan period, and no poet could break away from it. Gradually its contents became more and more colourless; it became more and more stereotyped and stiff. In the old Arab poetry there is already no difference between the nasib of a Beduin and that of a townsman. Kais b. al-Khatîm, Hassân b. Thâbit and 'Adi b. Zaid describe the beauty of their beloved in the same way as, for example, Imra' al-Kais, and lament their separation from her just like a Beduin poet. We must remember however that in the pre-Muhammadan period even a townsman knew Beduin life (of 'Adi b. Zaid we know that he spent a part of the year in the desert; cf. Kitâb al-'Aghâni, Cairo 1928, ii. 105). In later times however, the poets no longer knew the life of the desert from their own experience; the nasib thus became more and more stereotyped. In the end it became a matter of ridicule that every kâsid began with the lament at the affal; a critic of the 'Abbâsid period (cf. Goldziher, Abhandlungen, p. 144) asks whether every man with a command of language who would write a good poem must of necessity be lovesick.

From the nasib we learn of amatory relations of a kind which probably played a considerable part in pre-Islamic Arabia. These were unrestricted relations, not contracted in the forms which were already used in pre-Islamic Arabia at a marriage. They were based on natural inclination and spontaneous devotion and ended with this. As is evident from the nasib such unions were usually concluded in the spring grazing season when different tribes were encamping peacefully side by side. When the end of this fine season of the year came these love affairs also came to an end as a rule. The position and the reputation of the kholi (as the beloved is often called) were not affected by this illegitimate relation; she remained in her tribe and went off with them, while a ba'ith did not live with her tribe.

As is the case with all Arab poetry, the question what is the oldest nasib and its origin cannot be answered. Arab tradition records that Muhâllab was the first to put a nasib in front of a kâsid; this does not mean however that he was the first to compose one. In the Kitâb al-'Aghâni (Cairo 1928), ii. 123 sq. we find a parallel to the nasib. Al-Nu'mân sent to King Anushirwân a girl with an accompanying letter which described her merits of mind and body. In the tales of the roos Nights also, nasib-like poems are inserted but these are all of a comparatively late period. Many parallels may be found in the Song of Solomon, and old Egyptian love-poems resemble in spirit and conception and frequently often in phrase the Arabic nasib.

NASIB, a town in Mesoopotamia. The name is derived from Semitic origin and to be derived (with Philon Byblos in Step. Byz.; Muller, F. H. G., iii., 571, fig. 8) from Nasib in (nasib). The idol of Nasib is said to have been called Abul (Assemani, Bibl. Orient. i., Rome 1719, p. 27), i.e. stone or El (according to W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, London 1887, p. 210, note 1). On coins the usual form of the place-name is NESEB (Urbanus in Step. Byz.; Nesibis; Pinly, Nat. hist., vii., 42; Nesebis); in the Scriptures (Historiae Augustae and elsewhere we find the forms Niti, Niter, Nizibi, etc. (J. Markwart, Sudarmenien u. d. Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 259 sq., note 1), in Armenia the town is usually called Mebin (on the form see Markwart, op. cit., p. 166 sq., note 3); Mattéos of Edessa (ed. Watrampat, 2nd ed., 1988, p. 245 = Durlurier's transl., p. 206) calls it "Nesib, also called Mebin or Nesib" (also on p. 62 Nesib). But he also mentions a "Nasib, which is the town of Sitar" (p. 157 = p. 158, ch. xxvi. of Durlurier's translation which (p. 413 wrongly connects these with our Nasib and Sippa) which lies on the left bank of the Euphrates on the road from Severak to Savvarek (Arabic Suwaiyda) to Hsin Mansur (Armen. Harsan Musroy) (Mattéos, p. 157 = 130 Durlurier; 186 sq. = 157 sq. Durlurier). This Nesib corresponds to the "town of Nasib in the bank of the Frat, called Nasib al-Kum, 3-4 days journey from each of Amid and Harran on the road from Harran to the land of Rum" (Yakut, Muqaddim, iv., 789), in Pseudo-Wa'ätz (Fudaij Darab wai-darab Bakr, transl. by B. G. Niebuhr, in Schriften der Akademie von Ham., vol. i., ii., Hamburg 1847, p. 50, 175 sq.) mentioned along with Suwaida, i.e., Suverek, as Nasib al-Saghiri, the name of which is marked on the Turkish General Staff's map of 1333 (1917-1918), scale 1:200,000, sheet Siverak-Kharput, 20 miles almost due west of Siverak and 1/2 miles from Kanjara at a bend of the Euphrates. The Syriac authors usually identify Nasibin with the Sûhâ of the Bible and say that Nunrod founded the town (Michael Syr., Chron., transl. Chabot, i., 20; Barbelaeus, Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 8).

The town lay in the plain below the Măsûr oğuz [see Tör Ḍarûn] on the river Mydgonias (Theophil. Simok., ed. de Boor, v., 5, 6; Muqaddim), the Hirma of the Arabs, Nahar Mâshi or Mâshi of the Syrians (Assyr. Kharmish; Noledeke, in Z. D.M.G., xxxii., 328), the modern Diaghjagh. The country between Nasibin and the Tigris was called Bêh Ārabaye by the Syriacs (Theophil. Simok., i., 15, 2: Barlasch, iii., 10, 1: v., 1, 2; 3, 2: A'ubili; G. Hoffmann, Anzeige aus syr. Akten pers., Mart., p. 23, note 170), by the Armenians Arwastan (cf. Arwastan, in J. A., 1869, p. 168; Arwastan-ar

Frömm. Justi, Beiträge, i., 16, 24; Marquart, Eräänahr, p. 162 sq.).

The town is mentioned as early as Assyrian times under the name Nasibin, first, so far as we know, about 900 B.C. in the reign of Adad-nirari II (O. Schroeder, W. V. D. O. G., xxxvii., N° 84, i. 41 sq.) In the period between 852 and 715 B.C. it was the capital of a province whose governors were allowed to hold the eponymy (Forrer, Provinzteilung des assyr. Reiche, p. 32, 106; Schachermeyr, article Nasibine in Reallexikon d. Vorgesch., viii., 1927, p. 449). In the last wars of the Assyrians with the Babylonians Nasibin is mentioned in 612 B.C. (C. J. Gadd, The Fall of Niniveh, London 1923, p. 35, Cuneiform tablet, British Museum 21901, reverse, 1. 48).

Seleucus I is said to have settled Nabibis with Syrians (C.I.G., iv., 6585; Tscherikower, Philologia, suppl.-vol. xix., part i, p. 89 sq.). The Macedonians called the town Αντρεσιμία ἐν τῷ Μεσσαλία (Strabo, xvi., 747). In the reign of Antiochus IV. the Ptolemies struck coins with the legend Αντρεσιμία ἐν τῷ Μεσσαλία (Brit. Mus., Catal. Seleucid. Kings, p. 42, N° 86-88; Head, Historia Numorum, 5, 815). Tigianes of Armenia took the town from the Parthians, who then held it, and put his brother Geras (Gher) in command of it; in the war against him, Lucullus occupied it in 68 B.C. (Plutarch, Luc., p. 32, 4 sqq.). The Armenian historians say that the town was from the middle of the second century B.C. to the beginning of our era the capital of the Arshakund kings and later of king Sasantras (St. Martin, Mémoires sur l'Armenie, i., Paris 1818, p. 161; Marquart in Hersfeld, in Z. D.M.G., lxviii. 659 sq.). About 37 A.D. the Parthian king Artaianus III took it from the Armenians and gave it to king Iazes of Adiabene (Joseph, Ant., xx., 3, 9). In the period of the Parthian war of Corbulus (62 A.D.) it was Parthian or Adiabenian (Tacit., Ann., xx., 5). The emperor Trajan took Nasisin again and Hadrian restored it to the Parthians (Dio Cass., lxviii., 23). In the Parthian war of Lucius Verus, it again suffered a siege by the Romans, as a result of which a pestilence broke out in it (Lucian, De conscrib. hist., p. 15). The Parthians fled across the Tigris and the town then doubtless repassed into the hands of the Romans. After the victory of Septimius Severus over Pescennius Niger, the princes of Osrhoene and Adiabene asked that the emperor should withdraw the Roman troops from Nasisin in return for an acknowledgment of his suzerainty (Dio Cass., lxv. 1, 2 sqq.). The emperor then went to Nasisin in 195 A.D. and made it the capital of a new province; it was now given the name of Septimia Nasisi Colonia Metropolitana (Dio Cassius, lxv. 3-2; Hill, Catal. of Greek Coins, Brit. Mus., Arabia, Mesoopotamia and Persia, London 1922, p. 5, 119-124; MacDonald, Catal. of the Hunterian Collection, iii., 315, pl. lxix.). After the emperor's departure the governor Laetus defended the town against the attacks of the Parthians. After the assassination of Caracalla in 217 A.D. the Parthians again besieged it but then made peace with Maximinus. The first Sassanian Ardashir at once besieged Nasisin (Zonar, xii., 13; Geogr. Synkell, p. 674). It was taken by the Persians in the reign of Maximinus but in 242 regained by Gordian III's son-in-law Timeites; Philip the Arabian, under whom it was given the name of Julia Septimia Colonia Nasisib Metropolis, soon withdrew however from the whole.
of Mesopotamia. Odenathus of Palmyra in 261 again took Nisibis from the Persians and destroyed it (Histor. Aug., Trebellius Popplio, Triginta tyrannis, p. 13; 39). Decius, instead of passing the town, which had become Roman again at the peace of 297 A.D. (Marquart, Erdkunde, p. 169), the sole centre of trade between Persia and the Roman empire (Petr. Patai, frag. 14. in F.H.G., iv. 189 Cod. Just., iv. 63-4 Expositio totius mundi et gentium, p. 22 in Riese, Geoer. lat. min. p. 108) and one of the principal fortresses on the Mesopotamian Imses (on the Imses see Poidebard, Syria, xi. 1930, p. 33-42). In the Persian wars of Constantius, the Nisibin, Orientis primam maximum citatum (Amman Marcel, xxv. 8, 14), was three besieged (326 and 346 and A.D. (Peeters, Anab. Syn., xxxviii, 1920, p. 285-373). During the first siege died the monk Jacob of Nisibis, the teacher of Ephraim, who had built the great church in his native town in 313 A.D. Perhaps he is to be regarded as the founder of "the Persian school" of Nisibis, which Ephraim transferred from there to Edessa in 363 as a result of the persecutions by Shapūr II (on it see I. Guidi, Gli statuti della scuola di Nisibis, in Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana, iv., 1890, p. 165-195; J.-B. Chabot, L'Ecole de Nisibis, in Rev. de l'Architecture Islamique, s. v. ii, 1896, p. 43-93; Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Literatur, Bonn, 1922, p. 113 sqq.; Th. Herrmann, Die Schule von Nisibis vom 3.-7. Jahrh., in Zeitschr. f. neutestament. Wiss., 1926, p. 89 sqq.).

In the war of 359 Shapūr II at first passed by Nisibis on his way to Tela and Amida, while the Roman army was stationed at Nisibis (Amman, Marc., xxv. 7, 1-9). After the death of Julian, Jovian, and the death of the conquerors of Nisibis, the peace of 363 (Amman, Marc., xxv. 7, 9-11). The inhabitants were allowed to migrate to Amida (Amman, Marc., xxv. 8, 15-9; 6). Zosimus, iii. 33 sqq.; Ps. Dionysius of Tellmahma, Chron. under the year 674; Syr. Vita of Ephraim, ed. Lamy, p. 24 sq., Feustos Byz., Venecia 1832, p. 26; Nau, in R. O. C., ii., 1897, p. 58). They were perhaps sent on from here and settled in the above-mentioned "Little Nisibin." From this time the frontier on the Imses was Sargatho, 70 stadia west of Nisibis, the modern Serdijeb-Khan (Nimkomm, Syria, x. 1929, p. 283 sqq.). The Romans made frequent attacks on the lost town but always without success, for example in 421-422 A.D. after their victory at Sargatho (Socrat., Hitt. Etat. vii. 18), in 503 under their general Areobindos (Josep. Styl., ch. 51, p. 44, ed. Wright; Mich. Syr., transl. Chabot, ii. 159), in 526-527 under the Pus and Strateles Timostratos (Zach. Rhet., ix. 17, 256) and in 572 under Patriarch Marcellus (John of Ephesus, iii. 6, 5). In the sixth century the inhabitants were still inclined to be friendly to the Romans (Ps. Zach. Rhet., vii. 5, p. 211, ed. Land). After the Nestorian academy of Edessa had been transferred to Nisibis in 489 by the Metropolitan Barsawmā as a result of the persecutions of the Nestorians in the Byzantine empire, the town remained for centuries the intellectual centre of Nestorianism (cf. also Mas'ūdi, Kitāb al-Tawhīd, ed. de Goeje, p. 150). In the reign of Khusraw II the Church of St. Sergius in Nisibis was built (Theophyl. Simok., v. 1, 7). Sergius Strateletes was held in particular veneration by the nomadic tribes of this region (Noldeke's Tabari, p. 284, note 1; Peeters, in Huchard, Vienna 1911, p. 187; Herzfeld-Sarras, Archäol. Reise im Euphrat-u. Tigrisgebiet, i., 1911, p. 138, note 2).


Sa'id al-Dawla began his campaign against Armenia in 328 (940) from Nisibin (Freya, in Z.D.M.G., x. 467). Byzantines in 331 (942) under John Kurkutas invaded Mesopotamia and took Mayafārīkūn, Arzan and Na'ilūn (Barhebraeus, op. cit., p. 179; Welt, Gesch. der Chal., ii., 699). Nisibis by this time probably belonged to the Hamdanid Naṣir al-Dawla (Z.D.M.G. x. 185 under the year 547 (1158); Z.D.M.G. x. 482). After his death in 558 (968-969) his son Abu 'l-Muyazzar Ḥamdūn was for a short time governor of Nisibin (Z.D. M.G., x. 485). The Byzantines again attacked the town under the Domestics (the Armenian Mēkh) on the 1st Mahram 362 (Oct. 12, 972) and instituted a dreadful massacre in it (Barhebraeus, p. 192; Z.D. M.G., x. 486; Welt, iii. 19 sqq.; Yahyā b. Sa'd al-Anṣārī ed. Krackowsky-Vasilev, p. 15 = Patrol. Orient., xxiv. Paris 1932, p. 353 wrongly makes the Emperor John Tzimiscē himself conduct the campaign; cf. against this: D. N. Anastasiōv, in Rev. Zeltsch., xxx. 1929-1930, p. 403 sqq.).

Halab in 1171 took the town without opposition and dealt rigorously with the Nestorian Christians there. All their new buildings were destroyed the treasuries plundered and about 1,000 volumes of their writings burned (Mich. Syr., iii. 359 sq.). After his death, his nephew Saif al-Din of al-Mawsil seized the town (Mich. Syr., iii. 360). It surrendered to Salih al-Din in 1182 (Barbareus, Chron. Syr., p. 360). In the following year the latter gave to ʻImād al-Din Sinḍjār, Nasibin and other towns in exchange for Halab (Barbareus, p. 362) and he ruled there until his death in 594 (1198) (Barbareus, p. 398, 402). In the region of Našibin there was fierce fighting in 582 (1186–1187) between Kurds and Turkomans (Barbareus, p. 370). ʻImād al-Din was succeeded in 1198 by his son Kutb al-Din but Nūr al-Din Arsāfnāš h of Mawsil immediately took the town from him. But when a severe epidemic wrought great havoc in his army, he abandoned it and Kutb al-Din returned thither (Barbareus, p. 402). Nūr al-Din in 600 (1203–1204) took part in the siege of Našibin (Barbareus, p. 416 sq.). Malik al-ʻAlī al-Din took the town in 606 (1210–1211) from Kutb al-Din (Barbareus, p. 424). After his death (615 = 1218–1219) it passed to Malik al-ʻAsfahr of Urfa (Barbareus, p. 424, 439).

The Arab geographers placed Našibin in the fourth clime, the southern boundary of which ran about 12 farsakh south of the town on the direction of Šindžar (al-Masḍūdī, Kitāb al-Tamkhī, p. 32 sq., 35, 44). According to Yaḥūṭ, it lay on the upper course of the Hūrūs in the midst of numerous gardens. Ibn Hawšal, in 53 (966–967), visited the town which lay at the foot of Djabal Bašā, speaks of the pleasant life in it, apart from the dangerous scorpios found there. Al-Makdīsī describes the fine houses and baths, the market, the Friday mosque and the citadel. Ibn Djabair also visited it in 580 (1184–1185) and mentions its gardens, the bridge over the Hūrūs inside the town, the hospital (mārzīthān), several schools and other places of interest. In the vilāt (xvth) century it was already for the most part in ruins; but the Friday mosque was still in existence and the gardens around it from which rose-water was exported (Ibn Baṭṭūta). Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi, according to the words of the author, the circumference of 6,500 paces, praises its fruits and wine but laments the unhealthy moistness of the climate, the large number of scorpios and the plague of midges.

Hūlūgī in 657 (1259) occupied the city, Našibin and Harān (Weil, Gesch, der Chaliften, iv. 10). The Mongol Khan Mangū Timūr (q.v.) died, poisoned in Džarāt b. ʻOmar, on his way from there to Našibin on the 16th of Māḥarram 631 (April 26, 1282; Barbareus, p. 546 sq.). When Timūr Khan in 1395 was on his way to Ṭūr ʻAbdin, the people of Našibin and Maʻarrā hid in caves from the Mongols but were suffocated in them with smoke (App. to Barbareus, Chronographic, ed. Wehde, p. 57; p.xxiv.). The Ḥasanāyīs Kūnids in 1402 pillaged Našibin and the country around (ibid., p. xxiv.).

The town passed into the hands of the Ottomans in 1515 (v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii., Pest 1828, p. 449 sq.). It became the capital of a sandjaq in the pashalik of ʻĀmid (Hādżīḗ Khālīf, Džahan-nūmā, Stambul 1732, p. 438). Later it was placed in the sandjaq of Mardin in the pashalik of Baghdād (St. Martin, Mémories sur l'Arménie, i., Paris 1818, p. 161 sq.). To its position on the southern border of the highlands and on the road from al-Mawsil to Syria it owes its great strategic and commercial importance. The building of the Baghdād railway has brought it new life; it is said now to have about 50,000 inhabitants.

Bibliography: T. Grahame Bailey, History of the Ottoman Empire, 1922; Ram Babu Saksena, History of the Muhammadan Dominions, 1927; Sir G. S. Tiddy, Histoire de la littérature hindoue et hindoustanie, 1870 (E. G. Leesón)

AL-NAŠĪR LI-DIN ALLĀH, ABRU ʻL-ʿABBĀS AHMAD B. AL-MAṬĀṢĪ B. AL-ΜΑṬṢĪ, the 34th Abāsīd caliph (575–622 = 1180–1225), was
the son of a Turkish slave-girl named Zumurrud. He was the only caliph of the later period of the caliphate who was able to pursue a consistent policy. This was entirely directed towards restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. The caliph was assisted by the fact that the Seljuk empire which had previously held the secular power had begun to collapse. In the confusion which brought about its final downfall, the caliph did all he could to hasten its end and did not hesitate to support the Khwarizmshah Takshak as the strongest rival of the dying Seljuk empire in his fight against the last Seljuk Sultan Tughrul II. This struggle finally ended in the defeat of the Seljuk's at Kutay where Tughrul died fighting (Rabi’I, 590 = March 1194).

As a result of the political diversities of the two allies a quarrel broke out between the caliph and the Khwarizmshah as soon as negotiations for the partition of the Seljuk territory were begun. The caliph wished to seize the opportunity to extend his personal estates by incorporating the Persian provinces while the Khwarizmshah in the exercise of the temporal power wished to succeed to the whole inheritance of the Seljuk's. While Takshak was involved in war in the east, Ibn al-Kasab, the caliph's vizier, was able to conquer Khuzistan and other Persian provinces (beg. of 591 = 1195). His troops were however completely routed by Takshak on his return (Shaban 592 = July 1196) so that the caliph had to abandon his conquests. Only Khuzistan was left to him.

In the years following, the caliph had a hand in the intrigues of local rulers in Persian Iran, usually against the Khwarizmshah (from 596 = 1200 'Ala al-Din Muhammad). The disputes with the latter culminated in 613 (1216) when the caliph had a supporter of the Khwarizmshah, Oghalhish, vizier of the governor of Persian Iran, assassinated by Isma'ili envoys. The Khwarizmshah now began to prepare for the decisive struggle against the caliph; he prepared for war and in 614 (1217) invaded Persian Iran. Here, in order to destroy the caliph as a political force also, he had his 'ulama' in a fitna declare the caliph al-Nasir unjust for the caliphate and appointed an 'Ali named 'Ali al-Mulk from Tirmidh as imam. The caliph in vain attempted through negotiations to persuade the Khwarizmshah to retreat. Instead he advanced on Baghda from Hamadhan. But he was unable to deal his blow at the caliph owing to an unexpected circumstance; for in consequence of the early coming of a severe winter, which destroyed his army, the Khwarizmshah was forced to abandon his march and return home with the intention of advancing on Baghda next year.

In order to meet the danger threatening him, the caliph however in the meanwhile began negotiations with the Mongol Qingiz Khan in order to persuade him to attack the Khwarizmshah. In 616 (1219) the latter was attacked and decisively defeated by Qingiz Khan before he could resume his intended campaign against Baghda. He died while fleeing from the Mongols on an island in the Caspian Sea (617 = 1220).

The caliph had thus achieved his immediate aim and rid himself of his most dangerous opponent for the moment. But the Mongols were approaching perilously near him, especially after the conquest of Maragha (618 = 1221) had established them in Ḍhārbārī. At first however, there were only minor complications with the Mongols.

On the other hand, after the temporary withdrawal of the Mongols, the young Khwarizmshah Djalal al-Din Mangubarti, Muḥammad's son and successor, attacked al-Nasir and took Khuzistan from him.

As al-Nasir had concentrated his whole attention on the east where he was fighting to strengthen and increase his private domains, he took no interest in the west where Saladin was waging his great struggle with the Crusaders and gave Saladin very insufficient help in spite of several appeals from him.

Al-Nasir's policy seems also to have aimed at the restoration of the internal unity of Islam in addition to restoring the temporal power of the caliphate. He himself had a leaning to the Shi'a of the Imamite sect (Twelver-Shi'a) and invited Alids to his court; he seems to have wished to reconcile in person the claims of 'Abbasids and 'Alids. He also established an agreement with the extreme Isma'ili sect of the Assassins. In 608 (1211-1212) the Grand Master of the Assassins, Husain III, abandoned his claims to the imamate and paid homage to the 'Abbasid caliph.

Al-Nasir's efforts to centralise round his person the order of chivalry known as the futuwa in a reorganised form are also perhaps connected with his political plans; in 578 (1182-1183) he had himself been admitted by the Shaikh 'Abd al-Lajabbar b. 'Seeb into the futuwa order. He then only allowed those of the organisators of the order to remain in existence which acknowledged his personal control. By admission into the order he was then able to establish connections with the princes of the Muslim world, who now regarded him as the head of their order (the chronicles tell us of this in the year 607 = 1210). Ibn al-Furat gives us a description of the robing of a prince as an external sign of his admission into the order in the presence of the caliph's envoy (the story is reproduced in V. Hammer, in J. A. 3rd ser., vi, 1855, p. 285 sq.). The strict regulations introduced by the caliph into the futuwa order are well illustrated in the blazon of 9th Safar 604 (Sept. 4, 1207), published by P. Kahle in the Oppenheim-Festchrift, which the caliph had issued on the occasion of the murder of a member of the order.

Al-Nasir died on the last night of Ramadān 622 (Oct. 6, 1225) at the age of about 70. Ibn al-Athir describes him as tyrannical towards his subjects and inconsistent in his measures; his fondness for the futuwa and its sporting activities (cross-bow shooting, training carrier pigeons) seems to him a strange caprice. Ibn al-Tikjaši judges him more favourably; he describes him as unceasingly engaged in the duties of a ruler and lays stress on his rich endowments, although he also mentions his fondness for money. When a medieval Muslim ruler is reproached with covetousness it usually only means that he was endeavouring to carry through a sound and cautious financial policy. Al-Nasir is further reproached with having allied himself with the Mongols and thus being the cause of the great disaster which the Mongol hordes later inflicted on the lands of Islam.

Among buildings known from inscriptions to have been built by al-Nasir are the Talisman Gate in Baghda (618 = 1221-1222; blown up in March 1917 on the retreat of the Turks from Baghda) and
the sanctuary of the Mahdi (Chaibat al-Mahdi) in Sāmarrā. Both are interesting and suggestive for his political aims, the latter as a distinctly Shi'a sanctuary for his Shi’a tendencies and the Tallman Gate for the remarkable pictorial representation once visible upon it; the caliph seated between two dragons, the jaws of which he is tearing apart and grasping their tongues. According to M. van Berchem's brilliant interpretation, we have here the caliph represented as victorious over two enemies, who had disputed his spiritual power: the Grand Master of the Assassins Ḥasan III as for a time the representative of the most radical opposition to the orthodox 'Abbasid Caliphat, who had finally paid homage to the caliph on 608 and died in 618; the other, the Khwarizmshāh who had dared in 614 to set up an anti-caliph but was overcome in 617 and died a fugitive. In this connection the inscription is also interesting; in it the caliph uses the expression al-dawr al-hāliyya, which is a name the Assassins gave themselves (cf. M. van Berchem in J.A. ser. 9, vol. ix., 1897, p. 456 and 462), for his own caliphate, his conquest of the world. Bibliography: The chronicles of Ibn al-

AL-NĀṢIR IBN ALENNAS (the last name is also written 'Ālān, 'Āmnās and even Chilin by Ibn Diahārī), fifth ruler of the Ḥammādīd dynasty, succeeded his cousin Bulükkin b. Muhammad in 454 (1062). His reign marks the apogee of the little Berber kingdom founded by Ḥammād [q.v.]. The ephemeral rise of the Ḥammādīds was the immediate result of the downfall of their relations and neighbours, the Zirids of Irikiyya, the first victims of the Hīlāl invasion. On his accession, al-Nāṣir, who lived in the Kal'at Banū Hammād, was already ruler of a little kingdom, the chief towns of which were Ashīr [q.v.], Miliana, Algiers, Hamza (Buira), Naga and Constantine. Shortly afterwards, he regained Biskra whose governor had rebelled against Bulükkin; but his chief hope of extending his territory lay in the decline of the kingdom of Kairawan.

The abandonment of the old capital by the Zirid al-Mu'izz and his flight to al-Mahdiya (1057) had left Irkiyya a prey to anarchy. The country districts were in the hands of the Arabs and the towns had chosen their own rulers; on all sides governors were in rebellion; leaders of the tribes imposed their authority on the threatened citizens; some towns turned to the Ḥammādīds who were able to protect them. The people of Kastiliya [q.v.] for example sent a deputation to al-Nāṣir to convey him their homage; the people of Tunis did the same. At their request the Ḥammādīid sent them as governor 'Abd al-Ḥaʃık of the Ṣanḥādja family of the Banū Khurāsan. The latter worked wonders; he negotiated agreements with the marauding Arabs which secured the safety of the city. Later, after casting off Ḥammādīid suzerainty, he made Tunis the capital of a kingdom.

If the arrival of the invading nomads had meant an immediate accession of strength to al-Nāṣir and an increase of population and economic activity to his capital, they were not without danger as neighbours. The Arabs soon involved him in a dangerous adventure. In 457 (1064) the Athbāʤī, one of their tribes, asked him to help them against their enemies, their brethren the Riyāḥī, who had joined the Zirid ruler Tamīm [q.v.]. Al-Nāṣir agreed, seeing an opportunity to invade and perhaps annex Irikiyya. He put himself at the head of a large army which included Arabs, Ṣanḥādja, and even Zenātā, led by the king of Fās, al-Mu'izz b. 'Atiyā. The Riyāḥī in their turn received subsidies and arms from al-Mahdiya. The armies met at Sība, near the ancient Sufes. From the first the Zenātā of Fās, won over by the enemy, gave way, which resulted in the rout of al-Nāṣir. With great difficulty he reached Constantine with 200 men, then the Kal'a the outskirts of which were systematically sacked by the Arabs.

After this disaster al-Nāṣir tried to make terms with the princes of al-Mahdiya, but the negotiations failed, perhaps through the fault of the ambassador, and al-Nāṣir incited again by the Athbāʤī, resumed hostilities against the unfortunate Zirid kingdom.

He entered Laribus and Kairawān (460 = 1067) but these successes led to nothing; he had to abandon them again as he could not hold his conquests. These adventures, into which he was dragged by the Arabs and which brought him no lasting advantage, lasted for some ten years. In 470 (1077) al-Nāṣir made peace with the Zirid Tamīm and gave him his daughter in marriage.

The Arab scourge which had ruined the kingdom of Irikiyya began now to threaten seriously the Ḥammādīd kingdom. The Zenātā, hereditary enemies of the Ṣanḥādja lords of the Kal'a, found among the immigrant nomads allies always ready to resume the conflict. In 468 (1075), the Zenātā chief Ibn Khurāsan, supported by the Arab Banū 'Adī of Tripolitania seized Msiḥa and Ashīr. Al-Nāṣir succeeded in driving him back to the desert where, drawing into him a trap, he had him murdered. He sent his son al-Mansūr against the Zenātā Banū Tadjīn, who had joined the Banū 'Adī and were laying waste the country districts of the Central Maghrib. The rebels were caught and tortured.

The Athbāʤī Arabs themselves, of whom al-Nāṣir had hoped to make valuable auxiliaries, proved most undesirable neighbours. Although he seems to have put down — not without cruelty — the majority of the revolts, life in his ancestral capital became more and more difficult from year to year. This decided him to select another. Occupying the lands of the Bilāḍī Berbers, he founded there, on the site of the ancient port of Saldae, a town which was first called al-Nāṣiriyah and later became known as Bougie. There he built the splendid Palace of the Pearl (Kaşr al-Luṭlū). "Having peopled his new capital he expelled the inhabitants from the kharādž and in 461 (1068) he settled there himself" (Ibn Khaldūn). The exodus of the Ḥammādīd royal family to the coast was caused by the same event as had led the Zirids of Kairawān to move to al-Mahdiya: the settlement of the nomad Arabs in Barbary and the insecurity which resulted in the interior. This exodus was only completed under al-Nāṣir's successor, his son al-
**AL-NASIR**

The latter assumed power at his father's death in 481 (1088).


**AL-NASIR, the name of two Aiyūbīds.**

I. AL-MALIK AL-NASIR SALAH AL-DIN DAWūD b. AL-MALIK AL-MU'AZZAM, born in Dîjmađâdî 603 (Dec. 1205) in Damascus. After the death of his father at the end of Dhul-Ka'ādî 624 (Nov. 1227) Dâwūd succeeded him on the throne of Damascus and the Mamūlīk *iz al-Asrâb al-Malik* acted as regent. Dâwūd's uncle's however, covetous of territory, did not leave him long in peace. Al-Malik al-Kâmil [q.v.] first of all claimed the fortress of al-Shawbaq [q.v.] and when it was refused him he occupied Jerusalem, Nâbulus and other places (625 = 1228).

In this perilous position, Dâwūd appealed to another uncle al-Malik al-Asrâf, who administered the Aiyūbīd possessions in Mesopotamia. The latter came to Damascus but then took al-Kâmil's side and arranged with him a formal division of the whole kingdom. By the arrangement between the two brothers al-Asrâf was to receive Damascus and Dâwūd Harrân, al-Râka and Hims, while al-Kâmil took southern Syria with Palestine, and Hamât was left to Dâwūd's brother al-Malik al-Muṣaffâr. But when Dâwūd would not consent to this, al-Asrâf began to besiege Damascus. After al-Kâmil had concluded peace with the Emperor Frederick II he joined al-Asrâf and after a three months' siege, forced his nephew to yield (Sha'bân 626 = June-July 1229) whenupon al-Asrâf was recognised as lord of Damascus under al-Kâmil's suzerainty while Dâwūd had to be content with al-Kâmil [q.v.], al-Shawbaq and several other places.

In spite of this unfriendly treatment, Dâwūd remained loyal to al-Kâmil when the other Aiyūbīds [q.v.] combined against him, and entered his service in Egypt. Soon after al-Kâmil accompanied by Dâwūd had taken Damascus, he died in Raqqa 635 (March 1238) and Dâwūd whom al-Kâmil had appointed governor of Damascus had to return to al-Kâmil. In Egypt al-Kâmil's son al-Malik al-'Adîl was recognised as his successor and appointed his cousin al-Malik al-Dâwūd Yâsus governor of Damascus. When Dâwūd tried to assert his claims to Damascus he was defeated at Nâbulus. In the following year Yâsus, who did not feel secure against Sulṭân al-'Adîl, exchanged Damascus with his cousin al-Malik al-Sulṭân Aiyūb for Sindjar, al-Râka and 'Ana. This pleased neither al-Adîl nor Dâwūd so they joined forces for an attack on Aiyūb. The events that followed have already been fully related in the article AL-MALIK AL-SULṬÂN NAṢĪR AL-DĪN AYYŪB so that the reader may be referred to it. After Dâwūd had lost all his possessions except al-Kâmil he appointed his youngest son al-Malik al-Muṣṭaṣsam 'Issa as his deputy and died in Halab (647 = 1249-1250) where he was kindly received by al-Malik al-Nasir Yaṣuf (see below). His private fortune in the form of valuable jewels, valued at least 100,000 dinârs, he entrusted to the care of the caliph al-Mustaṣsim, who acknowledged the receipt of them but never could bring himself to restore the treasure entrusted him. Soon afterwards Dâwūd's two older sons, who had felt themselves neglected, turned to Sulṭân al-Malik al-Sulṭân Aiyūb and offered him al-Kerak in return for fiefs in Egypt which offer the latter gladly accepted. Alleging unfavourable reports about Dâwūd, al-Malik al-Nasir Yaṣuf had brought him to Hims in the beginning of Sha'bân 648 (Oct. 1250) and put under arrest. In 651 (1253-1254) he was released on the intercession of the caliph on condition that he was not to stay in any lands under the rule of al-Malik al-Nasir Yaṣuf. He therefore wanted to go to Bagdad but was not admitted into the city. He then lived for a time very wretchedly in the region of 'Ana and al-Hadîtâa, and in the end he found a place of refuge in al-Anbâr. His appeals to the caliph were not answered; finally however, the caliph obtained him permission to settle in Damascus. After several unsuccessful efforts to get back his property in Bagdad which had been confiscated, he was in the desert when he was taken prisoner by al-Malik al-Muqitī, then lord of al-Kerak and al-Shawbaq and brought to al-Shawbaq. As the caliph thought he could be of use to him in the impending fight with the Mongols, he sent an envoy to al-Shawbaq to fetch him; the envoy was bringing him back to Damascus when he heard of Hûlîgân's capture of Bagdad; when he heard of his capture, al-Kâmil left Dâwūd who went to al-Bâwâdî, a village near Damascus. Here he died of the plague on 27th Dîjmađâdî 1, 657 (May 12, 1259). Abu l-Fida' speaks highly of Dâwūd's eloquence and poetical gifts.


II. AL-MALIK AL-NASIR SALAH AL-DIN AL-MU'AZZAM, born in Halab on 19th Ramâdân 627 (Aug. 1, 1230). His father was al-Malik al-'Azzî, lord of Halab, his mother Fatîma, daughter of Sulṭân al-Kâmil. On 4th Rabî I (Nov. 5, 1236) Yaṣuf succeeded his father under the guardianship of his paternal grandmother Dâ'îfâ Khâtûn bint-al-Malik al-'Adîl [see HALAB]. After her death in Dîjmađâdî 1 640 (Nov. 1242) Yaṣuf himself assumed the reins of government and soon extended his power over most of Syria. When Aiyūb the Sulṭân of Egypt with the help of the Khwārizmians had conquered Palestine and also Damascus Yaṣuf became ultimately involved in the conflict. The Khwārizmians were dissatisfied with Aiyūb, went over to al-Malik al-Sulṭân Ismâîîl, lord of Ba'albek and Bosrâ, and laid siege to Damascus on his behalf. The lords of Hims and Halab then appeared on the scene. The Khwārizmians were completely
routed (644 = 1246) and Isma'il had to flee to Ḥalab and take refuge with Yūsuf [see AL-MALIK AL-S-hash NāṣIR AL-DIN AYYUB]. In 646 (1246—
1249) the latter's general Shams al-Din Lu'lu' al-Arman attacked Ḥims [q.v.] and after a two months' siege forced the emir al-Malik al-Asahrāf to capitulate and cede the town to Yūsuf in return for Tell Bāghir [q.v.]. Two years later, the latter conquered Naṣībin, Dārā and Ḋarākisā' from the Atābeq of al-Mawṣil Bād al-Din Lu'lu' [see LU'LU'].
After the assassination of Tūrisānihāh [see AYYUBIDS] in 648 (1250), Yūsuf was made sultan by the Damascus emirs and Rabi' II (July 1250) he entered Damascus. To avenge the murder of Tūrisānihāh he prepared for war against Egypt and proposed an alliance with Louis IX of France; but these negotiations came to nothing. In Rādjab of this year (Oct. 1250) the Syrians were defeated by the Egyptian emir Fāris al-Din Aṯkāi near Ghazza. Yūsuf did not lose courage however but prepared for a new attack on Egypt. In the vicinity of al-Abbāsā [q.v.] he met the Egyptian army (Dhu 'l-Ka'da 648 = beg. of Feb. 1251); victory was within Yūsuf's grasp when the treachery of his Turkish mamlūkš turned the scale in favour of Egypt. Yūsuf had to take flight, several Syrian princes were taken prisoners and Aṯkāi invaded Syria where he occupied Nābulus and several other important towns until a strong Syrian force finally checked his further advance. After long negotiations, peace was finally concluded at the beginning of the year 651 (1253) by which Yūsuf had to give up any claims on Egypt, but a year or two later war was nearly broke out again. On the advance of the Mongols under Tulagu [q.v.], Yūsuf endeavoured to avert the danger by showing a humble frame of mind and sent envoys with presents to the Mongol camp; but when he began to calculate on getting support from other Muslim rulers and answered a threatening message from Tulagu in a challenging fashion, the latter laid siege to Ḥalab. Yūsuf sees at first to have thought of advancing against him to raise the siege. He encamped in front of Damascus and sent messengers with appeals for help in all directions but as neither Syrians nor Egyptians answered him and Ḥalab fell into the hands of the Mongols (658 = 1260), there was nothing left for him but to abandon Damascus and go south. Ḥamāt, Ba'labek and Damascus were taken and Yūsuf had finally to surrender to Tulagu. The latter had him executed, probably after the defeat of the Mongols at Hīmā towards the end of the year 659 (1261; see also the article ḤALAB). According to Abu 'l-Fida', Yūsuf was distinguished for his scholarship and poetical gifts; he was further kindly and good natured and fond of good living and so lacked the strength to maintain order in his kingdom.


K. V. Zettersten)

AL-NĀŠIR, the name of two Mamlūk sultāns.
1. AL-MALIK AL-NĀŠIR NĀṢIR AL-DIN MUḤAM-

SAD, the ninth sultan of the Bahri Mamluks, son of Sultan Kahlān [q.v.] and a Mongol princess named Aslan (Ašān) Khātān. Born in the middle of Muḥarram 684 (Dec. 1285), he received homage as sultan after the assassination of his brother al-
Malik al-Asahrāf Khaṭīl in Muḥarram 693 (Dec. 1293). After the two emirs Za'in al-Dīn Kethbogha al-Manṣūrī and 'Alam al-Dīn Sandjar al-Shuḍjātī had agreed that the former should hold the office of administrator of the government (niyābat al-
ṣalāfat) and the latter the viceroyate, these appointments were confirmed by the nine-year-old sultan, but the agreement between the two high officials was not long maintained. When al-Shuḍjātī tried to get rid of his rival, he was unsuccessful and was himself killed. In order to get all the power into his own hands, Kethbogha pardoned the two murderers of Sultan Khālīl, who naturally felt it necessary to overthrow Nāṣir in order to escape his vengeance, and when al-Khālīl's old Mamlūkš mutinied out of indignation, they were brought to terms by the loyal troops. Kethbogha then succeeded without much difficulty in persuading the emirs that the political situation required a man and not a child on the throne, whereupon al-Nāṣir was deposed and Kethbogha proclaimed sultan with the title al-Malik al-'Adil (Muḥarram 694 = Dec. 1294). Two years later (Muḥarram 696 = Nov. 1296), Kethbogha shared the fate of his predecessor. He was succeeded by one of al-
Khālīl's murderers, al-Malik al-Manṣūr Ḥūsān al-
Dīn Lāḏīn al-Manṣūrī who was murdered in Rabi' II 698 (Jan. 1299). The emirs in authority then agreed to recall the 14 year old Nāṣir who was in Kerak and in Dāmādā I (Feb. 1299) he entered the capital in order to receive for the second time the diploma of sultan from the caliph and the oath of fealty from the emirs. The actual rulers were now the administrator of the kingdom Salār al-Manṣūrī and the commander-in-chief of the troops, Kukan al-Dīn Bahīr Bahār al-Dījāshnagī. The most important event in the period was the war with the hereditary enemy, the Mongols. In Rabi' I, 699 (Dec. 1299) the Ilkhan Ghāzān [q.v.] crossed the Euphrates and was soon before Ḥalab. In the same month Nāṣir who had left Cairo in Dhu 'l-Hijja 698 (Sept. 1299), because the Egyptians had long been afraid of a Mongol invasion, reached Damascus. The sultan encountered the much superior enemy near Ḥims, his tried emirs were defeated and the army returned to Egypt in great disorder while Ḥims fell into the hands of the Mongols. Damascus met the same fate, except the citadel which was bravely defended by its Egyptian commander Ardajwāshī. In the meanwhile the Egyptians were preparing with desperate energy to resume the struggle and in Rādjab 699 (March–April 1300) a new army left Cairo. But when they arrived in the same area they found they could not take the citadel of Damascus; they withdrew before it came to a battle and the Egyptians reoccupied Damascus, Ḥalab and the whole of Syria. After an unsuccessful campaign against northern Syria in Rabi' II 700 (Jan. 1301) which only resulted in the pillaging of the region visited by the Mongols, Ghāzān sent an embassy to open up peace negotiations; but as these overtures came to nothing, the decision was left to arms for the third time. In Shabān 702 (April 1303) the Mongol general Kūṭūshāh (Kuṭūlghūshā) crossed the Euphrates and at the same time a portion of the Egyptian army under the command
of Baibars al-Dībānī entered Damascus. On 27th Ramaḍān (April 20), a battle was fought on the plain of Mardj al-Suffar after the rest of the Egyptian troops under Sulṭān al-Nāṣir and the caliph al-Mustaʿfī had joined Baibars. Nightfall put a stop to the desperate fighting but it was renewed next day and ended with the total defeat of the Mongols; 10,000 prisoners are said to have fallen into the hands of the victors. Ghazān died soon afterwards and his successor Ulūjātī did not dare to measure his strength with his formidable opponent. For the time being the reign was a fairly peaceful one apart from a few minor military enterprises of slight importance. At the beginning of the year 702 (1302), an expedition was sent against the Templars who had established themselves in the island of Arwād on the Syrian coast and harassed the mainland opposite [see Ṭartūs]. The district of Sīs [q.v.] was also invaded; its ruler had made common cause with the Ilkhan and did not send Egypt the usual tribute promptly. The Egyptian authorities were on the whole on good terms with foreign powers; on the other hand, home affairs gave cause for anxiety. After the defeat at Hims, the Beduins in Upper Egypt rebelled against the authorities and levied taxes on their own account. A large army was therefore equipped to punish the rebels. At the same time, the governor of Kūs advanced from the south and cut off their access to the southern desert. The rebellion was put down with ruthless vigour, the men massacred without mercy, the women and children taken prisoners and property carried off. Many took refuge in caves difficult of access but they were suffocated with smoke in them. The large Christian and Jewish elements in the population had also to suffer a great deal. Several of the Umayyads, Abbāsīd and Fāṭimid caliphs had already issued special regulations affecting non-Muslims and the Abbāsīd al-Mutawakkil had gone furthest in this direction; in general however, such measures were only enforced for a short period and were therefore usually repeated after a time; at least this is true of Egypt. In al-Nāṣir's reign many Christians were holding honoured positions as officials when suddenly from some insignificant cause the secret jealousy of the Muslims flared up and in 701 (1300–1301) an edict was issued which ordered among other things that in future Christians should wear blue and Jews yellow turbans in order to be at once distinguishable from the true believers; nor were they to be allowed to take prisoners or ride horses. Very soon a prohibition was issued against the appointment of Christians and Jews to the offices of the sultān or of the emirs. The immediate consequence of this measure was that several churches were destroyed by the fanatical mob and the others remained closed until the authorities allowed them to be reopened at the demand of the Byzantine emperor and other Christian rulers. On the 23rd Dhu'l-Ḥijja 703 (Aug. 8, 1303) the whole of Egypt was affected by a terrible earthquake in which not only many private houses but also palaces and mosques were destroyed and large numbers of people perished. All traces of the catastrophe were however obliterated with the greatest energy and the emirs and well-to-do citizens vied with one another in spending lavishly to restore the shattered buildings. After an unsuccessful attempt to escape from the tutelage of the two emirs Sallār and Baibars, both of whom aimed at the sole power and regarded each other with suspicion, the sultān, who was prevented from exerting any influence in the government, left the capital on the 24th Ramaḍān 708 (March 7, 1309) under the pretext that he wished to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca but went instead to al-Kerāk. On reaching the citadel, he told the emirs who accompanied him that he was abandoning the pilgrimage and abdicating in order to live in peace in al-Kerāk. Baibars was proclaimed his successor under the title of Ḥusayn al-Mu'azzam. On the 23rd Dhu'l-Ḥijja 709 (April 5, 1309) while Sallār remained in office as administrator Baibars however enjoyed no real popularity; an oppressive rise in prices made him hated among the people who without justice blamed him for the difficult times. Sallār was intriguing secretly and al-Nāṣir was vigorously adding to the number of his followers in Syria. When Baibars heard that al-Nāṣir had entered Damascus and the Syrian emirs had gone over to him, there was nothing left for him but to abdicate and appeal for mercy to his rival. The latter pardoned him and even offered him the lordship of Siyyawm [q.v.]. But after he had made his entry into Cairo al-Nāṣir had Baibars strangled (beg. of Shawwāl 709 = March 1310). Very soon afterwards, Sallār was also disposed of; he died of starvation in prison. The Mongols not long after this resumed hostilities. Two emirs who did not feel safe with the sultān went to the Ilkhan Ulūjātī and urged him to invade Syria. The Mongol expedition did not however go beyond the siege of the town of al-Rahba (Ramaḍān 712 = Jan. 1313). When the Mongols saw that their efforts were unavailing, they abandoned their plan of campaign and retired. At the beginning of the year 715 (1315) a campaign was undertaken against Malāṭiya, on the course of which see the article MALĀṬYA. At the same time, the lord of Sīs had to cede several strongholds and increase his annual tribute. Little Armenia was several times invaded by the Mamlikūs who wrought great havoc there. In Mecca the sons of the Shahīr Abū Numayyār [q.v.] were engaged in a prolonged struggle for supremacy; as the Mamlikū sultāns claimed to exercise a kind of suzerainty over the two holy cities, al-Nāṣir intervened without however playing any very effective part. His authority was recognised in Madīna in 717 (1317) and when he intervened in the domestic troubles of the Yaman and sent troops thither to support al-Muḍjāhid, one of the pretenders to the South Arabian throne, he was assisted by the Maccans (725 = 1325). In the meanwhile, the situation had improved in favour of al-Muḍjāhid so that the troops sent to his help by al-Nāṣir had to return amid great hardships after achieving nothing. Al-Nāṣir also tried to extend his power into Nubia. For this purpose he sent in 716 (1316–1317) a Nubian prince named Abū ʿAllāh, who had been converted to Islam and brought up in Egypt, with an army to put him on the throne. He succeeded in driving out the legitimate heir but the latter was able after a time to return and expel the intruder Abū ʿAllāh whose tyrannical rule had made him generally hated. Al-Nāṣir was more successful in N.W. Africa; in 711–717 (1311–1317) he was mentioned as suḥān in the khūṭba in the pulpits of Tunis, whose ruler, the Ḥafṣīd Abū Zakariyāʾ Yāḥyā, owed his throne to him. In 723 (1325) he finally concluded peace with the Ilkhan.
Abû Saʿīd. After the latter's death in Rabî’ II 736 (Nov. 1335), Hasan Buzurg pledged himself to recognise al-Nâṣir’s suzerainty if the latter would support him with an armed force. Al-Nâṣir, who was a better diplomat than soldier and had not the sułṭān’s decisive element, did not fulfill the condition. Al-Nâṣir had diplomatic relations with most of the rest of the known world and at his court appeared embassies not only from the Golden Horde, the Ilkhan, the Rastûlids of Yaman, the king of Abyssinia, and the Hafsids of Tunisia, but also from the Emperor of Byzantium, the Czar of Bulgaria, the Pope, the King of Aragon, Philip VI of France and Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluq of Dîhil. Al-Nâṣir died in Dhu ’l-Hijja 741 (June 1341); he left eight sons, who reigned one after the other but were themselves ruled by the emirs who were usually quarrelling among themselves. His immediate successor on the throne was al-Malik al-Manṣūr Saif al-Dīn Abû Bakr, who was deposed after only two months in favour of another son of the late sultan. The third reign the position of the Christians improved, and they frequently tried to alleviate their hard lot, although his efforts sometimes failed against the stubborn opposition of the Muslim clergy. The ordinances of the period when Sallār and Baibars were the real rulers were at not enforced to the full extent and we even find that the sultan put Christians, i.e. Copts, into the government offices, presumably simply because they were cleverer and more wily than the Muslims. Men of learning were treated with a benevolent interest, and the Ayyūbid Abû ’l-Fida’ [q.v.], celebrated as a historian and geographer, was the sultan’s trusted friend "perhaps the only one among all the nobles whom al-Nâṣir treated till his death with equal love and respect" (Weil, iv. 400). Al-Nâṣir further abolished many taxes which oppressed the people. He built canals and roads and carried out other public works for the improvement of means of transport. Architecture in particular flourished exceedingly; among the splendid buildings which date from his reign special mention may be made of al-Ḵaṣṣ al-Ablaṣ, al-Madrasa al-Nâṣiriya, and Dîjamī al-Nâṣir. These works however cost large sums of money and there were really no bounds to his extravagance. He was able through his long reign to maintain the Mamluk state in its place among the great powers, and he was also able to make his authority felt at home. In some respects he reminds one of Sultan Baibars I; like the latter he was little scrupulous in his choice of means. To undeniable gifts he added suspicion, covetousness and a sly, even cynical, nature, and it has been observed, undoubtedly with justice, that al-Nâṣir inspired more awe than respect.


II. AL-MALIK AL-NÂṢIR NÂṢIR AL-DIN HÅSAN, the nineteenth sultan of the Bahri Mamluks, son of the preceding. After the murder of his brother al-Malik al-Muzaffar Saif al-Din Hâdjî, Hasan who was then only eleven, or, according to others, thirteen years old was proclaimed sultan on the 14th Ramadân 748 (Dec. 13, 1347). Another son of the sultan al-Malik al-Nâṣir was Ahmad b. Kâliyb, called Hûsain, was also put forward but this plan fell through and he never attained the throne at a later date. More important than the elevation of this minor prince to the throne was of course the distribution of the high offices of state among the emirs; the emir Baibogha Arwas became administrator of the kingdom, his brother Mendjek al-Vâsûfi vizier, and the chief emir Shâhîd, Atâîg of al-Malik al-Ṣâliḥ, was put in charge of the Domains, Saîd al-Din Şâhî, [q.v.], afterwards sultan. Thanks to Baibogha’s adroit policy, al-Nâṣir was able to survive for four years, although, except for the last few months, he exercised no influence worth mentioning on affairs of state. His reign was filled with unedifying quarrels among the ruling emirs and systematic raiding by the Beduins. The most noteworthy event of the period was however the visitation of a great part of the world by the sultan al-Khâlid, which, known in Europe as the “Black Death”, spread from Asia through Egypt and over almost all Europe to England and Scandinavia. In Egypt the plague raged in the second half of the year 749 (1348–1349) being accompanied by a less fatal cattle-plague. In Syria it had appeared a few months earlier. Everywhere countless men fell victims to the angel of death and it is not surprising that the political and economic life of the state was crippled. The plague only died down in the following year. In Shawwâl 751 (Dec. 1350) the sultan succeeded in getting rid of the most powerful emirs and taking the reins of government into his own hands, but after a very few months he was deposed and his brother al-Malik al-Ṣâliḥ, al-Din Şâhî, the eighth of the sons of sultan Muhammad b. Kâliyb, was placed on the throne (Djumâdâ II 752 = Aug. 1351). He ruled only for three years; on the 2nd Shawwâl 755 (Oct. 20, 1354) he was dethroned and his brother al-Nâṣir restored. The real ruler at first was Shâhîb; but in 758 (1357) the latter was waylaid and so severely wounded that he died a few months later. His successor Şârgîmtîsh, who was suspected of having instigated the murder, did not allow the sultan the slightest independence, but was however arrested in Ramadân 759 (Aug.–Sept. 1358). In Muḥarram 761 (Nov.–Dec. 1359) the governor of Ḥalab undertook an expedition against Sis and established Muslim garrisons in Adana and Tarsus. About the same time, the troops who had been sent to Mecca by the Egyptian government to settle the endless family feuds were defeated by the Meccans and those taken prisoners sold in Yanbu‘ to slave traders. On hearing this the sultan is said to have sworn to exterminate the sharifs completely; but before he could carry out this plan, he was himself deposed. For, as he wished to preserve his independence, he quarrelled with the powerful emir Yalavgba, who had reproached him with his extravagance. The latter combined with several other dissatisfied emirs and prepared to fight. Al-Nâṣir was defeated and had to abandon his plan of escaping secretly to Syria. Instead he was taken prisoner and handed over to his enemy Yalavgba (Djumâdâ I 762 = March 1361). His ultimate fate is unknown; according to one, in
itself quite credible, story he was strangled and his body thrown into the Nile. His mosque (Qubūl Sūlān Ḥasan) built in Cairo in the years 1356–1363 is considered the most important example of Egyptian-Arabic architecture.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khaldu'n, al-'Ibar, v. 447 sqq.; Ibn Ḥsyn, Ta'rikh Misr. i. 190 sqq.; Well, Gesch. d. Chaliften, iv. 476 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i. 87 sq.

(K. V. Zettersten)

AL-NAṢIR, honorific of the fourth sōve-
regn of the Māhrībī dynasty of the Muʿminīns or Almohads [q.v.], 'Abd Allāh Muḥam-
mād b. Yaʿqūb al-Manṣūr b. Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Muʿmin. He was proclaimed on the death of his father on the 22nd Rabi' I 1595 (Jan. 25, 1199). The beginning of his reign was marked by the suppression of a rising led by an agitator in the mountainous country of the Qūmāra and a long stay at Fās during which he rebuilt a part of the wall of the Ṣaḥa of this city. Hearing of the rising of Yahiya b. Iṣaḥīk Ibn Qāhīriya in Ifriqiya, he sent for the eastern part of his empire and laid siege to the town of Mahdīya [v. 1], which was taken on the 27th Dżumādā I 1602 (Jan. 9, 1206). He returned to Morocco in the following year leaving as his deputy in Ifriqiya the shaikh 'Abd Muhammad 'Abd al-Wāhāb b. Abī Ḥassan al-
Hantīq, ancestor of the Ḥafsids [q.v.]. At the same time, he sent from Algiers against Majorca [cf. Balearic Islands], which had belonged to the Banū Qāhīriya since the period of the last Almavids, a fleet which took the island; this remained in Muslim hands till 627 (1230). In 607 (1211) al-Nasīr sent an expedition to Spain which ended in a disaster to the Muslim troops under Ibn al-
Tākh or Idris de Tolosa [q.v.] on 15th Saḥar 609 (July 16, 1212). This severe reverse deeply affected al-Nasīr who returned to Morocco and made his subjects take the oath of allegiance to his son Yūsuf. He then retired to his palace. He died in Riḥāl al-Ṣafī (Rabat, q.v.) on 10th Sha'ban 610 (Dec. 25, 1213). According to some chroniclers, he died a violent death on the same date in Marrākush, his capital, the victim of a conspiracy hatched by his viziers.

**Bibliography:** cf. the article Almohads.

(E. Levi-Provençal)

AL-NAṢIR. [See Uṭrūṣ.]

AL-NAṢIR LI-DIN ALLĀH, official name of se-
veral Zaidī imāms.

I. Among the Caspian Zaidīs this title was borne by 1. AL-NAṢIR AL-KABĪR AL-UṬRŪṢ [q.v.]; and his great-grandson 2. AL-NAṢIR AL-SĀDIR AL-ḤUSAYN b. AL-ḤASAN b. AL-ḤASAN [q.v.]. All the latter gained for himself a dominion beginning in Hāwsan, where he could find associations with the earlier period of Zaidī rule. He laid great emphasis on the religious character of Zaidism; he gave out of the state treasury funds to support people who learned the Kur'ān by heart. He was also a poet. After his death (476 = 1083), his tomb in Hāwsan was a much visited place of pilgrimage.

II. Among the Yaman imāms this title was borne by 1. AL-NAṢIR ĀḤMAD, son of al-Hādī Yahiya and his brother's daughter Fatima. In the heavy fighting which the father had to wage in order to found the new state, Āḥmad had been more distinguished than his elder full brother Muḥammad. Homage was, it is true, paid first to the latter as al-Murtaḍa shortly after the death of al-Hādī (280 = 911); but after 6 months he elucidated as he could make no progress against the Karmātīn 'Ali b. Faḍl, and suggested as his successor the vigorous Āḥmad, whom the Banū Ḥshawān especially favoured. As a poem composed when allegiance was sworn to him in Sa‘dah 301 (Aug.—Sept. 913) challenged him to do, he made war on the Karmātīns his first duty and played a considerable part at least in damming back the threatened Ismā'īlisation of the Yaman. He died at Sa‘dah, probably in 315 (927); his tomb is there. All succeeding bearers of the title except the next one: 2. ĀḤMAD EL-FATIḤ AL-NAṢIR AL-DAILAMI, so called from his first Caspian sphere of activity, were of his family although of different lines. In the Yaman, in contrast to his predecessors, he began operations south of Sa‘nā‘, fell in 447 (1055) fighting 'Ali al-Sulayhi there and was buried near Dhamār. The life of 3. AL-NAṢIR SULAYH AL-DIN was marked by internal strife which ultimately caused his death. In the first half of the viii th (xvth) century, several insurrections disputed the succession. About the middle of the century his father al-Mahdi 'Ali b. Muḥammad attained considerable influence, which was however much reduced in the period before his death at Dhamār in 774 (1372). Sulayh al-Din became sole imām and advanced as far as the Tihāmah against the Rastūls [q.v.]. But when in 793 (1391) he died at Sa‘nā‘, his death was concealed for two months on account of the insecurity and his body was concealed in the castle in a coffin covered with plaster. It was only when rumours of his death reached the Rādī al-Dawwāṛi in Sa‘dah that the latter arranged for his burial in Sa‘nā‘. The son 'Ali b. Sulayh al-Din could only obtain recognition as 'Imām of the Djihād and fell in 840 (1436), one of the many victims of the great plague. When in spite of opposition a Zaidī power was once more built up, it was destroyed by the young dynasty of the Tihrids from the Tihāmah (850–923 = 1446–
1517), especially by its second member 'Abd al-
Wahhāb b. Dāwūd, from 883 (1478), until at the end of the ixth (xvth) century Al-Hādī Ḥiz al-
Din b. al-Ḥasan again reestablished and extended their power. His son 4. AL-NAṢIR AL-ḤASAN b. ḤIZ AL-DIN (c. 900–929 = 1494–1523) who had primarily inherited from his father a love of learning, could only maintain a limited power in the north. He had to put up for a long time with an anti-imām al-Manṣūr Muḥammad b. 'Ali al-
Sarārdī in Sa‘nā‘. 5. AL-NAṢIR AL-ḤASAN b. 'Ali b. Dāwūd at the end of the ixth (xvth) century organised in the north the one of the centres of resistance to the Turks and had been penetrating into the country since 927 (1521) and 943 (1536) but was taken prisoner by them in 1004 (1596–
1597). Among the pretenders within the family of al-Manṣūr b. al-Ḵasim (d. 1029 = 1620), the liber-
rator from the first Turkish conquest, was 6. AL-
NAṢIR MUḤAMMAD b. IṢḥāq b. AL-MAḤDĪ HIJJĀM; he set up first in 1136 (1723–1724) in the north in the hills of Sufyān among the Banū Baktil, then in 1139 (1726–1727) away in the south at Zafār but had finally to submit to his cousin's son al-Manṣūr al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḵasim b. al-Ḥasan b. al-
Maḥdi Ḥijjām and died in 1167 (1753) as a private individual in Sa‘nā‘. In 1252 (1836) the dissatisfied troops who had been discharged by the very extra-
vagrant imām al-Manṣūr 'Ali b. al-Maḥdi 'Abd Allāh
summoned 7. AL-NAŞİR 'AbD Allāh b. ḤASAN to the imamate. He had inherited strong religious tendencies from his grandfather al-Mutawakkil ʿĀhad and from his great grandfather al-Mahdī ʿAbdās and insisted on the strict observance of the neglected shāriʿa. He had even to appoint teachers to instruct in the divine service. He was ambushed and murdered with 6 followers in 1256 (1820) while on a peaceful excursion to the Wādī Dirḥ northwest of ʿAṣār by people of the Banū ʿHamdān and was succeeded by the brother of his predecessor, al-Ḥādi Muḥammad b. al-Mahdī ʿAbd Allāh, who had been long kept in prison by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥasān. — As required of an imām, most of the above wrote a great deal; a number of works, chiefly of a legal nature, have survived, mainly by the earlier Yaman imāms.

Bibliography: Cf. the article ZAIDIS.

(R. STROTMANN)

NAŞİR ʿALI of Sarhind (d. in Dīhil on the 6th Ramaḍān 1108 = March 29, 1697), one of the best of the Pers. poets of India, who were by this time very numerous; their productions however are for the most part of little artistic value. Of his life we know only that he travelled a great deal but finally settled in Sarhind where he enjoyed the favour of the governor Saif Khan Badakhshāi and of the Amir al-ʿUmāri ʿDhu ’l-Fikr Saif Khan. His principal work is a version of the love story of Madhumalt and Manāhar in Persan verse, the original having been written in Hindi by Shālikh Dājamān. The same subject was taken after Naṣīr ʿAli by Mīr ʿAskar ʿAdil Khan Rāzī (d. 1666), one of the governors of Delhi under ʿAlamgir (1659–1707), who called his poem Mīhr-i-uljāh. Besides the poem Naṣīr ʿAli wrote a short maḥmūm, ʿSafi in character, and a description of Kaṣīmīt both of which still survive. His lyrical Divān was collected by his friends after his death; it consisted of the usual ghazals, some ʿSāfī-nāma’s and poems in praise of the Kalendar dervishes (lith. Lucknow 1244 and 1281 and Cawnpore 1892).

Bibliography: H. Ethé, G.I.Ph., ii. 252, 310; V. Ivanow, Curzon Collection Cat., no. 278–279 in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, no. 813–817. There are MSS. in most of the principal libraries.

(E. BERTHELS)

NAŞİR AL-DAWLA ABU MUḤAMMAD AL-ḤASAN b. ʿAbD Allāh, a prince of the Ḥamdānid dynasty [q.v.]. From the year 308 (920–921) he acted as lieutenant to his father, Abu ʿl-Haḍīd ʿAbd Allāh [q.v.], in the governorship of al-Mawsīl, and on the latter’s death in 317 (929) succeeded to the leadership of the Ḥamdānid family. Owing to the part played by Abu ʿl-Haḍīd in the second temporary deposition of the ʿAbbasid caliph al-ʿUkṭādīr [q.v.], the latter, on his restoration, attempted to put an end to the Ḥamdānids’ control of al-Mawsīl by appointing a governor unconnected with them. Nevertheless when this officer died during the same year, al-Ḥasan was confirmed in all his father’s holdings.

The Ḥamdānids profited by the rapid decline in the power of the ʿAbbasids that set in from this time to extend their rule; and though they remained tributary to the caliphs, by 332 (943–944) they had secured control of most of the Ḳaṣrā and of northern Syria. Al-Ḥasan also made two unsuccessful attempts, in 322 (934) and 326 (938), to add Ḳaṭābārādīn to his dominions. During the early part of this period of expansion al-Ḥasan was much occupied in the suppression of local rebellions. He was anxious also to remain in the caliph’s good graces, and for this reason declined to assist the general Muʿīn [q.v.] in his quarrel with al-ʿUkṭādīr, which ended in the latter’s death. In 323 (935), however, the caliph al-Rāḍī attempted to displace him in the governorship of al-Mawsīl in favour of his uncle Saʿīd. Al-Ḥasan thereupon had Saʿīd murdered; and though al-Rāḍī at first sought to impose his will by force of arms, he was in the end obliged to agree to al-Ḥasan’s restoration in prison by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥasan. — As required of an imām, most of the above wrote a great deal; a number of works, chiefly of a legal nature, have survived, mainly by the earlier Yaman imāms.

[The next part of the text is not visible in the image.]
dominions until he should be ready to absorb them. For he now took one of Nāşir's sons as a hostage for his obedience, and two years later led another expedition against al-Mawsil. This again came to nothing, however, since Mu'izz was obliged to make peace before attaining his object, owing to the outbreak of trouble in Persia, where his brother required his assistance. Nāşir now agreed to pay tribute for Diyar Rab'a, the Dijzara and Syria, and to have the names of the three Bayđīs pronounced in the jamā'a after that of the caliph throughout this territory.

It was not till 345 (956–957) that further trouble arose between the rival potentates. In that year Mu'izz was called away from Baghdad to deal with a revolt, whereupon Nāşir sent two of his sons to occupy the capital. Mu'izz, however, succeeded in overcoming the rebel; and on his return the Hamdānids decamped. Yet in spite of this provocation Mu'izz contented himself with exactly an indemnity and a renewal of Nāşir's contract to pay tribute, and it was only when Nāşir withheld the second year's payment that he took further steps against him. He then advanced into his territory, took al-Mawsil and Nišîbin, and finally sent a force to al-Raḩba. Nāşir, who had fled first to Māyâfīrīkūn and then to Aleppo, which was now held independently by Saif, attempted to make peace. But Mu'izz rejected his advances, and came to an agreement only when Saif offered to take his brother's place as tributary for al-Mawsil, Diyar Rab'a and al-Raḩba.

Five years later, in 353 (964), Nāşir opened negotiations to recover his position as tributary for these territories. But he included in his demands one, for the recognition of his son Abū Taghlib al-Ghadanfar, who succeeded, which Mu'izz was unwilling to grant. He again attacked the Hamdānids, occupying both al-Mawsil and Nišîbin. But they were more successful in withstand him on this occasion; and an agreement was arrived at whereby Abū Taghlib undertook the payment of tribute for his father's former holdings.

In 356 (967) both Mu'izz and Saif died. Almost the last action recorded of Nāşir is the advice he then gave his sons to refrain from attacking Mu'izz's son and successor Bahlīyūr till he should have exhausted the resources bequeathed to him. For on the death of Saif, to whom he had been much attached, Nāşir lost all interest in life, and also antagonized his family by his avarice that they resolved to take the control of affairs into their own hands. Abū Taghlib, who had in any case taken his place as tributary, and his mother, Nāşir's Kurdish wife Fāṭima bint Aḥmad, continued to gain possession of all his property and fortresses; and when Nāşir attempted to enlist the help of another son, they imprisoned him in the castle of al-Sālāma in the fortress of Arḏūnāwīt. He died, still in confinement, either the next year, 357 (968), or the year after.

Nāşir al-Dawla's rule was disastrous for the territory over which he had control. The contemporary Ibn Ḥawkal, who refers in several passages to his ruinous exactations and tyrannical seizures of land (see his descriptions of al-Mawsil, Balad, Sīndjār and Nišîbin). And Miskawain notes that by bringing fictitious claims against landowners he would force them to sell to him at low prices, till he became not only the lord, but also the owner, of most of the region of al-Mawsil.


Nāṣir al-Dawla. [See Iṣṭaʿrāʾ.]

Nāṣir al-Dīn. [See Humayūn.]

Nāṣir dīn al-ʿAlāʾ. [See Masudi b. Ṣaʿīd.]

Nāṣir al-Dīn Kūbāḥa. [See Sīr.]

Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Tūsī. [See al-Tūsī.]

Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, whose full name was Abū Muḥammad Nāṣir b. Khusrāw b Hārūn, one of the most important Persian poets of the 4th century.

Life. Nāṣir was born in 394 (1003) in Kubādiyān in the district of Balkh. The Persian historians usually call him 'Alawi in which case it can hardly mean descent from the caliph 'Alish but simply indicates his adherence to the Šīʼa. His father was probably a small landowner in the vicinity of Balkh. Nāṣir received a good education and was early acquainted with almost all branches of the learning of his day. In the forties of the 4th century we find him as an official in Marw where, according to his own confession, he led a rather dissolute life. In 1045 however, a sudden change came over him, the real reasons for which are unknown, but which Nāṣir himself explained by a prophetic dream. He decided to give up his position and all his pleasures and went on pilgrimage to Mecca on which he visited the Kaʿbah four times. This journey had important results for Nāṣir. He left Persia at a difficult period, when the country was being laid waste by the continued wars between the various princes. He found the same wretched picture in all the other Muslim countries which he had to traverse on his journey. Only Egypt proved a pleasing exception; there he saw prosperity, rich harvests, and peace and tranquility. As the Ismāʿīli dynasty of the Fāṭīms were ruling in Egypt at this time, Nāṣir concluded that Islam had diverged from the true path and that only Ismāʿīlism could save the true believers from inevitable ruin. Nāṣir made the acquaintance of several Ismāʿīlī dignitaries, joined their sect and finally received the blessing of the caliph al-Mustansir (1036–1044) in order to spread the new teaching in his native Kūhūrān. He was consecrated as a kudūfa, a fairly high official in the complicated Ismāʿīli hierarchy. Returning to Balkh he devoted himself with the greatest zeal to his new task. But the Sāḏīqīs who ruled the land soon became convinced that Nāṣir's activity was a serious threat to them. He was persecuted and had to flee from Balkh. He went first to Māzar darān but found that this also was not safe enough and was finally forced as a last resort to take refuge in the Vumgān valley among the inaccessible mountains of Badakhshān. There in these poor and inhospitable highlands the aged poet spent his last years; there his most important works were written and there he died in 1060 or 1061 (452–453). Down to the present
day there has survived in this region a little sect known as the Nāṣiriya, which owes its origin to the “saint Shīr Nosīr” and tells fantastic stories about its founder.

Works. Nāṣir’s works were probably very numerous but have survived only in very imperfect and corrupt form. The most important is the great philosophical Divān, which was composed in the miserable years of his exile. The artistic value of his poems is not especially high, the style is often clumsy and awkward but the philosophical material which still awaits its investigator is of very great importance for the history of Persian literature. It is a complete encyclopedia of Iṣmā’īli teaching but of course unsystematic and disconnected. From the linguistic standpoint also the work is of extraordinary interest. A good edition of the Persian text appeared in Teherān in 1928. Two not very long didactic poems in his Divān, Sāḥbat-nāma, which presents a whole philosophic system having an undeniable similarity with the teaching of Avicenna, and Sa’dat-nāma which sharply criticises the aristocracy of the kingdom and praises the peasant, “the nourisher of every living creature”.

The best known of Nāṣir’s prose works is the Safar-nāma, a description of his pilgrimage to Mecca which is an exceedingly valuable source of the most varied information. Unfortunately this work has come down to us only in a very mutilated form and has probably been edited by a Sunni hand. The other works of Nāṣir are mainly Iṣmā’īli textbooks. Among them first place should be given to the Ẓūd al-Muṣṭafīrīn. It is an encyclopedia of a special character which deals with the most varied questions of a metaphysical and cosmographical nature. A good edition of the Persian text was published in Berlin in 1925 (Kaviani). No less important is the Wadjhi Din, an introduction to Iṣmā’īliism, which gradually initiates the reader into Iṣmā’īli beliefs by means of quotations from the Kūnī slightly put together. A number of other similar pamphlets like Umm al-Kitāb, which were quite recently fairly widely disseminated among Iṣmā’īlis of the Pamirs are credited to our author but so far nothing definite has been ascertained about their authenticity.

Although a considerable portion of Nāṣir’s works is now available in good editions, one cannot yet assert that sufficient light has been thrown upon his striking personality. It would be particularly valuable if his philosophical system could be studied as it is of far reaching importance for the history of thought in Persia.

Bibliography: H. Ethè, G. J. Ph., ii. 278–283; do, Nāṣir Churayus Ruminīn, Persian and German (Z. D. M. G., xxxviii. 645–665; xxxiv. 428–494); do, Kurze Lieder u. poetische Fragmente aus Nāṣir Churayus Divān (N. G. W. Göttingen, 1852, p. 124–152); do, Auszüge aus Nāṣirīs Kāfīr (Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 478–508); do, Nāṣir bin Churayus’s Leben, Denken und Dichten, Leyden 1884; E. Fagman, Le livre de la félicité, Persian and French (Z. D. M. G., xxxiv. 643–674): emendations by F. Teufel, (Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 96–114); Ch. Schefer, Sefer Nama, (text and transl. with introduction), Paris 1851: this edition is now somewhat obsolete and it is advisable to use for the text the new edition, Berlin 1923 (Kaviani), which also gives as an appendix the text of the Rūqaynā-nāma and of the Sa’dat-nāma. — Translations: Guy Le Strange, Nāṣir-i Khurayru, Diary of a Journey through Syria and Palestine, London 1888; A. P. Fuller, Account of Jerusalem (J. R. A. S., 1872, p. 142–164); E. Berthels, Safar-nāma (Russian), Leningrad 1933. — In addition to the new edition of the Divān, already mentioned there is also an oldest lithographed text, Tabriz 1820. A Tarīqī‘band, the authenticity of which is doubtful, has been published with Russian transl. by V. Zhukovski, in Zapiski (iv. 386–393). Text of the Wadjhi-Din pr. Berlin 1925 (Kaviani). (E. Berthels)

AL-NĀṢIRA, Nazareth, the home of Jesus, lies in a depression sloping to the south surrounded by hills in a fertile district. While the hills to the north and northeast are not very high, in the northwest the Djebel es-Sūkh rises to 1,600 feet above sea-level. The name of the town, which does not occur in the Old Testament, is found in the New and in the Greek fathers of the Church in the varying forms Natsa, Natsar, Naṣīr and Naṣīrə, with ə, but according to Josephus written in Hebrew a əδ, which is confirmed by the Syriac Naṣrat and the Arabic Nāṣira as well as by the Talmudic derivative form Natsirm, while the Christian Arabic has ə. All these forms as well as Natsarão (Mark i. 24) have in the first syllable an a obscured to e in Talmudic. In Christian Aramaic there is a subsidiary form Natsir with o in the second syllable with which is connected the derivative Naṣīrān (Matt. xxvi. 71; John xviii. 5), cf. τὸν Ναζαρανίου ἀνέστη (Acta xxiv. 5). The Mandaean term Naṣarae (e.g. Dalman, Aram. Gram. 2, p. 178; Gressmann, in Z. A. T. W., sibu. 26 sq.) is usually connected with this but Lidzbarski (Nowe Litt. p. xvi. sq.; Z. S., i. 230 sqq.) wants to explain it as “observers”, while Zimmerm (Z. D. M. G., xlviv. 429–477, 76, 66) seeks its origin in the Babylonian Naṣīra. That the Arabic naṣīr, Christians, naṣīrūn and Nāṣīrmiyā come from the name of the town is known to the Arab writers.

Nazareth, which in the time of Jesus was a little town of no importance (cf. John i. 47: “what good can come out of Nazareth”); it is not even mentioned by Josephus), was not in the early Christian period one of the places of the New Testament to which large numbers of pilgrims went. According to Epiphanius, it was inhabited exclusively by Jews till the time of Constantine the Great. The number of Christians however gradually increased and was maintained after the Muslim conquest (636). In the time of Arculf (c. 670) it had two churches, and in 332 (943) Mas‘ūd mentions a church held in great veneration there, no doubt the church of St. Mary. Before Galilee was conquered by Tancred and the Crusades, Nazareth was destroyed by the Saracens; it revived under Christian rule, especially after the bishopric of Scythopolis was transferred thither. The Russian abbot Daniel (1115–1115) has given us a very good picture of the Church of the Annunciation and of the Well of Mary there in the period. In 1187, Saladin took Nazareth and at the peace between him and Richard (1192) it remained in his hands. In 1251, during the last unsuccessful crusade, Louis IX undertook a pilgrimage from ‘Akka to Nazareth. Yâkût (623 (1225) who relies on the Gospel story instead of Muslim legend mentions Nāṣira as a village 13 miles from Šābiriya. In 661 (1263) the Mamlik
Sulṭān Baibars ordered the emir ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn to destroy Nazareth and particularly the Church of St. Mary. Dimāṯkī (c. 1300) calls it a Jewish town belonging to the province of Ǧ safat and inhabited by Yamānis, and Khālid al-Zāḥī (d. 872 = 1468) numbers it among the townlike villages in Ǧ safat. The Christian visitors however describe Nazareth as a wretched village inhabited by very few Christians with a ruined church and complaint of the hostile attitude of the Muḥammadan population. It was not till 1520 that better days dawned when the Druse chief Fāqrī al-Dīn [q.v.] opened the town to the Franciscans. The Roman Catholic monastery with the Church of the Annunciation was rebuilt, although not completed till a century later. There were only a few Christians in addition to the monks in the town, until in the middle of the xviiith century the Shīrkh Zaḥīr al-Amīr of ‘Akka increased its prosperity after which they gradually grew in number. In 1890 according to G. Schumacher, there were 7,419 inhabitants in the town of whom 1,825 were Muslims, 2,870 Greek Catholics and the remainder Christians of other confessions; since then the number has increased. Jews were not allowed to live there. The great monastery with the Church of the Annunciation in the southeast belongs to the Roman Catholics, the Church of the Annunciation in the northeast to the Greek Church. The Muslims have a mosque of considerable size and five serald. The well of Mary which has a dome over it and is open on one side, has its water brought from a spring below the Greek Church of the Annunciation.


(For BuHL)

NAŠĪRĀBĀD. [See Sīsṭān.]

NAŠKH (A.), infin. I from n-rih, with the technical sense of "abrogation (of a sacred text)". See Ǧ urān, 3.

NAŠHKĪ. [See ARARĪ, d.]

AL-NAṢR, the vulture. It gets its name from the fact that it tears the dead animals on which it feeds to pieces with its beak and devours them. It can still it can not longer than 1,000 years. Its eyes are so sharp that it can see its prey at a distance of 400 farsakh; its sense of smell is equally sharp but fragrant scents are so deadly to it that they destroy it. It shows great endurance in flying and follows armies and pilgrim caravans in order to fall upon the corpses of man and beast. It also follows flocks because it is particularly fond of stillborn lambs, a statement which is confirmed by Brchm who says it attack lambing sheep. It lays its eggs on high cliffs and is said not to sit on them but to leave them to the heat of the sun. It is however very anxious lest its eggs or young be eaten by bats and therefore covers them with the leaves of the plane-tree. The use of the gall, brain, flesh and bones in mediæval times corresponds to the usage in ancient medicine.

al-Nasar was also the name of a deity in pre-Islamic Arabia (see Wellhausen, Rasse, p. 23).

Bibliography: Kazwini, ed. Wustenfeld, i. 424; Darī, ii. 476; Ibn al-Bīṭār, ii. 370.

(For BuHL)

AL-NAṢR, the title of Sīrā ex., taken from its first verse. The word means "help, assistance" and is often used of God's help in war and then with the meaning of "victory". Sīrā lxi. 13 is also associated with al-fāṭ置换, cf. xlvi/ii. 13. The Sīra clearly belongs to a later period and verse 2 in particular recalls the year 9, the Year of the Embassies. It is therefore natural to refer al-fāṭ置换 (verse 1) in keeping with the frequent use of the word to the capture of Mecca, except that it is not mentioned as a fact (as We!, Ibn Hīgūm, p. 933 translates it) but is represented as an assumption, which is also true of verse 2. This is perhaps only a rhetorical figure intended to emphasise the general prevalence of the idea and does not exclude reference to a particular event.

Bibliography: Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Korāns, i. 219 sq. (For BuHL)

NAṢR B. AHMAD B. ISMĀ‘IL called al-Sā’id, a Ǧamānīd. After the murder of his father in Djamāda II, 301 (Jan. 914) the eight year old Naṣr was put on the throne and the able vizier Abū Ǧabdūl Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Dijāhānī given the regency. Soon afterwards the people of Sītān rebelled against the Ǧamānīds and placed themselves under the rule of the governor Badr al-Kabīr appointed by the caliph al-Muktaṭīr. At the same time the caliph's generals al-Faḍl b. Ḥaṭīrī and Khālid b. Muḥammad al-Marwawī occupied the towns of Ghazna and Bust who were in the possession of the Ǧamānīds. When al-Faḍl fell ill, Khālid rebelled against al-Muktaṭīr, routed the troops sent against him and went to Kirmān where he encountered a force sent against him by Badr. The battle ended in Khālid's defeat; he was himself wounded and taken prisoner; he died soon afterwards of his wounds. In the same year, the uncle of Naṣr's father Ishāq b. Ahmad b. Asad rebelled in Samaḵr and marched on Bukhārā, accompanied by his son (Ramāḏān 301 = April 914) but was driven back by Ḥamūya (Hamūya) b. ‘Ali. A second attempt also failed; Ishāq took to flight again and Ṣamāḵrānd fell into the hands of the government troops. He then tried to hide himself but had finally to come out of his place of concealment and throw himself on Ḥamūya's mercy. The latter took him to Bukhārā where he remained till his death, while his son thus went to Farghāna in the year 302 (914—915) another son of Ishāq, Abū Sāmān Muḥammad, stirred up trouble in Nairābūr in combination with al-Husayn b. ‘All al-Marwawī (al-Marwawrūdī), who had rendered great service to the Ǧamānīds but felt he had been neglected by them. After Muḥammad's sudden death Ḥusayn, who was suspected of having poisoned him, went to Nairābūr and seized the town. In Rabi‘ I 306 (Aug.—Sept. 918) he was taken prisoner by Ahmad b. Sahl, a tried general, who had been long in the service of the Ǧamānīds, and brought to Bukhārā, while Ahmad took up his residence in Nairābūr. Ḥusayn was after some time released and given a position at
the court of Naṣr; for some unknown reason he was again thrown into prison and ended his days there; in the following year, ʿAbd al-Salih deserted the Sāmānid because Naṣr had not kept his promise to him, and recognised only the caliph’s authority. He went from Naṣībulnā and entrenched himself in Marv; in Ṣadja 307 (Dec. 919) however, he shared the fate of Ḥusain. Ḥamūya cunningly succeeded in enticing him out of the town. ʿAbd al-Salih was defeated, and taken prisoner and died a few months later in Bukhāra in prison. In Tabaristan also there was fighting. After the death of the Zaidi imām al-Uṭrūs [q.v.], al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim, called al-Dāʾī al-Ṣāhib, was recognised as his successor. In 308 (920–921) the latter sent his general Laila b. al-Naʿmān al-Dalālimi to Dūrdjān. From there he went first to Dāmaghān and then to Naṣībulnā where he had the khafta read for al-Ḥasan b. al-Kāsim (Dhū Ḥijjah 308 = April–May 921), after Karategin had been put to flight. In the neighbourhood of Tūs he encountered Ḥamūya b. ʿAlī whom the government of Bukhāra had sent against him. At first a considerable part of the Sāmānid army took to flight but Ḥamūya himself stood firm and Laila had no further success; he had to take to flight, was captured and beheaded by Ḥamūya’s orders (Rabıʿ 1 309 = July–Aug. 921). Karategin then returned, but when he left Dūrdjān and Abu ʿl-Ḥusain b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Uṭrūs seized the town, Naṣr sent 4,000 horsemen there, led by Simdūr al-Dawātī, who at once laid siege to Abu ʿl-Ḥusain. When the latter made a sortie with a force twice this size, he fell into an ambush but escaped to Astarābādīd and then to Sāriya. Simdūr then went to Astarābādīd; but when his efforts came to naught he bribed Abu ʿl-Ḥusain’s deputy Mākān b. Kākī and persuaded him to pretend to vacate the town for a time and then to reoccupy it. This was done as arranged; Simdūr occupied Astarābādīd but soon returned to Naṣībulnā whereupon his subordinate, only left there as a feint, was driven by Mākān first out of Astarābādīd and soon afterwards out of Dūrdjān. In 310 (922–923) Illūs b. Ishāq rebelled in Farghāna and went to Samarqand; this enterprise came to nothing through the inability of Abū ʿAmr Muḥammad b. Asad, who with 2,500 men prepared an ambush and scattered Illūs’s army, said to have numbered 30,000 men. After some time, the latter joined the governor of al-Shaḡr, Abu ʿl-Fadl b. ʿAbd Yūsuf, but had again to take to flight and went to Kāshghar where he joined the Dihkān Toghitnīnī. After failing in an attempt to invade Farghāna he returned to Kāshghar. He was finally pardoned by Naṣr and settled in Bukhāra. About the same time Abu ʿl-Fadl Muḥammad b. Ṭabīb Allāh al-Balāmī [cf. BALAMI] was appointed vizier in place of Abu ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Dajlamī. In the year 314 (926) Naṣr at the instigation of the caliph al-Muḍṭadī undertook an expedition against al-Raiy where Fāṭk, a freedom of the rebel governor Yūsuf b. Abī ʿl-Sadīq, was ruling. He took the town in Lūmānī II (Aug.—Sept. 926) and returned to Bukhāra after two months’ stay there. Al-Raiy remained in possession of the Sāmānids till the beginning of Shaʿbān 316 (Sept. 928) when the governor appointed by Naṣr fell ill and surrendered the town to the ʿAlī al-Ḥasan al-Dāʾī and his general Mākān b. Kākī. In 317 (929–930) or 318 (930–931) Naṣr’s brothers, Yahyā, ʿĀnsūr and Ibrāhīm, whom he had imprisoned in the citadel of Bukhāra, succeeded in regaining their freedom with the help of their followers among the dissatisfied elements of the citizens and seized the town. When Yahyā claimed the throne, Naṣr who had gone to Naṣībulnā at the head of a large army to assist the caliph against the rebel ʿAsfār b. ʿĪsā had to return as quickly as possible and after several encounters with Yahyā had to able to restore order. Yahyā was pardoned and the governorship of Khorāsān given to the emir of ʿṢaghānīyān ʿAbd b. ʿAbd Muḥammad b. al-Muṣafīr. On the fighting in Dūrdjān and Kirmān see the article MĀKĀN b. KĀKĪ.

The last year of Naṣr’s reign was marked by a great revival of ʿṢīʿa propaganda, which had never ceased in Khorāsān and had been particularly encouraged just at this time by the rise of the Fāṭimid caliphate. The people of Naṣr’s paid homage to an ʿAlīī named Abu ʿl-Ḥusain Muḥammad b. Yahyā as caliph. Naṣr invited him to Bukhāra and when he left not only gave him a robe of honour but also granted him an annual allowance from the treasury. Ḥusain b. ʿAlī al-Marwazi had been converted to the ʿṢīʿa by Fāṭimid emissaries in Khorāsān. He was followed by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Nakḥshbābī (al-Nasafī) who transferred his activities to Bukhāra and gained a number of proselytes among the high officials. He finally succeeded in winning Naṣr himself over to his party and in inducing him to pay the Fāṭimid caliph al-Kāīm [q.v.] a considerable sum to atone for the death of Ḥusain b. ʿAlī who had been killed in a Bukhāra prison. This naturally aroused the wrath of the orthodox clergy, who were joined by the Turkish guards and provoked a powerful reaction. Naṣr regretted his complaisance and is said to have abdicated in favour of his son Nāḥī, who had not been guilty of any heresy. Naṣr’s ill-health may have contributed to this decision. The details are variously recorded; in any case, the ʿṢīʿa in Bukhāra and Khurāsān were persecuted and al-Nakĥshbābī with several followers executed.

According to the usual statement, Naṣr died after thirteen months illness of pulmonary consumption on 27th Ṣadja 331 (April 6, 943); others say he was murdered like his father. According to some reports, he died earlier, on 12th Ramādan 330 (May 31, 942). This latter date perhaps refers not to his death but to his abdication. Nāḥī’s formal accession in any case only took place after his father’s death.

If we may believe Ibn al-ʿAthīr, Naṣr was distinguished by a singular gentleness of character; according to other sources however, this was not the case. He was also celebrated as an enlightened patron of poets and scholars and is particularly held in honour for encouraging the poet Rūḍānī [q.v.] in every way.


(V. Z. Zettersten)

NASR B. SAIYÂR AL-LÂTIHI, GOVERNOR OF KHURÂSAN. As early as 86 (705) we find him distinguishing himself in the campaigns of Kutaiba b. Muslim [q.v.] in Central Asia and from this time onwards his name is often mentioned in history. In 106 (724) he took part in the campaign conducted by Muslim b. Saïd-al-Kilabî, governor of Kurhâsan, against Fârghânâ. When the two tribes of Râbî’a and al-Azd refused military service, Nasr was sent with the Mu‘arid against the mutineers and defeated them at al-Barbûs near Balkh. After serving for some years under command of Balkh he was relieved of his office but afterward restored to it. When the governor of Kurhâsan Asad b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Kâsî [q. v.] died and the caliph Hâshâm b. ‘Abd al-Malik sought counsel of a trusted adviser, who was acquainted with the conditions in Kurhâsan, regarding the filling of the vacant post, the latter proposed among other names that of the seventy-four year old Nasr because he was “abstemious, experienced and shrewd” (tâjîf muqarrab ‘âdhî), and in Radjab 120 (June–July 738) he received the diploma of investiture. He honestly endeavored to live up to the above description of him. The old cities of Kurhâsan were four in number: Merw, Naisâbûr, Merw al-Rûdîh and Herât; there were also special commands in Balkh, Samarkand and Khwârizm. After taking over the governorship, Nasr transferred his headquarters from the remote Balkh to the more central Merw. In 121 (738–739) he declared war on his Turkish neighbours and invaded to Samarkand. From there he penetrated to Uzberûs and thence on to al-Shâhân. The Turkish chief Kursâl, who had only recently been killed the Khâqân and was regarded as one of the leading personalities among the Turks, along with al-Hâtîh b. Surâidî, a Murjâ’i who had rebelled against Arab rule and taken refuge among the unbelieving Turks, endeavored to check his progress; when the opposing forces actually met however, Kursâl was taken prisoner and hilled. Nasr then made peace with the ruler of al-Shâhân on condition that he banished al-Hâtîh, who, upon the latter went to Pârâb while Nasr continued his campaign into Fârghânâ without winning any considerable success. The result was that he had to be content with concluding a treaty of peace. The Soghdians who had at an earlier date migrated to join their Turkish neighbours in al-Shâhân and Fârghânâ, but found the troubled conditions prevailing after the assassination of the Khâqân intolerable and wished to return to their old Iranian home, were treated by Nasr with a wise leniency and an agreement was come to by which the Transoxians who had been converted to Îslâm but had gone back to the faith of their fathers were not to be persecuted in any way, the private debts and arrears of taxes of the emigrants were remitted and the Muslim prisoners taken by them were only to be restored to liberty after the evidence of witnesses had been taken and a judicial decision given. These measures, it is true, provoked not only the displeasure of the Arab emirs in Kurhâsan but also the dissatisfaction of the caliph Hâshâm; nevertheless Nasr succeeded in carrying out his plans. As regards domestic politics he regulated the relations between the Muslims and those under their protection by an important reform in the system of taxation, by which he ordained that all landowners, including Muslims, should pay the land-tax (khâshîd) while the poll-tax (qiyâza) should be imposed on non-Muslims exclusively. But the deep rooted clannishness of the Arab caused him continual difficulties. In the first four years of his tenure of office he chose his subordinates exclusively from the tribe of Mu‘arid; then he began to be little more broad-minded in this respect and to pay some attention to the Yamanis and thus gradually to pave the way to a reconciliation of the tribes at feud with one another. In the year 123 (740–741) the governor of the ‘Irât, Yusuf b. ‘Omar al-Thâkafî, endeavored to arouse the caliph’s suspicions of him; Hâshâm thereupon sent him a letter and left Nasr in his post. When al-Wâlid II ascended the throne in Râbî’ II 125 (Feb. 743) he confirmed Nasr in office but soon afterwards allowed himself to be persuaded by Yusuf b. ‘Omar to recall him and therefore ordered him to come to Damascus and to bring with him all kinds of hunting-birds and musical instruments. Nasr however did not hurry and before he reached the frontier of al-‘Irât, the news of the caliph’s assassination reached him and he at once turned back. When al-Wâlid’s successor, Yazid III, appointed Mansûr b. Dju’mah governor of al-‘Irât and Kurhâsan, Nasr refused to recognize him. In 126 (743–744) trouble broke out among the Azd and Râbî’a in Merw. When Nasr wanted to pay the troops not in money but with the gold and silver instruments procured for the caliph al-Wâlid they mutinied; Dju’dâb b. ‘Ali al-Kirmâni put himself at their head and appealed to their feelings by demanding vengeance for the Banu al-Muhallab who had been mercilessly persecuted by the Lîmâyids, a course which he knew would appeal to them. When the Mu‘aridis appealed to Nasr to render al-Kirmâni innocuous, he declined at first but later yielded to them and had him arrested (end of Ramâdân 126 = middle of July 744); but a month afterwards he escaped from prison. Negotiations were then opened between Nasr and al-Kirmâni but they led to no real decision. A much more dangerous opponent was al-Hâtîh b. Surâidî who at the end of Dju’mâdâ II 127 (beginning of April 745) again appeared in Merw after a many years’ sojourn among the Turks. In order to be safe from this rival, Nasr had unfortunately secured a pardon for Hâtîh and his followers from the caliph Yazid III and after his arrival in Merw he endeavored to win al-Hâtîh over by the greatest indulgence and friendliness. He even went so far as to confer on him the governorship of Transoxiana; but all his efforts were in vain; al-Hâtîh adhered firmly to his Murjâ’i conceptions and stubbornly refused to recognize Nasr as governor. As his following was steadily growing, he finally demanded that Nasr should resign his office and leave the choice of his successor to a court of arbitration. Nasr said he would agree to this, but when he declined to obey the judgment of the court insisting on his
resignation, open fighting broke out. Al-Hāthīth tried to take the city by surprise but was driven back (end of Djamāda II 128 = end of March 746). He then joined forces with al-Kirmānī and they attacked Naṣr with their combined strength. After several days' fighting, the latter had to abandon Merw and retire to Naisābūr; it was not long however before the two rebels fell out. Among other things al-Kirmānī's cruelty made him hated; in addition there were the endless feuds among the various Arab tribes. After al-Hāthīth's most influential follower Bishr b. Djamāts b. Dabbār had left al-Kirmānī with 5,000 men, al-Hāthīth soon followed his example but was killed in the fighting that ensued (end of Radjab 128 = April 746). Al-Kirmānī was now lord of Merw. The Yamanīs stood by him while the Muʿārids sought refuge with Naṣr in Naisābūr. Naṣr's position was by no means an enviable one. So long as al-ʻIrāq was in the hands of the Khāridjīs and the ʻAlīd rebel ʻAbd Allāh b. Muʿāwiyah [q. v.], Naṣr's communications with the caliphate were cut and even after Yazid b. ʻOmar b. Ḥabīrābād had regained al-ʻIrāq for Marwān II, he could not reckon on any very considerable help. There was therefore nothing left for him but to concentrate his efforts on the reconquest of the city of Merw. After repeated encounters between his troops and those of al-Kirmānī, he went there in person and pitched his camp opposite that of his opponent. The two rivals continued to fight with varying fortunes without being able to bring about a decision. Naṣr's appeals to Marwān and Ibn Ḥabīrābād for reinforcements remained unheeded; in view however of the danger that threatened from Abu Muslim the leadership of the rebels of the ʻAbbāsid propaganda, negotiations were begun between Naṣr and al-Kirmānī. After a son of Ḥāthīth b. Suraydī had killed al-Kirmānī to avenge the death of his father, the Khāridjī Shabīb b. Salama took his place and in the name of the Azd concluded a truce for one year. Abu Muslim was able however to bring this agreement to nothing by persuading ʻAli b. Dujādī al-Kirmānī that Naṣr had instigated the murder of his father and the Azd who were devoted to him broke the truce just concluded and resumed hostilities against Naṣr. When Abu Muslim was approached for assistance by the two combatant parties he was able to come forward as an arbiter and decided in favour of the Azd against the Muʿārid. He then entered Merw, according to the most probable statement in Rabī' II 130 (Dec. 747), and made the inhabitants swear allegiance in general terms to a caliph of the family of the Prophet without a name being mentioned. For Naṣr there was nothing left but to seek safety in flight. From Merw he fled via Sarakhs and Tūs to Naisābūr, where the news reached him that his son Tamīm, whom he had sent against Abu Muslim's general Kaḥṭāb b. Shābīb al-Tāʾī [q. v.] had been defeated and slain at Tūs. From Naisābūr he went to Kūmīs and thence to Djamālad. Nubātā b. Ḥanẓala al-Kirābī was here with a large army which Ibn Ḥabīrābād had at last sent him by the caliph's orders. But Naṣr and Nubātā did not cooperate and in addition the Kaīsīs went over from the former to the latter. On the 14th Dhu'l-Hijjah 130 (Aug. 1, 748) Nubātā was defeated by Kaḥṭāb and fell in the battle. After his defeat Naṣr could no longer stay in Kūmīs but fled, pursued by Kaḥṭāb's son Hasan, to al-Ra'y, without receiving any support from the Umayyad officials. Reaching al-Ra'y, he fell ill; nevertheless he wished to continue his journey to Hamadān but was no longer able to move without assistance; he had to be carried and died in 12th Rabī' I 131 (Nov. 9, 748) in Sawā [q. v.] at the age of 85. Naṣr combined with his eminent qualities as a statesman considerable gifts as a poet.


Naṣr Allāh b. Muḥammād b. ʻAbd al-Hāsūd Abū ʻl-Maʻālī of Shirāz, a Persian author and statesman, vizier of the Ghaznavid Khusraw Malik (1160—1186) by whose orders he was arrested and executed. Naṣr was the first Persian to succeed in giving a satisfactory Persian version of the celebrated Khaṭṭā al-Din. His version is based on the Arabic of ʻAbd Allāh the Muṭafāfī and was completed about 538—539 (1144), i.e. in the time of Bahramshāh (1118—1152). For a long time his translation was regarded as a model of elegant Persian style which could not be surpassed and served as the basis for the metrical version by Ḥāfiz (658 = 1260) and for a series of Turkish translations. It was only in the xvith century when even Naṣr Allāh's language appeared too homely and archaic that his translation was superseded by the celebrated Anwār-i Suhailāt of Husain Wālī al-Kashīfī [q. v.], d. 939 (1532—1533).


Naṣr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr ʻAḥmad b. Marwān, third and most important prince of the Marwānid dynasty [q. v.] of Diyar Bakr. He succeeded to the provincial sovereignty after the death of his elder brother, Muḥammad al-Dawla Abū ʻAbd Allāh Sā'd, in 401 (1010—1011), after a struggle with the latter's murderer, and was in the same year formally recognized by the ʻAbbāsid al-Kādīr, from whom at the same time he received his laḳāb, and by the Būyid amir, Sulṭān al-Dawla. Though now established in the capital, Maiyafārīqīn, he was unable to obtain effective control of ʻĀmid, the next most considerable city of the province, until 415 (1024—1025), when his tributary, Ibn Damna, who had hitherto ruled it, was assassinated; and during his reign of over fifty years, he suffered several ineffective attacks on his territory from the ʻAlālids of Diyar Raba', to whom he appears, at one period at all events, to have paid tribute (see Ibn al-Athīr, ix. 121),
and to whom, in order to compose a quarrel arising out of his divorce of a lady of that family, he was obliged, in 421 (1030), to cede Nisibin. In 433 (1041–1042) Dijâr Bakr was invaded from Adharbajjân by the bands of Ghuz Turkmen which had pushed north-westwards on the advance of the Seldjûkí leaders into the Djîbâl; and for two years parts of it were subjected to their depredations. Otherwise the province enjoyed, throughout his reign, a tranquillity remarkable in this troubled age.

The ruler of Dijâr Bakr was regarded as a principal guardian of the frontier of Islam, and as such was expected to harass the Christians whenever opportunity offered (see the letter addressed to Naṣr al-Dawla by the Seldjûkí Tughhrî-beg: Ibn al-Athîr, ix. 275). Nevertheless Ibn Marwân’s relations with the Byzantine Empire were for the most part amicable, being based on a pact of mutual non-aggression, to which both parties appeared when it was infringed. The only important breaches of this agreement occurred in 418 (1027), when Naṣr al-Dawla seized Ruhâ (Edessa), which, however, was recovered by the Greeks four years later, and in 426 (1034–1035), when an attempt was made by the Christian inhabitants of that city, in league with Arabs of the Numair tribe, to invade his territories. Later their good relations were of use to the Emperor—Constantine X—, who in 441 (1049–1050) obtained Ibn Marwân’s help in securing from Tughhrî-beg the release of the Georgian general Liparitî with whom he had been in league against the Georgian king, and who had been captured the year before by Tughhrî’s half-brother Ibrahim Inâl. Up to 436 (1045) Armenia, which also marched in part with Dijâr Bakr, was still independent of the Empire; and in 423 (1032) a Marwâní commander led a successful raid into this country. In 427 (1035–1036), on the other hand, a hajîdî caravan from northern Persia was attacked and looted near Ani by Armenians of the Sunnûsîa tribe, upon which Ibn Marwân forced the aggressors to give up their prisoners and booty.

Early in Naṣr al-Dawla’s reign the north of Syria and parts of the Djîzair contiguous to Dijâr Bakr were obliged to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Fâtimid caliphs, though their hold on these parts remained somewhat precarious. And his own territories were menaced by Fâtimid pretensions, when in 430 (1038–1039) the governor of Damascus, Anîşıkîn al-Dîzbarî, who was then reasserting his rule in northern Syria, projected an attack on Dijâr Bakr. This, however, came to nothing.

The reign of Naṣr al-Dawla saw the rise of the Seldjûkîs from complete obscurity to the empire of Persia and the İrâk. His first communication with them occurred as early as 435 (1043–1044), on the Ghuzz invasion of Dijâr Bakr; when he addressed a letter of protest to Tughhrî, who, though he was scarcely in a position to do so, undertook to restrain the marauders. (It may be noted, nevertheless, that Ibn al-Athîr describes this Ghuzz invasion as having been actually instigated by Tughhrî, who, he says, granted the province as a fief to its two leaders in advance; cf. Amedroz, The Marwânî Dynasty of Mavâyûrîn, in J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 137.) Surely this author is mistaken in considering the date 434 as wrong, since it agrees exactly with those given by Ibn al-Athîr). Eight years later Naṣr al-Dawla acceded to Tughhrî’s demand for recognition as suzerain; and this subservience, which was renewed in 446 (1054–1055), when Tughhrî made a triumphal tour through Adharbajjân and Muslim Armenia, spared Dijâr Bakr the experience of a Seldjûkí visitation. In the following year, however, Tughhrî’s attention was drawn to the murder of a Kurdish chieftain by Naṣr al-Dawla’s son Sulâmîn, his lieutenant in the Djîzair; and in 448 (1056–1057), when the sultan was obliged to visit al-Mawṣîl in order to oppose a combination of Shî’i leaders headed by al-Bassîrî [q. v.], he forced an indemnity from Ibn Marwân by laying siege to Djîzair and Ibn Ḥumar.

Naṣr al-Dawla was sagacious, or fortunate, in his choice of the three wazîrs who served him in turn, namely Abu ‘l-Kâsim al-Isfahânî, to whom he owed his throne (in office 401–415 = 1010–1025), Abu ‘l-Kâsim al-Maghribî [q. v.] (in office 415–428 = 1025–1037) and Abu Naṣr Ibn Djîhîr (afterwards entitled Fâkr al-Dawla) [q. v.] (in office 430–453 = 1039–1061). It was no doubt owing in part to their abilities that the remarkable tranquillity enjoyed by Dijâr Bakr during his reign was turned to advantage and resulted in an equally remarkable prosperity. This Naṣr al-Dawla fostered by a reduction of taxation and by renouncing the practice of fining the rich in order to augment the revenues. Nevertheless his court is said to have surpassed those of all his contemporaries in luxury, and many instances are quoted of his profusion and generosity. Maiyûrîn became during his reign a centre for men of learning, poets and ascetics, as also a refuge for political fugitives. Among the latter were the Bayyind prince al-Malik al-A’iz [q. v.], who was ousted from the amirate in 436 (1044–1045) by his uncle Abî Kâhlîjî [q. v.], and the infant heir of the ‘Abbâsîd al-Kâlin—afterwards al-Muqtâdî [q. v.]—who was removed with his mother from Baghdad on the occasion of its occupation in 450 (1058) by al-Bassîrî. Naṣr al-Dawla is said as being resolute, just, high-minded and methodical, and though much addicted to sensuality, he was strict in his observance of religious injunctions. He died, aged about eighty, on 24th Shawwal 453 (November 1061), leaving Fâkr al-Dawla still in office to secure the succession to his second son, Abu ‘l-Kâsim Naṣrî, Niẓâm al-Din.


(Harold Bowen)

Naṣr al-Din (pron. Naṣr-e-dîn) Kötu, the hero of the stories of wit and stupidity among the Turks, who bears a strong resemblance to the German Till Eulenspiegel, the English Joe Miller, the Italian Bertoldo, the Russian Balâkirev, etc. Various opinions are current about his life. One tradition for example makes him a learned man of the time of Hârîn al-Râshîd, but another makes him a contemporary of the Khârîzมînshâh ’Alî al-Dîn Takash (reigned c. 1172–1200). The two traditions are not to be taken seriously; at most they might be regarded as an indication that many of the jests of the Kötuja date from the period of the caliphate or that some of them came through a Persian intermediary.
The other versions of the life of Naṣreddin can be divided into two groups, of which the first puts him in the xviith and beginning of the xviiith century (the period of Bayāzīd I, Timūr and the eighth Karamanid 'Alāʾ al-Dīn), and the second in the xiiiith century (the period of the Saldijāk 'Alāʾ al-Dīn).

The first view appears to come from the Travels of Ewliyā Celebi (ii. 16—17). There, for example, the story of Timūr's meeting with the Khodja in the baths is told, when the Khodja said that he would give 40 əšq for Timūr's shirt but nothing for him himself. In spite of all the improbability of such an utterance and in spite of the fact that the older tejkhrs put this answer in Ahmadī's [q.v.] mouth (cf. also E. J. W. Gibb, *Ottoman Poems*, 1882, p. 166—167) Ewliyā's story, was given currency in Europe by Cantimir, Diez, Goethe, von Hammer, etc. When Mehmēd Tekvīfī accepted this story of Ewliyā's in his editions of the jests of Naṣreddin and Buqa (since 1853) which were later translated into German (about 1890), it was given renewed life and became almost the predominant opinion in Europe.

The second group of traditions champions the xivith century as the period of Naṣreddin and relies on the following facts. Firstly the poet Lāmī (d. 1532-1533) asserted in his Lāmīy, that Naṣreddin was a contemporary of Shāyād Hamza, who lived in the xivith century; secondly in old manuscripts the Khodja is associated with the Sulṭān 'Alāʾ al-Dīn. Koprulu Zinde (see Bīb.) therefore inclines to the view that he was a contemporary of the Saldijāk 'Alāʾ al-Dīn (xivith century). Sh. Sāmī Bey (Kūmīs al-Aṭām, vi. 4577) and P. Horn (see Bīb.) had already decided for the Saldijāk and the latter definitely for 'Alāʾ al-Dīn, but Koprulu Zinde supported his view by evidence, partly new, which we proceed to quote: 1. that the inscription on the tomb of Naṣreddin in Aşḵāhīr bears the date 386, which on the supposition that it was reversed, would indicate that the Khodja died in 683 (1284—1285); 2. on two authentic charters of endowment (awāliṯ/tevā) of the year 685 (1287) and 688 (1290) respectively, a certain Naṣreddin Khodja appears before the kādū as a witness, and 3. the statement which the former mutaf of Siwī-Ḥišār, Ḥasan Efendi, made about 45 years ago in the Medīnī-i Maʿrif about Naṣreddin, agrees with this assumption. According to Ḥasan Efendi, Naṣreddin was born in the village of Khorto (خورتو) near Siwī-Ḥišār in the year 605 (1208—1209), held there the office of Imām in which he succeeded his father, and moved in 635 (1237—1238) to Aşḵāhīr where he died in 683 (1284—1285).

Although this evidence is by no means to be rejected off hand, it seems to have been completely neglected by other scholars (Krymski in 1927 [see Bīb.] does not even mention Koprulu's book except for my article entitled *Je le Naṣreddin-Khodja ziehe* (*Did Naṣreddin Khodja really live?*) in the Christmas supplement to the Belgrade Politika (Jan. 6, 1932), where it was described as worthy of consideration, if not yet absolutely convincing.

After all these traditions and opinions, it is not a matter for surprise that some scholars (H. Ekhī, R. Basset, M. Hartmann, A. Wesselski [see Bīb.]) have been more or less sceptical about the historicity of the Khodja.

These doubts are to some extent closely connected with the question of the origin of Naṣreddin's jests. Basset, for example, thinks (in *Recherches sur Djehâ a...*) that they are a translation of the old Arabic droll stories which were current in large numbers at the end of the fourth (tenth) century about a certain Djehâ (Djehâ) of the tribe of Fażāra in Kūfa. Djehâ's stupidity became proverbial among the Arabs, as is already evident from Maidnā (d. 1124) (cf. *Arabum proverbia*, ed. G. Freytag, i. 403, N.° 175), and a Book of *Anecdota of Djehâ* (كتاب نادر جهان) is expressly mentioned as early as the *Fihrīs of al-Nādīm* (d. 993) (cf. Flügel's edition, i. 313). This collection, which had previously reached the west through oral transmission, was translated into Turkish in the xviith or xviiith century and the hero identified with a certain Naṣreddin Khodja, whose existence Basset thinks is at least doubtful.

This thesis of Basset's was not everywhere accepted without demur. Horn and Christensen (see Bīb., for example, do not believe in a translation from the old book of Djehâ's jests and Wesselski holds the view "that there is no evidence of the existence of any story of Djehâ in the period before that of Naṣreddin's alleged or actual life, which could with certainty be assumed to be the source of one of the jests of Naṣreddin". M. Hartmann describes Naṣreddin's jests as the common property of the literature of the world, expressed to some extent in a specifically Turkish guise and therefore regards any question as to whether there ever was such a person as of little importance. Horn and Krymski also regard the Khodja's jests and folk stories found almost everywhere. Christensen thinks similarly but admits that these jests form an independent collection "into which probably very many stories from the old book (of Djehâ) have been incorporated".

Whatever the truth may be, one thing seems to be certain: the immediate source for most of the stories of Naṣreddin is to be sought, as Basset and Hartmann say, in the world of Arabic culture and Islam where Djehâ certainly is often the hero of such anecdotes. In other words, Djehâ might be regarded as the ultimate prototype of many of the adventures of Naṣreddin. While Basset's theory then may not be correct in all details, it seems to be right in its main features, especially in the fact that it has directed the student of Naṣreddin to the influence of the rich Arabic literature of humorous anecdote. That many of these stories are originally not Arabic but Persian, Syriac, Indian, Greek, etc. is quite natural, especially when we remember that they are common to many literatures, but in this case it must often have been the Arabic version that was the source upon which the Turkish drew.

For the problem of Naṣreddin it is also important to put on record that stories of Djehâ are very early mentioned by Persian poets and authors (Mifrid, d. 1040/1041) or transmitted (a story in Anvari [d. c. 1190], three stories in Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī [d. 1273] and a dozen stories in 'Ubaid-i Zākānī [d. 1370—1371]). When we remember the part played by Persian culture among the Saldijāk of Rūm and their Ottoman successors, we cannot consider it impossible that some stories of Djehâ may have come to the Turks through Persian literature.
This is all the more probable as Djalal al-Din Rumi himself spent the greater part of his life in Anatolia (especially in Konya) and used Diwh's (as Djalāh is called among the Persians) popularity to illustrate his mystic ideas (cf. Mathnawi, ed. Nicholson, ii. 3116 sqq.).

Particularly in view of this popularity and the fact of oral transmission, it is not impossible that the common people altered the name Djalāh (Djoha), as Basset repeatedly insists (Mélanges africains et orientaux, Paris 1915, p. 49). On the other hand, there may have been a droll Khodja named Nasreddin among the Ottomans (or Seldjucks), around whom gathered humorous stories of others, in addition to his own jests, and thus became the typical representative of wit and stupidity. For this reason he was probably also credited with the tales of the simplicity of Ārākūsh [q.v.], Saladin’s steward, who had been dead since 1201.

Other jests attributed to Nasreddin go back several centuries further which is proof that they cannot originate with him. The fact that most of the jests are not original is obvious (cf. e.g. Weisza’s parallels), in spite of all the changes and transformations they have undergone among the Turks.

One of the Turkish versions (with additions) was, according to Basset, translated in the middle of the xith (sixth) century into Arabic and thus the Turks returned to the Arabs part of what they had formerly borrowed from them. Nasreddin and DJah, being similar types, later became amalgamated in such a way that the Arabic editions identify the two in the title: Navaqād al-Khodja Nasr al-Din Efendii Djah. Sometimes however, the Arabs distinguish between the two by calling Nasreddin the “Rumelian DJah” (Djaha-al-Rumi). This DJah of the Navaqād easily reached the Berbers through the Arabs as Si DJah (Djah). In a similar way the Nubians procured their DJahua and the Maltese their DJahan. Whether the fool of Sicilian popular story, Giufo or Guca also comes from DJah is a further question.

On the other hand, the Turkish version of the jests of Nasreddin (under his or another name or anonymously) became known not only to the Rumanians, Bulgars, Greeks, Albanians, and Yugoslavs but also in Armenia, Georgia, the Caucasus, the Crimea, the Ukraine, Russia, Turkestan etc. On these long travels, Nasreddin naturally underwent many changes; distortions and additions were made which are quite foreign to the original text, so that the number of his (or Djaha’s) stories increased to several hundreds (in Wesselski to 515 or 555). The oldest manuscript (Leyden, No. 2715), which was already in the possession of a European in 1625, only contains 76 jests.

The first edition of the chapbook on Nasreddin, which was the foundation of many later editions, appeared in 1837 (125 jests). Mhemed Tewfiq’s edition (1299 = 1833) in which the coarse stories of the chapbook are omitted only contains 71 but a few months later Tewfiq published a further 130 under the name Bu Adam (“This Man”, i.e. the same Nasreddin) (in the final edition of 1302 Bu Adam only contains 96 stories). Anecdotes of Nasreddin were later collected by I. Kunos from the lips of the people between Aidin and Konya and separately published (Budapest 1899, with 160 stories and introduction, and in

Radloff’s Proben der Volksliteratur der turkischen Sämme, vol. viii., St. Petersburg 1899). The fullest, but uncritical, Turkish edition is that of Behāfī (pseudonym of Weled Čelebi), the fourth edition of which (1926) contains nearly 400 anecdotes.

The Turkish editions in the Roman alphabet are much shorter (e.g. Narrettin Hoca Hijayeleri, 1928 [only 79 pp.] and Letafi Narrettin Hoca, 1929 [only 96 pp.]) or are divided into various periods of Nasreddin’s life (like the Narrettin Hoca of Kemalettin Şakir 1920–1931, in four parts).

The first European translations were based on the early editions of the Turkish chapbook: the German by Camerloher and Prolog (Triest 1857, with 126 jests) and the French of Decourdemanche (Les plaisanteries de N. hoda, Paris 1876, also containing 126 anecdotes) which was increased in the second edition (1908) by those about Ārākūsh. Decourdemanche also provided a translation based on much larger material (he drew upon unpublished manuscripts also) entitled Sittietier der Nasr-Edām-Hodja (Brussels 1878, with 321 humorous anecdotes). While the translation by Camerloher and Prolog made it possible for R. Kohler to find many stories told of Nasreddin in European collections and to trace many of them back to an Indian origin (Orient und Orientale, i. [1862]; a later edition with additions in his Kleineren Schriften zur Märchenforschung, i. [1898]), Decourdemanche’s translation served Dragomanov as the basis for his studies on the dissemination of stories of Nasreddin in the Ukraine (Kiewskaia Starina, 1886).

Later (about 1890) Mhemed Tewfiq’s edition, including a portion of Bu Adam was translated into German by Mullendorff (Reclam N°. 2735). The remaining of the Bu Adam stories (N°. 131–226) were translated by Menzel; the much too long Abenteuer Budjem (N°. 197) in the Türkische Bibliothek (vol. xiii., 1911) and the others in the Beiträgen zur Kenntnis des Orients, vol. ix. (1911), p. 124–159. Nasreddin’s jests have also been translated into English, Russian, Hungarian, Greek, Serbo-Croat, Italian, Russian, Bulgarian, etc. Wesselski’s Der Hodschia Nasreddin (1911) is at present the most complete translation of these anecdotes in a number of versions (see Bibl.).

In conclusion, it may be mentioned that some anecdotes of Nasreddin were retold by A. Pann in Rumanian (1853), by Murad Efendi (Fr. v. Werner) in German (1878), by V. Veličko in Russian (1892), by V. Šcurat in Little Russian (1896) and by Kopitu-Zaide in Turkish verse (1918).

Nasr Al-Din — Nasrids


Nasrani. [See Nasar.]

Nasrids, the Banu Nasr, also sometimes called Banu ‘l-Ahmarr, a Muslim dynasty which ruled over the kingdom of Granada in the north of Spain from 629 to 897 A.D. (1231—1491).

While, thanks to the narratives of the contemporaries Ibn al-Khatib [q.v.] and Ibn Khaldun [q.v.], we are very well informed about the history of the kingdom of the Nasrids down to the second half of the sixteenth century, we have for the later period only a very few sources available in Arabic—and it is not always easy to fill the gaps from Christian sources—a few pages of al-Maqrizi’s Naqf al-‘Ibl and the short anonymous chronicle published in 1863 by Muller.

We give below a chronological list of the Nasrids; when a date A.D. is not preceded by its equivalent A.H., this is because it is not given either by Muslim historians or Arabic inscriptions.


I. Foundation of the Nasrid Kingdom. At the time when the power of the Almohads was beginning to collapse in Spain, two influential families, the Banû Mardanîsh in Valencia [q.v.] and the Banû Hûdî in Murcia [q.v.], took advantage of the civil strife to form for themselves little principalities in the east of the Peninsula. At the same time a member of the Arab family of the Banû ‘l-Ahmâr, settled in Arjona, a little town some 20 miles north of Jaen, who traced their descent from the chief of the Banû Khazraj, Sa’d b. ‘Ubâda, also tried his fortune at profiting by the troubled times. He was Muhammed b. Yusuf b. Ahmad b. Naṣir and was known as al-Shâkih. In 629 (1231) he found a few supporters to proclaim him; these were mainly members of his own family and of another, related to it, the Banû Ashkilîla. The towns of Jaen, Guadix and Baza rallied in the following year to his standard. After various exploits the details of which are somewhat obscure, Muhammed I, ancestor and founder of the dynasty of the Nasrids, took Granada, in 635 (1237—1238) and made this town his capital. He soon decided to build a royal residence on the famous hill of the Alhambra [q.v.]; al-Hamrâ’ or Hamrâ’ (Gharbâ’). In the course of the following year, he made himself lord successively of Malaga and Almeria. The little town of Lorca did not come under his sway until 663 (1264—1265). Hitherto Muhammed I had had to employ all his forces to fight against his Muslim rivals and in order to have his hands free he declared himself the vassal of Ferdinand I, king of Castile (1217—1252) to whom he undertook to pay a considerable annual tribute. He had to take part with his overlord in the capture of Seville from the Muslims in 1248 and be a passive witness of the triumphs of the armies of the king of Castile in the south of Spain. When on the death of Ferdinand I, Alfonso X succeeded him, Muhammed I had to renew his oath of vassalage to the latter. His kingdom, "the kingdom of Granada", was now the only area in the Peninsula ruled by a Muslim prince; bounded by the Mediterranean from the Straits of Gibraltar to Almeria, this kingdom did not go farther inland than the mountains of the Serrania de Ronda and the Sierra d’Elvira.

II. The Nasrid Kingdom in the xivth Century. — Muhammed I died in 671 (1273) and was succeeded by his son Muhammed II, called al-Fâkıh, who on his accession sought an
alliance with the Marinids who were finally putting an end to Almohad rule in Morocco. The Marinids answered his appeal. On coming to the throne Muhammad II had found himself faced with the necessity of putting down threatening rebellions; the most serious was that of the Banū Aṣkūliya, governors of Malaga and Guadix. He was able to rout the rebels near Antequera, with the help of forces sent him by the Infante Don Philip and Don Nuño de Lara. On the other hand, he soon realized that the king of Castille, his suzerain, had every interest in letting the kingdom of Granada exhaust itself in internal strife. This is why the Nasrid turned to the Marinids. In consideration for the return of Algeciras [q.v.] and Tarifa [q.v.], the sulṭān of Fās Abū Yūsuf Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣṣa agreed to cross into Spain where he inflicted two defeats on the Castillian troops. The chroniclers of the Marinid dynasty record the four expeditions of the king of Fās into Spain and give details of the loss of Tarifa which the Spanish leader Alonso Perez de Guzman, celebrated in legend as Guzman el Bueno, was to defend heroically a little later, in 1293. But it is from this time that the permanent intervention of the sulṭāns of Fās in the affairs of the Nasrids of Granada dates; under pretence of a ḥifāṣ they were able at every opportunity to add to the confusion of a political situation already much troubled and to weigh heavily upon the destinies of the Nasrid throne by playing a game of alliances which were often broken as readily as they were made. The kings of Granada henceforth were to have at their side a regular body of Moorish soldiers, the ghnūt (sing. ghnt) under the command of a Marinid shāhīkh, consisting of adventurers of fortunes who had become more or less a slave remnant of their native land.

When he died in 701 (1302) Muhammad II was succeeded by his son Muḥammad III who was later to be known as al-Makhluṭ (the deposed). It was he who built the great mosque of the Alhambra. He had to put down risings by the governors of Guadix and Almeria but had to bow before the rising of a prince of his family, Abu l-Diyuṭūs Naṣr b. Muḥammad, who assumed the power in 708 (1309). Muḥammad III abdicated and withdrew to Almuñecar [q.v.].

Naṣr's reign was hardly any longer or happier than that of his predecessor. After a display of energy by which he forced the king of Aragon to raise the siege of Almeria and the king of Castille to raise the siege of Algeciras, he failed against a conspiracy hatched by a Naṣrid prince Ismā‘īl, who seized the power in Granada and left only the town of Guadix to Naṣr. The latter established himself here in 713 (1314) and stayed there till his death in 722 (1322).

The fifth Naṣrid ruler, Abu l-Walid Ismā‘īl I b. Faradž b. Ismā‘īl b. Yūsuf b. Naṣr, was one of the most remarkable members of the dynasty. As soon as he had assumed the power, he showed a certain strength of character and did his best to put his frontiers in a state of defence. He regained for a time the old Naṣrid lands which had passed to the Marinids: Algeciras, Tarifa and Ronda. In 719 (1319) he had to meet an offensive from Castille and with the help of the Shāhīkh al-Ghuzzat, Abu Saʿd ʿUṯmān b. Abī ʿAbd al-Ula al-Marini, he inflicted heavy defeats on his enemies at Alicum and in the Sierra d'Elvira. In this last battle the Infantes Don Juan and Don Pedro, guardians of king Alfonso XI, were killed. Soon afterwards, Ismā‘īl I regained the fortresses of Huescar, Orce and Galera, then that of Baza. In the following year he took Martos. In 725 (1325) he was assassinated in his palace at the instigation of one of his relations with whom he had quarrelled, the lord of Algeciras Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl. He left four sons of whom the eldest, Muḥammad, succeeded him on the throne of Granada.

Muḥammad IV was still a minor on his accession and remained for several years under the strict guardianship of his ministers, notably of the vizier Muḥammad Ibn al-Mahrūk. The latter, after a long struggle with the Shāhīkh al-Ghuzzat Ibn Abī ʿAbd al-Ula, was finally put to death by orders of his sovereign who then took the reins of power into his own hands. The remainder of his reign was continually troubled. The help which he sought from the Marinid Sulṭān Abu l-Ḥasan al-ʿAli against the Christians earned him the enmity of the family of the Banū Abī ʿAbd al-Ula. In succession he lost Ronda, Algeciras, Marbella and Gibraltar and was ultimately assassinated in 733 (1333).

His brother Abu l-Ḥājjāj b. Yūsuf I b. Ismā‘īl succeeded him and reigned for a considerable period. His first care was to avenge his brother by expelling from his kingdom the Banū Abī ʿAbd al-Ula who took refuge in Tunis and in giving the office of Shāhīkh al-Ghuzzat to a Marinid lord, Yaḥyā b. ʿUmar Ibn Raḥmān. The struggle with the Christians was resumed in his reign. He sought and obtained the help of the Marinid Abu l-Ḥasan, who crossed the Straits of Gibraltar in 741 (1340) with a large force and laid siege to Tarifa. This expedition ended disastrously. The king of Castille, Alfonso XI, with his army and that of the king of Portugal inflicted a sanguinary defeat on the Muslims near the mouth of the River Salado, on the 7th Dhu- ʿAlīd 741 (Oct. 30, 1340). Abu l-Ḥasan had to take refuge in Algeciras, whence he was able to reach Morocco. Yūsuf I returned with all speed to Granada, while Alfonso XI profiting by the confusion of the Muslims seized Alcazaba la Real, Priego and Benameji. After taking Algeciras he granted the Naṣrid king a truce of ten years, at the end of which he laid siege to Gibraltar. Alfonso XI however died of the plague during the siege. Yūsuf I himself was assassinated by a madman in the great mosque of Granada on the day of the feast of the "Breaking of the Fast" of 755 (Oct. 19, 1354). This Sulṭān's name will always be associated with certain monuments of the Alhambra. It was he for example who built the great gateway of the enclosure called Bab al-Sharifa (gate of the Esplanade; commonly called wrongly "gate of Justice", in Spanish "Puerta Judiciaria" or "de la Justicia") the inscription on which records that it was finished in Rajab 1 749 (June 1348; cf. my Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne, No. 171). It was also Yūsuf I who in 750 (1349) built the madrasa of Granada (ibid., No. 172).

His successor was his eldest son Muḥammad V, who bore the honorific takab of al-Ghāni bi-llāh. This Sulṭān left the exercise of power in the hands of his father's old minister, the ḥājjib [q.v.] Riḍāwān, who maintained peaceful relations with Castille. After a few years, a conspiracy of dissatisfied Naṣrid princes forced Muḥammad V to abdicate and take refuge in Guadix, and afterwards in Morocco where he was well received by the Marinid Sulṭān Abu Salim (760 = 1359).
Isma'il II b. Yūsuf I, brother of Muhammad V, a Nasrid prince devoid of personality and prestige, was put on the throne, but only for a few months. In 761 (1360) he was assassinated at the instigation of the rā'īs Muhammad VI b. Isma'il b. Naṣr, who seized the power; his troops soon afterwards suffered a defeat at the hands of the Christians at Guadix. He was soon overthrown by Muhammad V who had returned to Spain and asked the help of Peter the Cruel of Castille to recover the throne. Muhammad VI also appealed to the Christian ruler but the latter had him put to death in 763 (1362).

Muhammad V’s second reign lasted for good or evil another 30 years. It was mainly occupied by family quarrels and civil strife. It was at this time that the famous vizier Lişān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khaṭṭīb had to seek refuge in Morocco, which however did not save him from assassination. It (1392) and the throne passed to his son Muḥammad VII. The latter imprisoned his elder brother Yūsuf in the fortress of Salobreña and resumed the offensive against the Christians, who took the fortress of Zahara from him in 809 (1407). When he died next year his elder brother Yūsuf III, the prisoner of Salobreña, assumed power and held it till his death in 820 (1417). After him his eldest son Muḥammad VIII became king of Granada; he is usually called by the chroniclers al-Aisar (“the left-handed”). It was in his reign, also much troubled, that we find the family of the Banu ‘l-Sarrāj, the Abencerrages [q. v.] and that of the Zegris (Arabic ṣaghrī: “man of the frontier”) beginning to play an important part in the history of Granada and the civil wars which characterise it. After various adventures, Muḥammad VIII had to abandon his

---

**Genealogical Table of the Nasrid Sultans.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naṣr</th>
<th>Yūsuf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Muḥammad I</td>
<td>Isma'il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muḥammad II</td>
<td>Faraj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Isma'il I</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Muḥammad IV</td>
<td>7. Yūsuf I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Muḥammad V</td>
<td>9. Isma'il II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Muḥammad VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṣr</td>
<td>11. Yūsuf II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Muhammad VIII</td>
<td>15. Muḥammad IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Yūsuf IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Muḥammad X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sa'd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 'Ali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Muḥammad XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is also at this date that the history of the Nasrid dynasty not only by Ibn al-Khaṭṭīb, but also by Ibn Khaldūn, stops. Our information about the later rulers is not only scanty but also inaccurate. The relations of the kings of Granada and of the rulers of Castille continued to be much what they had been, truces or expeditions of short duration with limited objectives. But gradually the ultimate aim of Castilian policy became apparent and generally became more and more easily attainable: the capture of Granada, which was at the same time to put an end to the Nasrid dynasty and to Muslim rule in Spanish lands. Below we give only a brief sketch of the last period of the history of the Nasrid kingdom.

---

**III. End of the Nasrid Kingdom.** — Muḥammad V died in 793 (1391) and was succeeded by his son Abu 'l-Ḥādžīsāl Yūsuf II who reigned only a short time. He died in 794 capital for a time and went to seek an asylum with the king of Tunis, while Muḥammad IX known as al-Ṣaghīr assumed power. Muḥammad VIII soon returned and his second reign was marked by the disastrous battle of Higuerauela, near Granada, in which the Muslims were routed by the army of John II on July 1, 1431. Al-Aisar had to take refuge in Malaga for some months during which the throne passed to Yūsuf IV b. al-Mawl, a grandson of Muḥammad VI. Al-Aisar then resumed the throne for a third time but the frontiers of his kingdom were shrinking every day. The towns of Jimena, Huescar (1435) and Huelma (1438) fell into the hands of the Christian power and in 1445 Muḥammad VIII was forced to abdicate in favour of his nephew Muḥammad X, while the Abencerrages, gathered at Montefio, proclaimed Abu 'l-Naṣr Sa'd sultan. It was during the latter’s reign that in 1462 Gibraltar was taken by Rodrigo
NAṢĪR (A.), etymologically: what is apparent to the eye, as a technical term: text. In this sense the word does not occur in the Kurān nor in the Ḥadīth. Al-Ṣāhibī, on the other hand, appears to be acquainted with it. In his Risāla he uses it chiefly in the sense of nasī' dārām (p. 7, 16, 30, 41) or nasī' ḥukm (p. 5) “what has been laid down in the Kurān”. In other passages nasī' al-ḥāda'ī is distinguished from sūna (p. 2, 4, infra, 24, 71, 81, 31, 65, 21). The combination nasī' sūna occurs, however, also (p. 50, 14, 66, 2). From these passages it may also appear that al-Ṣāhibī uses the term chiefly to denote legal precepts. In accordance with this is the definition of the term as given in the Liwān al-Arā'ib: the naṣī' of the Kurān or of the sūna means the precepts (ṣahād) contained in the plain words (zāhir) of these sources”. 

An extension of the term has taken place chiefly in three directions, so that naṣī', apart from the general sense of text, may mean: a. the text of a precept of the law, written or not written; b. the zāhir [q.v.] of a sacred text; c. the sense of such a text. For other special meanings of the term, cf. Dozy, 5upplements aux dictionnaires arabes, s.v. Bibliography: al-Ṣāhibī, al-Risāla fi ʿIrāq fi-7īq, Cairo 1321; Muḥammad al-Ṭahānawi, Dictionary of the Technical Terms, ed. A. Sprenger, Calcutta 1862, p. 1405 sqq. 

NASSADES were the light wooden warships built in Nasso or Hohenau (Lower Austria), the “Nassauer” or “Hohenauer”, Magyar nassad, pl. nassadok, Slav. nasad, which were used on the Danube. They were usually manned by Serbian seamen who were called martoloses (from the Magyar martolás, martolat, lit. “rober”). According to a Florentine account, this Danube flotilla in 1475 consisted of 330 ships manned by 10,000 “nassadists” armed with lances, shields, crossbow or bow and arrow, more rarely with muskets. The larger ships had also cannon. About 1522 the commander of the Danube fleet was Kadi Borić who reorganised it at Peterwardein (cf. K. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, 1/1, 158 sqq.). Through want of money, the Serbians were often deserted to the Turks (ibid., p. 262) who after the fall of Belgrade seized the Danube fleet and developed it into a powerful arm. About 1530 the Danube fleet consisted of 800 nassads and was commanded by the voivod Kázm (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.N., iii, 85). Bibliography: E. Szentesky, A dunai hajóhadok története (Budapest, Ungar. Akadémie, 1886); G. Vítkovic, Vergangenheit, Einrichtungen und Denkmäler der ungarischen königlichen Flotte (= Pröllö, urtanéva i spanyol ugarskij kraljevskij flot), in Glasnik, vol. lviii., Belgrad 1887; Hans Demkowicz’s “Zügflug einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Konstantin (1553—55), ed. by F. Babinger (Munich and Leipzig 1923), p. 4; K. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, 1/1, 242 and passim. 

(Franz Babinger)

NASTA’LIK. [See ARABIA, i. 391b].

NAṢĪH PASHA, an Ottoman grand vizier, was of Christian descent and was born either in Gumuldjina (the modern Komotini, Thrace, Greece) or in Drama. According to some sources (e.g. Bauder and Grimestone in Knolles), he was the son of a Greek priest, according to others (e.g. Naṭmā, Ta’rīkh, first edition, p. 283: arnaud

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.
NAŞÜH PASHA — NAVARINO

djindž) of Albanian origin. He came early in life to Stambul, spent two years in the Old Seray as a telerdār (halbardier) and left it as a câşçah. Through the favour of the sultan's confidant Mehemmed Agha he rapidly attained high office. In quick succession he became woiwod of Zile (Anatolia), master of the horse and governor of Fülek (Hungary). He married the daughter of the Kurdish Mir Seref and thereby obtained riches as great as his power, which every one was now beginning to fear. His ambition and arrogance, his vanity and cruelty knew no bounds and he was even said to be aiming at the throne. In 1015 (1606) he was to conduct the campaign against the Ottomans as the son-in-law of Mir Seref and on account of his local knowledge, with the rank of third vizier and serasker, but his attention was claimed by the trouble in Anatolia which was affecting the whole of Asia Minor; through Kurd treachery he lost a battle and it was only in the autumn of 1608 that his troops joined the army of the grand vizier who received him very coolly (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 412 sq). In 1011 (1602) Naşuh Pasha had been appointed governor of Siwas, the next year of Halab and in 1015 (1606) of Diyarbakr. His goal was the grand viziership. He did not hesitate to ask the sultan to give him the imperial seal and the post of commander-in-chief in return for a sum of 40,000 ducats and the maintenance of the army at his own expense. Ahmet I handed on the offer to the grand vizier, who summoned Naşuh Pasha to him and fined him that sum as a punishment (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 446 sq). When soon afterwards the grand vizier, the Croat Kuyduju Murad Paşa died at the age of over 90, Naşuh Paşa became his successor (Aug. 22, 1611). In the following year he married A'isha, the three year old daughter of Sultan Ahmet I (Feb. 1612). His arrogance now knew no bounds; all his opponents were ruthlessly disposed of. His personal qualities dazzled everyone: "Of imposing appearance, brave and eloquent, never weary of talking, but at the same time passionate, impetuous, quite incapable of kindly conduct and uttering flattering words and always intent on humbling the other viziers" (J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 472). As human life was nothing to him but wealth everything, he accumulated vast treasures. Sycophants and astrologers nourished in him the delusion that he was born to rule. The number of his enemies increased from day to day as a result of his intrigues and his ruthlessness. When on Friday the 13th Ramazi 1023 (Oct. 17, 1614) he was to accompany the Sultan to the mosque, suspecting no good, he said he was ill. The bostandji bâbi sent to him had strangled by his own garden guards. His body was buried on the Ok Ma'dan. His estate which fell to the coffers of the state was enormous: pearls, jewels, carpets, cloth and bullion without number (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 474 sq. quoting Mezeray, ii. 195). — Naşuh Pasha left several sons, one of whom Husain Paşa (d. 1053 [1643]; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., v. 260 and Hâdi'dji Khalifis, Fedžile, ii. 226) had a son named Mehmed. The latter wrote a history of the Ottoman empire (Dheil-i Ta'vir-tikhi Ahi Othmân) from the death of Murad IV (1048 = 1639) to 1081 (1670) the original MS. of which is in Dresden (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 211).


NAȚÎDJA (A.) is the usual name for the conclusion resulting from the combination of the two premisses mútakadămât in the syllogism (biyyā). It corresponds to the Stoic ἐπιποθήσης; this word in the works of Galen known to the Arabs is applied to the various discharges from the body but also means, as with the Stoics, the conclusion. Aristotle used the word ἐπιποθήσης: that which concludes or completes the syllogism. In place of the usual nattîda we also find rīdî or râfî (≡ deduction). (T. J. DE BOER)

NÂTÎK. [See SABIYA.]

NAVARINO (Navâzin), a little seaport in the southwest of Messenia not far from the ancient Pylos, opposite the promontory of Koryphasion on which there was in prehistoric times an acropolis and later, during classical antiquity, an often mentioned settlement. The harbour of Navarino is one of the safest in the Greek east for it is sheltered by the island of Sphacteria, which lies right opposite it and has intimate connections with many ancient, medieval and modern events. Recent research has shown that Navarino has no connection with the Homeric Pylos. The latter was in Triphylla near the village of Kakabatos where prehistoric tombs were recently excavated. The derivation of the name Navarino cannot be given with certainty. According to Fallmerayer, Gesch. der Halbinsel Morea, i. 188, the name Navarino is a distinct survival of Avar rule in Morea between 587 and 807. On the other hand, Hopf thought that it owed its name to the Navarrese (cf. below). Fallmerayer's view has been adopted by F. Curtius, Peloponnesus, i. 86; ii. 181 and W. Miller among others. According to M. Leake, Travels in the Morea, i. 411, the name Navarino developed from Ναυαρίνος. Hopf's view is however wrong, for Navarino is mentioned before the appearance of the Genoese in the Morea. In the middle ages the country round Navarino
NAVARINO — NAVAS DE TOLOSA

was called Zonglon (Zonchio), from which came the French name of the place Junch (Old French jonc = reed). One of the earliest mentions of Navarino is in the geographical treatise, the Nuzhat al-
Manazzik of Idrisi; he refers to the place as Irouda and adds that it has "a very commodious harbour.
After the period of Frankish rule, information about Navarino becomes fuller. The Knights, who
under Guillaume de Champlitte and Godefray de Villeharduin had planned the conquest of the
Morea, in 1205 took its inhabitants and governor
prisoners after the capitulation of Navarino.

Later the Baron of Thebes and Marshal of Achaea,
Nicolas St. Omer (d. 1294), built for his nephew
Nicolas III St. Omer, the Neocastro (New Castle)
of Navarino. This is said, according to Buchon,
to have been called Neo-Avarino in contrast to
Palaio-Avarino. At the end of 1381 or early in
the next year, the Navarrese company seized Nava-
riano and made it the chief centre of their military
power. Navarino then became known as Château
Navarres (Voyage d'Outremer par le Seigneur
[Nompar] de Caumont, publ. par la Grange, Paris
1858, p. 89). The Greeks however at this time
called Navarino Spanochori ( = village of the
Spaniards, after the Navarrese). In 1417 Venetian
soldiers occupied Navarino and six years later the
republic of St. Mark became the lawful owner of
the place. In the summer of 1460 Sultan Mu-
hammad II appeared before Navarino with an
army, which, in spite of the recently concluded
peace treaty, laid waste the country round the
town. In August 1500 the Turks took Navarino
from the Venetians without difficulty after taking
Modon and Koron shortly before, although the
garrison of Navarino numbered 3,000 soldiers and
had provisions for about three years. Soon after-
wards the Venetians were able to retake Navarino
by a stratagem and to destroy the Muslim garri-
son. Ali Paşa now advanced from the land and
Kemâl Reis attacked with his fleet by sea and in
1501 they took finally Navarino, inflicting great
losses on the Venetians. Navarino retained its
importance under Turkish rule and was often the
place of concentration of the imperial fleet. Hâджî
Khalifa and Eyiûlâ Celebi give some important
information about Navarino and the former says that
its original name was Anavarin. In the year 1568
the Venetians again took the town which they
held till 1715. The Turks then entered upon their
last period of occupation.

During the first Russo-Turkish War in the reign
of Catherine II (1768—1774) Navarino played an
important part. After a stubborn defence for six
days by the Turkish garrison and the Muslim
civilian populace, the Russians on April 10,
1770 forced the fortress, the town and the nearby
island to surrender. The fortress was now strongly
enough fortified but still amply provided with
munitions and artillery, to capitulate. By the
terms of the treaty, the Turks of Navarino
got to Chania (Crete) leaving behind them a
number of Christian women whom they had had
imprisoned in their harems. Soon afterwards
the Russians made Navarino, the fortifications of
which they renovated, their principal base of
operations in the Morea. Fate decided that the Russians
had to evacuate Navarino again. On June 1, 1770,
the Russian ships sailed from the harbour of
Navarino. The Turks next day occupied the well
placed fortress, which was in part burned and
destroyed.

During the last decades of Turkish rule in the
Morea, the Turkish family of Bekir-Agha of Nava-
riano played a prominent part. Soon after the out-
break of the War of Liberation, the Greeks laid
siege on March 29, 1821 to Navarino where the
Turks of Arcadia (Cyparissia) had also taken refuge.
On Aug. 7, 1821 the Turks surrendered to the
Greeks who massacred them all without mercy in
spite of all protests. In the spring of 1825,
Ibrahim Paşa of Egypt occupied Navarino and the
neighbouring fortress in spite of a heroic defence
by the Greeks.

What gave Navarino its special place in history
was the naval battle fought on Oct. 20, 1827 in
its harbour between the combined fleets of England,
France and Russia on one side and those of Turkey,
Egypt and Tunisia on the other, in which the
latter were almost completely destroyed. It is cal-
culated that the Turks lost 6,000 killed and the
allied losses were only about 1,000. Soon after
the battle, Ibrahim Paşa concluded a truce with
Admiral Codrington.

Navarino remained in Ibrahim Paşa's hands
until the spring of 1828. The French under General
Maison then relieved the Egyptian-Turkish troops.
Alfred Reumont gives a fine picture of Navarino
under French occupation in 1832.

Bibliography: (Selection, in addition to
references in the text): J. v. Hammer, Rumeli
und Bosnia geographisch beschrieben von 

Hadschi Chalâfa, Vienna 1812, p. 122—123; 
Eylülah Celebi, Sıâyhat-nâmesi, viii., Istanbul
1928, p. 309 sqq.; Pier Antonio Pacífico, Breve
descrizione corografica del Peloponneso ö Moria,
Venice 1704, passim; F. Gregorovius, Geschichte
der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter, ii., Stuttgart
1889, p. 201 (cf. also the Greek translation with
supplements by Sp. Lambros, ii., Athens 1904,
p. 204, 584—585); William Miller, The Latin
in the Levant, London 1908, passim; 30., Essays
on the Latin Orient, Cambridge 1921, p. 105
sqq., 571 (where earlier literature is given); A. G.
Momfontatos, Melâna ki Kanonon ëpì Eiçtòpìçakis,
Athens 1914, passim; J. Philimon, Apoânoi ëpì tò
perì ëpì ëllì.Ἱππαταστάσεως, Athen 1859, p. 213;
P. M. Kontiojannis, Οἱ Ἑλληνες κατὰ τὸ πῦρτον
ἐπὶ ὘ικατηρίας ἀ Ρωσιοσοτηρικά τόπων, Athens
1903, p. 136 sqq., 185 sqq.; Memoir of Admiral
Sir E. Codrington, London 1873; A. Reumont,
Reisesschriften und Umrisse aus südlichen
Gegendem, Stuttgart and Tubingen 1835, p. 53
sqq. (Nikos A. Bees [BEHS])

NAVAS DE TOLOSA (LAS), a place in the
south of Spain in the province of Jaen on the
frontier of Andalucia, a short distance from the
modern town of Carmona. Its site corresponds to
that of a fortress called Hisn al-'Ishâb in the
Muslim period. It was in the plain which lies in
front of it that there was fought on the 15th
Safar 699 (July 16, 1212) the great battle
between the Christians and the Almohads which
ended in the rout of the latter.

As a result of the defeat of Alarcos [q. v.], the
king of Castile, Alfonso VIII, had concluded a
truce with the Muslims. On its expiration at the
end of the xiith century, the Christian troops
began a series of surprise attacks on the Muslim
frontiers. Disturbed at this, the Almohad ruler
al-Nâṣir [q. v.] prepared a great expeditionary
force in Morocco while on his side the king of
Castile secured the help of the kings of Aragon,
Navarre and Leon, as well as of the Count of Portugal and the Pope, who preached a crusade against the infidel. The Christian troops gathered in Toledo and set out, but the encounter was a bloody one. The Muslim volunteers from Morocco and the Andalusian contingents soon lost ground and the Almohad 'abd were in their turn decimated. The victors were able to exploit their success and took Ubeda [q.v.], Baéza [q.v.] and other strongholds. The Christian victory of las Navas de Tolosa was certainly one of the most important steps in the "Reconquista".

**Bibliography:** The Arab historians given in the bibliography to the article ALMOHADS and Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Himyari, al-Raqa'i al-Must'in, article AL-IIFRIB. — A study on the campaign of 1212 by A. Huici, Estudio sobre la campaña de las Navas de Tolosa aparecido en Anales del Instituto General y Técnico de Valencia, Valencia 1916. (E. LEVI-PROVENCAL)

NAVAR. [See NURJ.]

AL-NAWAWI (or AL-NAWAWI), MUHAMMAD AL-DIN ABU ZAKARIYA' YAHYA B. SHARAF B. YUSUFI [following Nawawi's own spelling, Syuyt, vol. 53]. B. HASAN B. HUSAIN B. MUHAMMAD B. DUNA' B. HIJAZ AL-HIZM B. AL-URMAI, a Shi'i jurist, born in Muharram 631 (Oct. 1233) in Nawaw south of Damascus in Ljódwám. The ability of the boy very early attracted attention and his father brought him to 649 to the Madrasa al-Rawahiyya in Damascus. There he first of all studied medicine but very soon went over to Islamic learning. In 651 he made the pilgrimage with his father. About 655 he began to write and was called to the al-Ashrafiya school of tradition in Damascus in succession to Abu Shamsa who had just died. Although his health had suffered severely during his life as a student, he lived very frugally and even declined a salary. His reputation as a scholar and a man soon became so great that he even dared to approach Sulam Baibars to ask him to free the people of Syria from the war-taxes imposed upon them and to protect the teachers in the madrasas from a reduction in their income.

This was in vain however, and Baibars expelled al-Nawawi from Damascus when he alone refused to sign a fikhr approving the legality of these exactations. (This action of al-Nawawi's is commemorated in the popular romance Sīrat al-Zahir Baibars, Cairo 1326, xi. 38 sqq., in which the Sultan, cursed by al-Nawawi, becomes blind for a time.) He died unmarried in his father's house in Nawaw on Wednesday 24th Radjab 676 (Dec. 22, 1277). His tomb is still held in honour there.

Nawawi has regained his high reputation to the present day. He had an exceptional knowledge of Tradition and adopted even stricter standards than later Isāmī; for example he admits only five works on Tradition as canonical, while he expressly puts the Sunan of Ibn Mājda on a level with the Mustad of Ahmad b. Handal (cf. Sharh Muslim, i. 5; Adhkar, p. 3). In spite of his fondness for Muslim, he gives a higher place to Bukhārī (Tahdīh, p. 550). He wrote the principal commentary on Muslim's Sahih (pr. in 5 volumes, Cairo 1283); as an introduction to this, he wrote a history of the transmission of this work and a sketch of the science of Tradition. He gives not only observations on the text and a grammatical explanation of the traditions but he also comments on them, mainly from the theological and legal aspect, quoting whenever necessary not only the founders of the principal schools but also the older jurists like al-Awzā'ī, al-Dhahabi, etc. [p. 183].

Al-Nawawī's importance as a jurist is perhaps even greater. In Shi'i circles he was regarded with his Minhāj al-Talibīn (finished 669; pr. Cairo 1297 and frequently; ed. van den Berg with French trans., Batavia 1882—1884; cf. thereon Snouck Hurgronje, Versgr. Geschr., vi. 3—18) as the highest authority along with al-RAHĪ and since the tenth (with) century the two commentators on this work, Ibn Hadjar's Ta'ā to and Ibn-Kamil's Nihāyā, have been regarded almost as the law books of the Shi'i school. The book consists of excerpts from the Muḥāraʾ of Rahī and, as the author himself says, is intended to be a kind of commentary on it. It certainly owes the estimation in which it is held also to the fact that it goes back via al-RAHĪ and al-Ghazzālī to the Imam al-Haramain. We should also mention the Rawad fi Muhkamār Sharī' al-Rahī (on Ghazzālī's Wadīj) finished in 669 on which commentaries have often been written and the commentaries on Shāhāz al-Muḥadadab and al-Tanbih (G. A. L., i. 387) and al-Ghazzālī's Al-Wasīṣ, which do not seem to have survived, and a collection of several's put together by his pupil Ibn al-Asārī (Cairo 1352).

His biographical and grammatical studies resulted in the Tahdīh al-Asanw wa l-Lughāt (Part 1 on the names, Wustenfeld, Gottingen 1842—1847; Part 2 on in Ms. in Leyden; included by Ibn al-Asārī among the unfinished works and there are certainly gaps in it) and l-Tahlif fi Alfāz al-Tanbih. To his mystical tendencies — he had attended lectures on the Kishārī and transmitted it — we owe works like the Kīwād al-Adhkar in the prayers, finished in 667 (pr. Cairo 1311 and frequently), the Kīyād al-Ṣalātīn (finished in 670; pr. Mecca 1302, 1312) and the incomplete Busān al-Arījī fi l-Zahd wa l-Taṣawwuf. An almost complete list of his some 50 works is given in Wustenfeld, p. 45 sqq., those that are still in MSS. are given in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 394 sqq. and index and those that are printed in Saris, Muḥām, vol. 1876—1879.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Asārī (d. 724 = 1324), Talhīf al-Talibīn fi Tadājamat Sahīhīn al-Imām al-Nawawī [with many stattica's], MS. Tubingen, No. 18; al-Suhaylī (d. 949 = 139—1497), Tadājamat Kīth al-Adhkarī ... Al-Nawawī, MS. Berlin, Wetzstein, in 1742, fol. 140—207 (Ahlwardt, No. 10125); al-Suyūtī, al-Minḥāj fi Tadājamat al-Nawawī, MS. Berlin Wetzstein II, 1807, fol. 53—68 (Ahlwardt, No. 10126); al-Sukhī, Tabkāt al-Adhkarī l-lybīrā, Cairo 1324, v. 165—168; al-Dhahabī, Tadājurīl al-Hufūr, Haidarābād n.d., iv. 259—264; al-Vâbī, Mizhī' al-Qanān, Haidarābād 1339, iv. 182—186; the other sources are printed in Wusten-
field, Über das Leben und die Schriften der Schrift Alu Zabariah fi Al-mawlawi, Gottingen 1849; Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschichten, ii. 357 sq. For the reference to the popular romance I am indebted to Heffinge.

Wangelin. (HEFFENING)

AL-NAWAWI Muhammad b. Omar b. 'Arafi al-Djawi, an Arabic writer of Malay origin, born in Tanara (Banten), the son of a village judge (pangulu), after completing his studies made the pilgrimage to Mecca and settled there permanently about 1855, after making a short visit to his native land. After he had studied and completed his education with the teachers of the holy city, he set up as a teacher himself and gained great influence over his fellow countrymen and their kinsmen. From 1870 he devoted half his time to authorship. He was still alive in 1888.

He wrote a large number of commentaries on popular textbooks, which are listed by Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 501 in addition to Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 362 sq. Of these the following may be mentioned, with some information additional to what is contained in these two works.

He expanded the Kur'an in his al-Tafsir al-munir al-Malik al-Tansir al-musir 'an U'idah Malak al-Ta'wil, Cairo 1305. In the field of Fiqh he annotated the Fath al-Kharî of Muhammad b. al-Kasim al-Ghazzî (d. 918 = 1512), a commentary on Abu Shujâ' al-Islahî al-Takhib, entitled al-Ta'wilî, Cairo 1305, 1310, and again entitled Kût al-Hâbî, Cairo 1301, 1305, 1310.

He wrote a commentary on al-Ghazzî's Bidâyat al-hidâyâ under the title Marâkî 'l-Cuthâîa, Bulûk 1293, 1309; Cairo 1298, 1304, 1307. 1308. 1319, 1327. — On the Manâthîl al-Na'dîf of Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Shirînî al-Khatîb (d. 977 = 1569) he wrote al-Fath al-ma'dî, Bulûk 1276, 1292; Cairo 1297, 1298, 1306; Mecca 1316. — On the Sa'fînât al-Salâh of 'Abd al-Lâh b. Yâhiyâ al-Hadrâmî he wrote the Sallam al-Munâdî, Bulûk 1231, 1297; Cairo 1301, 1307. — He wrote a commentary on the 601 questions of Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Zâhidî (d. 819 = 1416) put into verse by his fellow countryman Mu'tâfa b. 'Othâm al-Djawi al-Kâritî as al-Fath al-ma'dî on âlût, alums, fast and pilgrimage under the title al-Tel al- Khâmîn, Cairo 1300; the Sa'fînât al- Na'dîf of Sâlim b. Sansir of Shîrîn in Hadrâmawt, ended in Batavi, was expanded under the title Kûsîfîl pill-Salâhî, Cairo 1292, 1301, 1302. 1303. 1305; Bulûk 1309. — On the exposition of the Wâlî al-Djawi by his colleague Muhammad b. Sulaîmân 'Hass Abî allâh al-Ridâlî he wrote the commentary al-Zîmîr al-alîfâ, Cairo 1299, 1308, 1329; Bulûk 1302.

In the field of dogmatics he annotated al-Sâ'îrî's al-Mun al-Dâ'ârîn (l. 892 = 1490) entitled Dhorât al-yâsins, Cairo 1304; the Sidât al- Asrowning of Ahmad al-Marrûkî (c. 1281 = 1864) entitled Nûr al- Zârun, Cairo 1303, 1329; al-Badîjri's Kisaâ fi 'ilm al-Tawîl entitled Tâsîân al-Dorârî, Cairo 1301, 1309, Mecca 1329; the Marâkî of Abu 'L-Lâth entitled Krir al-Ghaith, Cairo 1301, 1303, Mecca 1311; the anonymous Fath al-Rûhîâm entitled Hîyât al-Sîyâkî in a Madakhî, Mecca 1304; the al-Dur al-farîd of his teacher Ahmad al-Nâshrâwi entitled Fath al- Madîrî, Cairo 1298.

In the field of mysticism he wrote a commentary on the Manâshîmâ Hidâyat al-ad-Dhikrât al-Tarîkh al-Awlîyâ' of Zain al-Din al-Malbârî (d. 928 = 1522) entitled Safâlîm al-Fudâ'âsî, Cairo 1301, Mecca 1315; and on his Marâkî fi 'l-Allâmî al-Imân he wrote the Khâfat al-Tiqîyân, Cairo 1305. On the al-Manâbî al-stamî fî Tâwâb al-Nukhûm of 'Ali b. Husîn al-Din al-Hindi (d. 975 = 1667) he wrote Mi'âhâb al-Zûmî, Mecca 1314. — His commentaries on stories of the life of the Prophet may be classed as edifying popular literature; such he wrote on the Mas'âdî al-Nâdî under the title al-A'rûsî, Cairo 1926, which is ascribed by some to Ibn al-Djawi, by others to Ahmad b. al-Kasim al- Harîrî, entitled Fath al-Qâmid al-Malik 'alâ Mas'âdî al-Shâ'ikh Ahmad b. Kâsim wayyusamâ 'alâ Brûd al-Fawzi al-Byâ'în Alûfî; Mas'âdî Ibn al-Djawi, Bulûk 1292, entitled Bûrahât al-Awâm fî Sharîk Mustâfî al-Sâ'îrî al-Mu'în le-Îbâna, Bulûk 1292 and Fath al-Qâmid al-Malik 'alâ Mas'âdî al-Shâ'ikh Ahmad b. Kâsim, Mecca 1306, as well as on the Mas'âdî of Djâ'far al-Barrandji (d. 1179 = 1765) entitled Tâbârî al-Mustânî, Bulûk 1292, and on the Mas'âdî of al-Mustâfî al-Jâ'înî, Bulûk 1296, and on his al-Khâfat al-nabîwîa entitled al-Dauîr al-âshâî, Bulûk 1299. He made an excerpt from al-Hasâlînî's (d. 923 = 1517) Mas'âdî entitled al-Ibîrî al-darî fî Mas'âdî Sâ'idîma Muhammad al-Sâ'idî al-Munî, Cairo 1299.

In the field of grammar he wrote a commentary on the Adharîlmiya under the title Khâfat al-Mu'înîya 'an Siyâr al-Adharîlmiya, Cairo 1308 and on a versification Fath al-Qâmid al-Khâfatîiya 'alâ l-Kâwâbi al-âshâîa fî 'l-Nasîr al-Adharîlmiya, Bulûk 1298, on 'Abd al-Mun'im Iwâd al-Djârîjâni's (c. 1271 = 1854) al-Aswâd al-tâsriyya entitled Fath al-falît al-yâsîniya, Cairo 1299, in the field of rhetoric he completed in 1293 (1876) a commentary on the Râsidîl al-Nâ'îrîrî of Husain al-Nawwâlî al-Mâlikî entitled LÎdâb al-Bayân, Cairo 1301.

Bibliography: In the article; cf. also J. L. Sarkis, Mâdîm al-Mîsîrî, col. 1879-1883.

(C. BROCKELMANN)

NAWBA, an art-form in the music of the Islamic East similar to the European cantata or suite. There are two varieties: i. the nawba of chamber music; ii. the nawba of military music [for the latter see TÂBIL KIÎNÂ in the Supplement]. The nawba of chamber music varies in construction according to its provenance, and does not always carry this particular name. As early as the viiith century A.D. we appear to see this nawba in its nascent stage. The musicians at the court of the Caliphate under the early 'Abbasids performed in turn (dorî) and succession (nawba), and it is the time of al-Wâqî (d. 777) we know that a court musician had a particular duty for his nawba (Khîbî al-Îghânî, iii. 177; v. 82, 120; vi. 73; x. 123; xvii. 131; xxi. 150). Some musicians were famous because they specialized in certain genres of music, such as İbrâhim al-Mawsîlî in the máakhirî and Hakâm al-Wâdi in the kasîrî rhythms (Îghânî, vi. 12, 66), and a programme made up of these diverse types of music probably led to the term nawba being transferred to the programme itself (Ribera, Las Cantatas, p. 48).

Although we read in the Alî Laila wa-Laila of a nawba (ii. 54), a dârî (a quick movement; cf. the modern dârî) of a nawba (iv. 87), as well as a complete nawba (iv. 173) being played, yet it is not until the xivth century A.D. that we
possess precise information about the nawba and its integral parts. ‘Abd al-Karīd b. Ghalib [q.v.] tells us that among the ancient forms of musical composition were the nawba, masāḥ and bāṭil. The nawba, he says, was made up of four movements (‘āṯār) viz., the bawāl, the ḍhawāl, the tarāna, and the ḍarāʾid dā’ūlah. In the year 1579, whilst at the court of ‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Din Baybars the Dīlūrīd sultan of al-Irāq, Ibn Ghalib introduced a fifth movement to the nawba, which he called the mustaqād. During this occasion, he tells us, he composed fifty nawbāt for the court, and the words of one of these have been preserved (fol. 96v). These five movements were instrumental as well as vocal, and besides the verse-form being specified (the tarāna for instance was in ṭurūq), the rhythms (‘abād) for the instrumental accompaniments were also prescribed, one of the ḍhawāl group being essential. The purely instrumental movements are also mentioned by Ibn Ghalib including the overture called the ṭhawrād, which even to-day is the prelude to the nawba. He calls it ṭaḥūṭ ("embroideries"), and says that the ṭhawrād al-falānī has three or seven sections (siyāf). In day of old the nawba was considered the most important art-form in the music of Islamic peoples. To-day it has fallen into neglect and in some countries will probably soon disappear. Two distinct cultures may be found in the modern nawba, the Eastern and Western. The former is a clear survival of that nawba described by Ibn Ghalib in the xviith century A.D. The latter is claimed (Vafîl) to have had its origin in the Alandalus in the viith—ixth century, and is known to-day as the nawba gharānī. It is confined to North Africa, the purest type being found in the West, whilst the nearer the East is approached the more we find the influence of the Eastern nawba.

The Levantine nawba to-day comprises the following movements: 1. The ṭaḥūṭ, an instrumental prelude played by the muqallim or chef d'orchestre; 2. the bawāl or bāṭil, an instrumental overture; 3. the bār, a vocal movement; 4. the nawbāt, whose name recalls the form of the xviith century tarāna; 5. the ṭaḥūṭ, also reminiscence of the muqallim of old, since its function is tonal "embroidery"; 6. the ṭābīr sambār, in slow rhythm; 7. the dāḥir, comprising verses; 8. the yiḥār sambār; 9. the ṭābīr sambār, an instrumental finale (cf. Thibaut and Lavigne, v. 2861). A shorter nawba is described by Ducoudray (p. 22), whilst the famous British musician Sir Arthur Sullivan has related (Fortnightly Review, 1905, p. 86) his experiences as an auditor of the nawba. The various movements, especially the instrumental ones, are also cultivated in the Near East as sole items of performance, the bawāl, ṭaḥūṭ, and ṭābīr being specially favoured. The bawāl or bāṭil is still composed in sections as of old, but these are called ṭābīr instead of bāṭil. Another interesting type of nawba in Egypt includes the dance, and an example is given in complete score by Victor Foret. It comprises seven movements: 1. the bawāl, for instruments and voices; 2. the ṭarīmanī al-waṭwāl, for the ballet; 3. the sūqām, for the solo dance; 4. the ṭarīmanī al-thāthīnī, for the ballet; 5. the ṭaḥūṭ, for the solo dance; 6. the ṭarīmanī al-thāthīnī, for the ballet; 7. the ṭaḥūṭ, for the solo dance. The whole is accompanied by choir and instruments.

In Western Turkestān the nawba of to-day shows that in the Middle East it has developed somewhat differently from that of the Levant. Here, more attention has been paid to the purely instrumental movements, and they have been kept separate. The nawba is here called a maṣūm, a name which properly stands for "a melodic mode". It is divided into three parts, the first two being the most important. These two are the maṣūm or instrumental pieces, and the maṣīr comprising vocal-instrumental pieces. The names of most of the sections of the muṣūkhālīt and maṣīr refer to either rhythmic (ṣūq) or melodic modes (maṣūmāt), although two of them, the ṭhawrād and the tarāna, retain names which occur in the xivth century Ibn Ghalib treatise. In Buhūrā, only six maṣūmāt (= nawbāt) appear to have survived, although the Uzbek claim that they know others. These have recently been described by the Uzbek poet Fitrat, whilst the notation has been published by a Soviet Union official, Colonel V. A. Uspensky. There is also another but shorter type of maṣūm known in Buhūrā, and six of these have also survived. In Khwarizm, the muṣūkhālīt of the maṣūmāt (= nawbāt) differ from those of Buhūrā, and here an additional one has been spared the avages of time. The Khwarizm muṣūkhālīt are probably purer than those of Buhūrā because they appear to have been handed down, not viva voce as elsewhere, but by means of a notation which was known as early as the time of Khwarizm Shâl ‘Allâ al-Din Muhammad (d. 1220) (cf. Pro-Musica, New York 1927, v.; The Sackbut, London 1924, iv.).

In North Africa, as already stated, a different tradition in the nawba has been followed. Here there are several varieties, but the most highly esteemed is the nawba gharānī. As the name signifies, it is a pure form of origin, and this is claimed for both the words and music. Although MSS. exist which contain the words of the Granadan nawbāt, yet we only know the music itself from modern Moorish practice. We read of the "twenty-four nawbāt", which tells us that the nawbāt were composed in the twenty-four modes (jubayt). Others say that the Andalusians only possessed twelve or fourteen nawbāt (F. Salvador-Daniel, p. 52; Vafïl, Pref.) but it has now been shown (Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor) that there were twenty-four originally, but their names are different from those which some writers have presumed (Delphin et Guin, p. 62; Lavigne, v. 2859). The nawba gharānī as performed in Algeria to-day comprises the following movements: 1. the dâṭār, a short vocal prelude. 2. the muṣūkhālīt, an instrumental prelude; 3. the ṭāshiya or towâshiy ("ornamenting"), the overture proper; 4. the muṣūk or muṣūkād, a vocal movement, preceded by a short instrumental prelude called a kârs; 5. the bâṭil or bâṭilī, a vocal movement preceded by a kârs; 6. the dâṭār, also a vocal movement preceded by a kârs; and whose form is practically identical with the old dâṭār (cf. above); 7. the ṭaḥūṭ, a vocal movement which is introduced by a ṭāshiya; 8. the ṭaḥūṭ or muṣūk, the finale (British Museum MS., Or. 7007; Vafîl, Maṣūmî; cf. Lavigne, v. 2941; Delphin and Guin, p. 65). The words of the classical Granadan nawbāt have been edited from MSS. sources and viva voce by Edmond Vafîl in his Maṣūmî al-Aghânî, whilst with the collaboration of Jules Rouanet he issued his Répertoire de musique arabe
et maure which contains the music of a complete nawba gharnafti and sundry movements from others. In 1863, Christianowitsch published his Esquisse historique de la Musique arabe, which also contained the major portions of seven Grandan nawbah. Another type of nawba practised in Algeria, but of secondary importance, was the ikhtilatat. In Morocco the five movements of the nawba are the bazat, the ka’t si nanfis, the bâsîtî, the kadâm, and the daraf, as well as the overture fûjîya.

Bibliography: Treatises: Christianowitsch, Esquisse historique de la Musique arabe, Cologne 1863; F. Salvador-Daniel, La Musique arabe, Algiers 1879; Ducoudray, Souvenirs d’une mission musicale en Grèce et en Orient, Paris 1876; Delphin and Guin, Notes sur la poésie et la musique arabe, Paris 1886; Yafîl, Madâ’în al-Aghâni wa l-A’ilmi min Kullûm al-Anaduls, Algiers 1904; Rouanet, La Musique arabe et La Musique arabe dans le Maghreb (Lavignac’s Encyclopédie de la Musique, v., Paris 1913–1922); British Museum MSS. Or. 2561, fol. 215; Or. 767, fol. 72b; Ibn Khazin, Bou Saïd, Mus. Marsh, Ms. N. 828, fol. 95; Fitrat, Ubîk kiltîski mûziqati, Tashkent 1927; Uspeisky, Klasscheskaia mûziqka Usbek, Tashkent 1927; Kûtub at’l-Aghâni, Bulak 1896 sg.; Alf Laila wa-Laila, ed. Macnaghten, Calcutta 1839–1842; Raouf Yeke Be, La Musique turque (Lavignac, Encyclopédie, v.), Musique orientale, Le compositeur du “kifir” dans le mode Nihavand (Revue Musicale, 1907); Loret, Quelques documents relatifs à la littérature et la musique populaires de la Haute-Egypte (Mémoires… de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, i., Paris 1889); Farmer, An Old Moorish Lute Tutor, Glasgow 1933; John Rylands Library Manchester Pers. MS. N. 707, fol. 18; Vienna MS. N. 1517; Mironov, Obor muzikal’nykh kultur usbekov, Samarkand 1931.


NAWBAKHTI. This Iranian patronymic (now or noi + baht “new fortune”) was borne in Baghdad during the first two ‘Abbasid centuries by a family remarkable for its influence on the advance of learning and on the political legitimacy of the Imámids.

It claimed descent (cf. Buhtari, Divan, p. 115) from the Persian hero Gw son of Gudarz celebrated in the Shâhnâma (cf. Justi, Iranisches Nationalbuch, p. 399 and Christiansen, Kayandis, p. 59, 117). Its first known representative Nawbakht, an astrologer, owed his fortune to the future caliph al-Mansûr, to whom in prison he is said to have foretold the throne and later the victory over the Zaidi rebel Ibrâhim ibn al-Yamamah in the year 761/796 of which, having drawn up the horoscope of Baghdad, the new capital, he was granted fiefs in it. His son Abî Sâlih Timâmî (on this curious prenome cf. Ibn Abî ʿUṣâibî, ed. Aug. Müller, Leipzig 1884, iii., p. xii. [Vorwort] and H. Ritter, op. cit., p. 9) (d. 760 = 785) had seven sons by his wife Zerrin, the founders of the various branches of the Al Nawbakht in which we find theologians like Ibrâhim b. Iṣâk b. Abî Sahîl (wrote about 750 = 961 the Kitâb al-Yaḥûsî, on which a commentary by ’Allâmah nâtîf al-Ikhâlî). In Morocco the five movements of the nawba are the bazat, the ka’t si nanfis, the bâsîtî, the kadâm, and the daraf, as well as the overture fûjîya.


NAWBAKHTI, nisha of the Nawbakht family.

1. Fâdîl b. (Abî Sahîl) b. Nawbakht (d. 200 = 815) an astronomer like his father (with whom he is confused) and, like his brother Hasan, attached to the Dîr al-Ḥikma to translate from Persian, wrote at least seven books (Ibn al-Nadîm, Fihrist, p. 274). All of these survives is a fragment of the Kitâb al-Nuhrânîn or (Yaḥûsî) on questions relating to horoscopes (Fihrist, p. 238–239).

2. Iṣâk al-Alî b. ... b. Nawbakht (235–311 = 849–925), the real political leader of the Imâmids party, who kept in close touch with the famous vizier ‘Alî b. al-Furat (whose father, Muhammad Mûsâ b. Hasan, we may note, had been a follower of the Nusairi heresy; cf. Nawbakht, Firaq, p. 78), and was also a theologian (cf. Massignon, Passion d’al-Hallaj, p. 142–159) who disputed with the learned Thâbit b. Qurra, the Mu’tazilī Djabî, and the mystic Hallâj; he also refuted, after their deaths, Abû l-Athâiyah, Abî Ṭâsî al-Warrâq, and Ibn al-Ramâdî. Of his 32 works (Ibn al-Nadîm, p. 176; Ṭâsî, p. 57) only a fragment of the Tanbih survives (in Ibn Babawâlî, Ṭâsî, p. 53–59) (cf. Ibn al-Nadîm, p. 176) which gives us the first outline of the Sharia shaiba.

3. Hasan b. Musa b. Nawbakht, d. before 310 (922), classed in this family through his mother, sister of the preceding: an Imâmî theologian, student of Hellenistic philosophy, author of 44 works (Ritter, l.c., p. 17–20; Eghbâl, p. 129–134) of which there survives, besides fragments of the Kadd ala’l-Ǧubûlat (in Khaṭṭî, vi. 380) and of the Aʿā wa-Diyyânî (Muṣâf, ii. 156; Ibn al-Qâwî, Tâlis, p. 42–43; 47, 49, 69, 74, 81–82, 88, 91), only one complete text, of very great value for our knowledge of the sects of the Shâï, the Kitâb Firaq al-Shâla, ed. H. Ritter (Istanbul 1931, vol. iv. of the Bibl. Isl.). In an interesting chapter (op. cit., p. 143–161), A. Eghbâl has collected the passages of the Firaq found in a contemporary, Sa’d b. ‘Abd Allah Aşârî (d. 299 = 914), which shows either plagiarism or the use by both of an earlier source.

(Louis Massignon)
NAWÍ, Muhammad Ridā of Khabāshān in the vicinity of Mashhad, a Persian poet. The son of a merchant, in his youth he spent some time in Kishān where he studied under the Mawlawi Najmī. Moving to Marv, he became intimate with the Hākim Nūr Muhammad Kāhlan there. Like the majority of Persian poets of the 11th century, however, he was attracted by the brilliant court of the Moghuls and went to India where at first he found a patron in the person of Mirzā Yusuf Khan Mughadāni but soon afterwards entered the service of Khānjānān Mirzā 'Abd al-Rahīm and remained with him and with prince Dāniyāl till his death, which took place in Burhānī in 1019 (1610). Nawī's best work is his poem Sīr u-Gūzā ("Burnning and Melting") which has a touching theme, the devotion of a Hindu princess who accompanies her late husband in death on the funeral pyre. It is written in excessively artificial language and distinguished by the originality of its subject, which had not been taken by any Persian poet before Nawī. Nawī's works were very highly esteemed in India, and he is said to have received 10,000 rupees, an elephant and a horse with valuable trappings for a Sādā-nāma dedicated to the Khānjānān. His Dilwān, which is entitled Lubb al-Āhlib, has come down to us but has so far attracted little attention.


NAWṑRŪZ (p.), New (Year's) Day, frequently represented in Arabic works in the form Nawīrūz (Kālahshānī, Sūb al-A\'ābą, ii. 408). It was the first day of the Persian solar year and is not represented in the Muslim lunar year (Mas\'ūdī, Murādī, iii. 416 sq.). In Achaemenid times the official year began with Nawrūz, when the sun entered the Zodiacal Sign of Aries (the vernal equinox). Popular and more ancient usage however would appear to have regarded the midsummer solstice as Nawrūz (Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, transl. Sachau, p. 185, 211). It was the time of harvest and was celebrated by popular rejoicings, but it also marked the date when the Khurās became collected. The two different dates were retained in Persia proper and also in Tūrk and Djībīl under Islam, and Hamza al-Iṣfahānī states (Ṭabīḫī, Berlin, 1340, p. 104) that Nawrūz in the first year of the Hijra fell on the 18th Hazīr (June), which he erroneously equates with the 1st Dhu 'l-Ka\'dā. Confusion arose however because the intercalation of one day every four years which allowed the date to correspond with the position of the sun was omitted in Islam (Mas\'ūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbih, p. 215) and unscrupulous revenue officials found it to their advantage to keep to the false calendar date rather than to the correct traditional one because it permitted them to collect their dues earlier (Makrizī, *Ḳīṣdot*, ed. Wiet, iv. 263 sq.). By the time of the Caliph Mutawakkil the date of collection of khurās had advanced by almost two months and in 245 A.H. he fixed the date of Nawrūz as the 17th Hazīrān, which approximated to the old time (Tabari, iii. 1448; Birūnī, *Chronology*, p. 36 sq.). The reform had no lasting effect and the Caliph Mu\'tawād was compelled again to move the date which was fixed as the 11th Hazīrān (Tabari, iii. 2143). Later again, in Sultan Malikshān's reform of the calendar, the Persian astronomers proclaimed the vernal equinox as Nawrūz (Ibn al-Athīr, x. 34; 467 A.H.) and the first day of the new era fell on the 10th Ramādān 471 (March 15, 1079).

Nawrūz was adopted in Egypt as elsewhere and has been retained by the Copts as the New Year's Day (Makrīzī, *Ḳīṣdot*, iv. 241 sq.), but it now falls on September 10 or 11.

Popular festivities have marked Nawrūz wherever it has been celebrated. In Sāsānian Persia the kings held a great feast and it was customary for presents to be made to them while the people who gathered to make merry in the streets sprinkled each other with water and lit fires. Both in Tūrk and Egypt these customs persisted in Muslim times (Tabari, ii. 2165; Māridī, Murādī, vii. 277; Makrīzī, *Ḳīṣdot*, ii. 410) and although Maṭawād attempted to prevent the customary horseplay in the streets during the midsummer solstices he was unsuccessful (Tabari, *Ḳīṣdot*). In the various parts of the Turkish Empire the day was celebrated as a public holiday and in Persia it has throughout its history been marked by great festivities as the chief secular holiday of the year.


NAZAR (A.), probably did not receive until the ninth century A.D. the meaning of research in the sense of scientific investigation as a translation of the Greek σύνεξις. With Aristotle (e.g. *Metaph.*, 1064 b 2) the philosophies were then divided into theoretical (nazarīya) and practical (camāliya); the latter seek to obtain the useful or the good for man, the former pure truth, in physics, mathematics and metaphysics.

Nazar is primarily an epistemological conception and after the example of Ammonios Heriae, a pupil of Proclus, is dealt with among the Arabs in a work prefixed to the *Isagoge* of Porphyry (Περὶ ἐγκαθίστασιν τῆς φύσεως) (cf. the article ῬΑΝΔΡΗ). Nazar is also discussed as an activity of the human ἀληθή in psychology but in this case as a rule under synonyms like ἐφύσεως, ταφάκου, etc. (cf. *Nafs*).

The history of this terminology has still to be written. In the oldest, still incomplete, logic (edited by ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mukaffa or his son Muhammad b. Ḥasan) ἐφύσεως and ταφάκου are already distinguished as branches of philosophy (ἡμών), but ἐφύσεως is defined as a *ταβάνσαρ* and ταφάκου of the ἱδρύμα (i.e. of the mind) (cf. G. Furlani, *Di una presunta versione araba di alcuni scritti di Porfirio e di Aristotele*, in *R. A. L.*, ser. vi., vol. vi. [1926], p. 207).

The old speculative theologians of Islam were
perhaps more familiar with the distinction *itum* (אֶתַּל) than with *nazar* (נָזָר). The *itul* is generally recognised as a "root" of the Ma‘tazim system. The Zaidi Al-Kashim mentioned it (beginning of the third century A.D.) among his *itul*: *tefik*, Kurrin and *suna* (R. Strothmann, Die Literatur der Zaiditen, in *Jisr*, ii. 1911, p. 54). Nazar was felt to be an innovation like *rak* and *kekik* in *zikra*. The Hanbali school objected to the adoption of *nazar* but its greatest representative Ibn Hazm admitted *nazar* without hesitation — of course the *nazar* created and equipped by God — as a source of knowledge. Not blind belief (אֶתַל) nor deduction from the unknown (בְּיַרְכָּה) were to lead it to the acceptance of the Kurrin, *suna* and *zimma*, but quite certain knowledge. There is nothing which Ibn Hazm insists upon so often and so emphatically as this; there is no other way to certainty than that of tracing to sensual perception (Seeing) and intuition of the intelligence (‘אֶתַל’). Indeed sensual perception is so much preferred by him that comprehension by the reason is called a defect (כַּרְשָׁה לְכָלַת, i. 4—7). The philosophical position of Ibn Hazm is also well known. Theological and mathematical investigations of the *nazar* are called (perhaps here still synonyms) *bikra* (deduction by analogy) and *istiklah* (proof by circumstantial evidence). From what we know of *bikra* in Zaidi (cf. the article הָקָרְא לְכָלַת by J. Schacht, and Snouck Hurgronje, *Ver. Spr. Geis*, i. 140 sq.) and of *istiklah* in medicine (see Masudi, *Paris 1861—1877*, iv. 40; vii. 172 sqq.), we have probably to think of a process which is a mixture of induction and deduction, both methods used very arbitrarily. Analogous cases, often superficially regarded as similar (cf. Mazhahib, ed. v. Vloten, p. 8 sq.), were sought for, the *illa*, i.e. not the actual cause (causa) but the reason (ratio) in a higher conception of method or species, under which the further cases could be grouped. For Aristotle and his followers in Islam (Farabi, etc.) deduction had one meaning; they believed in causality or even in the creative activity of abstract thought. The great majority of Muslim theologians, jurists and physicians did not rise so far. It was not till the school of Asharite that the method of nazar superficially grasped penetrated into halal and halab was defined as *ilah al-nazar wa istikhala*. Rejected at first by the majority, gradually tolerated and used as an instrument against heretics and sophists, nazar in the orthodox school was finally recognised as a religious obligation.

Let us now turn back to the general conception of the *halah nazar...* Al-Farabi (d. 950) distributed them from the philosophical point of view in a special treatise (*Tishah...* Cairo n.d.) in a way which became the model for later. It was he who first worked on the logic of Aristotle wherefore his school was often called that of the *Manzhiyan*. He assumed with Aristotle that the *alhal* contained in itself the fundamental principles of all knowledge, the evidence of which had simply to be acknowledged. But the way of reflection and proof led to the non-evident, the culmination of which, apodictic proof (birkha), is described in "Second Analytic". From this eminence the branches of knowledge can be surveyed. After some observations on phylology (cf. the Stoics) first and most fully logic — whether as instrument of philosophy or as a part of it is a matter of indifference. Logic itself is of course a nazar with an object.
of its own. Next come the science of physics, mathematics and metaphysics with main and subsidiary branches. Each is a näzar. But it is noted that for example among the physical sciences medicine is a mixture of theoretical and practical and similarly music and mathematical subjects. Metaphysics is however like logic purely theoretical. Finally the three practical sciences of Aristotle, ethics, economics and politics, are united under the head of political science, with the addition of şiḥ and kalâm; al-Fârâbî remarks that the science of şiḥ and the art (şihr) of kalâm have to do partly with opinions (şûrah), partly with actions (aš'î). 

In conclusion let us compare with this philosophical division that of the Ash'arī theologian ʿAbd al-Ḵārī b. Ṭāhir al-Baghdâdî (d. 1037–1038) in his Catûl al-Dîn, Constantinople 1298, p. 8–14. After the distinction between divine knowledge and the knowledge possessed by other living creatures is laid down, the latter is classified as follows:

I. ḍârîrî (necessary, directly evident)

   1. ṣîrî 2. ḥamîrî

   (internal and external perception)

II. muhtasab (=all ʿilmû naṣrîya)

   (acquired)

   1. ʿāḥîyâ abârîyâ

   (knowledge acquired by reason and by law)

The ʿilmû naṣrîyâ are further divided into four acquired according to the way in which they are acquired:

1. Ṣâdîl bî ʿāṣî min ʿîjâh al-ḵyâl wa ʿl-nâzar (speculative theology);
2. Maṭûm min ʿîjâh al-ṭâdîfîrî wa ʿl-ḥâzî (e.g. medicine);
3. ʿIlmû min ʿîjâh al-ḥârî (legal science);
4. ʿIlmû min ʿîjâh al-ṭalîm (prophetology).

Compared with the ʿazîţa monism of Fârâbî this division still looks rather eclectic. But from the xiiith to the xivith century A.D. philosophy and theology, without becoming one, were approaching one another more closely. Ibn Sînâ, who builds upon Fârâbî, was the intermediary. Ghâzâlî sought to combine the ʿazîţa of the Neo-Platonic mysticism with the ʿazîţa fi of the rationalist thinkers, and Fâkhr al-Dîn al-Râzî appropriated the methods of proof of Aristotelian logic to a much greater extent than his theological predecessors.


NAZARETH. [See al-Nâṣîrâ]

AL-NĀZĪZ, title of sūra lxxix., taken from the opening word.

NĀZIM, properly Muṣṭâfâ b. Ismāʿîl, a notable Ottoman religious poet. The son of a Janissary, the inspector Yeni Baghşîl Ordeke İsmâʿîl Ağha, he was born in Constantinople and succeeded his father in his office, after rising through all the grades in the Janissary office: he became hâgırd, khalîfa, bash ʿalîî darî, and finally in 1165 (1756) yevecî darî, becoming the Janissary of the army. He died in this year on the campaign against Belgrade.

Nāzım wrote an extensive Divânî, the poetical value of which is not very great but which contains much that is religious and mystical in its 550 ghasels and about 50 târîkîh of the end of the reign of Mehmed IV.


NĀZĪM, Yaḥyâ, the most important Ottoman religious poet of his period, as is apparent from his epithet Nâṣîr al-Dîn, the singer of hymns. Born in 1659 (1649) in Kâsim Pasha in Constantinople, he entered the Serai as a boy where he received the education of the Enderûn and had the opportunity to acquire special proficiency in Arabic and Persian. He showed a talent for poetry and considerable musical ability. His beautiful voice and his work as a poet and composer gained him the favour of Sultan Murâd IV. He was given important offices at the court as a result: the office of the keğvîsh aghâdî to the kîsîr-i hâzî; he next became newbedîgî bashî and hürmî yevecîgî bashî and attained considerable influence. He then retired of his own accord and became bashar bashî. Later he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. He remained in Medina as muḥâdrî, where he died at the age of 80 in 1139 (1726). According to another statement (Brusail Mehmed Tâhir), he died in Adrianople.

He flourished under Mehmed IV and down to the reign of Ahmed III. He was a member of the Mewlewî order. Shâkiş Nêshât-i Mewlewî was his teacher in poetry and probably also in music. Nâzîm is the most religious poet of his period. He devoted the whole of his poetical talent to the naṭî, the hymn. His Divânî therefore resembles a warrant of pardon (aṣurî ʿaṣurî) He also gave special attention to the devotional forms of the teʿwîh, tâhmîd and muḫwârî.

His Divânî, printed in Constantinople in 1257 (1641), forms a thick volume of 500 pages, of which one third is devoted to the naṭî in the form of 60 keydâs, hundreds of ghâsîlîs, kâfîs, teʿwîh, tâhmîd and muḫwârîs, teʿwîh and a methâwî for the Prophet. The Diwâni is divided into five parts, each of which is in turn a kind of Diwânî in itself. He also wrote methâwîs for Mehmed IV and Mustafa II, Ahmad III, Selim Giray Khan, Mustâfâ Pasha and the vizier Ahmed Pasha; also târîkîh in imitation of Nâṣîr and Nâbî and sharîkîh in imitation of Nemîd.

Nâz-is a clever technician who gives expression to his effort for variety and change, not in the matter but in the form. In all his works however, a deep religious belief, even fanaticism is marked. His poems are a true reflection of the inclination of the period for religion and Sîfâism.

Bibliography: Feût, Teskere, Constâ...
NAZIM — NAZMI

NAZİM FARRUKH HUSAIN, a Persian poet. Mullâ Nazim, son of Şâh Rûdá Sabzawâri, was born in Herât about 1016 (1607) and spent the greater part of his life there. Little is known of his career, except that he made a journey to India and, after spending several years in Delhi, returned to his native town where he died in 1051 (1641–1642). He was court poet of the Emperor Shâh Jâhân. His early poems, which are not extant, are usually numbered in the minor mubâris of the Nâṣîr al-Dîn Târikh. His most important work, however, is his Hikmat al-Tabâkh, a collection of eighty-four stories dealing with the life of the Prophet. This work was originally written in Persian, but a Persian translation was made byAbâb al-Ilm al-Râfâ'I, Nazim was considered a high authority on Hadith. He wrote a number of works, none of which have been printed, namely: Hadîyet al-khûdân (“Present of the Brethren”): biographies of the seven greatest Kahlwetî personalities (Yâsun Mâkhdûmî; Mâhûmad Râkî; Şâh-Kobâdî Şîrwanî; Abî al-Majdî Şîrwanî; Şams al-Dînî Swâsî; Abî al-Majdîî Şîrwanî; Abî al-Achâd al-Nâbî) and some accounts of their successors. His poetic works consist of the rhymed Turkish translation of the first book of the Methhest of Jalâl al-Dîn Rûmî, a Divân of the usual type (with many hymns and sacred songs); also the Mîrâj al-farîhât (“Touchstone of the Order”). Bibliography: Thureqâ, Siqill-i ‘otkmâni, iv. 560; Hâlîm, Zîrârî-i Elyâsî, 1335. P. 120–122; Sâmi, Kâmur al-Dîvân, vi. 458–4590; Brussel Mehmed Tahir, ‘Otkmâni Muqaddimiyê, i. 175; Hammer, G.O.D., iii. 596–597; Basmandjian, Essai sur l’histoire de la littérature ottomane, Constantinople 1910. p. 127.

NAZMI, MEHMET (according to the Siqill-i ‘otkmam: Nazmi Nişâmî), Ottoman poet of Adrianopol in the period of Sulaimân al-Kâmbî. He was the son of a janissary, later himself became a janissary, then silâhdar and sipâhi. He died in 996 (1588) in Adrianopol, where he is buried in the Turbe of Shaikh Shujâ‘.
Naṣīr possessed great poetic gifts and ability, which he displayed particularly in the clever and accurate imitation of other poets, in so-called nafiz’s (pl. nafiz’). He also himself wrote ghazels. He rendered a great service to Ottoman literary history by collecting an enormous anthology of the best Ottoman poems, arranged under the eight principal metres. This anthology contains 4,000 ghazels by 125 Turkish poets and nafīz by himself in addition: Madīna al-Naẓīr. He presented this work, which he brought down to the year 930 (1524), to the Sulṭān. Hammer deals fully with it, as it deserves.

He also wrote a ghazel with the rhyme ‘īf on each behr of the Risālī-l ʿarūṣiyī of Wahīd Tabrīzī.


(Menzeł)

AL-NAẓĪM, IBRĀHĪM B. SAYYĪR B. ḤANFĪ B. ʿALLĀH, a Muʿtazilī theologian of the Baṣra school. Brought up in Baṣra, he spent the latter part of his life in Baghdaḏ, where he died between 220 and 230 (835—845) while still, it seems, at the height of his powers. A brilliant poet, a philologist of note, and above all an extremely periscopic and subtle dialectician, he is one of the most interesting figures in the culture of the ʿAbbasid period. He occupies a most important place in the development of Muslim ideas. He studied speculative theology in the madīja of Abu Ḥudhail al-ʿAllām. His ideas regarding the body and its relations are the logical result of this teaching. The structure of these ideas is however strongly influenced by the polemic against Manichaeanism, the fundamental problems of which al-Naẓīm had studied deeply. In his positive demonstration of the dogma of the creation one occasionally thinks there are traces of Aristotelianism: the creation was a setting in motion and the created world is in a continual state of movement (even rest is defined as a form of movement). God is then himself immobile but at the same time the primordial moving power. The tanbih, the distinction between the creator and creation, is carried a considerable distance. The divine attributes are represented to us by negations. The divine word is a body (therefore created) but that of man is an accident. The Kurʾān is miraculous because of the information it gives about the past and on account of the secrets which it reveals but not on account of its style, which men could have imitated if God had not prevented them (in reality there is no muḥaddaḏa in al-Naẓīm). Al-Naẓīm fundamentally rejects the arbitrary interpretations of the Kurʾān given by the great authorities on Tradition, ʿIṣraʿīl, ʿAlī, Abī ʿAbd Allāh, ibn Ṣadiq; he demands a strictly literal exegesis. The prophethood has always been universal, i.e. all the prophets and not Muhammad alone have been sent to the whole of humanity (against the traditionalists; al-Naẓīm thus did not deny the prophethood of Muhammad).

2. Aṣ ṣal-al-ʿall. The freedom of the human will is restricted, according to al-Naẓīm in a way that anticipates the Ashʿarī theology. All the actions of a man are movements, therefore accidents and movements which relate only to the man himself; the effects which are realised outside of the man are not due to him but to the natural forces which God has placed in his body (denial of taʿawwul). Man is the ṭābīʿ, which penetrates the body; the body in its turn represents an infirmity (ṣifā) of the ṭābīʿ. Now it is the body, different from man in the strict sense, which sets in motion the action of which man (i.e. the ṭābīʿ) is capable. It follows that man (the ṭābīʿ) is capable of the action before it is realised (al-ṭābīʿa kallî ʿl-ṭābīʿī), but at the moment when it is realised, the man is not capable of it.

3. Aṣ ṣal-al-waʿd wa ʿl-waṣīṭ. Al-Naẓīm is very
keenly interested in practical problems of fikr; we know his views and those of his school on the ghazāl, on fraud and on ritual purity (in which connection he gives some very curious psychological explanations). He is particularly concerned with the ṣūdūl. He waged a passionate campaign against the aṣūdāb al-raʿy wa l-ḥiyās, therefore against the Ḥanafis who were the representatives of the Mūjdūs. He flatly refused to admit raʿy and ṣūdūl and did not shun even from attacking the great men among the aṣūdāb who in his opinion had been guilty of using them. He was in this way led to criticise violently the institution of the iṣmāl which however he admitted to a certain extent. Through all this he prepared the way for Dāwūd al-Zāhirī and the Zāhirīa school.


(H. S. Nyyberg)

**NEBUCHADNEZZAR. [See BUKIT NAŠAR.]**

**NEJD.** The highlands of Arabia in contrast to the low-lying ground along the coast (Ṭībāma) or the depression (Ghor). In the dialect of the Hudhail Najd is pronounced Najd. The exact application of this originally topographical conception is very differently understood and sometimes it means more generally the elevated country above the coastal plain or the extensive country, the upper part of which is formed by the Ṭībāma and the Yaman and the lower by Syria and the Ṭīrāk, or the part of Arabia which stretches from the frontiers of al-Yaman to al-Madina and thence across the desert from al-Baṣra to Bahrain on the Persian Gulf (Ṭīsqaḵqārī, ibn Ḥawḵal) or the territory between the Ṭīrāk (al-Ṭīsqaḵqārī) and Ṭīrāk (ibn Khurdaḵzibī) or from the Ṭīrāk to al-Ṭībāma (Kudāma) or the land which lies behind the so-called Dīch of Chosroes (Ḵirā) as far as the Ḥarra (al-Biḥlī), or lastly, the territory between the depression of the Ṭīrāk (Ṭībāma) and the slopes of the Ṭīrāk (al-Amālī). That originally the name was applied to the plateau only is clear not only from the definitions of the separate authors but also from the fact that Najd appears in combination with various place-names; thus al-Asmāʾi (Ṭākūt, iv, 745) knows of Najdī bārīk (al-Yaman), Najdī ʿUrāf, Najdī Kākūb (near ʿArafāṭ), Najdī Mārī (in the Yaman), al-Bakri (ii, 574) besides the last named mentions Najdī al-Yaman, Ṭākūt (iv, 750 sq.) further mentions Najdī al-Ḥidżr, Najdī Alwādh in the country of the Hudhail, Najdī al-Shara, al-Hamadānī (p. 55) Najdī Ḥīmyar and Najdī Madīḥdīj along with a number of places not otherwise known which are combined with Najdī. Hamadānī (p. 277) further makes a distinction between upper Najdī (Najdī al-Uṣūrī) which is regarded as Najdī proper (al-Najdī) and in which he includes the district (ḥūrā) of Ḥidżrī and the town of Yābābām, and lower Najdī (Najdī al-Saffā) which is described as ʿArd Najdī and with the Ḥidżrī and al-ʿAṣrūn forms Central Arabia (p. 1, 8 sq., 36, 13 sq.), the territory in which pure Arabic is spoken (p. 156, 8 sq.). The original meaning is also seen in the dual Najdān, which, it is interesting to note, is used for two mountains in the Ṭāqī range, as well as the place-name Najdī Mārī and in the spring pasture ground Najdān in the land of the Khāṭām mentioned by the poet Ḥamīd b. Ṭhawr (Ṭākūt, iv, 745).

That the wide interpretation of the name Najdī above given is not unjustified is shown by the foundation in the second half of the fifth century A. D. by Ḥārūm, chief of the Kinda, of a short lived kingdom which extended from the Syrian times and al-medina to al-Yaman or from the hill of Ṭomīya in the N. E. on the Wādī Ṭ-Rummān to Ṭāqī ʿIṣr. At a later date, the whole of al-Najdī belonged to the administrative district of al-Yaman (Ṭākūt, iv, 746).

The widest area to which the name Najdī has ever been applied is probably that of the present kingdom of the same name which owes its origin to the Wūhābī chief ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Suʿūdī, who, as Amīr of Najdī, conquered Riyād in 1903, was chosen ʿaṣīf of Najdī and the adjoining lands in the summer of 1921, on Jan. 10, 1926 conquered the Ḥidżrī and on Jan. 19, 1927 was proclaimed king of Najdī and its dependencies at Riyād. The frontiers of his kingdom are: in the east, the Persian Gulf from Ṭīfāna and Ṭaṣṣar to Riʿāṣ al-Mīṣāṭīn, then the neutral zone between Najdī and Kuwait from this promontory to Riʿāṣ al-Kullīya; in the west the kingdom of the Ḥidżrī; in the south the line which runs from the port of Ṭūnūfūdīn on the Red Sea south of Abīlā Ṭāṣir and south of the Wādī ʿDaṣ&wār and includes Najdīn. The war at present going on between the king of Najdī and the Imam of al-Yaman may perhaps alter this frontier, especially as Ḥafīd in the. Yaman has previously been a bone of contention. The northern frontier which was delineated by treaties between the ruler of Najdī with the Ṭīrāk and England on the one side (signed at ʿUkūr on Dec. 2, 1922) and Najdī, Great Brittan and Transjordania on the other (signed on Nov. 2, 1925 at Ḥadīth in the Ḥidżrī) runs along the neutral zone between Najdī and the Ṭīrāk (29°–30° N. Lat. and 45°–46° E. Long.) and is then continued in a line running N. and N. W. to the intersection of 39° E. Long. and 32° N. Lat. and leaves the Dībāl ʿAnēzē on its north, then S. W. to the Wādī Raddíl and passing through in the S. E. the point where 38° E. Long. and 30° N. Lat. intersect. The Wādī Sirīñ is thus still in Najdī. This line continues towards the south from 25° to 38° E. Long. and crosses the Ḥidżrī railway towards Ṭāṣirā. The extent of the territory is estimated at 900,000 square miles and its population at 3,000,000. The capital is al-Riyyād; the more important towns are Buraidā (Berēde), Ṭāneīza (ʿAnēzē), Ḥīṣīl (Ḥayīl), Ṭhartāma,
Shakrā, Madjma'ā, Huraimla (Harēmle), al-Husḥuf and al-Katif. The population, which with the exception of al-Hasū with 30,000 Shī'is and a few Sūnīs has almost entirely adopted Wahhābism, belongs to the tribes of Muṣāir (Meṣirī), Harb, 'Utayba ('Atēbē), Subai', Dawāsir, al-'Uḏjmān, al-'Awizīm, al-Suhūl, Beni Murra and Ḥajjān.

The North-Arabian Nadjd forms a part of the great desert plateau which is formed of primary rock with overlying sandstone and volcanic outbursts and has two great mountain ranges running through it; that in the north is about 40 miles long and at its northeast end some 4,500 feet high, known in ancient times as Djabal Taiy or Djabal Taiy, i.e. Adja' and Salmā (Hamdani, p. 125, 25 yr.), is now called Djabal Shammar or Djabal Iḍā (Adja').

Ammārīya or Ujjidd, which towers some 500 feet above the ridge usually 2,000—3,500 feet high. The long southern part of the Tuwaykh is intersected by numerous wādis which lead the water that falls in the rainy season to the Rub' al-Khali. Its most important part is the Aftād, 40 miles long, with the oasis of Laila.

Nadjd is in the main steppe and desert. Nafūū and Dahna occupy the greater part of northern Nadjd while the Rub' al-Khali joins them on the S. E. There are no perennial streams in Nadjd so that the country has to rely upon subterranean channels of supply which are at various depths and have to be reached by wells. In the oasis of al-Kharid the wells are from 20 to 40 feet deep, in Aftād 30—60 feet, in Ḥāfīl and al-Riyadh about 80 feet. Sometimes these springs form ponds, for example in al-Kharid the springs of which form three pools, the largest of which is 150 paces long and 80 broad (cf. the picture in Philby, ii., p. 34) while the springs of Aftād feed a lake nearly a mile long and a quarter of a mile broad (Philby, ii., pl. at p. 86). These supplies sometimes dry up suddenly, probably because they have found a subterranean exit as has happened in the case of two waterholes in Aftād and the two larger ponds in al-Kharid. The hydrographic conditions of the country are therefore exceedingly dependent on the rainfall from the summer and winter rains. The former (wasmi or mafar al-ṣaij) fall in August and September and particularly refresh the pastures which the summer sun has dried up, while the latter produce a spring-like effect in the land on which they fall. The classic phrase saḥā 'allāk Nadjdun min raḥīm wa-ṣaijīn (Bakrī, ii. 647) eloquently sums up this state of affairs. Heavy rainfalls were also observed in April 1871 in the central
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Both ranges, which rise out of a tableland levelled by weathering, are of granite. The Djabal Adja' stretches from N. N. E. to S. S. W., about 35 miles S. E. of it in approximately the same direction the Djabal Salmā, in front of which in the S. W. lies the Djabal Ramān, while S. E. of the Djabal Salmā lies the Ḥarrā of Faid, of volcanic origin.

S. E. of this rises the sandstone plateau, overlaid with limestone, of Djabal Tuwaykh (Tuwaykh) running N. W. to S. E., which forms the western declivity of a plateau which has come into existence through weathering and slopes towards the Persian Gulf on the one side and the sands of the desert of Rub' al-Khali on the other. It begins S. E. of the district of al-Kaṣim (S. E. of the Ḥarrā) and stretches E. from al-Wāṣim to al-Arid with the town of al-Riyadh and then turns, west of the Kharid oasis, S. S. W. towards the Wdzi 'I-Dawasir. The most important peak on this edge of the plateau is the Djabal
Wádi l-Rumma and in May in ’An’ezé between Djibal Salmá and ’An’ezé (1884, Ch. Huber), and Philby (ii. 110) noticed thundershowers in May as well as drizzle, while Doughty met with hail at Khabra (near ’An’ezé) in April. That the climate here cannot have changed very much is evident from Ibn Djeibir who records very heavy showers in this district in April 1184 a.d. Huber met with rain in June 1884 between ’An’ezé and Mecca, Sadlier, at the end of July 1819 between al-Hasá and Dar’iya heavy thunderstorm and rain, which however was described by the natives as unprecedented. Philby (i. 141, 147) records thunder and rain in December. The rainwater collects in the hollows below the thick layer of sand and enables palms to grow and also, on chemically decomposed fertile soil, wheat and barley, vegetables and fruit trees. The hot summer of course everywhere makes it necessary to water the crops from wells. On the other hand, the frequently very sudden flooding of the water-courses led in quite early times to the building of dams to hold back and store the water; such were built in the Wádi l-Rumma at ’An’ezé (Bakri, i. 207: Yāqūt, ii. 738), Dar’iya (Bakri, ii. 637) and on the road from al-Yamáma to ’An’ezé (al-Hamadhání, p. 174, 192). Doughty found remains of such dams in the Djibal Adjdā.

The district of al-Šharaf is the richest part of al-Nadjd, and the valleys of the Wádi 1-Djarír and Wádi l-Míáib are celebrated for their pastures. Here the early caliphs had vast grazing grounds (khamí) e.g. in Dar’iya, al-Rabádh, Faid, al-Nir, Dhu ’l-Šharí and Naqť. The most famous was that of Dar’iya, where the caliph Omar I secured an area six Arab miles in diameter as pasture for 300,000 ingophs and 36,000 camels for the army. Oghmán extended this area until the diameter was ten miles. The ’Abbásid al-Mádhí abandoned it, as the policy of this dynasty was to neglect Arabia deliberately in contrast to the Umayyads who, for example, intensively colonised western Nadjd. In the sixth century A.D. Nadjd was still well wooded, and al-Shurba, south of the Wádi l-Rumma, and Wajdja were particularly celebrated in this respect, while at the present day they only possess scanty remnants of these forests. Many areas seem to have been ruined by drought or disastrous inundations (Philby, i. p. 115; ii. p. 9); the decline of al-Yamáma is probably due to the latter cause. Crops are sometimes damaged by sharp frosts — in winter (January) the temperature sometimes sinks from a maximum of 53° F. by day to below 23° and ice and snow have occasionally been seen at the higher levels — while the summer drought with a maximum temperature of 113° destroys the crops. The two most important wádís are the Wádi l-Rumma about 650 miles long, which runs right across the plateau of North Arabia, rising in the Harrá of Khabra and entering the Euphrates plain at Harrá, and the Wádi l-Darawár. These have formed since ancient times the two main routes of traffic in Central Arabia.

It is with the object of improving agriculture that the king of Nadjd is endeavouring to keep the Bedú to the soil. Every tribe or clan has therefore been allotted a definite area of ground near a well where huts are being erected and the ground planted. These new settlements are called hijíra. In the last ten years, since the revival of Wahhabism, about 70 of these colonies with 2,000—10,000 inhabitants have been established; the most important is Iratiyá built in 1912; Riháni (p. 198) gives a list of others. In this way not only is the cultivation of the land secured but the revenues of the state are increased; these consist of the zakát (10% on movable property), the customs, a fifth in case of war and (formerly) £60,000 subsidy from England. The coins in circulation, in addition to the Maria Theresa dollar, are the English and Turkish sovereign, the Indian rupee and copper coins of ʻOmán of the last century, 60 of which go to the dollar. The once famous gold mines of the Barn Sulaím at al-ʻAṣlúr, al-Mujdíra and Bihán (Hamdání, p. 1544, 4 sq.) are now no more important and unlike al-Yamána, the country possesses no industries.


**NEDROMA (Ar. NADRUMA), pron. NADRUMA, and sometimes Medrum, 40 miles S.W. of Tlemcen, has since the dawn of the modern period been the most important town in the hilly country between the sea on the north, the lower course of the Tafna on the east, the plain of Lalla Moghniya (Marina) on the south and the Algero-Moroccan frontier on the west. It is the country known since the xvii century A.D. as the land of the Trara, Berbers converted to Islam and Arab culture in the period of the Idrisids who were known in the middle ages as Kūmīa. This little Berber bloc, speaking Arabic, forms with Nadruma, which is as it were the heart of it, a whole so homogeneous that they cannot be dealt with separately.

1. Past History. We may reject the childish etymology *Ndr-Ruma* "resembling Rome" given by Leo Africanus (ed. Schober, iii. 13). Nadruma was first of all the name of a tribe, a section of the Kūmīa family of the Berber stock of the Banū Fāten (Ibn Khaldūn, *Berbers*, transl. de Siane, i. 251). The name is mentioned by al-Baiḥākī (ed. Lévi-Provençal, *Doc. inéd. d’Hist. Almoh.*, Paris 1928, p. 44; transl., p. 66) where we must understand by al-karia Nadruma "the people of the citadel (i.e. the Nadruma)." This passage, written in the xiiith century, would tend to show how the name of the tribe of the Nadruma became attached to the little town which was then their principal centre.

Before this period however, Nadruma was the name of the town, for al-Bakri (xith century) gives it this name and gives us a brief description of its "he qualifies it as nadrina "town" and not as simply karya. In the time of al-Idrīsī (cf. the *Sīlah*) in the xiiith century, the town was a prosperous one surrounded by walls and had an important market. There is no doubt also — although these two geographers do not mention the fact — that Nadruma had a mosque.

In the xith century A.D., the Muslim geographer al-Yaḥṣibī (Kitāb al-Buldān, ed de Goeje, p. 18 and transl., *Descr. al-Magribiyya*, Leyden 1860, p. 117) mentions a considerable town inhabited by Berbers at the extreme boundary of the lands ruled by the descendents of the Idrīsī Muhammad b. Sulaimān. The name of this town, written in the Arabic text, might be Fālāšen or Fālāšen, but with difficulty "Fellousen" (cf. R. Basset, *Nerroman et les Tuars*, p. 7, No. 2) on account of the present day pronunciation of the word by the natives of the country. René Basset (ibid.) thinks this town could be identified with Nadruma, built on the N.W. flank of mount Fālāšen (modern local pronunciation) — the Fālāšen-on in the maps.

The Almoravid s of the xith—xiiith centuries gave Nadruma an important mosque and a pulpit, inspired, G. Maarçais says, by that of the Great Mosque of the Umayyads of Cordova as that of the Almohad Kuttubia of Marrakush was later to be. This fact alone would suffice to show the importance in the Almoravid period of this Muslim centre which must have been the greatest in the land of the Kūmīa at this period.

Nadirma had access to the sea by several small ports, the most important of which, Honain, which also served Tlemcen (cf. Marçais, *Honain*, in *R.A.*, 1928, p. 355–356) was however somewhat difficult of access from Nadruma by the very steep N.W. flank of mount Taghra. This town had therefore to use the port of Māṣīn (al-Bakri) which was only 10–12 miles away, easy of access at the end of a valley (Wādī Māṣīn) north of Nadruma.

In the Almohad period Nadruma as well as all the land of the Kūmīa, where 'Abd al-Mu'min, the first caliph of the dynasty, was born, must have been the object of special solicitude by these rulers, who were lords of Africa and Spain. Moreover it was on the Kūmīa, the tribe which they originated, that the Almohad caliphs relied for support — like all Muslim rulers —: these Berbers were the best auxiliaries in the conquests and the most reliable supporters of Marrakush. Although the name of the Kūmīa has now disappeared and has been replaced by that of Trara, it would be too much, as we shall see, to think that the Kūmīa tribes disappeared in the wars of the Almohads.

The name Trara is quite recent; it appears, it seems, for the first time in a treaty of union — of which the Arabic text is given by R. Basset (*loc. cit., App.*, p. 212–218) — between the Arab and Berber tribes of the N.W. of Oran and eastern Morocco, prepared in 955 (1548–1549) in anticipation of the struggle with the Spaniards, then lords of Tlemcen. In the text the Trara are described as made up of many sections, the names of which are unfortunately not given. At later dates we again find this name of Trara in various authors without being able to say to which it refers. As in the xith—xiiith centuries, Nadruma is still the capital and the principal town for these tribes.

Most of the Trara tribes of to-day have preserved the names which the same Kūmīa tribes bore in the time of the caliph 'Abd al-Mu'min.

This little Berber capital was undoubtedly never very large if we may judge by the traces still visible of its walls, which have hardly changed since the time of al-Bakri. It appears in the history of the middle ages, as in modern times as one of the chief towns of the province of which Tlemcen was the capital, whose political and religious influence dominated it and whose destinies it followed.

When in the xith—xvith centuries, Tlemcen being the capital of the 'Abdahwālid kingdom, Nadruma, a peaceful town with a temperate climate, in a charming position, overlooking the blue sea a few miles away, became the country resort of the rulers and princes of the royal house. They had a fortified palace there (the *kaṣira*) of which considerable remains of the surrounding wall still stand as well as the walls of the buildings. It commanded the town, standing quite near it on the south, and its ruins are still called *kaṣir* or *fustān*. It was to this place that Abū Yaḥṣibī *Yūsfî* renounced the royal throne of Tlemcen to the advantage of his two younger brothers Abū Sa'd
and Ābū Thābit, retired in 749 (1348) to live far from the court and politics in meditation and prayer (Ibn Khaldūn, Berberes, transl. ii, 422 sqq. ; Yahya b. Khaldūn, Histoire des Rues de Tlemcène, ed. and transl. A. Bel, Algiers 1903-1910-1913, i, 14, 18).

It was here that his son Ābū Hammūd II (reigned at Tlemcène 1359-1359) lived with him and the latter's son was born, Ābū Tāchīfn II who dethroned his father and reigned after him (1359-1393). This pious withdrawal of Ābū Yaqūb to Nadrūmā was only to last about four years until the conquest of Tlemcène and Nadrūmā by the Marinids of Fās in 1352.

No king and apparently no prince was ever buried at Nadrūmā. There is however the mausoleum of a saint in the midst of the ruins of the palace. The individual whose tomb it is believed to mark is called “Sīdi Sulṭān”. Neither the name, nor history, which does not mention him, nor legend, which simply makes him come from Egypt at a remote period, tells us anything of value about him. Nevertheless, in view of the numerous similar examples of the creation of holy places sacred to saints by the Berbers, who are of a deeply religious nature, and in particular by the Berbers of Nadrūmā and the Trārā, it is easy to reconstruct the process of the foundation of the mausoleum in question. The sojourn in the palace of Nadrūmā of a great prince who had abandoned his rank for a life of devotion must have impressed the people of the time and long afterwards the spiritual merits of this “sulṭān” must have been related, as one who had certainly been touched by the grace of Allāh. When many years later the name and story of this devout king had been forgotten, the place where he had lived, this ẓahr-e-sulṭān, this ẓahr as it is still called, although in ruins, impregnated with his sanctity—his baraka—remained a holy place. It was only a very short step from this to localise the centre of radiation of this baraka in a little sanctuary in which prayers could be addressed to the unknown saint who is alleged to be buried there. At the present day the little white dome covering the so-called tomb of Sīdi Sulṭān under a very old wild olive tree is the goal of the pilgrimage of numerous women; they come there particularly to seek the cure of a sick child; they expect to obtain this by the fumigation of the invalid with leaves from the olive-tree. Men also visit it. Every year the mosques of Nadrūmā (who say that Sīdi Sulṭān was a descendant of Bilāl, the Prophet's muʿādhdhin) go there on a mass pilgrimage and sacrifice a bull calf; they hope thereby to obtain the regular rainfall needed by the district.

If we have dealt rather fully with this feature of the religious mentality of the people of Nadrūmā, it is because it is a sign, among many others, of one of the most characteristic aspects of the religion of the Berbers and of those of Trārā. Mithraism is so developed among them that René Basset in his study of Nadrūmā and the Trārā has collected the names and sanctuaries of 296 holy men and 9 holy women, which is a large number for so small an area. This however does not prevent the people from observing as well as they can the ritual duties of Sunni Islam and of zealously attending the many mosques in Nadrūmā and in all the villages of the Trārā.

It has been mainly since the sixteenth century, during the great popular mystical movement which spread through all North Africa, that the people of Nadrūmā and the Trārā have developed this cult of saints and placed all their trust in men of religion and Sulṭām. Particular evidence of this was seen in the assembly on the banks of the Wardafla, on the borders of the land of the Trārā, of the tribes of the region of Nadrūmā and the adjoining country when in 1548 the holy man al-Yaʿqūb, whose venerated sīriṣa[q. v.] is a little to the west of Nadrūmā, led them against the Spaniards who then held Tlemcène.

As a matter of fact the Spaniards who were established in Oran and Tlemcène were never able to occupy Nadrūmā and the land of the Trārā. The Turks who finally occupied Tlemcène and the province were not always warmly welcomed there. On several occasions the sultān sharifs of Morocco were able to advance their frontiers to the lower Tāfīnā. However the Turks ended by establishing their authority which lasted until the conquest of Algeria by the French. Nadrūmā and the Trārā did not at once accept the rule of ʿAbd al-Kādir; they preferred to be under the sultāns of Morocco. Later they took the side of the emir against the French and it was in these mountains that ʿAbd al-Kādir often found a safe asylum when he was defeated, even after 1842 when the French occupied Nadrūmā, and notably in 1845 at the time of the famous affair of Sīdi Brāhim (cf. P. Azan, L'Emp. Abd el-Kaïd. Paris 1923, p. 207-214) a few miles west of Nadrūmā.

II. The Present. Nadrūmā, surrounded by gardens full of olive and other fruit-trees of various kinds, rises in terraces which lie on a well-marked ridge's back sloping from N. to S. running from the palace on the right bank where he had lived, this ẓahr-e-sulṭān, this ẓahr as it is still called, although in ruins, impregnated with his sanctity—his baraka—remained a holy place. It was only a very short step from this to localise the centre of radiation of this baraka in a little sanctuary in which prayers could be addressed to the unknown saint who is alleged to be buried there. At the present day the little white dome covering the so-called tomb of Sīdi Sulṭān under a very old wild olive tree is the goal of the pilgrimage of numerous women; they come there particularly to seek the cure of a sick child; they expect to obtain this by the fumigation of the invalid with leaves from the olive-tree. Men also visit it. Every year the mosques of Nadrūmā (who say that Sīdi Sulṭān was a descendant of Bilāl, the Prophet's muʿādhdhin) go there on a mass pilgrimage and sacrifice a bull calf; they hope thereby to obtain the regular rainfall needed by the district.

If we have dealt rather fully with this feature of the religious mentality of the people of Nadrūmā, it is because it is a sign, among many others, of one of the most characteristic aspects of the religion of the Berbers and of those of Trārā. Mithraism is so developed among them that René Basset in his study of Nadrūmā and the Trārā has collected the names and sanctuaries of 296 holy men and 9 holy women, which is a large number for so small an area. This however does not prevent the people from observing as well as they can the ritual duties of Sunni Islam and of zealously attending the many mosques in Nadrūmā and in all the villages of the Trārā.

It has been mainly since the sixteenth century, during the great popular mystical movement which spread through all North Africa, that the people of Nadrūmā and the Trārā have developed this cult of saints and placed all their trust in men of religion and Sulṭām. Particular evidence of this was seen in the assembly on the banks of the Wardafla, on the borders of the land of the Trārā, of the tribes of the region of Nadrūmā and the adjoining country when in 1548 the holy man al-Yaʿqūb, whose venerated sīriṣa[q. v.] is a little to the west of Nadrūmā, led them against the Spaniards who then held Tlemcène.

As a matter of fact the Spaniards who were established in Oran and Tlemcène were never able to occupy Nadrūmā and the land of the Trārā. The Turks who finally occupied Tlemcène and the province were not always warmly welcomed there. On several occasions the sultān sharifs of Morocco were able to advance their frontiers to the lower Tāfīnā. However the Turks ended by establishing their authority which lasted until the conquest of Algeria by the French. Nadrūmā and the Trārā did not at once accept the rule of ʿAbd al-Kādir; they preferred to be under the sultāns of Morocco. Later they took the side of the emir against the French and it was in these mountains that ʿAbd al-Kādir often found a safe asylum when he was defeated, even after 1842 when the French occupied Nadrūmā, and notably in 1845 at the time of the famous affair of Sīdi Brāhim (cf. P. Azan, L'Emp. Abd el-Kaïd. Paris 1923, p. 207-214) a few miles west of Nadrūmā.
NADRÔMA: that of the weavers (darrín) and that of the potters (zâdârin).

The weavers of Nadrôma have retained their ancient loom with low warp without any modern improvement not even the pucker, and all the old equipment of their ancestors, notably the warper (nârâ) and spinning wheel (redâbâna). On the loom, material and method of working, one may compare what is done in Tlemcen in identical fashion (cf. A. Bel and P. Picard, Le travail de la laine à Tlemcen, Algiers 1913, p. 63 sq.). The weavers of Nadrôma now make only woolen blankets (bârâbâh), white or decorated with stripes of colour, hooded cloaks with very short sleeves (dgallbâha), the white haik for men (particularly old men here) which is a long piece of wool without seams, which is wrapped round the body in a certain way. Nadrôma makes several kinds of haik (cf. L'industrie de la laine, loc. cit., p. 109). The potters have for centuries from father to son had their ateliers in the upper part of the town in the S.E. beside the Kâsha. They make pots and other articles on wheels (mânâ) of the usual type driven by the foot: cooking pots of rounded shape without handles called fâdra (whence the name zâdârin given to the potters), cooking dishes called fâgin and for barley or wheat griddle cakes or different kinds of cakes (mâbâla), portable ovens (mâgmar), thârâla which is in the form of an oven with an earthenware dome above it shaped like the bottom of an inverted pot on which is poured the liquid paste of these pancakes, as thin as paper, which on account of their thinness are called by the Berdouns in Orania rygâg "slices" and in Nadrôma as in the towns are called by the old Arabic name of lîth. When required the potters of Nadrôma also make other earthenware articles such as flower-pots (mîbâbâla) and the musical instrument called agwal, used by women, consisting of a large earthenware tube, one of the ends of which is closed by a skin stretched over it which is beaten.

The total population of the town of Nadrôma is 7,051 of whom 6,124 are Muslims, 850 Jews and about 200 Europeans (chiefly French). The Jews and the Turks actually have a special quarter but they live almost entirely in Darb al-Sîlgh and in another in the Bain Zul quarter; they are petty traders, labourers and artisans (it is they who make the saddles for the mules and asses). The majority are of Berber origin; they are usually poor. Although they only marry with one another and live apart from the Muhammandans, the Jews live in houses quite like those of the Muhammandans, lead the same kind of life and use an Arabic dialect among themselves.

The negroes (raib) who are not very numerous are called gnawa (Guineans) and live in a separate quarter in the west centre of the town. They are in very humble circumstances, stokers of the baker's ovens or the furnaces of the baths, labourers and workmen. Although regarded as Muslims, their religious life is not at all regular and they are regarded, as elsewhere, as more or less of sorcerers.

The French element is very small; it consists almost entirely of officials and their families. They live by themselves in the public buildings (schools, gendarmerie etc.) and in European houses roofed with red tiles, which form an entirely distinct quarter outside the native town (to the N. and N.E.),

Nadrôma is the capital of a mixed commune. The civil administrator who lives there has under his authority the town and the Trâra tribes of the neighbourhood: Djiha, Zâviya al-Mira, Saâliha, in the West and N.N.W., Bani Mina, B. Meshal, B. Khallâl, B. âbed, in the N.E., or S.E. the population of which numbers 47,224 native Muslims and 83 Europeans.

The other Trâra tribes are not under Nadrôma: these are the Marda, in the extreme N.W. who belong to the mixed commune of Marnia; the B. Wargûs and the Uthâsha Ghrâba, to that of Remchi-Montagnac.

On Thursday which is the market-day there come into Nadrôma large numbers of people from all the country round; they bring in their stock, especially sheep, goats, cattle and mules and, according to the season, the produce of their fields and gardens (wheat and barley, almonds, carobs, figs, grapes, etc.) and of their flocks (wool and goat-skins, butter, curds etc.) as well as chickens, eggs and honey. The country artisans (men and women) bring in the articles they have manufactured (articles of woven grass, walking-sticks and little articles of wood carved with the knife with Berber designs), wool, articles of terracotta, notably Berber pottery decorated with geometrical designs, made by the women of Mstâda (and similar to the other Berber pottery made by the women of Kabylia, the Tiss and elsewhere).

It is on market-day that one realises that Nadrôma is the economic centre of the whole district of the Trâra and sees the variety of products of the soil and industry of these Berbers.

The abundance and variety of these products are not due only to the activity of the inhabitants; the climate and the soil also help. The climate is fairly equable; tempered by the proximity of the sea it is never extreme as in the case of continental districts. For the rest, the height of the hills, while sufficient to encourage rainfall, is not very great: it does not exceed 3,500 feet at Fallausen and 1,200 at Nadrôma. It is therefore only in the very hardest winters that snow for brief periods whitens the summits of the range. As to the soils of this coast range, which, between a depression of the Tânâ in the east and the neighboring plains of the Moroccan frontier in the west, runs from the Wâd Meshal (2 miles N. of Marnia) to the sea, they offer a certain variety in their nature and origin. Around the primary massif, which includes the highest peaks, Fallausen and Tadja, are several eruptive islets (granite) and hills of secondary formation (Jurassic). The lower areas, especially the plains of the N.W., as far as the coast (where there are several old eruptive mamelons) and the depressions of the S.E. and E. along the Tânâ, are middle Mesocene formations.

The mountains also possess numerous perennial springs which feed little streams which irrigate the gardens; there are also various minerals, several of which have recently been or are still being exploited by Europeans.

It is due to the quality of the clay around Nadrôma and the granitic sand used for molds that the pottery industry is one of the oldest and most prosperous in the town. The native vegetation is abundant and varied; in addition to the many varieties of trees of the highlands (notably sumach [æzâba]), the wood of which is exported.
to Europe through the port of Nermours), we may mention many kinds of plants used for medicinal purposes or dyeing. It is for example thanks to the madder abundant in these regions and used by the natives for dyeing the dwarf palm leaf that the people of Uhâshâghâbra are able to make a fine and famous straw work (men's hats with high crowns and broad brims called mijal — baskets of various shapes all of dwarf palm leaves). All these articles are prettily decorated in red on the yellowish white foundation of the palm leaf; they are known and purchased by the natives of the whole of Orania and eastern Morocco.

It is also owing to the abundance of pasture in these hills that the rural dwellers, none of whom however are nomads, can raise so many flocks especially sheep. The wool from their flocks is almost entirely used in the country by the weavers of Ndrûma and by the country women who by their weaving, using the loom with a high rail like all the women in North Africa, make a considerable part of the family's woolen garments. All these women are excellent spinners; they have a great reputation for the fineness of their work.

Even from chickens — to feed which the country women in the autumn collect the red fruit of the mastic which is very abundant in this country — the people, who are greedy of gain, make a profit; thousands of eggs also are exported every month from Ndrûma via Nermours, to France and particularly to England.


(Alfred Bel)

NEFî, the greatest satirist of the Ottomans. Omar Efendi whose nom de plume (makhîs) was Nefî came from the village of Hasan Kaâfa near Erzerûm (Eastern Anatolia). Not much is known of his early life. He spent his early years in Erzerûm where the historian 'Âlî [q.v.], who was a defterdar there, became acquainted with him. During the reign of Ahmad I fate brought him to the capital Stambul where he worked for a time as a book-keeper. He failed in an attempt to gain the sultan's favour or that of his son, the unfortunate 'Othmân II, with some brilliant kâşîdas. It was not till the reign of Murâd IV that he gained the imperial favour but his malicious, sarcastic and indecent poems soon brought him into disgrace. He was appointed to the poll-tax office and later again became a member of the sultan's circle. His irresistible impulse to make all the notables of the empire the butt of his mockery made him a host of enemies. A satire on Bairâm Pashâ, the sultan's brother-in-law and vizier, who had succeeded in being recalled from banishment and again attaining influence, cost him his life. The mufti gave his sanction to the execution of the great poet. With the sultan's consent he was shut up in the wood-cellar of the serây, then strangled and his body thrown into the sea. The year of his death is 1044 (beg. Jum. 27, 1363), not 1045 as Hâjjîdî Khalîfa, Fâîlîdî, ii. 185 wrongly says (cf. on the other hand his Kitâb al-Zanîm, iii. 318 and 631 where the correct date is given).

Neîf wrote Turkish and Persian with equal ease. His mastery of technique and natural poetical talent make him one of the greatest Ottoman poets; he is also undoubtedly one of the greatest, although hitherto little known satirists. The reason why he is so little known is that a scholarly edition with full annotations of his Turkish Divânentitled "Arrows of Fate", Şâhîd-i  Kháşâ, has so far never been undertaken, so that at the present day hardly any one is able to understand the countless allusions to particular circumstances and the veiled attacks on the individuals dealt with. The publication of his poems demands a knowledge of the conditions of his period and particularly of life at court which it is hardly possible to attain and which it would be very difficult to gather from the existing sources. Many of his flashes of wit and allusions are very difficult to understand. Many of his poems are distinguished by an obscenity which can hardly be surpassed and however great may be their importance for the social history of his time, they are of little value as evidence of his poetic gifts. The "Arrows of Fate" are directed against almost every one prominent in politics and society in his time. In G. O. D., iii. 241, J. v. Hammer has compiled a list of them. Some of his poems which pillory existing institutions, like the popular saints, the Kâlender-devishes [q.v.] etc. are of value for social history. Hardly one important contemporary was able to escape his scorn and ridicule. They were all made targets for his "Arrows of Fate" without mercy. He attacked the jurists ('ulàmà) particularly unmercifully.

Neîf's Turkish Divân has been several times printed: two parts at Bûlûk in 1253 and in 1269 at Stambul. Selections (with ample evidence of 'Abîl al-Ḫâmîd's censorship!) were published by Abu 'l-Dîyâ Tawfîk in 1311 at Stambul. There are MSS. in European collections in London, Leyden and Vienna. Mr. Walther von der Porten now (1933) in Zurich owns two particularly beautiful and old MSS. A short Şâbî-nûme by Neîf is mentioned in the catalogue of MSS. of the Leipzig council library by H. L. Fleischer (p. 547). On his death, cf. Farâ'îdîzâda, Ta'rîkh-i gülşer-i Müsîrif, i., Stambul 1252, p. 668, and Naîmân, Ta'rîkhî, ii. 489.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned cf. also Gibb, Ottoman Poems, p. 208 and H. O. P., iii. 252 sq.; the history of Naîmân (i. 586) and Brûsâf Mehêmmêd Tâhir, 'Othmânî Mêlikêlyî, ii. 441 sq. (according to which parts of his Persian Divân were published in the Khazine-i Fûmîn).
NEFTA, a town in the south of Tunisia, lies 15 miles W. of Tozeur on the isthmus which separates the depressions of the Shott al-Djarid and the Shott Ghasra. In the middle ages it was considered one of the principal centres of the land of Kastilia [q.v.] along with al-Hamma, Takjius and Tozeur, which was the capital. It was regarded as the old town of Nefta and not the town of Nepte or Agarsel-Nepte. The Roman town must now be buried in the sands close to the present town. We may presume that there still existed in the early centuries of the Muslim period visible traces of the old town. Al-Bakri tells us that the town was built of large blocks of stone (qabār). The author of the Istīlār regards the wall which surrounds it as having been built by the ancient. The dam on the Wadi Nefta is made of Roman blocks if it is not actually of Roman work (Tissot).

Memories of the pre-Islamic past were also found among the people of Nefta. Its large population was regarded as consisting for the larger part of descending Christians (Ya’qūbī, Christians of the Prophet) who have retained their faith for a considerable period. Ibn Khalīdān (Berbères, i. 146, transl. i. 231) remarks on the presence of Christians in the province of Kastilia at the end of the xivth century. The outlying position of this province perhaps explains the survival of a Christian colony, which was exceptional in Barbary. It is moreover worth noting that the attitude of the people of Nefta in religious matters has often been non-conformist. In the tenth century, according to Ibn Hawkāl, Khāridjīsm still survived there; in the eleventh century, according to al-Bakri, the people of Nefta still called their city “the little Kūtā”. We shall see that at the present day it is an important centre of maraboutism.

The remoteness of the capital assured Nefta, like other towns of the Djarid, a fairly regular political independence. Like al-Hamma and Tozeur, it was long (probably from the period of anarchy which followed the Hilāl invasion) governed by a council of notables, the president of which held the position of a feudal lord, indeed prince. In the xivth century this office was held by the family of the Banū Khalāf, who claimed to be of Ghassānid Arab origin. The Banū Khalāf and the people of the oasis whom they ruled maintained regular relations with the Sulaimīd Arabs of the great tribe of Kūfī, who periodically frequented the country around. A tradition of reciprocal service united these immigrant nomads and settled natives, the nomads defending at need against the attempts of the central power the settled population who in turn assured them their subsistence and the provision of their supplies. The central power when it felt sufficiently strong naturally endeavoured to bring the Djarid under its authority again. Nefta thus underwent alternatively periods of submission and independence. In 744 (1343) the Hafṣid caliph Abu Bakr sent his son Abu I-Abbās to enforce the submission of the people of Nefta by cutting down a part of their palm-trees and putting to death nearly the whole of the Banū Khalāf. A century later (845 = 1441) the caliph Abu Omar al-‘Othmān, having taken Nefta, sacked it, executed the chiefs of the Banū Khalāf and placed the town under a kāfīr of his own choice. If the partial destruction of the palm-trees — a classical procedure — had brought the people of Nefta to terms, it was because these trees supplied the greater part of their income. Very abundant springs (the largest of which rising north of the town forms the Wad Nefta) assured and still assure the life of this splendid oasis. There is at the present day a forest of 273,000 palm-trees there. Nefta was however also a commercial town, a wealthy emporium of the exchange of goods. Before the establishment of the protectorate trade was mainly carried on at two periods of the year: at the beginning of spring, when the expeditionary force which had come from Tunis to collect taxes could guarantee the security of the routes and at the end of summer when the marauding Arabs had left the country to buy corn in the north.

Consisting of merchants and farmers with the important aristocracy of the Shorfa [q.v.], the population of Nefta (estimated at the present day at over 15,000) is distributed over eight quarters separated from one another by palm-groves. Each of the quarters has its mosque. Al-Bakri tells us that Nefta in his day had already a great mosque, equivalent to several minaretts. The places of worship belonging to the zawiya of the various brotherhoods are still characterized by their hemispherical or ovoid domes. The most important zawiya is that of the Kādiriya, an influential centre of worship. The architecture of the houses, the decoration of their façades with relieves of brick, contribute to give to Nefta an imposing appearance which is also characteristic of Tozeur.


[This record appears to be a mixture of different sources and topics.]

NEHĀWAND. [See NIHĀWAND.]

NERGISĪ, properly NERGISĪ-ZĀDE MEHMD EFFENDI, an important and distinctive stylist of the old school, poet and calligrapher. Born about 1500 (1502) in Serajevo (Bosna Serai) the son of the nūdīb Nergis Ahmad Effendi, he received his education in Constantinople where he attached himself as a pupil to Kādirzade Faiz‘ Abū al-Hāy. On the completion of his studies he served as muqaddar and nūdīb in Gabela, Mostar, Yeni Pazur (Novi pazar). Elbasan, Banyaluka and Monastir. He was on intimate terms with the Shāhāb al-Fārābī Yahya Effendi. He travelled a great deal. Nergīsī was appointed imperial historiographer (nefīz‘ nūrīs) when Murūd IV set out for Bagdad on the campaign against Erician. He died on the march at Gebze (Gebze) on the Gulf of Irmid as the result of a fall from his horse and was buried there (1045 = 1634). The other statement (Hāsib and Riażiz) that he was buried in Ayūb is not at all probable.
Nergis is also a great calligrapher particularly celebrated for his speed in writing. There are works written by him in several libraries.


**MENZEL**

**NEŞHet Khâdîja Suvalmân, an Ottoman poet.** He was born in Adrianople in 1148 (1735), the son of the poet Ahmad Raﬁ Efendi, then in exile; the latter is known as Mâgbûbû Şahkârîyân. With his father, who had regained the sultan’s favour by writing a şarîf, which met with general approval, he came to Constantinople. He also accompanied his father on a journey to the Hidjâz and the young Hâçdîjî, on his way back, joined the Mewlewî order in Konya. After his father’s death, he devoted himself to study, especially Persian, in order to understand the Mehdveci. In Persian, which he came to love passionately, he attained a high degree of perfection with the result that he had more pupils than an ordinary school in his house in Molla Gûrânî, where he taught Persian and expanded the Mehdveci (Mehdveçi, Kamîn al-‘Alâm). He enjoyed great prestige among the people. Later he attached himself to the Naşîhîbendi Şâhîkh Bursuwî Emin Efendi. He held a sief and therefore took part in 1182 (1768) in the Russian campaign. He could use the sword as well as the pen. Nêşêh died in 1222 (1807) and was buried on the Top Kapı.

He received the nom de plume of Neşê’t from Djâdî. Neşê’t was a moderate poet but an admirable teacher. No one would say an unkind word about him and they winked at his smoking the şiwel which was otherwise forbidden. He wrote poetry in Turkish and in Persian. Many of his pupils far surpassed him, such as Gâlib İlede. He left a Divân which was printed in two parts in Bâlük (1252 = 1836). His Mevhâ-î-name’s (about 20 in the Divân) are distinctive in character; these are poems in which he bestowed epithets upon gifted pupils. In addition he left writings on the Naşîhîye: Tefîn-i Mârifet; Târîxmat al-IŞhî; Malak al-Anwâr wa-Mandâl al-‘Azîr. His Terejim-i Şarîf-i dâbi Molla ‘Ismî was printed at Constantinople in 1265. A biography of him by his pupil Pertev Efendi which was continued by Emin Efendi is said to exist.

**Bibliography:** Brussel Mehmed Tahir, ‘Othmanî Mi’zellêr-i, ii. 461; ‘Uçullûm Nâdî, Mejdîyân, No. 8, p. 74—76; do., ‘Othmanîlî Şâ’ârîn, i. 64—70; Khâzîmî Fûrân, Istanbul 1312, ii. 230 (Esluf); Thîreia, Sîdîqî ‘otâmâni, iv. 552; Sâmi, Kamîn al-‘Alâm, vi. 4576; Mehmed Djelal, ‘Othmanî Edebîyâtî Numûnceleri, Istanbul 1312, p. 263; Flügel, Die arabischen... Hs... zu Wien, i. 866.

(MENZEL)
NESHRĪ — NESTORIANS

NESHRĪ, MEHEMMED, an Ottoman historian, with the nom de plume (makkala) of Neshrī; his origin is not definitely known. According to Ewwiyād Cevbeli (Secretary of the Bursa. Of this, he belonged to German-ele (v. 225) he was the career of a certain Mewīnī Mekhimmed b. Neshrī among the 'ulama' of Murād II. According to him, the latter came at an early age to Brussa, studied there in the Sūlān Medrese, was appointed muṭarrīs there, and died in Brussa. In view of the rarity of the name — indeed it is not otherwise known, it is probable that this Mehemmed b. Neshrī was the grandfather of the historian. As to the latter we know only that he was a teacher in Brussa and it may be assumed that he died there in 420 (1526).

Neshrī wrote under the title Līḥān-nūmá a history of the world in six parts, of which only the sixth, dealing with Ottoman history, seems to have survived. This, usually called Ta'rīkh ʿAlī ʿOthmān, is obviously a compilation but the question is still unsettled whether Neshrī was the compiler or whether he copied a compilation already in existence in order to add it as a sixth part (kām) to his own compilation on the history of the world (cf. P. Wittke, in M. O. G., i. 150, who decides for the second hypothesis). There are suspicious echoes of the work of ʿAshīq Pashā-Zade and of Bihishti's Chronicle (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 43 sq.) and it should perhaps be investigated whether the madah b. Neshrī made a popular version of Bihishti's Ta'rīkh which was written in an elevated style, or the stylist Bihishti rewrote the work of Neshrī in elegant language. The sixth part of the Līḥān-nūmā is divided into three sections (Qalabtāt: B. Ewwiyād ʿOghlan, Saldjiqūs of Rūn and the House of ʿOthmān The history of the Ottomans is narrated down to the time of Bāyazīd II; the work comes down only to the year 1485, that is, as far as his sources go, of which one went up to 1485. He concludes with a kaṣīda in praise of the ruling sultān in the year of his reign. Bāyazīd II. Neshrī had considerable influence on contemporary and later historiography and is frequently cited as a source, e.g. by ʿAlī, Saʿd al-Dīn, Šolā-zağde and Munefīdīna-baṣhī. A full survey of the contents of the Taʿrīkh of Neshrī is given by Wittke, ibid. M. O. G., i. 77–150. There is so far not been published. There are a number of good manuscripts in existence. e.g. in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Suppl. Turc, No. 153, a very handsome MS) and No. 1183 of the Charles Schefer collection and in Vienna, Nat. Bibl., No. 986 (cf. Flügel, Kat., ii. 209). Specimens of his text have often been published; see a list of them in F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 39. Bibliography: Cf. the sources collected by F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 39, notably J. H. Metzdottmann, in Isl., v. (1920), p. 159 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. D. (1923), p. 168 sqq.; also J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., ii. 310.

FRANZ BABINGER

NESMI, SIYIĎ İMAD AL-DIN, known as Nesmi, an early Ottoman poet and mystic, believed to have come from Nesmi near Baghdād, whence his name Nesmi. As a place of this name no longer exists, it is not certain whether the lāḥab should not be derived simply from nāitzīm "zephyr, breath of wind". That Nesmi was of Turkoman origin seems to be fairly certain although the "Siyid" before his name also points to Arab blood. Turkish was as familiar to him as Persian; for he wrote in both languages. Arabic poems are also ascribed to him. Little is known of his life; it fell in the reign of Murād I (1359–1390) as his biographers tell us. He was at first a member of the school of Şâkiş Shībī (247–334 = 861–945) but about 804 (1401) he became an enthusiastic follower of Fadl Allāh Ḥādīlī [q. v.] with whom he was undoubtedly personally acquainted. He championed the views of his master with ardour and at the risk of his life. The poet Reftī, author (811 = 1405) of the Bihishti-nāme (copies in London, cf. Rieu, Cat., p. 164 sqq. and Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., p. 401 and 492 (two MSS., the second more complete), and presumably a Gond-nāme (in Vienna, cf. Flügel, Kat., i. 1700) was his pupil. A certain Shāh Khāndān who was a dervish mystic is mentioned as his full brother. Nesmi met a cruel death in 820 (1417–1418) in Aleppo where he was flayed for his heretical poems on a fēṭāw of the extremely fanatical muftī. He is considered the greatest poet and preacher of the Ḥādīlī sect. His work consists of two collections of poems, one of which, the rarer, is in Persian and the other in Turkish. The Turkish Divān consists of 250–300 ghazals and about 150 quatrains, but the existing MSS. differ considerably from the printed edition (Starmb 1298 = 1881). No scholarly edition has so far been taken. The Persian Divān has not been examined at all. Nesmi's spiritual influence on the dervish system of the earlier Ottoman empire was considerable. The pro-ʿAlid guilds in particular honour Nesmi as one of their masters, testimony to whose far-reaching influence is found even in earlier European travellers like Giov. Antonio Menavino (c. 1540; cf. F. Babinger, in Isl., xi, note 1, from which it is evident that Nicolas de Nicolay copied him and therefore cannot be regarded as an independent source, as Gibb, H. O. P., i. 356 sq. thought) and Sir Paul Reuct (xvii century; cf. Gibb, H. O. P., i. 357 sqq.). Nesmi's importance as a poet and mystic can only be estimated and stabilised in connection with a thorough study of the older Ḥādīlī texts, among which a most important one is that mentioned but not recognised by W. Pertsch, Pers. Handwörter, Berlin, p. 264 sqq. No. 231 by Siyid ʿAlī al-ʿAlā (d. 822 = 1419) because it might show the connection of the Huṣīfa with the Bektāshīa. Nesmi's poems were made popular in earlier times, especially by the wandering Kalendar dervishes [q. v.] and were known to every one.

Bibliography: Gibb, H. O. P., i. 343 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., i. 124 sqq. and the Ottoman biographers of poets who however contribute practically nothing to the life history of Nesmi. (FRANZ BABINGER)

NESTORIANS. The Christian community (müller) which we know as Nestorians is at the present day better known under the name of ʾashīqa or dhīfīla. Down to the year 1914 they lived in the central part of Kurdistan which lies between Mawṣīl [see Mawṣīl], Wān and Urmiya [see Urmeya]. Their main nucleus was represented by the highland Nestorians, in practice independent, living in the inaccessible regions of the highlands on the middle course of the Great Žāh, Tičārī, Tičānī. Tīkhab, Ijīlī, Dīz, Urī, Salbekan, Bāz, etc. Outside of this national centre the Nestorians are
found scattered in enclaves among the Muḥam-
dan population, Kurd and Persian, of the adjoin-
ing districts: Gawar, Tergawar, Mergawar, Shāmdinān [q. v.]; on the plateau of Urmīya (some sixty villages), in this town itself; finally in the
north at Salamas, Bāshkalā Khūshāb and in the
south in Mawsil and around it (Alkosh etc.).

Geography. It may be useful here to touch on
some of the salient features of the Nestorian country in
the strict sense, which is but very little known.
We mean by this the area on both sides of the
middle course of the Great Zāb, in the part where
it describes an arc towards the east, between 37°
and 37° 30' N., 43° 30' and 44° E. In Layard (Nineveh, i) we have a description of the Nestorian
district on the right bank: the upper Tiyyārī with
Cumbī and the greater part of the Lower Tiyyārī
with Ashṭā and Līzān. We shall give here a
general account of those on the left bank, namely,
going from N. to S. and from E. to Dizz, Kīu, the eastern part of the Lower Tiyyārī, Tal,
Walto, Tākhūm (with Tikhūb); further to the east,
Dijlū, Bāz and lastly Iṣṭāzīn. All these districts
lie in the folds of the massif which the Turks
know by the general name of Dijlū Dāgh, but
which for the natives has a number of names.
Thus the abrupt fall of Dijlū Dāgh at some degree forms
a curve in the inverse direction of the arc of the
Great Zāb.

History. The teaching of the Nestorians, who
were very active missionaries, was at one time
very widely disseminated in Asia. An inscription
in Chinese and Syriac was discovered at Singanfu.
At Travancore, in South India, there is still a
Nestorian community in existence. It was under
the Sāsānians that the Nestorians played an
important part. It is true that under Shāpur II (309–
379), Yazdegird I (399–420) and Bahram V
(420–438) severe persecutions took place for
various reasons, of which the extraordinary spread
of the sect was not the least. On the other hand,
purely political reasons, fear of Byzantine influence,
made the Persian government distrustful of them.
We know for example, that the Byzantine emperor
demanded from Bahram V and Khusrav I the free
exercise of the Christian religion. Permanent
good relations between the Nestorian Church and
the state therefore date only from the declaration
of independence of the Eastern Syrian church
under a Catholicos of Seleucia with a dyophysite
confession of faith. The most flourishing period
of Nestorianism was therefore in the reign of
Hormizd IV and at the beginning of the reign of
Khusrav II, i.e. from 578 to 605 A. D. Under
the influence of Gabriel of Sīgar, who had been
governor of some monophyist provinces, Khusrav II began
to persecute the Nestorians; one result was that from
609 to 628, the year of Khusrav's death, the
position of Catholicos remained vacant. Two events
in this period are of special importance to us.
The first was the establishment of Christianity in
Central Kurdistān, where we still find direct and
indirect traces of it at every step: churches,
monasteries, traditions, place-names. In the fifth
century the faith gained ground daily among the
people of the high plateaus of Iran proper and
among the Kurds. Pethion (4, 447) conducted
a very successful missionary campaign in these
mountains, which was crowned by his martyrdom.
Emulating him, Saba, the "teacher of the heathen",
got among the Kurds, who were sun-worshippers.

His eloquence supported by numerous miracles
won many converts (J. Labouret, Le christianisme
dans l'Empire Persé sous la Dynastie Sassanide,
Paris 1904). Let us not forget this first Nestorian
advance into Kurdistān. The oldest Nestorian
churches in Central Kurdistān date from the fourth
and fifth centuries. These are Mār Zaya at Dijlū;
Mār Bāshū at Iṣīl; Mār Sāba (ruins) at Kočānūs;
Mār Memo at Ormar. The monastery and church
of Mār Sāba at Ashṭā in Tiyyārī were also held
in great veneration but we do not know their date.
Secondly we must note here how relations were
established between the Nestorians and Islam (Tor
Andreae, Der Ursprung des Islam und das Christen-
tum, Upsala 1926). The part played by the
Nestorians at a certain period under the Sāsānians
explains the conversion of the Yaman to Nestorianism
at its conquest by the Persian general Wahrīz in
597. It was in the Nestorian form that Christianity
penetrated into Arabia in the zone of Persian
influence, i.e. from Ḥadramawt to Palmyra. We
know the names of six Nestorian bishops on the
eastern shore of Arabia. The first to be founded
was that of ʿOman (acts of Councils 424, 544,
576, 676). A Christian community on the island
of Soğotār used to receive its priests from the
Catholicos of Persia. Relations with Persia were
established by sea. By the time of Muḥammad the
South Arabian church was already Nestorian. We
have definite evidence of this in the fact that
Ṣayyid, prince of Nejdrān, came with the bishop
Iṣḥāyāb to Muḥammad to seek favours. Bar Hebraeus
who records the incident adds that the Prophet
gave them a document ordering the Arabs to see
that no injury was done to the Christians and to
help them to rebuild their churches. The priests
and monks were to be exempt from the poll-tax,
which besides was not in general to exceed 4 izaq
for the poor and iṣā‘ for the state. According to
another source, the bishop only wrote to Muḥammad.
A passage in a letter of Iṣḥāyāb III (647–648)
shows that the relations between Arabs and
Nestorians were very good. This may be attributed
to the fact that the Christology of the
Nestorians was much more acceptable to the
Muslims than that of the monophysites. Every Nestorian
church in the east possessed its own version of
the letter of protection alleged to have been given
by the Prophet (cf. for example that given by
George Dav. Malech in his History of the Syrian
Nation and the Old Evangelical-Apostolic Church
of the East). In any case this letter did not pre-
vent (see below) the proclamation of the ḥijāḥ
from which the Nestorians later suffered so much.
The life of the Nestorian Church during the
period from the Muḥammadan conquest to the
establishment of the Mongols need not detain us
here, as it is part of the religious history of the
Christian sects. We need only mention as par-
cularly concerning Ābighabīdān which the Jacobite
and Nestorian rites were rivals there. Thus from
630 to 1265 we have a line of Jacobite bishops.

We know also (Assemani, Bibl. Or., iii/ii. 707) of
Nestorian bishops both to the east of Lake Urmīya
and also in the country of Lake Wān and Central
Kurdistān. It is not always easy to identify the
names found there. We have good evidence of
the antiquity of Nestorianism in Salamas where
there is in the burial ground of Khusravām an
epitaph of the viiith century recording the name of
Khosrow Escolayā "the student Khusrav" (cf,
Duval, *Dialecte nie-araméen*, 1883). Under the Mongols we find at first that the Nestorian priests (arkants) were treated with consideration at the taking of Bagdad (Hammer, *Itkán*, ii, 152). We know also that Hülâgu's father was a Christian: at the taking of Arbil, the see of an important Nestorian metropolitan (Adharbâjjan was also under it), the lances of the Mongol horsemen bore little crosses. Later, in proportion as the Mongols became converted to Islam, the Nestorians became subjected to persecution, and particularly after the invasion of Timûr they sought refuge in the mountains of Kurdîstân from which they did not begin to emerge until the beginning of the xvi th century when they spread eastwards towards the region of Urmia and S. E. towards Mâwîsh. Duval (*op. cit.*, p. 9, note 4) gives notes on the different residences of the Nestorian patriarchs after the taking of Bagdad in 1258. It was under the Patriarch Simeon IV in 1450, that an innovation was introduced, making the episcopate hereditary; this produced a schism in the Nestorian community in 1551 when Sulâkha was elected in opposition to Simeon Bar Mama. From this dates the term "Chaldeans" henceforth applied to these Nestorians who recognised the supremacy of Rome, while English, American and German writers speak constantly of the "Assyrians", and lastly the Nestorians themselves like to be called Siwales. In Russian the name used is aîorî. In the second half of the xvii th century, the bishop Mâr Yusîf recognised the authority of Rome and received the title of Catholic Patriarch of Babylon and Chaldaea, while one of his near relatives, elected patriarch of the Nestorians and remaining faithful to this rite, was enthroned under the name, henceforth hereditary, of Mâr Shimûn and at once set out for the mountains of Central Kurdîstân, where his residence was sometimes at Kûrans and sometimes at Dûlâmêrk. Thus originated this quasi-autonomous community of Nestorian highlanders in which an ecclesiastical authority exists alongside of a purely tribal organisation. Indeed while the supreme power is in the hands of a hereditary Mâr Shimûn (passing from uncle to nephew) having the title of patriarka d-madenbû, who was consecrated patriarch by the Metropolitan Mâr Hûnsîtûn, living in Dera Rejû at Shândûnû, each tribe (shbûta) had alongside of a bishop (abûna), the ecclesiastical chief, a mûlûk or lay chief, distinguished by peacock feathers fixed on his conical felt hat, a characteristic feature of dress. The custom of the men arranging their hair in little pigtails may also be mentioned. The mûlûks had power to declare war on another tribe and to conclude peace.

The tribal organisation and mode of life of these highlanders have given some writers to give them the name of "Christian Kurds" (Garzoni, Lerch).

A. Wigram in the introduction to his *History of the Assyrian Church* thinks that some at least of the Christians of Hakkâri [cf. Kurds] are of Kurd origin although they deny it vigorously. On the other hand, there are Kurd tribes who remember that they were once Christians. Other writers (Grant), led astray perhaps by the theocratic aspect of Nestorian society, the names and certain Biblical traditions, see in them evidence in support of the hypothesis that the Nestorians are the de-cendants of the ten tribes of Israel. We know however which actually are the Jewish communities in Kurdîstân, quite distinct from the Christian groups in dress and customs. Only their language is also a Neo-Aramaic dialect. — The Highland Nestorians annually pay Mâr Shimûn a contribution called rich d-chîta. The arrears due to the Turkish treasury were simply left to mount up. Cuinet (p. 749—751), speaking of the autonomous tribes, gives the total of arrears as already 160,000 £ T in his time. There was besides somewhere in the Nestorian country (cf. Lalayan, who gives a photograph) a "rock of the collector of taxes" marking the limit beyond which this official never risked going. — The relations of the Nestorian hillmen with their Kurdish neighbours are no worse than with one another usually are. The interest of the tribe came before every consideration of religion, so that ad hoc alliances could be concluded between the Kurds and the Nestorians for joint action against their co-religionists.

"The grass grows quickly over the blood spilt in a just battle". A kind of fair play is therefore the ruling principle of the inter-tribal code. There are, it is true, exceptional cases. The pan-Islamism of 'Abd al-Hasîm had its unpleasant repercussions in Kurdîstân; the Turkish officials appointed there after the revolution of 1907 only complicated the position still further. Since the affairs of the Nestorians and Kurds were conducted on a tribal basis, we find the door of the patriarch's residence open to Kurds and Nestorians indifferently, who come to settle their disputes and hospitality is offered to all alike. On the other hand, we find the Nestorians seeking the good offices of Shaikh Salîm of Barzan known as the "Christian Shaikh", who was executed by the Turks in Mawîsh at the beginning of the War.

The Nestorians and the Dijhâd. Even before the official outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Turkey, in August 1914, the patriarch Mâr Shimûn was invited by Ljewdet Bey, the wâli of Wân, to come to see him. Presents were lavished upon him and assurances given that all the grievances of the Nestorians would be redressed. As a result of the proclamation of the dîjhâd however, the atmosphere became heavy in Kurdîstân. In November, Turkey entered the war and the per-secution of the Nestorians of Alûb (Bâsh-kal'as) began at once. In Persia fighting broke out between the Chritians of the Urmia region and the Bekâzî Kurds. At the end of 1914, the Russians evacuated Urmia and Salamas. Those Christians who did not save themselves in time by going to Dûlâmêr perished in large numbers. As to the Nestorians of the highlands, although the massacres and deportations of Armenians were at their height, the Turks endeavoured to attach the Patriarch to their side and to secure the loyalty of the Nestorians. Complete educational freedom, good rutes, subsidies and grants to the Patriarch and to the bishops and mûlûks, all these things were promised in vain. Mâr Shimûn retired to the particularly inaccessible district of Dîzû from which the Patriarch's personal bodyguard had always been recruited. About this time an accidental shot killed Mâr Shimûn's uncle Nestoros, who was, it was said, urging a more conciliatory policy towards the Turks. After an interview, which decided matters, with the Russian commander at Mûhändîjî, near Salamas, the Patriarch on May 10, 1915, issued the order for mobilisation. The fortune of war resulted in the Nestorians, at first encouraged by the Russian successes in Wân and Urmia at the beginning
of the summer, being left to their own resources. To be brief, with the help of the Barzānī Kurds, the Turks sacked Tāhāma, Tiyyārī, Dājūī and Bāzū. We may note especially the destruction of the irrigation ditches by acqua ced ita in Sargone province in the time of the Tsar. The famous march of Mār Zāia at Dājūī, of the fourth century, was desecrated for the first time in its long history. Interesting ex votos, Chinese vases, brought there in early days by missionaries, disappeared. The inviolability enjoyed by Mār Zāia is said to have been due to a letter guaranteeing it written on a piece of cloth, attributed to the Prophet (cf. above). After this disaster the Nestorians withdrew to their summer pastures, at a height of 10,000 feet. This final trial was a painful one. Harassed by the Kurds, with insufficient food and no salt, the Nestorians nevertheless held out. The Patriarch, taking refuge on the plateau of Shina, endured privations which were even harder for him who could not eat meat (even the mother of the patriarch apparently must not eat meat). The Nestorian rā'īāt of Gāwar were massacred at this time under the orders of Nūrī Bey. Finally in October 1915 a skilful retreat was carried through. The Kurds were actually holding the approaches to the Persian frontier. A detour was effected towards Abāk in the north via Kōrtanis (Berwar) and the bridges were burned after crossing the Ghūrā. The Kurds succeeded however in threatening the retreat by using the natural bridge of Hezkelan, but were driven back. The bravura of the Nestorian church was destined to become legendary. In the month of November the exodus of the Nestorians was completed, and they were safe within the Russian lines at Salamas. The Russian authorities organised assistance for the refugees, who, to the number of 40,000, were settled in the Persian districts of Khūr Salamas and Urmiya where they remained till 1918. After the departure of the Russians as a result of the revolution, the Nestorians formed detachments with the help of Russian munitions and instructors and opposed the advance into Aḡbarbādān of the Turks led by 'Ali Iḥsān Pāshā. Having been dispersed by the Persians in 1910, however, their munitions being exhausted, the Nestorians left the region of Urmiya via Saldūz-Sain Kāla-Bīdjār for Hamadān where the English forces then were. From there the refugees were sent to the concentration camp of Bakūba near Baghādād. The Patriarch was no longer alive. Led into an ambush by the Shūkār Kūrīd chief Ismā‘īl Aḡā Simkū, Mār Shim‘ūn was treacherously assassinated at Kohneh Shehr on March 4, 1918.

The Nestorian community is now living in scattered groups in the 'Irāq, Persia, Syria etc. The post-war history of the Nestorians is closely bound up with the problem of the wilayet of Mawji, finally attached to the 'Irāq. The line admissible for the same boundary of the wilayet in question, however, leaves the Nestorian districts to Turkey and it is very unlikely that they can return there. The martial qualities of the Nestorians were used by the British authorities who raised four battalions from them, which were very useful especially at the beginning of their establishment in the 'Irāq.

In conclusion a few words should be said about the Nestorians of the region of Lake Urmiya. Those of Salamas believe (Duval, cf. cit.) that they are aborigines converted in the early centuries of our era. In 1883 there were however only fifteen Nestorian families, the remaining 3,000 having become Roman Catholics under the bishop Mār Ihsāyāb (d. 1789). As to the Nestorians of the plateau of Urmiya, we know in general, according to which their immediate ancestors came down from the mountains five or six centuries ago, which corresponds very closely to historic fact. The Nestorians of Urmiya have been the object of lively competition among the missions, of which the Presbyterian was first established (1832). The Roman Catholic Lazarists followed in 1863 and finally an Orthodox mission, the brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, began work in 1905. At one time shortly before the War, there were also Anglican and Cæcilian missions. The work of the missions has made quite appreciable modifications not only in the beliefs of this ancient Christian community but also in its life and customs. Although little information has been preserved on the subject, there is reason to believe that the Nestorians of Urmiya also lived under the authority of mālik, who were recognised by the Shāhs as the official representatives of the community. We have seen a number of firman preserved in the family of Dr. Johanna Malik. They were administered according to the old collection of canon law called Sunhāds of which Šamsaša Yūsuf Kaleta published a new edition in 1916 at the American Mission Press.

This is probably only one of the versions of the Syriac, which are known in the Chaldean edition with its wealth of learning. In the eyes of the Muslim authorities the Nestorians were zimmī (dāmmī; cf. dāmmā) and their position was regulated by Muhammadan law. With the coming of the missionaries, the position gradually changed. The mālik were replaced by miltē bāsī, each dependent on his respective mission. The Persian governor had to appoint a sersef, an official whose special duty was to deal with foreigners and those under their protection. During the War a national council called motawa was organised, which dealt not only with the defence of Christian interests before the local authorities, but also with the return to their numbers of the Nestorian territory acquired a certain political character but later disappeared in the general débâcle. — In conclusion it should be mentioned that in the present article we have confined ourselves mainly to the Nestorian highlanders of Central Kurdistān. The historical phenomenon that we have been led to study in this connection is far from being so limited and simple, for it demands not only consideration of linguistic problems, the ramifications of which go back to a remote past through Aramaic, but also of facts of ethnology even less known which are implied in the idea of Nestorianism. Finally the geographical area is also enormous if we remember for example the epigraphic material from Russian Central Asia.


NEWİ, YAHYÂ B. PIR 'ÀLI B. NAŞİR, an Ottoman theologian and poet, with the nom de plume (makhlûq) of Newi, was born in Malghara (Rumelia), the son of Shaikh Pir'Ali in 1490 (1533). Up to his tenth year he was taught by his learned father and then became a pupil of Karamanî-zade Mehemmed Efendi. His fellow pupils were Bâtî, the poet [q. v.] and Sa'd al-Din, the famous historian [q. v.]. He was an intimate friend of the former. He joined the 'Ulemâ, became modernis of Gallipoli in 973 (1565) and after filling several other offices became a teacher in the Medrese of Mir-i-Madî Sultan. In 998 (1598) he was appointed Kâdi of Baghi'd and before he could take up office Sultan Murâd III appointed him tutor to his son Mustafâ and to the princes Bâyazid, 'Othmân and 'Abd Allâh. When after Murâd III's death (1003 = 1595) the usual slaughter of the princes deprived him of all the charges, he retired completely from public life and lived on a pension granted him by the new sultan. He died at Stambul in Dhu 'l-Qa'da, 1417 (June 1499) and was buried in the court of the Shâh-i Wêfa mosque. He was the son of Newi-zade 'Aṭî (q. v.).

Newi was a man of great learning and his encyclopaedic knowledge was most clearly revealed in his best known of his works, the Naftul gilânä wa-Maḥasin al-Muṭân, in which he surveyed the twelve most important branches of learning; on it cf. [J. v. Hammer] Encyclopädische Übersicht der Wissenschaften des Orientes, part i. (Leipzig 1864), p. 22 sqq. and the German translation of the story of Shâhân and Beşîr, ibid., p. 24 sqq. which forms the concluding section of this work. Brunsâ Mehemmed Tahir gives a list of other prose works in his 'Oftâmânu Mu'llifikât, iii. 475 sqq. with references to the libraries in which they are kept. It is evident that the style of his contemporary Bâtî without however reaching his level. His poems which were collected in a scarce Dîvân (MS. in Stambul, Hamidiye library), lack ease and betray too readily the learned author who frequently makes his work difficult to understand with unusual words and obscure allusions. He tries his skill in different forms of verse, the ḵāṣīa, ghâzal, and mawwâd, without however attaining popularity in any one of them. His fame as a poet is completely overshadowed by that of his contemporary and friend Bâtî. Newi's high position as an author he owes to his learned work, particularly the already mentioned encyclopedia, which was the sort to appeal to, and as is evident from the numerous MSS. still in existence in European collections (e.g. Berlin, Bologna, Dresden, Leyden, London [3 copies], Upsala, Vienna). A Sultânîmûne by him (Paris, Bib. Nat., cod. reg. 44, Cat. No. 308 and F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 76) does not seem to be mentioned by his biographers. His son Newi-zade 'Aṭî wrote a very full life of him (p. 418—27 of the Dîvân to Tashkoprûdzâ's work).

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii. 108; Gibb, H. O. P., iii. 171 sqq.; Hâdisî Khalifa, Fedisiko, i. 120 sqq. also the biographies of poets by Kiânî-zade and 'Aḥdî.
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NEWİZÂDE 'ÂTĪ, 'ÂTĪ AL-DIN, an Ottoman author and poet, better known as 'Aṭî with the nom de plume Newi-zade, i.e. son of Newî, was born in 991 (1583) in Stambul, as the son of the celebrated Newî [q. v.]. After the death of his father from whom he received his early education, he placed himself under Kafrâzî Fâdî Allâh Efendi, the compiler of an anthology, and later under Akâhî-zade 'Abd-ı-Halîm Efendi. He then joined the 'Ulemâ but did not attain any of the higher offices. After becoming a muftızî, he was appointed a judge and served in this capacity in a number of Rumelian towns like Loğâ, Silistria, Rusuk, Tîrnovo, Monastir (Bitîf),
Trikalla and Český (Skopje). Soon after his retirement from this sphere of activity he died in 1634 (1634) in his native city of Stambul; here he was buried beside his father, Ishak. The latter is best known for his continuation (джакы) in Turkish of Taşkıprızade’s Şahisi ışık Naşri. This work, entitled Ḥadīth al-Ḥaṣbah fi Tahlīmat al-Şahis is, continues in a supplement to the Şahis ışık in which a place is given to many scholars of the time of Sulaiman and Selim II, overlooked by Taşkıprızade, the biographies of Ottoman ‘Ulema’ and dervish shaikhs down to the reign of Murâd IV (on the contents see F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 172). Death prevented the author from continuing his work, which was taken up by others. Aşı’s book contains 999 biographies. It was written in a very artificial style permeated with Persian, which was popular at the time. Aşı’s book also enjoyed a great reputation as a poet. He wrote a quintet (Kahvam) on the contents of which see Gibb, H.O.P., iii. 234 sqq. The Ḥadīth al-Ḥaṣbah, manuscripts of which are also common (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 172 to which may now be added Stambul, Lâlî Isma‘îl, No. 339), was printed at Stambul (15 + 771 pp. 2°) in 1668. The poetry still awaits a printer. Aşı’s signification as a prose writer is much greater than as a poet.
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NIEBŁA, the name of two Ottoman poets.

1. ‘Abd al-Razzâk known as Niebla, or more accurately Niebla-i Kadim, “Niebla the Elder,” to distinguish him from ‘Othmân Niebla [q.v.], came from Kûrück (near Bagdîd) and was probably of Kûrück origin. He seems however to have come to Stambul at an early age to prosecute his studies. Here he became a mödérres but in the year 1159 (1746) entered upon a legal career. According to the ‘İṣğilî-i ışık-i ışık, he held the office of jâfît in Sarajevo and Kutahya. His sharp tongue which found particular expression in daring and malicious chronograms (tɛo-wîrih) earned him banishment to Kethyana (Crete) along with the poet Haşmet and then to Brussa; he was later, according to Wâsîf (Taribî, p. 211), sent back to Kutahya. In any case he died in Brussa in Şawwâl 1175 (May 1762) of a broken heart and was buried in the cemetery opposite the mosque of Pir Ufûd the Muḥammad the founder of the order of the Djalwata. ‘Abd al-Razzâk Niebla composed a Dîvân in Persian and Turkish (p. Stambul 1300 and we believe 1304), and also a history of the war with Nâdir Şâh in 1145 (1730) in which he took part on the staff of Hekïm Oghlu Ali Paşa. The little book called Têrîsî-yi Hekïm Oghlu Ali Paşa is written in ornate language and is of no historical value. The fair copy in the author’s hand is preserved in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (Cod. Or. 8° 2186). Niebla also enjoyed the reputation of being a distinguished münkî. Excerpts from his Inbâh are given by J. v. Hammer in his G.O.R., ix. 643 sq. His Divân is called Muḥallaq

al-Hikâm which gives the year 1172 (1758) for its completion (cf. however a similarly titled work in Vienna: Flügel, Cat., iii. 486, No. 1991).

Bibliography: Cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 204 sq. with further references. The promised very full bio-bibliography of Niebla Efendi by Iba al-Mu‘in Mahmîd Kemal Bey has not yet appeared (1933).

2. ‘Othmân, called Niebla or, to distinguish him from his older namesake, Niebla-i Djemed, came from Chios. He held several military posts in the capital and died there in 1293 (1876) in retirement. He is buried in the Karâđja Ahmîd cemetery in Skutari. His collected poems have been twice printed, Stambul 1257 and Stambul 1290 (by Yüsuf Kâtîlî Paşa) (Dîvân-i ‘Othmân Niebla). In 1302 there was published at the suggestion of ‘Abd al-Kârim Nâdir Paşa in Stambul under the title Efdî-i Nâdiri specimens of his prose and verse. A Turkish translation of the Gulûân by him exists in MS. ‘Othmân Niebla had a very thorough command of the three languages of Islam and wrote poetry in all three. His work however is hardly of permanent value.

Bibliography: Brâssilî Mehmedh Tahir, ‘Othmânî Mu‘ellifleri, ii. 405 sq. (FRANZ BABINGER)

NICEA. [See Iznik.]

niebla (Ar. ليبلا), a little town in the S.W. of Spina, 15 miles W. of Seville on the right bank of the Rio Tinto. Now much decayed, it has less than 2,000 inhabitants and is in the judicial district of Moguer, in the province of Huelva. It is the ancient Iliipa. In the Visigothic period it was the see of a bishop. In the Muslim period it enjoyed considerable prosperity. It formed part of the district of al-Sharaf (Ajarâfe) and was also called al-Ḥamrâ, “the red”, no doubt from the colour of its ramparts and of the water of its river. It was particularly an olive-growing centre. The gentian was also cultivated there and deposits of alum and of sulphate of iron were worked.

Niebla was taken in 94 (713) by ‘Abd al-‘Azîz, son of Mâsû b. Nuṣâir [q.v.]. In 149 (766) it was the starting point of the rising of Sa‘îd al-Maṣfîr al-Yaḥṣubî who seized Seville but was soon defeated and slain by the troops of ‘Abd al-Rahîm I. The town in 230 (844) suffered from a visit of the Normans (Maghûr; q.v.). In 284 (997) it rebelled against the Umayyads: it was however retaken by force of arms in 304 (917) by order of ‘Abîd al-Rahîm al-Našîr by his general Badr b. Ahmad. At the time of the fall of the Caliphate, it became the capital of a little kingdom formed in 414 (1024) by Abu l-‘Abbâs Ahmad b. Yaḥyâ al-Yaḥṣubî who seized al-Dawla, which also comprised the lands of Huelva and of Djalal al-Cyûn (Gibralon). This prince died in 433 (1041) and was succeeded by his brother Muhammad l‘izz al-Dawla. The ‘Abbâsid sovereign of Seville al-Mu‘tâqid [q.v.] soon displayed his desire to annex the principality of Niebla and made several raids into it. ‘izz al-Dawla had to abandon his capital and take refuge with the lord of Cordova Abu l-Walîd Muhammad b. Djalwar in 443 (1051) leaving the power to his nephew Abu Naṣr Fâth b. Khalaf b. Yaḥyâ al-Yaḥṣubî Naṣîr al-Dawla, who at first bought peace from al-Mu‘tâjid by paying him tribute but was forced two years later in 445 (1053) to abandon his
principally to the ruler of Seville and join his uncle in Cordova. Niebla passed a little later to
the Almoravids [q.v.]. When the power of this
dynasty was beginning to collapse in Spain, it
became the headquarters of another rebel, Yusuf
b. Ahmad al-Birawashi (or al-Batruji), who in 549
(1154) finally submitted to the Almohad general
Barraz al-Masafi and went five years later to Sala
on the summons of 'Abd al-Mu'min. A few years
later Yusuf al-Birawashi, maintained as governor of
Niebla by the Almohads, rebelled and the town
was retaken in 549 (1154) by the governor of
Seville and of Cordova, Yahiya b. Yaghmur, who
executed 8,000 of the inhabitants. This massacre
was condemned by 'Abd al-Mu'min who had
Yahya brought in chains to Morocco and then
exiled to Tlemcen.

Niebla remained under Muslim rule until 1257,
when it was taken after six months siege by
Alfonso X and became finally Christian.

Bibliography: al-Idrisi, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espeante, ed. Dozy and de Goeje,
p. 174 and 175, 209 and 215 of the transl.;
Yahya, Mu'izz al-Mulidin, ed. Wustenfeld, ii,
332 and iv, 346; E. Fagnan, Extrait des lettres,
relatives au Maghreb, Paris 1924, index; Ibn
al-Khatija, Fatih al-Anadul, ed. J. Ribera, Madrid
1926, index; Ibn 'Idhari, Bayan al-alam shari'i,
i, ed. Dozy and transl. Fagnan, index; lit.; E.
Levi-Provenzal, index; Ibn Abu Zakariya, Rawad al-
Khufis, ed. Tornberg, p. 137; Ibn Khaldun, L'Ori
Histoire des Sultans d'Espagne, ii, 192; Dozy, Histoire
des Musulmans d'Espagne, Leyden 1932, index;
E. Levi-Provenzal, Documents inedits d'histoire
almaohide, Paris 1928, p. 213; Codex, Decadencia
y desaparicion de los Almoravidos en Espana,
Saragosse 1899, p. 41, 56; A. Prieto y Vives,
Los reyes de taifas, Madrid 1926, p. 72.

NIFFAR (Niffar), a ruined site in southern
"Irak, in 32° 7' N. Lat. and 45° 10' East Long.
(Greew), now in the bed of Afek
in the Iquz al-Dijaniye. Niffar corresponds,
as J. Oppert was the first to point out, to the
town of Nippur well known from cuneiform inscriptions,
one of the oldest and most important places in
Babylonia. Its great importance was not political
but religious, as the temple of the chief deity of
the town formed a kind of central sanctuary or place
of pilgrimage for the whole of Babylonia, to which
almost all the important sovereigns of the period
before Hammurapi, and Hammurapi himself, as
well as the Kassite kings and many later rulers
like Assurbanipal, dedicated gifts.

Nippur's period of greatest prosperity lay in
the millenia before Hammurapi; but it remained
an important city down to the last Babylonian
and Achemenid rulers and an important com-
mmercial centre with a very mixed population which
gave it a somewhat cosmopolitan character. In
the fifth century B.C., under Artaxerxes I and Darius II,
we find in it an important business and banking
house, the firm of Muraqshab & Sons to whose
activities many documents still bear eloquent
testimony. Nippur still continued to flourish under
the Seleucids and Arsacids as buildings of this
period show, quite apart from the numismatic
evidence. It is not directly mentioned by Greek
or Roman writers, but the name of the district of
Nippur may be concealed in nippurine, the
name of a stone which Pliny (Nat. Hist., xxxvii.
10, 175) says is of Persian (i.e. presumably
Parthian?) origin.

In the Babylonian Talmud Nippur appears as
Niphar (ניפָר) and Nuphar (נָעַפָר); the latter form
corresponds to that which is now most usual:
Nuffar. In the passage in question in the Babylonian
Talmud (Yoma, 10b) we read: Kalneh (כַּלְנָה)
is Naphur (Nuphar) Ninni (ננה, נני); the qualification
Ninni (נני) is obscure; Daiches' explanation in O.L.
Z., xi, 539 as Ninib falls to the ground as the
name of this deity is now known to read Ninurta.
The basis of the equation Kalneh (Gen. n. 10)
= Nippur is not yet satisfactory. A Babylonian
place-name Kaln is so far not been found in
cuneiform inscriptions.

Nippur was also an inhabited place in Muslim
times; for example we find it mentioned in 38
(659) on the occasion of a rising against the caliph
Ali (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i, 3425, 3242) as well
as during the Khurdi trouble (op. cit., ii, 929, c.
also Yahya, ed. Wustenfeld, iv, 275, 798 and
ages we find Nivar mentioned as a Nestorian bisho-
"p in the chronicles of the Patriarchs
(Askher Faqisik kuriu al-Maghrib), ed. Gissone,
Rome 1897 and 1899 of 'Amr b. Matta' (p. 83,
p. 95, a.) and of Mār b. Sulaiman, in the period
900—1058 A. D. (cf. also Sachau, in Abh. Pr. A.A.,
W., 1909, No. 1, p. 31). When the town was
abandoned by its inhabitants and became com-
pletely desolate we do not know. It probably
was the result of one of the Mongol invasions,
that under Hulagu or that under Timur, which
dealt their death-blow to so many flourishing places
in Mesopotamia.

The ruins of Nippur are next to those of
Babylon and al-Warka [q.v.], the most extensive
in the whole of the Babylonian plain; they cover
an area of almost 150 acres. The first European
to visit them was W. K. Loftus who spent some
time here in 1850 and came back again in 1854
(see the Bibl. for his report). A year later than Loftus,
in Jan. 1851, Layard was in Nippur and spent
two weeks digging but with little success because
Layard, paying too little attention to the difference
between Assyrian and Babylonian mounds, did not
dig deep enough and only turned over the cemetery
of a people who had settled there only in the
last centuries of antiquity, under the Arsacids.

The University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)
was the first to undertake a methodical investigation
of the ruins and in four expeditions from 1888
to 1900 (1888—1889, 1889—1890, 1893—1896
and 1898—1900) under the leadership of Peters,
Haynes and Hilprecht carried out excavations on
a large scale. On the results of this intensive work
see Hilprecht's full report in Exploration etc.
(see Bibl.), p. 289 sq.

On the topography of Nippur see, in addi-
tion to the descriptions by Loftus and Layard,
especially Peters, op. cit., ii, 104 sq.; Hilprecht,
op. cit., p. 540 sq. and notably Fisher, op. cit.,
cf. also King, op. cit., p. 85—86. The American
expedition also found an ancient Babylonian plan
of Nippur which Hilprecht, op. cit., p. 518 (re-
produced in Zeitschrift, op. cit., p. 66) published;
more distinct in Fisher, op. cit., pl. i. This plan
has been since 1926 in the possession of the University
of Jena with the rest of Hilprecht's private Assyrio-
logical collection; see Zimmer, in Z.A., xxxvii. 242-
The sight of the ruins is very impressive; they rise like a range of hills in close formation from 30—60 feet above the plain, culminating in the cone of Bint al-Amir 95 feet high, the ziggurat of the chief temple.

The most important part of the whole eastern quarter is the ziggurat of Im-Kharsag, still 95 feet high, which the inhabitants for some reason now forgotten called Bint al-Amir, the "prince's daughter". The triangular mound south of the sanctuary proper marks the site of the great temple library, about a twelfth of which, yielding some 23,000 cuneiform tablets and fragments, has been excavated. The western half of the inner city contains the residential quarters with the bazaars, business houses and private dwellings. Its history is still obscure as in the course of centuries it was repeatedly resettled. In the Persian period a large cemetery extended over a considerable part of the clay buildings which had fallen to pieces there.


In addition to the great Ešnāl temple E-kur there were a number of other highly venerated temples in Nippur.

According to the cuneiform inscriptions, Nippur must have in ancient times lain on the Euphrates itself or at least in its immediate vicinity (cf. e.g. O. L. Z., XX, 142, note 1); this fact forces us to the assumption that this river in the Babylonian period must have taken a much more easterly course below Babylon than in the middle ages and present day. The inner city is divided into two parts by a canal now dry but once navigable, which the natives call Shatt al-Nil. This was an important watercourse which, according to Hilprecht, was in many places at one time 20—25 feet deep and 150—190 feet broad and which the modern inhabitants rightly describe not as a mere ṣānīr (stream), canal) but as Shatt al-Nil.

According to the mediaeval Arab geographers: Nahr al-Nil was the name of one of the canals led off from the Euphrates to the Tigris. It still survives in its entirety; as in the middle ages, it starts from Babylon and flows a little above 32° 30' N. Lat. in an almost straight line eastwards. The geographer Sūrāh (who used to be called Ibn Serapion; cf. iv., p. 1130a) writing in the fourth (tenth) century observes that this canal bears the name Nahr al-Nil only after passing the town of al-Nil (the modern ruins Nīlīye). At the present day it is called only Shatt al-Nil throughout its course. Somewhat east of Nīlīye a side-canal, now dry, branches off to the south for which, not only in its lower part where it flows by the ruins of Nīfar but along its whole extent, the name Shatt al-Nil, the same as that of the main canal, was and is usual. Yākūt however says (iv. 77, 798) that Nīfar lay not on the Nahr al-Nil but on the bank of the Nahr al-Nars, a canal dug, it is said, by the Sāsānian king Narsē b. Bahram (293—303 A. D.) which leaves the Euphrates at al-Hilla a little below the Nahr al-Nil and turns southeastward. It was presumably connected by a branch with the southern small canal of the same name which branches off from the Nahr al-Nil, so that the occurrence of the two names Nahr al-Nil and Nahr al-Nars for the river in Nīfar is explained. It should be noted also that the nomenclature of the Babylonian canals changed several times already in the middle ages. On the Nahr al-Nil or Shatt al-Nil and Nahr al-Nars see Loftus, op. cit., p. 238; G. Le Strange, in J. R. A. S., 1895, S. 256, 260—261 and do., in The Lands of the East Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 72—74; Streck, Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographien, 1. (Leiden 1900), p. 30 sq.; Hersfeld, in Sarre-Hersfeld, Archäolog. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigritgebiet, i. (Berlin 1911), p. 234 sq.; Hāshīm al-Sa‘dal, Dīnghāṣīyat al-‘Irāb al-ḥadīthā, Baghdad 1927, p. 34. 35.

Below Nīfar the Shatt al-Nil loses itself in the swamps of Hōr al-Afek. The Shatt al-Kār very probably forms its southern continuation.

If the "Euphrates of Nippur", as it is called in the cuneiform inscriptions, really represents the old course of this river, and not simply a branch of it, the modern Shatt al-Nil with its continuation, the Shatt al-Kār, probably corresponds to the bed of the Euphrates of Babylonian times. On the great changes in their courses which the rivers of Mesopotamia have undergone, cf. especially Fisher, op. cit., p. 2 sq. Hilprecht, who is followed by others like Zehnpfund, Unger etc., thinks that the name of the canal, Kābara (=the large) found in later texts from Nippur, corresponds to the "Euphrates of Nippur" of the older texts. He further compares it with the Kēbar (722) of Ezekiel (i. 1 etc.); see Hilprecht, Explorations, p. 412 and also in Der Bāl-TEMPEL in Nippur, p. 10. The identification of the Kābara with the old bed of the Euphrates, i.e. the modern Shatt al-Nīl, I do not consider proved; the Kābara may also be a canal in the neighbourhood of Nippur.

West and Southwest of Nīfar lies the very extensive Hōr al-Afek (on the meaning of Hōr see i.ii., p. 147b).


**AL-NIFFāR MUHAMMAD IBN `ABBĀD AL-DJÄBÄR.** This mystic, whom the principal Sufi biographers fail to mention, flourished in the ivth (9th) century, and, according to Häflig Khažifa, died in the year 554 (965). His *nisba* refers to the town of Niffar [q.v.] in Mesopotamia, and one MS. of his works asserts that it was during his residence at Niffar and Nil that he committed his thoughts to writing. Niffar's literary reliquiae consist of two books, the *Mawāṣif* and the *Mukhṭatābât*, together with a number of fragments. It is improbable that Niffar himself was responsible for the editing of his writings; according to his principal commentator, `Affī `Al-Dīn al-Tilmansî (d. 690 = 1291), either his son or his grandson collected his scattered writings and published them according to his own ordering. The *Mawāṣif* consists of 77 sections of varying length, made up for the most part of brief apodémes touching on the main aspects of Sufi teaching, and purporting to be inspired and dictated by God; the *Mukhṭatābât* is similar in content, and is divided into 56 sections. Niffar's most characteristic contribution to mysticism is his doctrine of *wakfā*. This term, which would appear to be used by him in a peculiarly technical sense, implies a condition in the mystic which is accompanied by direct divine audition, and perhaps even automatic script. *Mawāṣif* is the name given to the state of the mystic in which *wakfā* is classed higher than *mar'a*; and *mar'a* is above *'ilm*. The *wakfā* is nearer to God than any other thing, and almost transcends the condition of *bahšārya*, being alone separated from all limitation. Niffar definitely maintains the possibility of seeing God in this world; for he says that vision (*'ra'a*) in this world is a preparation for vision in the world to come. In several places Niffar distinctly touches on the theory of the Mahdi, and indeed appears to identify himself with the Mahdi, if these passages are genuine; and this claim is seemingly in the mind of Zābīd, when he describes Niffar as zābī ʿal-dhawā wa l-'qalā. Tilmansî however interprets these passages in an esoteric and highly mystical sense; and it does not accord with the general character of the author, that he should make for himself such extravagant claims. Niffar shows himself in his writings to be a fearless and original thinker. While undoubtedly influenced by his great predecessor al-Hallīdī, he acknowledges no obligations, and has a thorough conviction of the reality of his own mission.


**NĪĠDE, a town in the Turkish sāndjağa** (now wilâyet) of the same name in a fertile trough on the east edge of the Central Anatolian steppe. The town is first mentioned in the Turkish period; previously the chief town of the district was Tyana or Tana (A. A. Tivane) but it is probable that the striking hill which commands the important road from Cilia to Kaisāriye at its entrance to a pass over the mountains had a fortified settlement upon it in the pre-Turkish period. The old place-name may be the origin of the modern one, an older form of which was Nekide (Yakī, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 511: Nakida; Ibn Bībi and others, also in inscriptions down to the xvith century: Nakida; the modern form

Nīqād [in the new Turkish script: Nigde] is already found in *Hamd Allāh Muṣṭafā, Niẓāḥ, in G.M. S., xxiii/1, 99*. In this particular district some villages have retained their ancient names (Andavāl–Andabalis, Melegop–Malakopaisa) and considerable numbers of descendants of the original Christian inhabitants survived until quite recently (R. M. Dawkins *Greek in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1916, p. 16 sqq.).

Nigde is first mentioned in connection with the partition of Saldıjak territory among the sons of Kīlidj Arslān II (685 = 1189) when it was allotted as an independent lordship to Arslān Shāh (Ibn Bībi, ed. Houtsma, *Rec.,* iv. 11). Nigde had perhaps previously belonged to the Danishmandids but Ewliyā, ii. 189, cannot be taken as evidence of this. Kaikāra I granted Nigde to the Emir-i Aḡrār Zain al-Dīn Bāhārā (Ibn Bībi, p. 44) who shortly before his death built the important mosque of *Ala* al-Dīn here (620 = 1223). In the xivth century Nigde was the headquarters (amīr-vaḵšār kert) of one of the great military districts of the Saldijūks. Under Kīlidj Arslān IV, Ibn at-Ḳahṭār Masʿud held this office. At first an ally of the all powerful Muʿīn al-Dīn Perwānī, with whom he killed the sultan in 1264, he endeavoured to remove the young Kāhṣurā times out of Perwānī's influence and brought him to Nigde (1276). But the help for which he had appealed to Egypt came too late and he succumbed to Perwānī who was supported by the Mongols (Ibn Bībi; Weil, *Gez. d. Chalifen*, iv. 80 sqg.). He built a well in Nigde opposite the *Ala* al-Dīn mosque (666 = 1268). Under the Ilkānīs there ruled in their name, or in the name of their Anatolian governor Eretu, Sunqur Aqgha who is known only from inscriptions and is, it is remarkable to note, not mentioned by Ibn Batṭūta who visited Nigde about 1333 (ed. Defrémery-Sanguinetti, ii. 286); he made himself independent after the death of Abū Saʿīd. He gave a large mosque on the wall of the gate which facing the Bezīstān is a Persian inscription, in which he grants Christian foreigners exemption from *jīvra* and *kharāj* (736 = 1335). The Saljuq princess Khusawāt bêtānīn buried in 732 (1332) in her splendid tomb built in 712 (1312) on the other hand probably did not rule in Nigde although she resided there. She was, if the lady buried beside her in 1344 was her daughter, then the eldest of the emir Shadjaʿ al-Dīn who is mentioned as the father of the lady on her sarcophagus: he ruled according to al-Umarī (ed. Taeschner, p. 31) in the Bulghanlagh, where a wilāyat Shadjaʿ al-Dīn is still mentioned in Saʿīd al-Dīn (i. 517 following Idrīs) and where lies Ubūkṭaḵī which, according to Häflig Khažifa (2bkāνmēnd, p. 617), was also called Shadjaʿ al-Dīn. After the period of Sunqur's rule, Nigde probably passed directly to the Karamanoglu, who held it against the attacks of the Eretuīn *Ala* al-Dīn *ʿAlī* (c. 1379) (Azīz b. Ardašīr, *Rezm u-Rezm*, p. 141 nqg.). In 1390 Nigde surrendered with other Karamanian towns to the Ottomans but was restored to the Kār-
manids who defended it successfully against Kāfīr Burhān al-Dīn, lord of Kāsīrīyā and Siwās (Bīzm u-Raṣāzm, p. 245). After Timūr’s invasion the power of the Karamanids extended northwards as far as Deweli Kārāṣhār which previously belonged to Kāsārīyā and for a time even to Kāsīrīyā itself. Nīgde then ceased to be a frontier town. Apart from a temporary occupation by Egyptian troops in 1419 (Weil, v. 146 sqq.) it enjoyed peace and prosperity and the special care of the Karamanids who had one of the bulwarks of their power here till the end of the dynasty. A series of buildings, the first of which not only in time but also in size and quality is the Aq-Medrese of the year 1409, is evidence of their interest in the town. Nīgde surrendered in 875 (1470) to the Ottoman general ʿErfān Pāsha who had the defences of the town restored. In 878 (1473) the Ottoman Sandjaḵ-bey of Nīgde, Kōtī Bey, forced Deweli Kārāṣhār which still belonged to the Kāramanoglī to surrender to prince Musaṭṭhī. The latter died on the way back at Nīgde (Saʿd al-Dīn, i. 517, 550).

The sandjaḵ of Nīgde belonging to the beyler-beylik of Kāraman, contained the kaẓr of Urubūgh, Bor, Deweli, Deweli Kārāṣhār and Ulukhāla. When about 1720 the grand vizier Ibrāhīm Pāsha transformed his birthplace of Muṣlla in the kaẓr of Urgūb into the imposing town of Newchehr, the site for the garrisons of the decayed fortresses of Nīgde and Deweli Kārāṣhār were transferred to the new foundation (v. Hammer, G.O.R. ii, iv. 250 sqq.). At the end of the Ottoman period the sandjaḵ of Nīgde, to which the kaẓr of Ak-serāi also belonged, contained 148,700 Muslims and 49,551 Christians the latter mainly natives and mostly speaking Turkish. Nīgde was the residence of the metropolitan of Konia. The town numbered at this time 11,526 inhabitants, in 1927 (after the exchange with Greece) only 9,463.

Nīgde (now on the Kayseri-Ulukhāla railway) consists of an upper town running north and south, now largely uninhabited (Tepe Whāne) at the highest point of which in the north stands the imposing citadel and the lower town (Shehr alti) which was also once surrounded by a wall. In the upper town is the ‘Alī al-Dīn mosque, one of the oldest mosques in Anatolia, with an architect’s inscription in Persian. Before the gate of the upper town at its south end is the Gothic mosque of Sunkur (c. 1350) showing influences from Little Armenia and Cyprus, and the bazaar. West of and below it is the Kāramanian Aq-Medrese of 1409. A little apart to the west of the town, separated by a broad road, running north and south is the modern quarter Kāyabaš with a few remnants of the old cemetery and a group of tūbīs among which that of Khuward Mādhūn of the year 1312 is prominent.

Bibliography: Cuinet, Turquie d’Asie, i. 839 sqq.; Turkish Sīḥā ṣuṣ-ṣuṣ-ṣumīlī, ışgūrafiyāšī Medīmūn, No. 2: Nīgde (1922); A. Gabriël, Monumenten turcs d’Anatolie, i. 1931, p. 105 sqq. (historical and Muslim monuments of Nīgde, Bor and Ulukhāla). — Inscriptions: Khalīl Edhem, in T.O.E.M., ii. 747 sqq.; i. 821 sqq., 873 sqq. and A. Tewḥīl in Gabriël, op. cit. — On the Christian monuments of the region see Rott, Kleinasiatische Denkmäler, 1908; and De Jerphannot, Eglises ruppestres de Cappadoce, 1925.

PAUL WITTEK.

NIHĀL ČAND LĀHWĀRĪ, Indian man of letters, Hūḍī by religion, was born in Dīḥūb, but left it in early life and went to Lahore where he lived for a considerable time. Owing to this circumstance he called himself Lāhwārī. Search for a livelihood led him to Calcutta. Here he was introduced to Dr. J. B. Ghilghist who asked him to translate into “Hindi rekhā” the story of Tādī al-Mulākī and Bakawīlī. He consented and thus became one of the famous band of Fort William translators. He made the translation from Gulī Bakawīlī, a Persian rendering by Shaikh ʿIZZAT ULLĀH, 1772, of an old Hindi story, which has been reproduced in Urdu verse by Dāyā Shinkar Kāwul Nasim (q. v.), in his well-known māhnāwī Gulīrī-i Nasīm.

Nīhāl Čand called his work Māḥābī-i Ṭāhī. It is in very good prose mixed with verse. The name gives the date 1217 (1802). Apart from the above mentioned facts nothing is known about the writer.


NIHĀWĀN, a town in the old province of Hamādān, with, at the present day, 5,000–6,000 inhabitants (de Morgan), at a height of 5,860 feet on the branch of the Gāmāsh which comes from the S. E. of the vicinity of Būrāūj; the Gāmāsh then runs W. to Būsūtūn. Nīhāwān lies on the southern road which, coming from Kirmānshāh (Ibn Khurdābqīb, p. 198), leads into Central Persia (Iṣṭāḥāb) avoiding the massif of Alwand (‘Opārī) which rises W. of Hamādān. Hence the importance of the town in the wars of Persia with her western neighbours.

The French excavations of 1931 (Dr. Conteau) have shown that the site of Nīhāwān was inhabited from pre-historic times. The ceramics (‘Ibīs style’) which have been found there, seem to be older than those of style I and II of Susa. Potelmy VI, 2 knows of Nīhkuvānī and according to Ibn Faḵīh, p. 258 the town already existed before the Ptolomy. In the Stašfīnīan period the district of Nīhāwān seems to have formed the fief of the Kānīn family (Dīnīwārī, p. 99). There was a Protestante there. According to Ibn Faḵīh, p. 259 there could be seen on the mountains near Nīhāwān two figures of snow in the form of a bull and a fish (a similar talismanic are said to have existed at Bīlās also cf. also the steles of wisḵāp (‘dragons’), protectors of waters) in Armenia west of Lake Sewan which combine these symbols, Zāp, xxiii/3, 1916, p. 409).

The same legend is reflected in the name of the river Gāmāsh (Gāmāšt-Ab = ‘water of the bull and fish’; māšt is the Kurdish form of the Pers. mā‘īn). Among the products of Nīhāwān the Arab authors mention willow-wood which was used for polo-sticks (paṭālāgh), aromatic seeds (ḵaṣḥat al-ḵašārī or al-taḵmāḥ al-ḵeṣārī) which were used like ḥanī (a perfume put in coffins) and black clay used as wax for sealing letters. The district of Rūdrāwār was under Nīhāwān (cf. de Morgan, Mission, ii. 136: Khuward). and was famous for its abundance of saffron (Iṣṭāḥāb, p. 199). For a list of the places more or less dependent on Nīhāwī, cf. Schwartz, Iran etc., p. 505–509.
In the Mongol period, the Nusheh al-Kulib mentions three districts of Niwhand: Mal'iyir (now Daulatabad), Ishdihan (= Isbidihaan, see below) and Dhibukk. (Niwhand no longer forms part of the province of Hamadhân; cf. Rabino, Hamadan, in R. M. F., xiii., 1921, p. 221–227).

Near Niwhand was fought the famous battle which decided the fate of the Iranian plateau and in which the Kufi Nurmân b. Mu'arrin defeated the Sasanian generals. The commander-in-chief is given different names: Dhu'il-Hajibn Mardan-shâh (cf. Baladhuri, p. 303); Marquart, op. cit., p. 115 identifies him with the Mattaib Khurrazid) or Farhawi (cf. Tabari, i. 608; the latter also gives the name of his generals: Zarduk, Bahman Dâjdâya and the commander of the cavalry Anushék). The Arab camp was at Isbidihaan and that of the Persians at Waykhurd (†). The sources do not agree about the date: Sa'îb b. Oumar (Tabari, i. 2615−2619) gives the end at the year 18 (639) or the beginning of 19 (640); cf. Wellhausen, Skizzen und Verarbeitungen, vi., 1899, p. 97, while Ibn Isâkh, Abû Ma'shar and Wâkidî, followed by Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, iv., 1911, p. 474−504 put the battle in 21.

The district of Niwhand (formerly called Mih-Bahram, also Mêh-Dâr) was finally incorporated in the possessions of the Byzantines and called Mêh-Bâra (=the Media of Rasa) (Baladhuri, p. 306).

Niwhand is often mentioned in the period of the wars between the Safawids and the Ottomans. In 998 (1589) at the beginning of the reign of Abbas I, Cîhâlta-Zade built a fortress at Niwhand (Ailan-arâ, p. 273). After the death of Murad IV a rebellion took place among the garrison of Niwhand; the Ottomans were driven out by the Shi'i inhabitants. As a result in 1012 (1603) war again broke out with Turkey (ibid., p. 440). In the spring of 1142 (1730) Nâdir [q.v.] took Niwhand again from the Turks.

Bibliography: de Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, ii., Etudes géographiques, 1895, p. 152 and passim, pl. lxvi. (view of Niwhand); Marquart, Érâniak, Barthold, Istoriko-geogr. oteck. Iran., 1903, index; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 196−197; Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, i. 498–509, index; Conteneau and Ghirshman, Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles de Tépi-Giyan, près Nêhâwand, 1931, in Syria, 1933, p. 1−11. (V. Minorsky)

NIKH (א), marriage (properly: sexual intercourse, but already in the Kur'an used exclusively of the contract). Here we deal with marriage as a legal institution; for marriage customs see 1. 1. The essential features of the Muslim law of marriage go back to the customary law of the Arabs which previously existed. In this, although there were differences according to districts and the conditions of the individual cases, the regulations governing marriage were based upon the patriarchal system, which permitted the man very great freedom and still bore traces of an old patriarchal system. It is true that before the coming of Islam a higher conception of the marriage state had already begun to exist but the position of the woman was still a very unfavourable one. The marriage contract was made between the suitor and the "guardian", i.e. the father or the nearest male relative of the bride, the latter's consent not being regarded as necessary. But even before Islam it had already become generally usual for the dowry to be given to the woman herself and not to the guardian. In marriage the woman was under the unrestricted authority of her husband, the only bounds to which were consideration for her family. Dissolution of the marriage rested entirely on the man's opinion; and even after his death his relatives could enforce claims upon his widow.

2. Islam reformed these old marriage laws in far-reaching fashion, while retaining their essential features: but as in other fields of social legislation Muhammad's laws are not so much a change of position of the woman's position. The regulations regarding marriage which are the most important in principle are laid down in the Kur'an in Sura iv. (of the period shortly after the battle of Uhud): "3. If ye fear that ye cannot act justly to the orphans marry the women whom ye think good (to marry), by twos, threes or fours; but if ye fear (even then) not to be just then marry one only or (the slaves) whom ye possess; this will be easier that ye be not unjust. Give the women their dowry freely; but if they voluntarily remit you a part of it, enjoy it and may it prosper you. 26. Marry not the women whom your mothers have married (except what is already past); for this is shameful and abominable and an evil way. 27. Forbidden to you are your mothers, your daughters, your sisters, your aunts maternal and paternal, the daughters of your brother and sister, your foster-mothers and foster-sisters, the mothers of your wives and the step-daughters who are in your care, born of your wives, with whom ye have had intercourse — but if ye have not had intercourse with them, it is not a sin for you — and the wives of the sons, who are your offspring; also that ye marry two sisters at the same time except what is already past; Allah is gracious and merciful. 28. Further married women except (slaves) that you possess. This is ordained by Allah for you. But he has permitted you to procure (wives) outside of these cases with your money in decency and not in fornication. To those of them that ye have enjoyed give their reward as their due, but it is no sin to make an agreement between you beyond the legal due. Allah is allknowing and wise. 29. If however any one of you has not means sufficient to marry free believing women (let him marry) among your believing slaves, whom you possess; Allah best knows (to distinguish) your faith. Marry them with the permission of their masters, and give them their dowry in kindness; they should be modest and not unchaste and take no lovers". Also Sura iv. 220 (uncertain date), the prohibition of marriage with infidels, male or female (cf. Sura lx. 10), Sura xxxii. 49 (probably of the year 5), an exception in favour of the Prophet, and Sura v. 7 (of the farewell pilgrimage in the year 10), permission of marriage with the women of the possessors of a scripture. Other passages of the Kur'an which emphasise the moral side of marriage are Sura xxiv. 3, 26, 32 and Sura xxx. 20. In tradition various attitudes to marriage find expression; at the same time the positive enactments regulating it are supplemented in essential points. The most important is the limitation of the number of wives permitted at one time to four; although Sura iv. 3 contains no such precise regulation, this interpretation of it must have predominated.
very early, as in the traditions it is assumed rather than expressly demanded. The co-operation of the "guardian", the dowry and the consent of the woman is regarded as essential and competition with a rival the result of whose suit is still in doubt is forbidden.

3. The most important provisions of Muslim law (according to the Ṣahih school) are the following. The marriage contract is concluded between the bridegroom and the bride’s wali (guardian), who must be a free Muslim of age and of good character. The wali is in his turn bound to assist in carrying out the contract of marriage demanded by the woman, if the bridegroom fulfils certain legal conditions. The wali should be one of the following in this order: 1. the nearest male descendant in the male line; 2. the nearest male relative in the male line among the descendants of the father; 3. do. among the descendants of the grandfather etc.; 4. in the case of a freed woman the mawla (manumitter) and if the case arises his male relatives in the order of heirs in intestacy [cf. Sīrāṣṭah, 6, 6]; 5. the representative of the public authority (ḥākim) appointed for the purpose; in many countries his kāds or his deputy. In place of the ḥākim the future husband and wife may agree to choose a ṭal and must do so if there is no authorised ḥākim in the place. The wali can only give the bride in marriage with her consent but in the case of a virgin silent consent is sufficient. The father or grandfather, however, has the right to marry his daughter or grand-daughter against her will, so long as she is a virgin (he is therefore called wali muḥbir, wali with power of coercion); the exercise of this power is however very strictly regulated in this interest of the bride. As minors are not in a position to make a declaration of their wishes which is valid in law, they can only be married at all by a wali muḥbir. According to the Ḥanafīs on the other hand, every blood relative acting as ṭal is entitled to give a virgin under age in marriage without her consent; but a woman married in this way by another than her ascendant is entitled on coming of age to demand that her marriage be declared void (faṣāḥ) by the kāds. A bridegroom who is a minor may also be married by his wali muḥbir. As a kind of equivalent for the rights which the husband acquires over the wife, he is bound to give her a bridal gift (mahr, ūṣūb) which is regarded as an essential part of the contract. The contracting parties are free to fix the mahr; it may consist of anything that has value in the eyes of the law; if it is not fixed at the conclusion of the contract and if the parties cannot agree upon it, we have a case for the mahr al-mīrād, a bridal gift fixed by the kāds according to the circumstances of the bridegroom. It is not necessary to pay the mahr at once; frequently a portion is paid before the consummation of the marriage and the remainder only at the dissolution of the marriage by divorce or death. The wife’s claim to the full mahr or the full mahr al-mīrād arises only when the marriage has been consummated; if the marriage is previously dissolved by the man the wife can only claim half the mahr or a present (muwāra) fixed arbitrarily by the man; these regulations go back to Sūra ii. 237 sq. (cf. xxxiii. 48). In form the marriage contract, which is usually prefaced by a solicitation (ḥāla), follows the usual scheme in Muslim contracts with offer and acceptance; the wali of the bride is further recommended to deliver a pious address (ḥīṣa) on the occasion. The marriage must be concluded in the presence of at least two witnesses (ṣāхīād), who possess the legal qualifications for a witness; their presence is here not simply, as in other contracts, evidence of the marriage but an essential element in its validity. On the other hand, no collaboration by the authorities is prescribed. But since great importance is usually attached to fulfilling the formalities of the marriage contract, upon which the validity of the marriage depends, it is usual not to carry through this important legal matter without the assistance of an experienced lawyer. We therefore everywhere find men whose profession this is and who usually act under the supervision of the kāds. The part they take is to pronounce the necessary formularies to the parties or even to act as authorised agents of one of them, usually the wali of the bride. The most important impediments to marriage are the following: 1. blood relationship, namely between the man and his female ascendants and descendents, his sisters, the female descendents of his brothers and sisters as well as his uncles and great-uncles; 2. foster-relationship, by which extension of the Kur'ānic law by tradition is regarded as an impediment to marriage in the same degrees as blood relationship; 3. relationship by marriage, namely between a man and his mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, step-daughter etc. in the direct line; marriage with two sisters or with an aunt and niece at the same time is also forbidden; 4. the existence of a previous marriage, in the case of a woman without limitation (inclusive of the period of waiting after the dissolution of the marriage, ʿidda, q.v.) and in the case of a free man with the provision that he cannot be married to more than four women at once; 5. the existence of a threefold woman (q.v.) or of a ḥām (q.v.); 6. social inequality; the man must not be by birth, profession etc. below the woman (unless both the woman and wali agree); a free Muslim can only marry another's slave girl if he cannot provide the bridal gift for a free woman, and the marriage between a master (or miśṭress) and his slave (or her slave) is quite impossible (a master is however permitted conubinage with his slave); 7. difference of religion; there is no exception to the prohibition of marriage between a Muslim woman and an infidel while the permission given in theory for marriage between Muslim men and the women of the possessors of a scripture is at least by the Ṣahihis so restricted by conditions as to be prohibited in practice; 8. temporary obstacles such as the state of ʿiyām (q.v.). On the other hand, the law knows no minimum age for a legal marriage. If a marriage contract does not fulfil the legal requirements, it is invalid; the Ḥanafīs and especially the Mālikis but not the Ṣahihis distinguish in this case between invalid (bāṭil) and incorrect (faṣāḥ) according as the error affects an essential or unessential element in the contract; in the former case there is no marriage at all, in the second its validity may be attacked but (according to the Mālikis) consumption removes any defect. Marriage does not produce any community of property between husband and wife and the woman retains her complete freedom of dealing; but certain laws regarding inheritance come into operation [cf. Sīrāṣṭah, 6, c]. The man alone has to bear the
expense of maintaining the household and is obliged to support his wife in a style befitting her station; if he should not be in a position to do so his wife may demand the dissolution of the marriage by farzâ [q.v.]. The man can demand from his wife readiness for marital intercourse and obedience generally; if she is regularly disobedient, she loses her claim to support and may be chastised by the man. The latter however is expressly forbidden to take upon himself vows of continence (idâ and zîkâr). Children are only regarded as legitimate if they are born at least six months after consummation of the marriage and not more than 4 years (the predominant Shâfi i view) after its dissolution; it is presumed that such children are begotten by the husband himself; the latter has the right to dispute his paternity by idâ [q.v.]. Parentage can also be established by the husband's zîkâr [q.v.], while both recognition and adoption of illegitimate children are impossible.

4. The laws regarding the rights and duties of husband and wife cannot be modified by the parties at the drawing-up of the contract. This can however be effected by the man pronouncing a conditional malik [cf. Talik, vii] immediately after the conclusion of the marriage contract; this shift to secure the position of the woman is particularly common among Indian Muslims. For the rest the couple are left to private agreements which need not be mentioned in the marriage contract. The actual position of the married woman is in all Muslim countries entirely dependent on local conditions and on many special circumstances. It is not a contradiction of this to say that the legal prescriptions regarding marriage are most carefully observed as a rule. In spite of certain ascetic tendencies Islâm as a whole has been decidedly in favour of marriage. — In modern Islâm the problem of the woman's position in marriage and polygamy is especially discussed between conservatives and adherents of modern social ideas. For the different views resulting from these conditions see the Bibliography cited below.

5. Alongside of the usual form of the old Arabian marriage which in spite of its laxity aimed at the foundation of a household and the procreation of children, isolated the temporary marriage in which the pair lived together temporarily for a period previously fixed. Such temporary marriages were entered upon mainly by men who found themselves staying for a time abroad. It is by no means certain that these are referred to in Sûra iv. 28, although the Muslim name of this arrangement (mut'a [q.v.], "marriage of pleasure") is based on the literal meaning of the verse; it is however certain from Tradition that Muhammad really permitted mut'a to his followers especially on the longer campaigns. But the caliph 'Umar strictly prohibited mut'a and regarded it as fornication (zîdâ) (a group of traditions already ascribes this prohibition to the Prophet). As a result, mut'a is permitted only among the Shi'is but prohibited by the Sunnis. The latter have however practically the same arrangement; those who wish to live contrary to the law as husband and wife for a certain period simply agree to do so without super- lating it in the marriage contract.


NIKOPOLIS(S), in Turkish spelling Nibul or Nikûlîn (in Ewliyâ Celebi, vii, 463: نیکوپولیس), town on the southern bank of the Danube, at 43° 43′ N., 24° 54′ E. This Nikopolis, founded by Heracles (c. 575—642), has often been confused, especially in medieval literature, with Nikopolis ad Istrum or ad Haemium, founded by Trajan in 101 in commemoration or his victory over the Dacians (ruins recently excavated near modern Nikop in the upper valley of the Djantra by Mt. Haemus). The Byzantine Nikopolis is sometimes called Nikopolis Major to distinguish it from Trajan's Nikopolis and Nikopolis Minor on the opposite bank of the Danube near the Romanian town of Târnagure.

The importance of Nikopolis as a trade centre and military post is due chiefly to the command which it holds over the Osma and the Aluta, the two Danubian arteries reaching into the heart of Bulgaria and Roumania respectively. Situated on a naturally flat plateau, it dominates the plains to the south, the Danube to the west, and the eastern gorge connecting the interior of Bulgaria with the river. The medieval double walls and strong towers surrounding Nikopolis were destroyed by the Russians during their occupation of the city in 1810 and 1877.

Nikopolis was first captured from the Bulgarians in 791 (1389) by Ali Pâsha Cenderelî [see Ali Pâsha]. Seven years later, it was the scene of the famous battle in the Crusade which is called by its name. The acquisition of Bulgaria by the Turks and their continual irruptions north of the Danube into territories claimed by Hungary, together with a state of comparative peace in western Europe in the last decade of the sixteenth century, made it both necessary and possible for most Catholic countries to participate in the expedition. An army of about 300,000 men (according to the most reliable estimates) from France, Burgundy, England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Hungary, Poland, Wallachia and Transylvania marched along the Danube, seized Widdin and Rahova, and finally set siege to Nikopolis while an allied Veneto-
Genoese fleet blockaded the city from the river. The siege lasted about fifteen days, during which Bayazid [q. v.] abandoned the siege of Constantinople, burnt the siege machinery, and summoned his Asiatic and European contingents to arms. A Turkish army of perhaps 110,000 men met at Adrianople and, marching through the Shipka Pass, descended into the valley of the Osma and pitched their camp on the southern hill commanding the Nikopolis plain.

The battle took place on Monday, September 25, 1396, and the crusaders were completely routed owing to the superiority of Ottoman tactics and the dissensions amongst the leaders of the Christian host. Bayazid divided his army into two large sections. The first, consisting of two large bodies of irregular cavalry and of irregular infantry, occupied the slope of the hill. Between the cavalry vanguard and the foot rearguard of this section, the Turks planted a field of pointed stakes. Beyond the sky-line on the other slope of the hill, hidden from their unsuspecting enemy, the second and more important section, consisting of Bayazid with his Sipahi and Stephen Lazarović with his Serbs, waited for the right moment to advance against the exhausted Christians. These tactics proved to be effective when the Crusaders' vanguard of French and foreign auxiliaries defeated the Turkish irregular cavalry and, after forced dismounting to uproot the stakes, routed the irregular infantry and pursued them uphill to face the new and unseen forces. Meanwhile, a stampede of riderless horses produced confusion in the Crusaders' rear which comprised the Eastern European armies. Michael and Laczko, who were for Sigismund of Hungary, retired with their Wallachian and Transylvanian auxiliaries who constituted the left and right wings of the rearguard. After desperate fighting for the relief of the French and foreign contingents, the Hungarian nobles persuaded their king to board a Venetian galley and escape by way of Byzantium and the Morea to Dalmatia. The rest were either killed or captured, only to be massacred on the following day by Bayazid in order to avenge in this way the severe losses which he had sustained. A small number of nobles were, however, saved from the massacre for a ransom of 100,000 gold florins.

The immediate result of the Ottoman victory was the extension of the conquests into Greece and the submission of Wallachia to Ottoman suzerainty. More important, however, was the breathing-space it gave for the consolidation of the Turkish territories in Europe, which enabled the Ottoman empire to survive the critical struggles of the next decades.

In later history Nikopolis plays only a minor part. During the wars of the sixteenth century it was thrice captured by Russian armies (Sept. 1810; July 1829; July 1877), and by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878) was included in the tributary principality of Bulgaria.

**Bibliography:** The standard histories of the Ottoman Empire. For the "Crusade of Nikopolis" a full and classified bibliography of the extensive MS. and printed sources, both Eastern and Western, is contained in A. S. Atiya, The Crusade of Nikopolis (London 1934); see also the following older monographs: A. Brauner, Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis, 1396, Breslau 1870; J. Delaville Le Roulx, La France en Orient au XIVe siècle, Paris 1886; H. Kiss, A'Nicapoly nióket, Magyar Academiai erettesito, 1896; I. Kohler, Die Schelachten bei Nikopolis und Warnia, Breslau 1882; F. Šišić, Die Schlacht bei Nikopolis, Vienna 1893. (A. S. Atiya)

**NIKOS, Neo-Caesarea**, first mentioned by Pliny (vi. 3) so that it presumably arose under Tiberius, lies in the Anatolian wilayet of Stwā [q. v.] 1,150 feet above sea-level. The town is picturesquely situated at the foot of a hill, crowned by the ruins of a mediaeval castle which was erected from the material provided by the numerous buildings of antiquity there. Here in remote antiquity was Cabira and after its decline Dias polis founded by Pompey, later called Sebaste. In Church history Nikós is famous as the scene of a Council (314 A.D.) and as the birthplace of Gregory the miracle-worker. In the Muslim period it became important under the Samdiks of whom numerous and important buildings have survived to the present day. It became more important with the Dānīshmandīya [q. v.] whose founder Malik Dānīshmand Aḥmad Gāhāz took Nikos among other places. His grandson Muhammad successfully resisted a siege by the emperor Manuel in Nikos. His son Yaghibāşan (537—562 = 1142—1166) of whom there survives an inscription of the year 552 (1157) died in 562 (1166) whereupon Nikos was taken by the Byzantine emperor Manuel (Kinnamos, p. 296 sq., 300) although only for a short time. In 1397 Nikos passed to the Ottomans and gradually lost its former importance. It remained noted for its very prolific orchards, celebrated already in the time of Fakhr al-Din and later (in 1848) the special produce of which, very large and sweet cherries, pears, figs etc., were famous at all times. Ewliya Celebi (cf. Siyağat-nâma, ii. 389; v. 14; Travels, ii. 102 sqq.) who visited Nikos in 1083 (1672) describes the town in his usual extravagant fashion, mentioning 70 schools, 7 monasteries, many mills and waterwheels and 500 shops with a large number of shoe-makers. The pomegranates there, he says, are the size of a man's head and weighed 1 okka. The remains of the Muslim period so far as they bear inscription, have been published by Ismail Hākki, Kiltāber (Stamboul 1345=1827, pp. 58—73. The turves (sepulchral cupolas) of Malik Gāhāz and of Ḥādji̇ Chīrfê are worth mentioning; among old dervish monasteries there are the Iṣkur-tzekke and the Kołak-tekke. Nikos has often been visited and described by modern travellers. The population (c. 4,000) was before the war one quarter Christian; they were mainly engaged in the silk and rice trades.

AL-NIL, the river Nile. The Nile is one of the large rivers which from the beginning have belonged to the territory of Islam, and the valleys and deltas of which have favoured the development of an autonomous cultural centre in Islamic civilisation. In the case of the Nile this centre has influenced at different times the cultural and political events in the Muhammedan world. Thus the Nile has, during the Islamic period, continued to play the same part as it did during the centuries that preceded the coming of Islam.

The name al-Nil or, very often, Nil Miṣr, goes back to the Greek name Nīlēkos and is found already in early Arabic literary sources, though it does not occur in the Qur'ān. (In sūra xx. 39 the Nile may be meant by al-yamm). The Christian habit of calling the river Gēbōn, after one of the rivers of Paradise, as found in the works of Euphrasius Syrus and Jacob of Edessa and in the Arabic-Christian author Agapius (Patrologia Orientalis, v. 596), is not followed by the Muhammedans, who know only the Ouxos under this name. Al-Zamakhshari (Kitāb al-Asma'īnina, ed. Salverade de Grave, p. 127) mentions as another name al-Faṣīf, no doubt a poetic allusion to the yearly flood. Already in the Middle Ages, the word baḥr having come to acquire in Egyptian Arabic the meaning of "river", the Nile is also called a l-Baḥr or Baḥr Miṣr (cf. al-Makrīzī, ed. Wiet, i. 218), which is also the case with several other parts of its river system, such as Baḥr Yūsuf or Bahr al-Ghazal. In the Delta the different ramifications of the river are occasionally also called Nile, but where necessary the main stream (ṣāmīd) is distinguished from the minor branches (ghīrā' or khalijā'ī) and the canals (tur'a).

The geography of the Nile is treated here only from a historico-geographical point of view so far as the knowledge of Islamic science is concerned. The geographical knowledge of the Nile among the Muhammedans, so far as we can learn from their literary sources, is based partly on direct observation, but for the most part on the pseudo-scientific traditions which go back to local beliefs or to classical science. For a long time during the Middle Ages the limit of Islamic territory on the Nile was well fixed; it ended at the first cataract near the island of Bílīk (Philae) to the south of Usāwn (Assouan); here began, since the treaty (baḥr) concluded by ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Sāḥib with the Nubiāns, the Nubian territory, where for long centuries Christianity prevailed (al-Baldbhūrī, p. 236; Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Miṣr, ed. Torrey, p. 188) the first locality on Nubian territory, where tribute was paid, was called al-Kafr (al-Maṣūdī, Murūǧīd, iii. 40, 41).

Historical tradition has preserved parts of the alleged correspondence between ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ and the caliph ʿUmar on the subject of Egypt, then newly conquered; here the Nile is described as a river "whose course is blessed"; while the flood and the inundations are praised in poetic terms (ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-Kahlī, Faḍl al-Miṣr, ed. Østrup, p. 204; al-Dimbashi, ed. Mehren, p. 109). The same correspondence reveals the perhaps historical fact that ʿUmar did not wish to see the Arab army established in Alexandria, because there would be then a great river between the army and the caliph (Ibn ʿAbī al-Ḥakam, p. 91; cf. also what is said on p. 128 about those who went to live in al-Dīzu).

The principal towns by which the Nile passed in medieval Egypt in Upper Egypt, between Usāwn and al-Faṣīf, are Aṭfū (Edfu, on the left), Isnā (Esna, i.), Ṭarm (I.), Kūsār (r.), al-Akṣūr (Luxor, r.), Kīff (r.), Iḥṣām (Akhmīm, i.), Uṣūyāt (Assūy, i.), al-Uṣmānīnīn (i.), Anṣān (r. opposite al-Uṣmānīnī), Taḥāt (i.), al-Kāsī (i.), Dalālīn (i.), Ahnās (i.) and Iṣfīḥ (Aṭfū). This succession of towns is given for the first time by al-Yaʿqūbī (B. G. A., vii. 331—334), while Ibn Hawkāl (B. G. A., ii. 95) is the first to give a table of the distance between these towns, expressed in birādis, the entire distance being 21 days' journey (al-Mundisi, ed. Dūzī and de Goeje, p. 52, gives 25 days' journey for the same distance). Shortly before al-Uṣmānīnīn branched off on the left the canal that conducted the water to al-Faṣīf, which is known to Ibn al-Faṣīf (B. G. A., vi. 74) as Naḥr al-Lāhūn and to al-Mundisi (p. 50) as KHolād al-Maḥmūd; this canal, according to unanimous tradition was dug by Joseph, occurs already on the MS. map of the year 479 (1086) of Ibn Hawkāl in the Serai Library of Constantinople, No. 3346 (reproduction on fol. 658 of Monumenta Africæ et Aegyptiæ by Yousouf Kamīl). It is the Baḥr Yūsuf of our days; on it was situated al-Bahnaus. The banks of the Nile in Upper Egypt are not very completely described by the geographers; one finds repeated everywhere the assertion that the borders were cultivated without interruption between Usāwn and al-Faṣīf (cf. al-Iṣṭakhri, B. G. A., i. 59), but that the width of the cultivated territory varied during the river's course, dependent on the greater or lesser distance of the two mountains that border the river. Ibn Hawkāl (MS. of Constantinople, cf. supra) describes two extremely narrow strips, one between Usāwn and Aṭfū (now called Gebelein) and one between Isnā and Ṭarm (now called Gebel Silsile). The curves in the course of the Nile, especially in the upper part of the ʿAtīd, are not indicated on the maps of Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkāl. The oldest extant Arab map of the Nile, however — which is at the same time the oldest Arab map that we know of — gives clear indications that the sinuous course was a known fact. This map is found in the Stratburg MS. of the year 1037 of al-Khwārizmi's Sīrat al-ʿArq and has been reproduced in the edition of that text by H. v. Miik (B. H. L. C., iii., Leipzig 1926). The representation of the Nile here is connected with the classical tradition of astronomical geography; al-Khwārizmi himself, and after him Suhāb (Ibn Saʿīd) and Ibn Yūnus (MS. 143 of the University Library at Leyden, where on p. 136 a special table is given of the towns lying on the banks of the Nile) give exact indications as to the longitudes and latitudes of the Nile towns; but these indications need many very uncertain corrections to allow of the reconstruction of a map, as v. Miik has tried to do for al-Khwārizmi in Denkacher. Ak. Wiss. Wien, lix, Vienna 1916 and J. v. lebeau, Ibn al-Wásü in Vi. i. of the Atlas annexed to his Géographie du Moyen-Âge, Paris 1850. But the fact that the course of the Nile is from south to north is well known to all the Arabic sources, which often repeat the
assertion that the Nile is the only river in the world for which this is the case. Only the text of Ibn Hawkál seems to imply that the Níl reached al-Fúsíy, from the S. E. (R. G. A., ii. 96).

The Delta of the Nile begins to the north of al-Fúsíy, where the distance between the two mountain ranges widens, while these hills themselves become lower and pass gradually into the desert. Immediately below al-Fúsíy began the canal that was dug by 'Amr b. al-‘Àṣ to link up the Nile with the Red Sea; this canal (Khâlidj Mîṣr or Khâlidj Amir al-Mu’mínîn) was made in 23 (644) according to Muhammad b. Yûsuf al-Kindi (cited by al-Makrîzî, Khiṭbât, Bâlik, ii. 143; cf. Yâkût, ii. 405) and served for the conveyance of provisions to the Hijâj until the reign of ʿUmar Ibn ʿAbd al-‘Àzzî; afterwards it was neglected and even obstructed by the order of the caliph al-Mansûr, so that, in the ivth (9th) century, it ended at Dhamab al-Tîmisî in the lakes to the north of al-Kulzûm (cf. al-Maṣûdî, Murādî, i. 147).

The two principal arms of the Nile in the Delta began about 12 miles to the north of al-Fúsíy (a little further than nowadays, according to Guest) and had, as now, a great number of ramifications which communicated in many ways and ended for the greater part in the big lakes or lagoons south of the Delta. To the south of these lakes were called in the Middle Ages: Bahairat Maryût (behind Alexandria), B. Idkî, B. al-Farrûûsî or B. al-Bâbi and the very large B. Tinnís, which last contained a large number of islands with Tinnís as the most important. On the land tongue, where the two main arms separated was situated the town of Shânâfât. The western arm went as now to the town of Raghit (Rosette) after which it reached the sea; near the town of Shânâfât a branch parted from this arm in the direction of Alexandria, ending in the Bahairat Maryût; this branch was only filled with water in the time of the flood (a very complete survey of the different “canals” of Alexandria by P. Kähle, in Jcl., xii. 83 sqq.). The eastern arm ran, as is still the case, past Dimyût (Damiette) and reached the sea shortly afterwards; it had several branches that went to the Bahairat Tinnís, one of which continued one of the Nile mouths of antiquity. Though many sources, based on a pseudo-historical tradition, repeat after each other that there are seven Nile arms (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hâkâm, p. 6; further al-Khwârizmî, Kudāmâ, Sûrasingh, al-Masûdî, Ibn Zûlâtî, the more realistic authors Ibn Khudâdbêh, al-Yâkûtî, Ibn Rustâ, al-Istakhî, Ibn ʿHawkál, al-Mârî, only kings of the two main arms). These were linked up by a canal system which, in the Middle Ages, differed considerably from the present situation. The chief sources from which we know them are Ibn ʿHawkál and al-Idrîsî, who give itineraries following different branches, but as the places named in these itineraries have been identified only in part, an integral reconstruction is not yet possible (on this problem cf. R. Guest, The Delta in the Middle Ages, in J.R.A.S., 1912, p. 941 sqq. and the map annexed to this article). The description in the text of Sûrasingh (ed. v. Milik, B. A. H. C. G., v.) has little value as an endeavour to trace back to his time (xth century) the seven legendary arms; among these arms special attention is paid to the “Arm of Saradîs”; which, according to tradition, was dug by ʿHamân (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hâkâm, p. 6; cf. Guest, loc. cit., p. 944 and Massépor and Wiet, Matériaux, in M.I.F.A.O., xxxvi.) Al-Makrîzî gives a detailed description of the canal system in the province of al-Buḥâra, to the east of Alexandria, from the Khâtâb al-Minâhâjî of Abu l-Ḥasan al-Maḥrûmî, who wrote in the xith century (M.I.F.A.O., xlvii., p. 167 sqq.). It seems possible that a study of the ancient maps (especially the Delta map of the Constantinople MS. of Ibn ʿHawkál and the maps of al-Idrîsî) may be useful for a more complete reconstruction of the medieval situation.

The Nile arms have always been decisive for the administrative division of the Delta, where the sources call by the name of Aṣâf al-Arîd, Aṣâf al-Arîd, or Aṣâf al- Ṭārî Mîṣr. The region to the east of the eastern branch was called Al-Ḥawf; the texts of al-Iṣâkhî and Ibn ʿHawkál place Al-Ḥawf to the north of the Nile, which may be understood in connection with the view referred to above that the Nile at al-Fúsíy had a direction from S. E. to N. W. The region between the two main arms was called Al-Kif (a name sometimes used for the entire Delta as well) or Baṣîn Al-Kif, while the country to the west of the western arm was called Al-Buḥâra and later Al-Ḥawf al-Gharbî, the original Ḥawf being called then Al-Ḥawf Al-Ṭāriq (the Ḥawf that is divided into kâras, the limits of which were determined by the more important branches; the bigger administrative units of later times [cf. Egypt] depended likewise on the river system. The present geographical aspect of the Delta is the result of the new irrigation works that began in the xith century under Muhammad Alî; the most conspicuous new canals are the Maḥmûdîya canal, dug from Fîwâ on the western arm to Alexandria, the Tawfîkîya, Maḥfûsiya and Buḥairîya canals that were completed in 1890, and the Ismâʿîliya canal, which links up the Nile with the Suez canal.

As to the knowledge of the course of the Nile to the south of Egypt the Muhammadan geographical literature begins rather late to give information based on direct observation. At first these sources content themselves with saying that the Nile comes from the country of the Nîba; for the rest there were ancient sources of a different kind that helped to complete the geographical conception of the course of the great river. This conception involved also the origin of the Nile, covered since antiquity by a veil of mystery. The real origin of the Nile always remained unknown to the Muhammadan scholars and travellers. It is a curious fact, however, that the information on this subject which we find uniformly repeated in the Islamic sources from the treatise of al-Khwârizmî (+ 830 A.D.) gives an idea of the origin of the Nile which does not correspond entirely to the data furnished by the classical sources. This conception makes the Nile emerge from the Mountains of the Moon (Djabal al-Kamar) to the south of the equator; from this mountain come ten rivers, of which the first five and the second five reach respectively two lakes lying on the same latitude; from each lake one or more rivers flow to the north where they fall into a third lake and it is from this lake that the Nile of Egypt begins. This conception is largely schematized and corresponds only partly to Ptolemy's description of the Nile sources; Ptolemy
knows only two lakes, not lying on the same latitude and does not speak of a great number of rivers coming from the Mountains of the Moon. The third lake especially is an innovation (cf. A. v. Mäik, in Denksehr. Ak. Wiss. Wien, lixxix., p. 44); in later authors such as Ibn Sa'id and al-Dimashqī this third lake is called Kūrā and may connected with some notion of Lake Chad (the same authors change the name of Djabal al-Kamar into Djabal al-Kumr which pronunciation is commented on by al-Māqrīzī, ed. Wiet, i. 219), but this is not probable for the time of al-Khwārizmī; the knowledge of more equatorial lakes, however, may perhaps be traced to the experiences of the two centuries dispatched by al-Ma'sūdī and the geographical region, which has been identified with the Bahr-al-Ghaţal. The system described by al-Khwārizmī of the origin of the Nile is represented on the map in the Strassburg MS. and is repeated many times after him (Ibn Khurādābīdhe, Ibn al-Fakīh. Kudāma, Suhrāb, al-Iṣmīrī and later authors). Al-Ma'sūdī, in describing a map he has seen, does not speak of the third lake (Murūǧ, i. 205, 206) and Ibn Rusta (B. G. A., vi. 90) says that the Nile comes from a mountain called B-ban and also knows only two lakes. Al-Iṣiṣkī and Ibn Ḥawkal on the contrary, frankly admit that the origin of the Nile is unknown, which is also illustrated by their maps. Still the system of al-Khwārizmī continued to be a geographical dogma and is found as late as al-Suyūtī. Al-Khwārizmī also took over from Ptolemy a western tributary of the Nile, which comes from a lake on the equator; this river is called by Ptolemy Astatos and may perhaps be identified with the Atbara. A later development, which connects with the Nile system a river that flows to the east in the Indian Ocean, is found for the first time in al-Ma'sūdī (Murūǧ, i. 205, 206; ii. 383, 384); this view is later taken up again by Ibn Sa'id and al-Dimashqī.

Another category of notions about the origins of the Nile is connected with the Jewish and Christian traditions which make the Nile come from Paradise. Medieval cosmographical theories place Paradise in the extreme East, on the other side of the sea (cf. the maps of Beatus), so that the Nile, like the other rivers of Paradise would have to cross the sea. This state of things is actually described in an old tradition, probably of Jewish origin, of a man who went in search of the sources of the Nile and had to cross the sea, after which he reached Paradise (al-Ma'sūdī, Murūǧ, i. 268, 269 and Akhbār al-Zamān, MS. Vienna, fol. 151b-h; al-Ma'ṣṣīsī, B. G. A., iii. 21). With this origin in Paradise is perhaps connected the view, which all sources attribute to al-Iṣāhāzī in his lost Kitāb al-Buldān, that the Nile and the Mahrīn (Indus) have the same origin (cf. al-Ma'sūdī, Tanṭīkh, B. G. A., viii. 55), a view which is sarcastically criticized by al-Iṣmīrī (Indur, p. 101).

To the same origin may go back the idea, often found in Muhammadan sources, that, when the Nile rises, all the rivers of the earth go down in level.

Thirdly there is a cycle of geographical conceptions which link up the western part of Africa with the river system of the Nile. Herodotus already had sought a western origin and Pliny quotes the Lybica of king Juba of Mauretania, who makes the Nile rise in western Mauretania. Mar-

quardt (Brün-Nammlung, p. 125 sqq.) has explained this view from a corruption of the name of the river Nuhul, which he identifies with the Wādh Nīl and which has its origin in the Mauritanian Atlas. Traces of this western Nile are to be found in Ibn al-Fakīh (B. G. A., v. 87) who, following an authority of the time of the conquest, places the origin of the Nile in al-Sūs al-Akṣā. Al-Bakrī for the first time identifies this western Nile with the river Nīger, although we find already in al-Ma'sūdī the knowledge of a great river, far to the south of Sūḏūmās (Murūǧ, iv. 92, 93). Al-Bakrī describes the Nile as passing through the territory of the Sūdin (ed. de Slane, p. 172) and numerates the tribes of the Sūdān, tribes and their towns which border the river; the westernmost town is with him Šanghāra, followed in eastern direction by Takrūr, Silla, Ġhāna, Tiraḳkā and finally the country of Kawāw. After al-Bakrī a similar description is given by al-Iṣrāʾīlī, but this last author goes back to another source than al-Bakrī when he places the mouth of the Nile in the neighbourhood of the salt town Awīlīs, thus identifying the lower course of this Nile with the Senegal (Marquardt, loc. cit., p. 171). Al-Iṣrāʾīlī likewise shows himself informed on the course of the Nile to the east of Kawāw, though he is in doubt if Kawāw is situated on the Nile itself or on a side arm (ed. Dossy and de Goër, p. 17); he finally derives this western Nile from the third branch of the big Nile lakes mentioned above, thus connecting the Nile of the Sūdān with the Nile of Egypt in one river system. So long as the complete text of al-Bakrī is not known, we cannot ascertain if this conception goes back already to that author. Al-Iṣrāʾīlī's Nile course is clearly indicated on his maps of the 1st—4th section of the first climate. After him it is especially Ibn Sa'id who has described the western Nile in this way and he has been followed again by Abu 'l-Fīđā. Al-Dimashqī (ed. Meiren, p. 89) gives the same representation; this last author even makes the third lake, which he calls like Ibn Sa'id the lake of Kūrā, on the Nile, and which borders the Sūdān on the western side, the Nile of Egypt, and a third river running in eastern direction towards Baḥḍāshī in the Zand pl. county on the Indian Ocean. This last river, which was also connected by al-Ma'sūdī with the Nile [cf. supra] is probably identical with the Weber river in Italian Somalia.

While the geographical authors constructed in this way the Nile system with a good deal of credulity and imagination, the real knowledge of the Nile south of Egypt advanced but slowly. The southernmost point reached by the Arab conquerors was Dongola (al-Kindī, ed. Guest, p. 12) and it was well known that this town was situated on the Nile; its latitude and longitude are given by al-Khwārizmī and Suhīrā. Al-Yaḥṣī (Tarīḵ, ed. Houtsma, p. 217) knows that, in the country of the Nība called 'Alwa, which lies behind the Nība called Mukurra, the Nile divides into various branches; this same author, however, places Sīr behind 'Alwa. Al-Ma'sūdī (Murūǧ, iii. 31, 32) knows that the country of the Nība is divided into two parts by the Nile. Ibn Ḥawkāl (Constantinople MS.) describes two places where there are cataracts (jumāḏātī), namely the one above Uswān, which is the "first cataract", and one near Dongola, of which it is not certain whether the "second" or the "third" cataract is meant. About the same time,
AL-NIL

however, a traveller named Ibn Sulaim al-Luwátî wrote a valuable description of the middle Nile course, which has been preserved in al-Mâkriži’s Khiṣaf (ed. Wiet, in M.I.F.A.O., xvi. 252 sqq.). This Ibn Sulaim, on whom al-Mâkriži’s Khiṣaf gives some information (cf. Quatremer, Mémoires sur l’Égypte, ii.), had been sent by the Fatimid general Džawhar to the king of the Niha on a diplomatic errand, and was the author of a Khiṣaf Akhbar al-Nîha wa ‘l-Muṣṭaf wa-al-Ālwa wa ‘l-Bağha wa al-Nîhl, in which a detailed description is given of these countries. He says that the region between Luxor and Dunqûla, and Dunqûla and the north by the Maris and more to the south by the Muṣṭaf; the northern part is barren and the great cataracts are correctly described. The country between Dunqûla and ‘Alwa (this last spot is the region of Khaṣrūn) is described as highly flourishing; the big wending of the Nile here is perfectly known to Ibn Sulaim. The Nile “is divided” then into seven rivers; from the description it is clear that the northern one of these rivers is the Aḥbara, coming from the east; further south the “White Nile” and the “Green Nile” join near the capital of ‘Alwa and the “Green Nile”, which comes from the east, is again the result of four rivers, one of which the author thinks from the country of the Ḥabasha, and one from the country of the Zandj; this last, incorrect, statement may have been influenced by learned tradition. Between the “White Nile” and the “Green Nile” there stretches a large island (djawād, as it is still called on our maps), which has no limits in the south. This is about the only description in medialāl Islamic literature that shows how far the knowledge of the middle Nile really went. Only little of it seems to have reached the systematic geographic treatises; al-Idrisi, e.g., describes this part of the river in a way which only shows that he did not make good use of the inadequate sources that were at his disposal.

The exploration of the upper Nile and its sources since the end of the xviiith century was the work of European travellers. They discovered, or perhaps re-discovered, the real big Nile lakes and identified the Ruwenzori mountain range with the Moon Mountains, the name of which was found again by the explorer Speke in the name of the Ḫunawzi country, the “country of the moon”. A part of the exploration of the Nile was due, however, also to Egyptian initiative. The well-known military expedition of 1820—1822 under Muhammad ‘Alì’s son Ismā‘îl Pasha, during which the city of Khaṣrūn was founded, established Egyptian domination in the Egyptian Sūdān and opened the way for further scientific exploration. In the years 1825—1842 three Egyptian expeditions went up the White Nile, and during the reign of Ismā‘îl Pasha the Egyptian government repeatedly tried to cleanse the swamps of the White Nile above Sobaž from the masses of vegetation (sudād) which hindered navigation.

The yearly flood of the Nile (ṣīwa, faṣī, fayyāṣa) is the phenomenon to which Egypt has been at all times indebted for its fertility and prosperity, as it provides, in compensation for the almost complete lack of rain in the country, a natural and almost regular irrigation for the lands on both sides of the delta and for the delta itself. It is the foundation of all cultural life and justifies entirely the attribute muḥārak so often given to the river. On the same account the Nile is considered, as well as the Euphrates, as a “believing” river (al-Mâkriži, ed. Wiet, in M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 218). The flood deeply influences the private and public life of villagers and townsfolk alike, and already the oldest Muḥammādian traditions about Egypt reflect the feelings of wonder and thankfulness that animated the people of Egypt before them (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, p. 109, 205). Having reached its lowest level towards the end of May at Assuan and in the middle of June at Cairo, the Nile begins to rise again, reaching its highest level in the beginning of September. Then and in the beginning of October at Cairo. This regularity brings about a similar regularity in the methods of irrigation in the several parts of Egypt, in the times of the sowing and reaping of the different crops and consequently in the modes of levying the land taxes (e.g. al-Mâkriži, ed. Būlāk, i. 270, which text comes from Ibn Hawkal); all the dates referring to these occupations have always continued to be fixed according to the Coptic solar calendar.

There is much discussion in the literary sources about the causes of the flood. The most ancient belief, which at the same time corresponds best with reality, was that the flood is caused by heavy rainfall in the countries where the Nile and its tributaries have their origin. This is expressed in a somewhat exaggerated way in a tradition that goes back to ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, according to which all the rivers of the world contribute, by divine order, with their waters to the flood of the Nile (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, loc. cit., and p. 149). This implies the belief that all other rivers fall while the Nile rises, but, on the other hand, it is sometimes observed that other rivers also show the same phenomenon of rising and falling, especially the Iūdas, and this again is considered as a proof of the common origin of the two rivers (al-Mâkriži, ed. Wiet, M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 227). There are, however, other views, which attribute the cause of the flood to the movement of the sea, or to the effect of the winds; these views have been inherited from sources of the pre-Muḥammādian period, among others from the treatise on the flood of the Nile attributed to Aristotle, and they are discussed and refuted at length in a special chapter of al-Mâkriži’s Khīṣaf (M.I.F.A.O., xxx. 236 sqq.).

Up to the xviith century the irrigation system of Egypt continued along the same lines. When the flood begins all the outlets on both sides of the main stream and its principal arms in the Delta are closed, to be opened again about the time of the highest flood, when the water level has reached the necessary height according to the different places. The most important of these yearly “openings” was that of the canal (Khālidj) of Cairo, which, until recent times, remained a public festival. In Cairo the flood is complete (wawrī al-Nīl), when it has reached 16 ḏā‘ūrī, generally in the first decade of the Coptic month of Mesore (about the midst of August), and this was proclaimed everywhere in the town (cf. the description by Lane, Manners and Customs, ii. 257 sqq. and E. Littmann, Ein arabischer Text über die Nilwellschiefe, Festschrift Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, p. 66 sqq., for older times, al-Kalḵṣuḏl, iii. 156).

The height of the level of the Nile has been measured since olden times by the Nilometers (cf. wawrīk). Many of these wawrīs are recorded by the
sources, the southernmost being that of 'Alwa and the most celebrated the one of al-Fustat, constructed by Usama b. Zaid al-Tanakhī about 92 (711) and often restored afterwards (a complete survey of all the mīqāṭs is given in Omar Toussoun, Mémorial sur l'Histoire du Nil, ii. 265 sqq.). These instruments generally were made of stone, with marks upon them, but they were sometimes of other materials (see al-Jazari's treatise on the manufacture of tabanīf in Nubia; cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 262). The level necessary for the operations of irrigation varied in different places: in the capital the average level had to be 16 dīrāṣa above the lowest level of the Nile; if the flood surpassed 18 dīrāṣa it became dangerous, while a flood not exceeding 12 dīrāṣa meant famine (cf. e.g. al-Idrisī, p. 145, 146). In the history of Egypt the years after 1444 (1052), and especially the year 451 (1059), are notorious for the famine and disaster caused by the failure or practical failure of the flood. A historical account of the flood from the years 152—1296 (759—1579) is given on p. 454 sqq. of Omar Toussoun, Mémorial sur l'Histoire du Nil.

The regulation of the main stream and its branches are ascribed to the ancient Egyptian kings (al-Maqrīzī, on the authority of Ibn Wāṣif Shāhī), but no real irrigation work of a wider scope existed in the Middle Ages and later except the famous canal system of al-Fayūm [q.v.], which all the sources ascribe to the prophet Yūsuf. In the rest of Egypt the water was allowed to flow freely over the lands after the piercing of the dams, so that large areas were completely inundated for some time; the Arabic sources contain some vivid descriptions of the large stretches of water, where in those days the villages were with the villages being only possible by means of boats during that time of the year (al-Maṣʿūdī, Murūjī, i. 162; Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 205). Since the reign of Muhammad al-ʿĀthir new irrigation works have been planned with the aim of making the country more productive, a possibility at which already the medieval authors hinted more than once. The first efforts, however, failed. About 1840 was begun the construction of a great barrier across the two arms of the Nile at the apex of the Delta, according to the plans of the French engineer Mouget, but this enterprise began to bear fruit only fifty years later when this barrage project, including the Tawfikīya, Manṣūria and Fuḥāṭīya canals, had been completed in 1890. The later great irrigation works were executed higher up the river, such as the great dam and locks at the head of the cataracts near Philae above Assuan, in 1902, which was raised again in 1912, and again in 1933. While allowing, on one side, a better regulation of the distribution of Nile water in Egypt, these barracks higher up enable at the same time a better irrigation of the borders to the south of Egypt. Herewith is connected the enormous barrage of Mākwār, near Sennāf on the Blue Nile above Khartūm, which permits the irrigation of the region called al-Layṭra, between the Blue Nile and the White Nile. This work was finished in 1923 and is meant to be completed by a similar barrage on the White Nile. In this way the control of the Nile waters has passed to a certain extent out of Egypt: it recalls the days of the great floods in 1959, when the Egyptians thought that the Nubians were holding up the flood of the Nile.

The same problem came up recently with regard to the new project of constructing a dam on the frontier of the Süddan and the Belgian Congo and the question was raised whether this dam will prove a fālāq ṣaʿīla or a fālāq ʿaḍīla for Egypt (cf. the newspaper al-Balāzgh of March 17, 1934).

It has already been shown how the flood of the Nile was the occasion of popular festivals such as the opening of the canal of Tāfannīf in Nubia (cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 262). Other respects also the Nile is connected with traditional customs of a religious character, which are to be traced back through the Greek-Christian period into very ancient times. When the Arabs conquered Egypt, the sacrifice of the "Nile Bride" was still in use; every year a richly apparelled young virgin was thrown into the Nile to obtain a plentiful inundation. According to a tradition first recorded by Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam (p. 150), this custom was abolished by Amr Ibn al-ʿĀṣ and the Nile resumed its flood after a note of the caliph ʿUmar had been thrown into it requiring the river to rise if the flood was willed by God. In later times a symbolic bathing of a girl called adīrīya (Norden, Travels in Egypt and Nubia, 1757, p. 63—65); Lane (Manners and Customs, p. 290) mentions a round pillar of earth, near the dam of the canal of Cairo, which pillar was called adīrīya. Another custom, practised formerly by Christians and Muḥammadans alike, was to bathe in the Nile on the eve of the Epiphany, in memory of the Baptism of Christ (cf. Evetts, Churches, p. 129). Al-Maṣʿūdī (Murūjī, ii. 364 sqq.) describes this festival, which he calls Ṭalal al-Ghīṣār, for the year 330 (942). Lane (p. 263 sq.) describes the same ceremony, but in his account communication between the villages being only possible by means of boats during that time of the year (al-Maṣʿūdī, Murūjī, i. 162; Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, p. 205). Since the reign of Muhammad al-ʿĀthār new irrigation works have been planned with the aim of making the country more productive, a possibility at which already the medieval authors hinted more than once. The first efforts, however, failed. About 1840 was begun the construction of a great barrier across the two arms of the Nile at the apex of the Delta, according to the plans of the French engineer Mouget, but this enterprise began to bear fruit only fifty years later when this barrage project, including the Tawfikīya, Manṣūria and Fuḥāṭīya canals, had been completed in 1890. The later great irrigation works were executed higher up the river, such as the great dam and locks at the head of the cataracts near Philae above Assuan, in 1902, which was raised again in 1912, and again in 1933. While allowing, on one side, a better regulation of the distribution of Nile water in Egypt, these barracks higher up enable at the same time a better irrigation of the borders to the south of Egypt. Herewith is connected the enormous barrage of Mākwār, near Sennāf on the Blue Nile above Khartūm, which permits the irrigation of the region called al-Layṭra, between the Blue Nile and the White Nile. This work was finished in 1923 and is meant to be completed by a similar barrage on the White Nile. In this way the control of the Nile waters has passed to a certain extent out of Egypt; it recalls the days of the great floods in 1959, when the Egyptians thought that the Nubians were holding up the flood of the Nile.

The quality of the Nile water is a matter of discussion in medical treatises. Avicenna (al-Kānin in al-Tibb, ed. Bulāk 1294, i. 98; cited by al-Maqrīzī) holds that the circumstance that a river flows from south to north has a bad influence on the water, especially when a south wind blows, and on this account he thinks that the abundant praise given to the Nile is exaggerated. The Egyptian physician Ibn Riwān (d. 453 = 1061) says that the Nile water reaches Egypt in a pure state, owing to the health in the country of the Süddan, but that the water is spoilt by the impurities with which it on Egyptian soil (cited by al-Maqrīzī, Mifṭāḥ al-Aʿlā, xxx. 275 sqq.). This same author describes very clearly the troubled condition of the water when the flood begins. He discusses likewise the influence of the Nile on the climate of Egypt and the medicinal properties of its water.

Other authors speak at length of the fauna of the Nile, giving especial attention to the fish. A very long list of fishes is given by al-Idrisī (p. 16 sqq.) with a description of their often curious qualities. The animals most frequently described by the geographers are, however, the crocodiles, and the animal called sakankūr, which is said to be the result of a cross between a crocodile and a fish, but which seems to be in reality a kind of lizard. The productions which are afforded for navigation are best seen from the historical sources. Sea-going vessels do not seem ever to have entered
its arms, while the traffic on the river was maintained by small craft; various names of Nile boats occur in literature; in the sixteth century the vessel called ḥabatyā is especially known. In earlier times the term saḥlatī is used for a Nile boat (al-Kindī, Kitab al-Umarā, ed. Guest, p. 157; Dusy, Supplement, s.v.). The skill of the fishermen in their saḥlatī boats on the Nile is often recorded on shallow places, however, as well as on the inundated lands, boats had to be moved by means of oars or poles. The rapids between Egypt and Nubia were, as nowadays, an insurmountable barrier to river traffic; the loads were conveyed along the shore to the other side of the falls (Ibn Hawkal, MS Sultan Ahmad Kosk, No. 3346, fol. 86).

The cataracts above Assuan for a long time continued to form a barrier to the spread of Islam towards the countries bordering the Nile to the south of Egypt, which forms a curious contrast with the part played by the Nile in the introduction of Christianity into Nubia (cf. J. Kraus, Die Anfänge des Christentums in Nubiien, Münster [ Diss. ] 1930). Islam penetrated only slowly into Nubia and became more generally disseminated in the Sudán only in the sixteth century (cf. Sudán).

Something has been said already about the praises of the Nile and its descriptions in poetical terms, by which this river has contributed to Arabic literature. Al-Maqrizi (loc. cit., p. 270 sqq.) cites some fragments of poems in praise of the Nile and its flood; among the poets which he names are Tanīm Ibn al-Mu’izz (q.v.) (d. 985) and Ibn Kalakas (d. 1172). Further Yakūt (i. 592; iv. 865) cites some poems which he attributes to Umayya b. Abi ‘l-Salt; this poet is probably Abū l-Salt Umayya b. ‘Abd al-Azīz (d. 1134) who wrote a treaty al-Risāla al-Miṣriyya, from which also al-Maqrizi makes quotations. The earliest Arabic poems on the Nile are probably those found in the Divān of Ibn Kais al-Rukayyat (q.v.), the court poet of ‘Abd al-Azīz Ibn Marwān in the beginning of the eighteth century. Several treatises have been especially devoted to the Nile. Ibn al-Zark (d. 1067) says in his Faḍl al-Miṣr (MS, arabo No. 1818 of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, fol. 317) that he has written a book on the importance and the salutary qualities of the Nile, which now seems to be lost. Further there are a treatise Taḥṣīrat al-Akhrār fi Nil Miṣr wa-Alḥawātih sin an-Narb (MS. in Algers; cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 506), and two short opuscules by Djalāl al-Dīn al-Mahallī (d. 1459) and al-Suyūṭī, which are found together in the MS. Or. 1535 of the British Museum (Rieu, Suppl., No. 1198; G.A.L., ii. 114).

As the aim of the present article is to give only an account of the Nile from the point of view of Islam and its history, it seems superfluous to quote here even the most important modern works and articles belonging to the abundant bibliography of the Nile. The earlier Muhammadan authors have all been named in the text; the later ones, such as Yakūt, ‘Abd al-Latif, Abu ‘l-Fidā‘ī, al-Kalakrahim, al-Maqrizi, al-Suyūṭī (Hamm al-Muhaddara), al-Nuwwarī and others are in most cases a compendium of earlier earlier views and statements. A very important later Muhammadan source is al-Khitīf al-Tawfīkīyya by ‘Ali Bīl Mubārak. The Muhammadan literary sources have been used in the following works: Else Reitemeyer, Beschreibung Aegyptens im Mittelalter, Leipzig 1903, p. 31–61; J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Mémoire pour servir à la Géographie de l’Egypte, in M.I.P.A.O., xxxvi. 215 sqq.; and very profusely: Omar Toussoun, Mémoire sur l’Histoire du Nil, vols. i., ii., iii., in Mémoires présentés à l’Institut d’Egypte, viii., ix., Cairo 1925. The last of these three volumes contains a series of cartographical reconstructions. A number of ancient Muhammadan maps of the Nile are to be found in the Maggæs Arabiæ, ed. Konrad Miller, Stuttgart 1926–1930, and more completely in vol. iii. of the Monumenta Cartographica Africae et Aegypti by Youssouf Kemal, as far as this work has appeared; in this same work all the geographical references to the Nile are also to be found in a chronological order.

(N. H. Knaben)

NILÜFER KHATUN, wife of Urkhan and mother of Murad I, apparently the Greek name Nευτηρια (i.e. Lotus-flower) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 59), was the daughter of the lord of Yarıcı (Anatolia, near Brussa; cf. Hadjiyi Khalifa, Lékkanum, p. 659) and according to one story was betrothed to the lord of Belokoma (Bilecik). 'Othmen, the founder of the dynasty which bears his name, is said to have kidnapped and carried her off in 699 (1299) and to have destined her to be the wife of his son Urkhan, then only 12 years old. Idris Bitlis, and following him Nesrī, tells the story of the rape but the Byzantine sources make no reference to it. Nilüfer Khatun became the mother of Murad I and also of Sulaiman Pasha. The river which flows through the plain of Brussa bears the same name as also does the bridge over it in front of the town and monastery there. The bridge and monastery are said to have been endowed by Nilüfer Khatun. Nothing more is known of her life. She was buried beside Urkhan on the citadel of Brussa. That Ibn Battuta, ii. 323 sq. really means Nilüfer Khatun by Bayallīn, (بیالینی) Khatun, which both F. Giese (cf. Z.S., ii. 1924, p. 263) and F. Taeschner (cf. Isl., xx. 135) think to be obvious, as they take بیالینی to be a corruption of نیلیفه, is however by no means proved, because Bayalīn is a name which occurs again in Ibn Battuta for a Byzantine princess (cf. ii. 393 sqq.). Besides, the mention in Ibn Battuta who paid his respects to the princess at her court in Iznik (c. 740 = 1339) is very brief. F. Taeschner suggests that Nilüfer is a corruption of Olivera, while hitherto Nilüfer (cf. Pers. nilūfar “water lily” and Greek νεφείζω and νερόβαζα with the same meaning) has been derived from the Greek. Nilüfer was and is also popularly known as Lüfter (e.g. in the early Ottoman chronicles) or Ulfur the river Ufer Čai; cf. F. Taeschner, op. cit. p. 135 sq.

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 59 sq.; Siğilli ‘ishā‘īnī, i. 86 (according to Nesrī); F. Taeschner, in Isl., xx. 133–137.

(Franz Babinger)

NI'MAT ALLAH b. AHMAD b. KHUṢRĀK, known as Khālij Şeff, author of a Persian-Turkish Dictionary, entitled Lūhčī: Ni'mat Allah. Born in Sofia, where as an enameller he made a reputation as an artist, he moved to Constantinople and there entered the Nikšbānḏi order. Association with the Nikšbānḏi dervishes made him more closely acquainted with literature and
especially with Persian poetry. Ni'mat Allâh decided to make accessible to others the knowledge he had acquired by an ardent study of Persian literature and thus arose his lexicographical work which he probably compiled at the instigation and with the assistance of the famous Kemsî Paşa-zade (d. 940 = 1533). He died in 969 (1561-1562) and was buried in the court of the monastery at the Adrianople gate in Stamboul. His work which survives in a considerable number of manuscripts is divided into three parts: verbs, particles and inflection, nouns. His sources were: 1. Ėkrmîn-i ʿAdım (s. Ėr., p. 291, N. 108); 2. Kâsim-i Lutf Allâh Hâlim (Ḥaddîjî Khâlîfa, iv. 505); 3. Khâlid ibn al-Ḥakam (Flugel, Arma Catalogue, i. 197); 4. Lügât-i Korî-Hâkim (Rieu, p. 515); 5. Șêhê-i ʿAdım (Ḥaddîjî Khâlîfa, vi. 91 and Leyden Catalogue, i. 100). Besides making careful use of these sources Ni'mat Allâh added much independent material, of which his dialect notes and ethnographical observations are especially valuable. This work is of considerable scientific importance and deserves greater attention than it has so far received.

Bibliography: O. Blau, Uber Ni'matullah's persisch-türkische Worterbuch, in Z. D. M. G., xxxi. (1877), S. 484; Rieu, Catalogue, p. 514; Ḥaddîjî Khâlîfa, vi. 362. Partly used by Gollus in his part of the Catalogue of the Libri glotten. The best MSS. are Don, St. Petersburg Catalogue, No. 431 (p. 426) and Flesscher, Dresden Catalogue, No. 182. (E. Berthels)

N'I'MAT ALLAH b. HABIB ALLAH HARAWI, a Persian historian. His father was for 35 years in the service of the Great Mughal Akbar (1556-1605) where he was a khâlîsa inspector. Ni'mat Allâh himself was for 11 years historian to Djiâhânîr (1605-1628), then entered the service of Kânâ-Djiâhân whom he accompanied in 1018 (1609-1610) on the campaign against the Dekkan. Soon afterwards he became acquainted with Miyân-Habêt-Kân b. Sâdîm-Kân Kâzar of Sâbûnâh who persuaded him to write a history of the reign of Kânâ-Djiâhân. Ni'mat Allâh began his work in Malkâpûr in Dhu l-Ḥijdja 1020 (Feb. 1612) and finished it on the 10th Dhu l-Ḥijdja 1021 (Feb. 2, 1613). The work is dedicated to Kânâ-Djiâhân, is entitled Târîkhi Kânâ-Djiâhânî, and begins with a history of the Afghans, beginning with their legendary descent from the Banû Isma'il and treats with special fullness of the history of Bahûl Lodi, Shîr Shâh Sûr and Nawwâb Kânâ-Djiâhân Lodi. The last chapters are devoted to the genealogy of the Afghans and the reign of Djiâhânîr. The khâlitma contains biographies of famous Afghân shâhiks. There is also an abbreviated version of the work entitled Mîhâgan-i Afghânî.


N'I'MAT ALLAH WALI, a Persian mystic. Amir Nûr al-Dîn Ni'mat Allâh, son of Mir 'Abd Allâh, and a descendant of the fifth imâm of the Shîa, Bûrîr, the founder of the Ni'mat Allâh order, is highly esteemed in Persia as a great saint and wonder-worker. He was born in Halab in 730-731 (1230-1330/1), spent his early years in the 'Irâk and went to Mecca at the age of 24 where he became a pupil and khâtîf of the famous Shâhî 'Abd Allâh Yâfî [see Yâfî]. After his teacher's death, he went to Samarkand, then visited Herût and Yazd and finally settled in Mâhân, 8 farsaks from Kirmân, where he spent the last 25 years of his life and died on 22nd Ra'jâb 834 (April 5, 1431). His tomb is still a popular place of pilgrimage (zâvâratâkh). In his lifetime he was held in great honour by all rulers and received particular marks of esteem from Shâh-Rukh. His grandsons migrated to India and were appointed to high office in the Deccan by 'Alî al-Dîn Ahmad-Shâh Bahmanî (1435-1457). Ni'mat Allâh was, 1555, prolific theorist of Sûfism, it is said to have written over 500 risâlas on different questions of Sîf doctrine. About a hundred of these have come down to us and can be identified. They are for the most part quite short treatises, generally explanations of difficult passages in the classics of Sîfism like Ibn al-'Arâbi, Fâkîr al-Dîn Târîkî etc. His large Divân of lyrics is more valuable; it contains much true poetry and is marked by a fervent sincerity.

Bibliography: H. Ethê, in G. I. Ph., ii. 299, 301; Rieu, Catalogue, p. 434, 645, 645b, 774a, 829a, 829b, 868a; E. G. Browne, History of Persian Literature, 3rd ed., Cambridge 1912, p. 465 sq.; Divân, lith. Tîhrân 1276. A biography by Šan Allâh Ni'mat-Allâh, Savânî al-A'îmâ fî Mustâhîjat al-A'îmâ malawim ki-Silatat al-Ārîfîn (Persian), lith. Bombay 1307 (1890). See also Ḥabîb al-Siyar, iii. 3, 143 (where 25th Ra'jâb is given as the date of his death) and Dawlatshâh (ed. Browne, p. 333-340), who however with his usual carelessness gives 827 as the date of his death. (E. Berthels)

N'I'MAT KHAN 'ALÌ, MIRZâ NûR AL-DîN MÜHÂSÂMAD, son of Haçim Fâth al-Dîn Shîhâzî, a Persian author, was born in India and came of a family several of whom had been distinguished physicians in their ancestral home in Shâhâzî. He entered the service of the state under Shâh-Djiâhân (1628-1659) and was appointed keeper of the crown jewels with the title of dârâghgî-î dastvîr-khâmân. He attained his highest honours under Awrangzêb (1659-1707) who gave him the title of Ni'mat Khan (1104 = 1692-1693), which was later changed to Mûkarrab Khan and then to Dânâshâh Khan. He died at Dehli on the 1st Rabî' II 1128 (May 30, 1710). Ni'mat Allâh who wrote under the taqhallîs of 'Ali, was exceedingly prolific and wrote a number of works in prose and verse of which the following are the most important: 1. Wâ'dî-l-i Haïdarâbâd: a description of the siege of Haidârâbâd by Awrangzêb in 1097 (1685-1686). This work is characterized by a biting wit and describes the siege in a satirical form which procured the little book the greatest popularity; 2. Diang-nîma, a chronicle which covers the last years of Awrangzêb's reign and the war which broke out after his death among his sons; 3. Bahâdur-zâb-nîma, a chronicle of the two first years of the reign of Shâh 'Alam Bahâdur-Shâh (1707-1712); 4. Hîzan u'zîkh, also called Kuttubdîyâ or Munawwâziyî Hîzan u'zîkh, an allegorical love story, an imitation of the celebrated Hîzan u-Dil of Fâtihî [q.v.]; 5. Râbât al-Kulâb, satirical sketches of a number of contemporaries; 6. Râshâ-yî Hâfiz-i 'Ukamãî
anecdotes of physicians and their incoherence; 7. Khánn-i Nímat, a work on cookery; 8. Ruḥášt, letters to Mirzá Muḥárrak Alláh Irádat Khánn Wádí, Mirzá Muḥammad Sa’dí, the head of the imperial kitchen and others, which were very highly thought of as models of a choice style of letter-writing; 9. a lyrical Dáwát 10. a short Mathnwc without a title, which deals with the usual Sáhi ethical themes. This survey shows a great versatility on the part of Nímat Khánn but it must be pointed out that, with the exception of the satirical works which are really original and of great value for the characterisation of his age, none of them rise above the level of degenerate imitations of classical models.


Nírúd, a ruined site in the ancient Assyria, the northern portion of the modern Irák, about twenty miles south of Músíl, in 36° 5’ North Lat. and 43° 20’ East Long. (Greenwich) in the angle formed by the Tigris and its tributary, the Upper or Great Záb, six miles above the mouth of the latter. The plateau of Nírúd rises abruptly from the surrounding country, and the great advantages of this situation caused a settlement to be made here already in remote antiquity. Excavations on the site have established the fact that the ruins there were those of the town of Kalákh (Kalikhu). This is also mentioned as Kalákh (Calah) in the Old Testament in a passage which is not absolutely unambiguous (Gen. x. 11—12), which says it was built either by Nírúd or Āshur; the latter appears to me more intelligible. In Greek writers we find only the name of the district Kalákyi or Kalákw (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, Realmsch. der klas. Altertumswiss., x. 1530). It was no doubt its favourable strategical position that decided the Assyrian King Salmanassar I (c. 1280—1261) to raise it to be his royal residence alongside of the previous capital Āshur (now Kalíkh Šerkt); q.v.

We learn nothing from the cuneiform inscriptions about the decline of Kalákh. Kalákh probably fell about the same time as Nineveh after a stubborn resistance to the onslaught of the Median-Babylonian army. When Xenophon in 401 B.C. passed by the town, which he describes clearly, it was already a ruin.

So far as I know Kalákh is not mentioned in Syrian literature and in the Arab writers of the middle ages only incidentally and under wrong names. In Yákút (ed. Wustenfeld, i. 110, 16: iii. 115) we are told that al-Salámiyá is in the vicinity of the ruins of the town of Āshur, which can only mean the ruins of Kalákh (cf. also ii., p. 184). At the present day the site is known only as Nírúd, which so far as I know first appears in Niebuhr, who stayed in Músíl in 1766, see his Reisebesch. nach Arabien und anderen untelligen Ländern, ii. (Copenhagen 1778), p. 355, 368. When this, now the usual, name arose is unknown; I consider it to be of modern origin. It should be noted that names like Nírúd, Toll Nírúd, etc. are not found in the geographical nomenclature of Mesopotamia and the Irák in the middle ages, while they are several times met with at the present day.

The first European to give a brief account of the ‘ruined castle’ of Nírúd and the remains there was Niebuhr, although not from his own inspection. In 1821 Cl. Rich visited the site and gives the first detailed account of the ruins; in his posthumous work are the first pictures of cuneiform tablets discovered there. A few years before Layard, William Ainsworth examined the site. In 1843 Fletcher visited it. Layard, the real investigator of Nírúd, twice examined the mounds of ruins in 1840 but it was not till 1845 that he was able to begin excavations, which were conducted in two great expeditions (1845—1847 and 1849—1851). Layard’s reports were supplemented in many details by the notes, to which no little attention has so far been paid, by Sandrock (see Bibl.) who spent a considerable time in Músíl and its neighbourhood in 1850. After Layard’s departure home, H. Rassam continued his work in Nírúd. In 1873 G. Smith resumed Layard’s work but only for a month. Finally Rassam on behalf of the British Museum again conducted the earlier excavations for a period of five years (1878—1882).

Our study of the topography of Nírúd must still be based on the large map of the vicinity of Nineveh and the whole area between the Tigris and Upper Záb made by F. Jones in 1852, which the Royal Asiatic Society published in three sheets under the title Vestiges of Assyria (sheets 2 and 3 deal with Nírúd). The commentary on these maps is the article by Jones, in J.R.A.S., vol. xvi. (1876), 107—169. The fairly comprehensive complex of ruins at Nírúd forms in the main a rectangular plateau, out of which a triangular mass juts in the southeast giving the whole the appearance of an irregular hexagon. The longest side, which runs east and west, measures 7,000 feet and the northeast side 5,000 feet (in the southeast including the salient triangle 6,600 feet). The circumference of the whole area is six miles. Layard’s investigations revealed that this extensive area marking the site of the town of Kalíkh was surrounded by a wall with towers. In the north he found fifty-eight, in the east fifty of these towers; in the south this wall of earth has now almost entirely disappeared (cf. Layard, Discoveries etc., p. 656). The length of the wall was seven miles, that is to say it was longer than the boundary of the whole ruined area because two arms were necessary to include the suburbs in the southeast.

The royal quarter in the southwest corner with the palaces and chief temples occupied a relatively small part of the area described. It lay on a terrace and was shut off from the rest of the town by a wall. To it also belonged the high cone-shaped mound in the northwest which is the dominating
feature of the landscape at Nimrud. Its diameter is 350 feet in breadth and 600 in length and it still stands 130 feet above the level of the Tigris but must as a storied temple tower (zikkurat), have been originally about 160 feet high. The royal city is oblong in shape and has a circumference of over 2,000 yards; its west side measures 2,000—2,050 feet and its north side about 1,200 feet.

In the northwestern part of the royal city stood the temple of Ninurta (formerly read Ninh), the chief centre of worship of this deity in Assyria. It had a storied tower, the builder of which, according to an inscription, was Salmanassar III, Xerophon's "magus Kāšānī, now represented by the conical mound (cf. Streck, op. cit., p. cxix., note 2 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien, e. 20 sq. and 60, Armentia, 111, 253 sq.). Farther south on the same side was the so-called northwest (better: west) palace of Assurnasirpal II which Sargon II replaced by a new building. The sculptures with which its founder adorned it came for the most part to the British Museum (cf. Redaction der Assyriologis, i. 218). In the centre of the royal city but more to the south, Salamanasar III built the so-called central palace which at a later date was completely restored by Tiglatpileser III. The famous black obelisk came from it. This palace is less well preserved as Assurabadon partly destroyed it when he took out Tiglatpileser III's reliefs to transport them to the new palace which he built in the southwest of the royal city. This southwest palace however remains unfinished as after a fire the building was not resumed; cf. Meissner and Rost, in Beitr. zur Assyriol., iii. 191 sq.; Redakt. der Assyriol., ii. 202 and see also E. Unger, Die Reliefs Tiglatpilezers III aus Nimrud, Constantinople 1917.

In the south-east part of the royal quarter Assur-til-lānī built a palace and at the same time restored a temple of Nābū there which Adad-nirāri III had built and called after the chief sanctuary of this deity, E-zīda in Borsippa (= Birs; q.v.). Here Rassam discovered a series of statues of Nābū dating from the time of Adad-nirāri III which because they were found in situ were of topographical importance (cf. Streck, op. cit., i., p. cc—cclii. and ii. 272).

The eastern and north-eastern sides of the royal city have so far only been cursorily examined; probably they also conceal royal buildings.

Outside of the city walls, in the already mentioned triangle at the south-east corner, there are smaller mounds. Layard (Discoveries, p. 656) thought that the largest of these tells was perhaps once a fort or castle; he gives it the name of Tell Aṭṭār (op. cit., p. 165) on the authority of the local Arabs. Now it is true that — as already mentioned — in the Arab middle ages, the mounds of ruins near al-Salamiyya, i. e. the modern Nimrūd, were erroneously thought to be ruins of the town of Aṭṭār. Educated Moslems still held this view in the time of Rich (cf. Rich, op. cit., ii. 131). I think nevertheless that Layard's name Tell Aṭṭār for the mound or four mounds in question is due to a misunderstanding. In Vestiges of Assyria, sheet ii., Jones gives the name Tall Yaṣār for it, J. Oppert (op. cit., i. 309) Tulūl Yaṣār, Sachau (op. cit., p. 106) writes Tell Aṣār, which is probably the name of a tribe (Yaṣār, J. A., 1879, xiii. 224, 226).

The Tigris now runs about one and a half miles from Nimrud but in Assyrian times it flowed directly past the walls of the town as distinct traces still prove (cf. thereon Jones in J. R. A. S., xv. 342—343 = Selections etc., p. 446 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien, p. 27 and his Armentia, 111, 250 sq.). In the centre, between the still distinct ancient bed of the Tigris and the modern one, is a third bed which the river filled in the middle ages; this latter now bears the name of Sīrat Alīb Debān (see Jones, Vestiges and J. R. A. S., xv. 343 = Selections, p. 447) = "The road of Alīb Debān", apparently after a Beduin tribe (the explanation given by Jones is hardly tenable).

A quarter of an hour west of the ruined site of Nimrud (called frequently al-Kaṣr = the citadel) is an older settlement, the fair-sized village of (old) Nimrūd also called Darāwīsh. Still farther west, near the Tigris is a village also called (New) Nimrūd of more recent origin and a mile N.W. of it directly on the river the village of Nāife. Again a mile N.W. are the remains of a dam first described by J. Macdonald Kinneir from personal observations (see his Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia and Koordistan, London 1818, p. 465). The natives call it Sāk or Sārū Nimrūd (see Kinneir, loc. cit.; Layard, Nineveh, i. 8) = Nimrud's Dam. Jones gives (J. R. A. S., xv. 343 = Selections, p. 447 and Vestiges of Assyria, sheet ii.) Sākhir Nimrūd (= Nimrūd's Cliff); I suspect that he picked up the name wrongly (ṣākhr for sāk "dam"). At the same time we also have the name Sīk al-Awāzī (Rich, op. cit., i. 129) or simply al-Awāzī, Āwā (Layard, op. cit., i. 8, 365; Jones, loc. cit.) = "dam of noise" or "the noise" (awāzī or awāh from Persian awāštān; see Vullers, Lex. Pers., i. 56) and this second name owes its origin to the great noise caused by the waters breaking over the rocks here. The people of the vicinity say that there was once a bridge here. Probably a barrier of rock in the river was already used in ancient times as the foundation for a dam for irrigation purposes.

Still farther northwards about three miles from the ruins of Nimrud lies Selāmīye on the Tigris, now a small village but in the middle ages as Yākūt, iii. 113 (al-Salamiyya; cf. also i. 119, 46) tells us, one of the most beautiful places in the region of Mōsul. The modern Selāmīye lies in the southeast corner of an area covered with old ruins.

This Selāmīye may with great probability be identified with the Biblical Resen, numbered among the four Assyrian towns founded by Ashšūr (or Nimrūd; cf. above) according to Gen. xi. 11—12, and there located as lying between Nineveh and Calah (Calah). The assertion constantly made in learned works because of the words describing them "the same is a great city" and in view of passages in Jonah (1, 2. 3—4; 4, 11) that these formed a gigantic tetrapolis linked together hardly deserves serious refutation.

The greater part of the finds at the English excavations at Nimrūd are in the British Museum where they are exhibited in the Assyrian transept, the Nimrud Gallery and in the Nimrud Central Saloon (cf. the B. M. Guide etc. [see Bibi], p. 41 sq.). Nimrūd provided the British Museum with even greater treasures in sculptures (not inscriptions) than Koyunjik—Nineveh. Various objects from Layard’s collection were left in Bombay on the way home and are now, with some pieces brought
by Rawlinson, in the possession of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; on them see Karkoria in the *Journal B. R. A. S.*, xviii. (Bombay 1891), p. 97–107. A large series of sculptures came to the Louvre; cf. E. Pottier, *Catalogue des Antiquités Assyriennes* (Louvre), Paris 1924, p. 23, 49–63. There are also miscellaneous antiquities from Nimrud in the national collections in Stambul, Berlin, Zürich and Leningrad (Hermitage); on a few finds by Lehmann-Haupt, see his *Materialien*, p. 22 sq.

The English excavators left the site without filling in or even roughly levelling the ground they had cut up. In the spring of 1920 the 'Iraq government however had the half exposed sculptures lifted and put in the new Museum in Baghda'd. During my stay in Nimrud (May 1928), I saw the sculptures lying on the bank of the Tigris ready to be moved (2 statues of Nabû, a colossal bull, fragments of another, an unfinished lion in stone, two great slabs with inscriptions of Assur-nasirpal II.).


**NIMRUD** [See SîTAN.]

**NIRIZ**, a place in A'dharbâjdâjan on the road from Marâgha [q. v.] to Urmia [q. v.] south of the Lake of Urmia. The stages on this route are still obscure. At about 15 farsakh south of Marâgha was the station of Barza where the road bifurcated; the main road continued southward to Dinawar while the northwest went from Barza to Toilis (2 farsakhs), thence to Djâbârwan (6 farsakhs), thence to Niriz (4 farsakhs), thence to Urmia (14 farsakhs); cf. Ibî Khûrâddâbhî, p. 121 (repeated by Khudâm with some variations); MuÊkâddasî, p. 383.

The distance from Urmia indicates that Niriz was in the vicinity of Sudûz [q. v.] which would confirm the etymology from nir-z "flowing". Sudûz lies in the low plain, through which the Gâdir flows to the Lake of Urmia. At the present day the name Niriz is unknown, but a Kurd tribe of the region of Sa'dûj-bulâk [q. v.] bears the name of Nirizh.

After the Arab conquest a family of Tâ'i Arabs settled in Niriz. The first of these semi-independent chiefs was Marr b. 'Ali Mawjûl who built a town at Niriz and enlarged the market of Džâbârwan (cf. Râlàhûrî and Ya'kûbî, ii. 446). One of his sons, 'Ali, was among the rebels of 212 (827) whom the governor of A'dharbâjdzân Muhammad b. Hamîd Tâsi deported to Baghda'd, but 'Ali succeeded, it seems, in returning to his lands) cf. Ibî Khûrâddâbhî, p. 119. Abu Rûdânine 'Omar b. 'Ali, appointed in 260 (873) governor of A'dharbâjdzân by the caliph, made war on his predecessor 'Ali b. Ahmad Aqlî and killed him (Tabâri, iii. 1886). He was supported by the Khândîjîs. Cf. the account in *Pâdghârîn-i gummân*, Tehran 1929, ii. 27, 34–35.

In the 4th century Iṣâqî, p. 186 and Ibn Hâwkal, p. 240 mention the Banû Rudânine as a dynasty already forgotten which had reigned over Dakhûrân (read Džâbârwan), Ta'bîr (read Niriz) and Ugrînân al-A'dhîâyê [cf. OMNE].

(V. MINORSKY)

**AL-NISÂ',** the "Women", the title of Sûra iv. of the Kûrân; so-called because in the opening verses the position of women is dealt with. Xoldeke (*Geschichte des Qur'ân*, i. 193) thinks that the greater part belongs to the period between the end of the year 3 and the year 5 A. H. This sûra contains many verses that were abrogated: among these principal we may mention 8–9 abrogated by 12; 10 abrogated by ii. 178; 20 abrogated by xxiv. 2; 33 abrogated by xxiv. 60 etc. . . .

It is also one of the most important sûras of the Kûrân because many of the precepts formulated in it form the foundations for the Muhammadan laws of marriage.
The story lacks unity, consisting as it does of a collection of verses of different origin and on different subjects. The following is a brief analysis of its contents: the creation of man; consanguinity; the care of orphans; rules for succession; marriage; relations of husband and wife; impediments to marriage; almsgiving; evidence; accidental homicide; holy war and the art of war; obedience to Allah and to the Prophets; punishment of the unbelieving Jews and Christians.

*Biography:* Cf. the att. al-Nahf and add: Tawfiq Jawhari, Tawfiq, Cairo, 25 vol.; Ahmad Rida, Tawfiq al-Munir, Cairo, 9 vols. so far appeared. (MAURICE CHEMOUL)

**NIS."** See ZAKAN.

**NISAN, the seventh month in the Syrian calendar.** Its name is taken from the first month of the Jewish religious (seventh of the civil) year with the period of which it roughly coincides. It corresponds to April of the Roman year and has its 30 days. On the 10th and 23rd Nisàn, according to al-Bïrûnî, the first two stars of the moon rise in the direction of the city of the two as first and second shows that the numbering was established by scholars for whom Nisàn was the first month) and the 15th and 16th set. In 1300 of the Seleucid era (856 A.D.), according to al-Bïrûnî, the stars of the 28th and 1st stations of the moon rose and those of the 17th and 25th set while the rising and setting of the 2nd and 16th stations of the moon took place in Ayyar.

*Biography:* al-Bïrûnî, Aflarî, ed. Sachau, p. 60, 70, 347-349; cf. also the references under TAMMUE.

(M. PLESSNER)

**NISH** (Serbian Niš), the second largest town in Serbia, now the capital of the banate of Morava in the kingdom of Jugoslavia, situated 650 feet above sea-level in a fertile plain surrounded by hills, on both sides of the Nišava not far from its junction with the Morava and an important centre of communications by rail and road, on the interantional route to Sofia-Istanbul or Salonika-Athens. The larger part of the town with the railway station lies on the left bank, the fortress is on the right. The two parts of the town are connected by four iron bridges (including a railway bridge), cover an area of 11.5 sq. m. and had in 1931 35,384 inhabitants of whom only 3.7% are Muslims. According to the latest (Dec. 1933) statistics of the Imam-registrar, Nish has 1,982 Muslims in 365 households, chiefly gipsies, while Muslims speaking Serbo-Croatian, Turkish and Albanian form the remainder. These gipsies call themselves Muslims, bear Muslim names, marry with Muslim rites but nevertheless observe at home some of the Serbian Orthodox Church feasts, visit the churches etc. There are a number of offices of the civil and military authorities in the town, including a district shari'a court. This court has existed only since Oct. 29, 1929, i.e. since the abolition of the old office of district mufti whose authority till then extended over the whole of Serbia. The authority of the new court extends over a part of that of the older (19 districts) while the remainder are under the kâdi of Belgrade. The Muslims of Nish have also a district wakf muftâf council (cf. i., p. 760), a common council (etnanički medži) and a registration office (imâna). There are said to have been 19 mosques in Nish in the last Turkish period (1878), only one of which now survives. The second last mosque of which the great minaret is still standing, was destroyed as a result of the great floods of 1896. Nish has also Serbian Orthodox churches and a Roman Catholic church and a synagogue. Besides several colleges, it has a Hygienic Institute, two hospitals and a society for popular education. The town is making steady progress. Its whole show that Nish has always been an important strategical and commercial centre.

In antiquity Nish (Nassas, Niz, Nissa etc.) belonged at first to the Roman province Moesia Superior and later became the capital of Dardania.

Nish's greatest claim to fame is that it was the birthplace of Constantine the Great (306-337) and attained great prosperity in ancient times. The Romans had state munition works here.

In the time of the migrations of the Huns, Nish was taken after a vigorous resistance by Attilla (434-453) and destroyed but rebuilt and refortified very soon afterwards by Justinian I (527-565). By the middle of the sixth century the first forces of the Slavs who had entered the Balkan peninsula in their endeavours to conquer the peninsula of the Byzantine empire appeared before Nish. Nish was thus in the ninth century usually in the hands of the Bulgars and until 1018 it belonged to a Slav state founded in Macedonia in 976 by the emperor Samuel. The Byzantines held it from 1018 to the end of the eleventh century, when we find it described as large and prosperous; Idristi who calls it "Nisa" (also on his map of 1154, ed. K. Miller) lays special emphasis on the quantity and cheapness of food and the importance of its trade. But even then it did not enjoy peace. In 1072 the Hungarians reached the town on a marauding campaign, and in 1147 the inhabitants had to defend themselves in a strenuous battle "at the Bridge" against the Crusaders in which the latter suffered very heavily, and in 1182 the town was taken by Bela III supported by Nemanja, the Serbian prince. A little later Nemanja took Nish and the whole country as far as Serdica (Sofia). The town suffered considerably in these troubled times. The Third Crusade (1189) found it almost empty and practically destroyed. In spite of this, Nemanja was able to receive the emperor Barbarossa in Nish with great ceremony. From this time on to the Turkish conquest Nish was generally in Serbian hands.

In the earlier Turkish chronicles (e.g. Shukrullah, Urudj b. Zaid, Ali Cevkipahzadie, Nizam [Noldeke], Anonymous Giese) there is no mention of the taking of Nish: Sa'd al-Din (i. 92-93), Hajići Kjulafta and Ewlyia Celebi, then von Hammer (G.O.K., i. 157) and Lane-Poole (Turkey, p. 49) on the other hand, assume that it took place in the reign of Murad I in 777 (1375-1376). The Serbian chronicles however definitely give 1356 and this year, which Gibbons has recently strongly urged as the correct date (The Foundations of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916, p. 161-162), is now generally accepted.

During the Turkish period (1356-1578) Nish had chequered fortunes. In 1443 it was taken by the Christian army under king Vladislav III and John Hunyadi and destroyed. After the fall of Smederevo in 1459 the Serbian despotate became a Turkish province and Nish was even more secure in Turkish hands. For several days after June 29, 1521 a great fire raged in Nish which would have destroyed it completely if the Beglerbeg Ahmad Pasha, who was leading an army against Hungary
at the time, had not come at the last moment to its assistance [F. Tauer, Histoire de la campagne du Sultan Suleyman 3rre contre Belgrade en 1521, Prague 1924, p. 26 (Persian text), p. 31 (transl.)]. Western travellers who visited Nish in this period (Dernschwam, Contarini etc.) were not particularly attracted by it.

Turkish writers give us an idea of the appearance of Nish in the xvii century. Hâdîddî Khalîfâ (c. 1648) describes it i.e., as a great town and kâdînîn in the sandjak of Sofia. The description which Ewliya Celebi (c. 1666) gives is much fuller: it is a fortified town in the plain with 2,060 houses, 200 shops, three mosques (i. Gâzi Khâdîwendi-giâr; 2. Mašli Efendi; 3. Husain Kethkadî), 22 schools for children, several maṣjîdîs, darîwshî monasteries, fountains, baths, many vineyards and gardens etc.

On Sept. 23, 1659 Nish was taken by the Austrians under Ludwig of Baden but abandoned the very next year to the Turks (1690). In 1737 Nish was again taken by the Austrians under Seckendorf but lost to the Turks again after two months occupation. It is to this period that the city owes its fortifications.

When in 1804 the Serbs under Karadörde (Ildji) rebelled against the Turks they soon won a number of successes and in 1809 were able to build redoubts against Nish, in which, Stevan Sindelić, one of Karadörde's voivodes, on May 31 blew himself and the attacking Turks. Nish was nevertheless not relieved and the Turks built the so-called Cele-ului ("tower of skulls") with the heads of the Serbs killed there, of which A. de Lamartine gave a moving description on his way home in 1833 (Lettres de l'Orient, Paris 1859, p. 255—256). It was not till Jan. 11, 1878 that Nish, with the capital of a Turkish ilâç, finally passed from the Turks. This induced many Muslims to migrate to Turkey.

Lying on the military road between Constantinople and Vienna and therefore exposed to every campaign Nish was by no means favourably situated to become a centre for the development of even a modest intellectual life. It appears, at least according to Gibb, that Nish has produced no Turkish poets or authors, except perhaps Sumbaldeâ Webdi (end of the xviii century) who celebrated in song his meeting with the young Sarch in the Turkish camp at Nish (H.O.P., iv. 255). In Nish however, two Turks worked for a time who later were to become celebrated: 1. Ahmed Lutfi (1815—1907), afterwards imperial historiographer served in Vidin and Nish from April 1845 (G.O.W., p. 384); 2. the famous statesman and author of the Turkish constitution of 1876, Midhat Pasha [q. v.], was appointed governor of Nish and Prizen in 1861. In this capacity he saw to the building of a Serbian school (1864) in Nish.

Nish played an important part in the World War: first as the seat of the Serbian government and the Skupština (till Oct. 26, 1915) and then as the scene of a battle between the Germans who were then on the sandjak here and the Serbs in pursuit of them which ended in the capture of the town by the latter (Oct. 12, 1918).


(FERHIM BAJRAKTEVIC)

NISANDJI, secretary of state for the Sultan's tughras, chancellor.

The Sâlûjûks and Mamlûks already had special officials for drawing the tughras, the sultan's signature. As their official organisation was inherited in almost all its details by the Ottomans this post naturally was included. Its holder was called Nisandji or ievâli. The nisandjî held the same rank as the defterdârs [q. v.], and indeed even preceded them, for we find defterdârs promoted to nisandjîs but never a nisandji before a defterdâr. The nisandjîs were individual among the "pillars of the empire" (evâni deâlev). The part which he played varied in course of time. Besides being secretary of state for the imperial tughra (nîþân) he had originally considerable legislative powers and he was called mufîsî ësûnî (to distinguish him from the mufisî proper, i.e. the Şâhiş al-lîsmâ). In his office the texts of the laws were prepared under his supervision. Most of the Ottoman codes of law (ësûnîn) that have come down to us go back to nisandjîs. As they had besides the right to approve the contents of documents put before them for the imperial tughra, they had no slight influence on the business of administration. Of their official career we know that according to the Kânûn-nâmâ of Muhammed II they had to be chosen from teachers acquainted with law (muître), apparently because they had to display legislative ability, or from the defterdârs and rûçasû-êkûtêdâb. As their authority diminished more and more in course of time, so did their influence, and finally they were limited to preparing the tughra. According to Mouradjea d'Ossel (Tableau de l'Empire Ottoman, iii. 373), the nisandjîs received from the state a salary of 6,620 piastres. On their official dress, see v. Hammer, G.O.K., iv. 431, according to whom they wore red in contrast to the other锹 evâni deâlev锹 who wore violet.

Bibliography: Cf. the article TUGRA and the references there given; also J. v. Hammer, G.O.K., i. 173; ii. 217, 229; iv. 3; viii. 431; J. v. Hammer, Der Osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, Vienna 1815, i. 64; ii. 127, 135.

(FRAZ BABINGER)
NISHĀNDĪ — NISHĀPUR

The founder of the Sa'dārid dynasty, Ya‘qūb b. al-Laith b. Mu‘addal, entered Nishāpur on the 2nd Shawwāl 259 (Aug. 1, 873) and took Mu‘ammad b. Tahir prisoner (Tabari, iii. 1881; Gardizi in Barthold, Turkestân down to the Mongol Invasion, p. 217, note 6) but the latter soon regained his liberty and land. Only after Ya‘qūb’s death was his brother ‘Amr b. al-Laith granted the fiefs of Khurāsān and other districts. Rāzī b. Harījāna in 882 took Nishāpur from him (Tabari, iii. 2039) and ‘Abd al-Malik b. Tahir in 902 again lost it to the new governor of Khurāsān in 885 again; but in 279 (892) ‘Amr was finally confirmed in office as governor and erected many buildings there. He finally fell in battle (899–901) with Ismā‘īl b. Ahmad. The town thus passed to the Sāmānids, under whom it retained its greatest prosperity. It was the residence of the governor and commander-in-chief of the province of Khurāsān (sipāh-sālār).

The Arabic geographers describe Nishāpur at this time as a thickly populated town divided into 42 wards, 1 farsakh in length and breadth (al-Iṣkāshīrī, B. G. A., i. 254) and consisting of the citadel, the city proper and an unincorporated village. The chief town in the province was Khurāsān (al-Iṣkāshīrī, 4th ed.); it was the public market called al-Mu‘askar, the governor’s palace, a second open space called Maidān al-Ḥusainīyin and the prison. The citadel had two gates and the city four: the Gate of the Bridge, the Gate on the road from Ma‘ṣīl, the Gate of the Fortress (Bāb al-Khānāzīd) and the Gate of the Taktin Bridge. The suburbs also had walls with many gates. The best known market places were al-Murabba‘at-al-Kabira (near the Friday Mosque) and al-Murabba‘at-al-Saghir. The most important business streets were about fifty in number and ran across the city in straight lines intersecting at right angles; all kinds of wares were on sale in them (on the products and exports of Nishāpur see G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphs, p. 420 sq.). Numerous canals were led from the Wādī Saghātar, which flowed down from the village of Būstāntik and drove 70 mills, from whence it passed near the city and provided the houses with an ample water supply. Gardens below the city were also watered in this way. The district of Nishāpur was regarded as the most fertile in Khurāsān.

The town suffered many vicissitudes after this period. A great famine broke out there in 401 (1011). At the beginning of the 12th century Nishāpur was the centre of the pietist Karrāmīs led by the anchorite Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Isḥāq. The Sādīqū Tughrul-Beg occupied the town in 1037 and made it his capital. Alp Arslān also seems to have lived there (cf. Barheinæus, Ch. on. Syr. ch. 4, ed. Bedjan, p. 243). In May 1142 the Khwārizmīshāh Atσīz took the town for a time from the Sādīqū sultan Sanjār. When it was sacked by the Ghurids in 548 (1153), the inhabitants fled, mainly to the suburb of Shādīyāk (al-Shādīyāk) which was enlarged and fortified by the governor al-Mu‘ayyid. Tughrul-Shah Abū Bakr ruled the city 1174–1185 and his son Sandjar Shahl 1185–1197.

In May or June 1187 the Khwārizmīshāh Takhīr took Nishāpur and gave it to his eldest son Malik-Shāh. At the end of 1193 the latter received Marw and his brother Kūth al-Dīn Muhammad became governor of Nishāpur. Malik Shah died in 1197 in the neighbourhood of Nishāpur. ‘Alī al-Dīn Muhammad (as Kūth al-Dīn called himself after

NISHĀNDĪ. [See Ɗähltəlaxe Mustafə Cëlsëh: Karamanı Memed Pașa.] NISHĀPUR, the most important of the four great cities of Khurāsān (Nišāpur, Marv, Herat and Balḵ), one of the great towns of Iran in the middle ages.

The name goes back to the Persian New-Shāhpūr ("Fair Shāhpūr"); in Armenian it is called Niušhapūr, Arab. Naṣībūr or Niṣābūr, new Pers. Nishapur, pronounced in the time of Ya‘qūt: Nišāpur, now Nišāpur (Noldeke, Tod. p. 59, note 3; G. Hoffmann, Anciente... p. 81, note 510). The town occasionally bore the official title of honour, Irānshāh.

Nishāpur was founded by Shāhpūr I, son of Ardaxšīr I (Hama sa-Isfahānī, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 48), who had slain in this region the Turanian Pahlīcak (Pālīčak) (Staatsliche von Erān, p. 13); some authors say it was not founded till the time of Shāhpūr II (Tabari, i. 840; al-Tha‘alībī, ed. Zoteberg, p. 529).

In the year 968 the sense of Nishāpur comprised the districts of al-Tabaṣsūn, Khūstān, Nisīs, Beward, Abarshāh, Djam, Kāshās, Tūs, Zōzān and Marv (Ya‘qūbī, ed. de Goeje, p. 278; cf. Tabari, i. 288). In the narrower sense Nishāpur was the province of the governor of Khurāsān (Armen. Apur aškher, the "district of the Apurāvis"); Marquart, Erānshāh, p. 74; vo. Catalogue of the Prov. Capitals of Erānshāh, p. 52), which was in turn divided into 3 Rustāks and 4 Tassāds (names in Iṣkāshīrī, p. 258; Ibn Hawkal, p. 313; Ibn Khurṣidābīh, p. 24; Ya‘qūbī, p. 278; Ibn Rusta, p. 171). The latter were: in the west Rīwand (now Rīwand), in the south al-Shamāt, Pers. Tak-Ab, in the east Pūšhtīr (now Pūshīr Farah) and in the north Māsīl (now Māsīl); cf. al-Maḥdīs, p. 14–321.

In the Rīwand hills to the northwest of the town was one of the three most sacred fire-temples of the Sāmānids, that of the fire Burzūn-Mīhr (G. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 290). Yazdārdīr II (438–57) made Nishāpur his usual residence.

In the year 30 (651) or 31 (652) the governor of Baṣra, ‘Abd Allāh b. Amīr [q.v.], took Nishāpur (Tabari, i. 3305; Bālaghūrī, p. 404) whose governor Kaṇārān (Xawāryyavī: Marquart, Erānshāh, p. 75) capitulated. The town was then insignificant and had no garrison. During the fighting between ‘Ali and Mu‘āwiya (36–37 = 666–667) the Arabs were again driven out of Nishāpur by a rising in Khurāsān and Tukhtāshān (Tabari, i. 349, 3502; Bālaghūrī, p. 408; Dinawarī, p. 163); Pērūz III, the son of Yazdārdīr and of the daughter of Kaṇārān of Nishāpur, is said to have lived for a period in Nishāpur. Khulādī Bay Kā’s was sent in 37 by ‘Ali against the rebellious town (Dinawarī, op. cit.). Mu‘āwiya reappointed ‘Abd Allāh b. Amīr governor of Baṣra in 41 (661–662) and commissioned him to conquer Khurāsān and Sīdijān. The latter in 42 (662–663) installed Kās b. al-Haitham al-Sulamī in Nishāpur as governor of Khurāsān. Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān in 45 (665–666) made Khulādī Bay Kā’s Allāh b. Al-Hanafī governor of Abarshāh (Nishāpur). ‘Abd Allāh b. Khāzin rebelled in 683 against the Umayyads. He fell in 692 at Marv fighting against ‘Abd al-Malik, whereupon Umayyad rule was restored in Khurāsān.

The prosperity of the city dates from the time when Abū 1-l-Abbās ‘Abd Allāh b. Tahir made it his capital in the third (`nineth) century.
his father's death) took Marw and Nishapur in 1202 from Ghayath al-Din and his brother Shihab
al-Din.

In addition to the wars and rebellions (e.g. 1207–1208) which afflicted the town, it suffered from
repeated earthquakes (540 = 1145, 605 = 1208, 679 = 1280). Yakut who visited it in 613
(1216) but stayed in Shadyak, still could see the damage done by the first earthquake and by the
Ghuzz but nevertheless thought the town the finest in Khurasan. The second earthquake was
particularly severe; the inhabitants on this occasion fled for several days into the plain below the
city. In 618 (1221) the Mongols under Cughiz-Khan sailed up the river. The city of Hamadan,
Allah Mustawfi (c. 1340) and of Ibn Battuta (c. 1350) it had to some extent recovered. After each
earthquake the inhabitants had rebuilt the town on a new site but it never regained its former
importance.

According to the Georgian chronicle (transl. by Broset, Hist. de la Gorie, i. 472), the Georgian
queen Tamar is said to have taken the city of Romgur between 1210 and 1212; Broset identified
this with the Mahalla Ramdaj mentioned by Yakut in the district of Nishapur (more probably a suburb
of it). Here the patriarchs of Antioch, whose jurisdic- tion extended to the upper Khorasan, compiled
in 854 (ed. Schone in his edition of Eusebius i., pp. 82 sq.) already at this time extended to Khurasan
(μέχρι της επιστείας έρημου του Χαραστ), created about 1053 the cathedral of
"Pamuhazes or Pamohazes into Persia which, in
name at least, still existed in 1365 (Brief des
antiochenischen Patriarchen Petros III. an Domi-
nico von Greuze and Aquila, ed. by Cornelius Will,
Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiis Greec.
et Lat. saculis XI composita extant, Leipzig and Mar-
bur 1861, p. 212; Notitia Antiochana, ed. Geizer,
in B. Z., i. 247; ii. Niels Donatpros, ed. Parthey in
Hierocles Symeonus et Notitiae graecae episcop.
atuum, Berlin 1866, p. 273; Acta patriarchatus
Constantinopolitan, i. 207, 464–465; Pref., p. x.).

The modern Nishapur is in 36° 12' N. Lat. and
58° 40' East Long. (Greenwich) on the east side
of a plain surrounded by hills. To the north and
east of the town lies the ridge of Binallah-Kuh,
which separates it from the valley of Meshhed
and Tus. At its foot spring a number of streams,
among them the Shurah Rood and the river of
Dizbeh (Hamid Allah al-Mustawfi) which irrigate
the lands of Nishapur and disappear in the salt
desert to the west. North of the town in the
mountains was the little lake of Cashmab Saba-
out, according to al-Mustawfi, two streams, one
to the east and the other to the west.

Northwest of Nishapur were the famous turquoise
mines (Ma'din: the district is still called Bari-
Ma'den). In the S. E. of the town is shown the
tomb of her celebrated sons 'Omar Khayyam and
Farid al-Din 'Attar.

A history of the 'ilmad of Nishapur was comp-
leted in 8 volumes by Haskan Abi 'Abd Allah
al-Baiji al-Nisaburi (d. 405 = 1014); it was used
by Yakut and Haji Husain al-Khulfa (ed. Fuguel, ii. 155
sq.) and continued by 'Abd al-Qahhar b. Isma'il al-
Farisi down to the year 518. Al-Dhahabi produced
an abbreviated version of the Baiji's work.
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V. Mark, ibid., v, Leipzig 1930, p. 35 (No. 140);
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1931 (Analecta Orientalia, iii.), p. 52 sq.; C.
E. Yate, Khurazan and Sistan, Edinburgh and
London 1900; G. Le Strange, The Lands of
the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905 (repr.
1930), p. 382–388, 429 sq.; P. M. Sykes, A
sixth journey in Persia, in Geogr. Journ.,
xxxvii., 1911; H. R. d'Allemagne, Die Khurazan
an paz de Baktiyar, 1911; W. Barthold,
Turkistan down to the Mongol Invasion, 1928
(G. M. S., N. S., v.), General Index, p. 365
(E. Honigmann).

NISIB (نورم و نزيب and Nisib in the modern
Turkish orthography Nizip), an administrative
district in the Turkish vilayet of Ghazi 'Attab (now officially Gaziantep) which borders
on Syria in the south. The little town lies not far from the right bank of the Euphrates, N. E.
of Halab (Aleppo). Nisib formerly belonged to
northern Syria, to the sandjak of Urfa in the
vilayet of Halab. According to the census of
1927, the whole district had 45,717 inhabitants
of whom only 3,000–4,000 were in the town.
Nisib is noted for its extensive olive groves and
sesame fields, which extend to Kilis (in the same
vilayet but nearly on the Syrian frontier); in this
town the annual production of oil is estimated at
5 million kilos.

Ewiliya Celebi visited Nisib in the xviiith century
and describes it as "an inhabited town in the middle
of an unfertile district on the edge of a high hill,
with inas, mosques, baths and a small market but
without vineyards or gardens". Nisib at this period
was the residence of a judge on the salary scale
of 150 akçe.

During the war (1831–1840) between the Turks
and Egypt under Mehemet 'Ali, Nisib became
the scene of a celebrated battle. Ibrahim Pasha,

The Encyclopedia of Islam, III.
Further the niya must immediately precede the act, lest it should lose its character and become simple decision (ṣawm). It must accompany the act until the end (Abū Ishāk al-Shirāzī, Ṭūnīkh, ed. Jayyoubi, p. 3). Its seat is the heart, the central organ of intellect and attention. Lunatics, therefore, cannot pronounce a valid niya.

So the niya has become a legal act of its own. It is usually called obligatory, but in some cases, e.g. the washing of the dead, commendable. It can even be asked what the intention of the niya is. According to al-Bāḍūrī (p. 57), four conditions must be fulfilled in a niya: who pronounces it, it must be Muslim, compost mentis, well acquainted with the act he wants to perform, and having the purpose to perform this act. In some instances qawma is used, where the later language has nasu (e.g. Nasu, Ṣiyām, bāb 68; Tirmidhi, Ṣiyām, bāb 53).

The term does not occur in the Kurān. It is found in canonical hadith, but the passages show that is has not yet acquired in this literature the technical meaning and limitation described above. The development of this technical use appears to have taken place gradually, probably aided by Jewish influence. In Jewish law the kawmānā has a function wholly analogous to the niya. Al-Shahtī’s († 204 = 820) appears to be acquainted with the niya in its technical sense (Kīthāl al-Uṣūm). In canonical hadith — i.e. the literature which, generally speaking, reflects the state of things up to the middle of the eighth century A.D. — neither the verb nasu nor the noun niya appear to have any special technical connection with the šidāt. On the contrary, niya has here the common meaning of intention.

In this sense it is of great importance. Bukhārī opens his collection with a tradition, which in place of a declaration that he is performing the act, does in their intention only (imama l-māni bi l-niya or bi l-niyār). This tradition occurs frequently in the canonical collections. It constitutes a religious and moral criterion superior to that of the law. The value of an īhdā, even if performed in complete accordance with the precepts of the law, depends upon the intention behind the performer, and if this intention should be sinful, the work would be valueless. *For*, adds the tradition just mentioned, “every man receives only what he has intended”; or “his wages shall be in accordance with his intention” (Māhī. Ḥāyāt, trad. 36). In answer to the question how long the ḥifṣa is open, tradition says: “There is no ḥifṣa after the capture of Mecca, only holy war and intention” (Bukhārī, Manāṣib al-Arāb, bāb 45; Dīthāū, bāb 1, 27; Muslim, Ḥimā, trad. 83, 86 etc.). This higher criterion, once admitted, may suspend the law in several cases (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Islam und Phonography, in T.B.G.K.W., xlii. 393 sqq. = Versp. Geschriften, i. 410 sqq.). So the intention, in this sense, becomes a work of its own, just as the intention in its juridical application. Good intention is taken into account: by Allāh, even if not carried out; it heightens the value of the work. On the other hand, refraining from good intention is reckoned as a good work (Bukhārī, Kīthāl, bāb 31). In this connection the (post-canonical) tradition can be understood, according to which the intention of the faithful is better than his work (Līli al-Arāb, xx. 223: cf. Ghazālī, Ḥayā, iv. 330 sqq., where this tradition
NIYĀZĪ, an Ottoman poet and mystic.

Sama al-Dīn Mehemmed known as Miṣrī Efendi, Shaikh Miṣrī, whose muḥājil was Niyażī, came from Asfūrī, the former summer capital of Malatia (cf. Eswaṭī Celebi, iv, 15; v; Mithke, Reiselschriften, pp. 349), where his father was a Naṣāḥīandi dervish. Niyażī was born in 1027 (1617—1618). The statement occasionally found that Shoghaṣīfī was his birthplace is not correct. His father instructed him in the teaching of the order, then he went in 1048 (1638) to Diyarbakr, later to Mardin where he studied for three years and finally to Cairo. There he joined the Kādirī order, travelled for seven years and finally settled down in the Anatolian village of Elmali, once notorious as a centre of heresy, to devote himself to study under the famous Khaļwetī Shaikh Umni Taṣnīm (d. 1060 = 1658).

He stayed with him for twelve years until he was sent by the Shaikh as his deputy to ʿUṣhāshqī near Smyrna. After the death of his master he moved to Brussa where a pious citizen, Abdal-Čelebi, built a hermitage for him. The fame of his sanctity and his gifts of prophecy spread more and more and finally reached the ears of the grand vizier Koprulu-zâde Ahmad Pasha, who invited him to Adrianople, entertained him with great honour for 40 days and finally sent him back to Brussa. When in 1083 (1672) the army set out for Kemeniec in Podolia (q. v.), he was summoned to Adrianople where he had great audiences as a preacher. As he had allowed himself to drop obscure allusions (kelimāt-i ʿ dazzī) he gave umbrage and was banished to Lemnos. There he spent some years in exile until he received permission to return to Brussa. The fact that during his stay on the island it was spared Venetian attacks was interpreted as a miracle wrought by this holy man. But when he stirred up the people by “kabbalistical” preaching he was again banished to Lemnos in Şafar 1088 (May 1677). All kinds of prophecies which were fulfilled as well as the stories of his coming had been foretold by Ibn al-ʿAtā (q. v.) strengthened his reputation as a holy man and miracle-worker. He spent ten years on Lemnos until in 1101 (1690) the vizier Koprulu-zâde Muṣṭafâ Pasha allowed him to return to Brussa. In the next year he was summoned to Adrianople; he again excited the people by political utterances and mystical allusions so that the Kālimaḵām ʿOṯmān Pasha had him taken with all respect by a guard of Janissaries and Čawsheṣ out of the mosque and sent directly via Gallipoli to Brussa. From there he was again banished to Lemnos but died on the 20th Radjab 1105 (March 17, 1694). The date 1111 (1699) given by v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii, 588 must therefore be wrong.

Unfortunately the contemporary notices give no information about the nature of the sermons by Niyażī which gave offence from the political as well as religious point of view. The historian Demetrios Kantemir said Niyażī was secretly a Christian. His Divān, in Arabic and Turkish, does not justify this suggestion although the poem declared by v. Hammer (G. O. D., iii, 569) to be apocryphal, given in translation by Kantemir, is really taken from his Divān, as Gibb, H. O. P., iii, 315 has proved. No study has yet been made of the Divān or of Niyażī’s position in the religious life of Turkey generally.

The order founded by Niyażī once possessed several monasteries on Greek soil, in Modoni, Negroponte (Eghriboz), Saloniki, Mytilene, also in Adrianople, Brussa and Smyrna. Cf. thereon the study by V. A. Gordel’evsky, Tarikat Mṣri Niyaẓī, in Duklajy Akademiy Nank S. S. R., 1929, p. 153—160.

The main source for the history of Niyażī’s life and work is the rare Turkish treatise of Morrīzide Ṭūsfī (Muṣṭafā Lūsfīlūfī), Tuhfat al-ʿaṣrī fi Manākīb Miṣrī, published at Brussa in 1508 (1690—1691).

Niyażī’s poems were repeatedly published 1254 and 1259 in Bālā, also 1260 and 1291 in Stambul; cf. thereon J. v. Hammer, in Wiener Jahrbiicher, lixxv, p. 36 and J. A., ser. 4, vol. viii., p. 261. On his numerous other works, only available in MSS. of Brūsl Mehemmed Tāhir, ʿOthmānī Mīlāʾifīrī, i, 173 sq. with references to where they are preserved.

his celebrated work, called the Ta'bahār-i Akbari (Traditions), Tāfīr (Commentary on the Kurān) and literature. His tomb is visited by innumerable Muhammadans from all parts of India during the time of his 'Urr (anniversary of his death). His work and the utterances of the saints taken down from his lips by Hasan 'Ali Sandjari (cf. Rue, Cat Brit. Mus., p. 972; Hādīdī Khalīfa, iv. 478); Kāhāt al-Mubīdīn, discourses of the saint uttered in several successive sitting during the year 689 and 690 A. H. and taken down by one of his disciples (cf. Rue, Persan Cat Brit. Mus., p. 973).


NIZĀM AL-MULK, ABD AL-HĀJIB AL-HANAS E. ALI B. ISKĀH AL-ﺘﺼI, the celebrated minister of the Sālджūq sultān Alp Arslān [q.v.] and Malik al-S̱āh [q.v.]. According to most authorities, he was born on Friday 21 Dhū 'l-Ka‘d 408 (April 10, 1018), though the sixth (twelfth) century Turākī Bahārā, which alone supplies us with detailed information about his family, places his birth in 410 (1019-1020). His birth-place was Rādkān, a village in the neighbourhood of Tūs, of which his father was revenue agent on behalf of the Ghaznavid government. Little is recorded of his early life. The Wāsālāī however for a description of the capability of which see J. R. A. S., October 1931: "The Sarguddāshī Sayyidnā, etc.") contains several anecdotes of his childhood, and is also responsible for the statement that he became a pupil in Nāshāpūr of a well known Shāfī'i doctor Hībat Allāh al-Muwaffāk. On the defeat of Mas‘ūd of Ghazna at Dandānīkan in 431 (1040), when most of Khurāsan fell into the hands of the Sīlājkūds, Nizām's father Alī fled from Tūs to Khurāsamārād in his native Bahārā, and thence made his way to Ghazna. Nizām accompanied him, and whilst in Ghazna appears to have obtained a post in a government office. Within a few years of the latter, he left the government for the Sālджūq service, first attaching himself to Caghri-beg's [q.v.] commandant in Balkh (which had fallen to a Sālджūq force in 432 [1040-1041]), and later, probably about 445 (1053-1054), moving to Caghri's own headquarters at Māw. It seems to have been now, or soon after, that he first entered the service of Alp Arslān (then acting as his father's lieutenant in eastern Khurāsan) under his wariz, Alī Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Shāhān. And he so far won Alp Arslān's regard as on Ibn Shāhān's death to be appointed wariz in his stead (then, probably, receiving his best-known labāb). During the period between the death of Caghri-beg in 451 (1059) and that of Tughrī-beg in 455 (1063), therefore, Nizām had the administration of all Khurāsan in his hands.

The fame he thereby acquired, and the fact that now Alp Arslān was firmly attached to him, played a considerable part in prompting Tughrī-beg's wariz al-Kunduri, first, before his master's death, to scheme for the throne to pass to Caghri's youngest son Sulaimān, and then, after it, to do his utmost to prevent Alp Arslān's accession. For he calculated that Alp Arslān, on becoming sultān, would retain Nizām rather than himself in office. In the event al-Kunduri, who
soon found himself too weak to oppose Alp Arslan, and therefore sought to retrieve his position by acknowledging his claim, was retained in his post on the new sultan’s first entry into Raiy. But a month later Alp Arslan suddenly dismissed him and handed over affairs to Niẓām. Al-Kunduri was shortly afterwards banished to Marw al-Rād, where ten months later he was beheaded. His execution was undoubtedly due to Niẓām, whose fears he had aroused by appealing for help to Alp Arslan’s wife.

During Alp Arslan’s reign Niẓām accompanied him on all his campaigns and journeys, which were almost uninterrupted. He was not present, however, at the famous battle of Manzikert, having been sent ahead with the heavy baggage to Persia. On the other hand, Niẓām sometimes undertook military operations on his own, as in the case of the reduction of Iṣṭakhir citadel in 459 (1067). Whose, his or Alp Arslan’s, was the directing mind in matters of policy it is hard to determine. Its main points, however, appear to have been the following: first, the employment of the large numbers of Turkmen that had immigrated into Persia as a result of the Seldjuk success in the future; in fact, part of the army was despatched into Fāṭimid territory: hence the apparently strange circumstance that Alp Arslan’s first enterprise after his accession, despite the precarious condition of the empire he had inherited, was a campaign in Georgia and Armenia; secondly a demonstration that the sultan’s force was both irresistible and mobile, coupled with clemency and generally reinstatement for all rebels that should submit; thirdly the maintenance of local rulers, Shīʿa as well as Sunni, in their positions as vassals of the sultan, together with the employment of members of the Seldjuk family as provincial governors; fourthly the obviation of a dispute over the succession by the appointment and public acknowledgement of Malikshah, though he was not the sultan’s eldest son, as his heir; and lastly the establishment of good relations with the Abbasid caliph al-Kāʾim [q.v.], as the sultan’s nominal overlord.

Niẓām al-Mulk did not really come into his own until after the assassination of Alp Arslan in 465 (1072). But thenceforward, for the next twenty years, he was the real ruler of the Seldjuk empire. He succeeded from the outset in completely dominating the then eighteen-year-old Malikshah, being assisted in this purpose by the defeat of Kaurwābāg’s attempt to secure the throne for himself (for which service Niẓām received the title aṭ-ṭugh [q.v.], thus bestowed for the first time). Indeed in one aspect the history of the reign resolves itself into repeated attempts by the young sultan to assert himself, always in vain. Malikshah undertook fewer campaigns and tours than his father, the prestige of the Seldjuk arms now being such that few would risk rebellion, and warlike operations being left largely to the sultan’s lieutenants, as they had not been under Alp Arslan. Nevertheless, from Iṣṭahār, which had by now become the sultan’s normal place of residence, Malikshah visited the greater part of his empire accompanied by Niẓām. Policy continued on the same lines under Malikshah as under his father. Niẓām, however, was notably less tender than Alp Arslan had been to insubordinate members of the Seldjukid family, insisting at the outset on the execution of Kāwrud, and, later, on the blinding and imprisonment of Malikshah’s brother Takāṣh. Niẓām also reversed during the earlier part of Malikshah’s reign the conciliatory policy originally pursued under Alp Arslan towards the caliph. He had been rewarded for the friendly attitude he first evinced — which formed a welcome contrast to that of al-Kunduri — by the receipt from al-Kāʾim of two new lakhs, viz. ʿIzbān al-Dīn and Raʾīṣ Arvī al-Muʾimin (the latter believed to be the earliest of this type in the case of a waqf); and up to 460 (1068) his relations were fair. In fact, the caliph’s waqf Fakhār al-Dawla ibn Djiḥār [q.v.] became more and more cordial; so much so, indeed, that al-Kāʾim in that year dismissed Ibn Djiḥār, chiefly on account of his too-subservient attitude to the Seldjukid court. To secure this attitude in the caliph’s waqf was, however, the very aim of Niẓām; and on Fakhār al-Dawla’s dismissal he sought to impose a nominee of his own in a certain al-Riḍāwārī, and subsequently in the latter’s son Aḥbā Shūdjaʿ. Al-Kāʾim, to avoid this, reappointed Fakhār al-Dawla, though on condition that his relations with the Seldjukids should not be normal in the future. In fact, Fakhār was, in every respect, strained, till Niẓām came to attribute any unwell event in Baghād to Fakhār’s influence. For many years matters were prevented from coming to a head by the tact of Fakhār’s son, ʿAmīd al-Dawla [cf. Ibn Ṭurjān, 2], who won Niẓām’s favour so far as to marry in turn two of his daughters, Nāṣīḥa and Zubiyya; but in 471 (1075) Niẓām demanded Fakhār’s dismissal, which the caliph al-Muṣṭadī [q.v.] (who had succeeded in 467 [1073]) was obliged to grant. Niẓām now hoped to obtain the office for his own son Muʿayyid al-Mulk; but to this al-Muṣṭadī would not agree. Thenceforward, accordingly, Niẓām’s dislike was directed to al-Muṣṭadī himself, and to Aḥbā Shūdjaʿ, his former protégé, whom the caliph now created deputy waqf in an effort to conciliate him, leaving the waqfrate itself unoccupied till the next year, when he appointed ʿAmīd al-Dawla. But in 474 (1082) Niẓām in turn demanded the dismissal and banishment of Aḥbā Shūdjaʿ, and at the same time composed his quarrel with Fakhār al-Dawla, when the latter was sent on a mission to Iṣṭahār, concerting with him a plan by which Fakhār should watch his interests at Baghād. As a result al-Muṣṭadī, who gave in with a bad grace, lost all confidence in the Banū Djiḥār, and two years later replaced ʿAmīd al-Dawla with the offensive Aḥbā Shūdjaʿ, whereupon Fakhār and ʿAmīd fled to the Seldjukid headquarters. Niẓām, on this, vowed vengeance on al-Muṣṭadī, and at first even seems to have contemplated the abolition of the caliphate (see Muʿāṭ al-Zamān), as a prelude to which he commissioned Fakhār to conquer Dīyār Bakr from the Marwānids [q.v.], the sole remaining Sunni tributaries of any consequence. The Marwānids were duly ousted by 478 (1085); whilst al-Muṣṭadī, on his side, showed himself consistently hostile to Niẓām. But Niẓām’s feelings towards the caliph were in the following year completely transformed as a consequence of his first visit to Baghād (not for the wedding of al-Muṣṭadī to Malikshah’s daughter). The caliph received him very graciously; and thenceforward he became a champion of the caliphate in face of the enmity which developed between al-Muṣṭadī and Malikshah as a result of the marriage.
The celebrity of Nizâm al-Mulk is really due to the fact that he was in all but name a monarch, and ruled his empire with striking success. It was not his aim to innovate. On the contrary, it was to model the new state as closely as possible on that of the Ghaznavids, in which he had been born and brought up. His position was similar to that of his forerunners, the Barkamids (q. v.), and the notable Bûyûd wâzir ʿImâlî b. ʿAbhâd (q. v.). All three may be said to have represented the old Persian civilization (progressively Islamicized, of course) in the face of a rise to empire of barbarian conquerors, Arab, Dailami and many Turkmen. The monarchs were in each case equalled, if not surpassed, by their wazirs, and most of all in the case of Nizâm al-Mulk. For with him the invaders aspired to an emperor’s position whilst still quite unacclimatized to their new habitat, so that his superiority in culture was the more marked (cf. Barthold, Turkistan, p. 308). But in revenge the Saljûqids’ lack of acclimatization stood in the way of a complete realization by Nizâm al-Mulk of the now traditional Perso-Muslim state. Hence the lamentations that recur in the Siyâsê-Nâma.

The Siyâsê-Nâma, written by Nizâm in 484 (1093), with the addition of eleven chapters in the following year, is in a sense a survey of what he had failed to accomplish. It scarcely touches upon the organization of the dîwân, for instance, partly, it is true, because the book was intended as a monarch’s primer, but also because Nizâm, having absolute control of the dîwân, as opposed to the dârgâh (cf. again Barthold, p. 227), had succeeded, with the assistance of his two principal cadijûrs, the mustâwî Shahraf al-Mulk and the maqûl Kamâl al-Dawla, in exactly modelling this, his special department, on traditional lines. Of the dârgâh, on the other hand, Nizâm complains that the sultân’s failed to maintain a sufficient majesty. They were neither magnificent (though he approves their daily free provision of food), formal, nor awe-inspiring enough. At their court, accordingly, the formerly important offices of hâzi, waqîî and amîr-i harat had declined in prestige. Nor, as had his model potentes, would they maintain a sound intelligence service, whereby corruption might be revealed and rebellion forestalled. The Siyâsê-Nâma consists in all of fifty chapters, of advice illustrated by historical anecdotes. The last eleven chapters, added shortly before the wâzir’s assassination, deal with dangers that threatened the empire at the time of writing, in particular from the Ismâ’îlîs (for a review of the world by Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 216–217).

Nizâm’s situation resembled that of the Bûyûd administrators in another respect. He was faced, as they had been, with the problem of supporting a largely tribal army, and solved it likewise by a partial abandonment of the traditional tax-farming system of revenue collection for that of the iqtâ, or sef (q. v.), whereby military commanders supported themselves and then troops on the yield of lands allotted to them. Since in the decay of the ʿAbhâd power provincial amîrs had tended to assume the originally distinct and profitable office of amîl, the way for this development had been paved. The Bûyûds had later attempted to restore the older system, but the establishment of numerous local minor dynasties had favoured the new. Nizâm now systematized it in the larger field open to him. In the Siyâsê-Nâma he insists, however, on the necessity of limiting the rights of fief-holders to the collection of fixed dues, and of setting a short time-limit to their tenures (see on this subject Becker, Stenographie und Lehensverw., in Ist., v. 5).

In the absence of the intelligence service he de-tired, Nizâm contrived to intimidate potential rebels and suppress local tyranny by a judicious display of the might and mobility of the Saljûqids’ army. He also insisted on the periodic appearance at court of local notables such as the Mardinid (q. v.), and ʿOṣâyîlids (q. v.), and proclaimed the sultân’s accessibility to appeals for the redress of wrongs by means of notices circulated throughout the empire and exposed in public places (see al-Mâfarukhî, Makhirn-i Istahân). He also gained the powerful support of the ʿalâmâ, especially those of the Shâfi‘i school, of which he was an ardent champion, by the institution of innumerable pious foundations, in particular of madrasâs, most celebrated being the Nizâmîya of Baghdad (opened 459 = 1067), the earliest west of Khursâân; by the general abolition of mukâṣ (taxes un sanctioned by the shârî’a) in 479 (1080–81); and by undertaking extensive public works particularly in connection with the hâdîqâ. After the Hîdâjâ had returned from Fâtimid to ʿAbhâsid allegiance in 468 (1076), he exerted himself to make the ʿIrâq road safe from brigandage for pilgrims, as well as to diminish their expenses; and from the next year until that of his death the journey was accomplished without mishap. It was not until the second half of Malikshâh’s reign that the full effects of Nizâm’s achievement made themselves felt. By 476 (1083–84), however, such were the unwonted security of the roads and the low cost of living that reference is made to them in the annals.

Nizâm al-Mulk was naturally much sought after as a patron. The poet al-Mâizzly (q. v.) accuses him of having “no great opinion of poetry because he had no skill in it”, and of paying “no attention to anyone but religious leaders and mystics” (see Câhîr Mašâila, transl., p. 46). But though his chaitly, which was profuse (see for example al-Sulûk, iii. 41), went in large measure to men of religion — among them the most notable objects of his patronage being Âbâ Išāk al-Shârî (q. v.) and al-Ghâzâlî (q. v.) — he was clearly a lavish patron also of poets, as is testified by the Damaqy al-Kâyr of al-Bâkhkârî (q. v.), the greater part of which is devoted to his panegyrist. In another sphere, the inauguration of the Dârgâh calendar (q. v.) in 466 (1074) was probably due to his encouragement, since at this time his ascendency over Malikshâh was at its most complete.

For the first seven years of Malikshâh’s reign Nizâm’s authority went altogether unchallenged. In 472 (1079–80), however, two Turkish officers of the court instigated Malikshâh into killing a protégé of the wâzir; and in 473 (1080–81) again, the sultân insisted on disbanding a contingent of Armenian mercenaries against Nizâm’s advice. Malikshâh now began to hope, indeed, for the overthrow of his mentor, showing extraordinary favour to officials such as Ibn Bahmanyar and, later, Saiyid al-Ruṣâsî, who were bold enough to criticize him. Ibn Bahmanyar went so far as to attempt the wâzir’s assassination (also 473),
whereas Saiyid al-Ru‘asā‘ contented himself with words. But in each case Niẓām was warned; and the culprits were blinded. In the case of Ibn Bahmanvār, in whose guilt a court jester named Dījāfarak was also implicated, Malikshāh retaliated by contriving the murder of Niẓām’s eldest son Dījam al-Mulk, who had taken Dījāfarak’s execution into his own hands (475 = 1082). After the fall of Saiyid al-Ru‘asā‘ in 476 (1083–1084), however, the sulṭān left plotting till, some years later, a new favourite, Tāj al-Mulk, caught his fancy.

All went well with Niẓām al-Mulk till 483 (1090–1091). In that year, however, occurred the first serious challenge to the Saljuqīd power, when al-Baṣra was sacked by a force of Karmaṭians; and almost simultaneously their co-sectary the Assassin leader al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāḥ [q. v.] obtained possession of the fortress of Alamūt, from which repeated attacks failed to dislodge him. Meanwhile, moreover, an awkward problem had arisen over the succession to the sulṭānate, on account of the death in turn of Malikshāh’s two eldest sons, Dāwūd (474 = 1082) and Aḥmad (481 = 1088). These sons had both been children of the Čarbhāgī princess Terken Khatūn (see Dāmīr al-Tawārīḵ), who had borne the sulṭān a third son, Mahmūd, in 480 (1087). She was eager for Mahmūd to be formally declared heir. Niẓām, however, was in favour of Barkiyārūḵ [q. v.], Malikshāh’s eldest surviving son by a Saljuqīd princess. Hence Terken became his bitter enemy, and joined with Tāj al-Mulk, who was in his service, in instigating Malikshāh against the wāzir.

Tāj al-Mulk accused Niẓām to the sulṭān, who by this time was in any case incensed with the wāzir’s championship of al-Muṣṭafid, of extravagant expenditure on the army and of nepotism; and Malikshāh’s wrath was finally inflamed beyond bearing by an unguarded reply made by Niẓām to a formal accusation of these practices. But even so he did not dare to dismiss him. (The earliest historian to assert that he was dismissed is Raḥshid al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, who appears to have misunderstood the purport of some verses by al-Nahlāṣā quoted in the Kāfijat al-Sanā‘ī, and really composed after Niẓām’s death). Niẓām al-Mulk was assassinated on 10th Ramaḍān 485 (October 14, 1092) near Sīhāna, between Kanguwar and Bisūṭīn, as the court was on its way from Isfahān to Baghādād. His murderer, who was disguised as a Šāfī, was immediately killed, but is generally thought to have been an emissary of al-Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāḥ. Contemporaries, however, seem to have put the murder down to Malikshāh, who died suddenly less than a month later, and to Tāj al-Mulk, whom Niẓām’s retainers duly tracked down and killed within a year. And Raḥshid al-Dīn combines the two theories, stating that the wāzir’s enemies at court concerted it with the Assassins. The truth is therefore uncertain; but as Raḥshid al-Dīn is one of the earliest historians to whom the Assassin records were available, his account would seem to deserve attention.

The extraordinary influence of Niẓām al-Mulk is attested by the part played in affairs after his death by his relatives, despite the fact that only two appeared to have displayed much ability. For the next sixty years, except for a gap between 517 (1123) and 528 (1134), members of his family held office under princes of the Saljuqīd house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al-Fākīh al-Adji’īl</th>
<th>al-Mulk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niẓām</td>
<td>al-Mulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāhāb al-Islām, ważir</td>
<td>to Sandjar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakhr al-Mulk, ważir to Tutush</td>
<td>486–488, to Barkiyārūḵ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥāyīd al-Mulk, ważir to Barkiyārūḵ</td>
<td>486–488, to Barkiyārūḵ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻĪzz al-Mulk, ważir to Barkiyārūḵ</td>
<td>485–487, to Muḥammad Sandjar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻĪzz al-Mulk, ważir to Muḥammad</td>
<td>500–504, to al-Mustarshīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāms al-Mulk, ważir to Muḥammad</td>
<td>500–504, to al-Mustarshīd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with a model battalion of 1,600 men was raised, to be composed of volunteers. This body was formed of young men of different nationalities and religions, mostly Austrian or Russian deserters collected during the war with Russia. The result was that the force enjoyed little prestige and native Turks only joined it in small numbers, with the consequence that this corps, popularly called încenc 'askeri, consisted of only a few hundred man and was unable to attain to the strength of a battalion (1,600) until 1799. The Sultan's force trained and armed on European lines was limited to this body. The Sultan employed foreign officers, mainly from England, Sweden and Spain, to train the soldiers and see to the management of the arsenals, shipbuilding and fortifications. Large barracks and ammunition depots were built. The new revenue earmarked for military purposes which by 1797–1798 amounted to 60,000 purses, i.e. 48,000,000 francs (cf. Djedvet, Tarihî, viii. 139 sq.), supplied the necessary funds. Internal difficulties, especially the ever increasing number of opponents of reform, prevented the Sultan from completely realising his plans. The name Nizâm-i djidid became more and more hateful and pejorative so that it finally decided to abolish it altogether and to call the corps of regular troops Sejmên or Sığah, i.e. "kennelmen." On Selim's deposition it was disbanded. Under his successor Mustafâ [q.v.] the attempt was made to revive the Nizâm-i dji did. The Austrian renegade Sulaimân Agha who had previously commanded the division quartered in Lewend Ciftlik was ordered to reconstitute it again secretly, but this effort met with no permanent success (cf. Zinkeisen, G.O.R., vii. 552 sq.).


**NIZÂM ŞÂH, title assumed in 895 (1490) by Malik Aḥmad Bahri, founder of the Nizâm Şâhi state of Ahmândagar [q.v.], one of the five independent sultânates which arose out of the ruins of the Bahmani kingdom of the Dakhân towards the end of the fifteenth century. For a chronological list and genealogical table of these kings of Ahmândagar see Cambridge History of India, ii. 704–705; also Zambar, Manuel, p. 298–299.**

The second ruler, Burhân Nizâm Şâh I (914–960 = 1509–1553), adopted, in 1537, the Şâh's form of Islam which, except for a brief period under Isâîlî when the Mahdawis were in power, became the established religion of this kingdom. During Burhân's reign an unsuccessful attempt was made by the anti-Dakhân party known as the Foreigners, to place his brother, Râjdâdî, upon the throne. The flight of the defeated rebel to Berâr, combined with the refusal of 'Alî al-Ibrāhîm Şâh to surrender Pâhti, the home of Burhân's Brahmân ancestors, led to war with Berâr and to the capture of Pâhti. It was a dispute as to the possession of Sholâpur, the chief bone of contention between Ahmândagar and the neighbouring kingdom of Bîdjabur, that caused Burhân to adopt the disastrous policy of joining forces with Sâdâtshârâvîyya of Vîjâyânâgar, as a result of which the Hindu monarch was able to annex the Râjâtîr Dîwân to his dominions, while Burhân was successful in capturing the fortress of Sholâpur.
Burhan was succeeded, after a period of civil warfare, by his son Husain who reigned until 712 (1313). His reign, however, is of outstanding importance in the history of the Dakhân, for it was at this time that the Muslim rulers of this area, with the exception of Berar, irritated by the overbearing insolence of Sadāghārvārya and realizing the strength of the Hindu menace in the south, combined to crush the military power of Vijayānagar at the battle of Tālikota (712 = 1565).

In the same year Husain was gathered to his fathers and his son, Murutdā Niţâm Shâh I (712 – 794 = 1565 – 1566), reigned in his stead. Murutdā, called Diwāña or Madman, neglected the affairs of his kingdom for a life of dissipation, the real power being in the hands of his ministers. An unsuccessful attempt was made during this reign to drive the Portuguese out of India, but the effort came too late, for, during the critical years when the Portuguese had been establishing themselves along the coast, the forces which might have united to hurl the invaders into the sea had been engaged in inglorious internecine conflicts. The most important event in this reign was the annexation of Berar, in 792 (1574).

The subsequent history of this dynasty, until the Mughal invasions of the Dakhân, is unimportant. Full details will be found in the pages of Fīqihāt, the national annals of the dominion. The efforts of the dowager queen, Când Bibi, the imperial forces conquered Aḥmadnagar in 796. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the incorporation of the Niţâm Shâhi dominions in the Mughal Empire was effective under Akbar. All attempts by his successor Dāh Hundreds to complete his father’s policy were frustrated by the organizing ability of Malik Ambar, an able Abyssinian minister, who was in charge of the affairs of Aḥmadnagar until his death in 1035 (1626). It was not until 1042 (1633), in the reign of Shabhdhāman, that this kingdom was finally annexed, although for some years afterwards the Marâghâ leader Shâh Shâh attempted to resuscitate the Niţâm Shâhi dynasty.

Bibliography: Alí b.ʿArīz Allah Šābabʾi, Burhān-i Mâqīr, annotated translation by H. W. Haig, Bombay 1923; Mâhâm Mâhâm Fīshā, Ġulīqān-i Irānšāhī, Bombay 1852; Sir T. W. Haig, Cambridge History of India, vol. iii., ch. xvii. (C. Collin Davies)

NIZĀM, NIZĀM AL-DĪN ABU MUḤAMMAD ILĀYAS B. YUSUF, ONE OF THE GREATEST POETS OF PERSIA. He was born in Ganjīdā, the later Elsavetpol in 535 (1140–1141). His parents died while he was still quite young so that the education of his brothers and of his younger brother had to be undertaken by his uncle. From Niţâm’s poems, it is apparent that his uncle very soon followed his parents to the grave. Nevertheless the two boys succeeded in getting an excellent education, for Niţâm’s brother, who wrote under the pen-name of Kiwâmi Mutârri, attained a very high skill as a writer of kâfīs (an ingenious kâfī by him is given in Browne, Lit. Hist. of Pers., ii. 47 sg.). Niţâm was thrice married and had a son named Mâhâm Mâhâm. The poet was interested in Siyâṣah and studied in Sufi circles under a certain Shahīd Aĥšū Farrukh Râhānī. Nothing more is known about his career and it may be presumed that he led a relatively uneventful life, as he says himself that he avoided the bustle of princes’ courts and had a strictly ascetic conception of life. Neverthe-
it is not on his chivalrous adventures that stress is laid but on seven stories related to the hero by seven kings' daughters with whom he is in love. Each of these stories is associated with a day of the week, a planet and a colour. They form a masterpiece of Oriental story-telling which has never been surpassed and their grotesque and gruesome fantasy is particularly effective. As a master of fantasy, Niẓāmī recalls F. T. A. Hoffmann and J. Callot and is able to make his readers visualise his wonderful pictures just as vividly as the European masters. Besides these large works, Niẓāmī left a lyrical Divān of which only three MSS. are known (Bodleian, No. 618, 619 and Berlin, Fetsch Cat., No. 691) and which so far has received little attention. It contains no καθισια in the court style and is distinctly Şafī in tone.

Niẓāmī's works are of the greatest importance in the history of Persian literature. They mark the zenith of epic poetry in Persia, as in them for the first time the antithesis between the language of the lyric and the archaic style of the epic is overcome and the epic is brought into the milieu of the time, which until this time was already fully developed in the lyric. The epic however at the same time loses its heroic character and devotes itself more and more to psychological characterisation at which Niẓāmī was a master. The overloading with learning, which in time came to choke the action completely, is very noticeable.

Niẓāmī's influence on the later poets was unusually strong. A whole series of important poets, among them men like Amīr Khusrav Dihlawī, Khwādžū Kirmānī, Kātibi, Dāmān, Hāfīz and even the great mystic Farid al-Dīn 'Attār and the great master of Cagāhat poetry Mir 'Ali-Shir Nawī, tried their skill in niṣāras on Niẓāmī's Aʿbādāt (the number of poems in later writers rises to seven).

In spite of its great importance, so far critical editions of parts only of the Khamsa have appeared and we are dependent for the rest on bad Indian lithographs or manuscripts difficult of access. It is most desirable to put an end to this state of affairs and devote greater attention in Europe to the study of Niẓāmī.


(E. Berthelez)
of the first rank, to judge by the fragments that survive; in any case it was very inferior to his prose. Auch Brown says is almost unequalled in Persian.

The Čâdâr Mojâfa consists of four discourses, each of which deals with one of the classes of men whom the author regards as indispensable in the service of Kings: secretaries, poets, astrologers and physicians. Each discourse begins with general considerations, which are followed by anecdotes, often from the writer's personal experience. The number of these anecdotes, which form the most interesting and valuable part of the book, is about forty; some give valuable information on the literary and scientific state of Persia. We may say that the "Four Discourses" (especially the second) and Awšâl's Lâhab are the two old works which deal systematically with Persian poetry. Dawlatshâh made a great deal of use of it (cf. Brown, Sources of Dawlatshâh, in J. R. A. S., 1899, p. 37-66). We may specially point out that it is to Nizâmi that we owe the earliest notice of Firdawsí and the only contemporary reference to Khayyám. On the other hand, we must point out the historical inaccuracy of certain passages, even in the case of events in which Nizâmi claims to have taken part. His book is mentioned or quoted by Awshâl (Lâhab), Isfandîyâr (Jâhil, of Tahârat), Muwâfî, Khâzûn (Târîkhi Gohi), Dâ'îmî (Silisht al-Dhâkah), Ghastari (Nûrîstân), Hâdîjî Khâla speaks of a Madâ'î al-Nâvâ'îr, though he thinks it is different from the Čâdâr Mojâfa; but Mirzâ Muhammad Khâzûn has shown that this is another title of the same book.


(H. Massâ').

NIZâMI, Hasan, a Persian historian whose full name was Şâder al-Dîn Muhammad b. Hasan. Born in Nishâpûr, he went on the advice of his shaikh Muhammad Kûfi he left to give an opportunity to his remarkable talents as a stylist. A severe illness forced him to leave Ghariz. and he went to Dâbih. He was appointed to court historian to the Pathân Sulhâns and began to 602 (1206) a great historian's work Tâdî al-Mâshir fi Târîkhi, which brought him great fame. He deals with the history of the first three Pathân Sulhâns of Delhi - Muhammad b. Sâm (588-602 = 1192-1206), Kûf al-Dîn Alâbâk (602-607 = 1206-1210) and Shams al-Dîn Ilutmish (607-633 = 1210-1235). The book begins with the capture of Adâmîr by Mu'izz al-Dîn in 587 (1191) and ends with the appointment of Na'îr al-Dîn Muhammad as governor of Lahore (614 = 1217). An Appendix contains a panegyric of Ilutmish and his campaigns of conquest. The work was very highly esteemed in the Muslim east as a model of elegant style. It is written in high flow and is less a language art than a large number of poetical passages inserted in it. It is only with difficulty that the historical facts can be extricated from the medley of rhetoric but nevertheless the book is of undeniable value for the history of India and Afghanistan.

Bibliography: Rieu, Catalogue, i. 239; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, ii. 204-243; N. Lees, in J. R. A. S., 1868, p. 433; Flügel, Catalogue Viennæ, ii. 173 (No. 951); W. Potts, Die persischen Handschriften der... Bull. z. Götha, p. 53: E. Blochet, Catalogue des ms. persans de la Bibli. Nationale, Paris 1905, i. 333; C. Salomon and v. Rosen, Indices alphabet. codicum ms. persicorum... in Bull. Imp. Litterarum Universitatis Petropolitanae, St. Petersburg 1888, p. 12, No. 578. On the biography of the author see also Miskhônd (lit., Bombay, i. 7. (E. Berskès).}

NIZAMI-SHâH (i.e., Hîr-yi Nizâm-Shâh) "ambassador of Nizâm-Shâh" of the Dakhân), a Persian historian whose real name was Khîrshâh b. Kûhâl al-Husâini. Born in the Persian 'Iraq, he entered the service of Sultan Burhân (cf. Nizâm-Shâh). The latter being converted to the Shi'a sent Khîrshâh as ambassador to Tâhmsâp-Shâh Safawi. Reaching Raiy in Radjab 952 (Sept. 1545), he accompanied the Shah to Georgia and Shirwân during the campaign of 953 (1546) against Alkây-Mirzâ. He stayed in Persia till 971 (1563), perhaps with occasional breaks. He died at Golconda on the 15th Dhu 'l-Kâda 972 (June 24, 1564).

Khîrshâh's chief work is the Tûrîkhi-i Hîr-yi Nizâm-shâh, a general history from the time of Adam bây on each source taken from Dâbih, Tûrîkhi-i gushta, Fâtar-nâmâ, Hâlib al-Suyûrî, the Memoirs of Shâh-Tâhmasp" etc. The book is divided into a preface and seven mojâfas, each of which is again divided into several gusfâr. The most important part of this work is that which refers to the reign of Tâhmsâp-Shâh (in the Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 153, written in 972 = 1565, the events come down to 969) and to the local dynasties of the Caspian provinces: Mâzandârân, Gilân, Shirwân. The two manuscripts in the British Museum show differences in their contents: Add. 23,513 (written in 1093 = 1684) has passages added by some continuator, and taken from Dâbih and a document of Ahmad b. Muhammad Ghâfî. The later additions of Or. 153 come down as late as 1200.

According to Fir âstâ, "Shâh Khîrshâh", during the reign of Ibrâhîm Kûsh-Shâh of the Deccan (957-988) also wrote a history of the Kûsh-Shâhis [i. v.]. It is difficult to reconcile this with a continuous stay in Persia from 952 to 971.

Bibliography: Rieu, Catalogue, p. 107—111; Schefer, in his Chrestomathie persane, ii., 1885, p. 5815-133) printed the sections relating to the Caspian provinces.

(Y. Minorsky).

NIZâR b. MA'ADD, a common ancestor of the greater part of the Arab tribes of the north, according to the accepted genealogical system. Genealogy: Nizâr b. Ma'add b. 'Adnân (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tabellen, A. 3). His mother, Mu'mâna bint Uhlâla, was descended from the pre-Arab race of the Djarum. Genealogical legend which has preserved mythological features and folklore relating to several eponyms of Arab tribes is almost silent on the subject of Nâzîr (an etymological article about his name: Tâdî al-A'mâs, in. 563, 15-17 from the Kâ'âd al-Dir' of al-Suhali [i. 8, g-86] is without doubt of very late origin as is shown by the connection which is established
with the prophetic mission of Muḥammad; the same etymology from *nazar* "insignificant" is further found in Ibn Duraṣ, Kīrāb al-ṣāḥib al-ṣāliḥ, p. 20, 62 *Muṣjadiyya*, ed. Lyall, p. 763, 16 (without the story in question). Tradition has more to say about his four sons Kābi', Muḍār, Anmār, Ḣiṣād and about the partition of the paternal heritage among them, in connection with which they visited the Djarūmi ḥabām al-Afīs. Their adventures on the journey (they are able to describe minutely the appearance of a camel they have never seen from the traces it has left) form the subject of a popular story which has parallels among other peoples; its object is to make the origins of the *ḥādiqah* go back to the most remote period (al-Mufaḍḍal b. Salama, al-ṣāliḥ, p. 155–156 and the sources there quoted; Tabārī, i. 1108–1110 etc.); it perhaps is of interest to note that the story was known to Voltaire who introduced it into his Zadig.

As Robertson Smith showed half a century ago (Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, p. 5 991, 283–289) and as Götzüther has confirmed by numerous quotations (Mukaddamische Studien, i. 1915, p. 92), the name Nīzār only appears late in Arab poetry, while that of Maʿād (which is found as early as the Byzantine historians Propozius and Nonnus) appears quite early in it, although its ethnic character is rather vague (as that of `Adnān, still more comprehensive, one of the oldest historians of Arab poetry, Muḥammad b. Sallām, d. 230 = 844–845, had already pointed out that his name was almost unknown in ancient poetry, Tabārī, al-Sīrah, ed. Hell, p. 5, 1; cf. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, al-Ināʿāth, p. 102, and Kūfah: Cairo 1359, p. 48). Before the Umayyad period the only trace we find of the use of Nīzār as an ethnic is in a verse of the pre-Islamic poet Biṣr b. Abī Khāzim (in the Mannāfi, p. 667, 1) and in another of Kāb b. Zuhair (in Tabārī, i. 1106, 10), in the verse of Ḥassān b. Ḥithāib, ed. Hirschfeld, lx. 2, the reference is to another Nīzār, son of Maʿād b. ʿAmīr b. Luṣayy (Wustenfeld, Tabellen, p. 15) belonging to the Kūraish. The line in Umayyad b. Abī ʿl-Salt, ed. Schultheiss, U, i. 10, in which the descent of the Ṭāḥif from Nīzār is celebrated, is apocryphal and is connected with the known dispute regarding the origin of the Ṭāḥif. The story of the verdict of al-Akāb b. Ḥabīs al-Tamimi in favour of Djarīr b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrahi against Khālid b. Ṭāhā al-ṣāliḥ (Yahiyā), ed. Bevan, p. 141–1425; cf. Ibn Hishām, Sīra, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 50) in which there is a reference to Nīzār and which is placed before Islam, is not less suspect; its object is to defend the northern origin of the Baṣrāh (descendants of Annār), often disputed, as well as that of their brethren the Kūraish [q.v.], and to refuse the same origin to the Kāb descendants of the Ḥādiqah, to which it was attributed just at the time of the strife that raged around the succession to Yazīd I. The raidaz quoted by Ibn Hishām, Sīra, p. 49 (and often elsewhere; they are sometimes attributed to ʿAmīr b. Murra al-Dhuḥānī, a contemporary of the Prophet, and sometimes to a certain al-Allāh b. al-Yaḥyā, otherwise unknown) in which we find used with reference to Ḥuṣayn, the verb tanazzura "to announce oneelf to be descended from Nīzār" may be regarded as apocryphal. No need need be laid on the isolated reference in al-Balādhuri (Futūḥ, ed. de Goeje, p. 276, 16) to the quarters (khaṭṭ) of the Banū Nīzār in Kūfah contrasted with those of the Yamani; his language simply reflects the position in the author's time or that of his sources, later than the great revolution of the first century A.H.

It is only from this period, and to be more exact after the battle of Mardj Kāḥib (65 = 684) won by the Kūfah over the Kāṣīs, that we begin to find the name Nīzār recurring with increasing frequency; it occurs mainly in the poetry: Djarīr, al-Farāzāsāk, al-andezā, al-Kuṭāmah, Zuhair b. al-Ḥāṣim use it to designate the common source of the tribes of the north, contrasting it with the terms "Yaman" or "Kaḥīţa". The expression Ibnū Nīzārīn "the two sons of Nīzār" becomes regular; it indicates the Muḍār (Kāṣīs al-Aṣṣāh) and the Rāmūs as belonging to one ethnic group; they were previously regarded as unrelated to one another. The tribes descended from Annār (cf. above) and Ḣiṣād (the fourth son of Nīzār; but other sources make him a son of Maʿād) appear only rarely as members of the group. This is what the genealogical systematisation seeks to explain by alleged migrations of Annār and Ḣiṣād into the groups of Yamani tribes. But the implication of the term Nīzār continued to remain vague, more so than those of Kāṣīs, Muḍār and Rābī, which represent very large groups but more precise than that of Maʿād, of which it tends to take the place. This is due to the fact that the term Nīzār corresponds to a political ideal rather than to a historical reality; in the latter the reigning dynasty, claiming descent from Kūraish (themselves, consequently, Nīzāris) had as their henchmen the Kūfah, one of the most powerful Yamani tribes, while the Azd, another tribe of the south, bound to the policy of their most illustrious representatives, the Mahallabids, were sometimes on the side of the Umayyads and sometimes against them. It was this complicated position that gave rise to the attempt to separate the Ḥuada (i.e. the Kūfah) from the southern stock in order to make them descendants of Nīzār. The story told in Alghaynī, xi. 160–161, al-Baki, Muḍjam, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 14–15 is intended to explain the separation of the Ḥuada from the rest of the Nīzāris as a result of the murder of the Nīzāri Yadhīkur b. ʿAnaza by the Kūfah ʿHaṣimā b. Ṣaḥdān. The lines in Djarīr (Nūqūt ʿl-id, p. 994) sum up very completely the way in which the Ḥuada-Kāb were connected with the Nīzār, while elsewhere (e.g. ibid., p. 261: al-Farazāsāk) Ḥuada and Nīzār are opposed. Later, at the end of the Umayyad period and especially in the period of the struggle in Kūraish which was the prelude to the fall of the dynasty, Nīzār (also in the form Nīzārūn) became the term of designation which was contrasted with Yamaniya: henceforth the Banū Nīzār were to be the representatives of northern Arabism: as early as the period of decline of the Umayyads, the poet al-Kumait b. Zaid al-Asadi [q.v.] had composed a long poem, the Muṣakhakab, exalting the Nīzār at the expense of the Kāḥīţa; nearly a century later, the Yamani Dūūl [q.v.] replied to him; these poetical jousts on which the ṣālaḥiyya, nationalist fanaticism, of the two great ethnic groups of the Arabs was nourished, continued down to quite a late date, especially among the Yaḥūd of the Yaman.

From what has been said it is evident that we cannot speak of Nīzār as of a tribe having had
a real historical existence nor, as is the case with the Ma'add, as a comprehensive term indicating an effective grouping together of tribes of different origin. Nizār is simply a fictitious invention, a label intended to serve political interests. One must however ask whence the name came and what were the precedents which suggested its use in the sense above outlined. The problem has not yet been thoroughly studied and perhaps we do not possess the material necessary to solve it. It is possible that the history of the four sons of Nizār (cf. above), a popular story the nature and diffusion of which seem to take it back to a very early period and which originally had nothing to do with genealogical tradition, supplied the names on which the nizār later gave their imagination free play. But this is a pure supposition which would have to be confirmed by definite proofs.


NOBIZAR B. AL-MUSTA‘īR

Dolmān, born 10th Rabi‘ I 437 (Sept. 26, 1045).

On the death of his father, having been displaced by his younger brother al-Mustālī [q.v.], Nizār fled to Alexandria, took the title of al-Mustafāli-Din Allāh, and rose in revolt early in 488 (1095) with the assistance of the governor, Naṣr al-Dawla Aftakīn, who was jealous of al-‘Afjal, and the population of the city. He was at first successful in driving back al-‘Afjal and advanced as far as the outskirts of Cairo, supported by Arab auxiliaries. Al-‘Afjal again took the field against him, and after a short siege in Alexandria he surrendered towards the end of the same year, was taken to Cairo, and there immured by order of al-Mustālī.

By the Ismā‘īlī organization in Persia (see the art. Al-Ḥasan b. Al-Ṣabāḥī), Nizār was recognized as the rightful successor of al-Mustansir, and this, with its offshoots in Syria, formed a new group (al-la‘wā al-djādīda), opposed to the Mustashi group (al-la‘wā al-kudrīna), now known as Khudjas [q.v.] and Bohārās [q.v.] respectively. A party of the Nizārīya at first held to the belief that Nizār was not dead and would return as the Mahdi or in company with him, but the majority held that the line of Nizār was continued by the Grand Master of Alamut.

Bibliography: See under al-Mustālī; also Ibn Khalilīkān, transl. de Slane, i. 160—161 (from al-Nuwayrī); Sīdījlīm, al-Mustansir bi’llāh, MS., S. O. S., London, Ns. 35 and 43 (cf. B. S. O. S., vii. 307 sqq.).

[Hi. A. R. Ghil]

NOAH. [See NoH.]

NOVIBAZAR or YENI BAZAR is the name of a former (down to 1912) Turkish sanjaḵ in what was once the vilâyêt of Kosto; it now belongs to Jugo-Slavia. The district through which the river Lim flows and which is therefore also called the Lim district (area 7,350 sq. km. with 120,000 inhabitants of whom 1/4 are Christian Serbs and 1/4 Muhammadan Albanians), was bounded on the north by Bosnia and separated Serbia from Montenegro. The importance of Novibazar was for military reasons as it secured communications between Bosnia and Serbia (cf. ‘Ammār) and the same time prevented communication between Serbia and Montenegro. By art. 85 of the Treaty of Berlin, Austria-Hungary held the western part of the sanjaḵ (the Lim district) from Sept. 1879 to 1908, namely the towns of Plevje (Turk. Tağlıda), Prijepele and Bjelopole with a garrison of some 3,000 men, while the southern part, the kaza of Mitrovica, was returned to the Turks. After it was handed over in 1908, Novibazar formed a bone of contention between Turkey, Serbia and Montenegro. In 1912 the sanjaḵ was conquered by Montenegro (Bjelopole Oct. 12, Tusi Oct. 14, Berane Oct. 16, Gusanje Oct. 20, Plevje Oct. 24) and Serbia (Novibazar Oct. 23, Sjenica Oct. 24) and in 1913 divided between the two countries.

The district forms with Zeta the ancestral home of former Serbia and roughly corresponds to the ancient Rascia. The chief town Novibazar (in the official spelling Novipazar) is situated above the level on the Raska, is now an impoverished place of 11,000 inhabitants with miserable houses and poor streets. In the middle ages however, it was of considerable importance as the imposing remains of churches monasteries and baths around it show. Not far from it lie the ruins of the town of Rakovica, capital of the old Serbian Kingdom and already mentioned in Byzantine history in the 8th century (’Páro), where the Nemanjić prince Stephen held his court for a time. The settlement of Pazariste or Trygoviste there was called by the Turks Eskī Bazar, “Old Market”. A subābi is mentioned as being there in 1459 after the conquest of the land by the Turks (1456) and in 1461 a kāți. The Turks then founded a New Market not far away, Yeňi Bazar, which soon became the capital of the whole district. The Ragusa historian Laciari says the founder of Novibazar was Ese, i.e. undoubtedly Isk-Beg (1444—1460, from 1453 governor of Sarajevo), son of Isk-Beg (1414—1444), both of whom were governors in Uskub (Skopje) and were among the most important Turkish leaders of the time. The foundation of Novibazar must have taken place about 1460 for a year later we find mention for the first time in the archives of Ragusa of Ragusan merchants in Novibazar. In 1467 we already find a kāți and a subābi in Novibazar. The town from the end of the XVth century was frequently visited and described by western travellers as it lay on the old trade route from Ragusa (Dubrovnik) to Nish. The knight Arnold v. Hæff mentions Novibazar in about 1499 as Nunwamarchet. John Chrysostom (cf. Le voyage de Monseigneur d'Armançon, ed. Ch. Schair, Paris 1887, p. 11) describes Novibazar as ville non fermée, assez marchande. While these and other travellers of the XVIth century like Benedict Kurpišić (1530; cf. Benedikt Curipéschitz, Itinerarium der Botschaften des Jos. v. Lamberg, etc., ed. by Elenore Grönfin Lemberg-Schwarzburg, Innsbruck 1910, p. 43 sqq.), Catarino Zeno (1550, in his Descrizione del viaggio di Constantinopoli, 1550 in the Stärte of the Yugoslav Academy of Agram, vol. x.) and Melchior v. Selditz (1555, in his Gründlichen Beschreibung der Wallfahr, Gorlitz 1580) were very little impressed by Novibazar, Paolo Contarini (1580, in his Diario del viaggio de Venezia a Constantinopoli, Venice 1856: note on Girmian-Frankancion) and the Sieur de
Stochove (c. 1630, cf. *Voyage du Sieur de Stochove fait es années 1630, 1631, 1632, 1633*, Brussels 1643, p. 30: at second hand and not from his own observation) and also Louis de Hayes, Sieur de Courmenin (1621, in *Voyage de Laos out par le commandement de Rey en année 1621 par Le Sieur L[i]e[C] Courmenin*, Paris 1624) devote far more attention to it. P. Contarini spent a day of rest in the caravanserai of Novibazar (New Bazar) which he found was a town with 6,000 Turkish and 100 Christian houses. He mentions the Ragan settlement and the 16 mosques, the very long bazaar, which attains all kinds of local and international stores for sale (mostly articles of iron from the adjoining Günhavica in the S.E. of Novibazar which was as early as 1396 the seat of an Ottoman judge and had a customs house). The Sieur de Stochove describes *La ville de Genti Bazar, qui en Turez veut dire nouveau marché, elle est située sur la petite rivière de Rusa en un lieu haut et bas, et qui en rend la vue fort agréable, son circuit est de demy lieue sans entrer enfermé de murailles, est la ville la plus considérable que l'on trouve depuis la frontière* (i.e. the Dalmatian-Bosnian frontier). Louis de Hayes in 1621 found Igni Bazar (i.e. Yeli Bazar) a pleasant place with one storey houses. It was under the government of Barija judges and the Chief Kadi of Sarajevo (q.v.). The description given by the traveller Ewliya Çelebi (q.v.) of his visit to Novibazar (1669) (v. 544 sq.) is as usual full of exaggerations. He says there were 45 quarters in Novibazar, 23 large and 11 small mosques, 5 medresses and 2 monasteries. Of the mosques he mentions the Altun mosque and the mosque of Ghazi Tsk-Beg formerly a church, and the Taghçupru mosque and mosque of “Hadjagi mašterem” (2). The bazaar had 1,110 shops, and there were 7 churches of the *Serbs, Bulgars and Latins* in Novibazar. He particularly praises the white unmixed bread and 48 kinds of apples and 35 of pears. Among the nobilities of the time Hacı Ali Efendi, who had “cleansed” the roads to Bosnia and Herzegovina and erected bridges and rest-houses, and Dhu T-Fiğsr-Zâde Mahmûd Ağha receives words of praise. Both had palaces (sârâ) in Novibazar. In consequence of its exceedingly important military position and as the key to Bosnia for Turkey in Europe (cf. F. Kanitz, *Serbien*, Leipzig 1868, p. 200 sq.) Novibazar has frequently played a part in military history. In 1689 it was occupied under the Margrave of Baden; but the Christian inhabitants, disillusioned by the tyrannical attitude of the garrison, the excesses of the imperial armies, the heavy taxation, the intolerance shown the orthodox clergy and the partisanship for the Roman Catholic church, soon turned against their new masters and very soon Novibazar with the whole of Old Serbia again passed to the Ottomans. In 1737 Novibazar was again occupied for a few months by the imperial forces, but as a result of the careless leadership of the generals fell with Nish again into Turkish hands and this settled the disastrous result of the war for Austria (cf. F. Kanitz, op. cit., p. 203 sq. and the Turkish description of the Bosnian campaign, from the pen of the kadi of Novi, 'Omar Efendi' [q.v.], e.g. in the German version by J. N. v. Dubs, Vienna 1879, p. 134 sqq. or the English by C. Fraser, London 1830, p. 49 sqq.). It is remarkable that the defence of Novibazar in the Turkish period were never what the strategic importance of the place demanded (cf. the description in A. Boué, *Die Europäische Türkei*, vol. 1, Vienna 1859, p. 549). In view of the stubborn defiance and steady opposition of the people, the Ottoman authorities — Novibazar was the seat of a kâim-malâmân [q.v.] — had a difficult time. General Hasan Paşa who was to carry out the disarming in 1880, was killed in the street in a rising and those guilty were never brought to book. Unpopular officials were as a rule simply driven out. As the Porte ceased continuous fighting with the rebellious population of the sanjak it made no attempt to make a regular military expedition against them. The result was that all branches of administration, trade, agriculture and industry gradually went to pieces. From the xviith century therefore Novibazar was always a place of little importance. Nor did it revolve under the semi-independent feudal lords of the family of Ferhadagić (Ferhādagić). Of the remains of Muslim times in Novibazar may be mentioned the fortress (bašta) built in 1103 (1690) in the reign of Sultan Ahmed II. The surrounding buildings as a rule date only from the time of Abl al-Ḥamīd II. Historically most interesting is the Altun ʿAlem Mosque built by Ghazi Tsk-Beg (see above), the founder of Novibazar. Behind it lie the remains of the old mosque of the Chief Kâdi of Sarajevo (q.v.).


**NUBA, name of a country [and people?] to the South of Egypt** The names Nuba, Nubian, Nuba are commonly used without scientific precision and it is only in the linguistic sense that they have an unambiguous meaning. The frontier separating Nuba from Egypt proper is well defined as the first cataract of the Nile in the neighbourhood of Assawan, and the area where Nubian is spoken nowadays ends in the vicinity of the 18th parallel. The southern limit of Nubia is sometimes placed as far south as the junction of the Atbara and the Nile or even the confluence of the two. Nubia is often sub-divided into Lower Nubia
from Aswān to Wādi Ḥalfa and Upper Nubia from Wādi Ḥalfa southwards, but neither term has any political or administrative significance.

The medieval Arabic writers are equally vague about the southern extent of Nubia, the region immediately bordering on Egypt, which bore the name of Maris, seems to have been regarded as Nubia per excellence; to the south of it lay Muṣṭarrah with its capital at Dongola (Dunqula, Dunqula), and beyond this the kingdom of 'Alwa the capital of which was Sōba, near the site of the modern Kharga. According to the tenth-century author 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Salih (Sulaimi), quoted by Maqrizi, Maris and Muṣṭarrah had distinct languages, and the frontier between them was situated three post-stations (barid) to the south of the Third Cataract; politically, however, Maris formed part of Muṣṭarrah and this probably accounts for the fact that Ibn Sulīm immediately afterwards places the commencement of Muṣṭarrah at a day's journey from Aswān. The frontier between Muṣṭarrah and 'Alwa was the district of al-Abwāh, a name still in use for the country round Kabāysiyya in Berber province. 'Alwa is generally placed outside Nubia, and the preamble to the treaty which governed the political relations between Nubians and Arabs makes its provisions incumbent on the king of the Nubians and all people of his dominions .... from the frontier of Aswān to the frontier of 'Alwa'; yet Mas'ūdi speaks of 'Alwa as part of Nubia, and states that it is under the political suzerainty of Muṣṭarrah. According to Yāḳūṭ, Nubia extends along the Nile a distance of eighty days journey, Dongola being situated halfway at forty days distance from Aswān; of 'Alwa he speaks, with obvious exaggeration of the distance, as a people beyond Nubia three months' journey from the king of the Nūba, whose official title is 'king of Muṣṭarrah and Nubia'.

The modern conventional division of the population of the northern Sudān into Nubian, Beja, and Arab is in the main a linguistic one and does not correspond to any clearly-marked racial divisions. The "Nubian" type, itself a hybrid one, which poured into the Sudan in the middle ages and eventually brought about the fall of the Christian kingdoms of Dongola and 'Alwa. The numerous Danāğıla colonies on the Blue and White Niles have given up their language in favour of Arabic, and the same applies to a branch of the Maḥās, settled since the sixteenth century in the neighbourhood of Kharga; who now claim to be descended from the Khraddj of Arabia. Throughout the northern Sudān the original Nubian stratum has coalesced with the Arabs to such an extent that it is no longer possible to separate the two strains. This fusion has also affected the groups which still speak Nubian, though the Barābrā may be said to have maintained a separate identity and to have absorbed the foreign elements rather than the reverse. The Danāğıla repudiate the appellation Nubian, and the term Barābrā is used only by Egyptians and other foreigners, while the people themselves prefer to call themselves by their tribal names (Kenūz, Maḥās, Sukkot). It is only in recent times that they have begun to develop a national sentiment as Nubians and to make occasional use of the name.

Language. The Nubian language can scarcely be indigenous to the Nile Valley, and it is in no way connected with the language of the Beromitic inscriptions which preceded it in that area. The problem of its linguistic grouping has not been satisfactorily solved: both Hamitic and Sudanic features are present, and L. Reinisch (Die sprachliche Stellung des Nũba, Vienna 1911) regards it as a connecting link between the two groups. G. W. Murray (Sudan Notes and Records, vol. iii.) suggests the conclusion that in the remote past Dinka-Shilluk, Bari-Masai, and Nubian had a common origin, and that they all have to a greater or lesser degree been permeated by Hamitic influence. W. Menhof (Eine Studienfahrt nach Korofan) definitely classes Nubian as a Hamitic language.

The following branches are distinguished:

a. Nilotic Nubian (the language of the Barābrā and Danāğila) with three dialects: Kenūz, Maḥās, and Dongali; the latter is the third, though separated geographically, form a single dialect group. A fourth dialect distinguished by Reinisch (Fadida, Faddikka) is stated by Lepsius to be only a variety of Maḥās.

d. Hill Nubian spoken by a number of negroid tribes in the present province of Korofan. The area in question is inhabited by a medley of tribes of different linguistic and racial stocks, and it is only in the case of the Nubian-speaking groups (mainly in the north) that the appellation Nubia is justified. The best known dialect is that of Dilling (Delen). A form of Hill Nubian is also spoken by the people of Djebel Mādūb in northern Dāfūr.

On the problem of the racial and historical connexion between Hill Nubia and Nilotic Nubians, see below.

The isolated dialect of the Birched tribe in Dāfūr designated by Zylilar as South-West Nubian.

Old Nubian, the literary language of medieval Nubia. The examples which have survived belong to the viii—ix centuries and consist of homelitic and edifying pieces intended for the common people, as distinct from strictly theological literature for which Greek was employed. The language of these texts approximates most closely to modern Maḥās, although the provenance of the existing remains is the northernmost part of Nubia where Kenūz is spoken. Scanty remains from Upper Nubia justify the conclusion that Nubian (perhaps in a form more closely connected with the Hill dialects) was also used for literary purposes in the kingdom of 'Alwa.

Modern Nubian has no literature apart from biblical translations produced under European influence. The Danāğila and Barābrā use only Arabic for written communications and for literary purposes.

History. In speaking of the early history of the country the name Nubia is misleading, as there is no evidence of its use in ancient Egypt as a tribal or geographical name. To the Egyptians Lower Nubia was known as Wawat, and Upper
Nubia as Kaš (the Biblical Kush) which corresponds to the classical Ethiopia. From the earliest times there existed relations of trade, conquest, and cultural influence between Egypt and its southern neighbour, and under the Middle Empire the Egyptian penetration of what is now Dongola Province led to the development of a special local civilization based on the culture of Egypt, but deeply affected by local forms, materials and customs. Under the New Empire Wawat and Kaš were governed by Egyptian viceroy, and Napata (Qebel Barkal) became an important centre of the cult of Amon-Ra. Later Napata was the capital of an independent Ethiopian kingdom which, in its turn, conquered Egypt, and five kings of Napata sat on the throne of the Pharaohs (the 25th dynasty, n. c. 730–663). Subsequently the centre of gravity shifted southwards and Meroe, about 130 miles north of Khartum, was the capital of a kingdom which still preserved the elements of a civilization based on that of Egypt, though the isolation of the country, which was now almost complete, led to a rapid decline. In circumstances of which we have no detailed knowledge, the character of the population was modified owing to the ingress of negroid elements from Kordofan and the Dajzara, and cultural contact with the north diminished to such an extent that to the Hellenistic-Roman world Ethiopia was but vaguely known, as indeed was the case of medieval Nubia in its relation to the Muslim world. Byzantine missionaries, however, introduced Christianity in the sixth century, at which period the two kingdoms of Muṣarra and 'Alwa were already in existence: the Maccuritae, we are told by the chronicler, became Christians in 569 and the Alosaeans in 580, and an embassy of the Maccuritae visited Constantinople in 573.

The name Nubian appears for the first time in the Hellenistic-Roman age and the earliest occurrence seems to be in Eratosthenes (quoted by Strabo, xvii.) who speaks of the Noubai as “a great race living in Libya on the left side of the course of the Nile extending from Meroe to the bends of the river”. In this passage, as well as in other references in Greek and Latin writers, Nubians are clearly distinguished from Lybians, Ethiopians, and other Meroitic folk, and as late as ca. 550 A.D. a kinglet of Lower Nubia speaks of himself as basileus Neubadnos kai ean ton Alisitow. It is not until the Muslim period that Nubia is found to have replaced Ethiopia as the name for the whole of the riverain country to the south of Egypt.

Of the events which brought about this change of name (no doubt signifying a change in language and in the ethnic character of the people) there is no historical record. From the linguistic evidence it is probable enough that the name originally belonged to the negroids of Kordofan, and that the Noubai (Noubades, Nubate) of the classical writers were immigrants from the southwest who, as a result of political ascendency, imposed their language on the Ethiopians of the Nile valley. The fact, however, cannot be disregarded that the modern Hill Nuba are strikingly dissimilar in physical character and culture to the mainly Hamitic Barahra-Dangala, and on this ground the possibility of a racial connexion of the two groups has been challenged by C. G. Seligman and H. A. MacMichael (see esp. MacMichael, History, i. 14 sq.). Yet it is certain that the separation of the dialects must have taken place at a comparatively early date (before Christianity); the presence of “Nubian” speech in Kordofan can therefore not be explained as the result of Danagla settlement in recent times. For a discussion of this vexed question see Ernst Zuhler, Zur Stellung der Darfur-Nubischen, in W.Z.K.M., vol. xxxvii.; and S. Hillelson, Nubian Origins, in Sudan Notes and Records, vol. xxiii. (1950). What can be said with certainty is that the Arab conquerors of Egypt found on their southern frontier a population mainly Hamitic in the north, but containing negroid elements which increased in importance in the south. These people were Jacobite Christians, and they used Nubian as the language of government and letters.

Yākṣīt quotes two sayings ascribed to the prophet in which Nubians are praised as faithful friends and useful slaves, but there can hardly have been any contact between Arabs and Nubians before the two invasions (A.D. 641–642 and 651–652) the second of which carried the Arabs as far as Dongola (q.v.). As a result of these raids the relations between Muslims and Nubians were regulated by treaties which provided a system of mutual tolerance and non-interference; the tribute of slaves (baṣīr [q.v.] from πασαρί) to which the Nubians undertook to pay annually was not so much a sign of submission as the basis for an exchange of commodities. Intercourse between the two countries, whether commercial or political, remained very restricted, and the interests of the Arabs to the south of Egypt were in the main confined to the exploitation of the mines of al-Allāḥ, which affected the Bedja rather than the Nubians. An invasion of Upper Egypt, said to have been undertaken by the Nubian king Kyrikos in A.D. 737 (or between 744 and 750) is recorded only on the doubtful evidence of Christian writers and ignored by Muslim historians. Minor raids occurred from time to time, and the “tribute” was occasionally withheld, but on the whole relations were peaceful. Muslims began to penetrate into Nubia at an early date, presumably for purposes of trade, and as early as the tenth century they are said to have had a special lodging-place (rabah) in the capital of ‘Alwa. According to a Syrian writer (quoted by Mec., Renaissance des Islams, p. 32), Nubians resident in the lands of the caliphate remitted taxes to their own king and enjoyed the privilege of an autonomous jurisdiction. Further evidence of friendly relations is found in an account of an embassy to Baghdad in the time of al-Mutawakkil when a Nubian prince was honourably entertained.

Of internal conditions in Nubia we know very little; there are no native sources of information and Muslim accounts throw light only on special periods and occasional contacts. The fullest descriptive accounts, both dating from the tenth century A.D., are those of Majdu (ii. 302; iii. 31–34, 39–43) and Ibn Salim (Sulaim) who wrote an account of “Nubia, Muṣarra, ‘Alwa, the Budja, and the Nile”, of which extensive fragments are extant in the Khita of Maṣūlī (ed. Viet., vol. iii., ch. xxx. sqq.).

During the reign of Saladin Nubian affairs came into some prominence owing to the support given by the semi-Nubian Banū Kanṣ (on whom see below) to a Fāṣimid pretender, and Lower Nubia was
invaded by Saladin’s brother Turān-Shāh (1172—1179) who pillaged Ibrim and took many captives, but reported unfavourably on the resources of the country with the result that a planned annexation was not proceeded with. Soon afterwards (about 1208), the Armenian Abū Ṣāliḥ composed his account of the Churches and Monasteries of Egypt (ed. and translated by B. T. A. Bayly, Oxford 1895) which contains some interesting details about Maris, Muṣarrar, and ‘Alva, but must be used with caution owing to the confusion in the writer’s mind between Nubia and Abyssinia and his uncritical use of older authorities.

The factors which brought about the disintegration of the Nubian kingdom and the dispossession of the country were the immigration of Arab tribes, the rise of the Bānū Kanz, and the intervention in Nubian affairs of the Mamlük rulers of Egypt, especially during the reigns of al-Ẓāhir Baibars [q. v.] and al-Manṣūr Kālimūn [q. v.].

The Bānū Kanz are first heard of in 1202 when the Fāṭimid caliph al-Hākim, as a reward for services rendered, conferred the hereditary title of Kanz al-Dawla on Abū Makālim Hībat-Allāh, a chief of the Rāfī’a Arabs who had settled on the borderland between Egypt and the Sūdān. Already in the tenth century the Rāfī’a had gained control of the mines of al-‘Allāqī and imposed their rule on the Bēḍja with whom they allied themselves by intermarriage. Another section, settled near Aswān, fraternized with the local Nubians, and the tribe, formed by this amalgamation and ruled by the Kanz al-Dawla dynasty, came to be known as the Bānū Kanz; they are represented by the Kenzū of the present day. During the reign of the Mamlūks they were virtually in independent control of Upper Egypt, alternately in alliance with or in revolt against the Mamlūk government, and though repressed at times with a heavy hand, they remained a powerful tribe until the Ottoman conquest of Egypt. Before this event, however, they had played their part, together with nomad Avars and Mamlūk troops, in the destruction of Nubian independence.

The Bāhārī Mamlūks, for reasons not apparent in our sources, departed from the traditional policy of Muslim Egypt, and actively intervened in Nubian affairs. The pretext for the expedition undertaken by the generals of Baibars and Kālimūn were non-payment of the tribute and, more frequently, the championship of Nubian pretenders who had solicited Egyptian support in order to gain the throne. On several occasions such pretenders of the Mamlūk government were installed in Dongola only to lose the throne again as soon as the Egyptian troops withdrew. A formal treaty concluded with one of these kings virtually established an Egyptian protectorate. Meanwhile the disintegration of the kingdom went on under the pressure of Arab immigration, and Arab chiefs who married into the royal house took advantage of the matrilineal line of succession to grasp at the throne. The age-long Christianity of Nubia was gradually undermined and in the xivth century Muslim kings begin to appear: the first king to bear a Muslim name was Abū-Allāh b. Sanā who was installed in 1316 and after a short reign lost the throne to a Kanz al-Dawla. From the Kitāb al-Turjīf of Ahmad b. Yahyā b. Fadl Allāh, written some time between 1340 and 1349, we learn that at this date Christian kings still alternated with Muslims, and Ibn Baṭṭūṭā in 1354 (iv. 396) speaks of the Nubians as Christians, but mentions a Muslim king (Ibn Kanz al-Dun) of Dongola. The conversion of the common people we have no details: no doubt it was brought about by the absorption of the native inhabitants, or those who survived, in the Arab tribes.

The immigration itself has left little trace in the pages of the historians, though the outlines of the process can be reconstructed from occasional references and from oral tradition. The nomads who had entered Egypt in the wake of the first conquest can never have found that country congenial to their mode of life, and the rise of non-Arab dynasties tended to make conversion less attractive, while the Sūdān seemed to offer all the advantages, from the nomads’ point of view, that Egypt denied. For a long time the kingdom of Dongola formed an effective barrier to southward expansion, but a gradual infiltration of Arabs must have begun at a comparatively early date, even though the end of the process was not accomplished for several centuries.

The early stages of the movement are seen in the conditions depicted in the story of Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qumari, the events of which are laid in the reign of Ibn Tulun (Maqrizi’s Kitāb al-Muqaffa, quoted by Quatremère, li. 59—80). Arabs of Rāfī’a and Djihaania, led into the Sūdān by that adventurous prince, have fraternized with the Bēḍja and exploit the mines of the Eastern Desert, but the Nile is forbidden them and Nubia is too strong to be attempted by force of arms. A fratricidal struggle in the Nubian royal house provides an opportunity for an alliance between the Arabs and a princely pretender to the throne. Acts of unblushing treachery are committed on both sides and in the end the Arabs have the worst of the encounter. The end of the process is seen in the fourteenth century. The kingdom of Nubia had now to all intents and purposes ceased to exist and such kings as reigned in name were puppets of the Arab tribes. It is from this period, the early years of the fourteenth century, that the immigration of most of the camel-owning nomads of the Sūdān dates. Generally speaking, it seems, the Djihaania and their allies, most of whom we may be sure were Fazāra, loosened their hordes southwards and westwards, leaving the Bānū Kanz and Ikrīma in northern Nubia and Upper Egypt (MacMichael, loc. cit., p. 187).

Of ‘Alwa nothing is heard at this period, but no doubt the course of events was similar to that in the northern kingdom, and already in the time of Ibn Khaldūn (1332—1406) we hear of branches of Djihaania “close to the Abyssinians”, that is to say no doubt on the upper reaches of the Blue Nile in the southern Djihaaria. The kingdom of ‘Alwa nevertheless lingered on precariously and Nubian Christianity was still a living memory in the time of the Portuguese Alvares (1520—1527), but about the year 1500 Sōba fell to an alliance of Kawšma Arabs (a branch of Rafa’i-Djihaania) and the negroi Fundj [q. v.] who here for the first time appear in history.

The fifteenth century is almost completely barren of records relating to Nubia, and the historical memory of the present inhabitants remembers little of pre-Fundj days. With the coming of the Fundj who soon extended their influence to Dongola, the history of Nubia is merged in that of the
Sūdān, and the Nubians, now Muslims and deeply affected by racial mixture with their conquerors, survive only as a linguistic minority on the northern fringe of their ancient kingdom.

Lower Nubia, however, was politically separated from the Fundj kingdom by Selim I who annexed the country south of Aswān as far as the neighbourhood of the Third Cataract, and garrisoned it with Turks and fishermen called Ghuzz by the people of the Sūdān. From these many of the modern Barābra claim to be descended.

The Barābra-Đanagla of the present day (in the Egyptian province of Aswān and the Sūdān provinces of Halīf and Dongola) are a peaceful race of cultivators and skilful boatmen of the Nile. Owing to the poverty of their country and aided by an enterprise of disposition, large numbers seek their livelihood in Egypt and the Sūdān where they are found everywhere engaged in various forms of menial employment. The Đanagla have also spread all over the Sūdān as traders, and in the nineteenth century they played an important part, together with their rivals, the Djalliyin, in the trade of the Upper Nile and the Bahr al-Ghazāl where they adventured as slave-traders, sailors, and mercenary troops.

The men are generally bilingual in Nubian and Arabic which latter they speak ungrammatically and with an accent of their own. Those in foreign employment show themselves remarkably adaptable to alien ideas, at the same time they are taciturn of their own customs and clannish to a degree. Under modern conditions they are keen to take advantage of educational facilities, and show an aptitude for the educated professions. In the past they have made no important contribution to the intellectual and spiritual life of Islam and produced no scholars of note. Dhu l-Đumm the mystic [q.v.] is said to have been of Nubian origin, but he is generally called "the Egyptian". The most remarkable figure of their race is Muhammad Aḥmad [q.v.], the Mahdi of the Sūdān (died 1885), who was a Dongolawi, though his family claim to be sharifs. The Barābra and Đanagla are generally devout Muslims, and most of them belong to the Miḥrānīya (Khatmiya) tariqa.


(S. Hillelson)

NUBANDJAN. [See Shilistán.]

NŪBĀR PASHA (1825–1899), an Egyptian statesman, who played a most prominent part in Egyptian politics in the nineteenth century. Summoned by his uncle Boggos Bey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Commerce under Muhammad Ali, he came to Egypt in 1824 as the agent of the government service to second secretary to the Viceroy. In 1848 he accompanied Ibrahim Pasha to Europe as secretary and interpreter. Under Sa'id, Nūbār began to play a part in public life. His independent spirit, his methodical and precise mind were revealed in the organisation of the Egyptian railways which he put in order in the space of six months (1857).

But it was under Ismā'il that he fully revealed his gifts as a negotiator and diplomatist. He was however not called upon to play a national part because of his Armenian origin and his ignorance of the language of the country. Raised to the rank of Pasha at the beginning of the reign (1863) he hastened to take advantage of the support and advanced views of the Viceroy to carry through a great scheme: to encourage externally the independence of Egypt and its development not in Asia — this was Isrā'īlim's idea — but in Africa where her destinies summoned her, and at home the regeneration of Egypt with the help of Europe. From the first Nūbār Pasha grasped the great truths of the Egyptian question. But if the conception was grandiose, the execution of the scheme proved difficult on account of the confusion of interests and the European jealousies. These inherent difficulties in the Egyptian problem proved impediments to many solutions and the policy of reform frequently had to twist its way round obstacles of all kinds.

On the smaller matters Egypt had to wage an unequal struggle with Europe. Nūbār conducted the struggle on three fronts at the same time, on three fundamental questions.

The question of the Suez Canal. On Ismā'il's accession the Company formed a state within the state and constituted in the very heart of Egypt a kind of colony, as a result of the lands it had obtained along the sea canal and the fresh water canals which were linked up with it. Nūbār conducted negotiations in Constantinople and in Paris with the object of securing the territorial sovereignty of Egypt. His activity ended in the famous decision of the Emperor Napoleon III on July 6, 1864, who ordered Egypt to pay the Company $4,000,000 francs to regain her rights. This enormous indemnity was nevertheless far from bringing about a final settlement.
The question of judicial reforms. Nūbār used often to say: "Give Egypt water and justice and the country will be happy and prosperous". But in order to place justice on a sound footing so that it could protect the native against the government and the European who was exploiting him and particular against the arbitrary decisions of the consuls, each of whom laid down his own law to the governed and governors alike, Nūbār thought of organizing a mixed system of justice composed of Egyptian and European elements and thus establishing uniformity of jurisdiction, legislation and executive action. As a result of the systematic opposition of France and of certain powers interested in maintaining the "privileges", the mixed tribunals were not established till 1875 after ten years of striving and of waiting endured by the government.

The question of autonomy. The territorial servitudes inflicted by the Suez Canal and the system of capitulations did not prevent Nūbār from remembering the political restrictions imposed by Turkey, the suzerain power. From 1863 to 1873 Nūbār endeavoured to extract from Constantinople by negotiation and bribery privileges which would enable the work of progress to develop freely. After the firmans of 1866 and 1867, Egypt obtained the famous firman of 1873 which constituted a new charter conferring on the viceroy the title of Khedive (q.v.), hereditary succession to the throne in direct line from father to son, an increase in the army — limited to 15,000 in 1840 — and lastly the right to conclude loans and commercial treaties with the Powers.

But the error made by Nūbār and the Khedive was to consolidate Egyptian independence in theory but not in practice. Nūbār was anxious for the introduction of capital and European enterprise: a beneficial idea but also dangerous because the Khedive, encouraged by his minister, became involved without due consideration in a disastrous series of loans. The various enterprises which arose with the rapid development of the resources of the country had to be put in the hands of companies like the Steam Navigation Company, the Sudan Company, the Agricultural and the Trading Companies, in which Nūbār, Oppenheim, Dervieu and others were the chief directors. The failures of the companies were liquidated by Egypt which made good all losses. The collaboration of Nūbār with these financiers brought an atmosphere of suspicion into the good understanding between the minister and the Khedive, as did the negotiations conducted by him to conclude loans in Paris and elsewhere.

But the tragic side of the question lay in the accumulation of a debt of £90,000,000 which opened the gates of the Delta to foreign control. There is no doubt that Nūbār had always resolutely opposed any foreign interference. Down to 1875, during the little time that he was actually in Egypt — he was often on missions to Europe — Nūbār endeavoured to act as a check on absolute rule and to oppose all European interference from wherever it came. He was not popular either in England or France. He was rightly distrusted in the entourage of the Khedive also. But in the end of 1875 an event took place which modified his attitude. England having taken the unusual step of intervening in Egypt to defend the private interests of some of her capitalists and sending a mission under Mr. Cave to conduct an enquiry in the country, Nūbār, with his remarkable political instinct, felt the immediate danger of such interference and resolved to oppose it by all means. He was able to provoke the intervention of the consuls-general of Russia and Germany, who offered the Khedive the support of their governments. Ismā‘īl listened to this offer, which was a grave political error. He went farther and communicated with the English consul and did not scruple to sacrifice his minister.

Nūbār had to hand in his resignation on Jan. 5, 1876 and to leave Egypt on March 21. Henceforth he swore a bitter feud against his master and his attitude gradually changed and inclined to England. In deciding to undermine the personal authority of the ruler, and allying himself with the foreigner, without being able to fix in advance how far the alliance was to go, in a word in wishing to humble his sovereign, Nūbār weakened his country for the benefit of England. For it was to the government of England that he appealed in 1876 to intervene, acting on the pretext that intervention was here inevitable as a result of the enormous debts contracted by Egypt and that England’s action would be of more benefit to Egypt than that of any other power. The result was that England finally imposed on the Khedive both Nūbār and her complete control by exorting from him the rescript of Aug. 28, 1878 which established a "responsible ministry" presided over nominally by Nūbār but in effect by Rivers Wilson as Minister of Finance and de Bignières as Minister of Public Works. This dangerous innovation — the formation of a European ministry not responsible to the Khedive whose authority was now negligible, and installed in the heart of the country to support European policy and high finance — aroused the Egyptians from their lethargy and created general discontent. The Khedive became at once popular and his cause was identified with that of the nation. The result was the outbreak of Feb. 19, 1879 which removed the Khedive from power. The European ministry presided over by the crown prince was formed but the evil remained. Finally Ismā‘īl, emboldened by public opinion, dismissed the European ministers (April 7) and formed a national ministry under Sharif Pasha. But the Powers — and Nūbār’s doings in Europe were not without influence on their decision — decided on the ruin of the Khedive and succeeded with the help of Turkey in deposing him (June 26).

Two years after the English occupation, Nūbār returned to Egypt to form a ministry after the resignation of Sharif Pasha as a protest against the evacuation of the Sudan by Egypt, dictated by England. Nūbār endeavoured in vain to come to terms with England and to put a check on her policy of practically depriving Egypt of her territory in Africa (Jan. 1884 — June 1888).

He again formed a ministry (April 16, 1894) but he soon had to submit to the control of the English councillor in the Ministry of the Interior, and seeing himself powerless against Lord Cromer’s policy which aimed at controlling the whole of the administration he had quickly to retire from the scene (Nov. 1895).

Nūbār then went to Europe to compile his memoirs — still unpublished — and peacefully await his end. He was, to sum up, a great minister, a statesman who made mistakes, it is true, but
the fates were against him: 1875 marks the final blocking of his great project. We must not however forget the early struggles in which he extorted from Europe and from Turkey piece by piece rights and privileges which constituted a great boon to his country.


(Edward B. T. J. Peterson)

**NUBUWWA** [See Nabi.]

**Nūḥ, the Noah of the Bible,** is a particularly popular figure in the Kur'ān and in Muslim legend. The 'alā'ī gives 15 virtues by which Nūḥ is distinguished among the prophets. The Bible does not regard Noah as a prophet. In the Kur'ān Nūḥ is the first prophet of punishment, who is followed by Ḥūd, Sāliḥ, Idrīs, Shu‘āb and Mūṣa. Ibrāhīm is one of his following (Shu‘a) (Sūra xxvii. 81). He is the perspicuous admonisher (Muslih miṣri) of the Bible (Sūra xxi. 2), the “true believer” is named Nūḥ the messenger of God” (Sūra 107, 1), the abd al-‘abīr, “the grateful servant of God” (xxvii. 3). Allāh enters into a covenant with Nūḥ just as with Muhammad, Ibrāhīm, Mūṣa and Ḥūd (xxviii. 7). Peace and blessings are promised him (xi. 50). Muhammad is fond of seeing himself reflected in the earlier prophets. In the case of Nūḥ, the Muslim Kur'ān exegetes have already noticed this (see Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, p. 90). Muhammad puts into the mouth of Nūḥ things that he would himself like to say and into the mouths of his opponents what he himself has heard from his. Nūḥ is reproached with being only one of the people (27—74). God should rather have sent an angel (xxii. 24). Nūḥ is wrong (vii. 58). he is lying, deceiving (vii. 62), is possessed by qīrn (liv. 9), only the lowest join him (xxiii. 111). When Nūḥ replies: “It is grievous to you that I live among you, I seek no reward, my reward is with Allāh (x. 72—74; xi. 31); I do not claim to possess Allāh's treasures, to know his secrets, to be an angel and I cannot say to those whom ye despise, God shall not give you any good” (x. 31—33), we have here an echo of Muhammad's defence and embarrassment about many of his followers. Muhammad pictures events as follows: Allāh sends Nūḥ to the sinful people. Sūra lxxi. which bears his name, gives one of these sermons threatening punishment for which other analogies can be found. The people scorn him. Allāh commands him to build an ark by divine inspiration. Then the ‘chaldrum boils” (xi. 42; xxiii. 27). The waters drown everything: only two of every kind of living creature are saved and the believers whom Nūḥ takes into the ark with him. But there were very few who believed. Nūḥ appeals even to his son in vain; the latter takes refuge on a mountain but is drowned. When Nūḥ bids the waters be still, the ark lands on mount Ijūdī (q. v.; xi. 27—31). Not only Noah's son but also his wife with Iltī's wife are sinners (lxvi. 10). From the Haggada is developed, as Geiger shows, the following elements of this Qur'ānic legend of Nūḥ: 1. Nūḥ appears as a prophet and admonisher; 2. his people laugh at the ark; 3. his family is punished with hot water (main passages: Talm. Sanhedrin, 10a; Gen. Rabba, xxix.—xxvii.).

The post-Kur'ānic legend of Nūḥ as in other cases fills up the gaps, gives the names of those not mentioned in the Kur'ān, makes many links e.g. connects Nūḥ with Fārūq of the Persian epic although it is pointed out that the Magi (Persians) do not know the story of the flood. Nūḥ's wife is called 'Āliya and her sin is that she desires Iltī for his people as nāqān, the names of Nūḥ's sons, Sāmū, Ḥām and Yāfūq are known to Kur'ān exegesis from the Bible but it also gives the name of Nūḥ's sinful son who perished in the flood: Kānān, “whom the Arabs call Yāmī”. Muhammad's statement that Nūḥ was 950 years of age at the time of the flood (īfā'ān (xxix. 13, 14) is probably based on Gen. 16. 39 which says Nūḥ lived 950 years in all, but on the other hand, it serves as a basis for calculations which make Nūḥ the first muhammad; according to the Khab al-Muhammadin of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Sijistani (ed. Golzheir, p. 1), who begins his book with Nūḥ, he lived 1,450 years. Yet in his dying hour he describes his life as a house with two doors in which one door is closed and the other is opened. Muslim legend knows the Biblical story of Nūḥ, his times and his sons, but embellishes it greatly and in al-Kisā' it becomes a romance. From the union of Kābīl's and Shēṭē's descendants arises a sinful people which rejects Nūḥ's warnings. He therefore at God's command builds the ark from trees which he has himself planted. As he is hammering and building the people mock him: "once a prophet, now a carpenter?", "a ship for the mainland". The ark had a head and tail like a cock, a body like a bird (Thcab). How was the ark built? At the wish of the apostles, Jesus arises (for Hām) b. Nūḥ from the dead and he describes the ark and its arrangements: in the lower storey were the quadrupeds, in the next the human beings and in the top the birds. Nūḥ brought the ant into the ark first and the ass last, it was slow because Iblīs was clinging to his tail. Nūḥ called out impatiently: "come in even if Satan is with thee"; so Iblīs also had to be taken in. The pig arose out of the tail of the elephant and the cat from the lion. How could the goat exist alongside of the wolf, or the dove beside the birds of prey? God tampered their instincts. The number of human beings in the ark varies in legend between seven and eighty. Uḏ b. ʿAnāq was also saved along with the believers. Kābīl's race was drowned. Nūḥ also took Adam's body with him which was used to separate the women from the men. For in the ark continence was ordered, for man and beast. Only Hām transgressed and for this was punished with a black skin. The whole was covered with water and only the ʿIjrām (or Kīsā'), also the site of the sanctuary in Jerusalem was spared: the Ka'ba was taken up into heaven and Dījārīl concealed the Black Stone (according to al-Kīsā', the stone was snow white until the Flood). Nūḥ sent out the raven but finding some carrion it forgot Nūḥ; then he sent the dove which brought back an olive leaf in its bill and mud on its feet; as a reward it was given its collar and became a domestic bird. On the day of ʿAshūra' every one came out of the ark, men and beasts fasted and gave thanks to Allāh.

There are many contacts with the Haggada: the
different, it is true) partitioning of the ark, Nūh’s anxiety about the animals, Hāṭsin’s sin and punishment (Sankhedrin, 108a b). The story that the giant Og escaped the Flood is also taken from the Ḥaggada [see Ḥag. b. ‘Anaḥ]. But Mashiḥ legend goes farther than the Bible and Ḥaggada, like Muhammad who sees himself in Nūh.


On the name Nūh: Goldzweker, in D. M. G., xxiv. (1870), 207–211; on Nūh as Mu‘ammār; Goldzweker, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, ii, Leyden 1899, p. xxxix. and p. 2.

(Bernhard Heiller)

Nūh, the name of two Sāmānids. 1. Abu Muḥammad Nūh I b. Naṣr b. ʿAmmād, called al-Amīr al-Ḥanīd, succeeded his father [see Naṣr]; but the real ruler was the pious theologian Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Ḥamād al-Sulami. The latter long refused to take the title of “wazir” but finally succumbed to Nūh’s pressing representations, and took much less interest in the business of government than in his devotional exercises and theological studies which earned him the name of “al-ḥāṭik al-Ṣaḥwīḥī”. There were also by this time unmistakable symptoms of decline. In 332 (943–944) Abū Ṣalāḥ b. al-ʿAṣḥābī rebelled in Khawārizm and Nūh set out with an army from Bukhārā towards Merw. But when Abū Ṣalāḥ placed himself under the protection of the ruler of the Turks, whose son was a prisoner in Bukhārā, peace was restored, and the rebels were fought at Khātār and Bukhārā in Dūmāda I 336 (Nov.–Dec. 947); Abū Ṣalāḥ was defeated and returned to Saghāniyān. After some time a rumour spread that Nūh intended to attack him once more, whereupon Abū Ṣalāḥ again mobilized his followers. Bakhth and Tokhristan fell into his hands; in Rabi’ I 337 (Sept.–Oct. 948) however, he came into conflict with the government troops and suffered a defeat. The latter sacked Saghāniyān but when they were cut off from communication with Bukhārā, Nūh had to open negotiations for peace and in Dūmāda II of the same year (Dec. 948–Jan. 949) peace was made. The Ottomans sound the following details of the terms of the treaty: at any rate, Abū Ṣalāḥ’s son Abū ʿl-Muẓaffar Abū Allāh was sent to Bukhārā as a hostage and there received with great distinction while Abū Ṣalāḥ remained in Saghāniyān. Since Mānṣūr b. ʿAṣrāfī could not maintain discipline among the troops in Kūrāsān he repeatedly asked Nūh to relieve him of his office. The latter therefore promised Abū Ṣalāḥ to restore him to his old post and when Mānṣūr died in Rabi’ I 340 (Aug.–Sept. 951) Abū Ṣalāḥ was appointed his successor. In Ramaḍān (Jan.–Feb. 952) he left Saghāniyān, the administration of which he gave to his son Abū Mānṣūr Naṣr b. ʿAmmād, then went to Merw where he arrived at Naft, Nūh I b. Ḥāfīẓ (April–May 952). He restored order in Kūrāsān, but when by Nūh’s orders he attacked the Būyid Rukn
al-Dawla and his achievements did not come up to expectations, he was dismissed and Abū Sa‘īd Bakkā b. Mālik al-Farghānī appointed his successor, whereupon Abū ʿAlī sought refuge with Rukn al-Dawla. On Nūh’s dealings with the Bayyids see the article ʿABDALLĀH b. ZAYN. Nūh died in Rabī’ 1 343 (Aug. 954), and his son Abū al-Mālik succeeded him.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornø, viii. 319 sq., 331 sq., 344 sq., 359-370, 370a-381; Gardāzī, Zain al-Abdārīn, ed. Muhammad Nāṣīm, p. 32-34; 36-39; Description topographique et historique de Boukhara par Muhammad Arzakhb, ed. Schefer, p. 94 sq., 103, 112, 228; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Kāzwīnī, Taʾrīkh Gūzāda, ed. Browne, i. 347 sq., 350, 383; Amedroz and Margoliouth, The Epoch of the ʿAbbasid Caliphate, see index; Batholf, Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion, 2, p. 10, 14, 108 sq., 243 sq., 246-249, 259. — See also the art. SĀMĀNĪDS.

2. Nūh II b. MAṬAṢĪR b. NŪH, called al-Maṭṣār or al-Raḍjī, ascended the throne at the age of 13 after the death of his father in Shawwāl 366 (June 977). The government was at first in the hands of his mother and the able vizier Abū ʿl-Husayn Abī Allāh b. Ahmad al-ʿUthmānī, who assumed office in Rabī’ 1 367 (Nov.-Dec. 977). In 371 (981-982) the powerful Sipahsālār in Khurāsān Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Mūḥammad b. ʿIbrāhīm b. Simdžār, who according to Ibn al-Athīr’s description of him “only obeyed when he pleased” (lī yaʿīs illā fi-ma ʾyūrīt), was dismissed and Ḥusayn al-Dawla Abī ʿl-ʿAbbās Tāsh, a devoted servant of the vizier, put in his place. But the rule of the vizier did not last long; the Sāmānīd armies were defeated by the Bayyids and the vizier himself murdered at the instigation of Ibn Simdžār. When Tāsh went to Bukhārā in order to restore order there, Ibn Simdžār joined forces with the former Mamlūk Fātīk, who had taken part in the war against the Bayyids and offered him his assistance in the conquest of Khurāsān; they then met in Naṣīḥa and seized the country around. When Tāsh heard of this he went to Merw and entered into negotiations with the two allies with the result that it was agreed that Tāsh should retain the supreme command along with Naṣīḥa while Fātīk was to get Bahlī and Ibn Simdžār’s son Abū ʿAlī was to receive Harāt. After some time, in 373 (983-984) or 376 (986), Abī ʿAlī b. Mūḥammad b. ʿUzair was appointed vizier. The latter was hostile to the ʿUbī family and at once dismissed Tāsh and re-tore Ibn Simdžār to the supreme command in Khurāsān. Some officers indeed appealed for Tāsh but their representations were of no avail with the vizier, who was supported by Nūh’s mother. Equally unsuccessful were the efforts of the former Sipahsālār to enforce his claims by force of arms against Ibn Simdžār and Fātīk, although he was supported by the two Bayyids, Fakhr al-Dawla and Shabāl al-Dawla b. ʿAdud al-Dawla. Tāsh was defeated and fled to Ḥudjīn where he died in 377 (987-988) of the plague or, according to another statement, of poison. In Dhū l-Hijjah 378 (March 990) Ibn Simdžār also died and was succeeded by his son Abū ʿAlī, who was jealous of Fātīk and wished to get him out of the way. When he resorted to arms Fātīk could not resist him but fled to Merwarātaḥ. Abū ʿAlī then was recognised as governor of all the provinces south of the Amūl-Daryā and soon made himself independent of the central government in Bukhārā while Fātīk took possession of Bahlī. The amir Abū l-Hārīth Mūḥammad b. Ahmad b. Farīghūn, whom Nūh sent against him, was defeated and joined Fātīk against the lord of Saghānīyān, Tāshir b. Fadl. The latter could not resist the combined forces of the allies; he himself was slain and his army scattered. In addition, there was the intervention of foreign rulers in the domestic affairs of the kingdom. Abū ʿAlī turned to the ʿAkhshābīn Bukhīrī-Khān and arranged with him for a partition of the Sāmānīd kingdom by which Bukhīrī-Khān was to have Transoxania and Abī ʿAlī Khurāsān. As a result Bukhīrī-Khān appeared in Bukhārā in Rabī’ I 382 (May 992) but soon withdrew and died on the way back to Turkestan [cf. the article BUKHĀRĪ-KHĀN]. After Nūh, who had had to evacuate his capital, had returned, Fātīk again appeared on the scene. On the approach of Bukhīrī-Khān he had been sent against him, but, as we are told, presumably correctly, deliberately allowed himself to be defeated, whereupon he submitted and was rewarded by Bukhīrī-Khān with the governorship of Tirmīzh and Bahlī. After the return of Nūh he made an alliance with Abī ʿAlī whereupon the helpless Sāmānīd decided to appease him by help to the Ghaznavīd Sabuktegin [cf. the article SĀMĀNĪDS]. After a time Abī ʿAlī and Fātīk, who had taken refuge with the ʿAbūl Fakhr al-Dawla in Ḥudjīn, wished to return to Khurāsān (386 = 995). At first they had some success but when they encountered Sabuktegin near Tūs, they suffered a decisive defeat and fled to Amūl. They then sent messengers to Bukhārā to appeal for pardon. The authorities turned a deaf ear to Fātīk’s appeal but declared themselves ready to restore Abī ʿAlī to favour. Fātīk therefore fled to the ʿAkhshābīn, while Abī ʿAlī after many vicissitudes finally made his peace with the authorities in Bukhārā through the intervention of the amir Abū l-ʿAbbās Mūḥammad b. Mūḥammad in Surgand; he received very kindly but later thrown into prison with several of his brothers and officers. At the same time, a raid by the ʿAkhshābīn forced Nūh again to appeal to Sabuktegin who was then in Bahlī. The latter at once invaded Transoxania with a large army; but when he demanded that Nūh should join forces with him, Nūh refused on the advice of the vizier Abī ʿAlī b. ʿUzair. Sabuktegin was not at all pleased and Nūh had not only to give in but also to hand over the vizier and Abū ʿAlī, whereupon the vizierate was given to Abī Naṣīḥ Ahmad b. Mūḥammad b. Abī Zaid. Sabuktegin imprisoned Abī ʿAlī and Ibn ʿUzair in Gurdā. The former died in 387 (997) in prison while the vizier was afterwards released. At the conclusion of peace, Sabuktegin and the ʿAkhshābīn agreed that the steppe of Kāzwīn should be the frontier between the Sāmānīds and the ʿAkhshābīn. Fātīk was also recognised as governor of Samarkand. Sabuktegin ruled as an independent sovereign in Khurāsān; in Transoxania the vizier Abī ʿAlī endeavoured to restore order by force but after a few months he was murdered and Nūh appointed his successor Abū l-Muqaffa Mūḥammad b. Ṭahmān al-Barghashi. Nūh died in Rajab 387 (July 997) and was succeeded by his son Abī ʿl-Hārīth MāṬAṢĪR b. NŪH.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, ed. Tornø, viii. 495; ix. 7-9, 19 sq., 67, 68.
72, 75 sq., 91; Gardizi, Zain al-Akhbār, ed. Muhammad Nāṣim, p. 48 sq., 53–60; Description topographique et historique de Boukhoura par Mou-ammad Nermekhchi, ed. Schefer, passim; Hamd Allāh Mustawfi-Karwānī, Ṭavīrīk Īqāda, ed. Browne, i. 350, 353, 385–390, 393, 421; Amedroz and Margoliouth, The Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate, see index; Barthold, Turkīstan down to the Mongol Invasion, in G.M.S., p. 9, 252–254, 255–264.

(Rev. V. Zetterstēen)

Nūḥ b. Mustafā, an Ottoman theologian and translator. He was born in Anāla but migrated while still quite young to Cairo where he studied all branches of theology and attained a high reputation. He died there in 1659. He wrote a series of theological treatises, some of which are detailed by Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 314. His most important work however is his free translation and edition of Shahriārī’s celebrated work on the sects. TERGEMEI MILAT vee-Khawāl which he prepared at the suggestion of a prominent Cairo citizen named Yūsuf Efendi. It exists in manuscript in Berlin (cf. Perisch, Kat., p. 157 sq.), Gotha (Fertsch, Kat., p. 76), London (cf. Vell, Cat., p. 35 sq.), Uppsala (cf. Tornborg, Codices Antiqua, 213), Viena (cf. Fligel, Kat., ii. 190) etc. and was printed in Cairo in 1625. On the considerable differences between this Turkish translation and the original Arabic cf. Rieu in the British Museum Catalogue, p. 35. In his Memoire sur deux effets goniatiques du moyen age, du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Blacas (Paris 1832), p. 28 sqq. J. v. Hammer gave some extracts from the latter part of the work. He also wrote on it in the Wiener Jahrbücher, lxxi, p. 50 and ch. 4.

In 1150 (1741) a certain Yūsuf Efendi wrote a life of Nūḥ b. Mustafā which exists in MS. in Cairo (Cat., viii. 364).

Bibliography: The catalogues of MSS. above mentioned and also Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 314 and Muhammad al-Muhfīz, Ṭavīrīkh Khudāyat al-Āthār, Cairo 1868, iv. 458.

(Franz Babinger)

Al-Nukhālī, a town in the Ṭirāq, near al-Kūfa. It is known mainly from the accounts of the battle of Kādīsya. From the statements collected by Yākūt regarding its position it appears that two different places of this name had later to be distinguished, namely one near Kūfa on the road to Syria, which is several times mentioned in the time of the Caliphs ‘Alî and Mu‘āwiyah and another, a watering station between al-Muhfīz and al-‘Akhāra, 3 mīl from al-Hafar, to the right of the road to Mecca. Several encounters took place there during the second battle of Kādīsya. According to al-Kalâbî in al-Bakî, this al-Nukhālī was in the Syrian steppe (al-Fardāyī): Ibn al-Fakîh also seems to be thinking of this region. Caetani assumes that the reference in both cases is to the same place on the edge of the desert. According to Musīl, it perhaps corresponds to the modern Khān Ibn Nkhalīh about 14 miles S. S. E. of Kerbelā and 40 miles N. N. W. of Kūfa.


Al-Bakî, a plain west of the Djielb al-Harwan on the border of Trachonitis in Transjordan. The name al-Nukhā (the ‘cavity’) is quite modern. It is applied to an area which includes the two districts of al-Mukhātān (with its chief town al-Hafar) and Harwan (west of the hills of the same name), i.e. the whole northern half of Transjordan. In the wider sense al-Nukhā includes all the country from al-Lajj, Djaiedîr and al-Balka to the foot of the Djielb al-Harwan, in the narrower sense only the southern part of this; in any case it stretches from al-Sanāmīn to the Djielb al-Duruz (Harwan). To al-Nukhā belong Mu‘ātibin or Mu‘āhibn, Tubnā (now Tilnīb), al-Mahādja, Obaţ, ʿOlmā, al-Musāfiya and al-Faidān already mentioned in Syriac texts of the pre-Muslim period.


NUMAIR b. ‘Āmir ii. Ṣaṣa‘a, an Arab tribe (Wustenfeld, Genial. Tabellen, F 15) inhabiting the western heights of al-Yamāma and those between this region and al-Ḥima Dārīya: a bare and difficult country the nature of which explains the rude and savage character of the Numair. Their name like that of Namir and ‘Ammār borne by other ethnic groups (there are also in the list of Arab tribes a number of other clans with the name Numair: among the Assād, the Tamīm, the Djiṣṭ, the ʿAbdān etc.) is no doubt connected with namir, the Arabian panther; we know the dedications made by Robertson Smith from this fact and from other similar cases, to prove the existence of a system of totemism among the early Arabs (Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, second ed., p. 234). His theory is now abandoned.

The geographical dictionaries of al-Bakî and Yākūt mention a large number of places in the land of the Numair, especially their wells, and often even record a change of ownership from one tribe to another (e.g. Yākūt, Muḥjam, iii. 822: the well of Ḥish, which formerly belonged to the Tamūnī clans of the Khulāb b. Yarhī, later passed to Numairi); this wealth of references does not however mean that the Numair played an important part in the history of Arabia. It is only due to the fact that the country of the Numair is typically Bedain in its scenery and lends itself to description by poets. The Numair besides were much intermixed with the neighbouring tribes (especially the Tamīm, Bāhila and Kūṣair) and the boundaries of their territory were rather vague.

The Numair, a poor tribe without natural wealth, have always been brigands. The part they took in the pre-Islamic wars was a very modest one and they appear nowhere alongside of the other groups of the great tribe of ‘Āmir b. Ṣaṣa‘a (they hardly played any part in the battle of Fāir al-Riḥ against the Banu ʿl-Hārīth b. Ka‘b and their allies, Nakāfī, ed. Bevan, p. 469–472). It is to
this isolation that they owe the privilege of being known as one of the Ḍumār al-ʿArāb, i.e. a tribe which never allied itself with others (al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, ed. Wright, p. 372; Naṣāʾī, p. 946; Mafāṣīṣ, ed. Lyall, p. 841; on the different tribes to which this title is given, cf. Tāj al-ʿArūs, iii. 107); the other designation of the Numār is ʿAlī b. Ṭāhir, because of the same tribe as is the same ʿAmir (Maĥfīz, p. 259, 12–15 = 771, 2–4; the source is the Qamāḥa of Ibn al-Kalbī, Brit. Mus. MS., fol. 120b–121v). Neither during the life of the Prophet, nor at the beginning of the caliphate, did the Numār make any stir: they appear neither as partisans nor as enemies of Islam. It is only from the Umayyad period that the name begins to appear in histories, but only to record their insubordination to the central power or their exploits as brigands; in the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik their refusal to pay tribute brought a punitive expedition against them (al-Baladūrī, Fī Ṭalāb, p. 159; cf. Aḥbār, xvii. 112–113; sīx. 135–136). Another expedition of the same kind but on a larger scale was that sent against them under the famous general of the caliph al-Muta-wakkil, Buhār al-Kābirī, in 232 (846) to put an end to their systematic plundering: it ended in the complete dispersal of the tribe (Ṭabarî, iii. 1357–1363); a most interesting account of Bedouin customs including on p. 1361 a detailed list of the Numār clans only one of which, the Ṣaḥīb b. Numār, devoted itself to agriculture and grazing, while the others lived only by brigandage.

It appears however that the Numār soon resumed their old habits and another expedition was sent against them with the same object as the earlier ones in the 15th century A.D. by the Ḥamālīn Saʿīd al-Dawla (Yūnī, al-Mudīm, iv. 378).

An event of little importance in itself has given the Numār considerable fame in literary history, although little flattering to them: this is the satire directed against them by the poet Ḥajarī, which is one of the most famous examples of the invective of the ḥiṣbī (especially the hemistich: "Cast down thine eyes; thou belongest to the Numār!"). The occasion of it was the unfortunate intervention of the Numār poet al-ʿRābī in favour of al-Parādašī in the celebrated feud between him and ʿIjārī (Naṣāʾī, p. 427–451, No. 53: Aḥbār, vii. 49–50; xx. 169–171 et al.). The memory of this quarrel survived for a very long time. It was probably no accident that the man who urged the emir Buhār to the expedition against the Numār was the great-grandson of Ḥajarī, the poet ʿUmmār b. ʿAṣīl b. Bīrād b. Ḥajarī; the Numār moreover had slain four of his uncles (Ibn ʿUkba, Ẓīf, ed. de Goeje, p. 284, where we must read B. Ḥimma [b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Numār] in place of B. Dabba). The enmity between the family of Ḥajarī and the Numār was probably revived by the proximity of the latter to the title of the poet, the Bani Kulaib b. Yarīn.

To the Numār belonged notable poets — in addition to al-ʿRābī and his son ʿIjārī — ʿAbd al-Ḥayyā (in the early Abābādī period) and Ḥajarī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAwd, whose Dīwān was recently published (Cairo 1350 = 1931, publications of the Egyptian Library).


Al-Numār b. Bāshīr Al-Anṣākī, gover-

nor of al-Kūfa and Ḥimī. According to some Muslim authorities, al-Numār was the first anṣārī to be born after the Hijra. His father Bāshīr b. Saʿīd [q. v.] was one of the most distinguished of the Companions of the Prophet, and his mother, ʿAmr bint Rawāsha, was the sister of the much respected ʿAbd Allāh b. Rawāsha [q. v.]. After the assassination of ʿOthmān, al-Numār, who was devoted to him, refused to pay homage to ʿAli. According to some stories which seem rather apocryphal, he brought the bloodstained shirt of the Caliph, according to others, the fngers cut from the hand of his wife Ṣabīa to Dumascus and these relics were exhibited by Muʿāwiyah in the mosque. In the battle of Šīrīn [q. v.] he faithfully stood by Muʿāwiyah and he was always a favourite with him while the other anṣārīs were kept at a suitable distance from the Umayyad court. In the year 39 (659–660) al-Numār by order of Muʿāwiyah undertook an expedition against al-ʿAṣīl b. Kāhū al-ʿArabī, who had occupied in ʿAlī's name ʿAin al-Tamr on the frontier between Syria and Mesopotamia and began to besiege it but had to retire without accomplishing anything. Twenty years later he was given the governorship of al-Kūfa. He was not really fitted for this post, because his pronounced antipathy to ʿAli and his followers did not suit the Ṣufī population of the town. In addition he did not conceal his sympathy with the anṣārīs, who were attacked by Yazid b. Muʿāwiyah's favourite al-ʿAṣīl [q. v.], but freely expressed his opinion on the in-

sult offered to his fellow tribesmen. After Yazid had come to the throne in 60 (April 680), he nevertheless left al-Numār in office; but the latter did not long remain there. Al-Numār is described as an ascetic and he knew the teachings of the Kurān thoroughly. But his asceticism was not of the strictest type, and his interest in musical entertainments was regarded as evidence of lack of dignity. In policy he proved very tolerant so long as it did not come to an open rising. When Muslim b. ʿAṣīl, Ḥusain's partisan, appeared in al-Kūfa to ascertain the feelings of the people and found a number who were ready to pay homage to Husain, al-Numār adopted a neutral attitude and took no steps to check the vigorous propaganda. As a result the followers of the Umayyads in al-Kūfa wrote to the Caliph and called his attention to the fact that the threatening situation demanded a man of vigour who would be able to carry out the government's orders, while al-Numār out of real or feigned weakness was letting things take their course and only urging people to keep calm. When al-Yazid was discussing this with his coun-

sellors, notably the influential Ibn Sarājih, the latter showed him a document signed by Muʿāwiyah shortly before his death, containing the appointment of the then governor of al-Bayra ʿUthmān b. Ziyād [q. v.] to the same office in al-Kūfa. In spite of his antipathy to the proposal, Yazid carried out his father's wishes and made ʿUthmān governor of al-Kūfa without removing him from his post in al-Bayra, whereupon al-Numār hastened back to Syria. When the people of Mardin rebelled
at the beginning of the year 63 (682) and drove all the Umayyads out of the town, Yazid wished to see what tact would do before resorting to arms and sent a mission to Medina under al-Nu'mān to show the people the futility of armed resistance and to bring them to their senses. The mission was also instructed to go on to Mecca to induce the stubborn 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr to pay homage. Al-Nu'mān's warnings and threats had no effect on his countrymen however and there was nothing left for the Caliph but to subdue the rebels in the two holy cities [see the article YAZID B. MU'awiya] by force of arms. After the death of Yazid in Rabi' I 64 (Nov. 683) al-Nu'mān who had in the meantime become governor of Ḥims declared openly for 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. In Dhu l-Hijjah of the same year (July-Aug. 684) or in Muharram 65 (Aug.-Sept. 684) however, the latter's leading follower al-Dakāk b. Kais al-Fihrī [q. v.] was defeated at Mardj Rāhib [q. v.] and thus the fate of al-Nu'mān was also decided. He attempted to save himself by flight but was overtaken and killed. According to the Arab historians, the town of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān takes its name from Nu'mān b. Bashir.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, vi. 35; Tahtā, ed. de Goeje, see index; Ibn al-Abī al-Kānim, ed. Törnberg, i. 514; ii. 85; 393, 392; iii. 154, 228, 315, 436, iv. 9, 47, 17, 19, 75, 88, 120, 123—125; Ya'qūbī, ed. Houtsma, ii. 219, 228, 278, 301, 304 sq.; al-Dinawari, al-Ākhdār al-ṣiṭrāl, ed. Guirgass, p. 239 sq., 245, 247, 273; Mas'ūdī, Muḥāfaṣ, ed. Paris, iv. 296 sq.: v. 128, 134, 204, 227—229; Abu l-Fida', ed. Reiske, i. 77, 386, 393, 405, 407; Kūtāb al-Ākhbārīl, see Guidi, Tables alphabétiques; Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, viii. 325; ix. 233, 355; x. 275 sqq., see also index; Weilhhausen, Das arabischische Reich und sein Suri, p. 47, 82, 94, 96, 110; Lammens, Études sur le règne du califat omeyyade, p. 43, 45, 58, 110, 116, 407; id., Le califat de Yazīd, p. 119 sqq., 137, 140, 142, 207, 215, 221, 228.

K. V. ZIMMERSTEIN

**AL-NU'MĀN B. AL-MUNDIR (with the kunya Abū Kābūs or Abū Kūbās) was the last 'king' of the house of the Lakhmids of al-Hira [cf. LAKHM]. He is certainly the best known to the Arabs but not by any means therefore the most important of the dynasty. He is often mentioned by the poets, according to circumstances a subject of panegyrics or of lampoons. His best known court poet was al-Nābiḥa al-Dhubyānī [q. v.]; on his relationship with 'Adi b. Zaid al-Thābit see below.

His fame among the Arabs does not mean that we know a great deal about his life and activities. What we can get from the poetry is of very little historical value and what the historians tell us about him is of almost less value. Arab tradition about the house of Lakhmids is generally speaking of the same nature as that of the partly contemporary houses of Ḥassān and Kinda. In addition there is the complication produced by the frequent confusion of different people of the same name in the stories. What is to be found in non-Arab sources, although more reliable, is too trifling and accidental to build a historical narrative upon.

The material has been collected by Noldeke in his Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden and G. Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al-Hira and critically studied as far as possible.

The "kings" of al-Hira were vassals of the Persian Great Kings and were installed by them, and given the task of keeping together the Arab population of the marches and the desert Arabs, their dependents, and thus to protect the empire against raids and plunder by the Beduins. Al-Nu'mān is said to have reigned 580—602 a.d. or perhaps a little later. His father was al-Mundhir b. Hind, one of the three sons of the famous princess of the house of Kinda, who came to the throne in succession. His mother however was of humble origin; she was, it is said, the daughter of a goldsmith near Medina, a fact which the enemies of the king made good play within their lampoons on him. After the death of his father al-Mundhir, the Great King (Hormizd IV) is said to have hesitated for a time to fill the throne. Al-Nu'mān's final appointment is said only to have been made through the influence and cunning of the Arab poet 'Adi b. Zaid al-Thābit [q. v.], who was secretary for Arab affairs to the Great King and whose family were devoted to al-Nu'mān.

No really important events are known of the reign of al-Nu'mān. Mention is made of hostilities with Arab tribes and anecdotes of his life recorded. At first a pagan, like all his male ancestors, he was baptised which did not prevent him remaining a polygamist. But there had been previously Christians in his family. His grandmother Hind above mentioned founded a monastery [cf. al-Thura] and his sister of the same name (others say daughter) was a nun. Towards the end of his life he had the poet 'Adi b. Zaid put to death as his enemies had poisoned him against him. But he is said to have helped a son of the poet to obtain the same influential position with the Great King (Khusraw II) as his father had held. He himself was not long afterwards made prisoner by the Great King — it is said as a result of the machinations of this son of 'Adi — and died in prison. There are all sorts of legends giving details of his end.

**Bibliography:** Noldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 347; note 1, and Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lahmiden, p. 107—120, where the rest of the literature is given.

K. V. ZIMMERSTEIN

**AL-NU'MĀN B. THĀBIT.** [See ABD HANIFA] AL-NU'MĀN B. ABD ALLĀH MUḤAMMAD B. MANSUR B. AJMAD B. HAIYEN AL-TAMMĪ AL-SAMMĀLI AL-MUNDIRĪ ABŪ HANIFA, the greatest of the Ismā'īlī jurists and a protagonist of the early Fātimids in Egypt. Nu'mān appears to have been derived from a Maliki stock in Kairawān, adopting the Ismā'īlī faith early in life. The exact date of his birth is not known, but it is probable that he was born in the last decades of the third century of the Hijra. He began his service of the Fātimids by entering the service of al-Mahdi (first Fātimid caliph) and served him for the last nine years of his life, i.e., 313—322 a.h. Thereafter he continued to serve al-Kā'im (second Fātimid caliph) for the whole of his life. During this time al-Nu'mān was concerned chiefly with the study of history, philosophy and jurisprudence, and the composition of his numerous works. Just prior to al-Kā'im's death, which occurred in 335 (946), he was appointed a kāfī. His rank rose during the time of Mansūr (third Fātimid caliph) and he reached his
zenith in the time of the fourth Fāṭimid caliph, al-Mu‘izz (died 365 = 976), whom he predeceased by two years. Officially he does not seem to have been appointed ʿāṣim, a designation given for the first time to al-Nūmān’s elder son ‘Ali; but during the reign of al-Mu‘izz, al-Nūmān acquired great power and was in effect the highest judicial functionary of the realm, and one of the most important figures in the hierarchy of the Da‘wā (pronounced Da‘wa‘ by the Ismā‘ilis).

Kādji al-Nūmān was a man of great talent, learning and accomplishments; learned as a scholar, prolific as an author, upright as a judge. Not many external facts of his life are known. Possibly he was a recluse immersed in juristic and philosophical studies, and engaged in the composition of his numerous works. He was the founder of and is rightly regarded as the greatest exponent of Ismā‘ili jurisprudence. According to the Ismā‘ili tradition, he wrote nothing without consulting the Imāms who were his contemporaries; and his greatest work, the Da‘wā‘ im al-Islām (The Pillars of Islām), is regarded as almost the joint work of Imām al-Mu‘izz and Kādji al-Nūmān, and therefore of the highest authority. It was the official corpus juris after the time of al-Mu‘izz throughout the Fāṭimid empire. In addition to being a jurist, some of his other works are also considered as standard works by the Ismā‘ili doctors and are still eagerly studied, for example, Aṣīs al-Taw‘il and Tā‘wil al-Da‘wā‘ (taw‘il), Sharh al-Akhbār and Iṣṭilāḥ al-Da‘wā (akhbār), and al-Majdūl wa l-Mudāyirat (w‘ā‘).

Al-Nūmān was the founder of a distinguished family of kādjas, and both of his sons, ‘Ali and Muḥammad, attained the rank of chief kādja, kādji al-kadhaf.

Kādji al-Nūmān died at Old-Cairo (Mīr‘) on Friday, the 29th of Dhumādī II, 363 (March 27, 974).

Al-Nūmān was a prolific and versatile author, and the names of 44 of his works have come down to us. Out of these, 22 are totally lost; 18 are wholly, and 4 partially, preserved by the Western Ismā‘ilis of India. Instead of giving a complete list of his works, which may be found elsewhere, I am only classifying them according to subjects, mentioning the most important of them: A. Fīkh: 14 works (Kītāb al-Iṣlah, Da‘wā‘ al-Islām, Muhkhasar al-Āthār); B. Ma‘āyangar: 5 works; C. Ta‘wil (Allegorical Interpretation): 3 works (Aṣīs al-Taw‘il, Tā‘wil al-Da‘wā‘); D. Hafṣīk (Esoteric Philosophy): 4 works; E. Aḵā’īd (Dogmatists): 6 works (al-Kāfala al-muḥṣarā); F. Aḵbār al-Sira: 3 works (Sharh al-Akhbār); G. Ta‘rišk: 2 works (Iṣṭilāḥ al-Da‘wā‘); H. Wast: 3 works (al-Majdūl wa l-Mudāyirat); I. Miscellanea: 4 works.


Nūn, the twenty-fifth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 50, belonging to the group of liquids (al-khurāf al-dhahābi), and as such subject to numerous changes and assimilations; cf. the Bibliography.

On the palaeographic history of the character, cf. ARAH, plate i.


Nūr (Nūr), light, synonym daw‘, also dīw and dīya‘ (the latter sometimes used in the plural).

According to some authors, daw‘ (dīya‘) has a more intensive meaning than nūr (cf. Lane, Arabic-English Dictionary, s.v. daw‘); this idea has its foundation in Kūran x. 5, where the sun is called dīya‘ and the moon nūr. The further deduction from this passage that dīya‘ is used for the light of light producing bodies (sun) and nūr on the other hand for the reflected light in bodies which do not emit light (moon), is not correct, if we remember the primitive knowledge of natural science possessed by the Arabs in the time of Muḥammad, nor is there any proof of it in later literature.

The works on the natural sciences of the Arabs in the best period of the middle ages (Ibn al-Haitham, Ḥawāni and later writers) in the great majority of cases use the term daw‘ and it therefore seems justified to claim this word as a technical term in mathematics and physics.

Besides dealing with the subject in his Optics (Kītāb al-Manāsir) Ibn al-Haitham devoted a special treatise to it entitled Kanw al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥaitham fī l-Daw‘ which has been published with a German translation by J. Baarmann in the Z. D. M. G., xxvii. [1882], 195—237, from which we take the following details:

As regards light, two kinds of bodies are distinguished, luminous (including the stars and fire) and non-luminous (dark); the non-luminous are again divided into opaque and transparent, the latter again into such as are transparent in all parts like air, water, glass, crystal etc. and such as only admit the light partly but the material of which is really opaque, such as thin cloth.

The light of luminous bodies is an essential quality of the body, the reflected light of a body in itself dark on the other hand is an accidental quality of the body.

In the opinion of mathematicians all the phenomena of light are of one and the same character; they consist of a heat from fire which is in the luminous bodies themselves. This is evident from the fact that one can concentrate rays of light from the brightest luminous body, the sun, by means of a burning-glass on one point and thus set all inflammable bodies alight and that the air and other bodies affected by the light of the sun become warm. Light and heat are thus identified or regarded as equivalent. The intensity of light, like that of heat, diminishes as the distance from the source increases.

Every luminous body whether its light is one of its essential qualities (direct) or accidental (reflected), illuminates any body placed opposite it, i.e. it sends its light out in all directions. All bodies whether transparent or opaque possess the power of absorbing light, the former have futher
the power of transmitting it again; that a transparent body (air, water, etc.) also has the power of absorbing light is evident from the fact that the light becomes visible in it if it is cut with an opaque body: the light must therefore have already been in it.

The penetration of light into a transparent body takes place along straight lines (proof: the sun’s rays in the dust-filled air of a dark room). This transmission of light in straight lines is an essential feature of light itself, not of the transparent body, for otherwise there must be in the latter specially marked lines along which the light travels; such a hypothesis is however disproved by admitting two or more rays of light at the same time into a dark room and watching them. The ray is defined as light travelling along a straight line. The early mathematicians were of the opinion that the process of seeing consisted in the transmission of a ray from the eye of the observer to the object seen and the reflection from it back to the eye. Opposed to this is Ibn al-Haitham’s view that the body seen — luminous or opaque — sends out rays in all directions from all points of those going towards the eye of the observer collect in it and are perceived as the image of the body (cf. Optics, book i. 23: “Vidio non fit radiis a visu emissis” and also book ii. 23).

There is no absolutely transparent body; on the contrary, every body even the transparent one reflects a part of the light which strikes it (reflection of the phenomenon of twilight). According to Aristotle, the heavens possess the highest and most perfect degree of transparency. Ibn al-Haitham challenges this statement and shows from a use of the theory of the mathematician Abū Sa‘d al-‘Allī b. Suhail, which is based on the well known rules of there fraction of light in passing through media of different densities, that the transparency has no limits and that for every transparent body an even more transparent one can be found.

An explanation of the origin of the halo around the moon, of the rainbow, its shape and its colours, and of the rainbow to be seen at night in the steam laden atmosphere of the sea, is given in Physiography, i. (Agānī’s Makh̲k̲hat, ed. Wustenfeld, Gottingen 1849, p. 100 sq.; transl. Ethé, Leipzig 1868, p. 205 sqq.). Kašwini in his discussion replaces the raindrops by small looking-glasses; Ibn al-Haitham, on the other hand, deals with the problem in a much more conclusive fashion by assuming a single or double reflection of light in spheres (cf. E. Wiedemann, Wied. Ann., vol. xxxix., 1890, p. 575).

Bibliography: References given in the article.

(Willy Hartner)

The doctrine that God is light and reveals himself as such in the world and to man is very old and widely disseminated in Oriental religions as well as in Hellenistic gnosticism and philosophy. We cannot here go into the early history; it will be sufficient to refer to some parallels in the Old and New Testaments, e. g. Gen. i. 3; Isaiah, Ix. 1, 19; Zech., iv.; John, i. 4—9; iii. 19; v. 35; viii. 12; xii. 35 and Rev., xxi. 22 sq.

How Muhammad became acquainted with this teaching we do not know, but the Qurān has its "light" verses [notably Sūra xxiv. 35; the "light verse" proper; cf. with it Sūra xxxiii. 45 (Muhammad as lamp); lx. 8 sq. (Allah’s light); lxiv. 8 (the light sent down = revelation)]. The light verse runs (as translated by Goldziher, in Korānuntzüge, p. 183 sq.): “Allāh is the light of the heavens and of the earth; his light is like a niche in which there is a lamp; the lamp is in a glass and the glass is like a shining star; it is lit from a blessed tree, an olive-tree, neither an eastern nor a western one; its oil almost shines alone even if no fire touches it; light upon light. Allāh leads to his light whom he will, and Allāh creates allegories for man, and Allāh knows all things”.

From the context it is clear that we have to think of the light of religious knowledge, of the truth which Allāh communicates through his Prophet to his creatures especially the believers (cf. also Sūra xxviii. 40). It is pure light, light upon light, which has nothing to do with fire (nūr), which is lit from an olive tree, perhaps not of this world (cf. however A. J. Wensinck, Tree and Bird as cosmological Symbols in Western Asia, in Verg. Ak. Anst., 1921, p. 27 sq.). Lastly it is Allāh as the all-knowing who instructs men and leads them to the light of his revelation (cf. Sūra lxiv. 8). It is clear that we have here traces of gnostic imagery but those rationalist theologians, who — whether to avoid any comparison of the creature with God or to oppose the fantastic mystics — interpreted the light of Allāh as a symbol of his good guidance probably diverged less from the sense of the Kurān than most of the metaphysicians of light. Passages are very frequent in the Kurān in which Allāh appears as the Knowing (al-shī‘) and the Guiding (al-hādī). One did not need to look far for an exegesis on these lines. As Maḥdī observes (Maḥdal, ed. Ritter, ii. 534) the Mu‘tazilī-Allāh al-Ḥusain al-Nadjiḏār interpreted the light verse to mean that God guides the inhabitants of heaven and earth. The Zaidīs also interpreted the light as Allāh’s good guidance [cf. the article Sīḥā’].

From ca. 100 A. H. we find references to a prophetic doctrine of nūr, and gradually to a more general metaphysics of light, i. e. the doctrine that God is essentially light, the prime light and as such the source of all being, all life and all knowledge. Especially among the mystics and in the more emotional thinking vein of the Hellenistic age these speculations developed. Meditation on the Kurān, Persian stimuli, gnostic-Hermetic writings, lastly and most tenaciously, Hellenistic philosophy provided the material for new ideas. Kumait (d. 743) had already sung of the light emanating through Adam via Muhammad into the family of ‘Allī [cf. the article Sīḥā’]. The doctrine of light was dialectically expounded by Sahl al-Tustari (d. 896) (see also Massignon, Texte incīl., p. 39 and the article Sahl al-Tustari).

The first representatives of a metaphysics of light in Islām readily fell under the suspicion of Manicheanism, i. e. of the dualism of nūr and ghnūn (darkness) as the eternal principles. The tradition of Tirmidī that Allāh created in darkness [cf. the article Khuṣū] must have aroused misgivings. The physican Rāzi (d. 923 or 932), although a Hellenistic philosopher, adopted ideas from Persia and was for this refuted or cursed by various theologians and philosophers. Many mystics also (e. g. Ḥallāj; according to Massignon, Passion, p. 150 sq. wrongly) were accused of this dualism.

But the speculations about nūr found a powerful support from the ninth century in the monistic doctrine of light of the Neo-Platonists (we do not
know of any Persian monism of light) which was compatible with the monism of Islam. The father of this doctrine is Plato, who in his Politeia, 506 D seq. compares the idea of the good in the super-sensual world with Helios as the light of the physical world. The contrast is not therefore between light and darkness but between the world of ideas or mind and its copy, the physical world of bodies, in the upper world pure light, in the lower world light more or less mixed with darkness. Among the Neo-Platonists the idea of the good is the highest God is pure light. This identification was also facilitated by the fact that according to Aristotle's conception light is nothing corporeal (De anima, ii. 7, 418b [42a]... δε το τον άνθρωπον αύριαν οντος, aor. ἐκ τοῦ/) from the context which is however not altogether clear, it appears that Aristotle regarded light as an effective force (ενέργεια). This is however of no importance here. Many Aristotelian forces and Platonic ideas are described by Neo-Platonists and Neo-Platonists sometimes as forces and sometimes as substances (spiritual). With Aristotle σκότος (darkness) was conceived not as something positive but as στρίφωσις (privatio, the absence of light).

From this developed the doctrine which we find in the Arabic "Theology of Aristotle". Not far from the beginning (ed. Dieterici, p. 3) it is said: the power of light (κύρωσις κύριας) is communicated by the prime cause, the creator, to the  ἀκήλι and by the ἀκήλι to the world soul, then from the ἀκήλι through the world soul to nature and from the world soul through nature to things which originate and decay. The whole process of this creative development proceeds without movement and timelessly. But God who causes the force of light to pour forth is also light (μέρις; occasional synonyms: λάμπειν, ἀκήλι), the "prime light" (p. 51) or (p. 44) the "light of lights". Light (p. 51) is essentially in God, not a quality (φύσις) for God has no qualities but works through his being (κατά ζωήν) alone. The light flows through the whole world, particularly the world of men. From the super-sensual original (p. 150), the first man (ισημυ ἀκηλί), it flows over the second man (ισημύ μενήσιαν) and from him to the third (ισημύ διήνυμι). These are the originals of the so-called real men. Light is of course found in its purest form in the souls of the wise and the good (p. 51). It should be noted also that μέρις as a spiritual force (ὑπέρ, ἀκήλι) is distinguished from fire (μέρις) which is said to be only a force in matter with definite quality (p. 85).

Fire of course like everything else has its super-sensual original. But this is more connected with life than with light.

The elevation of the soul to the divine world of light corresponds to the creative descent of light (p. 8). When the soul has ascended on its return beyond the world of the ἀκήλι, it sees there the pure light and the beauty of God, the goal of all mysteries. Although the author of the Liber de causis is of the opinion that nothing can be predicates regarding God, yet he has to call him the prime cause and more exactly pure light (§ 5, ed. Bardenheuer, p. 69) and as such the origin of all being and all knowledge (in God is ʿuṣūṣ = mārifṣa; see § 23, p. 103).

The light emanated by God may, if it is regarded as an independent entity, be placed at various parts of the system. Most philosophers and theologians connect it with the ṛוח or ṛ ṛ ṛ ṛ or identify it with them, sometimes also with life (ḥayyāt), but this must be more closely investigated.

The great philosophers in Islam, Fārābī and Ibn Sinā, connected the doctrine of light with the ʿaṣrī in metaphysics as well as in psychology. Fārābī is fond of using many synonyms for the light of God and the ʿaṣrī (bahaḥ etc.; see e.g. Der Mutter- stap, ed. Dieterici, p. 13 seq.). In the biography of Fārābī in Ibn Abī Uṣāfī (Cynán, ed. Muller, ii. 134—140) a prayer is attributed to him in which God is invoked as the "prime cause of things and light of the earth and of heaven". Ibn Sinā like Fārābī takes up the doctrine of light in theology and further develops it. In his psychological writings he regards the light as a link of the soul and body (cf. Sahih al-Tustari who places ʿarūf between ʿarīf and ʿīn in the four elements of man). In the Kitāb al-Iṣbāḥ (ed. Forget, Leyden 1892, p. 126 sq.) he even reads the whole metaphysical doctrine of the ʿaṣrī of the Aristotelians into the light verse of the Kurān. Light is the ʿaṣrī bi ʿaṣrīr, fire the ʿaṣrī ʿaṣrīr and so on. Allāh's ʿaṣrī is therefore like the nous of Aristotle! This discovery of Ibn Sinā's was incorporated in the pious reflections of Ghāzālī (in Maʿārif al-Khānī Maʿārif al-Miṣrī al-Marāfī, Cairo 1927, p. 58 sq.).

The basic opinions of this further development of speculation on ʿaṣrī, especially among the gnostics and mystics, are in Massignon's articles ʿARMAṬIANS and TAṢAWWUF.


NUR ALLĀH AL-SAYYID B. AL-SAYYID SHARĪF AL-MARĀṢĪ al-HUSAINI AL-MUṢṭAFA, commonly called Kādī Nūr Allāh, was born in 956 (1549). He was descended from an illustrious family of the Maʿrāṣī Sayyids and settled in Shushtar. He left his native place for India and settled in Lāhore where he attracted the notice of Ḥakīm Abū l-Faḍī (d. 997 = 1588) and through his presentation to Emperor Akbar (963—1014 = 1556—1605), he was appointed Kādī of Lāhore in lieu of al-Shākī Muʿīn (d. 995 = 1586). Abū al-Kādir Badūnī, iii. 137, says that he was "although a Shīʿa, a just, pious and learned man. He was lugged to death in 1019 (1610), on account of his religious opinions, by the order of the Emperor Dāhirāng (1014—1027 = 1605—1628). He is regarded as al-Shahīd al-Thāḥīṭ, "the third martyr", by the Shīʿa and his tomb in Akaṭābād is visited by numerous Shīʿas from all parts of India.

He is the author of innumerable works of which the following may be quoted: 1. ʿHāṣīya ʿala l-Baiḍāwīt, a supercommentary to al-Baiḍāwī's commentary on the Kurān, entitled Arṣwār al-Tanzil, Asiatic Society of Bengal MSS., List of the Government Collection, p. 161; 2. ʿHāṣīya Sharḥ ʿUṣūl ʿala l-Tanwīl, glosses to Kūshī's commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī's Compendium of metaphysics and theology, entitled Taṣwīr al-Kākim; 3. Hāṣīya al-Ḥaṣb wa-Ishāb al-Bāṭil, a polemical work against Sunnism written in reply to Faḍl b. Rūzbihān's work entitled Ḥaṣāl al-Bāṭil, a treatise in refutation


Nūr al-Din-Abu Iṣaṣim Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Shāhruḵ, called al-Malik al-ʿĀṣir, atābeg of Ḥalab and Damascus. Nūr al-Din was born in 511 (Febr. 1118) and took part under his father in the siege of Kaššāf Dījar bar where the latter was murdered in Rabiʿ II 541 (Sept. 1146). His kingdom was then divided between his two sons, Saif al-Din Ghāzī [q. v.] who took possession of al-Mawṣil, and Nūr al-Din who established himself in Ḥalab. Scarcely had the news of the 'Imād al-Din's death reached Joscelin II who lived in Tell Bāṣhir [q. v.] than the latter entered into negotiations with the people of Edessa, mainly Armenians, the chief stronghold of the Crusaders, which 'Imād al-Din had taken shortly before and assured himself of their cooperation in his proposed attack on the city. He was thus able to occupy the city without difficulty and its Muslim garrison took refuge in the citadel. When Nūr al-Din heard this he hurried thither by forced marches; Joscelin fled and Edessa fell into the hands of Nūr al-Din who wreaked a terrible vengeance on the treacherous Christians, laid the city completely waste and left only a few citizens in it. In the following year he invaded the district of Ḥalab and took from the Christians Artāb and Kafarālah and several other places. The news of the fall of Edessa in 539 (1144) made a tremendous impression in Europe and induced the Pope Eugenius III on Dec. 1, 1145 to send a letter to Louis VII and the knights of France in which he demanded a new crusade and in the spring of 1146 to send St. Bernard of Clairvaux to preach the crusade. He was listened to with enthusiasm; on receiving the Pope's message Louis had already declared himself ready to take the crusader's vow and finally the Hohenstaufen Conrad III was also won over. In the first half of the year 1147 the two kings set out and after great difficulties and considerable losses through starvation, epidemics and enemy attacks, the European armies joined one another in Palestine in the spring of 1148. It was decided to attack Damascus which was then nominally in the power of the Būrid Mūdir al-Din Aḥāb b. Muḥammad although the real ruler was one of his Mamluks named Mūʿīn al-Din Anār. In Rabiʿ I 543 (July 1148) the Christians began the siege of the town from the northwest. The first few days were spent in heavy fighting with great losses on both sides. In the meanwhile Mūʿīn al-Din had appealed for assistance to Saif al-Din Ghāzī. The latter set out with a large army and was joined on the way by his brother Nūr al-Din. Before giving the hard pressed Mūʿīn al-Din the assistance he desired he sent him a letter in which he demanded the surrender of the town to his deputy in order to have a base in case of a defeat; but if he was victorious he would leave the town at once. But as Mūʿīn al-Din did not trust him completely he endeavoured instead to frighten the Christians by threats and declared that if they did not retreat he would hand over the town to Saif al-Din who would certainly drive the invaders completely out of Syria. These representations, supported by the gold of Damascus, did not fail to influence the eastern leaders who were able to appreciate the situation much better than their European allies. But as they had not the courage to propose that the siege should be at once abandoned, they suggested in the council of war held in the night of the July 26–27, 1148 that the camp should be moved from west to east because, they said, the walls on this side were not so strong and the attack would not be impeded by gardens. The besiegers followed the
advice of those possessing local knowledge but
soon saw that they had been deceived because the
terrain on the east side offered even greater
difficulties in every respect and there was there-
fore nothing left for them but to withdraw in
order to resume the siege another time. When
Bertrand, the son of Count Alfonso of Toulouse
who had just died, took the fortress of al-
Sira and threatened the district of Tripoli Count Raymond
of Tripoli appealed to Nūr al-Dīn and Mu‘ān al-
Dīn who had joined one another in Baalbek;
the two Muslim leaders supported by a contingent
sent by Saif al-Dīn hurried to his help. Bertrand
had to surrender; the fortress was destroyed and by
himself taken prisoner. The Christian troops
prepared to invade the district of Ḥalab; Nūr al-
Dīn however anticipated them, defeated them at
Yaghra taking much booty, which he divided among
his brother Saif al-Dīn, the caliph al-Muqtafi
and the Saldjuq sultan Mas‘ūd. At the beginning of the
following year (May 1149) Nūr al-Dīn invaded the
region of Anṭākiya, laid waste the country with the
suburb of Ḥārīm and laid siege to the fortress of
Inmī. Prince Raymond of Antioch hastened
up with a small army to attack Nūr al-Dīn but
was enticed into an ambush and fell in the fight.
Nūr al-Dīn then went with his victorious forces
doing great damage as he went, close up to Antioch
in order to inspire the inhabitants with terror
and on his way back took Ḥārīm and forced the
strong fortress of Fāmiya (Apamea) near Ismā‘īl
to surrender. About the same time Saif al-Dīn died
and his brother and successor Kūb al-Dīn Mawdūd
prepared to fight Nūr al-Dīn, but the dispute was
settled amicably [cf. the article Mawdūd]. Soon
afterwards (545 = 1151 or 546 = 1152) Nūr al-
Dīn succeeded in capturing his enemy Joscelin II
of Edessa. The latter had previously won a victory
over Nūr al-Dīn and treated him very scornfully.
When one night he was travelling with only a few
followers to Antioch he was surprised by a
troop of Turkomans in the pay of Nūr al-Dīn and
brought to Ḥalab where he remained a prisoner
till his death, while Nūr al-Dīn gradually took
all the fortresses belonging to the country of
Edessa. In order to split up the Christian forces
and to bring some relief to the Muslims besieged in
‘Aškalān, he made an agreement with his enemy,
the prince of Damascus, Muqjiy al-Dīn Abak, and
in Safar 548 (May 1153) they both appeared before
the walls of Bānīyās [q.v.]. But when the irresolute
Muqjiy al-Dīn would undertake no serious steps
against the Christians, they soon abandoned the
siege and separated without having achieved any-
thing. When ‘Aškalān, was forced to capitulate after
an eight months siege the Christians began to
cast covetous eyes on the great and wealthy
city of Damascus, especially as Muqjiy al-Dīn acted
almost as if he were their vassal. In order to
thwart their plans, Nūr al-Dīn endeavoured to gain
over Muqjiy al-Dīn by pretended friendship and by
making false charges against them persuaded him to get rid of his chief emirs so that Muqjiy
al-Dīn thus lost his most reliable friends. When Nūr
al-Dīn suddenly appeared before the gates of the
city they were opened to him by his friends in
Damascus as had been prearranged. Muqjiy al-
Dīn took refuge in the citadel and summoned the
Christians to his assistance but surrendered
the city before help arrived (Safar 549 = April 1154).
In compensation he received Ilīms. There he
began to intrigue against Nūr al-Dīn and the
latter offered him Bālās instead; Muqjiy al-Dīn
however was not satisfied, but settled in Baghdād
where he remained till his death as a protégé of
the caliph al-Muqtafi. In 551 (1156) Nūr al-Dīn
made a peace with Baldwin III of Jerusalem,
whereby the latter gave up the annual tribute which
Damascus had had to pay him since the time of
Muqjiy al-Dīn and ceded the half of the lands of
Bānīyās. In spite of this about the end of the year
551 (Feb. 1157) Baldwin fell upon a defenceless
encampment of Arabs and Turkomans in the neigh-
bourhood of Bānīyās, took the men prisoners and
carried off their cattle. As a result the war broke
out and Saif al-Dīn sent two Christian princes,
Saad al-Dīn Shīrkuh, some in the vicinity of Damas-
cus by Nūr al-Dīn’s brother, the emir Nāṣir al-
Dīn. Many prisoners were brought to Damascus and
put to death by Nūr al-Dīn’s orders in revenge for
the Muslims killed at Bānīyās. Nūr al-Dīn
then attacked Bānīyās and destroyed the town but
could not take the citadel; he retired on the
approach of Baldwin. The latter rebuilt the ruined
town, dismissed a number of his troops and
intended to return to Tiberias, but was surprised
on the way by Nūr al-Dīn and suffered a disastrous
defeat (Djumādā I 552 = end of June 1157). Another
peace was then negotiated by Nūr al-Dīn to take the town was also unsuccessful; he again raised the siege by the
approach of Baldwin. Very soon afterwards he
fell very ill and a rumour spread that he had died.
The Christians thereupon attacked Shāizar [q.v.]
which had been severely damaged by an earthquake,
and had along with Baalbek shortly before fallen
into the hands of Nūr al-Dīn. The attack failed
however owing to the jealousies among the Frankish
leaders. On the other hand, they were successful
after two months siege in taking Ḥārīm in the
following year and in inflicting a severe defeat
on Nūr al-Dīn on the Jordan (Djumādā I 553 =
July 1158). About the same time the emperor
Manuel I Comnenos appeared in Syria to chastise
the rebelling Franks and in particular the princes
Raynald of Antioch who had undertaken an expedition against
Cyprus. After receiving the submission of the
princes, the emperor resolved to join Baldwin in
an attack on Ḥalab at the beginning of 1159.
Nūr al-Dīn however escaped the danger which
threatened him by releasing the Christian prisoners.
He then concluded a truce f-r four months with
Baldwin, took Harrān and al-Raṣīk from his brother
Nāṣir al-Dīn and invaded the lands of sultan
Kirdil Arslān II [q.v.]; but when Baldwin began
to lay waste Nūr al-Dīn’s territory, the latter
hurried back to Ḥalab and Baldwin retired. About
this time conditions in Egypt began to attract
the attention of Nūr al-Dīn and from the year
556 (1161) his history is so closely bound up with
that of Saladin that it is sufficient to refer in
the article on the latter for the main facts. Only
the following need be added here. In 558 (1163)
Nūr al-Dīn had planned an invasion of the country
of Tripoli and encamped before Hīrān al-Adār
[q.v.] and was preparing to storm it when he
was suddenly attacked by the Christians. His
troops who were quite unprepared were scattered
and Nūr al-Dīn himself only escaped with difficulty.
Nevertheless he succeeded by exerting all his
efforts in raising a new army in a short time
with which he again advanced on Ḥārīm After
winning a decisive victory over the Christian relief force, he took Harrim by storm (Râmaḍân 555 = Aug. 1163) and a few months later also forced Bâniyas to surrender. When the atâbâg of Mawsîl, Nûr al-Dîn's brother Khûth al-Dîn Mawdûd, at the end of 565 (Sept. 1170) died and his younger son Sâîf al-Dîn Ghâzî was chosen successor by the emirs, Nûr al-Dîn went there and said that Sâîf al-Dîn Mawsîl but was forced by Sînjâr to his elder brother 'Imâd al-Dîn Zangî. In 568 (1173) he invaded Asia Minor and took several towns; on his relations with the Sâlîdî Sûlûn see the article KULDI ARSLÎN II. While he was still on this expedition, an envoy arrived from the 'Abbâsîd caliph of Baghdâd bearing a diploma recognising Nûr al-Dîn as lord of al-Mawsîl, al-Djazîra, Irîb, Khiît, Syria, Egypt and Kûnya. He died on 11th Shawwâl 569 (May 15, 1174) in Damascus of a disease of the liver (ilât at-khuwayînî) and was buried in the citadel; his body was later brought to the madrasa founded by him at the entrance to the Sûk Khawwâsîn.

With reference to Nûr al-Dîn, Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 265 says: "I have studied the careers of the rulers of the past but from the time of the legitimate caliph 'Abd al-Malik and 'Omar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz I have found none who led a purer life or had greater enthusiasm for righteousness'. As a pious Muslim convinced of the truth of the Prophet's mission, he was always eager to follow out in exact detail the many prescriptions of the Kûrâ and the Sunna regarding the conduct of believers in private and public life. He was distinguished by a remarkable love of justice which was seen for example in the fact that he would never punish on mere suspicion alone and was able to check any arbitrariness on the part of the lower courts also, and avarice and selfishness were entirely foreign to his character. He never gave way to the temptation always at hand to enrich himself at the expense of the treasury; on the contrary, he applied the proceeds of the booty taken in war to pious foundations and public works for the benefit of Islam. Among the important cities of Syria the fortifications of which were renovated by him, Ibn al-Athîr mentions (xi. 267) the following: Damascus, Hîmz, Hâmât, Halâb, Shîzar and Baalbek, and mosques, schools, hospitals and caravanserais were built everywhere. On his great activity as a builder cf. the article DAMASCUS; cf. also Fleischer, Mi'hâl Mi'sâhî's Cultur-Statistik von Damasus (Kleiner Schriften, iii. 306 sqq.). He was also a generous patron of scholars in whom he took great interest; on the battlefield he earned the admiration of his soldiers by his personal bravery, which was coupled with unusual talent as a general. If on the other hand he was guilty of acts which are not quite compatible with humane warfare, like the massacre in Edessa on the recapture of the town and the slaughter of the Christian prisoners in Damascus after Baldwin's attack on the defenceless Muslims at Bâniyas, it should be remembered that this was no breach of the practice of war of the time. The constant aim of his efforts was the expulsion of the Christians from Syria and Palestine and to this object he remained faithful throughout his life. In the political history of Syria and Mesopotamia, Nûr al-Dîn played an unusually important part and laid a firm foundation on which Saladin was later able to build.


Nûr Al-Dîn Abû 'l-Hâridh Arslân Shâh b. Masûd b. Mawdûd b. Zangî, called al-Malik al-'Adîl, lord of al-Mawsîl. After the death of his father [q.v.] in Shabân 589 (Aug. 1193) Nûr al-Dîn succeeded him; the real ruler however in the early years of his tenure of office was the governor of the citadel, the eunuch Mujâhidh al-Dîn Kamâz al-Zâînî, who is described not only as a pious and learned man but as an official much concerned with the welfare of the people. He died in Rabî I 595 (Jan. 1199) or, according to another statement, in Şafar of the same year (Dec. 1198). Many buildings, such as mosques, monasteries, schools and bridges, which the city of Mawsîl owes to him, are evidence of his interest in the welfare of the community. When the officials of Nûr al-Dîn's uncle, the lord of Sînjâr, 'Imâd al-Dîn Zangî b. Mawdûd, seized several places in the neighbourhood of Nasûbîn, but really belonging to the territory of al-Mawsîl, Nûr al-Dîn after long and fruitless negotiations decided to seize the town of Nasûbîn. 'Imâd al-Dîn then died and was succeeded by his son Khûth al-Dîn Muhammâd. The change in the throne caused Nûr al-Dîn to hasten; in Diûmâd I 594 (March—April 1198) he set out with a large army. Khûth al-Dîn was defeated and turned to the Aiyûbîd al-'Adîl [q.v.] with an appeal for help while Nûr al-Dîn established himself in Nasûbîn; but his army melted away through sickness and death and on the approach of al-'Adîl he evacuated the town and returned to al-Mawsîl (Râmaḍân 594 = July—Aug. 1198) whereupon al-'Adîl laid siege to Mârdîn. In Muhammâd 595 (Nov. 1198) the ruler of Egypt al-'Azîz died and when his successor al-Afjal recalled al-'Adîl's Egyptian troops and also made an alliance with Nûr al-Dîn, al-'Adîl had to withdraw and leave the conduct of the siege of Mârdîn to his son al-Kâmî [q.v.]. Nûr al-Dîn then took the field and along with his two cousins Khûth al-Dîn Muhammâd and Sînjâr Shâh b. Ghâzî, lord of Dzjarat b. Omar, encamped before Dunaîsîr [q.v.]. After two months there they moved their camp to Harmân between Dunaîsîr and Mârdîn. In the meanwhile, the inhabitants of Mârdîn had exhausted their supplies; in addition devastating epidemics
broke out which still further reduced the ranks of the
defenders; the commander therefore sent a message
to al-Kāmil and declared himself ready to surrender
the town within a definite period on condition
that he was allowed to import sufficient food.
Al-Kāmil agreed but with the arrival of Nūr al-
Dīn the people of Mārīn placèd up their courage
and continued to resist the struggle. Al-Kāmil
might almost have taken the town by treachery;
although Kuṭb al-Dīn pretended to be devoted
to Nūr al-Dīn he was really secretly attached to
al-Kāmil and had promised him to take to flight
at once in case of an encounter. When the troops
were drawn up for battle he was placed in such
a position however that there was no possibility
of escape on the narrow battlefield. Al-Kāmil was
defeated and fled to Damascus to his father (Shawāwīl
595 = Aug. 1199). As to Nūr al-Dīn, he fell sick
and could not follow up his victory but returned
to al-Mawṣil. After he had recovered from his
illness, he went in Ṣafāʾīn 597 (May–June 1201)
with Kuṭb al-Dīn to Harrān to resume the struggle
with al-Ādil. When he reached Raʾs al-Ašūr, he
encountered and overpowered him from whom he
obtained Kuṭb al-Dīn. A third party, al-Fāizi al-
Adīl who lived in Harrān to seek peace and as
he knew that the other Ayyūbidis wished to make
peace with al-Ādil and deadly epidemics had broken
out among his troops, he granted their request for
a return to the status quo and returned to
al-Mawṣil. In the year 600 (1203–1204), Kuṭb
al-Dīn openly paid homage to al-Ādil and had
the khūba read in his name; Nūr al-Dīn could
d not perni this and took possession of Naṣībūn
except the citadel. This also would probably have
fallen into his hands if the news that the lord of
Irbil, Muṣaffār al-Dīn Kūbkūrī [q. v.], had invaded the
territory of al-Mawṣil in his absence and he had
wrought great havoc, had not forced him to return.
After he had ascertained that the accounts that
had reached him were much exaggerated he turned
his attention to Tell Affar which belonged to
Sindjār and laid siege to it. But fortune did not
favor him. It is true that he succeeded in taking
Tell Affar; then a number of Mesopotamian
princes allied themselves with Kuṭb al-Dīn and
Nūr al-Dīn could not face their combined strength.
When it came to battle he was completely routed
and had to surrender Tell Affar and make peace
(beg. 601 = late summer 1204). The relations
between Nūr al-Dīn and Kuṭb al-Dīn had never
been particularly friendly and matters did not
improve when Nūr al-Dīn gave his daughter in
marriage to one of al-Ādil's sons. On the occasion
of this union of the two dynasties, Nūr al-Dīn's
viziers proposed to him to conclude an alliance
with al-Ādil so that he might himself take pos-
tession of Djazar Ibn ʿOmar which was under the
rule of Muṭʿiz al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Sindjār Shāh
and that al-Ādil should occupy Kuṭb al-Dīn's territory.
This plan which was entirely in keeping with Nūr
al-Dīn's desires was also approved by al-Ādil and
the latter undertook a campaign against the east.
On this campaign in a short time he took al-Khābūr
and Naṣībūn and besieged Sindjār. While Kuṭb
al-Dīn was preparing to fight to defend his capital,
Nūr al-Dīn equipped an army which was to join
al-Ādil's. Then a sudden change took place in the
political situation. The lord of Irbil, Muṣaffār
al-Dīn Kūbkūrī who had promised Kuṭb al-Dīn
to intervene with al-Ādil on his behalf but had
been unsuccessful, now proposed to Nūr al-Dīn to
join him against al-Ādil. Nūr al-Dīn agreed and
when the Ayyūbid ruler of Ḥalab al-Malik al-Zāhir
and the Saltāq Saltān of ʿOmayr Šāhīrūs 1 b.
Khitīr Arslān [q. v.] joined the alliance and al-
-Ādil was further ordered by the ʿAbbasid caliph
al-Nāṣir [q. v.] to abandon his hostile plans, he
had finally to yield, especially as his emirs had
no inclination to continue the campaign. In the
end Kuṭb al-Dīn was left in possession of Sindjār
and al-Ādil returned to Harrān. Nūr al-Dīn died
at the end of Radjab 607 (Jan. 1211) and
was succeeded by his son al-Malik al-Kābir Izz
al-Dīn Masʿūd.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallikān, Wafayāt al-Aʿyan, ed. Wüstenfeld, Nr. 81 (transl. de
Slane, i. 174 sq.); Ibn al-ʿAṭḥār, al-Kāmil, ed.
Tornberg, xlii. 87 sq., 97–99, 101, 110 sq.,
ed. Reiske, iv. 145, 163, 207, 243; Recueil des
Histoires des Croisades, Historien orientaux,
i. 71, 74, 82, 86; ii. 6, 346–362; Khālid
Edhem, Dāwelī-islāmīyī, p. 233; de Zambuar,
Manuel de gênalogie et de chronologie, p. 226.

Nūr Dīhān, name given to Mihr al-
Nīṣāʾ, the famous queen of Dīhānīr, the Muhağal
Emperor. She was born at Kandahār in 1577 when
her father, Ghiyāth Beg, was migrating from Persia
to Hindūstān (Maʾāthir al-Umārāʾ, i. 129). In
the reign of Akbar she was married to Aḥī Kuṭb Beg,
a Persian who had rendered distinguished military
service to the Emperor and who, because of his
bravery, was known as Shīr Afghān. The assas-
ination of her first husband will always remain
a matter of controversy, some regarding it as a
repetition of the story of David and Uriah, others
holding the view that he had been suspected of
disloyalty. It was not however until four years
later, in 1611, that she became, at the age of
thirty-four, the wife of Dīhānīr. In the eleventh
year of that monarch's reign her name was changed
from Nūr Maḥālī into Nūr Dīhānī (Ṭāzūkī Dīhānī-
ḡīr, ed. Rogers and Beveridge, i. 319).

An extraordinarily beautiful woman, well-versed
in Persian literature in an age when few women
were cultured, ambitious and masterful, she entirely
dominated her husband, until eventually Dīhānīr
was king in name only. The chroniclers record that
she sometimes sat in the ḟarāwak, that cows
were struck in her name, and that she even dared to
issue fārmāns (Īkāhāmā, p. 54–57). She became
the leader of fashion and is said to have invented the
ṭat-ṭī Dīhānīrī, a special kind of rose-water. Her
style in gowns, veils, brocade, lace, and her farāk
sandānī (carpets of sandalwood colour) were known
throughout the length and breadth of Hindūstān.
Ably assisted in political affairs by her father,
now known as Iʿtimād al-Dawla, and her brother,
Aṣāf Khān, she dispensed all patronage thus-
falling foul of the older nobility led by Maḥāt Khan. The history of the last years of Dīhānīr's
reign is the history of Nūr Dīhānīr's efforts at
paving the way for the succession of her son-in-
law, Prince Shāhriyār. But the death of her father,
combined with the fact that Aṣāf Khān was sup-
porting the claim of his own son-in-law, Prince
Khurrām, considerably weakened her power. On
the death of Dīhānīr, in 1627, she was com-
pletely outwitted by Aṣāf Khān, her candidate
was defeated, and Prince Khurrām ascended the
throne as Shāh Dīhānī. The last eighteen,
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of this remarkable woman's life during the reign of Shah Djañh are unimportant to the historian of Mughal India.
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NUR MUHAMMADI, the technical term for the pre-existence of the soul of the Prophet Muhammad; the predestined essence of the last of the prophets is said to have been created first, all, in the form of a dense and luminous point; all the predestined souls are saidto have emanated from this.

Among the Sunnis, the idea first appears among the mystics in the third century A.H., then gradually begins to dominate popular worship (cf. Sahl Tustari and Hakim Tirmidhi, in our Rezâl, 1929, p. 34, N° 39 and p. 39; Abd Bakr Wâsî, whose Hâ Mîm al-Kidâm should be identified with ch. 2 of the Tawâwîl of Hâlidi [cf. our P. 8]) extends it. According to Kitâb, Muhammad is "the image in the pupil which is in the centre of the eye of creation" (insân 'ân al-khwasîd); this is what Ibn Arabî calls the hašîkha muhammadiya the pre-eternal conception of which is celebrated by the poets Şârâ, Witrâ and the mystic Djañîlî; hence Muhammad's immaculate pedigree since Adam (cf. the poems of the Mawâlî). Orthodoxy has always carefully placed the doctrine of the uncreated Kur'an above this cult. Popular legend among the Hoşâyîn has reduced and materialised this devotion: in showing the model of the body of the Prophet knitted from a handful of earth from Paradise with from the spring Tazmân which makes it shine like a white pearl. But it is certain that it is a question here primarily of a gnostic pre-existence, an intellectual substance of the nature of the angels as is evident from the antiquity of the equation insîr = wâdî, borrowed from Tirmidhi from the Ismâ'îlîs (cf. 'Aqî). Among the Shi'is, this doctrine appears earlier and with more logical coherence; among the extremists, who explain this "prophetic light", either as a "spirit" transmitted from age to age and from elect to elect, or as spermatic germ (Tradicanism) inherited from male to male. At the beginning of the second century Mughira and Djañîlî taught the primogeniture of the luminous shadow (wâdî, opposed to šâbâb "dark body") of Muhammad. It is a fundamental dogma of Ismâ'îlism from its beginning (al-shâhîr nîr mahk = al-mîm); it is found again extended through solidarity to all the 'Alîs or to all the Tâlibis with the gift of sinlessness among the Nusârîs and even among many pious Ismâ'îlî writers (Kâfîn, Nûrî, p. 116). The authors of this doctrine derive it from the Kur'an (nîr al-mîm: xxiv. 35; the tawâwîl: the connection between the two terms called muhammadi by Bûhîrî [Brit. Mus. Add. 16,779]).

NURBAKHSHIYA, religious sect or order called after Muhammad b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh, called Nur Baksh (955–985) by the Brit. Mus. A.H.

1. Life of the founder. Of this person there is a detailed biography in the work Madâlî al-Muminîn of Nur Allâh al-Shustari (Bedleian MS., Osn. 366; see also Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Persian MSS., chiefly based on a work (tafsîk) by Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Samarqandi. His father was born in Kâfîn, and his grandfather in al-Hass, whence in some ghâsâls he styles himself Lahryvî. His father migrated to Kâfîn in Kuhistan, where his cousin was imam. The latter became a disciple of Isâsh al-Khâfrica, himself a disciple of Saiyûd 'Ali al-Hamadâni (whose biography is published in Khâshvat al-Afghânî, Lucknow 1322, ii. 293). Isâsh in obedience to a dream gave his pupil the name Nûr Baksh ('light-gift'), and conferred on him the khâfrica of 'Ali al-Hamadâni. In virtue of his supposed de-cent from the Imâm Mîsâ al-Kâfîm he received the title Mahdî, and was proclaimed leader of a number of followers; indeed in the heading of his Qânûn (Brit. Mus. Add. 16,779) he is styled "Imâm and Caliph over all the Muslims". In a letter to a disciple (Brit. Mus. Add. 7,688) he claims mastery of all sciences, religious and secular; he could have taught Plato mathematics, etc. He calls on the people of his time to take pride in such a contemporary and display activity in his cause. These pretensions were taken seriously by the Sultan Shâh-rakh (Timûrîd, 807–850) whose viceroys Bâyazîd arrested him at Kub-Tirî "a fortress in the neighbourhood of Khâfrica", whither he had gone in 826; he was sent to Herât and thence to Shirâz, where he was released by 'Ibrâhîm Sultan; after travelling to Başâ, Hilla, Baghdâd and the (Shî'î) Sanctuaries, he went to Kurdistân, where he was again proclaimed Caliph, and coins were struck in his name. He was again arrested by Shâh-rakh's order, and brought to Ashhab-âdjmân; he made his escape and after much suffering reached Khâfrica, where he was recaptured, and sent back to Shâh-rakh, who despatched him to Herât, where he had to mount the pulpit and abjure the caliphate. In 848 he was released on condition that he confined his activities to teaching; but, having incurred suspicion, he was sent to Tabriz, thence to Shirwân, and thence to Gîlân.

After Shâh-rakh's death he was set free, and took up his residence in a village Sulfân in the neighbourhood of Raiy, where he died.

2. His doctrines. In his poems (ghâsâls, ma'khasâzî and rubâ'îs), he insists on his personal importance, but also emphasizes the Sûfî pantheism, e.g. "We have washed away the impress of other from the tablet of existences; we have seen that the world is qualities and an identical substance". Prose works by him were a Riadî 'Afsâda probably in Persian, and a treatise on Law, in Arabic, called al-Fikriyy, which neither of these appears to have reached Europe. The extracts from the latter given in the Madâlî are Shi'î in character. The imâm besides possessing numerous virtues must be a descendant of 'Ali and Fâtimâ; this is sufficient for "the lesser gihaâ", but for the "greater" he must also be a wa'dî perfect in the ma'khasî of that dignity. The mu'âmar marriage is lawful, since it was so certainly in the Prophet's time, and the writer had been commanded to abolish innovations and revive the practice of the Prophet's
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time. He rejects the expedient called 'asad in dealing with deceased persons' estates, as being neither in the Kurān nor the Sunna.

3. Later history of the sect. The Magūliīn names two successors (khalīfāt) of Nūrbakhsh: Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Lahdijānī al-Gilānī, called Aṣīrī, the author of a Dirūnīn of which there is a copy in the Brit. Mus.; this person built a khanqāh in Shirāz; and Nūrbakhsh's son Shāh Kāsim Fatābakhsh, first heard of in 'Irāq, whence by permission of the Āq-Kuyunlū Sultan Yaḥyā (884–896) he was allowed to go to Khurāsān to cure Ḥusayn Mīrzā, the governor, of an ailment by his baraka. His religious opinions won him the favour of Ismā'īl the Safawīd (930). According to Firīghta, who cites the Zafar-nāme, a disciple of Shāh Kāsim, named Mir Shams al-Dīn went from 'Irāq to Kashmir about 902, where he was received with high honour by Fath Kān, who made over to him the confiscated lands which had formerly fallen to the crown. In a short time many of the Kashmiris, particularly those of the tribe Čūk, became converts to the Nūrbakhshī sect (Firīghta, transl. Briggs, Calcutta 1910). The Kashmiris had previously been Sunnī of the Hanafī rite according to Mīrzā Ḥusayn (author of Tārīkh-i Kakhūhī, transl. E. D. Ross, London 1895, p. 435), who when he came into possession of the country asked the opinion of the 'ulūmā' of Hindūstān about al-Fīrūz al-Abānātī; as they condemned it as heretical, he persecuted and endeavoured to extirpate the sect (about 950). His confused and fanatical account of it has misled some European writers. It survived his perseverence, and according to J. Biddulph, Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh (Calcutta 1880) it numbers over 20,000 followers, most of whom are to be found in Shigar and Khaspūl of Baltistān. A few of the sect, he adds, are now to be found in Kībtwarzar, to which place they were deported by Golāb Sing when he conquered Baltistān.

The work last cited contains some details about their practices; its account is, however, mixed with fables, and without access to the Fīrūz Akbarī it is difficult to estimate the justice of the assertion that the system is "an attempt to form a via media between Shi'ī and Sunnī doctrines".

Bibliography: references are given above.

(D. S. Marqolouth)

Nūrī, a common name in the Near East for a member of certain Gipsy tribes. A more correct vocalization would perhaps be Nawwār (so Hava, Steingass, etc.), with plural Nawwār, Minorsky [above, iii. 38] gives Nawwā. By displacement of accent we also find the plural form as Nawwār (e. g. in Jauzen, Coutumes des Arabes, p. 90, and British Admiralty's Handbooks, Syria [1919], p. 156, Arabia [1916], p. 92, 94). In Persia the current name for Gipsy is Lūrī, Lūrī, or Lūtī [q. v.]. It is not unlikely that by a natural phonetic transformation the form nūrī derives from Fīrūz, which, it has been suggested, originally denoted an inhabitant of the town of al-Rūr (or Arūr) in Sind. Quadrémère advanced the theory (Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, I., p. 5) that the name nūrī arose from the Arabic nūr (fire) [he gives the form نور] because these vagrants were usually seen carrying a brazier or a lantern. Even to-day many of the Nawwār earn their living as itinerant smiths. But it is more probable that the correct etymology is to be found in some Sanskrit dialect of N. W. India, the original home of the Gipsy tribes.

In the various countries of the Orient in which Gipsy families are located, we find several designations for them used. The older name, now much restricted in use, was Zuṭṭ [see ZOTT] or Jatt. The Turkish name Čingana passed into European languages under such forms as Činfāk, Tsagane, Zingaro, Ciszgany, Zigeuner, etc. Dusy (Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes, i. 605), quoting Causin de Perceval, records the occasional use of the name Žanāyıya, but this is inexact [cf. art. ZANJ]. The commonest names, apart from those already mentioned, seem to be Nawwar and Kurabt or Khurbat (perhaps of N. Syria and Persia), Čighar and Halabar (especially in Egypt and N. Africa) and Diman (in Mesopotamia). For other sub-divisions reference may be made to the bibliographical, and particularly to E. Littmann's Zigeunerv-Arabisch, which is an excellent summary of the whole subject, particularly on the linguistic side.

The collecting of data regarding the Gipsy tribes of the Orient is by no means easy. Even experienced orientalists and travellers have reached different conclusions regarding them. For example Lane (in his Modern Egyptians, London 1836, ii. 108) in spite of his profound knowledge of Egypt, asserted that there were few Gipsies in the land, while numbers of well-educated natives to-day, are still unaware of the presence of these tribes in their midst. The statistics of Massignon's Annales des musulmans (Paris 1925, p. 115) however, gives the number of Gipsies in Egypt as two per cent of the population, consisting, namely, of two tribes of Čhāgar and Nawwar respectively, and four tribes of Halabar.

The Gipsies as a rule seem, chameleonic-like, to take their creed, such as it is, from their surroundings. In Muslim countries these tribes usually profess Islam, in so far as they may be said to profess any religious views, many of them, indeed, being very superstitious and reported to be scoundrels and vagabonds. The same applies to the Muslim Gipsies of what was formerly European Turkey (Admiralty's Handbook of Turkey in Europe [1917], p. 62). In the Balkans many of them are Greek-Orthodox.

Persian and Arabic writers preserve for us the tradition that tribes of Jats (or Zutt) from the Punjdāb were conveyed westwards by command of the Sāsānian monarch Bahram Gūr (420–438 A.D.) and their descendants proved a troublesome problem some centuries later for the Caliph of Baghdad. Once more numbers of them were dispersed to the borders of Syria, where many of them were captured by the Byzantines, and thus found their way into the Eastern Roman Empire, thence to continue their migrations to other ends of the East and West. Many of them are even said to have risen to high rank, e. g. al-Sarī b. al-Ḥakam b. Yaḥṣūf al-Zuṭṭī, governor of Egypt (200–205 A. H.), while it has been supposed that the famous Bar- maude family at the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd were of similar Gipsy origin. The name Barāmūk is actually the designation in Egypt of a class of public dancers (Ghawārī) of low moral character and conduct who have been regarded as of Gipsy blood. The question, however, is doubtful (see Bouvier, Les Barricades d'après les historiens arabes et persans, Paris 1912, p. 110, 125).

The German traveller Setzen and the American
missionary Eli Smith gathered valuable material in the Near East regarding those nomadic peoples which proved useful to later scholars. They were followed by Capt. Newbold (1856) on the Gypsies of Egypt, Syria and Persia; von Kremer, Austrian Consul at Cairo, on the Egyptian Gypsies (1863); Sykes (1902) dealt with the Persian Gypsies, while an excellent treatise appeared in 1914 from the pen of R. A. S. Macalister on the Language of the Naur or Zut, the Nomad Smiths of Palestine. Macalister in this work had the rather difficult task of reducing to writing a language almost completely unknown, and interpreting and analysing the Naur stories. The folk-tales recounted to him by members of the Nauri settlement north of the Damascuse Gate in Jerusalem. He employed several of these Naur in the course of his excavations there. A small Syrian Gypsy vocabulary received by Miss G. G. Everest of Bairût from a friend at Damascus was also published in the Journal of the Gypsy Lore Soc., Jan. 1890, in an article by F. H. Groome. The philological aspect of the question has received, in recent years, the attention of scholars such as E. Galtier and E. Littmann (see Bibliography). 

In Egypt the Halab (sing. Ḥalab) are to be found mostly in Lower Egypt carrying on their special occupations at the various markets and masāfiit, as traders in camels, horses and cattle. Their womenfolk are noted seersesses and medicine-women, practicing all the arts of sorcery (ṣıdır): sand-divination (farḥ-ar-raml), shell-divination (farḥ-al-tad‘a), bibliomancy (fash-al-Kitāb) etc. Their tribal subdivisions are variously given by Galtier (p. 7) and Newbold (p. 291). Their name suggests some connection with Aleppo (Halab), but they themselves proudly claim a South Arabian ancestry their tribal chronicle being the popular broad-sheet production, Ta‘rikh Zir Sālim.

The Gharar Gipsy tribe, however, have a rather unsavoury reputation, a fact that is reflected in the modern Egyptian Arabic verb gharar “to be abusive”. Their speech has fewer foreign ingredients and Galtier is of the opinion that they are more recent arrivals in the Nile Valley, probably wanderers from Constantinople. The argot of the Gharars and the gharar al-Sim, and in modern colloquial Arabic in Egypt “to speak in enigmas” is yatakallam bi-l-Sim.

The word Nāri in Egypt is almost synonymous with thief, and their chasing propensities are libelously associated in a popular proverb with the inhabitants of Damānhūr [q. v.] ( alf Nāri wa-l Dāmanhūr). According to the age-old policy of setting a thief to catch a thief, the Naur are often recruited as estate watchmen (ghufūr).

Their pursuits and proclivities are varied in the extreme. Besides the myriad occupations of enchanters, amulet-sellers, quack-doctors, snake-eaters and astrologers many of them travel about as hawkers, metal-workers, animal-trainers, professional tumblers, rope-dancers, acrobats, monkey-leaders, musicians and ballad-singers, while some are employed to circumscribe Muslim girls, to tattoo lips and chins, and to bore ears and nostrils.


Nuṣāiri, the name of an extreme Shi‘a sect in Syria.

I. The etymology of the name is disputed: a. contemptuous diminutive from nasrūni “Christian”, in allusion to certain ritual similarities (Renan); b. corruption of material Latin name meiners for a Syrian tetrarchy of the first century near Edessa (but the name is still found uncorrupted in situ: it is the Djār‘at al-Nasirūn, which is crossed in going from Tell Kallākh to Homs, between the bridge called “Achan Kepru” and the lake of Homs; cf. British G. S. map of 1/250,000, Homs-Beirut sheet, 1918); c. nisba from a village near Kifā, Nuṣārāyya (Barhebræus; cf. de Sacy, Druses, i., p. clxxvi. and Ta‘bī, ill. 2128); nisba from an eponym: a fictitious Shi‘a martyr, son of 'Ali (according to the 'Alī-Ilāhīs), or a freedman of 'Alī’s or vizier of Mu‘awiyah (Dussaud, p. 10); or rather Ibn Nuṣāir, i.e. Muḥammad b. Nuṣāir Namītī 'Abbīt (≡ of the 'Abbīt al-Kās, a Bakr clan), whom we shall find below as the first theologian of the sect.

As a matter of fact this name adopted from the time of Khaṣibī (d. 346 A.H.) by these sectarians, previously called Namītīya (Namawbākht, Fīrāq, p. 78; Asbā‘ī, Ma‘āṣ, i. 15) and who called themselves mu‘āmilīn, has been applied since Samā‘ī (s.v.) and ‘Umāra (ed. Derenbourg, p. 145, 286) not to a district only partly converted in the north of Syria, but to an extreme Shi‘a sect also found in Egypt and along the Euphrates. This etymology, that of all the Muslim heresiographers, from the
Shī Ḫnr al-Ghāḍarī (d. 411 A. H.) and the Sunnī Ḫnr Hazām, has been and is the most probable.

II. the term has three acceptations: administrative, social and religious.

a. Administration: it is the “mountain of the Ansāriyya” of Syria (formerly Djabal Lūkkām), the former ḫnā’ī of Latakiya to the east of the Orontes which has been extended to the south and since 1920 has become the state of the Alawis (6,500 sq. km.; 334,173 inhabitants end of 1933 of whom 215,066 are Nuṣairīs, 61,957 Sūnīs in the north of Ṣāḥyūn and at Baniyya, 5,659 Ḫnā’īs at Kadmās and Mayās; 53,604 Christians, mainly Orthodox in Al-Ḥir and around the north of Ṭartīs; 35,652 in Latakiya (22,000) divided in Ṣūr, Latiyya and 8 kazas: Latakiya, Ṣāḥyūn (Hafta), Djabal, Ṭartīs, Mankūb (Banías), Ḫnā’īs‘ila (Tell Kallīkh), Sūrīs‘ila, Al-Ḥir (Maṣ‘af); a country of patient and industrious agriculturists (tobacco, silkworms). Its place-names studied by M. Hartmann (Z.D.P.V., xiv. [1891], 151—255) for the north (villages, not canons of which there is a list in [Delattre] Rēpertore ελπαθηβιτος, Latakia [Raghib‘ī press], Dec. 1933), show an old stratum of names, in part Aramaic and later vocational Arabic without any definite local religious traits except for modern Shī‘a influences, beneath which one can hardly see the pagan or Christian culture of the substratum (cf. on the contrary, Lebanon). The study of the district from the point of view of ethnology and folklore has hardly begun; certain prohibitions regarding food have been noted (Niebuhr, loc. cit.) Dupont, in J. A. P., 1824, p. 134; Batnāra, p. 57), some general (camels, hares, eels and catfish) and others special to the Ḫnā’īs‘ila (female or maimed animals, gazelles, pig, crab, shellfish, pumpkins, Ḫnā’īs‘ila, tomatoes). The only domestic art is bak-ken-making.

b. Socially, the name covers tribes of different origins, almost all speaking Arabic, who have adopted the Nuṣairī teaching.

1. In the state of the Alawis (215,066): the nucleus seems to be descended from Yemen clans of Hamdān and Kinda (Ya‘kūb, in B. G. A., vi., 3342); Ḥassān, Bahār and Taiḥ (Hamdānī, Šī‘a, p. 132) early converted to the Šī‘a, from the Tiberian and the Djabal Šam (where there are still Metwals) to Aleppo, increased by immigrants from Taiḥ (end of the ninth century) and from Ḫna‘ăn who at the time the Crusaders were being driven back came with their emir Ḥasan b. Makkūn (d. 638 = 1240, ancestor of the Ḥaddādān), from Mount Sīnjar, and imposed on the district their ruling families, their clans and ethnic structure (M. E. Ghālib, Tāwīl, p. 356). The following is the present day list of the principal clans (wāqī‘ah) (map in K. M. M., xlix. 6; cf. ibid., xxxvi. 278; and Tāwīl, p. 349—52) grouped in 4 confederations: Kulliyā (at Kahlāda; with Nawāsira, Karāhla, Iljula‘iya, Rashāwina, Shalhāma, Rasā‘ina, Dirdiyā, Hāt al-Sī‘īf, Bait Muḥammad and Darawīs); Khāyātīn (at Mankūb; with Sarāmīta, Makhalisa, Fāšāwī, Amānīra [mixed with Abī al-Kais]; Ḥaḍādīn (clan of the emir Ḥasan b. Makkūn; with Makhalisa, Banī ‘Aḥ, Yashbāya, Ṣawārīya, Mahārīya) and Mawāwīn (with Nūmālīyā, Sāwilīyā, Aleppo, Sarāwīna, Mahārīya who claim to be Ḥa‘īmīs, and Dāshārīga). From the xviith century the political history has been a series of persecutions by invaders (the Crusades; Ba‘bars who covered the country with mosques; legend of Durrat al-Ṣadaf, daughter of Shī‘a al-Anṣār [tomb at Aleppo] who instigated Tūnīr to sack Damascus; massacres under Selīm I) and civil wars among the clans themselves and against the Iṣmā‘īlīs of Kadmās (lost, and retaken for a brief period in 1808 by the Maḥārīza) and of Mayās, allied with the Turks;

2. In the sādīqah of Alexandretta (58,000: at Antioch 1/3, Ljūwādiya, Suwāidiya, Ljūidiya; with two deputies in Parliament;

3. In the State of Syria (29,693): at Ḥamāh and at Ḥom with one deputy; in two quarters of Aleppo; near Ljūs, and to the north of lake Hule (Ain Fic, 3,000);

4. In Šam (2,000): to the north of Nablus;

5. In Cilicia from the xviiith century (at Tarsus and Adana: 80,000 in 1921 now turkicised);

6. Along the Euphrates. In Kurdsṭān and in Persia, there are ultra-Shī‘a elements who have similar views and are called Nuṣairīs (among the ‘Ali-Īlahis or Ahl-ī Ḥaqq; q.v.);

7. In Lebanon, there were some down to the xviiith century (in Kṣrawān).

III. Religion: it is the religious teaching of the Nuṣairī sect that we have to study more particularly here.

Cosmogony and eschatology. According to the Nuṣairīs there is immediately below the ineffable divinity a spiritual world for heavenly beings (or stars), which emanates from him in the following hierarchy: Iṣm, Bāb and other Ahl al-Marāthī (of the first seven classes); it is the “great luminous world” (mawāj kāhir nūrīn); when they appear here below it is to lead back gradually to heaven the “little luminous world”, fallen beings, half materialized, imprisoned in the bodies which are their tombs; this operation revives them and brings them back to heaven to form the seven last classes of the Ahl al-Marāthī (119,000 out of a total of 124,000 = the traditional number of the prophets); next comes the “little world of darkness” (zulmānnt), extinguished lights, souls that damnation materializes (khwānān al-maṣūfīyya) in the bodies of women and animals; and lastly the “great world of darkness” composed of all the “adversaries” (afldāl) of the great luminous world, demons, who after innumerable metamorphoses in corpses of murdered men or slaughtered animals still quivering after death, are reduced to inert or passive manner (fused metals etc.). Just as the fall takes place through seven stages (doubts about divine appearances) so does the return to heaven of the elect go through seven cycles or adwār of divine emanations.

Theory of revelation. The pure divinity (ghāhib), the object of adoration, being ineffable his first emanation is the Name (Iṣm), the articulating prophetic voice (Nābī‘), the signification (Mā‘īn) of divine authority; such was the primitive teaching, that of Abu ‘l-Khaṭṭāb, the common teacher of the Iṣmā‘īlīs and the Nuṣairīs. But his disciple Māmūn Kāḍ ḳān, thinking that the enunciation by the divinity of an object which manifests him, is of greater importance than its signification which is a mute idea, detached the Mā‘īn from pure divinity, identified it with the ʾṢamīʿ (the silent) man; opposed to Nābī‘ and placed it a mere accident, below the substance, the Iṣm. Then, by reaction, other Khāṭṭābīya like Bāshshār, Shī‘ī, retaking the equation Mā‘īn = ʾṢamīʿ, reestablished the Mā‘īn before the Iṣm. And, as Abu ‘l-Khaṭṭāb had taught that in the Muḥammadiyya cycle, the
signification (maw’na) of the ineffable divinity was expressed through five privileged Asmā‘ (Muhammād, ‘Allī, Fāṭīmā (the masculine form of Fāṭima, for as we have seen women have no souls; this explains why they may form part of the offering of hospitality among initiates). Ḥasan and Husain, announcing equivalently its mysterious Unity), this group of Five equals, in which we recognise the Five of the nummāzāh (q.v.; cf. our, Salmān Fakh, No. 7 of the Soc. des Études Iranienes, 1933, p. 40–42) became in the hands of his pupil Maimān a descending series of five terrestrial terms (nummāzāh with the five spiritual terms, and inferior to them, the Druze say): Naḥī (Mim), Asūr (‘Arūn), Dīlā‘, Maḥdīn, Maḥštār; whence the Mim, the Khāridjīs Wadjalānī remarks, has the priority (cf. Nūr Muhammād). While according to Bāshāh, the five were equal and became Muhammād, Fāṭīmā, Ḥasan, Ḥusain, Muḥā’sān; ‘Allī being thought to surpass them was identified by hyperdulia and against all logic with the Ma’na. This is its last list that the Nuṣairis have adopted. And this is the origin behind their ‘god’ ‘Allī whom there is no need to seek antecedents in the Syrian pagan pantheon or in a Druze emanation. Bāshāh and the ‘Uqāyīya or ‘Ahdīya) copied by the Nuṣairis have simply copied the Karmaian list of Maimān, by inverting the order of priority between Mim and ‘Arūn, and making the ‘Ahdīya (Ma’na) the superiors of the Naḥī (Im) the following is the double list (Im in italics): a. in the seven cycles (nayb, kabhī personified by women among the poets) of the khurārī dīšiyā: 1. Ḥābīl, Adūm; 2. Nuḥ, šāhī; 3. ‘Arūn; 4. ‘Arūn; 5. Mīnā; 6. Mīnā, Ḥābīl; 7. ‘Allī (Abū Turāb, Ṭārīkh al-Nahr, Muhammād. Khasibi allows that there were 44 (=63–19) other khurārī (nīkhtiyā) during these seven cycles; b. in the šar ‘al-dīshānia (=the twelve classical imāms substituted for the early list of Ibn Nuṣair [which we shall see later) by Khaṣhi] each imām is promoted ma’na after having been the Im of his predecessor. The mode of appearance of the two divine emanations located behind the screen (agrāb, tifāzīf) of a phantasmagoric body (ṣamī al-zulāḥ, ma’mūn al-dīshār), is a reality for the faith of the Nuṣairis; this body is the support of a momentary illumination for the believer: while for the Druze nominalism it is only a mirage (zarīb) and for the Ishāṣiya, a real body, transfigured by a gradual sanctification. 

Theory of catechism. Aḥsa Kaiḥāshab had taught that the Five persons of the Im were pointed out to the believers by one or more inspired angelic intermediaries (tawāb, ṭawāḥif) of whom the first was Salāl or al-Sīn = Salmān in the Muḥammān, Muḥammad (cf. 106–110). Bāshāh’s initiates became, with his disciple Maimān, the five spiritual symmetricals of the Asmā‘ (ṣamī = Salmān; nāfi = Mīkūd; Ṯakar = Abī Dharr; fath = ‘l-Thāzīr b. Muḥā’b; Ḥāyāl = ‘Arūn; tāhīya = ‘ṣamā‘). Bāshāh. corr. thus No. 60 of the Druze catechism). While among the Track, these five initiates remained equal and far below the Im, became the five Alām (Mīkūd, Abī Dharr, ‘Abī Allāh b. Ṭawāḥ, ‘Uṭmān b. Muḥā’sān b. Kaḥbār), Salmān being thought to be above them was placed third as ‘Aḥbīr after the Ma’na and the Im. Such was the origin of the Nuṣairi descending series of five terrestrial terms (Im-Ma’na-Mīnā-Mi’un-Dīlā‘) in which there is no need to see an original pagan Syrian triad of Sun, Moon and Sky: this astrological correspondence, a favourite subject with Nuṣairi poets, found its way into the Shi’i catechism of Salmān under the influence of the Sufis of Ḥarrān; the assimilation, in the spiritual, of the sun to Muḥammād and of the moon to ‘Allī (the moon, like the imām, is the regulator of canonical acts; cf. our, Salmān, p. 36, No. 4) appears at Salmān with Maḥbūrah (d. 119 H.) In any case if pagan survivals are at the basis of astral gnosticism, as Dussaud suggests, it is not among the uneducated peasants (Dūḥal Lakkām) but among the towns-dwellers in Ḥarrān that they have been able to survive.


Below the Bāb are the Five Alām, whom he associates as lords of the elements (maw’kūkullū bi-magāl al-‘ālam) with his role of Demiurge engendering souls by initiation. The list of Nuṣairi alām given above should be compared (as well as that of the Druze ḥadīd ‘wise virgins’ of Salmān; like the Nuṣairi alām are the ṣāḥibāt of the Dīk al-A’rūn = Salmān) with the lists of Garmy (Aṣṭābād, Manbāq, p. 225) and of the Khaṭṭāyia the eightaries of the Pāhirs (R. E. I., 1932, p. 442, trans. Ivanow).

Initiation. This has three degrees (nakīf, nakīf, inām): the first consists of a solemn pledge (iğāk, kīfāb with tālīb ma’allāk; cf. suṣrābīyā) to reveal nothing of this spiritual marriage (niṭāb al-zamān) in which the word of the initiator fertilizes the soul of the initiate in three seances, the ritual of which is related to that of the other extreme Shi’a sects (and of the futuwwet-nāme) and through them and the Sufis of Ḥarrān to the old mysteries of Central Asia (cf. miṣār; Dussaud, p. 106–110). The cup of wine (called ‘ṣāf al-nūn, Cat. N. 4) of the anticipation of Paradise, is partaken of at it.

The initiatory teaching is essentially an ultra-Shi’a symbolism (ta’wīl) of the seven canonical rites (da’imān) of Islam which are personified: 1. alāt: the five āwāz by Muḥammad (= ωυν; same among the Ishāṣiyā, Fāṭimā, Ḥasan, Husain and Maḥdīn (= fadh); among the Druze as among the Khaṭṭāyia of the Pāhirs by the muḍāb, the kwāb, Abī Dharr, Mīkūd, Salmān). Similarly the 17 the 31 51 dīrāt; 2. yāṣīr: the secret guards of guarding 30 names of men (days) and thirty of women (nights of Khaṭṭāyia); 3. khaṭṭāb: by Salmān; 4. kīfāb: the sacred land 12 miles around’; this is the sect; Bait = the Iṣr; the Black
Stone = Məḥīdād; the 7. aḵāvat = the 7 cycles; 5. ẓirād = the maledictions upon the aḵāvat (Bāk., p. 44) and the discipline of the mystery; 6. ẓāwīlāyā = devotion to the ʻAlīs and hatred of their adversaries; 7. the ʻAdhāyān al-farānāk, the formal aḵāvat, the performance of the aḵāvat. The Karūn is an initiation to devotion to ʻAlī; it was Salmān (under the name of Džbrāyi) who taught it to Muḥammad.

The annual festivals include: the Sihā lunar festivals: Fīrīr, ʿAdhār, Gbādir, Mubāṣṭa, Fīrāš, Ṭāhīr, 9th Rabīʿ I (martyrdom of ʻOmar) and 15th ʻAšrān (death of Salmān); then certain solar festivals: Nawrūz and Mīhīrān, Christmas and Epiphany, 17th ʻAdhār, St. Barbara. Certain liturgies (kwādīzi) pertain to these festivals and are wrongly called "masses" (kwādīzi ʻṬīb, al-Baḥlār, al-Tābitā).

V. History of the Sect. All the initiatory, insāds of the sect go back from ʿKhashībī to Ibn Nuṣair through two intermediaries, Muḥammad b. Džundab and Muḥammad al-Džannān al-Džundabī. Of Ibn Nuṣair, a notable of Baṣra, teacher of ʿAbīyīhī, we know that in 245 a. h. he proclaimed himself the 10th of the 10th ʻĀli (the ʻAlīs) and of his eldest son Muḥammad who died before him in 249, the year of the ʻAhdā of the Mahdi, according to Ibn Nuṣair (Ibn Bābawāh, Gbābir, p. 62, l. 12, taken from Nawbābakht, Fīrāš, p. 77, 83; such was still the belief of the Ḥamādān emir Abūl Fīrās, Dīvān, 1873, p. 39). It is only ʿKhashībī who says that Ibn Nuṣair joining the eleventh imām (Nūrī, Naḥṣ, p. 144) had taken for mahdi his son Muḥammad b. Ḥasan.

Of the two successors of Ibn Nuṣair we only know that the second, like ʿKhashībī, belonged to Džundabī between ʻUkāf and Wāṣāf, the centre of the Žand and Karmātīn rebels (Ṭabarānī, iii. 1517, 1925, 2198; Maṣṣūḥ, Tāmbīr, p. 391), native place of Ibn Wahāḥib. Muḥammad b. Ḥamādūn ʻKhashībī (vocalisation attested by Dżhabāb, Muṣṭālīḥ; in Persia and the šāk wrongly now pointed Ḥaḍīnī) died in 346 (957) or 358 (968) at Aleppo (tomb to the north called Ǧāshīk Bairī�) was the real founder of the Nuṣairī sect; he lived, like his patrons the Ḥamādānī, between ʻUkāf (in 344. according to Aṣṭarādhī, loc. cit., p. 112) and Aleppo; he dedicated to them his Hiḍāyā; cf. his Ṭūlūn Kābābīya (Taḥlīl, p. 196 sqq., 210, 257). Among his 51 disciples the best known is Muḥammad b. ʿAli Ḥallī of Džulliyeh near Antioko where the chief of the Ḥaḍārī still lives. His direct disciple was ʿAbīd Mainīm Tabābanī (d. 427 = 1035), a prolific polemicist against the chief of the ʻIshāḥīya of Latakia, ʻAbī Dabha Ismāʿīl b. Khaḍīlād. After him mention is made of ʻImāt al-Ḍawla, Ḥātem Ḥarbānī (c. 700 = 1300; Paris, M., 1450, vol. 112; Taḥlīl, p. 315), author of the Ṭūlūn Kābābīya, Ḥasan Aṣṣūḥī of Ṭaʿān, died at Latakia in 836 (1432); lastly, several heads of parties, the ʻIsmāʿīlī poet Muḥammad b. ʿYūsūs Ḥalātī (1011 = 1602), who lived near Antioko, ʿAli Māhīṣūs, ʿAṣṣīr Ṣafīlā, ʿUṣūs Ḥaṣīdād. In this connection we may note that the four alleged Nuṣairī sects reduce themselves to two; that of the north (Šamsīya because it is Mīmīsīya, Šamsīyā = Ḥaḍārīsīa, from the name of ʻAli Ḥaḍārī, its head in the 14th/15th century = ʿIsmāʿīlīa) and that of the south (Kūlīyā, for it is dominant there), which is ʻAṣmīya, then ᴷᵃᵐᵃʳⁱya. The spiritual organisation is quite distinct from the political among the Nuṣairīs. The four Ṣaḥābah mentioned by Niebuhr in 1780 (at Bahlīlye near Latakia, Simerian-Khāḏbī, Ṣafīlā and Ǧūbāl Kahlīye) were temporal rulers. In 1914, there were two spiritual leaders, the ẓāwīlāyā (ʻAmīrī) in Cilicia and the ẓāwīlāyā aḥt al-baṣir (ṣamārī) at Karūn (1913; Sliman al-ʻAzmī al-ʿAzmī, the Nasirīs. From 1620 the Žaḥīr al-Sīrī al-kadīs of the south have found their way among the Nuṣairīs. In the last ten years a shepherd of the ʻAmāmirā, Sliman Muršīd, has been trying to find a new sect to the north of Maysaf.

VI. Bibliography: 1. Nuṣairī and Muḥammādīn sources: there is no canon of the Nuṣairī initiatory writings, as for the Dzuṣes (cf. de Sacy and Seybold); but Catafago has given a list (J.A.P., 1876) of 40 esoteric works, of which 29 are theological and 11 poetical (specimens translated by Huart, in J.A.P., 1879); we may mention No. 20, Ḥaḍīr Mūṣīrūn (= 16 liturgical sūras; text in Bāk., p. 7–34 and Dussaud, p. 181–189 with transl.) and No. 19, Ḥaḍīr Mūṣīrūn al-Yād of A. S. M. Ţabarānī; transl. in J.A.P., 1878, in R.M.M., xix, 56–57. This list might be supplemented. For the above-cited references to MSS. (1440–1450 etc.) there is a bio-bibliographical collection of the writers of the sect, similar to that of the ʻIsmāʿīlī writers published by Ivanow. Nuṣairī writing makes free use of moderate Sihā works (Mūṣīrūn is quoted by Ţabarānī) and have even written some; e.g. the Ḥaḍīyā of ʿKhashībī which is still read in Persia. Two Nuṣairī catechisms have been studied: Žālīm Diyānāt al-Nuosairiyya, in 101 questions (Paris, M., 1682; transl. Salisbury, in J.A.O.S., 1868, p. 287–308; cf. Taḥlīl, p. 356; the first part is taken from an authentic manual where there is not a lodge of initiation; cf. M., 564). A popular history, in places containing a good deal of romance but documented (without exact references), was published by Meḥmed Emin Ghalūb (d. 1932), of the Al-Ṭawālī al-Wadīrī of Adana: Žālīm Diyānāt al-Nuosair, by Tārāštī, Latakiya 1343 (1924), 478 pp. Two refutations are well known; a Dzuṣe by Ḥamza (Rūṣa Ḥamṣī, No. xvi. of the canon; perhaps refuting No. 9 of Catafago’s list) and a Sunni by Ibn Taimiyah (fatwā, p. 94–102 of the Magīnī, Cairo 1325; transl. Guyard, in J.A.P., ser. 6, vol. xviii., 1871, p. 158).

NUŠAIRI — AL-NUSHĀDIR


3. In Arabic the only recent studies are: Kudali, Khitat al-Sham, vol. vii. (1928), p. 258—268; and Kamil Ghazzi, Naher al-Dakhah (Aleppo 1432 A.D., vol. i., p. 204—205); cf. also the Bairut press (A’khr, Sept. 19, 1930) and that of Damascus (Ayyûm, March 29, 1933). (Louis Massignon)

NUSB, standing stone, especially one which is held sacred. The root is the same as in the Hebrew maszaba, Phoenician nĕb and nēb and South Arabian nēba, nēb. On the explanation of the Arabic forms the philologists are not agreed. They generally assume nēba as singular with the plural anēba, but others pronounce it nēbû and consider it the plural of nēb or nēba. In addition to these forms Arabic has also from the same root the substantives manṣāb and nazī’a.

In answer to the much discussed question of the ideas associated with standing stones, Arabia only makes one contribution, in as much as it is evident that the fundamental conception was that of a dwelling place of the deity (bé-tē). Of several of the old Arab deities we are told that they were rocks or blocks of stone, i.e. that they were incarnate or present in them. Whether this was always so or whether this form of worship developed out of stones placed upon graves (e.g. Hamúra, p. 502, l. 8 and the use of nēbā in the sense of tombstones) where the stones were originally memorials, is a question which cannot be dealt with here. We need only mention that the theory of worship of the dead breaks down if the deity has its abode in a tree, like al-Uzza of Nakha in a samara tree (umbrella acacia). Examples of the presence of a deity in a stone are given in the articles DHIU l-SHARK, AL-LAT and MANAT. Other examples are Dhu ‘l-Khalasa, al-Fals, al-Djasal, Sa’d. The worship associated with such stones usually consisted in sprinkling them with the blood of sacrifices. Thus Zahir, 10, 24 speaks of a sacrificial stone, manṣāb al-ziir, the top of which was red with blood; a wounded and bleeding man is compared to a red nēb (Ibn Sa’d, iv, l. 162, 4); among forbidden foods, Sūra v. 4 includes what is slaughtered ‘ala l-nēb; al-Ashā (Morgenländische Forschungen, p. 258) warns against worshipping a dhī l-nēbī l-mansūba (? read manṣīb) with sacrifices; cf. also Mutafammas, ed. Vollers, 2, 1. The words of Sūra lxx. 43, which say that the resurrected stream out of their graves as if they were running (yaihūna) to a nēb (other readings nēb or nēb) refer to a characteristic feature of the worship. In view of the prominent part played by the stones in the worship of the early Arabs, it is natural that Muhammad should have included anāb among things prohibited to the believers like wine, māṣir etc. (Sūra, v. 92) for the worship associated with them was one of the principal forms of idolatry.

The Sneering of the anāb with blood recalls the well known statement in Herodoto iii. 8 regarding the ancient Arabian ceremony of concluding alliances. There is however an essential difference. In the first place there is no question of any act of worship and further we are told that the participants put their blood on seven stones lying between them, and called upon the two Gods Qottūl and Allat [s.v.]. The stones were not here conceived to be habitations of the gods but owed their merit to the number seven which was the important thing on taking oaths.


(Fr. BuHL)

AL-NUSHĀDIR, also nussādir, nusādir, Sanskrit navasaidra, Chin. nau-āo, sal-ammoniac. The etymology of the word is uncertain; perhaps it comes from the Pahlavi anūsādir “immortal fire” as we find the form antušādir in Syriac.

The oldest references to the occurrence of sal-ammoniac in a natural state are in the reports of Chinese emperors with whom the good of the eightieth centuries, which were the subject of very full investigation in connection with a geological problem, the question of volcanoes in Central Asia by H. J. von Klapproth, A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter, in the first third of the xixth century. The reference was to mountains of fire, Pe-Shan on the northern slopes of the Tien-Shan south of Kuldja, Ho-Chou on the south side of the Tien-Shan near Turfan and the sulphur pits of Urumtsi. The mountain Pe-Shan was said to pour forth fire and smoke continually; on one side of it all the stones burn, and are melted and then after flowing some miles solidify again. Nau-āo and sulphur were obtained there for medicinal purposes but the stones could only be collected in winter when the cold had cooled the ground. A. von Humboldt and C. Ritter do not accept a reference to the burning of coal by which sal-ammoniac and sulphur are obtained. The statement that the volcanoes of Central Asia produce sal-ammoniac in immense quantities is found in G. Bischof and even G. von Richthofen still held the volcano theory. The botanist and geographer Regel who travelled in these regions about 1879 was the first to dispute the existence of volcanoes. After Nansen, Le Coq and others had been unable to confirm the existence of volcanoes but established the fact that there were large deposits of coal on the surface, the old sources in Central Asia are now generally attributed to the burning of coal.

Almost all the Arab geographers who refer to Central Asia, from al-Mas’ūdī, al-Iṣākī, Ibn Hawkal, to Yākūt and al-Kazwini, give fantastic stories about the method by which sal-ammoniac is procured in the Bumm hills east of Samarqand. Here again the details suggest the burning of the earth rather than volcanic exhalations. The Persian traveller Nāṣir-i Khusraw however mentions deposits of sal-ammoniac and sulphur at Demāwend and Ibn Hawkal is acquainted with the volcanic sal-ammoniac of Etan; the latter was still exported to Spain in the xivth century. At an earlier date they had begun to procure sal-ammoniac from the soil of camel dung. This product remained into modern times an important import by the Venetian traders and was only driven from the market by the modern cheap methods of production from gas liquor etc.

The use of sal-ammoniac as a remedy in cases of
inflammation of the throat etc. is already mentioned by Sahl b. Rabball an-Talar. Ibn al-Baṭrār also quotes from other authors all kinds of remarkable uses of it, on which no stress need be laid. Liljibr b. Huwān reckons sal-ammoniac among the poisons, which is true of large doses.

The part played by sal-ammoniac in alchemy is much more important. Liljibr b. Huwān adds it as a fourth to the three τυπατζια of the Greeks, quicksilver, sulphur and sulphide of arsenic (A₃S or As₂S₃), and it is used by all Persian-Arab alchemists in countless recipes. The preparation of carbonate of ammonia through distillation of hair, blood and other materials is already fully described in the "Seventy Books" and other works of Liljibr. These methods seem to have given the stimulus to the discovery of the Egyptian method of obtaining sal-ammoniac. All these things came with alchemy to Spain and thence into western alchemy.

In the earliest Latin translations sal-ammoniac is still called mescador, mizadir etc., i.e. translations of the Arabic name. The general term al-Cūbā is also found in the forms alivāda, alocaph or translated by aquila. The identification of this salt with the salt of the oasis of Ammon already mentioned by Herodotus is first found in Syrian authors and lexicographers.


NUSRĪRĀN. [See ANŠUHRĀN.]

NUŠTĀRĀD. [See SĪSTĀN.]

AL-NUWĀIRĪ. Shihād al-Dīn Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bakri al-Kindi al-Shāfī', a rabbi historiographer, born on the 21st Dhu-l-Ka‘da 677 (April 5, 1279) in Upper Egypt (probably in al-Kūs), died on the 21st Ramadan 732 (June 17, 1332) in Cairo, author of one of the three best known encyclopedias of the Mamlūk period (the others are by al-Umārī and al-Kalqashandī). His father before him had been an official (al-Kūthī) of note (628–699 = 1231–1300); the son filled several offices at the court of Sultan al-Malik al-Nāšīr (Muhammad b. Khalīl), whose favour he was. He was for a time Nāẓir al-Ḍirās in Tripoli (Syria) and later Nāẓir al-Dīwān in the Egyptian provinces of al-Dakhāliya and al-Muṣṭaḥṣa. His monumental work Nahlāt al-arab fi Fawā'id al-Adāb which was dedicated to al-Malik al-Nāšīr was a result of his administrative activities. As he says in the preface, at the beginning of his literary career he was almost exclusively concerned with kītāb (i. 2) and only later took up adāb (i. 3); he wished to sum up in his encyclopaedia all the knowledge that was indispensable for a first class kītāb. The book is divided into five sections called fāwn, each fāwn has five parts, each fāwn has a different number of chapters (abkūdā) varying from two to fifteen. The first fāwn is devoted to heaven and earth, the second to the man, the third to the flora and the fifth to history (full list of contents: vol. i., p. 4–25; also in de Goeje, Catalogus, i. 5–14; cf. also Šajdi Pasula, ed. Flügel, iv. 397–398, No. 14069). The division is unequal; the last fāwn of the fifth fāwn, which is devoted to Muslim history fills almost half the work, which runs to nearly 9,000 printed pages. In addition to the division according to subjects, the book is divided into volumes: the last, the 31st discovered by Ahmad Zaki Pāshā, contains the history of Egypt down to the death of the author in 731. From the dates of the separate parts and volumes it is evident that he devoted no less than twenty years to his book (cf. e.g. de Goeje, Catalogus, i. 16 where the year 714 is given; vol. i., p. 416: year 721; vol. v., p. 355: year 722 or Weil, op. cit., xv.: year 725 etc.). In the earlier parts later additions are often found (cf. e.g. vol. i., p. 13, q: 10: 15, 4–5; 20, 6–9). For contemporary history Nuwairī's book is of the first importance; in other parts its value depends on that of his sources. Its extent and many-sidedness will only be appreciated when the edition is complete and a study like that of Björkman on al-Kalqashandi Shihād al-Dīn has been undertaken. Al-Nuwairī himself makes no claim to originality; like the majority of Arabic encyclopedists, he expressly says that he follows his predecessors and places the whole responsibility on them (i. 26). Owing to the existence of many manuscripts of separate parts, European scholarship early became acquainted with al-Nuwairī; he is already mentioned by d'Herbelot (1625–1693) in his Bibliothèque Orientale (Maestricht 1776, p. 670). In the collections made by Golius and Warner some fine copies came to Leyden (includued in albums) (W. M. C. Jaymboll, Zesventende eeuwse Samenstelling van het Arabisch in Nederland, Utrecht 1931, p. 178; Catalogus, i. 5–18, No. 5) and attracted great attention in the xviiith century. One of the first to study him was J. Heyman (d. 1737) whose Newarijana — not too fortunate excerpts and notes — is in manuscript in Leyden (Catalogus, i. 18, No. 6); on Heyman see Reiske, Prodignagmata, in J. B. Kohler's Abultedeb Tabula Syriae, Leipzig 1766, p. 233 and Jan Nat, De studie van de oosterse Talen in Nederland in de 18e en de 19e eeuw, Purmerend 1929, p. 25–26). In general in the xviiith and early xixth centuries too much stress was laid on the account of pre-Musliman history in al-Nuwairī (Schultens, Monumenta, 1740, Historia, 1786; Reiske, Prodignagmata, 1766, p. 232–234, Primaire langue, ed. Wustenfeld, 1847; Rasheshcen, Historia pacificorum aradam regnum, Copenhagen 1817, p. 81–124 etc). Later investigation showed that while the existence of older sources (al-Nuwairī only of secondary importance (see Mittowch, Prachia arabum pagamom, Berlin 1899, p. 26–30; G. Olinger, The Kings of Kinda, Lund 1927, p. 19 etc). Of considerable importance are the parts which deal with later, especially contemporary, history and historical geography; in the course of the xixth century they were frequently appealed to and excerpts edited or translated by Silvestre de Sacy, de Sèville, Descrémery, v. Hamer, Quatremère, Weil, Tiesenhausen, Amari, etc. One of the latest studies of a section of his work is the second volume Historia de los musulmanes de España y Africa. Texto árabe y traducción española de M. Gaspar Remiro (Granada 1917–1919; cf. Angel González Palencia, Historia de la literatura arábigo-española, Barcelona 1928, p. 162–163). Ahmad Zaki Pāshā
deserves honourable mention for the interest he (died July 5, 1934) has aroused in the study of Nuwairi modern times. With great industry and perseverance he has collected photographs of all 31 parts of the Nihāyat al-ʿArab frequently from autographs, and these are now deposited in the Royal Library in Cairo. As a result of his efforts, a complete edition was undertaken in 1925 and ten volumes are now available in the handsomely and imposing edition of the Dār al-Kutub al-Misriyya, which affords a sound basis for the general estimation of the value of the book.

Al-Nuwairi was not only an official but also a fine calligrapher: he was able to copy as many as 80 pages a day. He himself made at least four or five copies of his own encyclopedia and sold them at 2,000 dinhems each. He made eight copies of the Sākh of Bulhāri at 1,000 dirhems each. He was also famous as a bookbinder.


(IGN. KRATSCHKOWSKY)

NUZHA. [See MIZAF.]

1) See also U.

AL-OBOLLA was in the middle ages a large town in the canal region of the Tigris Delta, east of al-ʿArba. It was situated on the right bank of the Tigris and on the north side of the large canal called Nahr al-ʿArba, which was the main waterway from al-ʿArba in a southeastern direction to the Tigris and further to ʿAbbādān and the sea. The length of this canal is generally given as four faraḍās or two barāds (al-Mašdi). Al-Obolla can be identified with ʿAṣlāb al-Maṭrūq, mentioned in the Periplus Maris Erythraei (Geogr. Graeci Minores, i. 255) as lying near the coast. In a story told by al-Mašdi (Muradī, iii. 364) there is still a reminiscence of the period before the foundation of al-ʿArba, when al-Obolla was the only seaport in the Tigris estuary. The earlier Arab authors, in discussing the ancient administrative division of lower Babylonia in Sāṣānian times and the foundations of towns by the Sāṣānian kings, identify al-Obolla with other places, such as Dast-Mašin (Ibn Khurādābhūhī, in B.G.A., vi. 7) or Bahman Ardashīr (Tabarī, i. 687), although these provinces must be sought on the opposite bank of the Tigris; Eutychius (in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, iii. 911) likewise makes al-Obolla a foundation of Ardashīr i (cf. on this question: H. H. Schaedler, in L.H., xiv. 27 sqq.). Ibn Khurādābhūhī, p. 7 quotes an Arabic poem of a contemporary of Muḥammad, where al-Obolla is mentioned. In the story of the conquests the town is reported to have been captured by ʿOthā b. Ghazwān in the year 12 (633) and this conqueror described it to the caliph ʿOmar as the "port of al-Baḥrān. ʿOmar, al-Hind and al-ʿIffāl" (al-Balāḏūsī, p. 341). This conquest enabled the Arabs to seize the opposite bank of the river (Dast-Mašin) and the so-called Euphrates county. After the rise of al-ʿArba, al-Obolla became of secondary importance, but throughout the ʿAbbāsid caliphate it remained a large town. It was further from the sea than it had been, but still the effects of the tide were perceptible even above al-Obolla. All the great geographical authors of the xth–xiith century give a longer or shorter notice of this place. Its environs are described in very laudatory terms (cf. Yaḥṣī, i. 97); the borders of the Nahr al-Obolla were one large garden (Ibn Hawkal, in B.G.A., ii. 160). The part of the Tigris opposite al-Obolla was important for navigation; in earlier ʿAbbāsid times there had been here a dangerous whirlpool, which had been eliminated by sinking a large quantity of stone in the water at the expense of an ʿAbbāsid princess. Here was erected a beacon light which is described by al-Idrīsī (ed. Jaubert, i. 364). Al-Obolla was in this period even larger than al-ʿArba, according to Mašdi (in B.G.A., iii. 118), and the place was n-tel for linen goods and also, as appears from al-Yaḥṣūbī (in B.G.A., vii. 360), for its shipbuilding. Naṣir-i Khosrow, who visited the place in 443 (1051), gives likewise a vivid description of its beautiful surroundings (Berlin 1341, p. 133). On the other hand, al-Obolla does not seem to have been an important strategic point; occasionally it was occupied, as in 331 (942) by the governor of Ḥātān in his action against the Barīdī brothers in ʿArba (cf. Miskawāzh, ed. Amedroz, i. 46), but as the events showed it was far from being an important bulwark of that city. After the xith century the general decline of those regions seems to have brought about the gradual disappearance of the place; Ibn Baṭṭūta (ii. 17 sqq.) calls it only a village and the Nushāt al-Kulūb
(p. 58) knows only the Nahr al-Obolla, but does not mention the place itself. About this time it must have disappeared; last account (as late as the 1830's) of the Nahr al-Obolla of the Hijaz is recorded by Lane-Poole in the "Raschid-Shaw" (p. 453) reproduce only obsolete geographical traditions.

**Bibliography:** Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 52, 177, 180; xi. 1025; G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 44 sqq.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCHIALY,** Turkish corsair and admiral in the eighteenth century. He was born in a village of Calabria called Licastelli, about 1750, as, at the time of his death in 1787, he is said to have been over ninety years old. Ochialy is the name by which he is known in Italian sources of the time; the Turkish sources call him Ulu'dj 'Ali, which name probably was given to him in Northern Africa. It may be the Arabic plural 'ulûdîj (from 'ulûdîj), denoting his foreign descent (Hammer, G.E. R., ii. 481-491) gives conflicting statements). After being a catured galley slave, he became a Muhammadan and entered on a long maritime career in the Mediterranean. According to the Sidjîl-i őethmani (ii. 502), he became Tersâne Kapudanî in 1769 (1554). He owed his rise to his connection with the famous admiral Torghud Re'îs, whose lieutenant he was. With Torghud he was at Djebba during Charles V's expedition against this island, and in 1565 both took part in the abortive expedition against Malta, where Torghud was killed. Then, until 1568, he was the latter's successor as viceroys of Tripolis, after which he was appointed in the same capacity to Algiers, as successor of Şehîd Pasha. During this time he extended his influence over Algeria, even west and, in 1567, he temporarily took Tunis from the last Haçşîd sulün and his Spanish protectors. Cervantes mentions him as king of Algiers in chapter xxxix. of his Don Quixote. In the following year Ulu'dj 'Ali took part in maritime expeditions against the Venetians and the Maltese. His chief exploit is connected with the battle of Lepanto [q. v.], in September 1571, where he commanded the left wing of the Ottoman fleet. His success in bringing a part of the fleet safely to Constantinople after the defeat procured him the dignity of Kapudan Pasha, the former grand admiral Mu'elîhdin-Zade 'Ali having perished at Lepanto. On this occasion the name Ulu'dj 'Ali is said to have beenchanged into 'Ilîdij 'Ali. He remained in this office until his death and commanded a series of predatory expeditions in the Mediterranean, participating i. a. in the reconquest of Tunis and La Goulette in 1574, along with the serasker Sînân Pasha [q. v.]. The inner political changes did not affect his favour with government circles. His last official activity was to bring the new Khân of the Cîmea to Kaffa to install him in place of the deposed Khân. Ochialy displayed considerable activity in ship-building, especially after the delâlec of Lepanto; in addition he was the builder of the Topkâne Dîâmî at Galata, and of a hamâmî in the sulün's palace. When he died unexpectedly in his own mosque (14th July 995 = June 21, 1587) he left an enormous fortune, which fell to the state.

**Bibliography:** The chief Turkish historical sources are the Tarîhî of Sélami, and the Tûbütî al-Khûsîr by Haijîdî Khâlîsî. A contemporary western source is: Pierre de Bourdelles de Brantôme, Vie des hommes illustres et grands capitaines étrangers, 1594. Further the historical works of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorgensen, and the Hamilton in the Mediterranean, London 1910, p. 344 sqq.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OCSONOBA,** the old name of the circle (kâra) in al-Andalus corresponding to the present Portuguese province of Algare de which Silves [q. v.]; Ar. Sîwâlîn was the capital. The geographers and historians transcribe this place name in the forms Ukkunuba and Ukkûnuba; we also find the wrong forms Čghknîya and Ukkûnîya, the result of graphic errors. The name Ossonoba seems also sometimes to be applied to a town which would be the old Santa Maria de Algarve [q. v.] now Faro. On the authority of an epigraphical reference it has however been identified with Milreu (Estoy) by Hubner (C.I.L., i. 3-4, 781-785).

**Bibliography:** Yëkîn, Muqîjan al-Buldûn, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 164, 343; iii. 312; al-Makkâ, Anatelet, i. 113, 809; I. Alcany Molufer, La geografia de la Península ibérica en los escritores árabes, Granada 1921, p. 110; David Lopes, Toponymia arabe de Portugal, in Revue Hispanique, 1902, p. 43-44; do., Os Arabic nas obras de Alexandre Herculano, Lisbon 1911, p. 79-80.

(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

**OPEN.** [See BUDAPEST.]

**OGHUL,** a word common to all the Turkish languages, meaning "son", "child", "descendant". In this connection attention may be called to certain formations, such as oğlak oğlu, "son of the old house", and oğlak oğlu, which may be applied to the sons of the Janissaries. Oğul is very frequently found in family names where it takes the place of the Persian zade or the Arabic ibn, e.g. Hekim-oğlu or Hekim-zade for Ibn al-Hekim or Ramađân-oğul or Ramađân-zade for Ibn Ramađân (where it should be remembered that the Arabic ibn does not mean exclusively "son" but "descendant"). An incomplete survey of such formations in an early period is to be found in Sijjl-i őethmani, iv. 778-812. — The new law on family names will give rise to numerous forms where oghul is combined with names and crafts.

Cognate is oğlan, "boy", "young man", "servant", a word also found in certain compounds, e.g. iî oğlan, "sultan's page" or iî oğlan, "language-boy", "interpreter". From oğlan we also get uylan, the name for light cavalry.

(FRANZ BÄRINGER)

**OHOD,** a mountain about three miles north of Medina, celebrated for the battle fought there in the year 3 which ended unfavourably for Muhammad. It is a part of the great range of hills which runs from north to south but here spreads to the east over the plain and thus forms an independent group of hills. The rocky walls surmounted by a rectangular plateau — without peaks, Yağıfit says — "which rise like masses of iron" (Burton) above the plain are quite destitute of trees and plants and only the face of the south wall is broken by a ravine which played a decisive part of the battle. The country round is stony and covered with gravel but farther south there are a few cornfields and gardens watered by a brook, but these are sometimes flooded by sudden rainstorms so that the pilgrims coming from the town cannot reach the hill. The Meccans who had
set out to avenge the defeat at Badr were encamped at the already mentioned cornfields at al-‘Irāl or al-‘Ijār, which were then full of ripe corn and supplied food for their animals. Muhammad who against his will and against the advice of the elders was forced to leave the town and meet the enemy in the open field, went unhindered past the enemy camp and drew up his troops at the foot of the hill with their backs to it: a strategy no less peculiar than that of the enemy. At first it looked as if the enthusiasm of his followers would secure him a victory like that of Badr. But when the archers, whom the Prophet had placed upon the hill with distinct orders to prevent a flank attack by the enemy and not to leave their positions, were unable to restrain themselves when they saw the Meccan camp being pillaged and hurried up to see what they could get, Khalid b. al-Walid’s quick eye at once saw the weak spot and when he attacked it, the tables were quickly turned. When the rumour spread that Muhammad had surrendered (the tradition says his men had given way, and finally the flight became general. In reality the Prophet was only wounded, and some of his followers succeeded in concealing him in the ravine. Fortunately the Meccans, little experienced in warfare, did not know how to follow up their victory and began to go home. The Prophet was in this way saved from the worst but he had to lament the loss of many of his followers, including his uncle Ḥamza [q.v.], a loss which he felt particularly. It is not easy to get a clear idea of the treatment of the fallen as the traditions differ very much. It is said that the Medinese at first brought their dead to Medina but the Prophet soon forbade this; some mention a common grave in which those who knew the Qur’ān were put in the first row; but according to others the martyrs were buried singly or in two and threes and some authorities say that the alleged common graves of the martyrs of Oḥod are really those of beduins who died in the reign of ‘Omar (Wāqidī, transi. Wellhausen, p. 143). All accounts however agree in their tendency to glorify Ḥamza. The Prophet is said to have uttered the ṣabūra over him first; the bodies of the other dead are said to have been placed beside him one by one and Muhammad prayed over him 70 times, as he included him in the prayer with each new corpse. Every year afterwards the Prophet went to Oḥod to visit his and the other graves and the early caliphs did so also. Muhammad is said to have ordered that the women in lamenting the death of every Anṣāri should begin with a lament for Ḥamza. In this way Oḥod became one of the most prominent places of pilgrimage the Medinahmāns, the mosque was built over Ḥamza’s tomb and it is mentioned by Maqādissi; it lay behind a well near the graves of the other martyrs. We have a brief description by Ibn Dju‘ārī in the 9th (xiiith) century. He mentions first of all Ḥamza’s mosque on the south side of the hill 3 miles north of Medina; a mosque is built at his grave with the grave in an open space to the north of it. Opposite lay the other graves of martyrs and opposite them again was the cave where the Prophet took shelter on the lower part of the hill. Around the graves of the martyrs is a low wall of red earth ascribed to Ḥamza at which people seek a blessing. The best modern description is that of Burckhardt who visited the place in 1814 after its devastation by the Wahhābīs. From his description we may quote the following: “About one mile from the town stands a ruined edifice of stones and bricks, where a short prayer is recited in remembrance of Muhammad having here put on his coat of mail, when he went to engage the enemy. Further on is a large stone, upon which it is said that Muhammad leaned for a few minutes on his way to Oḥod. . . . To the east of this torrent, the ground leading towards the mountain is barren, stony, with a mound, on the slope of which stands a mosque, surrounded by about a dozen ruined houses, once the pleasure villas of wealthy towns-people; near them is a cistern, filled by rain water. The mosque is a square solid edifice of small dimensions. Its dome was thrown down by the Wahhābīs but they spared the tomb. The mosque encloses the tomb of Ḥamza and those of his principal men who were slain in the battle; namely, Mu‘āz b. Umar, Dji‘ārī b. Muhammad (not mentioned in the traditions) and Abd Allāh b. Dji‘āh. The tombs are in a small open yard, and, like those of the Bākī, are mere heaps of earth, with a few loose stones placed around them. Beside them is a small portico, which serves as a mosque. A little further on, towards the mountain, which is only a gun-shot distance, a small cupola marks the place where Muhammad was struck in battle by a stone . . . . At a short distance from this cupola, which like all the rest has been demolished, are the tombs of twelve other partisans of the Prophet, who were killed in the battle . . . The people of Medina frequently visit Oḥod, pitching their tents in the ruined houses, where they remain a few days, especially convalescents, who during their illness had made a vow to slaughter a sheep in honour of Ḥamza if they recovered. Once a year (in July, I believe), the inhabitants flock thither in crowds, and remain for three days, as if they were the feast days of the saint. Regular markets are then kept there: and this visit forms one of the principal public amusements of the town”. In modern times Wavell records that the opening of the railway to Medina in 1905 produced a disturbance among the beduins which resulted among other things in the Banū ‘Ali, whose duty it was to protect the pilgrims visiting the tomb of Ḥamza, while putting no obstacles in their way, declining to take any responsibility. The Wahhābīs who now rule in northern Arabia permit pilgrimage but as at all the holy places forbid actual worship.


**OKAILIDS, a dynasty of al-Mawsīl.** The Banū ‘Oqail belonged to the great Beduin tribe of ‘Amir b. Sa‘sa‘a. From their original home in Central Arabia they spread in course of time in different directions and among their better known subdivisions were the Banū Khafāfa [q.v.] and the ‘Umarī [q.v.]. In the fourth century of the
Hidrja the Banū 'Okail in Syria and Irāk were tributary to the Ḥamdānids and when the latter were no longer able to maintain themselves in al-Mawṣil the city passed to the 'Okailids. The Kurd chief Bādh, the founder of the dynasty of the Murāwīdīs [q.v.], endeavoured to bring al-Mawṣil under his rule, whereupon the two Ḥamdānī brothers Abū Tāhir Ibrāhīm and Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥusain appealed for help to the emir of the Banū 'Okail, Abu l-Dhawwād Muhammad b. al-Musayyib. The latter at once announced his readiness to assist them and was given as a reward Džābir b. 'Omar, Naṣīrīn and the town of Balad. After the death of Bādh in battle (380 = 990—991) his sister's son Abū 'Ali al-Ḥusain continued the war with success. Abū 'Abd Allāh was taken prisoner and when Abu Tāhir went to Naṣīrīn to seek the protection of Abu l-Dhawwād, the latter took him, his son and several of his retainers prisoners, put them to death and then occupied al-Mawṣil. He then submitted nominally to the Bāyil Bahrā Ḍawla [q.v.] and persuaded him to send a representative to al-Mawṣil. But the latter did not play any part of any importance. Bahrā Ḍawla's efforts to make his influence felt in al-Mawṣil did not have the success he desired. Abu l-Dhawwād remained the real ruler. He died in 386 or 387 (996—997) and was succeeded by his brother al-Muṣallād [q.v.]. The latter was assassinated in Şafār 391 (Dec. 1000—Jan. 1001) and his eldest son Karwāsh [q.v.] was recognised as emir of al-Mawṣil. After holding office for fifty years, he was deposed by his brother Abū Kāmil Baraka [cf. Karwāsh] in 442 (1050—1051) and on the latter's death in the next year 443 (1051—1052) the rule passed to his nephew Kuwaris b. Badrān [q.v.]. The latter was succeeded in 453 (1061) by his son Muslim [q.v.] under whom the territory of the 'Okailids attained its greatest extent; their power then declined rapidly. On Muslim's death (478 = 1085) his brother Ibrāhīm who had been languishing in prison for years was set free and proclaimed emir of al-Mawṣil. In 482 (1089—1090) however, the Sālidjūk sultan Malikshāh invited him to come and give an account of his stewardship, and as soon as he appeared he was thrown into prison and Fāhār al-Dawla b. Dāhir [q.v.] was placed as governor over al-Mawṣil. Only after Malikshāh's death (Shawwāl 485 = November 1092) was Ibrāhīm set free and returned to al-Mawṣil. In the meanwhile Muslim's widow Ṣafiyah who was also the aunt of Malikshāh, had married Ibrāhīm, and on the death of Malikshāh she went with 'Ali, her son by Muslim, to al-Mawṣil. But as Muḥammad, another son of Muslim's, also coveted the city, its inhabitants split up into two parties and when it came to fighting, Muḥammad had to take to flight, while 'Ali occupied al-Mawṣil. As soon as Ibrāhīm heard of this he began negotiations with Ṣafiyah and received from her the town of Balad which Malikshāh had given her as a fief. The Sālidjūk prince Tutush [q.v.] then demanded that Ibrāhīm should recognise him as sultan and when the latter refused, the decision was left to arms. In Rās al-Ṣafā 1 486 (April 1093) the two armies met near al-Mawṣil; Ibrāhīm was taken prisoner and put to death and Tutush took control of the city. Muslim was given leave to settle there and to be governor over al-Mawṣil. He was not however long to dispute his power. He asked the emir Kuwaris [q.v.] to help him against his brother and the result was that he lost his life while 'Ali had to give up al-Mawṣil (Dhu 'l-Ka'dā 489 = Oct.—Nov. 1096).

In addition to the emirs of al-Mawṣil, several 'Okailidi dignitaries are mentioned in history. In 479 (1086—1087) Salīm b. Mālik b. Badrān b. al-Muṣallal surrendered Halab to sultan Malikshāh and received in return the fortress of Dja'bar [q.v.] to which al-Raḵša was soon added and these remained almost without interruption in the possession of his descendants until 504 (1106—1107) when his grandson Mālik b. 'Ali b. Salīm ceded them to Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī.

Another branch was established in Takrit [q.v.]. According to Ibn al-Aṣhrī, x. 289, where a short sketch of the history of this town is given down to the year 500 (1106—1107), the 'Okailid Rāfī b. al-Ḥusain died in 427 (1036) as lord of Takrit. His nephew Abū Ma'na Khamis b. al-Taghilib inherited his governorship. After the latter's death in 435 (1043—1044) he was succeeded by his son Abū Ghaṣṣāh. The latter was suddenly attacked in 444 (1052—1053) by his brother Ḥāfiz and thrown into prison and Ḥāfiz seized the power. In 448 (1056—1057) Ḥāfiz died and soon afterwards his son Naṣr died also. Ḥāfiz's widow Amīra then had Abū Ghaṣṣāh, who was still in prison, murdered and installed a governor named Abu 'l-Ghaṣṣāh in Takrit but he handed the town over to the Sālidjūk sultan Taḏhrīlābād.

'Okailidi governors are also occasionally found in other towns, like 'Anā, Ḥadīthā, Hit and 'Ukbara. After the extinction of the dynasty in Mesopotamia and the Irāk the 'Okailids withdrew to Bahrain.


(K. V. Zetterstén)

'Okāz, name of an oasis situated between Ṭā'if and Nakha. The Arab philologists derive the name from the root meaning 'to retain', in the middle forms 'to assemble' or from the meaning of 'concourse'. Both interpretations are based on the fact that 'Okāz was primarily celebrated for its annual fair, which was held on the 1st—20th Dhu'l-Ka'da and was at the same time an official occasion of mufakhara, i.e. a gathering of tribes or rather of groups and individuals belonging to the same tribe where individuals competed for honours and for the honour of their tribe.

These assemblies to which poets came to recite their poems were also a great fair at which merchandise was exchanged. That of 'Okāz was followed by those of Madjanna (last ten days of Dhu 'l-Ka'da), of Dhu'l-Madjāz (1st—8th Dhu'l-Hijja).
and those which accompanied the great pilgrimage. These weeks formed the climax of public life in pre-Islamic Arabia — the truce of the sacred months making discussion of the political affairs of the tribes of the Hijaz possible. The Tamim took no part in them. Islâm by condemning hereditary and individual feuds was the cause of the decline of the mawâzin [cf. MAWSIM].

Muhammad was on his way to the fair of 'Okâz with a few of his companions when at Nakha'(a) the djjâm heard the Kurān being recited and were struck with admiration as we are told in the Kurān (sūra Ixxii. 1 sqq.; xlv. 28 sqq.) and hadith (Bukhārī, Aḍḏi'l, bāb 105; Tafsir, sūra Ixxii., bāb 1; Muslim, Saḥārah, trad. 149; Tirmidhi, Tafsīr, sūra Ixxii., trad. 1).

'Okâz is also noted for the fighting which took place there at the beginning of Islâm.


(A. J. Wensinck)

'Oḵba b. Nāfī' b. 'Abd Kaṣī al-Kūrašī al-Fihrist, the famous general of the first century A.D. who endeavoured by consolidating the first successes of the Arab conquest in North Africa to put an end to the resistance of the Berbers but finally perished after a troubled career at the hands of African rebels.

The data supplied by the historians regarding the career of 'Oḵba are relatively abundant but like all that relates to the beginnings of the expansion of Islâm in North Africa have frequently to be taken with caution. They come from later traditions, and W. Marçais has clearly demonstrated the particular bias which they represent (Le passé de l'Algérie musulmane, in Histoire et Historiens de l'Algérie, Paris 1931, p. 150). It is certain as regards 'Oḵba that the essentials of what the Maghribi historians have preserved about him are of eastern origin and in addition the most circumstantial accounts of his career that we possess are from the pens of eastern authors: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam and al-Nuwairi. The only authority for the African tradition regarding 'Oḵba so far known is al-Ḥakām, but al-Ḥakāwī, at once detailed and new, found in a Maghribi MS. (cf. Bibliography) about 'Oḵba's raid into the south of Morocco seems fairly reliable up to a certain point from the very fact of its precision. Use of it after a critical study seems likely to throw doubt upon the statements hitherto regarded as reliable regarding the progress and chronology of the Arab conquest of Northwest Africa, such as are given in studies, already antiquated like Fournel (Les Berbères, Étude sur la conquête de l'Afrique par les Arabes, Paris 1875), or more recent and more distinguished works but also based on unchecked translations like that of E. F. Gautier (Les siècles obscurs du Maghreb, Paris 1927).

This is why in the present state of our knowledge we shall here confine ourselves to tracing a sketch of 'Oḵba b. Nāfī's activities in North Africa which need not be considered final on all points.

'Oḵba was born in the last years of the Prophet's life and was through his mother the nephew of 'Amr b. al-ʿAs [q.v.], the celebrated conqueror of Egypt, who shortly before his death in 43 (663) gave him the supreme command in Ifriqiya. According to a story, difficult to verify, 'Oḵba at that time was directing his attention to the Sudan and establishing Islam by force of arms at Ghadrânis. But this was only a raid and not a regular occupation of the country. It was not till some years later that we find him preparing for a new expedition, no doubt better equipped than the others. This was the expedition of 50 (670) in which he founded the military stronghold of al-Kaïra-wân [q.v.] in the middle of the province of Byzacene. For this expedition 'Oḵba had at his disposal a force of 10,000 horsemen which was gradually increased by the accession of Berbers converted to Islâm: with the help of this force he was able not only to attack the Byzantines who continued to hold out on the atlas sides of the coast of Ifriqiya but also the Berbers. The foundation of Kaïrawân, forming a strong base for the Arab troops, seems to have very much facilitated if not the occupation and pacification of Ifriqiya, at least its conversion to the religion of and obedience to the authority of the invaders. But in the end 'Oḵba who gathered the fruits of this spread of Islâm. Ifriqiya remained a dependency of the province of Egypt; the new governor Masmâla b. Mâqâlî dismissed 'Oḵba in 53 (675) and replaced him by one of his own clients, Abu l-Muhâdhjî, who very soon undertook a raid on Algiers, and according to Ibn Khalîlîn got as far as Tlemcen [q.v.]. On his return to the east, 'Oḵba is reputed to have complained to the caliph Mu'âwiya of the way in which he had been treated by the governor of Egypt and a little later Mu'âwiya's successor restored him his governorship.

This second appointment of 'Oḵba to Ifriqiya may be put with certainty in 62 (682). His enemy, the governor Abu l-Muhâdhjî, had in the course of his raid defeated the Berber chief Kūsâïla [q.v.] who became a Muslim and it was on these two that 'Oḵba wreaked his vengeance in his turn. He put them into chains and carried them with him wherever he went. At the same time he prepared an expedition on a larger scale than the previous one the stages of which can be traced from the narrative of Ibn Khalîlîn. 'Oḵba's army, preceded by an advance guard under Zuhâr b. Kaṣî al-Balâwî, advanced from Kaïrawân into the Central Maghrib, at first encountering in the Zag and again in Tafsîr the Berber and Byzantine elements which he defeated and received tribute from. He finally reached the region of Târîkha. The chief of the Ghumâr, Iyâm (Julian 2), submitted to the Arab leader and became his military adviser. He dissuaded him from crossing the Straits of Gibraltar and undertaking the conquest of Spain and pointed out the danger threatening the Arab troops from the great body of still unconverted Berbers in the Great Atlas and Sûs [q.v.]; 'Oḵba therefore turned his attention to the Berbers. First of all he occupied the massif of the Zarhûn, took the town of Uûlî (Volubilis), crossed the Middle Atlas and advanced through the Dra (Dar'a) and Sûs, the inhabitants of which he pursued up to the desert of the Lamsûn. He
then turned to the Atlantic coast, reached the land of Sari and began to subject the Berber bloc of the Ma'muda of the Jbel Duran (Great Atlas) then that of the Anti-Atlas as far as Tériblou [q.v.].

But however brilliant they seemed these successes led nowhere. An advance no matter how brilliant through a country meant nothing if it was not followed by an occupation which Okba was not able to secure. But when he and his army turned homewards, he does not seem to have realised that all would have to be done again. Kusaila escaped from him and organised resistance, making use alike of the fondness for fighting of his Berber compatriots and the discipline and technical skill of the Byzantine garrisons in the country. Okba trusting to his good fortune did not see the danger. Reaching the Zāb, at Thubunza (Ulūna) he went so far as to divide his army into several contingents which he sent off in succession on the road to Kairawan. Trusting the Berbers, who had submitted to him, he had only a small body of Arabs with him left out from the army [q.v.]. But he was soon surrounded by Kusaila's bands on the border, of the Sahara at Tahāda and fell with 300 of his companions in 63 (683).

His grave and that of his companions is still pointed out at the same place and forms the centre of a little village which bears his name: Saiyidī 'Ukba (vulg. Sidi 'Ukba), a few miles S.E. of Biskra, not far from the old site of Tahāda.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

AL-ʿOLAIMI, Abu l-Yemen ʿAbd al-Rahman b. Muhammad Muḥammad al-Dīn al-ʿOmari al-Ḥanjārī, an Arab historian, born on the 13th Dhu l-ʾKhāda 810 (Oct. 13, 1450) in Jerusalem, studied from 880 (1476) in Cairo, became in 885 (1481) kāšī in Ramla and in 891 (1486) chief kāšī in Jerusalem. He retired in 922 (1516) and died in 928 (1522) in Jerusalem.

His best-known work is a history of Jerusalem and Hebron, which he began on the 25th Dhu l-ʾḤijjāda 900 (Sept. 17, 1494) and finished on the 17th Rāmāḍān 901 (May 31, 1495), entitled al-luʾūs (al-Ans, which is sometimes found in the MSS. in place of it and is sometimes corrupted to Ṣanṣ al-qādīl bi-Tawṣīʾ al-Kuds wa l-Ḥalalīl). For the earlier period he takes almost everything out of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Makdisi’s (d. 765 = 1354) Muhīr al-ṣahrūm ilā Shirāz wa l-Kuds wa l-ʾAlam (cf. C. König, Der Kitaib Muhīr etc., Leipzig Diss. 1896, p. 20) and supplements it mainly with biographical data. The work which exists in numerous MSS. was first printed in Venice Cat. dell. Ar. Ingl. Bot., 2nd ed., N. 951; Brockelman, 3rd ed., i, 43, 609 sqq.; 1511; Burger, ii, 1022, 3759-60, 5999, 6103; Aya Sofya, N. 2976; Kiliç ʿAlī Pasha, N. 729; Bankiore, xv. 1084-1085, etc.) was first made known in Europe through extracts in the Journal des Étrangers, 1754, April, p. 8-45, and then through Hammer's Fundamenta, ii. — From the printed edition, Cairo 1283, H. Sauvain translated Histoire de Jerusalem et d'Hebron depuis Adam jusqu'à la fin du XVIe siècle, Fragments de la chronique de Meudjiraddîn, Paris 1876. At the end of his work the author announces his intention of continuing it when able to do so. This continuation is found in Leyden N. 953, down to 915, and in Oxford (see Cat., i, 853, 3) and in the Khalidi Library in Jerusalem (see A. L. Mayer, in Journ. Pal. Oriental Society, xi, 1-13).

Probably before he wrote his great work, he had written a general history with special reference to Jerusalem and continued it down to the year 896 (1491); this survives in a MS., in the British Museum, Suppl. N. 488 without title and is perhaps identical with the al-Tawṣīʾ al-muṣṭāfā fī Anbak man ʿamran mentioned by Ḥajīdī Khalīfa, ii. 150; v. 619. To the Tabābāt al-Ḥanjālāla of ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Shamsī b. Ahmad b. Radjab (d. 795 = 1393) he wrote a continuation al-Manhajī al-ʾAḥmadī fi Tarāqīm Afkār al-ʾImām, MSS. Berlin N. 10043, Laleli N. 2083 (see Spies, Beilage, 15, in the possession of J. E. Sarkis (Cat. 1928, p. 48, lvi, photo in Cairo, Firihis, v. 372), Kamāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. Muḥammad Shafīʿ al-Ghazzi (d. 1214 = 1799-1800) wrote a continuation of this work down to the year 1207 (1792-1793) and on this and the original work Muḥammad Ḥamāl b. ʿOmar al-Shaṭṭī al-Baghdādī in 1325 (1907) based his Muḥāz zar Tabābāt al-Ḥanjālāla, Damascus 1339 (see R. A. D., i, 160). Whether the al-ʿOlaimi who is mentioned in Dāwūd al-Mawsīli, Makālib al-Mawṣīl, p. 152-54 as the author of a commentary on the Diwan of Ibn al-Fārūq is the same as our author, is a question which is impossible to decide with our present knowledge.


OLCĀITU KHUDĀBANDA, eighth Ikhān of Persia, reigned from 1304 till 1317. He was, like his predecessor Ghāzī, a son of Arghun and a great-grandson of Hulāgū. At his acces-
sion he was 24 years of age. In his youth he had been given the surname of Kharbana, for which different explanations are given (cf. the poem by Rashīd al-Dīn reproduced on p. 46 of E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, iii. p. 46 sqq. and Ibn Battūta, ii. 115), but E. Blochet, in his *Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols* (M. S., xii. 51), has explained the name as a Mongolian word, meaning “the third”. The Byzantine historian Pachymeres calls him Kaghzībat (ed. Bonn 1835, ii. 459). His mother ʻUqūd Kattūn had baptized him as a Christian, but under the influence of one of his wives he afterwards embraced ʻIslām and received the name Muḥammad, while his surname was changed to Khudābanda. In addition he took the ḱāb of Ghīyān al-Dunya wa ʻl-Din. When Chāfīdī died, Olācitū was absent with an army on the Indian frontier of the empire, but there was no difficulty about the succession, as a possible claimant, his cousin ʻAlafrankī, had been killed previously. Olācitū continued the traditional warfare of his predecessors with the Mamlūk Empire and their friendly relations with European Christian powers; some of the letters addressed by him to the Pope Clement V and the English King Edward II are still extant; these letters were brought by his Christian envoy Thomas ʻIlūdū, who, in contradiction to the facts, kept up the fiction that his master was a Christian. Olācitū likewise sent a military expedition to relieve the Byzantine Emperor Michael Palaeologos by dividing the force of the Turks in Asia Minor; but this was of little avail (Pachymeres, ii. 588). Against the Mamlūks Olācitū himself conducted a campaign during which the town of Ṣashāna on the Ephrates was besieged in vain (1313). The authority of the government in the interior was strengthened by the conquest of Dīlān in 1307 and in the same year by the conquest of Herāt from the vassal ʻUqūd dynasty. In 705 (1305-1306) Olācitū made the newly founded town of ʻUṣūlānīa [q. v.] the capital of his empire, on the occasion of the birth of his son and successor ʻAbū Saʿīd. Prosperity was increased by the laws of Chāfīdī, whose canon was promulgated again by Olācitū, and also by the able administration of the famous historian Rashīd al-Dīn [q. v.]; the latter’s colleague and rival, ʻAbū al-Dīn, was executed in 1312 through the intrigues of ʻAli Ṣashān, who took his place. The dispute which soon arose between the two ministers made the sultān in 1315 assign to each of them the administration of half of the empire. The attitude of Olācitū towards ʻIslām deserves special notice. After first showing preference for the Ṣhiʿa (cf. the story of Māmaj al-Din of Shīrāz told by Ibn Batūtā, ii. 57 sqq.), he became an adherent of the Sunna. Then, after an attempt to introduce the Ṣhiʿa instead of the Ḥanāfī madhhab, he finally decided again to join the Ṣhiʿa, after having visited the tomb of ʻAli; one of his coins affords proof of this.

— Olācitū is described as a virtuous, liberal ruler; he showed interest in the observatory of Marāqqa, where ʻAbī al-Dīn, ʻAbū al-Din’s son, was appointed astronomer. He likewise favoured the literary-historical activity of Rashīd al-Dīn and the historian Ṣashāh. He died at ʻUṣūlānīa on December 16, 1316; afterwards Rashīd al-Dīn was accused of having caused his death.

In ʻUṣūlānīa his tomb is still to be seen.

**Bibliography:** Contemporary sources are the *Ṭarīkh-i Waṣṣāf*, lth. Bombay 1269, and a continuation of Rashīd al-Dīn’s *Qānūn* al-Tārīkhī, which continuation is found in several manuscripts, but has not yet been edited. Further the *Ṭarīkh-i Guzīda* by ʻAbd Allāh Mustawfī and the later Persian works. — Of European works must be mentioned: D’Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, iv. 478-598; J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Ichten*, Darmstadt 1843, ii. 178-251; H. Howorth, *Histoire of the Mongols*, iii. 534-584; E. Blochet, *Introduction à l’histoire des Mongols*, G. M. S., xii., Leyden—London 1910, passim. — For Olācitū’s coins: Stanley Lane-Poole’s *Catalogue*, vi. 44 sqq.

**ʻOMĀN,** a nominally independent state on the Persian Gulf under the protectorate of England. Its extent has varied considerably in the course of its history. While Ḵaṭṭārī, for example, who gives ʻOman an extent of 300 parasangs, includes the district of Mhara in it, Idrīsī describes the latter as an independent country. In the northwest ʻOman was bounded by the province of al-Bahrain or al-Ḥaljār, in the south by Yanan and Ḥaḍramāt. The sultanate reached its greatest extent under Sūlān Ibn Mālik b. al-ʻArab b. Sūlān, under whom ʻOman not only included the territory from Rās al-Ḥadd to Dīlūfār, but also al-Bahrain and other possessions, particularly on the African coast where his son Saif conquered Kilwa and Zanzibar. ʻOman at the present day includes the whole south-eastern part of Arabia with a strip about 500 miles long on the south coast of the Peninsula including the land of ʻOṣfār. By the decision of the International Court at the Hague in 1905 in a dispute between England and France regarding the granting of the French flag to owners of sailing-ships in Maskat, the southern boundary was fixed at Rās Ṣakār and the coast as far as Ḫūr Kalībe reckoned to ʻOman, while at the same time the sultān’s claim to the peninsula of Rās Masandūm from Rās Dībba to Tibbā was expressly recognised by both powers. This of course does not prevent the actual power of the sultān barely extending beyond the coast district of Maskat and Bātina. The population of ʻOman is estimated at half a million but that of ʻOman proper is about 40,000 only. As regards creed the ʻIbadīs are preponderant particularly in the south, but the northern districts are inhabited mainly by Sunnis. The capital is Maskat [q. v.] while at an earlier period ʻAbī Ṣubīr [q. v.] was regarded as the most important town in the country.

The following details of the distribution of the population may be given: the thickly populated district of Bātina has 105,000, the Wādī Sāmīl 2,800, Maskat 10,000, Māṭrah 11,000, Sīr 12,000, Suḥār 7,500. ʻOman for administrative purposes is divided into four districts: 1. Dīlān, the land of the Ben Alis.‘Ali and all the land south of Bedīa; 2. ʻOman proper from Bedīa to ʻUṣūlānīa; 3. Duṭra from the latter place to al-Buraimi and 4. al-Bāṭina, the narrow strip of coast from Sīr to Ḫūr Fakkān. The characteristic feature of the coast of the country is a mountain range which runs from Maskat south in a southerly direction as far as Sūr close to the coast but runs a considerable distance inland north of Maskat and thus leaves space for the fertile low-lying land on the coast, al-Bāṭina, which is in
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The following details of the distribution of the population may be given: the thickly populated district of Bātina has 105,000, the Wādī Sāmīl 2,800, Maskat 10,000, Māṭrah 11,000, Sīr 12,000, Suḥār 7,500. ʻOman for administrative purposes is divided into four districts: 1. Dīlān, the land of the Ben Alis.‘Ali and all the land south of Bedīa; 2. ʻOman proper from Bedīa to ʻUṣūlānīa; 3. Duṭra from the latter place to al-Buraimi and 4. al-Bāṭina, the narrow strip of coast from Sīr to Ḫūr Fakkān. The characteristic feature of the coast of the country is a mountain range which runs from Maskat south in a southerly direction as far as Sūr close to the coast but runs a considerable distance inland north of Maskat and thus leaves space for the fertile low-lying land on the coast, al-Bāṭina, which is in
a way comparable to al-Tihama in the Yemen, although it never attains the same width, being only from 20 to 30 miles across. South of Kustak just below 23° Lat., almost at right-angles to the former, is a second range, higher in its highest parts, known as Jebel Akhdar which with 10,000 feet is the greatest height in the country. It runs parallel to the coast as far as Ras Masandam and sends off a second range which runs to Ras al-Khim. The most fertile part of Oman is the already mentioned low-lying coast land of al-Batin where in addition to intensive cultivation of the date-palm, wheat is grown and all kinds of fruits flourish. The Arab geographers raised the dates of Oman and al-Ashar was not wrong in comparing Oman to a garden. Among the fruits special mention is made of bananas, pomegranates, and nebe (lotus nebk). A considerable part of Oman however is quite unsuited for agriculture; for example the part bordering on the desert zone of Arabia which however contains a few fertile oases among the mountains, for example on the way from Beni Abi ‘Ali to Nizwa. These oases are watered by subterranean deposits as was long ago pointed out by Ibn al-Fakih; where the water is not too deep below the surface or there are subterranean channels, springs supply the necessary water to the fields. The climate of Oman suffers from the great heat, which is only to some degree tempered by the refreshing winds from the sea; in Maskat the maximum in July and August is 91°—88° F. The rainy season is in winter from October to March, but the rains seldom fall more than three or four days in a month; among the mountains heavy storms occur and the snow sometimes lies. In Masqat the annual rainfall is 3 to 6 inches.

The cereals grown are wheat, dhura, some rice, the fruits, tamarinds, mango, bananas, pomegranates, quinces, pistachios, agrumi, grapes, almonds, figs, walnuts, water-melons, apricots and cherries, while cotton, sugar-cane and indigo are cultivated. Stockraising is now mainly confined to horned cattle; at one time Oman was celebrated for its strong, swift camels and oases. The Arab geographers (Ibn al-Fakih) praise Oman’s wealth in fish, which supplied the food of large sections of the community (especially in al-Batin). Industry, once very flourishing, is now confined to weaving on a modest scale in Maskat, Nizwa and Ibra, dyeing in the two last named towns and the making of weapons in Masqat. Idrisi mentions the pearl-fisheries of Srir below Cape al-Maladja and in Dammar. The pearl-fisheries now produce about half the revenue of Bahrain (10-15,000,000 rupees). The Arab philologists (Ibn al-Arabi) derive the name Oman from ‘amana with the meaning “to stay continually in one place”. According to others the name goes back to Oman b. Ibrahima al-KHSH, who built the town of Oman; this is of significance in as much as the classical writers knew of a town called Omana (Pliny, Nat. hist., iv. 172) and Omana in Persia (Potomly, vi. 7, 30), this has been identified with Suhr which was later regarded as the most important trading centre. Al-Mukaddasi (p. 35) compared Oman with ’Aden and Egypt for importance in the world’s trade and called it and Shiraf (q.v.) the forecourt of China (p. 449). This does not seem however to have much benefited the people of Oman, for they were regarded as dishonest, wicked and deceitful merchants; indeed Ibn al-Fakih (p. 92) describes them in much coarser language. The prosperity coming from the trade and agriculture is evident from the huge yield from taxation, 300,000 dinars in the Abbasid period. A dirhem a year was paid on each palm-tree (Muqaddasi, p. 105).

For the early history of Oman, Hatt’s account may be consulted.

The relations of England with the country have been of great importance to Oman. They began in 1798 with a treaty between the East India Co. and the sultan by which the French and Dutch were excluded from the territory for the duration of the war, and this was followed in 1806 by the granting of permission for the E.I.C. to have an agent permanently resident in Maskat. By the treaties made by the French with Sayid Saiid b. Sultan in 1807 and 1808, this resident was joined by a French Consular agent. But French prestige suffered a severe blow when Mauritius was occupied by the English in 1810. In 1839 a commercial treaty was concluded between England and Maskat, modelled on one concluded in 1833 between the U.S.A. and Oman. In 1844 there followed a commercial treaty with France, which secured this country the most favoured nation clause and freedom to trade in Maskat for its subjects. In 1852 came the Anglo-French guarantee of the independence of Oman, but England was able to secure a predominant influence in Oman by vigorously supporting the sultan at various crises and by paying him a subsidy. In 1891 the sultan declared in a treaty of friendship, which also regulated questions of trade and navigation between the two countries, and was binding upon himself and his successors, that he would not cede any of his territory in any way to any power other than England. When then, in 1898, the sultan in contravention of this agreement wished to allow France to have a coal-station in his territory, he had to withdraw the concession on receiving an ultimatum from England; France was compensated with a coal-station in Mukalla [q.v.]. The dispute assumed a more serious aspect which arose out of the practice of the French consul in Maskat giving ships’ papers and French flags to Maskat ships which abused the privilege to carry arms and slaves. The dispute was settled by the International Court at The Hague, the decision being that only those ship-owners who had received permits before January 2, 1892 were allowed to retain them. The result was that in 1917 only 12 ships of Oman were allowed to carry the French flag. The result has been the practical exclusion of French influence from Oman, and the securing of English predominance.

OMAR and ABD AL-AZIZ

Abu ʿAbd al-ʿAziz b. Marwān b. al-Hakam, Abu Ḥafs al-ʿAshādū, was a Umayyad caliph. He was born in Medīna in the year 63 (682–683). His father ʿAbd al-ʿAziz [q. v.] had been for many years governor of Egypt; through his mother he was descended from ʿOmar I. She was ʿUmm ʿĀṣīn bint ʿĀṣim b. ʿAbd al-Khaṭṭāb. He spent the greater part of his life in Medina. He was sent there by his father from Egypt to receive a fitting education in the city of the Prophet and remained there till the death of his father in 85 (704). His uncle, the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, then took him to Damascus and married him to his daughter Fāṭima. In Rabī‘ I 87 (Feb.–March 706) ʿOmar was appointed governor of the Ḥijāz by al-Walid I and he settled in Medina again. Unlike other governors who were as a rule very arbitrary, ʿOmar immediately on his arrival in the city formed an advisory council of ten pious authorities on tradition with whom he discussed all important matters, and further empowered them to keep a watchful eye on his subordinates. In other respects also, his patriotic rule was for the good of the subjects. But in the long run the all powerful Ḥādījādī [q. v.] was not pleased with ʿOmar’s mild rule because many Ḥārākis fled to the two sacred cities in order to escape the harsh lot by which they had to be prepared in their native land. Under pressure from him ʿOmar was recalled in 93 (711)–94 (712) without however being disgraced. After the death of Dābiq [q. v.] in Saʿfar 99 (Sept.–Oct. 717) of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik who had intended to succeed him, the autocratic theologian Rāḍā’ b. Hāwā wa assembles the Umayyads in the mosque and without mentioning any name demanded that they should pay homage to whomsoever Sulaymān should have mentioned in his will. Only when they had paid homage, did he announce the death of the caliph and the name of the successor designate. As ʿOmar belonged to a collateral line and had nevertheless been preferred to the two sons of ʿAbd al-Malik, Yazid and Hishām, it is not a matter for surprise that the latter at first raised objections to the choice of his cousin as commander of the faithful; but he was soon appeased and ʿOmar ascended the throne without encountering any serious opposition.

As a caliph, ʿOmar stands apart; he was distinguished from his predecessors and successors alike. Inspired by a true piety, although not entirely free from bigotry, he was very conscious of his responsibility to God and always endeavoured to further what he believed to be the right and conscientiously to do his duty as a ruler. In his private life he was distinguished by the greatest simplicity and frugality, although he is said to have lived no less luxuriously than other Umayyad princes before his accession. Poets who praised the delights of worldly pleasures were therefore not particularly popular at his court.

ʿOmar laid no special stress on military glory, and his reign which only lasted two and a half years was poor in military events. The siege of Constantinople was raised on his accession to the throne; but it is uncertain whether the Muslim army was actually withdrawn by him. In Mesopotamia he allowed the people of Turanda to evacuate their town whereupon they settled in the adjoining Malaya and Turanda was destroyed. In the far West the Muslim armies crossed the Pyrenees, invaded Southern France and returned to Spain laden with rich booty. On a later campaign which is usually but not quite certainly attributed to the reign of ʿOmar, they captured Narbonne, fortified it, and used it for a time as their headquarters. ʿOmar however by no means felt obliged to spread Islam by the sword; rather he sought by peaceful missionary activity to win members of other creeds to the faith of the Prophet and in case of conversion by this means demanded no tribute. This method proved particularly successful and suitable among the Berbers and it is even said that there was not a single Berber left unconverted to Islam in the governorship of Isma‘il b. ʿAbd Allāh appointed by him. In a similar way were converted the princes of Sind when ʿOmar’s governor Amr b. Muslim al-Bihili invited them to adopt Islam and promised them complete equality with Muslims; but under Hishām they lapsed again.

His interests were primarily in home affairs. He had the untrustworthy governor of Kharūsān Yazid b. al-Muhallab [q. v.] arrested and his post given to al-Djarrāb b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Hakami. In other cases also, the most important offices were filled with men whom ʿOmar thought to be capable and just. He adopted a kindly attitude to the Alids. The practice introduced by Mūsāiyya of publicly cursing ʿAll in the service in the mosque was abolished by ʿOmar. It is said that when he was a boy and his father appointed governor of Egypt he begged him to forbid the customary cursing of ʿAll and received the reply that such a step although laudable in itself would be against the interests of the Umayyad dynasty and might give support to the Alids claims to the caliphate. ʿOmar gave up in favour of the Alids the oasis of Fakag [q. v.] which had originally been the private property of Muhammad but was then declared a state domain and had finally become the property of the Umayyads. After his accession he decided that it should revert to its original use and according to one story expressly ordered that it should be handed over to the descendants of Fāṭima as the heirs of the Prophet. He also restored to the family of Taḥa their property in Mecca, which ʿAbd al-Malik had
taken from them and abolished the addition to the tithe which had been levied by a former governor of the Yemen, Muhammad b. Vusuf, a brother of al-Hadjjasdji. In general he laid great stress on compensating those who had in any way been subjected to illegal extortions; but, as is obvious, this principle, while it testifies to the caliph's love of justice, was often applied, according to Ibn Sa'd, v. 252, uncritically (lisza'ir al-abayina al-ha'ira) and in the long run could not be beneficial to the treasury and was destined to have serious consequences.

As a devout Muslim he was gracious to members of other creeds in so far as this was possible without a breach of the principles of Islam. Christians, Jews, and fire-worshippers, were allowed to retain their synagogues, churches, and temples but not to build any new ones. In Damascus, al-Walid [q. v.] had taken down the basilica of John the Baptist and incorporated the site in the mosque of the Umayyads. When 'Omar came to the throne, the Christians complained to him that the church had been taken from them with permitted Omaryar of the government to give them the site of the addition to the mosque. But as the people of Damascus would not agree to this, the matter was settled with 'Omar's approval by the churches outside the town, notably that of St. Thomas which belonged de facto to the Muslims and not by treaty because the Ghūla [q. v.] had been conquered by the sword and not surrendered by capitulation, being handed over to the Christians on condition that they abandoned all claims for the future on the Church of St. John. While 'Omar endeavoured to protect his Muslim subjects from being abused, he was also anxious that his Christian subjects should not be crushed by oppressive taxation. In Aila and in Cyprus the tribute settled by treaty had been increased: 'Omar reduced it to the original amount. In al-Yaman the Christians of Nadgrān had made a treaty with the Prophet which guaranteed them complete security in their land on payment of an annual tribute of 2,000 robes (jullū) each of the value of 40 dirhams. This treaty had been broken by 'Omar I. Nevertheless, they had to pay the full tribute until 'Othman reduced it by 200 robes. Mu'awiya or, according to another story, his son Yazid granted them a further reduction of 200 robes because their numbers had been much reduced by death and conversions to Islam (on this see Lammens, Le califat de Yazid Ier, p. 346 sqq.). But when 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad b. al-Ash'ath [q. v.] rebelled against al-Hadididh, the latter raised the total tribute to 1,800 robes because he suspected the Nadgrānians of being in secret agreement with the rebels. In the meanwhile however, their numbers had sunk from 40,000 to 4,000 and when they appealed to 'Omar to alleviate their hard lot he reduced the tribute to one tenth and demanded only 200 instead of 2,000 or 8,000 dirhams.

One of 'Omar's most important measures was his reform of the taxation. The comprehensive administrative system of 'Omar I which proved excellent for the conditions in his day, was now no longer suitable to the demands of the time. The treasury was continuously suffering from the ever increasing conversion to Islam of non-Arabs who had paid tribute and their consequent exemption from taxation and in addition many of the new converts settled in the large cities instead of remaining at home and tilling the fields, so that agriculture lost much of the labour it required. To overcome this difficulty al-Hadidj had imposed the kharūj also upon Muslim landowners who were not paying tribute and prohibited immigration into the cities. This aroused general dissatisfaction but this did not worry him. 'Omar, on the other hand, adhered to the principle that Muslims should pay no tribute. He further propounded, no doubt by agreement with those learned in the law in Medina, the theory that conquered land was the common property of the Muslim community and therefore could not be broken up and transformed by sale to Muslims into private property. Consequently in the year 100 (718—719), he forbade Muslims to buy land which should pay tribute; but he did not make this legislation retrospective and he placed no obstacles in the way of the immigration of new converts into the cities. Further, just claims upon the treasury for compensation for services rendered were never refused: he granted the Mawri the Krāsān, who had fought against the unbelievers, pay and exemption from taxation just like Muslim warriors. He thus found a balance of the various elements in the caliph's empire and although his system of reformed taxation did not survive because the principle of the inalienability of tribute-paying land could not be permanently maintained, he did his best to clear up the existing financial muddle.

The historians of the older school described 'Omar as an unpractical idealist, who pursued purely Utopian ideals as a result of his theological preconceptions, without paying any heed to actual conditions, and only modern research has put his work in its true light. His reign was spared trouble from the Khāridjīs but hidden forces were working in secret which were to bring about the fall of the Umayyad dynasty. 'Omar died after an illness of 20 days in Radjab 101 (Feb. 720) and was buried in Dair Simān near Halab. He was succeeded by his cousin Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.].

Very much influenced since his boyhood by pious authorities on tradition, he was one of the authorities in this field and regarded, although wrongly, after his death as one of the first collectors of Sunna. In course of time a whole cycle of pious legends gathered round his name which were quite devoid of any historical foundation. For example we are told (Ibn Sa'd, v. 301, l. 17) that a roll of parchment fell from heaven upon the men who were filling up his grave which assured him security from the flames of hell (amūn min Allāh il-'Omar b. 'Abd al-Azīz min al-nār). Even the biased historians of the Abbasid period who as a rule run down the Umayyads on every possible occasion in favour of the 'Abbasīds make an exception in his case and give him the highest praise. His tomb was also left undisturbed when those of the other Umayyads were desecrated after the triumph of the 'Abbasīds.

The persons in his poems are "sensitive, aimable creatures, full of individuality. They reveal their souls, they act, they speak. Dramatic scenes, full of feeling stand out vividly before the reader's eyes" (Schwartz). In the form of his verse also 'Omar is a gifted poetical genius who writes without difficulty. His verse flows easily and naturally in simple language. His prosody differs from that of the Beduin poets; although he uses the same metres, he does not prefer those most popular in the old poetry (bustí or tawill) but flexible and light metres (khsfij, ramal, muftarib, munarib). That he did not feel himself bound by tradition is shown by some traces of strophic verse in his poems. It would be a mistake to see in 'Omar the first love-poet of the Arabs. But he was the first to bring this form to perfection. The roots of this genre are to be found not so much in the introductory parts of the old Arabic Ḷaṣīṣas as in the love-poems, which were particularly cultivated in South Arabia (perhaps not without Persian influence). A study of the surviving fragments of Waddāl-yāman, a contemporary of 'Omar which has been long in preparation by V. Ebermann, will perhaps shed new light on this point.

'Omar attained great popularity with his contemporaries and in the following generations, chiefly among singers, wits and men of letters. But his popularity among learned men was hampered by two things: his simple language offered very few "testi di lingua" in comparison with poets like, e.g. al-Farazādāk, and the matter of his poems was little suited for study in schools, especially religious and literate circles. The importance of Arabic literature in modern times has brought about a change; besides several monographs devoted to him, special chapters are devoted to him in the text books. 'Omar b. Abī Rabī'a is now so to speak rehabilitated among the Arabs and recognised as a great poet.


'OMAR B. AIYŪB. [See Ḫāmad and Aiyūbīs supplement.]
'OMAR b. 'ALI (SHARAF AL-DIN) AL-MUṢRĪ, generally known as IBN AL-FĀRĪD, a celebrated Ṣūfī poet. The name al-Fārīd (noury) refers to the profession of his father, who belonged to Ḥamīt but migrated to Cairo, where 'Omar was born in 576 or, more probably, in 577. In early youth he studied Shaf'ī law and Ḥadīth; then came his conversion to Ṣūfism, and for many years he led the life of a solitary devotee, first among the hills (al-Muṣṭṭam) to the east of Cairo and afterwards in the Ḥijāz. On his return to Cairo he was venerated as a saint till his death in 632, and his tomb beneath al-Muṣṭṭam is still frequented.

The Divān of Ibn al-Fārīd, though small, is one of the most original in Arabic literature. Possibly the minor odes, which exhibit a style of great delicacy and beauty and a more or less copious use of rhetorical artifices, were composed in order to be sung with musical accompaniment at Ṣūfī concerts (Nallino, in R. S. O., viii. 17); in these the outer and inner meanings are divided, so that they may be read either as love-poems—a fact to which they owe their wide popularity in the East—or as mystical hymns. But the Divān also includes two purely mystical odes: 1. the Khuraṣiyā or Wine Ode, describing the “intoxication” produced by the “wine” of Divine Love, and 2. the Nqmi al-Sulūk or “Pilgrim’s Progress”, a poem containing 760 verses, which is often called al-Tawīyat al-akbrā to distinguish it from a much shorter ode rhyming in the same manner. In this famous qaṣīda, nearly equal in length to all the rest of the Divān together, Ibn al-Fārīd depicts his own experience as a Ṣūfī. The result is not only a unique masterpiece of Arabic poetry but a document of surpassing interest to every student of mysticism (for a résumé of the contents, see Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, p. 195–199). Its whole character is psychological rather than speculative; though some passages are pantheistic in feeling and expression, it bears little or no trace of the intellectualism which marks the system of Ibn al-'Arabi; and the charges of heresy brought against the poet do not appear to be justified. Among Ṣūfīs the Tawīya occupies the position of a classic, and many commentaries have been written on it.


'OMAR (Abū Di‘AFAR) b. ḤAṣṣ̄ was appointed governor of the province of Irfiyya by the 'Abbasid caliph al-Maṣūr in 151 (768). He belonged to a family which in the time of the Umayyads had furnished a number of high officials to the state. One of his uncles, al-Muhallab b. Abi Sufra, had attained fame as governor of Khurāsān under 'Abdu al-Malik b. Marwān. 'Omar whose bravery was celebrated had himself held a command in the eastern provinces; he had been given the Persian epithet of Haṣāmerd (“1,000 men”).

The difficult situation in Irfiyya at the time justified the choice of an energetic governor. Barbary had gone over almost entirely to various sects of the Khāridjī heresy. The chief leader of the movement was the Ṣūfī Abū Kūra. The Arab 'qurud showed little enthusiasm to fight the rebels and besides, it was much divided by old tribal rivalries.

'OMAR b. Ḥaṣṣ, appointed by the caliph, brought with him 500 horsemen. He cleverly won the hearts of the people of Kairawān and was able to secure the country over three years of peace. Al-Maṣūr having given him orders to strengthen the defences of Tobna (q.v.), an old town, the strategic position of which on the western borders of the empire was becoming so important, 'Omar went there with the utmost speed. 'Abū Kūra being thus denuded of troops, the Berbers rose and 'Omar’s lieutenant Ḥābib al-Muhallabi was killed. This initial success encouraged the rebels who concentrated a large force around Tripoli under an 'Ībādi chief, Abī al-Qa‘im b. Banū, who had assumed command at Kairawān after Ḥābib’s death, asked for reinforcements from 'Omar b. Ḥaṣṣ. He received them but was defeated. The inscription now became general. Kairawān was again besieged and soon 'Omar himself who had only 15,500 men under him was besieged in Tobna by several Khāridjī armies, 'Ībādi, and Ṣūfī united under the command of Abū Kūra and numbering over 73,000 (the figures given are of course not at all reliable). 'Omar wished to cut his way through his opponents but his companions prevented him. He then tried to bribe Abū Kūra to leave his allies and offered him 60,000 dirhams but the offer was rejected. 'Omar then turned to his brother (or son) and obtained for 4,000 dirhams the secession of the Ṣūfīs. Abū Kūra had then to withdraw. 'Omar b. Ḥaṣṣ, thus rid of his enemies, sent a corps against the 'Ībādi Abū Rustam who had to take refuge in Ṭahert (Tiaret) (q.v.).

'Omar was again at work in strengthening the defences of Tobna when he learned of the critical situation of Kairawān. The town blocked for eight months by the 'Ībādi Abū Hakim was in dire straits. With 700 men of the 'qurud, he hurried to Irfiyya but instead of marching on Kairawān he took the road for Tunis, enticing the Berbers after him. He succeeded in getting supplies into Kairawān which he then entered himself. The siege was resumed with fighting every day. Food again became very scarce. 'Omar b. Ḥaṣṣ wished to send two chiefs of the 'qurud to procure supplies but they refused to go. He then decided to make a sortie himself which meant certain death, without awaiting the reinforcements of 60,000 men with which the caliph was sending him. Throwing himself on the enemy like a camel mad with rage, he fell on the 15th Dhu l-Hijjah 154 (Nov. 27, 771).

OMAR b. ḤAFṢŪN, leader of a famous rebellion in Spain, who at the end of the ninth century A.D. held out for years against the Umayyad emirs of Cordova and in the end was only brought to book by the caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir (cf. UMAIYAD). His full name was OMAR b. ḤAFṢŪN b. OMAR b. DЇAFAR called al-ĪLĀMĪ, from his conversion from Christianity to Islam and he claimed descent from an ancestor named Alfonso who had the title of count (comtes). 'Omar's father Ḥaṣūn or with the specifically Spanish suffix (-ān), Ḥaṣūn, was thus the grandson of a Visigothic lord who had become a Muslim and lived on the income from his lands at Iznate (Ḥiṣn Āwī) in the region of Ronda [q.v.] in the south of Spain in the middle of the 9th century A.D. His son while still quite young displayed a very violent temper and as a result of a crime committed by him against the person of one of his neighbours, had to escape for a time to North Africa, and spent some time at Tábert [q.v.]. He only returned home to rebel at once against the Umayyad emir of Cordova. Having gathered around him a small body of followers he estabished himself in 267 (880) in a ruined fortress at Bobastro (Ar. بسترو; q.v.), which he restored.

Doby has identified this castle with el Castillón, to the south of Campillos, between Teba and Antequera, relying on the discovery at this place of an inscription, mentioning the municipium Singilenste Barbastren, while Simonet thinks that its site corresponds to las Mesas de Villaverde, a little farther south between Ardales and Carrastraca. Excavations have recently been begun in the district in order to find the ruins of Bobastro. Whatever be the real position of the castle, we know that it commanded the valley of the Guadalhorce in the direction of Malaga and from there Ibn Ḥaṣūn could disturb a considerable part of the territory of the ērra of Rejí, which a governor dependent on Cordova was supposed to rule. 'Omar having had several successes, the governor tried to bring him to reason but without success and he lost his post. His successor was no more fortunate. Soon Ibn Ḥaṣūn was exercising complete authority over all the inhabitants of the mountainous region which extends from Ronda towards Grenada, Malaga and Algeciras. The Umayyad emir Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, had to organise a regular expedition against him the command of which was entrusted to his vizier Hāshim b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. Ibn Ḥaṣūn submitted and went to Cordova to offer his services to the Umayyad emir in 270 (883). But his submission did not last long; in the following year the rebel had regained the mountains of Bobastro and took by storm the castle in which Hāshim had put a strong garrison.

From this time on Ibn Ḥaṣūn begins to play the part of a champion in the nationalist movement in the south of the peninsula, where he put himself at the head of all the malcontents, whether Christians or neo-Muslims (muwgalātūdūn). The rapid growth of his rebellion did not fail to disturb greatly the Umayyad emir whose position each day became more precarious. The task of bringing Ibn Ḥaṣūn to book was given to the heir-presumptive al-Munṣīr b. Muḥammad, who laid siege to one of the rebel's principal supporters Hāshim b. Ḥamdūn al-Rifa'i in his castle of Alhama. But in 273 (886) the emir Muḥammad died and al-Munṣīr had to go back to Cordova to be proclaimed in his place. Ibn Ḥaṣūn seized the opportunity to organise resistance in all the mountainous districts of Southern Spain and had himself recognised as leader of the rising by all the inhabitants.

On ascending the throne al-Munṣīr found himself faced by a critical situation. But he at once took the necessary steps with great energy. There were continual encounters between the rebels and the loyalist troops; in the end al-Munṣīr set out in person to lay siege to Bobastro, but after the siege had lasted forty days he died, undoubtedly poisoned at the instigation of his brother 'Abd Allāh who succeeded him.

The new emir displayed no less energy than his brother. Ibn Ḥaṣūn had profited by events to increase his influence and according to the chroniclers the land which he ruled was only separated from Cordova by a day's journey. After a truce which only lasted a few months, 'Abd Allāh and Ibn Ḥaṣūn resumed the struggle. The Umayyad emir at this time sent his two rebel chiefs, Sawwār b. Ḥamdūn and Sa'īd b. Ḥiṣād, whom he conquered, while Ibn Ḥaṣūn was collecting a considerable army at Polei [q.v.]. But 'Abd Allāh with a superior army defeated him, put him to flight and took Polei in 278 (891), then Ezīja [q.v.] and finally laid siege to Bobastro again. But the rising of the Banū 'l-Hāshidjdān in Seville created a diversion in favour of Ibn Ḥaṣūn, who from now on seems to have received at least the moral support of the Fāṭimid sovereigns of Ifrījīya.

The rest of the reign of 'Abd Allāh passed without any great successes being obtained. It would take too long to detail here all the negotiations followed by agreements, more or less observed, which went on during these very troubled years. But the most striking gesture of the rebel was to repudiate Islam openly and, in order to have the more complete support of the Christians of Andalusia and Cordova, to return to his ancestors. Ibn Ḥaṣūn then took the name of Samuel and proclaimed himself not only the leader of the nationalist movement but the champion at the same time of a regular crusade against Islam.

The situation was then very critical when 'Abd Allāh's successor, his grandson 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣir, mounted the throne of the emirate of Cordova in 300 (912). Without delay the new sovereign saw that it was necessary before all else to dispose of this threat which was steadily increasing in magnitude. Not only the future of his dynasty was at stake but also that of Islam in Spain. For several years he made his preparations with the greatest care and displayed exceptional tenacity. The mountain districts of Andalusia were blockaded, attacked and reduced in turn. Ibn Ḥaṣūn, more and more surrounded in the Serrania de Ronda, finally died in 306 (918) leaving to his sons the task of continuing the resistance.

According to some chroniclers, Ibn Ḥaṣūn in the last years of his life, seeing the futility of his efforts, submitted to 'Abd al-Raḥmān III and even gave him one of his sons as a hostage. He is himself said to have taken part in the campaigns against the Christians of the north in the Umayyad army.

In any case after the death of the aged rebel,
given ear to the Prophet's preaching. It is from this sudden reversal of his attitude as well as perhaps from the fact that it was under 'Omar that Islam became a world phenomenon, from the simple incident in Arab history that it originally was, that 'Omar has earned the epithet of the "St. Paul of Islam" which the west has given him. In reality there is nothing exceptional about him, two except the stubborn energy with which they later championed the cause against which they originally fought. As with all great converts, we have in his case only an example of change of polarisation of the same exclusive and uncompromising attitude which, recognising no middle course, is as impetuous in devotion as in hatred. Tradition places the conversion of 'Omar in his 26th year, four years before the Hijra. It is probably that the round figure of 30 which we thus get as the age of 'Omar at the beginning of the new era has something artificial about it. But he was in any case certainly in the flower of his vigour when he began his new career of apostle of Islam. Besides, at first his support was only personal and legend has no doubt exaggerated its importance. 'Omar was not able to assist the new religion through the power of his clan (he belonged to the Bani 'Adi b. Ka'b who being only Kurâsh-âzâwîhir enjoyed no influence in the political life of the early republic) in his position with regard to his fellow-citizens was in no way outstanding. Even if it is true that, as tradition has it, as soon as 'Omar joined the community of the faithful, the latter's faith in its ultimate triumph was increased, his intervention certainly had no influence on the events which led the migration to Medina. It is only in this town alongside of the Prophet and apparently through the prestige of his initiative and strength of will that 'Omar without holding any official position began to be the real organise of the new theocratic state. His part was that of councillor rather than of soldier; although he took part in the battles of Badr, Ohod and later ones, practically nothing is recorded of his military exploits. accounts of which are so abundant in the case of 'Ali and other Companions. Tradition which traces to his initiative no less than three Kur'ânic revelations (ii. 119; iii. 57; on the veiling of the Prophet's wives; ixi. 61; on the threat of punishment to the same women) is probably not only true but may even record only a few of the cases in which a suggestion from 'Omar stimulated the Prophet's inspiration. What is remarkable about 'Omar in the Medina period is his perfect agreement with Abû Bakr, a concord which — a surprising thing and one which is a tribute to the two great champions of Islam — was never disturbed by jealousy. The fact that 'Omar like Abû Bakr, also became the father-in-law of the Prophet through the marriage of his daughter Hafsâ, did not arouse the slightest feelings of rivalry in him; on the contrary it was he who on the death of Muhammâd thrust the caliphate upon Abû Bakr. The ingenious theory put forward by Lammens (M. F. O. P., iv. 113 sq. and reproduced in Études sur le siècle des Omeyyades) about the "triumvirate Abû Bakr, 'Omar, Abû 'Obaida b. al-Djarârah (these three individuals united by a bond of intimate friendship are said to have dominated and so to have monopolised the authority of the Prophet, controlling him either by direct action or through
his wives, A'isha bint Abi Bakr and Hafsa bint 'Omar) may be to some extent correct but should not be pushed too far. It is beyond question that 'Omar, the greatest brain of the three, was able in the lifetime of Muhammad as well as during the brief caliphate of Abu Bakr to resist the temptation to come too much into the foreground. But as soon as the first caliph became dead the power naturally passed to him.

The question whether the dying Abu Bakr designated 'Omar as his successor has been the subject of much discussion by the theorists of Muslim constitutional law. As a matter of fact, there does not seem to have been any formal act of investiture which would in any case have been of no value for it would have been quite out of keeping with Arab custom. 'Omar assumed power de facto and the recognition which was at once given him by the majority of the Companions assured him the exercise of it in a way quite similar to that in which the nomination of the emir in the tribes took place, who, as we know, was only firmly seated when the individual approval of the members of the tribe had been asked and obtained after he had effectively assumed power. Such a system however primitive gave no trouble, except when the feeling between two parties was acute; this is what happened at the election of 'Ali. Against 'Omar there was only the dissatisfaction of the "legitimist" party of 'Ali and the Ansar who had however been defeated too recently when Abu Bakr had become caliph to feel like organizing a regular opposition.

'Omar at the beginning of his rule found that the great expansion by conquest had already begun; he had perhaps contributed more than any other to its beginning in his capacity as adviser to his predecessor. This is not the place to discuss once more the traditional story of the Arab conquests, nor to subject to a revision the well-known thesis of Caetani on their origin and character. This thesis has seemed to lessen considerably the importance of 'Omar's personal action and to take from him the glory of having been their initiator and director, according to a strategic plan conceived in advance of the campaigns against the Byzantine empire and Persia. In reality there is reason to marvel that a simple citizen of Mecca should have been capable of controlling with an undisputed singleness of command undisciplined levies of Beduins, scattered over a vast area and should have been able to keep control over their chiefs who were practically the sole masters of the position. If the military victories were not due directly to 'Omar it was certainly to him that the credit should go of never having lost control of his generals and above all of having been able to make use of the powerful and talented family of the Omayyads, without however allowing them to have a free hand. His quarrel with Khalid b. al-Walid who, after having won the most brilliant victories for Islam, was dismissed and died in oblivion, gives us an idea of the political talent of 'Omar and the extent of his authority. The knowledge of the limits of his power (which is the mark of political genius) caused him to treat the wily 'Amr b. al-As with tact and to leave him the initiative in the conquest of Egypt. But he was careful at the same time to put at his side an old Companion of the Prophet, al-Zubair, as a check upon him. He was careful in general (and the appointment of al-Zubair was no exception to the rule) not to appoint to high commands respected Companions whose ambition he had cause to fear. He preferred to watch them from close at hand and to satisfy their parvenu desires with the revenues of the great royal domains of the 'Iraq and Syria, which he assigned to them [cf. Kafr and al-Hula]. If tradition has done justice to 'Omar's strength of will, it should be remembered that he also knew how to employ with success gentler and simple methods.

The caliphate of 'Omar which is marked by the complete transformation of the Muslim state, is regarded by tradition as the period in which all the political institutions by which it was later ruled had their origin. That there has been in tradition a process of idealisation which centred in a single individual a complicated development extending over several generations is what historical criticism has not failed to recognise. But the part played by 'Omar was nevertheless a great one. The regulations for his non-Muslim subjects, the institution of a register of those having the right to our military pensions (the d'adud), the founding of military centres out of which were to become the future great cities of Islam, the creation of the office of jàdî were all his work, and it is also to him that a series of ordinances goes back, religious (the prayer of the month of Rama'dan, the obligatory pilgrimage) as well as civil and penal (the era of the Hijra, the punishment of drunkenness, and stoning as a punishment for adultery; in connection with the last it looks as if he did not hesitate to interpolate a verse in the text of the Qur'an; cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qur'ans, i. 248—251). If it is true that several of these institutions, particularly those of a fiscal character, were rather of the nature of provisional regulations than definitive legislation and if it is also true that the fiscal business continued to be carried on by Persian and Byzantine officials and that the coins continued to be struck with the types of both empires, we cannot however refuse the title of political genius to the ruler who was able to impress a stamp of unity and permanence upon the variegated and confused elements which went to make up the new Muslim state.

In spite of the autocratic character of 'Omar's rule, his caliphate has nothing of the monarchal character about it. It is further distinguished from that of Abu Bakr by a deeper feeling of its permanent character. Thus for the title of khalif which conveys the idea of deputy, there was substituted that of 'Amir al-mu'minin (which 'Omar is said to have assumed in the year 19), in which the character of sovereign is more marked; at the same time the religious character in it becomes more distinct. Indeed one might say that 'Omar was inclined to renew, naturally with a shade of difference, the theocratic regime of the time of the Prophet; being neither able nor willing, it must be remembered, to pose as a prophet, he yet knew how to take advantage of the intimacy in which he had lived with the Prophet to legislate in the spirit of the latter and to give to his own measures an almost supernatural origin. It is perhaps this which tradition is trying to express when it makes Muhammad say: "If God had wished that there should have been another prophet after me, 'Omar would have been he"
(cf. al-Muhbib al-Tabari, Manākih al-Aṣghara, i. 199); we can easily understand how such an attitude was only possible through the surprising prestige of 'Omar (it ceased with him; the theory of the transmission of prophetic powers was only revived later by the Shi'a).

Tradition shows us 'Omar feared rather than loved. This feeling must have been a real one but it should be pointed out that it was only to his high moral character that 'Omar owed the respect which he inspired, for the physical force at his command was not great. The opposition to him (to that of 'Ali there was later added that of a number of the old Companions) did not dare to display itself publicly. The man in whom 'Omar confided, perhaps his successor in pector, was the third member of the "triunvirate": Abū 'Ubaidah. When he died, a victim of the great plague of the year 18, it does not seem that 'Omar had thought of the question of the succession. He was still, besides, at the height of his powers (53; according to the age accepted by tradition) when he fell for the 26th night of the month of Ḥijdja (Nov. 3, 644) by the dagger of Abū Lu'lu'a, governor of Baṣra. The motive which tradition gives to the murder is the very heavy tax against which the slave had appealed in vain to the caliph; according to Caetani, the murderer was only the unconscious instrument of a conspiracy of the Companions tired of the caliph's tyranny. It is certain that one of the latter's sons, the unstable 'Ubayd Allah who fell in the battle of Siffin (in 37 A.H.), cherished this suspicion but there is really no reason to believe that it was well founded (cf. the remarks made by the writer on Caetani's views in N.S.O., iv., 1912, p. 1059—1061). The history of murders of sovereigns shows that cases of assassination from personal vengeance are just as frequent as those with political motives. We may suppose that if he had lived to a greater age 'Omar would have provided for the succession — his farseeing mind would have undoubtedly shown him the necessity of settling this question which is always, in states not ruled by the dynastic principle, the crucial test of their vitality. He was not spared to do this and the plan of an elective council formed of the six oldest Companions (ṣāḥibān) which resulted in the election of Othman even if 'Omar had nominated him on his deathbed (which is denied with good arguments by critical historians) could only be a temporary expedient.

In going to rejoin his two dear friends, the Prophet and Abū Bakr, in the delights of Paradise, 'Omar could contemplate with satisfaction the work that he had accomplished. He was really, as has been said, the second founder of Islam, he who gave the edifice erected by the religious inspiration of Muhammad, its social and political framework. But it must be added that the formidable problems raised by the enormous and rapid expansion of Islam did not receive their final solution from him. In particular the question of the relations between the early converts and the first helpers, the Ansar, and the newcomers from the Meccan aristocracy and the question of the subordination to the central power of the Arab forces scattered over the immense territory of the empire, although still latent, presented difficulties and dangers of the utmost gravity. It was 'Omar's successor, Othman, who had to face them without possessing in the slightest degree the necessary qualities to overcome them.

While orthodox tradition reverses in 'Omar not only the greater ruler but also one of the most typical models of all the virtues of Islam (cf. a list of his merits in the work of al-Muhbib al-Tabari, al-Riyād al-nādira fi Manākih al-Aṣghara, Cairo 1327), the Shi'a has never concealed its antipathy to him who was the first to thwart the claims of 'Ali (cf. Goldziher, in W.Z.K.M., xv. 321 sqq.). The Shī'a teaching although it exalts the ascetic austerity of the life of 'Omar, has very little to do with him: besides this type of puritan lends itself very little to mystical speculations whether in its historical reality or in its idealisation in legend.

Bibliography: All the historical material is to be found collected in L. Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, ili.—vi. (Milan 1909—1912); vol. v. contains the historical synthesis of his caliphate and vi. the general index. The material contained in the works on Hadith, which has only been partly utilised by Caetani, is collected by A. F. Wensink, A Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition, Leyden 1927, p. 234—236, s.v. 'Omar.

G. Levi Della Vida

'Omar Efendi, an Ottoman historian, according to popular tradition originally called Elkezović or Čausićević, belonged to Bosnian-Novj (Bosanski-Novj). Of his career we only know that he was acting as kaši in his native town when fierce fighting broke out on Bosnian soil between the Imperial troops and those of Čačk-Oghlu 'Ali Paša (1150—1737). 'Omar Efendi at this time wrote a vivid account of the happenings in Bosnia from the beginning of Muhač 1149 (May 1736) to the end of Džumāda I 1152 (end of March 1739); written in a smooth easy style, this work is of considerable importance for social history. It seems to have been called Ghażawāt-ī Ḥakim-Oghlu 'Ali Paša but is usually quoted as Ghażawāt-ī Diyar-i Bosna, and sometimes as Ghażawāt-ī Fārānālić (i.e. Banjalučka in Bosnia). As a reward for this literary effort, 'Omar Efendi was promoted to be one of the six judges (rūbeh-i velde-i sitte). Of his further life and death nothing more is known. It is certain that he ended his days in Bosnian-Novj and was buried there. The site of his grave is still pointed out but the tombstone has disappeared.


Bibliography: Safvetbeg Bašagić, Bojanci i herojinci u islamskoj književnosti, Sarajevo 1912, p. 152; F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 276 sq.; Mehmed Handžić, Književnirad bosanski-heren...
'OMAR EKENDI — 'OMAR KHAJĪYĀM

'OMAR KHAJĪYĀM, famous Persian scientist and poet of the Sālīḥī period (d. in 526 = 1132).

Biography. Although reliable information on Kha'īyām is scarce we cannot underestimate the importance of the sources at present available.

In his Algebra he calls himself Abu 'l-Fath 'Omar b. Ibrahim 'Abbās Khājīyām and in his verses seems to use Kha'īyām ("tent-maker") as his taškal-luq. It is likely that this nickname refers to the profession of his ancestors. W. Litten, in his pamphlet Was bedeutet Chajīyām? (Warum hat O. Chajīyām ... gerne dieren Dichternamen gewählt, Berlin 1930 (25 p.), has suggested the possibility of a technical interpretation of Khājīyām as "poet, expert in metrics" (cf. Shams al-Din Muḥammad b. Kāis, Mu'ūjam, in G. M. S., p. 13–16), where metrical terms are explained by the names of different parts of the tent (bīt in Arabic both "house > tent" and "verse"). However, in the well-known quatrains, such as Kha'īyām ki kha'ma-hū-yi ḥakmat mīdīkht the reference is evidently to "tests" and not to "verses".

Omar was a Khūjāyām, from Nishāpur or its neighbourhood. The date of his birth is unknown. He was already famous as a mathematician in 467 (1074–1075) when with Abu 'l-Muzaffar Asfarī and Māmān b. Nadīm Wāṣīṭī (cf. Ibn al-Ashrī, x. 67, under the year 467) he was invited by Malik-Shāh to collaborate in the reform of the Persian calendar (cf. Dahākī). In 506 (1112–1113) Nizām-yi 'Arūđī met 'Omar, whom he calls Ḥudūji al-Ḥabbī, in Balkh and in 500 (1135–1136) visited his grave in the Hira cemetery of Nishāpur "it then being four (variant: some) years since he died". Consequently the probable date of Kha'īyām's death would be 526 (1132). (On Kha'īyām's grave beside the shrine of Muḥammad Maḥrūk see Muḥammad Ḥasan, Muṣṭafā al-Shamsī, iii. [Tehrān 1503 = 1886], p. 101, 175; Sir F. Sykes, A pilgrimage to the tomb of Omar Khayyām, in Travel and Exploration, London, Sept. 1909, ii. 129–138, and Williams Jackson, From Constantinople to the Home of Omar Khayyām, New York 1911, p. 240–245. See also a picture in the Times, July 16, 1934). On the occasion of Firdawsī's millenary (Oct. 1934) the Persian Government took the occasion also to erect a new monument of white marble over Kha'īyām's tomb).

Nizām-yi 'Arūđī's Čahār Maḥāla, written ca. 551 (1156), remains the oldest contemporary witness to 'Omar. The second and even more important biographer is Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali Bāhākī [q. v.; died 565 (1169)]; the relevant passages, already known through quotations in Shahrāzūrī, have been translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, Zu 'Omeri Chajīyām, in Isl., iii. (1912), p. 42–62 (English transl. of the principal passage by Sir E. D. Ross and H. A. R. Gibb, in B. S. O. S., v., p. 467–473). Bāhākī calls 'Omar al-Dustār al-Falāsīfī Ḥudūji al-Īslām 'Omar b. Ḥrabīn al-Kha'īyām. He says that he had a disagreeable character and was not so nice to his pupils as for example Asfarī. However, when in 507 (1113) Bāhākī (at that time only 8 years old; cf. Yā'qūbī, Ithād al-Arūđī, v. 208) visited 'Omar, the latter examined him in Arabic poetry and geometry and expressed his satisfaction. Malik-Shāh (cf. also Čahār Maḥāla, p. 63) and the [Karaḵhāndī] Shams al-Mulūk of Būkhārā (d. 472 = 1179) were particularly kind to 'Omar but Sandjar had a grudge against him. Among the persons who had direct intercourse with 'Omar are mentioned Abū Ḥamdūd Muḥammad al-Ghazālī and the learned prince of the Karaḵāndī dynasty Farzān b. 'Ali Farzānī Farzāmarz. In different sources 'Omar is also described as a follower of Abū 'Alt b. Sinā (Avicenna). Though he was a scholar in philosophy, jurisprudence and history he was no prolific writer and of his works Bāhākī mentions only a short treatise on physics (Mukhtarāf fi 'l-Tafriṣīyār), a treatise on Existence (Fi 'l-Wujūd) and a treatise on Being and Obligation (al-Kaws wa'l-Takīf). In the Khāridat al-Kāsar of 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Īsfahānī (written in 572 [1176–1177]) Kha'īyām is mentioned as an incomparable scholar of his time enjoying a proverbial reputation (bihī yuṭarbal al-maṭlib). Khākānī (d. 595 = 1198–1199) refers to him once in a verse. Among the later sources may be mentioned Shaikh Nadīm al-Dīn's Mirād al-Ībādād (620 = 1225–1224) where 'Omar is called "an unhappy philosopher, atheist and materialist". Kiṭīfī, Ta'rikh al-Hikamādī, ed. Lipper, p. 243–244 [the passage first utilised by Woepcke], represents Kha'īyām as a follower of Greek learning (cf. Bāhākī). Shahrāzūrī's Nuzhat al-Ārwaṭ (sixth century) chiefly repeats Bāhākī. Rashīd al-Dīn in his Ḥājīm al-Ta'wārīhī is the earliest authority known for the tale of three schoolfellows: Nizām al-Mulk, Ḥasan-i Šabāb and Kha'īyām. The chronological discrepancy involved by this story was already noticed by A. Müller: Nizām al-Mulk was born in 408 (1017) and there are no indications that Kha'īyām [or Ḥasan-i Šabāb] died at the age of more than 100 years (cf. A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland., ii. 97, 111; Browne, A Liter. Hist. of Persia, iii. 190–193. On the different explanations of the legend see Houtsma's preface to al-Bundārī, p. xiv., note 2; Muḥammad-Khan Kazwīnī in Browne's translation of the Čahār Maḥāla, p. 138 and latterly H. Bowen, in J. R. A. S., Oct. 1931, p. 771–782). However, the facts remain that Nizām al-Mulk must have met Ḥasan-i Šabāb (cf. Ibn al-Ashīr, x. 110 [year 494]) and that Kha'īyām in his metaphysical treatise dispassionately mentions the Ismā'īlī among the searchers for metaphysical truth, but the authorship of the treatise is suspect.

Kha'īyām as a scientist. Kha'īyām's scientific activities for a long time eclipsed his poetical renown and in 1848 Reinard in his learned introduction to Abu 'l-Fidākī's Geography wrote: "malheureusement, 'Omar alliait avec l'astronomie le goût de la poésie et du plaisir".

On the reform of the calendar for which Kha'īyām is responsible jointly with his colleagues, cf. Dahākī.

MSS. of Kha'īyām's principal work on Algebra exist in Leyden, Paris and the India Office (see Woepcke, L'algébre d'Omer Alkhiyami publiée, traduite et accompagnée d'extraits de ms. inédits, p. 1851). Kha'īyām's introduction to his researches on Euclid's axioms (Mukhtārāf) has been translated by Jacob and Wiedemann, in Isl., iii. (MS. in Leyden). The treatise MuṣḥkHzālī al-Ḥisāb exists in Munich. G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, Washington 1927, i. 759–761, calls Kha'īyām "one of the greatest mathematicians of
medieval times. His Algebra contains geometric and algebraic solutions of equations of the second degree; an admirable classification of equations, including the cubic; a systematic attempt to solve them all and partial geometric solutions of most of them. His classification of equations...is based on...the different forms of cubic equations.... Binomial development when the exponent is a positive integer. Study of the postulates and generalities of Euclid" (cf. also W. E. Story, *Omar as Mathematician*. Boston 1918 [17 pages]). In physics Khāyām’s researches were devoted to the specific weight of silver and gold (MS. in Gotha; see Wiedemann, *Über Bestimmung der spezifischen Gewichte* [Beitrag 8], in *S.B.P.M.S. Erf.,* xxviii. [1906], p. 170–173). The *Tārīkh-i-Aftī* (written about 1000 = 1591) quotes the names of the *Mā’īn al-Hikam* "on the methods of ascertaining the value of objects studied with precious stones without taking the latter out" (perhaps the same work on the same subject) and of the *Lavāzīm al-Ahmīdī* "on the methods of determining the orientation and the cause of the difference of climate of various countries".

Of metaphysical works of Khāyām a MS. of the above mentioned treatise on Existence in Berlin and a MS. of a little Persian treatise (Dar ‘Ilmi Kulliyātī) in Paris. Of the latter Christensen has translated several chapters, *Un traité de métaphysique d’Omar Khayyam*, in *M. O.*, i. (1908), p. 1–16. This treatise, of the contents of which Christensen has a poor opinion, is dedicated to a certain Fakhr al-Milla wa ‘l-Dīn Mu’ayyad al-Malk, probably one of Niẓām al-Mulk’s sons. Finally must be mentioned the *Nawrūz-nāma* of which the existence was first revealed by F. Rosen, *The Quatrains of O. Khayyam newly translated*, London 1930, p. 5–18. The text based on the unique Berlin MS. (Rosen: 1365 A.D.; Muḥammad Khān Kazwini: "not later than the 12th century of the Hīdjrā") was published with notes and a presentation pamphlet written at the request of a friend. The matters referring to Nawrūz [q.v.] occupy only 19 pages out of 77; the rest is taken up by such subjects as gold, horses, falcons, wine, beautiful faces. The treatise does not show any deep knowledge in the compiler and its authorship, for several reasons, cannot be considered as finally established. An incomplete copy of the same treatise (perhaps the first 43 pages out of 77 of the printed edition exists in the British Museum, Add. 23,568, fol. 869–1019; *Riśāla dar tāhlīl-i Nawrūz* [anonymous]).

For lists of Khāyām’s scientific works see Brockelmann, *O.E.L.*, t. 471; Suter, *Die Mathematiker und Astronomen der Quatrains*, 1900, p. 12; Muhammad Khān Kazwini, notes on the *Cāhūn Maṣlahāt*, p. 220–221; Caillié, *op. cit.*, introduction (21 names are quoted of which some are only Persian equivalents of Arabic titles).

In a very detailed book Khayyām, or uskī sawādīn kanīnī dāfūnī pur naqṣāna naqṣān, published in Hindustani by Saiyid Sulaimān Nadwī, ‘Aṣamgarh 1933 (508 pages), the following scientific works ascribed to Khayyām have been reproduced: *Riśālat al-Ka‘ūn wa l-Takhti* (with further polemics on the subject); *Riśālat al-Wujūd* (published in Cairo under the name of *Dīyā‘ al-‘akīt*); *Riśālat al-Wujūd* also called *Awqaf il-l-Mawjūfī; Riśālat fi Kulliyāt-i Wujūd* (in Persian); *Mā‘īn al-Hikam*.

Khāyām as a poet. Already Ḥāmad al-Dīn Isfahānī in his *Khāridat al-ʿAsr* (752 = 1152) mentions Khāyām among the poets of Khūrāsān and quotes four Arabic verses of his. Nadīm al-Dīn Kāzī cites two quatrains in Persian. Shahrazūri gives three Arabic fragments (?) numbering respectively 4, 6 and 3 verses [while the Persian translation of Shahrazūri, finished in 1011 (1602), substitutes for them 2 Persian quatrains]; that of 6 verses belongs to the same poem as the verses quoted by Ḥāmad al-Dīn. Kīṭī reproduces exactly the latter’s quotation. Dīwānī (658 = 1260), i. 128, puts a Persian quatrain into the mouth of Saiyid ʿĪzz al-Dīn who was counting the victims of the Mongol invasion in Khārizm in 618 (1221). One quatrain is found in the *Tārīkh-i-Guzida*, in *G. M.*., p. 818. From 741 (1340) we possess 13 quatrains preserved in the *Munṣīs al-ḥārīr*. The MS. edited by F. Rosen contains 329 quatrains but its date 721 (1321) is certainly wrong. The other oldest collections of the 13th (xvth) century arc:

Stambul A S 1032 861 (1456–1457)

N 3892 865 (1460–1461)

Oxford Bodl. Ouseley 140 865 (1460–1461)

158 quatrains.

Later the number of rubā‘īyat in some MSS. rapidly rises: the MS. in Vienna (*Flugel, Handschriften*, i. 496, Nr. 507) dated 957 (1550), has 482 rubā‘ī, that of the Bankipur Public Library, dated 961 (1553–1554), 604 rubā‘ī, till finally in the Lucknow edition of A. D. 1894 one finds 770 rubā‘ī. Miss Jessie E. Cadell (*Frazer’s Magazine*, May 1879) is said to have collected from all available sources 1,200 quatrains, which is the list of the MSS. in Caillié, *op. cit.*, p. 37–39.

Already in Th. Hyde’s *Veterum Persiarum.... religionis historia*, Oxford 1700, p. 529–30, there is found a Latin translation of Khāyām’s quatrain *Ay, sīḥāta-yi sīḥāta-yi sīḥāhtāni*. For the first time several Persian quatrains were published in a Persian grammar compiled by F. Dombay in Vienna in 1804. Khāyām’s renown in Europe, however, was long based on his scientific activities and it is noteworthy that his Treatise on Algebra was translated in 1851, while the first edition of Fitz-Gerald’s famous version of the quatrains was published in 1859, the French edition by Nicolas in 1867, and only since the second edition of Fitz-Gerald’s version in 1868 has the wave of admiration for Khāyām swept through western lands. *Critical studies of the text started only in 1897, when Żukowski published his article *Omar Khayyām istranstomyusjītā istworosthyjā* in *Almagrasīf*, a presentation volume to Baron V. Rosen, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 324–363 (made more widely accessible in an early (abridged) translation by Sir E. D. Ross, in *F.R.A.S.*, xxii., 1898, p. 349–366). Żukowski’s merits consist in:

1. rendering accessible some old texts on Khāyām’s biography entirely unknown up to that time, and 2. shattering the uncritical belief in the authenticity of the existing collections of quatrains. Żukowski showed that 82 out of 464 quatrains included in Nicolas’ edition are found also in the *diwān* of
39 other authors (and sometimes simultaneously in the *dhwâns* of several poets). He then divided these 82 quatrains into different subject groups and thought that the proportion thus obtained would (in inverse order!) serve as a hint for the characteristics of Khâyîm. For example, the interpolations of epicurean character represent 39 3/9, and those which give expression to Muslim free-thinking 2% of. Therefore, the safest way is to take as a basis the least interpolated groups “of which the authenticity has been shattered the least”. Consequently Żukowsky attaches a particular importance to the “mystic *šîfâst*” in Khâyîm’s poetry. This theory (which puzzled Christensen, *Recherches*, p. 10, and misled Hartmann, in *W.Z.K. M.*, xvii. 367) is certainly insufficient both psychologically and statistically, for it is not the percentage of interpolations but that of the remaining quatrains which is of importance. So Żukowsky’s discovery of a high proportion of “wandering” quatrains is valuable only as a negative principle (cf. Barthold, in *Zap.*, xxv. 403–404). The thoroughness of Żukowsky’s work is shown by the fact that the later researches by E. D. Ross and Christensen resulted in the raising of the total number of attributed “wandering” quatrains only to 108.

In his *Recherches sur les Rubâ‘îyât de ‘Umar Hâyân*, Heidelberg 1904, Christensen went one stage farther. Stating how rapidly the number of quatrains increased since the date of the Bodleian MS. (only a century later the Bankipûr MS. contains 604 quatrains!), he postulated a similar process for the time separating that MS. from Khâyîm’s death (over three centuries): “how many quatrains then would remain attributable to Khâyîm? A *dîwân* is transmitted tolerably intact, whereas a collection of *rubâ‘î* is much more exposed to tampering”. Consequently “there exist no criteria [of genuineness] both as regards the form and the matter” of the quatrains (p. 32). Christensen admitted only the probability that the twelve *rubâ‘î* containing Khâyîm’s name and the two quoted by Nâsîr al-Dîn Khâyîm had some contemporary genuineness. [But even one of the 12 quatrains of the first category has a variant ascribed to ‘Abd al-Kâshî].

The more optimistic conclusions of Christensen are that those 14 quatrains “contain, so to speak, in nucleus all the *rubâ‘îyât*” and that in general the poetical and historical importance of the *rubâ‘îyât* must be severed from the question of their authorship. As Khâyîm wrote in the national Persian spirit the later addition kept “within the same cycle of ideas” (see the 14 quatrains above mentioned). Only the few mystical and erotic quatrains seem to be interpolations foreign to Khâyîm’s nature. In a following chapter Christensen studies the historical traits of the Persian national character and winds up by saying that “Khâyîm’s spirit is the Persian spirit as it existed in the Middle Ages, and as in substance it is nowadays” (p. 89). This part of Christensen’s reasoning must be inevitably accepted cum grano salis, such matters admitting unfortunately no final demonstration. A further step in the study of Khâyîm’s text was the discovery by Muhammad Khân Khwânî of 13 quatrains in the anthology *Mu‘âmm al-‘ahrâr* (composed and copied in 714 = 1310; see Sir D. Ross, in *R.S.O. S.*, iviii., p. 433–439). F. Rosen, in the Persian preface to his new edition (1925) of the *Rubâ‘îyât* (also in German, *Zur Textfrage der Vierzeiler Omaros des Zeitmachers*), in *Z. D. M. G.*, 1926, p. 285–313, criticised the exaggerations of the theory of “wandering” quatrains but authenticated only 23 *rubâ‘î* (those quoted by Râzî, Dhuwâni, etc., six of those containing the name of Khâyîm and 13 of the *Mu‘âmm al-‘ahrâr*). Finally, after a new revision of all the materials available, Christensen in his *Critical Studies in the Rubâ‘îyât of ‘Umar-i Hâyân*, Copenhagen 1927, offered a new criterion to ascertain the genuineness of the quatrains. He divided (p. 10) the collections of quatrains into three categories: those in which the quatrains are disposed without any alphabetical arrangement, those with single alphabetical arrangement (i.e., in groups according to the final letter of the rhyme) and those with double alphabetical arrangement (under each rhyme letter the quatrains disposed in the order of the first letter, of the beginning word). He takes the first arrangement as the oldest and of this group mentions five specimens: one bearing the apparently false date 721 (1321), one dated 902 (1496) etc. The double alphabetical arrangement is already found in the Bodleian MS. and the single alphabetical one must be presumably older. Moreover Christensen noticed that in different collections (of the first and second class) there were found series of quatrains “in the same, longer or shorter succession” (p. 13). Though the comparison of the non-alphabetical group led to a purely negative result” (p. 27) as regards the establishing of a textual tradition, Christensen suggests that in some cases (MSs. dated 1528 and 1540) the principle underlying the non-alphabetical arrangement was the disposition according to the contents. Moreover he thinks that we may “learn something by studying the total stock of the texts” (p. 27) and consequently (p. 39) lays down an elaborate system of rules based upon the number of times a given *rubâ‘î* is found in different groups of MSS. This system being strictly enforced entails considerable changes in the former views on the subject: thus out of the six best attested quatrains containing Khâyîm’s name 216 are contained spurious, one uncertain and four genuine (p. 121).

Finally 121 quatrains which have stood the test are taken as a basis for a new characteristic of ‘Omar.

The new method, in spite of its mathematical character, greatly depends on the materials utilised by its author. H. Ritter in his important review of Christensen’s work (*Zur Frage der Echtheit der Vierzeiler ‘Omar Châyân*, in *O. L. Z.*, 1929, No. 3, col. 156–163) has quoted 7 ancient MSS. found in Constantinople. Of these the two oldest (that of 865 = 1456 containing 151 quatrains, and that of 865 = 1461 containing 315 quatrains) are non-alphabetical while that of 876 (1471–1472) containing 320 quatrains is alphabetical. This fact is partially in favour of Christensen’s views but the order in the two non-alphabetical MSS. is different from that of BNI (the oldest of the non-alphabetical MSS. quoted by Christensen, dated 902 = 1496–1497 and containing 243 quatrains). On the other hand, the MS. of 865, contemporaneous with the famous Bodleian MS., contains double the number of the latter’s quatrains. Lastly two of the MSS. mentioned by H. Ritter contain each 478 quatrains in a special arrangement by Yer (ṣ) Ahmad b. Husain al-Rashîdi al-Tabrizi, who in 867 (1462–1463) arranged the quatrains
in nine chapters according to their subjects. This fact, Ritter thinks, may be responsible for the traces of a similar arrangement in the two later MSS. (dated 1528 and 1540) mentioned by Christensen [in his introduction] a paper was read by M. F. M. Koprunzade at the Orientalist Congress at Oxford; it was also known to Husain Dânish; [v. i.] So H. Ritter falls back upon Christensen's conclusions of 1904 and in a somewhat modified form insists on the practical impossibility of authenticating this or that of Khayyâm's quatrains. The rubâ'iyât have been transmitted by methods typical of popular songs (typical Volkliederuberlieferung); they express the popular feeling of the masses (Volksempfindung) which opposed the official religious and literary spirit of foreign origin. As now we happen to speak of a truly "Khayyâmic" quatrains, so historically the particular genre must have been associated with the great saviant, and Christensen's attribution of his selection of quatrains to Omar can be understood only in the sense of a collective name for all what is looked upon as a manifestation of Omar's influence (Einzeluberlieferung).

Finally, it must be mentioned the discovery of a MS. dated 1423 and containing 206 quatrains announced by Mahfuz al-Âbâq at the meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, on April 5, 1932, and H. H. Schaefer's paper Der geschichtliche un der mythische Omar Khayyâm, read at the Orientalisten tag held at Bonn at the end of August 1934. Schaefer is extremely and perhaps excessively sceptical as regards the attribution of the quatrains to Omar Khayyâm. He concludes by saying that "Khayyâm's name must be struck out of the history of Persian literature". He also doubts the authenticity of the treatise published by Christensen and the Nafrâ'î-nâma. Schaefer's paper will appear in book form. For a resumé see Z. D. M. G., xiii.2, 1934, p. 25-28.

Conclusions. The upshot of the preceding study is that we possess nothing approaching a recension recepta of Khayyâm's poetical works. What could we say, if we consider the historical personalities we had his correspondence in which scarcely a single letter could be authenticated and many were decidedly spurious. Taking, for instance, the important point of "mystic Şûfism", we find that Žukowsky makes a strong point of it in Khayyâm's poetry, while Christensen denies its importance, though in support of this insufficiently attested tendency one could quote Khayyâm's metaphysical treatise in which the most honourable place is reserved to the Şîfî seekers of Truth (cf. Rosen, 1926).

The striking contradictions in the ideas and feelings expressed in the Rubâ'iyât have struck all those who have written on Khayyâm and the characteristic trait of the "type associated with Khayyâm" seems to be precisely the alternation of sarcastic pessimism and epicurean hedonism, of the consciousness of futility of our contingent existence and the joyful motto of carpe diem. Nevertheless it must be admitted that the pessimistic side of Khayyâm's poetry is better attested by the quotations in the older biographers and, what is more, by the Arabic verses of Omar Khayyâm which may have suffered in transmission but which certainly could not be imitated by popular tradition (F. Rosen has utilised the Arabic verses in his penetrating study of 1926).

FitGerald's version. Khayyâm's popularity among large circles of the public is chiefly due to the English version by E. Fitzgerald (1809-1883). This paraphrase of exceptional poetical merits, consisting in the second edition of 110 quatrains [third edition: 101], cannot, however be taken for a translation in the strict sense of the word. E. Heron-Allen who most carefully compared the English and Persian texts (Some side-light upon Fitzgerald's poem The Rubâ'iyât of Omar Khayyâm, 1898) has established that 40 quatrains are faithful paraphrases of single rubâ'î; 44 are traceable to more than one rubâ'î; 2 are inspired by the rubâ'î found only in Nicolaj's edition; 2 reflect the "whole spirit" of the original; 2 are traceable exclusively to 'Aţâr; 2 are inspired by Khayyâm but influenced by Hafiz and 3 (only in the first two editions) could not be identified. As manifestations of the almost religious feeling with which the admirers treat Fitzgerald's version may be mentioned the Omar Khayyâm Club, founded in London in 1892 (and its numerous imitations in the U.S.A.), as well as J. R. Tutin's book, A concordance to Fitzgerald's translations, London, 1900.


The principal European editions of the Persian text are J. B. Nicolas (with a French translation), Paris 1867; E. H. Whinfield (with an English translation), London 1882, 1893 etc.; E. Heron-Allen (facsimile of the Bodleian MS. of 865-1460 with an English translation), London 1898; F. Rosen, Berlin, Kaviān Press, 1304 = 1925; Husain Dânish with a translation and an interesting introduction in Turkish, second edition, Constantinople 1346 = 1927; Christensen, Critical Studies (v.s.) with a complete comparative table of the quatrains in the principal collections; B. Cilik, Les manuscrits mineurs des Rubâ'iyât de Omar Khayyâm dans la Bibli. Nationale, textes originaires des ms., Suppl. Persan 1777, 826; 745; 793; 1481, 1425; 1317; 1327; 1458, published as Nû. 2 of the Traux des de la Bibli. Universitaria de Seged, viii. (French introduction) + 69 (Hungarian introduction) + 85 p. (Persian text) [a very thorough study].
Translations into principal European languages: into English see above, Whinfield, Horen-Allen, Christensen, J. Payne, 1898; F. Rosen, The quatrains newly translated, London 1930; into German: A. von Schack, Stuttgart 1878; Bodenstedt, Breslau 1881; F. Rosen, Die Simplicius Omars des Zilmachers (several editions); into French: see above Nicolas, Ch. Grolleau, Paris 1902; Claude Anet [in collaboration with Muhammad Khān Kaswini], Paris 1920 (144 quatrains). Cf. also the extensive collection of translations into English, French, German, Italian and Danish edited by N. H. Dole, Boston and London 1898, 2 vols., cxixix. + 655 p. Single quatrains have been translated into most of European and extra-European languages, Basque, Yiddish and Gypsy included. Modern Arabic translations: Ahmad Hāmid al-Ṣarrāf, Baghādād 1350 (1931) (with lengthy introduction); al-Sayyid Ahmad al-Ṣāfī al-Nadjarī, Dimashq 1350. (V. MINORSKY)

1'OMĀRA B. ABI 'L-ḤASAN 'ALI B. ZAIDĀN AL-ḤAKAMI AL-YAMANI, an Arab man of letters born in 515 (1121) in Maṛṯān on the Wādī Waṣṭ in the district of al-Zar‘īb in the Thāāmāt al-Yamani executed on Ramadhān 2, 569 (August 1774) in Cairo by order of Ǧāhrū al-Salāṭīn [cf. the article SALĀDĪN]. In that period the Yamani, broken up into many little principalities, was suffering severely from continual civil wars. Traditional learning was still in a flourishing condition however, especially in the large towns. In 530 (1136) ʿOmāra was sent by his father to Ẓabīd, where he studied, especially Shāhī law, under ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Abbār and others. In the year 535 he was given his teacher’s diploma (iḏāma), visited his parents and taught for three years in the madrasa of Ẓabīd. While civil war was raging with particular violence in Ẓabīd, he spent some time in the coast town of ʿAnbara where he was on intimate terms with one of the pretenders, ʿAlī b. Mahḍī [q. v.]. Returning to Ẓabīd, he continued his studies and in the years 538–548 engaged in trading between Ẓabīd and ʿAdn which brought him into contact with the Banū Nadjāḥ, who bought the bulk of the butter from the Ẓabīd. In the year 538 (1143) he went on his first ḫadḍīj with some members of the dynasty. In ʿAdn he entered literary circles and was able to develop his poetic gifts. The rivalry between the Nadjāḥids and the Zura’īds who ruled in ʿAdn provoked intrigues against him which threatened his life and forced him to leave the Yamani. In 549 (1155) he went on pilgrimage to Mecca and was sent by the Sharīf Kāṣim b. Ḥāshim on a mission to the Fāṭimids in Egypt. Returning to Mecca in the same year, he visited Ẓabīd and ʿAdn for the last time in 551 (1156) and in 552 (1157) again made the ḫadḍīj. Sent on a mission a second time, he settled permanently in Egypt. He said himself that he came here to seek “position and fortune” (atĪbu al-ḏaḡa waʾl-imāla: Divān, i. 287); his later life is typical of the Arab adīb. Although he held for some time the title of ǧālī, he devoted himself exclusively to working as a court poet. His ǧālīs of praise were dedicated not so often to the last Fāṭimids caliphs fātimīn al-Fāṭīz [q. v.] (d. 555 = 1160) and al-ʿĀḍīd [q. v.] (d. 597 = 1171) as to their autocratic viziers, who changed on the stage like marionettes: Taḥlit b. Ruzzik [q. v.] (d. 556 = 1161), Ruzzik (d. 558 = 1163), Dirghām [q. v.] (d. 559 = 1164) and Shīrkhī [q. v.] (d. 564 = 1169). In the continued changes at court, ʿOmāra managed always to hold his position. When Ǧalāl al-Dīn came to power first as vizier, he addressed him to 1169 an appeal in verse which appears to have had the desired effect. With the end of the dynasty his position became difficult; ʿOmāra was neither a Sahī nor an Ismāʿīlī (cf. however Ismāʿīl al-Dīn in Dernbourg, i, 399 or al-Danjani, ibid., ii, 546–547) but his sympathies inclined to the Fāṭimids and he openly expressed them in a popular ǧālī of lament. Very soon afterwards he took part in a conspiracy, the object of which was the restoration of the Fāṭimids, was crushed along with other participants and buried in the cemetery of Cairo.

Among his contemporaries ʿOmāra was especially renowned as an authority on law; in Ẓabīd he was known as al-Farāḍī, in al-Yamani as al-ʿAbīdī (see al-Danjani in Dernbourg, ii, 546); several textbooks compiled by him on al-farāḥid were popular in his native land in his lifetime (see al-Nuṣrī al-Dīn, Dernbourg, i. 23). Nothing of his legal work has survived and we only know him as a literary man of very ordinary type. His works in number considered of Ǧalāl al-Dīn alone, but ʿOmāra enjoyed his time, but Dernbourg much exaggerates their literary value. The most interesting is perhaps al-Nuṣrī’s Kitāb al-wazār al-Miṣrīya (ed. by Dernbourg, i. 5–154; ii. 503–511) which contains many autobiographical details, an anthology of his verse and notes on the contemporary Egyptian viziers. It begins in the year 558 (1162) and comes down to the death of Ǧawwar (564 = 1169). He dedicated his history of al-Yamani to the Ǧāḍī al-ʿAbīdī [q. v.] (1135–1200); it began at his suggestion in 563 and finished in the following year (ed. by H. C. Kay). Based on the same plan as a work of his predecessor, the emir of Ẓabīd Ǧadīyāz b. Nadjāḥ (d. 498 = 1158), called al-Mufīṣ ḍī Ṣāḥāb Ẓabīd, which has not come down to us, it is known as the Ǧarīr al-Yamani. Its importance lies mainly in what it tells us from his own experience or from hearsay. Of less interest are his Tarāṣṣūlī, nine books (ed. by Dernbourg, ii. 431–449). They show the influence of the famous Kasūd al-Ǧāḍī al-ʿAbīdī, being in rhymed prose filled with all kinds of stylistic figures. His anthology of the poets of Arabia, particularly of al-Yamani, has not come down to us but was much used by Ismāʿīl al-Dīn in his Khatībat al-ʿAskī. Of his Divān (ed. by Dernbourg, i. 355–394; ii. 405–429, 511–539) no proper edition exists and all the known manuscripts differ in their contents and are not all complete. His famous ǧālī of lamentation for the Fāṭimids for example is known not from his own Divān but from the separate MSS. and other sources (in addition to the texts from Ibn Wasi and al-Makrizī given by Dernbourg, ii. 612–616 see now al-Kākshandī, Ṣubh al-ʿĀḏā, iii., Cairo 1914, p. 530–532). As a poet ʿOmāra was entirely in the tradition of the later ʿAbbāsid school. His models in the panegyric style he found in Bashīrī, Mihāyr and al-Buḥtūrī (Divān, i. 266–267); to these may be added Abī Tammām (the Arab critics had already noticed this; cf. e.g. Ibn al-ʿAṭīr, al-Maḥgūl al-sawrār, Cairo 1828, p. 409) and al-Mutanabbī. The influence of the last named is particularly marked,
not only in his verses, but also in many passages in his letters. As regards subject, his poems are mainly ḍaṣbīs of praise or lamentation. Satires (ḥādīt) are rare as he had once promised his father never to insult a Muslim (Derenbourg, ii. 791). This of course did not prevent him from mocking officials of Christian origin in epigrams which are quite obscene (Divān, i. 312, 331); in keeping with the taste of his time we frequently find in his Divān poetic lines (v. 353, 393, ii. 421, N. 343). The form of his poetry follows tradition in matter and composition; only a few muwaṣṣaḥāt are attributed to him (Divān, i. 388–391; to be added in M. Hartmann, Das arabische Strophengedicht, i., Weimar 1897).


OMDURMAN (Umm Durman), a town of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan situated on the west bank of the main Nile immediately below the junction of the Blue and White Niles. A seven-span steel bridge built in 1925–1928 connects Omdurman with Khartum [q.v.], and the two towns (together with Khartum North on the right bank of the Blue Nile) form for practical purposes a single city; but whereas Khartum as the seat of the government and the centre of foreign commerce has acquired a European character blended of British and Levantine elements, Omdurman remains the focus of native life and of the internal trade of the Sudan. The inhabitants number some 110,000, of whom the great majority are natives drawn from every part of the country.

The importance of Omdurman is of very recent origin; it started as an insignificant village in the territory of the Kishāb (a branch of the Dāmūy tribe) and is first mentioned as the dwelling-place of an ascetic and ‘holy man’, Ḥamad b. Muhammad generally known as Ḥamad Walad Umm Maryūm, who lived from 1640 to 1730 A.D. (see MacMichael, History of the Arabs in the Sudan, ii. 277). The site first became important when it was fortified by Gordon for the defence of Khartūm against the Darwīsh army of Muhammad Ahmad [q.v.] who captured it on January 15, 1885, ten days before the fall of Khartūm. Under Muhammad Ahmad’s successor, the khālīfa Abdūllāh, Omdurman was the capital of the Mahdist state and the religious centre of the new sect. The Mahdi’s tomb, a domed building designed by an Egyptian captive, was erected in the middle of the new settlement which henceforth was known as Buq’at al-Mahdi, the [holy] place of the Mahdi, and by the khālīfa’s ordinance the duty of visiting the tomb was substituted for the orthodox pilgrimage to Mecca. In order to consolidate his personal rule the khālīfa induced large numbers of his fellow-tribesmen, the Ta‘īsīs and other Baṣrās from the western Sudan, to settle in Omdurman where they could support themselves only through the spoliation of the rivetain population; this migration was described as a ḥijīrā in accordance with the Mahdist practice of establishing analogies between the life of Muḥammad and the early history of Islam. The population of Omdurman was further swelling by the enforced settlement of large numbers of tribesmen from all parts of the country whom the khālīfa desired to concentrate at his own headquarters for political or military reasons. The town grew up in a haphazard fashion and, apart from the houses of the khālīfa and his principal amirs, consisted of a straggling mass of straw huts covering a length of about six miles from south to north. The khālīfa’s “mosque” was a vast open space in the centre of the town enclosed by brick walls. For a graphic description of Omdurman under the khālīfa’s rule see Sir Rudolf von Slatin’s Fire and Sword in the Sudan.

The reconquest of the Sudan by the Anglo-Egyptian forces under Sir Herbert (later Lord) Kitchener was completed by the battle of Omdurman on September 2, 1898, the scene of which was near the village of Kerki in a few miles to the north of the town. Under the new administration the town has acquired such modern features as regularly laid-out streets, tramways and electric light. The houses of the well-to-do townpeople and the government buildings are built of brick and stone, but a large part of the town still consists of the rectangular mud buildings which are characteristic of the northern Sudan, and the life of the busy markets preserves its Oriental and African character. Associated with the principal mosque there is an institution known as al-mḍad had al-ulūm, presided over by a šāfi‘ī ‘al-‘ulām‘, which provides instruction in the traditional subjects of Muslim learning. The kādis employed in Muslim law courts are however drawn from students of the Gordon College in Khartūm. For secular education Omdurman possesses a government intermediate school and several kuttābs (government elementary schools) as well as a number of schools maintained by missionary societies and by private enterprises.

ORÂMÅR, ÜRMÅR. The administrative geography of Turkey speaks sometimes of the kaďa of Oræmår containing two nähiya, Dijluler and Iştişan, with 32 townships and 25,910 inhabitants (cf. Cuijet, *Turquie d’Asie*, ii. 756), sometimes of a nähiya of this name forming part of the kaďa of Gawar, in the sandjak of Hakkari, in the wilayet of Nîn [q. v.]. We incline rather to the second definition, having visited this district, lost in the middle of Central Kurdistan. Not only has Oræmår the name of a kaďa but the two nähiya attributed to it are inhabited exclusively by Nestorians [q. v.]; the one, Dijlû, being autonomous while Oræmår is at present at least purely Kurdish and an appendage of the house of Mâlû Mîrî, a tribe of Duskání Zbîrî and not Herîkî (Cuijet, *op. cit.†); a further proof of the inaccuracy of the Turkish statements regarding this part of Kurdistan. The boundaries of Oræmår are on the north Iştişan and Gawar; on the south Rekân; on the west Dijlû, Baz and Tjoímâ [cf. Nestorians] and Artuşi; in the east Sît [cf. Shâmddinân]. Oræmår situated at a height of 5,520 feet (cf. Dickson) is a group of hamlets scattered on the two sides of a rocky mountain spur above the Rûbârî Shîn. On the spur itself which is called Gaparànî Zher, at the place named Gire Bûti, is the capital of the group and the residence of the aqchâ, the Nûn Gund or “the middle of the town”. A large cemetery occupies the promontory at the end of the spur. The name of Gire Bûti which we explain as the “hill of the idol” seems to indicate the antiquity of the settlement. The fact that the slopes separated by the Gaparàn are very carefully cultivated and present a complicated system of little terraces each of which is a field or tiny kitchen garden, leads one to believe that man chose this site for habitation a long time ago, perhaps simply on account of its extreme isolation in the centre of a wild country.

Oræmår is at east end of the curve traced by the system of the Dijlû Dagh. According to Dickson, the chains and valleys of Turkish Kurdistan run roughly along the parallels of latitude and take a south-eastern direction as they approach the Persian frontier and at the point where they change their axis form a complicated system of heights and valleys. The most complicated part near the centre of the change of axis in question may be called Harkî-Oræmår.

Road System. Although they are really nothing but tracks used for intertribal communications, it is nevertheless interesting to indicate the directions to connect the routes with the road-system which we have studied at Rawînî and Shâmddinân [cf. these articles] which must have played a more prominent part in ancient times. Oræmår is connected with Gawar via Shamski, the pass of Bâştain,† Alû Kânî, Bâştïgâ and Dîzîa. It is a road which shows, traces of works undertaken at the more dangerous places. To the south the road going through a very narrow defile leads first to Nîrwa (cf. below) where it forks: 1. to the west, by the district of Artuşi, via Bîrî-Ci-Tîtim and the district of Nirwe via Wîlla and Pftî Halâna, this last place being on the left bank of the Great Zâb opposite Surîya on the road from ‘Akrå; 2. to the east, by the district of Rekânî, via Berejî-Sahdajî and Awi Marik (water course) to Barzàn and Bahrî Ras on the left bank of the Great Zâb opposite Bîra Kepran, also on the road from ‘Akrå. A third road goes from Nîrwa to Nehri, the centre of Shâmddinân, via Râzga, the heights of Peramîzî (frontier of the three tribes — Rekânî, Harkî, Duskání), Dirî, defile of Harkî (Shîwa Harkî), Begor, Mazra, Nehri. It is to be hoped that with the final delimitation of the boundary between Turkey and the İrâk, this region will be properly surveyed and mapped and will no longer as at present show so many blanks and inaccuracies on the maps (cf. *Asie Française*, Oct.–Nov. 1926, treaty of delimitation).

Ethnography. The following Kurdish tribes may be mentioned in Oræmår itself and in the vicinity with ramifications inevitable as a result of the Kurd migrations. After the name of each tribe we give in brackets that of the district and the number of households: Duskání Zbîrî (Oræmår, 2,000); Nirwe (Nîrwa, kaďa of Amâdiya, 800); Dîrî (Gawar and Gela Dîrî, 1,000); Penînîshî (between Gawar and Dijlûmerk, and the part of the Pirîhulî, near Basîkala, 4,000); Duskání Zbîrî (kaďa Dehûk, 2,000); Miûzî Zbîrî (ibid., 5,000); Berwûri (ibid., 4,000); Guweî, nomads (wintering at Dehûk; summering at Gawar and Oræmår, 1,400); Cella (Dijlûmerk, 6,000); Artûshi (summering at Fîrsînah, wintering at Bæri Zengar, 6,000); Artûshi (sedentary: Alîhî, 1,000; Nûrîzî, 1,000); parts of Artûshi: Gewdan, Mâm Khoûran, Zîri (around Dijlûmerk, 6,000).

History. There are so far as we know no texts mentioning Oræmår except this brief note in the *Miûrû al-Bûlûdân* (Tîhrân, p. 22): "Urmär bi-dammî awwal wa-sudînî-i thini takti as aţîzî-î Așdârba-idân ast dar amdî âjamî birzâvâ ajamî wa-mudâfâtî Sâdî ibn aţ’-As âjamî šabdand Sâdî Djarîr ibn ’Abd Al-lâl al-Bajdrî râ bi djarîr-i ân âjamât namûr kurd wa-djarîr ân âjamât râmuzhîn wa-sarkâd-i ibshân râ bi dîr zed. —

We may note here: 1. the reading Urmär which corresponds to the pronunciation of the Highland Nestorians for the first part Ur but differs in it giving an a and not an â for the second (in Kurdish the pronunciation is Horâmår with the characteristic aspiration); 2. the qualification al-Bajdrî which is to be connected with Bajdrî, a Kurd village in the neighbourhood known for its family of Shâikh Bajdrî; 3. the fact that the date of this event is not indicated. Orâmår however like all this part of Central Kurdistan must have had a rich history full of associations with the history of Christianity in these regions. Here we give a description of the Nestorian church of Mârî Mâmû which is in the village of the same name in Orâmår and has not been previously described; Dickson mentions it; as to Cuijet (cf. *op. cit.*, ii. 757) he says that the 40 Nestorian rays domiciled in Orâmår are entrusted with the care of the two Nestorian churches in the Kurdish town (see above). The second church called that of Mîr Dânîl at Nûn Gund (cf. above) has been turned into a mosque within the memory of the present generation. The Nestorian charm uttered at the sight of a snake in order to escape its bite mentions the two saints: Mârî Mâmû Mîr Dânîl kip’s-l-hawâlî hakîh ("M. M., M. D., the stone on the snake"). For legend says
that the saint Mārī Mamû escaped from martyrdom in the time of Julian the apostate at Caesarea in Cappadocia and took refuge in the mountains where he collected the reptiles and shut them up under a flagstone over which was built the church which bears his name (cf. Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum, ed. Bedjan, vi., 1896). The life of the saint however contains no mention of Orāmār or of reptiles but it does attribute to him certain powers over wild animals. The version collected by Dickson seems to differ too much from the life of the saint. Dickson thinks that the church was erected on the site of an Assyrian zikkurat. In any case the following is the description of the sanctuary which is guarded by the Nestorian family bearing the title of Serdar Bī Mārī Mamû. Were it not for a very little door adorned in the upper part with a Nestorian cross and two circles within which is the same cross, one would not suppose that the building of rough stone in the form of a parallelepiped was a church. In the semi-darkness of the interior one can see that a quarter of the area is taken up by the sanctuary while its separated from the nave by a wall in which are two doors. Through that on the left one approaches the altar proper represented by a stone over three feet high and about two broad half built into the wall with rounded edges and narrowing towards the top. Above this altar is an embrasure which admits a little light; on the left in the wall is a small niche. From the sanctuary a door through a stone wall leads into another chamber in which there is a primitive baptistry carved out of the rock and a little lower on the same base a hearth (tamura) for the preparation of the unleavened bread. In front of this part set aside for the divine offices, there are two pulpits also in stone for the liturgical books and for the Gospels and the cross. The bells are replaced by two metal plates hung from a rod connecting the two walls at the bottom of the vaulting. There are no sacred images. The dimensions of the church are 40 feet long, 17 broad and 16 high. According to the legend, the reptiles shut up beneath the altar would come out if the family of guardians were deprived of their secular privileges. The dust from the walls possessed virtues against the bites of mad dogs, the stings of snakes and scorpions, etc. — We have very little certain information about the Nestorian churches of Kurdistān, some of which, that of Mār Bīshū on the Persian frontier (Tergawar), that of Mār Zaia at Djjilī, that of Mār Sawā at Ashīta as well as the ruins at Kučanīs must with Mār Mamû go back to a high antiquity between the ivth and vth centuries, for it is to this period that we are told we must put the coming of the first missionaries, Mār Aqūn, Mār Bīshū etc. The plan of Mārī Mamû may be compared with that of Mār Bīshū given by Hezall (Kurds and Christians), while in W. A. Wigram (The Assyrians and their Neighbours, London 1939) is a sketch of the interior of the church of Mār Shālíthā at Kučanīs. In any case there is reason to believe that Orāmār was once inhabited by Christians. A local tradition even suggests that the ancestor of the modern Zājān came long ago into this Christian district and by stratagems and intrigues succeeded in driving out its inhabitants. The toponymy of Orāmār seems to confirm this. The etymology of the name Orāmār itself would also seem to be Aramaic. — We owe to Mgr. Graffin the interpretation of the name as Ur-nār “citadel of the master” (cf. Ur-šikûn). This explanation would be corroborated by the inaccessible character of the region. It would confirm at the same time our supposition that this district was inhabited at a very early date. — There are similar place-names elsewhere in the region: Ora Bighû, one of the slopes of Kūra Tawkē (cf. above); Oritis, a village beyond Geltī Nū; Urī, a Nestorian clan; finally Urmīya itself.

Bibliography: The only works with which we are acquainted are listed in our joint study with E. B. Soane, Suto and Tate, a Kurdish text with transl. and notes, in B.S.O.S., iii., p. i. — In the review of the Geographical Society of Paris appeared in 1935 our study on Le système routier du Kurdistān, containing besides many geographical details a general view of Orāmār from a rare photograph.

(B. Nikitine)

ORAN (WAHRAĪN), a sea-port town on the coast of Algeria (33° 44' N. Lat.; 0° 39' W. Long.). The anchorage which is protected on the west by the heights of the Aidour, the extreme end of the little range of the Murjdjado, and the bay of Mars al-Kabīr, 10 miles distant, was probably the Portus Divini mentioned in the Itinerary of Antoninus. According to the Arab writers however, the town was founded, like a number of other towns on the same coast, by an invasion at the beginning of the tenth century (c. 290 A.H.) a band of these émigrés came there under the leadership of two chiefs in the service of the Umayyads of Cordova, Mūhammad b. Abī 'Awn, and Mūhammad b. 'Abdūn who concluded a treaty with the families of the Berber tribe of the Azadājīs settled in the district.

Seven years after its foundation, Oran, which the agents of the Umayyads had no doubt wished to make a base for the enterprises of their masters, felt the repercussions of the rivalry between the Umayyads and the Fātīmids of Kairawān. A body of soldiers sent by the latter and supported by the Azadājīs Berbers seized the town and burned it. Rebuilt, Oran was placed under the authority of the Fātīmid governor of TIvrāt. Throughout the fourth century (tenth A.D.) it was held alternately by the Fātīmids and Umayyads and was taken and re-taken and destroyed (notably in 945) and rebuilt by expeditionary corps or Berber chiefs representing the two rival caliphs. In spite of these vicissitudes, the town enjoyed great economic prosperity as a result of its position on the coast. The geographer Ibn Hawqāl, who visited it in the second half of the tenth century, thought that there was not a more sheltered port in the whole of Barbary. The commercial relations with Spain were considerable. (The town however at this date was under the authority of Zīrī b. Manād [cf. Zīrīds], a vassal of the Fātīmids).

Large quantities of wheat were exported from it. The country around was well cultivated. The river (Wātī Rehā, now covered over in its passage through the town) served to irrigate the fine gardens.

In the eleventh century, Oran belonged to the Banū Khazer, a branch of the Maghrība Zenāta who ruled in Tlemcen. It was from them that the Almoravid Yūsuf b. Tashfin took the town when he conquered the Central Magrib in 473 (1081). 63 years later it was to be the scene of the drama in which Almoravid power met its end.
On Ramadán 27, 539 (March 23, 1145) the second last emir of the dynasty, Taḥšīf b. ‘Alī, defeated near Tlemcen by the Almohads, died there. Three days later the town passed to the Almohads.

Under its new masters the town prospered. Idiist described it as surrounded by a good wall of earth and possessing well-furnished bazaars. The harbour was supplemented by that of Mars al-Kabir which was within easy reach of Almería. It had a naval arsenal and ‘Abd al-Mu’min built ships there.

The part which it played in commerce with Spain became still more important when the ‘Abd al-Wāḍidīd [q. v.] replaced the Almohads in the Central Maghrib. Oran was, along with Honain, to the east of the modern Némours, a port of Tlemcen. The wealth of the capital depended on the possession of these ports and on the safety and liberty of traffic on the roads which led to them. This explains why throughout the xivth century, when the Marinids came to besiege Tlemcen, they sent a force against the coasts to try to take Honain and Oran. In 748 (1347) the Marinid Abu l-Hasan built two forts there.

At the beginning of the xvth century, the Castilians, continuing the work of the Reconquest on the Berber coast, endeavoured to take Oran, which had now become a dangerous centre of piracy. They were only able to take Mars al-Kabir in 1505 and Oran in 1509. On May 17, Pedro Navarro entered the town, massacred 4,000 Muslims and sent off 8,000 prisoners. Cardinal Ximenes who had organised the expedition came in person to take possession of the new conquest. Wishing to develop their success the Spaniards interfered in the quarrels of the last ‘Abd al-Wāḍid kings of Tlemcen. They gave their support to one of these princes who had lost his throne and this provoked the intervention of ‘Aṭīd [q. v.], the Turkish corsair of Algiers. The latter having been defeated and killed, the ‘Abd al-Wāḍid Abū ‘Abd Allāh was restored to the throne of Tlemcen by the Christians in 1543 and became their vassal. The other expeditions planned from Oran as a base produced little result, and were ended by the disastrous expedition of the Count Alcaudete against Mostaganem in 1558.

The Spaniards were at Oran, as elsewhere, practically confined within their walls, badly supplied by their Berber allies (los Moros de l’Az), exposed to famine, plague, and the attacks of the Berbers supported by the Turks; they nevertheless held it till 1708. After a siege of five months, they capitulated and the Bey of Mescara Bū Shalāghām took possession of it in the name of the Bey of Algiers.

At the end of twenty-four years of Turkish rule the Spaniards re-entered the town. The Count of Montemar, having routed the Arabs who held the coast, entered the town which was undefended in 1732. Bū Shalāghām tried in vain to re-take it. At last in 1791 after a terrible earthquake in which almost 2,000 perished and which was followed by an attack by the Bey of Mescara, Muḥammad al-Kabir, the king of Spain Charles VI agreed to surrender Oran to the Bey of Algiers; some 70 or 80 Spanish families remained in it however. The town restored to Islam became the residence of the Bey of the West and remained so till 1830. On Jan. 4, 1831, the French, already masters of Mars al-Kabir, entered Oran.

The town has developed immensely since then. The population, which was 3,800 in 1832, is now over 160,000. Of this total the Muslims number at least 25,000. They live mainly in the southern quarter known as the ‘village noir’. Among the Europeans the element of Spanish origin is considerable.

There is little trace of its Muhammadan past in Oran. The Spanish period has left more, notably the old fortress with its gateway adorned with vigorously carved coats of arms.


**ORFA** (Greek Edessa, Syr. Orhā, Armen. ʿUrhay, Ar. al-Ruḥā), an important town in Diyār Muḍar, the ancient Osroœne.

The origin of the town, which must have existed before the Macedonian conquest, is lost in obscurity. Repeated attempts to prove the existence of the name in Assyrian times (E. Honigmann, _Urfa keilschriftlich nachweisbar_, in _Z. A._, N. F., v. 1930, p. 301 sq.) have so far failed. The original name was probably Ṫayra which has survived in that of the spring Kallāqān, which lay below the walls of the town, and in that of the district of Norouane (cf. Ṭayra in Isid. Charac., i, ed. Müller, in _G. G. M._, i. 240; Osifin, _Steph. Byz._, s. Bārāzī; _Arabes Orosi_, Plin., _Nat. Hist._, vi. 85; vi. 129; in inscriptions _Orheni_, _C. L._, vi. 1707; their land was called in Syriac Ṭayra Ṭayra; _Cureton, Spicil. Syr._, p. 20). A derivation of the Syriac Ṭayra from the Arabic Ṭahra (a fallāt form from aṣwahrā, “rich in water”) as proposed by Markwart (in E. Herzfeld, in _Z. D. M. G._, lxviii., 1914, p. 665 sq.) can hardly be accepted; as little probable is that from Ṭairah, the alleged first ruler and patronym of the town.

Edessa was refounded by Seleucus I on the site of an older settlement (Euseb.-Hieron., _Chron._, ed. Helmi, p. 127) and renamed by Antiochos IV Ἀντιόχεια ἐντὸς Ἐρημίας (Plin., _Nat. Hist._, v. 86: _Edessam quae dicensant Antiochica dicitur, Callirhoeo a fonte nominatam; coins in Babelon, Kois de Syrie, ciii.; Head, _Hist. num._, 2, p. 814 and Hill, _Greek Coins of Arabia in the British Museum, London 1922_, p. cviii.-cixii. and 91-119). It received its Hellenistic name very probably from that of the capital of Macedonia (the ancient Agisai, now Vodena) and the wealth of water may have contributed to the choice of the name (Steph. _Byz._: Ἕδεσσα, τῆς Συρίας, διὰ τῶν τῶν ύδατων μέγα οὖς κληρίζει ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ: Noldeke, _Hermes_, v. 459, wished to emend οὖς to ὀρμόν, but cf. _rēsēssā_ from ῥῆς = ῥῆς, _tētō_, from which Vodena is derived: G. Hoffmann, _Die Makedonen_, Gottingen 1906, p. 257; J. Marquart, _loc. cit._, p. 665 sq.; W. Tomaschek, in _S. B. A._ Wiz.
cxxx, 1893, treatise ii, p. 5). According to Malalas, the town was also called "Antiochē μεταβατός (p. 418 sq., ed. Bonn).

In the pre-Christian period Edessa, like Harran, was the centre of a planet-cult. Edessenes called Venus "Baral Nikkal" (Docrina Addaia, p. 24), i.e. "the daughter of Ningal" (G. Hoffmann, in Z. A., xi, 1896, p. 258—260, § 11; Winckworth, in Journal of Theol. Stud., xxv. 402).

Before the foundation of the Osroene kingdom, the town seems to have been an uninhabited place under the Seleucids (to 139 B.C.). Its earlier history is quite unknown. The kings of Osroene, whom the Romans regarded as Arabs (Tacit., Ann., xii. 12, 14; Plin., Nat. Hist., v. 85; Aram. Orrhoecon), bore Nabatean (Mānū, Bakrū, Ābdūl, Sahrū, Gebāru, Arūyū, Arab (Abgar, Mānū, Wāllī) or Parthian (Phrađash, Uranpharatas or Phartamaspates) names. From the end of the first century A.D. the dynasty was closely related by inter-marriage to that of Adiabene (Duval, Hist. d’Edesse, p. 27 sq.) which then ruled Nisibis also (Josephus, Ant. Iud., xxv. 68).

The names and chronology of the kings or, as the Greeks called them, toparchi or phylarches of Edessa (Osroene) are known from the "Edessene Chronicle" (composed about 540 A.D.) and the "Chronicle of Zuqīn" (near Amīd; preserved in the same Cod. Vat. Syr. 162) written about 775 A.D. According to the "Edessene Chronicle," the dynasty ruled for 352 years, and began in 133—132 B.C. with Orhāh b. Ḥewwī, but according to v. Gutschmid, rather with Arūyū (Docrina Addaia, ed. Phillips, p. 47), whose name is not to be regarded as Iranian (v. Gutschmid, in Mém. de l’Acad. Imp. des Scienc., de St. Pētērbs., series vii., xxv., 1887, p. 19), but as Semitic ("Lion") (Duval, Hist. d’Edesse, p. 26 sq.).

The list of toparchi which has been corrected by von Gutschmid from historical references and coins is as follows: they were under Parthian suzerainty at first (down to 87 B.C.): Arūyū (132—127 B.C.); Ābdūl bar Mānū (127—120); Phrađash bar Gebāru (120—115), Bakrū I bar Phrađash (115—112); Bakrū II bar Bakrū (alone 112—94; together with Mānū I 94; with Abgar I 94—92); Abgar I (alone 92—68), in whose reign the kingdom passed for a short time to Tigranes of Armenia; Abgar II (Ariamnes) bar Abgar, of the family of Mānū, hence in Florus III, 11, and Ruf. Fest., Brev., 17: Mazorus, Mazzaes etc. (68—53), who entered into friendly relations with Rome about 65—64. After the battle of Carrhae there was an interregnum of one year (53—52). Mānū II Allāhā (Theos, 52—34); Pākūrī (34—29); Abgar III (29—26); Abgar IV Sumākā (26—23); Mānū III Saphūlī (23—4 B.C.); Mānū IV bar Mānū (7—13 A.D.); Camout found in the citadel of Bireljik an epitaph in Syriac of 6 A.D. (7) of Zābarā, commandant of Bātīr and governor for the toparch Mānū bar Mānū (Kugenier, in R.S.O., i, 1908, p. 587; Camout, Études syriennes, Paris 1917, p. 144); Abgar V Ukkāmā (for the second time: 13—50); Mānū V bar Abgar (50—57); Mānū VI bar Abgar (57—71); Abgar VI bar Mānū (71—91), under whom the Senator Mānū bar Mānū had a sepulchral tower built for himself in Seīrīn on the Ephrates (B. Moritz, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, ed. Oppenheim, Leipzig 1913, p. 163 sq.;) interregnum of 18 years (91—109; rule of Sanātčis of Adiabene, nephew of Abgar, over Edessa?); Abgar VII bar Īzū (109—116).

After the great rebellion of 116 the town was taken by Lucius Quietus and burned. There followed a brief interregnum under Roman rule (116—118). Iūr (or Yalud) and Pharnataspat (118—122), then Pharnataspat alone (122—123); Mānū VII bar Īzū (123—139); Mānū VIII bar Mānū (139—163). In the Parthian war of Lucius Verus, Edessa was besieged by the Romans in 163—164 and surrendered to them after the murder of the Parthian garrison. During the war the ruler was Wāllī bar Sahrū (163—165). After the conclusion of peace (165) Edessa passed under Roman protection; Abgar VIII (165—167); Mānū VIII phalāmāwās (for the second time 167—179); Abgar IX bar Mānū (under coins: Α. Κλής Εστίτιμος Μέγας "Αβγάρος; 179—214), when occurred the first great inundation of Edessa (Nov. 201) which destroyed his palace; a winter palace was therefore built in the Tērā quarter. The official account of the catastrophe and of the measures taken by the king is preserved in the "Edessene Chronicle" for documents in the royal archives. Abgar was in Rome perhaps in 202, when he was received with all honour by Septimius Severus. Christianity is said to have been made the state religion at this time; (which has however not been proved: Gompertz, Archäol.-epigraph. Mitt., aus Osterr.-Ungarn, xiv. 154—157); according to legend Abgar V Ukkāmā had become a Christian in the year 29 or 32 (R. A. Lipsius, Die edessnische Abgangsrede kritisch untersucht, Brunswick 1880). A friend of Abgar IX was the Christian scholar Bardaisān (Barqādāyān, 154—222 A.D.); Sex. Julius Africanus is also said to have spent some time at his court (Ps.-Moses Khoren., Hist., ii. 10). The cult of Thaḥmah was exterminated by Abgar IX with great rigour. Abgar then ruled along with Severus Abgar X bar Abgar as co-ruler (214—216); both were put in chains by the emperor Antoninus Caracalla in 216. The emperor spent the winter in Edessa which was now called a Roman colonia and on Apr. 8, 217 he was murdered on his way from there to Carthæa. After the fall of the kingdom of Edessa, according to the "Chronicle of Zuqīn," Mānū X bar Abgar ruled for another 26 years (216—242); but he probably lived during this time in Rome and was only nominal ruler.

When the Saṭānān Ardashīr and Shēhpuhīr I disputed Osroene with the Romans, Gordian III again set up a member of the old family as king in Edessa. According to the coins, Abgar XI Phrahates reigned from 242—244; he was probably a son of (Antoninus) Mānū. Returning to Rome, he erected a tombstone there to his wife Hooda with inscription (C. I. L., vi. 1797).

After the royal house had adopted Christianity, Edessa became along with Adiabene the centre of literary activity in Syriac (east Aram.) (cf. Duval, Hist. d’Edesse, p. 107 sq. and the histories of Syriac literature by Wright, Duval and Baumstark). Edessa became a Roman city from the time of Gordian (244); after his death, it is true, Philip the Arabian handed over Mesopotamia as far as the Euphrates to the Parthians; but the Roman garrisons remained in the country (Mommsen, R.G., v. 422). Shēhpuhīr I besieged Edessa in 260, and the emperor Valerian was taken prisoner by the Persians not far from here about this time. The
town then belonged for a time (till 273) to the kingdom of Palmyra under Odaenath and Zenobi.

After the peace of 363 Aphrem (Ephraim; d. June 9, 373) of Nisibis moved to Edessa and founded there the "Persian school"; the emperor Valens banished the Orthodox from Edessa as Arians in Sept. 373 and they only returned after his death in 378. The monasteries on the sacred hill at Edessa were plundered by the Huns in 396 and Aphrem's nephew 'Absamyl composed lamentations upon this.

It is only from the beginning of the third century that we know the names of bishops of the town; these begin with Balūt (c. 200) and among them are Rabbašt, the enemy of the Nestorians (411−435), his opponent and successor Hībā (435−457) and in the sixth century the founder of the Severian "Jacobites", James Baradaroos (Yaḥbōb Būrēš'ānā, d. 578), but later persecutions of the Christians led to the martyrdoms, much embellished by legend, of the "Edessa professors" Sharibil and Barsamyā (250 A.D.), Šemūnā, Girīyā, and Ḥabbīb (309−310). The legend of the "man of God from the city of Rome" (St. Alexius) is put in the period of Rabbašt.

Edessa became the capital and ecclesiastical metropolis of the eparchy of Osroene. There were seven bishoprics under it in 451: Maraqētōs (Syriac Hiklā de-Syājīyā, "temple of the hunter", Kāllīm (Harrān), Kīrīkēn, Bābī (now Bireidjik), Kallīnas, Kwašetīn (Tellā, Tellā du-Mawzelah), and that of the Ţayyāq (Schulsthess, in Abb. C. W. G. Gott., N. S., x., 1908, No. 2, p. 134). Later were added Bītma (Sarudjī), Šēwašīm (Tellmahró), 'Hmēri (Syri. Imerin), Dašargē (Arab. Kaṭal Dībār), Nīa Oṣānēti (Nīa Ošānēti) and Maraqē (Syri. Māratā; cf. B. Z., xxv., 1924, p. 73 sqq., 77 sqq.).

The emperor Zenο in 489 finally closed the school of the Persians" after the Nestorians had already with their leader Narsai been driven out of Edessa in 457 (Baumstark, Geich. d. syr. Lit., p. 104, note 12, p. 109, note 10).

The war with the Persians (502−506) in the reign of Anastasius is described in the Syriac chronicle by an Edessene, the author of which is wrongly said to be Joshua (Ishāy) Stylites. After Amida had fallen in 503, Kawkād besieged Edessa but could not take it (Procopius, Bell. Pers., ii., 13). The undisciplined Gothic troops, who were to defend it, plundered it like enemies and practically the whole of Osroene was depopulated. After the fourth inaudiation of the town (525 A.D.; see below) the emperor Justin I restored it and gave it the name of Kastōnī (Malucción, ed. Bonn, p. 419; Euagrius, Hist. ecc., iv. 8); Hallier's quite unfounded doubts, Texte w. Unters., IX, i. 130, are repeated by Ed. Meyers, R. E., s. v. Edessa, No. 2, etc.). Khosrow I in May 540 on his way back from Syria encamped in front of the city but retired on receiving 200 pounds of gold (Chr. of Edessa, ch. 105; Noldeke, Ṭabarī, p. 239). This stubborn siege in 544 proved without success. According to a late legend, the wondrous powers of the ēokin ḥemwetūt, which were rediscovered at this time, saved the city from the enemy.

In the sixth century the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia was won for the Monophysites. In Edessa Stephanos bar Ṣudali, who, influenced by Origen, preached a pantheistic doctrine, found many followers. In 580 Hormizd IV sent the general Adharmahan against the Byzantines but he retreated after a few days' siege of Edessa. Khosrow II who had been previously in Edessa on his flight to Mauricius, conquered the town in 609 (Chron. Pasch., ed. Bonn, p. 699; Cedren., ed. Bonn, i. 714; Theoph. contin., ed. Bonn, p. 432) after it had previously gone over to him for a time under the Byzantine general Narsae, and deported a large number of Jacobites to Khūrāsān and Sājidjān (Barhebraeus, Chron. ecc., ii. 125). After his victories over Persia, Heraclius in 628 restored orthodoxy in Edessa, and banished the prominent Jacobite families.

On the topography of the town Syracy and Greek authors supply us with a good deal of information. Edessa lay at the intersection of the road from Samsot (Samāt) to Carrahes (Harrān) with the great trade route between east and west from the Euphrates at Zegma-Balkis and Birtha-Bireidjik via Mardin and Našibin to the Tigris. The Antiochene Itinerary knows (p. 184−192) two roads from Germanicia via Zegma, one from there via Samsot and one from Callecom to Edessa. The town lay in a hollow surrounded on three sides by mountains and open on the southeast on the river Sīmēr (Syri. Dītwr, "the Leaper"); the modern Kara Koyun or Nahr el-Kouant. This river which with the Dijlāb flows into the Balikh, in the past, according to the Edessene Chronicle, four times inundated the town and wrought great havoc (in Nov. 201, Mar. 253, March 18, 413 and April 22, 555) until the emperor Justinian had a canal dug to drain off the flood water of the town (Procopius, De aed., ii. 7, 2 sq.; Anced., xii. 38). We hear again in 668 and 743 of floods however (Theoph. Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 537; Chronicle of Zuḵni, under the year 743). The town was surrounded by a double wall. This enclosed on the southwest the citadel which stood on a spur of the Nimrud-Dagh and was overshadowed by this mountain; Justinian therefore had its walls strengthened on this side. At the western end of the citadel are two columns one of which, according to its inscription, was put up by queen Shalmat, the daughter of Ma'nā (Sachau, in Z. D. M. G., xxxvi. 153 sqq.). On a large open place in the citadel called Bēth Tebārā, Abgar IX after the inundation of 201 had a winter palace built (cf. above) and the aristocracy of the town moved their quarters to the adjoining upper market called Bēth Saḥrāyē. There was also a large altar there which was still standing in Christian times, and probably also the royal archives (Ἀρχιβιβαῖος; Bēth Udānā). Below the citadel there were two ponds inside the town. The larger fed by a spring, the fish in which were considered sacred like those of the lake of Bambykhe (Mabbij), corresponded to the old spring Kallīmān, the modern Birket l'ā唯īhūm. South of it lay the smaller pond 'Ain Zilka. In the town stood the council house (Antφρων), a gallery built in 497 (τεμένος), several public baths (Σωμάζων), a theatre, a hospital and the hippodrome. The six gates were called: the Gate of Bēth Shemesh and the Gate of Barlāhā (Βαρλάθα τῶλα): Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 27, 44) in the north, the Gate of the Caves which led to the catacombs in the west, the Gate of the Hours (שיחא, probably the Σωμάζων τῶλα of Procopius, Bell. Pers., loc. cit.; cf. Duval, Hist. d'Edesse, p. 207, note 1) in the southwest, the Great Gate in the south and the Gate of the Theatre in the east (Duval, p. 14).
At a later date, the Arabs only mention four gates: that of Ḥarrān, the Great Gate, the Gate of Saḥā and the Water Gate. The "Old Church," several times destroyed by floods stood near the "Tetrapylon" and the square of Bēth-Shabţat (Barhebraeus, Chron. ecol., i. 359). The Syracusan authors mention many other churches within and without the town (Duval, loc. cit., p. 16 sq.; Baumstark, in O. C., iv. 164–183).

In the Nimrud-Dagher west of the town cavaes were hewn out in the rock in very early times; there also were the mausoleums of the kings, that of the bishop Abshelamā bar Abgar and, 2½ hours from the town, that of Amathshēnēk (Iyšaaśēnē, wife of Bēthshābḥa, son of Māwnā). Numerous anchorites had their cells in the "sacred mountain" and many monasteries on it. It is probably Στέματα (read Στέματον "Cross Hill" as at Antioch) ṣaṣāą on which the monk Aṣwānā (ἄσων) had his visions (Philoxenos, Letter to Patriarch, under the wrong title; Iyšah of Niphene, Letter to Symeon from Θεομάρτιος ṣaṣāą, in Nova Patrum Bibliothecae, ed. Angelo Mai, viii., Rome 1871, p. 186, ch. 39; cf. Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 29, 142, note 10; 225, note 2). Another hill was called in the Christian period Kāmāṭa de-Bēth Aḥlah Kīklā (Symeon Metaphrastes, Migne, Patr. Graec., cvii., col. 141: Bēšaškēšē). In the vicinity of Edessa were the villages of Bokhān, Serenn, Kubbē and Kefar Șelem or Negaḥ. Two aqueducts restored in the year 505 brought down from Tell Šimā and Mawdid supplied the town with spring water (Ps-Joshua Stylites, col. 59 sq., 62, 87). The position of these villages and of the buildings in Edessa can as a rule no longer be ascertained exactly (plans of ancient Edessa: by G. Hoffmann, who corrected the old sketches by Carsten Niebuhr [1780] in Wright, Chron. of Joshua Stylites, 1882; better in F. C. Bartkitt, Ephemeris and the Goth, London 1913, p. 46).

Abū Ubaidā in 637 sent ʿiyād b. Ghann to al-Djazira. After the Greek governor Jonnues Katema, who had endeavoured to save Oshoune by paying tribute, had been dismissed by the emperor Heraclius and the general Polémajos put in his place, al-Ruḥā (Edessa) had to surrender in 639 like the other towns of Mesopotamia (al-Baladuhr, ed. de Goeje, p. 172–175; Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Nurenger, ii. 414–417; Yaḵūṭ, s. v. al-Djazār; Khāṣirmī, ed. Baethgen, Fragm. syr. u. arab. Hist., Leipzig 1884, p. 16, 110 = Abb. K. M., viii., No. 3; Theophanes, ed. de Boor, p. 517, 521). The town now lost its political and very soon also its religious significance and sank to the level of a second-rate provincial town. Its last bishop of note, Jacob of Edessa, spent only four years (684–687) and a later period again of four months in his office (708). The Maronite Theophilos of Edessa (d. 785) wrote a "Chronicle of the World" and translated into Syriac the "two Books of Homer about Ilion".

Al-Ruḥā, like al-Raḥṣa, Ḥarrān and Karḵišiya, is usually reckoned to Diyar Maḏar (Ibn al-Athīr, vii. 287; Yaḵūṭ, i. 177; M. Hartmann, Bohān, p. 88, note 3 = M. V. A. G., 1897, i. 28). In 67 (686–687) al-Ruḥā, Ḥarrān and Sumašāt formed the willayet, which Ibrāhīm b. al-Aḥsār granted to Hātim b. al-Nuʿmān (Ibn al-Athīr, iv. 218).

The "old church" of the Christians was destroyed by two earthquakes (April 3, 679 and 718). In 737 a Greek named Bāšīr appeared in Ḥarrān and gave himself out to be "Tiberias the son of Constantine"; he was believed at first but was later exposed and executed in al-Ruḥā (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 119). In 133 (750–751) the town was the scene of fighting between Abū Djaḍār, afterwards the caliph al-Mansūr, and the followers of the ʿUmayyads, Iyšah b. Muslim b. ʿUkaili and his brother Bakkār, who only gave in after the death of Marwān (Ibn al-Athīr, v. 333 sq.). But continual revolts broke out again in al-Djazira (Ibn al-Athīr, v. 370 sqq.); in the reign of al-Mansūr, for example, the governor of al-Ruḥā of the same name, the builder of Ḥisn Manṣūr, was executed in al-Raḥṣa in 141 (758–759); (al-Baladuhr, p. 192). When Hārūn al-Rašid passed through al-Ruḥā, an attempt was made to cast suspicion upon the Christians and it was said that the Byzantine emperor used to come to the city every year secretly in order to pray in their churches; but the caliph saw that these were sanders. The Gümāyē (from al-Djuma, the valley of "Afrin in Syria"), who, with the Telmahāyē and Rusāfiyē, were one of the leading families of al-Ruḥā, suffered a good deal however from his coveousness (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 130). In 812 the Christians were only able to save the unprotected town from being plundered by the rebels Naṣr b. Shabāt and ʿAmar by paying 5,000 zānē; Abū Shāḥārah therefore fortified al-Ruḥā at the expense of the citizens (Barhebraeus, p. 136 sqq.). At the beginning of his reign al-Maʿmun sent his general Tāhir to al-Ruḥā, where his Persian soldiers were besieged by the two rebels, but he had a successful resistance supported by the inhabitants among whom was Mār Dionysios of Tellmahār (Barhebraeus, p. 139). Tāhir, who himself had fled from his mutinous soldiers to Kallinikos, won the rebels over to his side and made "Abd al-Aʿla governor of al-Ruḥā; he oppressed the town very much (Barhebraeus, p. 139 sqq.). Muḥammad b. Tāhir who governed al-Djazira in 825 persecuted the Christians in al-Ruḥā as did the governors under al-Muʿtaṣīn and his successors.

In 331 (942–943) the Byzantines occupied Diyārbakr, Arzān, Dārā and ʿAin, advanced on Naṣībān and demanded from the people of al-Ruḥā the holy picture of Christ called μανᾶλων (al-Ḥonas al-Manālū); with the approval of the caliph al-Muṭṭaḥī he was handed over in return for the release of 200 Muslim prisoners and the promise to leave the town undisturbed in future (Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Aḥṣārī, ed. Kravčikovski-Jančev, in Pastoral Orient., xviii. 730–732; Thabit b. Sinān, ed. Baethgen, op. cit., p. 90, 145). The picture reached Constantinople on Aug. 15, 944 where it was brought with great ceremony into the Church of St. Sophia and the imperial palace (cf. in addition to Yaḥyā, loc. cit.; al-Maṣʿūdi, Muḥāfī al-Dhānak, ii. 331; Ibn al-Athīr, viii. 302 and an oration ascribed to Constantine Porphyrogenetos on the οἰκώμας ἐξομολόγως or De imagin. Edessana, ed. Migne, Patr. Græc., xxii., col. 432, better ed. v. Dohschutz. Christusherder, in Texte u. Untersuch., xviii.). But by 338 (949–950) this treaty was broken by Saʿīf al-Dawla who together with the inhabitants of al-Ruḥā made a raid on al-Maṣṣūl (Yaḥyā, op. cit., p. 732). Under the Domestikos Leon the Byzantines in 348 (950–960) entered Diyar Bakr and advanced on al-Ruḥā (Ibn al-Athīr, viii. 393). The emperor Nicephorus Phocas towards the end of 357 (967–
became lord of Edessa and six months later (Sept. 23, 1083) Philarétos Brachamios succeeded him. But he lost it in 1086—1087 when in his absence his deputy was murdered and the town handed over to Sultan Malikshah. The latter appointed the emir Bużan governor of al-Ruha' and Ḥarrān. When the latter had fallen in 1094 fighting against Tutuşh, Alyaşrukt, general of the sultan of Dimashq and Halab, occupied the town but it was not plundered by his army as he was poisoned by a Greek dancing-girl called Gali. Then the Armenian Kuropatles Tòros (Theodors), son of Het'um, took the citadel. When in 1097—1098 Count Baldwin captured Tell Bāshir Tòros asked him to come to al-Ruha’ to assist him against their joint enemies and received him with joy but was shortly afterwards treacherously murdered by him (Matthews of Edessa, ed. 1898, p. 260—262 = transl. Dulaureier, p. 218—221; Anonym. Syriac Chronicle of 1025—1204 in Chabot, C.R. Acad. Inscr. Lettr., 1918, p. 431 sq). From 1098 the Latins ruled for half a century the "county of Edessa" to which also belonged Sumaissi and Sarudj (1098 Baldwin I; 1100 Baldwin II: 1110 Joscelin I; 1131 Joscelin II).

The town suffered a great deal under them. On Dec. 23, 1144 Imād al-Din Zangi of al-Mawṣīl took it (a detailed description of these events in the Anonymous Syriac Chronicle of 1203—1204, ed. Chabot, in C.S.C.O., series iii., vol. xv., p. 118—126; transl. Chabot, Une épisode de l'histoire des Croisades, in Milanges Schlumberger, i., Paris 1924, p. 171—179). Under Joscelin II and Baldwin of Kaisūn the Franks again attempted to retake the town in Oct. 1046 and succeeded in entering it by night, but six days later Nūr al-Din appeared with 10,000 Turks, and soon occupied and sacked it; the inhabitants were put to death or carried into slavery. Baldwin was killed and Joscelin escaped to Sumaissi (Barhebraeus, p. 311 sq). The fall of this eastern bulwark of the Crusaders aroused horror everywhere; in Europe it led to the Second Crusade. The Syrian Dioniouos bar Saḷibī as Diseounus wrote an "oration" and two poetic mēnrē about the destruction of the town. Three similar pieces were written by Basilios Abu 'l-Faraqī b. Shumānān, the favourite of Zangi; he had also written a history of the town of Orhāi (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 293, 298).

After the death of Nūr al-Din his nephew Saif al-Din Ghāżī took the town in 1174; in 1182 it fell to Saladin who later handed it over to al-Malik al-Manṣūr. When Malik al-Adīl died in 1218, his son Malik al-Ashtar Sharāf al-Din Mūsa became lord of al-Ruha', Harrān and Khūšā. In June 1234 the town was taken by the army of 'Alā' al-Din Kaļūhā büd and its inhabitants deported to Asia Minor (Kamāl al-Din, transl. Bluchet, in R.O.L., v. 88; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 468). But it was retaken within four months by Malik al-Kāmil. In 1244 the Tatars passed through the district of al-Ruha' and in 1260 the Mongols under Hūjāgū. The people of al-Ruha' and Harrān surrendered voluntarily to him but those of Sarudj were all put to death (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 509; Chron. arab., ed. Bairiś, p. 486). In the time of Abu 'l-Fida' al-Ruha' was in ruins. Hamd Allāh al-Mustawfī about 1340 could still see isolated ruins of the main buildings. According to al-Kāṭkhāndī, the town had been
rebuilt by his time (c. 1400) and repopulated and was in a prosperous state. In connection with the campaigns of Timur, who conquered al-Dżezir in 1393, al-Ruha′ is repeatedly mentioned in the Šafar-nāme of Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAli Yazdi (written in 1388 = 1425).

The Ottomans finally took the town, to which they gave the name of Orfa, in 1637 during Murād IV’s war with Persia.

Today Orfa (Orfa) has nearly 30,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of a wilayah of the same name numbering a little more than 200,000 souls. The town is 550 m. above sea-level.


ORIHUELA, Arab. Uryūd, a town in Eastern Spain (Levante), 15 miles N.E. of Murcia, the capital of an administrative area (partido) and the see of a bishop, contains with its adjoining country, which is thickly populated, 35,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Muslims at the same time as the other towns of the šūba of Todmir (q.v.) and was for a long time the capital of this šūba before it had to give way to Murcia. Its history was that of the latter town as long as it remained Muslim. It was however for a very brief period in the middle of the 10th century A.H. (middle of the 11th century A.D.) the capital of a petty independent state ruled by the Kādı Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī b. Ṭāsim.


ORISSA (ODRA-DEGA), a part of the modern Indian province of Bihār and Orissa, has an area of 13,706 square miles and a population of 5,306,142, of which only 124,463 profess the Muslim faith. For administrative purposes it is divided into five districts of Cuttack, Balasore, Puri, Angul and Sambalpur. There are in addition twenty-four native states, the Orissa feudal states, with a population of 4,465,385, the Muḥam-madans numbering only 17,100 (Census of India, 1931).

Modern Orissa, which embraces the deltas of the Mahanadi and neighbouring rivers, extends from the Bay of Bengal to the borders of the Central Provinces and from the river Subarnareka to the Čikla Lake. In the past its inaccessible proved its salvation for, while the coastal strip was sometimes conquered, the highlands of the interior remained under semi-independent or tributary chiefs. It was included in the ancient kingdom of Kalinga, the sole conquest of the peace-loving Aṣoka, but, with the disintegration of the Maurya empire, once more passed to the Kalinga kings. Until the eleventh century the history of this area is extremely confused. Those interested in the solving of chronological puzzles would do well to consult the first volume of Banerji’s History of Orissa.

Certain parts of modern Orissa were annexed to the empire of Muhammad b. Tughluḵ and were included in the province of Dāḏingar. The real conqueror of Orissa, however, was Akbar’s famous general Ṣadžā Mān Singh, who took it from the Afghān of Bengal, who had obtained a temporary footing in the country. Under Akbar it was administered as part of the šūba of Bengal, for it was not until the reign of Dāḏāngīr that it became a separate province. With the decline of the Mughal empire Orissa fell into the hands of the Bhoṣe Marāṭhīs of Nāgpur (q.v.). Although it nominally passed to the British by the Delhi grant of 1765 it was not finally conquered until the year 1803. With the exception of the district of Sambalpur, the territory now known as Orissa was administered along with Bengal until October 1905, and with
West Bengal until March 1912, when Bihar and Orissa was formed from two separate provinces. Orissa has always been a stronghold of Hinduism and the temple of Dajjanaath still draws thousands of pilgrims to the sands of Puri.


(C. Collin Davies)

**Orkhān or Urkhan (Ur-khan) 2 was the eldest son of the emir ‘Othmān (q. v.), the founder of the Ottoman dynasty.** His mother was Malikhatun, the daughter of Shāhshāh Ede-Ball of the village of Itbunna near Eski-Shehir. The year of his birth is not known and indeed the whole chronology of his reign leaves much to be desired. Ottoman sources say he was born in 857 (beg. Feb. 6, 1258); according to others he was born as early as 860 (beg. Apr. 22, 1251). The first date which probably goes back to Hājīdji Khālīfa’s Taṣawwīr has most in its favour. We know very little about his youth. When barely twelve years old he was married in 699 (1299) to the daughter of the lord of Yār-Hişar named Nilūfer-Khatun (q. v.). A Greek girl, who was betrothed to the lord of Belokoma (Bilećik). From his union were born among others his sons Murād, who succeeded him, and Sulaimān Pasha. Orkhān was nearly 40 when he ascended the throne in it is said, Ramadān 726 (Aug. 1326). According to tradition, Orkhān offered his brother Ali al-Din ‘Ali (usually called ‘Ala’ al-Din only; cf. Isl., xi. 20, note 3) a portion of the ancestral possessions but the latter is said to have been content with the vizierate. This story strongly resembles that of Moses and Aaron as given in the Qur’ān (xx. 30) and is probably intended to give a historical foundation for the office of vizier. ‘Ala’ al-Din ‘Ali was also the first to bear the title pasha (q. v.) which then passed to Orkhān’s son Sulaiman and was inherited from him by Kara Khalil.

Orkhān’s rule may be divided into two periods: that from 1326 to 1344 when he was establishing the Ottoman power in Asia Minor, creating the army and becoming the founder of the Ottoman empire and the period from 1344 to his death in 1359–1360 during which he was preparing to gain a footing in Thrace and Macedonia and to extend his rule on European soil. He laid the foundations for the later empire of the Ottomans and is to be regarded as its real creator.

Orkhān had already showed his ability as a conqueror in the lifetime of his father. Shortly before the latter’s death of gout at the age of about 70 he had taken Brussa without bloodshed. It now became the capital of the kingdom. Nicaea and Nicomedia were now the next objectives of Ottoman arms. He was assisted by a number of able leaders of whom the best known were Kose Mihkāl [see Mihkāl-Oghlu], Akke Koca, Konur-Ala, Abd al-Rahmān Ghaṣi, Kara ‘Ali, Kara Mural. With their help he carried through all his enterprises with the greatest success. Before taking these two cities, Orkhān first of all secured possession of the most northerly peninsula of Bithynia, which is enclosed on the north by the Black Sea, on the south by the Gulf of Nicomedia and on the west by the Bosphorus. The two strongly fortified fortresses of Semendra and Aidos which guarded the military road from Constantinople to Nicomedia were taken. The town and district of Semendra were given in feudal tenure to the general Akke Koca and henceforth known as Koca-Hil. The fall of these strong places was followed by the subjection of most of the little towns on the coast on both sides of the Gulf of Nicomedia, of which the fort of Hereke offered most resistance. Kara Mural conquered the land on the southern coast by occupying Yalova, famous for its medicinal baths, and the district of Kara Mural which bears his name. As Orkhān’s vassal, he pledged himself to maintain a small fleet to protect the coast so that communication by sea between Constantinople and Nicomedia was entirely stopped. Orkhān now took the field against Nicomedia in person. The town was taken without any special difficulty after the hill fort of Köyun-Hişar had fallen. While the emperor Andronikos abandoned Nicomedia, he prepared to defend the old seat of the Palaeologoi, Nicaea. At the beginning of 1330, the Byzantines moved over to the Asiatic shore and in the vicinity of the little coast town of Philokrene in Mesothyna, now Tawshandjil, a battle was fought about which there are no records in the Ottoman sources while the Byzantine historians (Kantakuzenos, ed. Bonn, i. 341 sq.; Nikephoros Gregoras, ed. Bonn, i. 434; cf. there on Phrantzes and Chalcocondyles) show obvious errors and deliberate perversions of the facts. The defeat of the Byzantines at Philokrene meant the end of any hope of saving Nicaea. The inhabitants did not even attempt a serious resistance but hurried to swear fealty to Orkhān. The city, upon which Orkhān lavished all kinds of endowments, soon became one of the most flourishing and prosperous towns in the Ottoman empire after its period of tribulation. Nicaea, now Iznik (q. v.), became celebrated as a centre of Muslim intellectual life especially through its medresees. In 1353 Orkhān’s son Sulaiman undertook a campaign into the still independent country north of the Sangaris (Sakarya) with the towns of Goinik, Modrene and Tarakdjik, which he occupied almost without striking a blow. All Orkhān’s victories and conquests had so far been won at the expense of the Greeks and there had been no warlike encounters with the little principalities which had arisen in Anatolia out of the Saldjūq empire. The adjacent country of Karasi (q. v.) where in 1335 the succession had given rise to a dispute between two brothers, the youngest of whom, Tursun, was living at Orkhān’s court, came first. Orkhān’s help was called upon by Tursun against his older brother (named Timur-khan) and he invaded Karasi on receiving certain assurances. On the way he took Ulubad, Kirmast (q. v.) and Mikhailidj along with the castles of Koilos and Ailos. Balkesiri was surrendered to Orkhān.
without a blow and the resistance shown was limited to Bergama. This town also soon passed into Ottoman hands as a return for the leniency shown by Orkhan to the lord of Karasi when the latter had treacherously disposed of his younger brother (736 = 1336). Haji Kili-beghi, the vizier of the last prince of Karasi, was entrusted with the administration of the newly won territory, and as his councillors Edje-Beg and Ewrenos [q.v.] were appointed. After the fall of Bergama Orkhan was engaged in consolidating his rule by systematic regulations and arranging for the administration of the now considerably enlarged Ottoman kingdom. He seems to have been the first to organize his rule on Anatolian soil (on this cf. the full account in Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. regularly sqq.) in which his brother 'Ali al-Din 'Ali played a prominent part until after his death in 1333; his place was taken by his nephew Sulaiman. In 728 (1328) 'Ali al-Din is said to have induced his brother to set up the first mints (according to Sa'd al-Din). In this year the first gold and silver was struck in Orkhan's name and replaced the Seldijik coins which had previously been current throughout the Ottoman empire. A regulation regarding dress produced a strict distinction between ranks and classes, and the army was completely reorganised in keeping with the new conditions by Cendereli Khaliti [q.v.]. In 1330 the corps of Janissaries [q.v.] was founded, the Turkish infantry composed of youths of Christian birth and associated with Haji Bektaş [q.v.]. But the irregular infantry also, the 'Azabs, was put on a better footing and the feudal cavalry (akindis) developed in keeping with the object of the new empire. At the same time Orkhan founded numerous mosques, monasteries and schools and the foundations which he endowed everywhere in the newly conquered territory bear witness to the great attention which he gave to matters of religion. The dervish system which at this time was at the height of its development — the order of the Bektaşis seems to have arisen in the reign of Orkhan — had undoubtedly a great patron in Orkhan as is seen by the number of cells and monasteries of holy men in his capital Brusa, who had come from the east during his reign to find asylum in the Ottoman empire. The religious life of Islam under Orkhan, which had a marked 'Alid, not to say Shi'a, stamp, is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of religion and still requires elucidation in essential points through special studies.

In Orkhan's reign we have the beginnings of friendly and peaceful intercourse between Ottomans and Byzantines, although we also have an alternation of peace and war, of enmity and alliance (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 126). Ottoman troops were repeatedly summoned to the assistance of the Byzantine emperors and when Orkhan ascended the throne, Turkish hordes had already crossed the straits three times, without success it is true, and without leaving the slightest trace on European soil (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., i. 120 sqq. and Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 184 sqq.). There obviously was no idea of establishing Ottoman power on the other side of the Dardanelles in these raids and the Byzantine emperor paid very little attention to them. But in course of time there arose out of these casual enterprises more and more regularly organised expeditions by the petty dynasts of Anatolia. For example the ruler of Aidin-eli [q.v.], Umar-Beg, one of the most brilliant, if very little known, figures of the time, had undoubtedly intended to develop systematically his repeated raids into Europe. Orkhan himself is said in 1333 to have concluded a treaty with the emperor Andronicus at the time of the siege of Nicomedia, by which he bound himself not to disturb further the towns of Asia Minor which were under Byzantine suzerainty (cf. Kantakuzeenos, ed. Bonn, i. 446). The increasing weakness of Byzantium and the growing power of the Ottomans soon however deprived any such agreement of its binding force. Already in 1337 Orkhan had tried to effect a landing near Constantinople with a fleet of 30 ships; his intention must have been to attack the capital and establish himself in Thrace. The Ottomans suffered a disastrous defeat and escaped with one ship only. The dynastic troubles which broke out soon afterwards in Constantinople when the Grand Domestikos Kantakuzeenos became emperor and joint ruler with John Palaeologus, brought about a rapprochement between Orkhan and Kantakuzeenos. Umar-Beg renewed his efforts to gain a footing on European soil, but, in spite of the expenditure of men and ships, they remained unavailing. Orkhan maintained an attitude of watchfulness. The empress Anna, mother of the young emperor John Palaeologus, induced him to send a force to help her against her rival Kantakuzeenos. The latter saw the increasing danger and after this force had come to a miserable end endeavoured with all his power to win Orkhan over for his own plans. In return for 6,000 soldiers he offered him his daughter Theodora, who was still a minor, as a wife in January 1345 (cf. Kantakuzeenos, iii. 31; ed. Bonn, p. 498; Dukas, 9, ed. Bonn, p. 33 sq.; Chalcoc., i. 24) and in May 1346 the wedding was celebrated with great splendour in Selymbria (Kantakuzeenos, iii. 95, p. 585 sq.; Nikeph. Gregorios, xxv. 5, p. 762 sq.; Dukas, 9, p. 35; according to Nikeph. the bride's name was Maria, cf. i. 762, certainly a mistake). It is worth noting that Orkhan's bride did not abandon her religion but remained a devout Christian (cf. Kantakuzeenos, ed. Bonn, p. 588; Zinkeisen, G.O.R., i. 201 sqq.) and acquired great merit by purchasing numerous Christian slaves and sending them home to freedom. The prince Khalil Celebi, who later became a prisoner of the Genoese and when very young married a daughter of the emperor John V, was probably the result of this union (cf. Jorga, G.O.R., i. 201). The alliance with the Ottomans was to cost Kantakuzeenos dear. When, shortly after the wedding, Orkhan sent 10,000 men to help in his fight with the Serbian prince Stjepan Dušan, the Turks turned against the Byzantines and returned with vast booty from Europe to Asia. This breach of faith did not deter Kantakuzeenos from again asking for assistance from his son-in-law in 1349. But this time also the army of 20,000 men, summoned unexpectedly back to Anatolia, recrossed the Dardanelles after burning and plundering all the way. Besides these two invasions of Europe by request the continual raids of the Anatolian hordes went on and the sufferings of the people of Thrace became intolerable. Orkhan took advantage of this uncertainty to carry out his long cherished plan of establishing the Ottomans permanently in Europe. His son Sualımân Pasha in 1356 was ordered to cross the Dardanelles. The crossing was successfully carried through at the fortress of Tsyme (the modern
Djemenlik). In 759 (1357) Kallipolis (now Gallipoli) was taken by the Ottomans. The sudden death in 760 (1358) of the conqueror Sulaiman Pasha, who was buried inside a cist in Brussa but in Sulaiman on Thracian soil, put an end for the time to any further advance by the Ottomans. Hâdji Hilbeghi and Edje-Beg conducted raids into the interior, it is true, but no effort was made to extend Ottoman power. Orkhan died very soon after Sulaiman. The date of his death is not exactly known. The most probable statement is that which says he died at the beginning of 761 (beg. Nov. 23, 1359). The statement (taken by K. J. Jirecek from a Slav chronicle) that Orkhan lived till March 1362, after the capture of Adrianople, has no claim to credence (cf. Archiv fur slav. Phil., xiv. [1892], p. 260), although Oskar Halecki, Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome (Warsaw 1932 = Travaux historiques de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, vol. viii.), p. 74, note 3, based on C. Jirecek, loc. cit., and Byz. Zeitschr., xviii. (1909), p. 582 sq. is inclined to accept the year 1362. That the Byzantine annals (especially p. 392) edited by Jos. Muller, in Sitzungsber. d. k. k. Ak. d. Wiss., Vienna 1853, ix. are in favour of such a supposition cannot be disputed as well as the fact that the Florentine chronicler Matteo Villani (cf. Muratori, Rerum Ital. Script., xiv., p. 672 sq.) puts "Orcam's" first actions still in November 1361. If Murâd I is justly called the "conqueror of Adrianople" the year of his father's, i.e. Orkhan's death must be fixed earlier as the taking of this town in spring 1361 (cf. thereon F. Babinger, in M. O. C., ii. 311 sqq.) can now be taken for granted (cf. thereon the fact not noted in M. O. C., that, according to O. Halecki, loc. cit., p. 75, the capture of Adrianople became known in Venice on March 14, 1361).—Orkhan was buried beside his father in Brussa (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.K., i. 157 sq. with a description of what his personal appearance is said to have been).

Bibliography: Contemporary Ottoman sources have so far not come to light. Of the Byzantine chroniclers the most important is Orkhan's father-in-law Kantakuzenos although his bias makes it necessary to use him with great caution. Nikephoros Gregoras is much more to be believed. The crossing of the Ottomans into Europe in the sixteenth century has been critically studied by Joh. Drasecke, in der Nüe Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum, vol. xxii., p. 7 sqq. The whole period of Orkhan's reign has recently been dealt with in not always reliable fashion by H. A. Gibbons (d. 1935), The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916. p. 54—109. Further sources are indicated in the works of J. v. Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga. (Franz Baringer)

ORMUZ. [See Hormuz.]
ORTOKIDS (Urtokids), a Turkmen dynasty, branches of which ruled in Mârûd, Hîshkafâ and Kharbârît. When the Sâlûq Sultan of Damascus, Tutush, conquered Jerusalem in 479 he appointed as governor of the town his officer Urtuk b. Al-Tabûb who had already served under Malikshâh and had taken over the city under the Abbasids in 477. He was succeeded in 484 (1091) by his sons Sukmân and Ilhâzâ, after the Holy City had been taken for the Fatimids in Shabban 489 (1096) by al-Adal b. Badr al-Djamiâl, Sukmân went to al-Rûha and Ilhâzâ to his lands in the 'Iqâ. In 495 (1101) Sultan Muhammad made Ilhâzâ his commissioner (Shâhna) in Baghda. A. Hîshkafâ, Mu'n al-Dawla Sukmân I (cf. iv., p. 510) assisted Mûsâ when he was besieged by Djakarmish in al-Mawûlî as and as a reward received from him in 495 (1101) 10,000 dinârs and the town of Hîshkafâ (Ibn al-Atîr, x. 234—236). He had already owned Sârûd since 488 and in 498 or shortly before, Mârûd also fell into his hands (Ibn 'l-Fîtâ, ed. Reiske. iii. 350—353). Along with Djakarmish, Sukmân took Count Baldwin and his brother Joshelin prisoners at Harra. After his death in 498 his son Ibrâîm ruled in Hîshkafâ while Mârûd passed to his brother Ilhâzâ in 502. In Hîshkafâ, Ibrâîm was succeeded first by his brother Rukn al-Dawla Dâwûd (who is mentioned in 508 and again in 511; Ibn al-Atîr, x. 352 sq.; ibi. 73), then by the latter's son Fakhr al-Din Kârâ-Ärslân who ascended the throne about 543 and probably died in 562 (or perhaps not till 570) (van Berchem in Arch. G. W. Cott., N. S. ix., 1907, p. 145, note 3). He ruled over Hîshkafâ and a considerable part of Dîyarbâk (Ibn al-Atîr, xi. 217); to him or his father we probably owe the bridge over the Tigris at Hîshkafâ [q. v.]. After his death he was succeeded by his son Nûr al-Din Mâhâmâm. When Sâlûq al-Din in 578 came to Dîyarbâk, Nûr al-Din was ready to pay homage to him and to assist him at the siege of al-Mawûlî. As a reward he was next year given the valuable town of Idrâm (579). He died in 585. He was succeeded by his son Kuth al-Din Sukmân II who lost his life in 597 from a fall (Ibn al-Atîr, xii. 112). Before his death he had designated as his successor a Mâmilik named Äyûs, as he hated his brother al-Mâlik al-Sâîh Nâsîr al-Din Mâhâmâm, whom strict Sunnîs condemned as a philosopher and heretic. But Mâmûd seized Idrâm when the emirs asked him to do so (Ibn al-Atîr, xii. 112). He recognised the suzerainty of the Ayyûbids 'Ädil and Kâmil and of the Sâdûqûk Kâlûcû. On an Âmid inscription of the year 605 (1208—1209) he calls himself sulâq of Dîyarbâk, al-Rûm and al-Ärman (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 147). After his death in 619 he was succeeded by his son al-Mâlik al-Masûd Mawûdî (Ibn al-Atîr, xii. 260). According to a coin of 628, Hîshkafâ then belonged to the ruler of Mârûd. The lands of the Ortûkîs had already been much diminished by the attacks of the Sâdûqûk sultans of Rûm when in 629 (1231) the Ayyûbid Kâmil advanced against Idrâm and took it with the towns that belonged to it, including Hîshkafâ (Ibn 'l-Fîtâ, iv. 395) which, if this statement is correct, had therefore again been taken by Mawûdî from his relative, Al-Kâmîl's son, al-Mâlik al-Sâîh, remained in possession of Idrâm and Kâfâ. In 639 he had to cede Idrâm to the allied armies of Halab and Rûm, while he retained Kâmil (Kâmîl al-Dîn, History of Aleppo, transl. E. Blochet, p. 219 = R.C.L., vi. 16.). Mawûdî remained in prison until the death of al-Kâmîl in 635; then he escaped and found refuge with al-Murâfîr of Hûmâ until his death probably during the Tatar invasions (Ibn 'l-Fîtâ, iv. 395).

R. Mârûd. On the death of its governor Lu'lû' the city of Halab submitted voluntarily in 1117—1118 to Nâdîm al-Dîn Ilhâzâ I [q. v.], who had since 502 (1108) been lord of Mârûd. Ilhâzâ
gave it to his son Timürtaş (Ibn al-Athir, x. 372). When in 515 the latter was sent by his father to Sulaiman Mahmud to intercede for Duhais b. Sadaka, the sulţan gave his father Ighţaţ Maiyâfirîkin (Ibn al-Athir, x. 418) which henceforth remained Ortoqîd until Şâlih al-Din annexed it in 581. After the death in 516 of Ighţaţ, the most dangerous enemy of the Crusaders among the Ortoqîds (Ibn al-Athir, x. 426), he was succeeded by his sons Şams al-Dawla Sulaiman in Maiyâ- 
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genealogical Table of the Ortoqîds</th>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[A. Hisn Kaifa]</th>
<th>Urtuk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sukman I</td>
<td>'Abd al-Djabbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ibrahim</td>
<td>Sulaïmân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Dâwûd</td>
<td>Balak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C. Khartabirt]</td>
<td>IV. Kara-Arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 'Imad al-Din</td>
<td>V. Nur al-Din Muhammed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Bakr</td>
<td>VI. Sukman II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişan al-Din (?)</td>
<td>VII. Mahmûd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>VIII. Mawdud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Bakr (?)</td>
<td>6. Urtuk-Arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isz al-Din Ahmad al-Khîdîr</td>
<td>7. Ghazi I al-Sa'id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nûr al-Din Urtuk-Shâh</td>
<td>8. Kara-Arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 'Ali</td>
<td>12. Sâlih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dâwûd</td>
<td>10. Ghazi II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ísa</td>
<td>17. Sâlih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bidj in 518 Balâk received a mortal wound from an arrow (Ibn al-Athîr, x. 436). In Halâb and his other possessions he was succeeded by Hûsîm al-Din Timûrtaş but the latter lost Halâb as soon as he went to Dîyâr Bakr as the city, besieged by the Franks, opened its gates to al-Bursuki [cf. ÅK SONGOR AL-BURSK]. After the death of his brother Sulaimân in 518 Timûrtaş inherited Maiyâfirîkin also (Ibn al-Athîr, x. 441) and at his death in 547 (1152-1153) was lord of Mârdîn and Maiyâfirîkin (Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 115). He was succeeded by his son Na'dim al-Dîn Alî. During the lifetime of his father he had received al-Bira from the Franks in 539; they had given him the town out of fear of 'Imad al-Dîn Zangi. At a later date (before 565), we find ruling there Shihâb al-Dîn b. Ighţaţ who had distinguished himself in fighting against the Crusaders. His son was besieged in 577 (1181-1182) in al-Bira by Kûb al-Dîn Ighţaţ II of Mârdîn (cf. ii., p. 466), who had succeeded his father Alî in 572, and

appealed for help to Şâlih al-Dîn; at the latter's command Kûb al-Dîn retired to Mârdîn (Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 313). After his death in 580 the guardian of his sons Shâh Arman Sulaimân of Akhîta, then after the latter's death in 581 (1185) Şâlih al-Dîn, took possession of Maiyâfirîkin (Ibn al-Athîr, xi. 335; C. Defremery, in F.d., ser. iv., i., 1843, p. 72-78). In Mârdîn Kûb al-Dîn was succeeded by his son Hûsîm al-Dîn Yûluk-Arslan (var. Bûluk, Bûlak-Arslan) who again in 587 regained Maiyâfirîkin for a short time; the next successor was the latter's brother Nâşir al-Dîn Urtuk-Arslan al-Manûr (from c. 596-598). In his time Mârdîn was besieged in 599 by al-'Arâf by order of al-'Adîl. At the conclusion of peace the Urtukîd recognised the suzerainty of al-'Adîl (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 117; coins). The later Urtukîds of Mârdîn are given by Abu 'l-Fida' (v. 295) down to his time (715 = 1315). Urtuk-Arslan was followed in 637 by his son Na'dim al-Dîn Ghazi I al-Sa'id, in 658 by the latter's son Kara-Arslan al-Mu'azzafar, about 691 by his son
Shams al-Dīn Dāwūd, about 693 by his brother Nadīm al-Dīn Gāzārī II al-Manṣūrī, in 712 by his son ʿĪmād al-Dīn ʿAlī al-ʿAdilī, then by his brother Shams al-Dīn ʿAlī, in 765 by his son Aḥmad al-Manṣūrī, in 769 by his son Muḥammad al-Ṣāliḥī, in 769 by his uncle Dāwūd al-Muẓaffarī, in 778 by the latter's son Maḥmūd al-Dīn ʿĪsā al-Ẓāhirī, and lastly by the latter's brother ʿAlī al-Ṣāliḥī (809–811 = 1406–1408). After Timūr had taken Mārīn, the ownership of the town passed to the Karā-Koyunlī. To the territory of the Ortōkid of Mārīn belonged at least down to the time of Nadīm al-Dīn Gāzārī II the town of Dunāsir (q.v., now Kazanūr), according to coins found in the neighbourhood near Tell Ermen (E. Sachau, in *Abb. Pr. Ak.* 1880, p. 117, phil.-hist. Kl., treatise ii, p. 80).

Khartābīrt (Kharpūt). Khartābīrt is found as early as 515 in the possession of the Ortōkid Balāk b. Bahrānī, who held it till 518. His relative Sulaymān then occupied it but he seems to have died in the same year. It then belonged successively to Dāwūd of Ḥiṣn Kaifa and his son Karā-Arsānā and grandson Muḥammad. There is an inscription (dated 561 = 1165–1166) of Fakhr al-Dīn Karā-Arsānā commemorating a building in Kharpūt (van Berchem, in *Abb. G. W. Göttingen*, xi/iii, 1907, p. 142 sq., No. 9). After the death of Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad in 581 (1185–1186) his brother ʿĪmād al-Dīn Abū Bakr founded an independent dynasty there as Lane-Poole was the first to show (*Essay on the Urduqis, in Num. Chron.* N.S., xiii., 1873) (van Berchem, op. cit., p. 144, note 1). At his brother's death he was in Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's camp before al-Mawṣil and at once set off for Ḥiṣn Kaifā on hearing the news to claim his inheritance. But his nephew Sukmān II had already taken possession of the fortress and had been recognised by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. The uncle had therefore to be content with Karābīrt (Ibn al-ʿAdhir, xi, 339). Abū Bakr must have died in 600 at latest for Muḥammad of Kaifā and Ḍāmid unsuccessfully besieged his son Niẓām al-Dīn in Khartābīrt in 601 (Ibn al-ʿAdhir, xii, 132). This last Ortōkid of Khartābīrt is said to have been called Niẓām al-Dīn Abū Bakr; according to the inscription on a bronze mirror in the Blacas collection in Paris, his name was more probably Niẓām al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, unless we have to see in Abū Bakr a (childless) brother of Ibrāhīm (van Berchem, op. cit.). Ibrāhīm had two sons: ʿĪz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muẓaffarī mentioned in a manuscript of 685 written in his reign and al-Ḥijrī named on the above mentioned mirror, father of Nūr al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdu l-ʿAbd Ortōk-Ṣāliḥ who ruled at an unknown time and unnamed place. Khartābīrt probably remained in possession of the Ortōkids only down to 531. At least the town was taken in this year by Ṣūltān Ka hüküm I.

Coins: Four mints are named on the coins of the Ortōkids: al-Ḥiṣn or Kaifā, i.e. Ḥiṣn Kaifā, Ḍāmid, Mārīn and Dunāsir. The strong influence of trade with Byzantium is seen on the coins in a remarkable fashion: we find on them not only rulers' heads taken from ancient coins and no longer understood but also the Virgin Mary, Christ and the Greek inscription Emmanuel on them.


(E. Hönigmann)

**OSMAN DIGNA** [see *OTTOMAN ABU BAKR DIGNA.*]

**OSRÜSHANA,** the name of a district in Transoxiana. The form Osrūshana is the best known although Yāḡūt (i. 245) says that Osrūshana is preferable. In the Persian versions of the text of al-Īṣṭakhrī and in the Persian text of the Ḥudūl al-Aʿlam (ed. Barthold) we find more often Surūshana while Ibn Khuradhdhib sometimes has Surūssana; the original form may have been Srūšana. This district lies to the north-east of Samarqand between this town and Khodjand, to the south of the Sir Daryā (Sāhūn) so that it forms the approach to the valley of Farghāna; on the north west it is bounded by the steppe. The southern part is occupied by the mountains of Kūhit which, along the upper course of the Zar-Mahsān, these hills are generally regarded as forming part of Osṛūšana. The geographical information about this region is based almost exclusively on the geographers of the tenth century; the later geographers down to Hādīdd Khulfa only repeat what their predecessors have said: it appears therefore that the name Osrūshana had fallen into disuse before the end of the middle ages. As a result of its numerous streams, which flow into the Sir Daryā, it was at one time a rich country visited by many travellers because the route to Farghāna lay through it. The geographers describe several roads from Samarqand to Khodjand all of which passed through the towns of Sābāh and Zāmīn, the name of which still survives. The principal town — in which in the tenth century the governor lived — was in all probability called Naʿmān ḏ-jī-kāth — this must be the basis of the more or less uncertain readings of a number of manuscripts (cf. especially Ballāšhūrtī, p. 420); the form Būndiktī given by Yāḡūt (i. 744; but see also iv. 307 where the name is Kuḥb) and adopted by Barthold is a late corruption; it lay a little to the south of the great road and was identified in 1894 by W. Barthold with the ruins called Shahrīstān to the south of the present town of Ta Tube; these ruins were examined a little later by P. S. Skvarky. The geographers describe the town in detail. Two other towns of some importance were Zāmīn and Dīzak, and a number of other places are recorded;
After several checks due to the treachery of subordinates, Khazin entrenched himself in a camp at a place, the name of which is not given, and by a number of strategic movements and with the help of reinforcements from Tukharistan succeeded in defeating the rebels, of whom large numbers were slain. Ostadsis escaped to the mountains but was captured in the course of the following year. The 30,000 who accompanied him were set free but he and his sons were sent to Baghda and executed. The rising of Ostadsis was of a religious character: he represented himself as a prophet and exhorted the people to kifir (Tabari, ii. 773); he was one of a series of heretical rebel leaders who appeared in Khurāsān after the death of Abū Muslim [q.v.] like Sinbād the Magian, Bih-āfrīd [q.v.], Yūsuf al-Barm, and al-Muḳānānī. It is probable that his views were based on Zoroastrian doctrines. The name of the leader is given by Tabarī as Usṭād-Sis; "lord Sis"; the name Sis is found in several Iranian names (cf. Justi, Altiran. Namensbuch, p. 336; Mani's successor was called, according to the Fihrist, p. 334: Sis al-Imām and in the Greek sources: Sisinios). On the other hand this heretic numbered among his adherents, according to the Kitab al-Bad' wa-l-Tarīqī (ed. Huart, vi. 86), a large number of Ghuzz Turks, as was the case also with the rebel Iṣāḥāk al-Tūr, who saw in Abū Muslim an incarnation of the deity. In al-Yaḥṣūbī's story it is said that Ostadsis declined to recognise al-Mahdi as heir apparent, but the most astonishing statement is that of Ibn al-Āthir, who says that Ostadsis was the father of Marāqījī, wife of Hārūn al-Rasādīd and mother of al-Ma'mūn, and that Ġhīlī, son of Ostadsis and maternal uncle of al-Ma'mūn, assassinated the latter's vizier, the famous al-Fadl b. Sahl known as Dhu 'l-Ryāṣātān. It is impossible to say what can be at the basis of this story but perhaps we may see in it a tradition from a Persian source the object of which was to give al-Ma'mūn a royal or even saintly pedigree. The rising of Ostadsis broke out about half a millennium after the foundation of the Parthian dynasty and one of its bases was Sudjīsān which may have made this leader be regarded as one of the "savours" (taṣāyāt) expected in Zoroastrian religious tradition (cf. G. van Vloten, Recherches sur la domination arabe, in Věk. Ak. Ansie., i. 3, 1894, p. 68).


**OTBA B. GHAZWAN** B. AL-ḤĀSHĪB B. DIĀRĪK B. WAHIB (OR WAHIB) B. NUSAYR ABU ʿUBAID ALĀH B. OTBA B. GHAZWAN B. MAZINI, belonged to the tribe of Kās ʿAllān, half of the Nafzaf or of the ʿAbd Shams, one of the oldest Companions of the Prophet, "the seventh of the Seven", i.e. the seventh to adopt Islam and one who had shared in the sufferings to which the first believers had been exposed in Mecca. He took part in both the battle of Badr, and in most of the battles and expeditions of the Prophet. He is best known as the founder of Baṣra. In the caliphate of ʿOmar he fist of all conducted an expedition which ended in the capture of Obolla. ʿOmar then appointed him agent (dāmil) in "the country of India", i.e. the borderland between Arabia and Persian territory with orders to begin a campaign in the Sawād [q.v.]. He made
his headquarters at a hamlet called Khuraba, where he built all that was necessary for a military base: a mosque (cf. iii., p. 318), a residence for the governor, quarters for the soldiers, their families and all that goes to make a rising town. This was the nucleus of al-Baṣra [q. v.]. The order of events and the chronology generally are far from being settled; the years given vary between 14 and 17. The years 15 and 17 are given for his death. Having performed the pilgrimage, he asked 'Omar to be allowed to resign his governorship but 'Omar refused to permit it. He then prayed God to spare him from returning to Baṣra. On the way back he fell dead from his camel at the age of 57. Another tradition is given by Ibn Sa'īd [cf. Bi.] He was succeeded by al-Mughira b. Shu'ba [q. v.].


(2) A. W. WENSICK)

'OTBA b. RABI'AH b. 'ABD SHAMS B. 'ABD MANṣUR, b. L-WALID, one of the chiefs of the tribe of Kuraish, who refused to follow Muhammad. He met his death in the battle of Badr. His daughter Hind was the wife of Abū Sufyān [q. v.].

Shocked by the number of adherents of Muhammad, 'Otba having consulted the other chiefs of the Kuraish, went to the Prophet to offer him anything he would care to ask if he would only abandon his propaganda. According to the traditional story, Muhammad in reply only repeated a part of Sūrat al-XLI, which made such an impression on him that the effect was still visible when he rejoined his friends, whom he advised not to importune Muhammad any more. — Tradition puts him in a similar light when it represents him as one of those who on the eve of the battle of Badr endeavoured in vain to persuade the Kuraish to withdraw. He himself was mortally wounded in the battle and his body was thrown into the common ditch (kūlah). Muhammad is said to have thought highly of his gifts.

Biography: Ibn Hīṣām, Sīra, ed. Wustenfeld, index; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, index; Ya'qūbi, ed. Houtsma, ii. 6, 19, 36; Buhār, Das Leben Mohammeds, Leipzig 1926, p. 183, 191, 342, 252; Lammens, La Vie de à la veille de l'hégire, Bairat 1924, p. 69, 75.

(2) A. J. WENSICK)

'OTHMAN I, very often called 'Oṯmān Ghāṣi, founder of the dynasty of Ottoman sultāns and the first in the traditional series of the members of the dynasty. We are only imperfectly acquainted with the life and personality of this founder of a great empire but we may conclude from the fact that his name has remained attached to the dynasty of the 'Oṯmān Oğulları or Al-i 'Oṯmān and is later found in the description of the empire and its inhabitants as 'Oṯmānlı or 'Oṯmān, that behind the name of 'Oṯmān there lies a powerful personality. The most extensive source of information about him is Turkish historical literature and particularly its ancient chronicles, the Tawarikh Al-i 'Oṯmān, representing the oldest tradition, along with a few poetical compositions of an epic nature dating from the end of the xivth century, like the latter part of the Iskandar-nāmas of Al-Jāmi. The study of the ancient chronicles reveals to us that although they certainly contain some good historical traditions, they are loaded with additions of a legendary character. These additions are explained by the enormous expansion of the power of the earlier Ottoman princes within less than a century of the death of its founder. As often happens in such cases the obscure history of the ancestor was embellished with details of a legendary character foreshadowing the greatness of his descendants. On the other hand, all the chronicles show a tendency to establish a historical connection between the power of the Saltāns of Asia Minor and that of the first Ottoman rulers by making Ertogrul or 'Oṯmān be invested with certain powers by Sultan 'Aла al-Din (II). These relations are more than doubtful. A third feature of the traditional accounts of 'Oṯmān's career, which we find in all the chronicles, is the explanation of a number of geographical names by connecting them with events which took place in the glorious period of the founder of the dynasty. There is further the tendency which we find pushed to its greatest extent in the chronicle of 'Ashīq Pasha Zade to attribute to 'Oṯmān events which belong to the tradition of Ertogrul, like the prophetic dream regarding the greatness of the posterity of 'Oṯmān and the daughter of Shaikh Ededali, and the capture of the castle of Karadağ Hisar; in the same way the chronicles put many feats of arms of Orkhan like the taking of Brusa and even the conquest of Қodja Ilı to the reign of 'Oṯmān, who had then long been an invalid "with a disease of the limbs". While in the chronicles we can still distinguish with some probability the non-historical features, pragmatic Ottoman historiography, with which 'Ashīq Pasha Zade and İdris Bulluş form the transition, represents these traditions as historical facts. Among the Byzantine historians, Pachymeres and Nicephoros Gregorios alone have preserved historical features independent of the Ottoman tradition, which clearly shows its influence in the later Byzantines (Phrantzes, Ducas, Chalcocopondas). Quite legendary stories of 'Oṯmān are also found in the hagiographic literature (cf. Das Vitalitäts-Namen des Hüği Bektasch, transl. E. Gross, in Türk. Bibl., xxv., Leipzig 1915, p. 133 sqq.);

According to unanimous tradition, 'Oṯmān was one of the sons of Ertogrul [q. v.] whom he succeeded as chief of a semi-nomad Turkish clan which had its winter camp at Sogud [q. v.] in the valley of the Kara Su. The date of Ertogrul's death is uncertain; later sources vary between 1264 and 1282. At this time Karadağ Hisar and Eski Shehir [q. v.] situated considerabily to the south of Sogud were perhaps already in the possession of this clan. They formed the frontier district bordering with the lands of the Germiya-
Oğlu. 'Othemān in the first phase of his career extended this cradle of Ottoman power to the north by taking the fortresses of Inegöl, Khar- mendjik, Biledjik, Yar Hisar and Kopru Hisar, which had hitherto been in the hands of the Byzantine feudal lords. This country consists of mountains and valleys lying to the west of the course of the Sakarya [q.v.] and ends in the north in the plain of Yeni Shehir; the capture of the last place seems to have been of great military importance as it became a base of operations for future conquests (cf. the map Das Stammgebiet der Osmanen, attached to the article Anatolische Fachungen, or F. Taeuber, in Z. d. M. G., N.S., vii. 83 ff.). Von Hammer, G. O., R. 2, i. 69 thinks the enumeration by Pachymeres (ed. Bonn 1835, ii. 413) of the fortresses taken by the Turks corresponds pretty well with the conquests of 'Othemān.

It is perhaps to this first stage of conquests that belongs the first recital of the Kushto at Kuradja Hisar in the name of 'Othemān by Tursun Fakth. The chronicles put this event in 689 (1290). During this time the newly conquered territory seems to have received an increase of population from the side of the Gerimyan (Aşlık Paşa Zade, ed. Giese, p. 20). The second phase in 'Othemān's career is that in which from his base at Yeni Shehir he continued his conquests in the westerly direction towards Brusa and in a northern direction towards Iznik. The Turks were not strong enough to take these towns but they ravaged the country round. According to the chronicles, there was a battle between 'Othemān's Turks and a confederation of lords (takwār) of Brusa, Iznik and several other places at Koyun Hisar, near Iznik, in which the Turks were victorious; this battle has been identified since von Hammer's time with the battle of Baphaeon, in which, according to Pachymeres (ii. 337), the heterarch Mouzalos was defeated in 1301 as a result of the impetuous onslaught of the Turkish cavalry. This victory enabled Lefke and Aş Hisar on the Sakarya to be taken and in the west Tricoccia between Iznik and Brusa (Pachymeres, ii. 637). In connection with this last victory (in 1308) Pachymeres mentions a personal feud between 'Othemān and the Byzantine princess Maria, sister of the emperor Andronicus, who lived in Nicomedia. She had been promised in marriage to the İlikhan Oelaiat Khudâbanda [q.v.] and had threatened 'Othemān with the latter's intervention. In this second period the Turks extended their conquests as far as Ulubâd (Leopadion) to the west of Brusa. The third phase is that in which 'Othemān no longer took part personally in the military expeditions although, according to tradition, he was still alive. It was Orkhan [q.v.] and his companions in arms who continued the conquests. The first enterprise of Orkhan was the expulsion of a horde of Tatars who had invaded the district of Eskî Shehir (perhaps sent by the Mongol allies of Byzantium). In the latest stage, 'Othemān devoted himself to the closer encirclement of Iznik and Brusa. This last town finally fell in 726 (1326), according to the chronicles, shortly before the death of 'Othemān who is said to have received the good news just before he died in Sagud. The sources are not agreed as to whether 'Othemān was buried at Sagud or Brusa. This last town has however for a very long time claimed to have a 'turbe of 'Othemān.

From the very beginning of his reign 'Othemān was surrounded by a group of devoted followers, consisting in part of his brothers and their sons and in part of allies like Şahîş Edebali — whose daughter Mâlkhatûn (in the two versions of Uruđ Beg her name is Râbi'a) became the wife of 'Othemān and the mother of his sons Orkhan and 'Alâ' al-Dîn — and the Byzantine lord of Kûrmendjik, Kosî Mîkhâl [q.v.] who later became a Muslim. The chronicles record how 'Othemān divided among his friends the civil and military administration of the places he conquered. As to 'Othemān's foreign policy, it seems that his relations with the Gerimyan Oğlu were not very friendly; it was from their territory that the army which was exposed to the invasion of the Tatars. The chronicle of Aşlık Paşa Zade tells us that he had other independent Turkish allies like Şamsâna Çâ'ush with whom he made raids across the Sakarya. The chronology of the career of 'Othemān is uncertain. It is a pure fiction to say his reign began in 700 (1300); this is connected with the popular belief that at the end of each century a new conqueror makes his appearance (cf. Alî, Kunh al-Akkhâr, v. 3). Neither does the statement made by several chroniclers that at his death 'Othemān had reigned nineteen years (beylîk ettî) agree with other records. Perhaps however it gives a hint that his death took place long before the traditional date. The importance of the career of 'Othemān has attracted research into the true nature of the expansion of the little Turkish clan and the power of its first chief. It has been suggested (Gibbon) that it was the conversion of 'Othemān to Islam which gave the first impetus to expansion, but that is little probable as most of the available facts suggest a milieu already Muslim; 'Othemān did just what a number of other Turkish chiefs were doing in Asia Minor about the same time. 'Othemān's name, which looks strange among the Turkish names of the members of his family (the name of his grandfather Sulaimân Şâh excepted), has also been the subject of study. While the chroniclers all write 'Othemān (like the few coins of Orkhan, cf. T. O. E. M., viii. 48 and an inscription of Orkhan at Brusa; cf. T. O. E. M., v. 318 sqq.), Pachymeres has the form Aruând and Nicephoros Gregorios (ed. Bonn 1820, i. 539) Aruaund. See also the Arabic sources (Ibn Baţûtâ, ii. 321; Ibn Khaldûn, 'Abû (' Âshî) give 'Othemândîjk (Ibn Faḍl Allah al-Umarî, however, has Taman) and the Italian historian Donado da Lisse (Historia Turcica, Bucarest 1910, p. 4) says that Ottoman was the son of Zich. Now some traditions make the founder of the dynasty be born in the town of 'Othemândîjk to the south of Sinope (Ewliya Çelebi, ii. 179) which may be a hint of the origin of the name. Moreover, the text of the chronicle of Uruđ Beg (p. 6), taken in combination with other texts, shows that Ertogrul had three sons with Turkish names which might even make one suppose that 'Othemān was not a son of Ertogrul (cf. J. H. Kramers, Wer war Osman, in A.O., vi. 242 sqq.; W. L. Langer and R. P. Blake, The Rise of the Ottoman Turks and its Historical Background, in American Hist. Review, 1935, p. 496). 'Othemān Şâzî then may have belonged to one of the corporations of şâzî's or abî's as did several members of his entourage like Edebali and his nephew Akhi Hasan (Aşlık Paşa Zade, p. 28), corporations which at this period represented a Muslim element more civilised
and more orthodox than the semi-nomad Turks. Bibliography: The Turkish chroniclers quoted in the text are those of Neşri (ed. Noldeke, in Z. D. M. G., xii. 194 sqq.), Abdül Paşa Zade (ed. Giese, Leipzig 1929), Urudj Beg (ed. Babinger, Hannover 1925) and the Anonymus Giese (Breslau 1922). All the general Ottoman histories give the history of 'Othmān (G., O., W.) as do the histories by v. Hammer, Jorga and Zinkeisen. A careful historical investigation is found on p. 11-53 of H. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916. (J. H. Kramers)

'Othmān II, sixteenth sultan of the Ottoman empire, was born on the 19th Dhu-mādār II 1012 (Nov. 15, 1603; cf. Siğilli 'Othmānî, i. 56), the son of Sultan Ahmād I. After the death of his father in Nov. 1617, the brother of the latter had been proclaimed sultan as Mustafa I [q. v.] but 'Othmān, taking advantage of the weak character of his uncle and supported by the muftī Efendi and the Khizlar Āgha Mustafa, seized the throne on Feb. 26, 1618 by a coup d'état. The youth of the new sultan at first assured the promoters of the coup d'état of considerable influence. To them was due the replacement of Khâlid Paşa as grand vizier by Oküz Mehmed Paşa [q. v.] in Jan. 1619. Khâlid had just concluded a treaty of peace with Shāh 'Abbās I of Persia, after a campaign which had been indecisive. The relations with the other powers, Austria and Venice, with which the capitulations were renewed, were also peaceful. But after, in Jan. 1620, Mehmed Paşa had been replaced by the very influential favourite Guzelde 'Ali Pasha [q. v.] who removed from the court all possible rivals, the chances of war increased. This time it was a war with Poland which broke out through the intrigues of the voivod of Moldavia. In the battle of Vassy on Sept. 20, 1620, the Polish army was annihilated by the ser-asker Iskander Pasha. The grand vizier, who held office mainly by satisfying the avarice of the young sultan, never lost an occasion to irritate and provoke the enmity of Austria and Venice. He died on March 9, 1621 and under his successor Husain Paşa of Okhri, 'Othmān II took part in person in the campaign of 1621 against Poland. This campaign ended in a check for the Turks and the Tartars, who, with great losses, had in vain tried to storm the fortified Polish camp on the Dniester near Chocizm. A preliminary peace was signed under the same conditions as before under Sulaimān I and the sultan appointed a new grand vizier Dilāwēr-Zade Husain Paşa. Since the time when Othmān, still considerably under the influence of the Khizlar Āgha Sulaimān and his khanum Khodja Molla'Omer, had begun to act independently, he had not been able to gain the sympathy of the army on account of his brutal treatment of the Janissaries, nor of the people chiefly as a result of his avarice, nor of the 'ulamā'. The latter were particularly horrified at the sultan's wish to take four legitimate wives from the free classes of his entourage; he actually married the daughter of the muftī Es'ad. His unpopularity increased still further when he wished to put himself at the head of an army to fight Fakhr al-Din, the Emir of the Druses, and to go on and make the pilgrimage to Mecca. Preparations had already been made for this expedition when on May 18, 1622 a mutiny broke out among the Janissaries and Simpson who plundered the house of Molla Omer. Next day the rebels secured the cooperation of the chief 'ulamā and demanded the heads of the Khizlar Āgha, the Khodja, the grand vizier, and three other high officials. 'Othmān at first refused but after the rebels had forced the third wall of the palace he had to sacrifice the grand vizier and the Khizlar Āgha. But in the meanwhile his uncle Mustafā had been brought out from his seclusion in the harem to be proclaimed sultan. 'Othmān tried during the night to secure his throne through the influence of the Āgha of the Janissaries, but the latter was killed on the following morning and he became the prisoner of the Janissaries who took him to their barracks. The rebels had no intentions against his life but in the meanwhile the direction of affairs had passed to Dâwūd Paşa, the favourite and son-in-law of Mâh-Feiker, the mother of Sultan Mustafâ. Dâwūd Paşa being appointed grand vizier had 'Othmān taken to the castle of Yedi Kule where he was put to death in the evening of May 20, 1622. He was buried in the turbe of his father Ahmad I. — 'Othmān is praised for his skill as a horseman and for his intelligence. He was also a poet with the maqâlîs of Farsî. He was the first of three sultans to lose his life in a rising, the others being Ibrâhim and Selim III.

Bibliography: The Turkish sources are the works of Na'imî, Peşvêkî, Hasan Bey Zade, the Râvast al-Abîr of Kara Čelebi Zade, and the Fârâbî of Hâджî Khalîfa. — The Wâfâ'i Sultan 'Othmân Khan of Tâghi is specially devoted to the deposition of 'Othmân (transl. by A. Galland; cf. G.O.W., p. 157), while his whole reign is described in a Şahâname by Nâdirî (G.O.W., p. 169). Among contemporary western accounts: the Relationi quoted by von Hammer, in the note on p. 806 of G.O.R., ii. and that of Sir Thomas Roe. Cfr. also the general histories by von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

( J. H. Kramers)

'Othmān III, twenty-fifth sultan of the Ottoman empire and son of Mustafâ II, succeeded his brother Mahmûd I on Dec. 14, 1754. He was born on Jan. 2, 1699 (Siğilli 'Othmānî, i. 56) and had therefore reached an advanced age when he was called to the throne. No events of political importance took place in his reign. The period of peace which had begun with the peace of Belgrade in 1739 continued; at home only a series of seditious outbreaks in the frontier provinces indicated the weakness of the Empire. In the absence of any outstanding personality the sultan was not often pleased, but his activities were practically confined to changing his grand vizier frequently (six times). His favourite Siyîh-Bîr 'Ali Paşa, grand vizier from Aug. 24 to Oct. 22, 1755, had his career terminated by execution. The appointment on Dec. 13, 1756 of Râghib Paşa [q. v.] was an important one, as for five years this great statesman showed himself an excellent administrator of the empire under Mustafâ III. 'Othmān III's other activities were the suppression of cafés, of the liberty of women to show themselves in public and the regulation of the dress of his non-Muslim subjects. His name is associated with the great mosque of Nûr-i 'Othmānî, which had been begun by Mahmûd I and was solemnly opened in Dec. 1755. The reign of this sultan is remembered
for the great fires in the capital in 1755 and 1756. He died on Oct. 30, 1757 and was buried, like Mahmidd 1, in the tomb of the Yeşi Ülümî.

**Bibliography:** The Ta'rikh of Waṣî is the principal source. The reign is described in the great histories of von Hammer, Zinkeisen and Jorga.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

**OTTOMAN III - AFFAN**

344 - 355 = 644 - 655. He belonged to the great Meccan family of the Banû Umayya and to the branch descended from Abu Ḥafs, whose grandson he was (cf. the genealogy in Wustenfeld, *Gesam. Tabellen*, U. 23). This makes his prompt acceptance of the teaching of Muhammad quite noteworthy; he became a convert, if not at the very beginning of the Prophet's mission, at least at a very early date, several years before the Hijra. ʿOṯmān was a rich merchant and an accomplished man of the world; tradition, which likes to represent him as a model of beauty and elegance and deals to a degree which borders on exaggeration with his toilet, may be correct, simply because it is unusual. Whatever was the exact motive that induced him to embrace a cause of which no one could then have possibly foreseen the success is a question that can never be answered with certainty. One of the most important facts of historical traditions connects his conversion with his marriage to Muhammad's daughter Ruqayya but other sources, probably with more justice, put this marriage after his conversion.

The conversion of ʿOṯmān, the first Muslim of high social rank, must have made a sensation and contributed to the success of the new religion, but his personal efforts on behalf of Islam were never remarkable. His indolent character, which was however accompanied by a very living faith and great good nature, is another feature ascribed by tradition to ʿOṯmān and it is unlikely that we have here an invention intended to excuse the inaction of this caliph against his lying officials; just because lack of energy and initiative is evident in ʿOṯmān from the very beginning of his career, this defect must have been a real one. ʿOṯmān is believed to have taken part in the migrations to Abyssinia and then joined the nûkâǧîrîn in Medina; but he did not take part in the battle of Badr (it is alleged that he had to attend to a sick wife; the Prophet however regarded him as present and allotted him his share of the booty). After the death of Ruqayya the Prophet's alliance with ʿOṯmān was renewed by his marriage with another daughter, Umûm Kulqûm; the doubts raised by Lammens (Fâtima et les filles de Mahomet, Rome 1912, p. 3-5) regarding the actuality of this marriage do not seem to be justified; there is no reason to think that Muhammad did not lay great stress on this alliance with the only member of the Meccan aristocracy of whom the Muslim community could so far boast.

During the lifetime of the Prophet and those of the caliphs Abu Bakr and ʿOmar, the part played by ʿOṯmān was a very humble one; how did it happen then that the council (qârî) appointed by ʿOmar on his deathbed chose him as successor to the second caliph? The sources dealing with the history of this laborious concave have been minutely analysed by Caetani; but it is only too evident that the mysteries of these secret deliberations are never destined to be revealed to historical criticism. What it seems possible to affirm is that, as often happened in the papal conclaves, the most outstanding candidates ruled one another out; for example ʿAli whose election would have meant the negation of ʿOmar's policy; or al-Zubair and Ṭalha, also it seems opponents of ʿOmar and whose ambition and covetousness was feared. If among the three who remained, Saʿd b. Abū Waqâṣ, ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. ʿAff and ʿOṯmān, it was the latter who was chosen, it may be thought that even more than his relationship to the Prophet it was his being a member of the Umayyad clan that proved the decisive argument in his favour. The Umayyads had already regained in the lifetime of the Prophet, and especially during the caliphate of ʿOmar, a part of the position they held during the Uğhûliya. There is no need to think as some one has done that Abû Sūfîyân, the head of the family, was the deus ex machina of policy during the first twenty years of the caliphate, and it would be naive to represent the Umayyads as having formed a kind of secret committee dealing with the Islamic state as it pleased. In reality it was not so much to their noble birth as to a real talent for affairs possessed by several of their members that the Umayyads owed their influence. But this was counterbalanced in the time of ʿOmar by the part played by other elements and especially by the oldest Companions. The strong personality of the second caliph had been able to maintain equilibrium among a number of heterogeneous elements, often in opposition to them.

It was otherwise with ʿOṯmān. In reality, as Wellhausen pointed out and Caetani has expounded at length, ʿOṯmān only followed and developed the policy of ʿOmar. The difficulties he encountered were only the results of the policy of his predecessor. But it was just here that the difference in their talents became apparent.

The tragedy which put a bloody end to the reign of ʿOṯmān and opened up the period of civil wars has caused the greatest embarrassment to the Arab historians, forced to record the series of grievances which the adversaries of ʿOṯmān raised against his rule and faced with the alternative of either acknowledging that the caliph had sinned against the laws of Islam or that his accusers, among whom were some of the most venerated patriarchs of the faith, had either lied or been deceived. It is owing to this painful dilemma (out of which orthodox tradition extricated itself by means of the theory of the "excusable error" and other subtle distinctions) that there has been preserved for us the long list of these grievances (which are given in great detail for example in Muḥammad al-Dîn al-Taḥbî, al-Kiyâd al-mâjîd fi Manâṣib al-ʾAlîhâ, Cairo 1327, ii. 137-152). The first and perhaps the gravest charge against him is that he appointed members of his family to the governorships in the provinces; if Syria had already been long in the hands of the Umayyad Muḥâwîya b. Abû Sūfîyân, ʿOṯmān replaced Abû Mûsâ al-ʾAshîrî and Saʿd b. Abû Waqâṣ at Basra and Kūfa respectively by his two relatives ʿAbd Allâh b. ʿAmir b. Kurâz and al-Walîd b. ʿUkba, his half-brother; when the latter was dismissed, having been involved in a scandal, he was replaced by another Umayyad, Saʿd b. al-ʾAzîz, to whom is attributed the celebrated saying: "The Sawâdî of Kūfa is the garden of the Kurâshî." Egypt, the first conqueror of which, ʿAmr b. al-ʾAsî, seemed to deserve the right to hold the governorship for
life fell to ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa’d b. Abī Saḥḥ, who was not an Umayyad, but whose Muslim past was, to say the least, suspicious. Finally the caliph’s intimate adviser to whom tradition likes to ascribe a baneful influence, was Marwān b. al-Ḥakam b. Abī l-‘Āṣ, first cousin of the caliph, who had recalled his father from the exile to which the Prophet had condemned him. It cannot be denied that these measures of ʿOthmān were not entirely free from nepotism; but we must recognise in them a deeper motive: the intention of establishing unity of government and administration which was being threatened by the excess of independence which the governors enjoyed. It was practically the same end that ʿOmar had had in view but the latter had succeeded by his energy and prestige in imposing his authority even on governors who belonged to other tribes and clans. ʿOthmān thought he could obtain the same results by using officials connected with him by ties of blood; he was not successful; the parts were reversed and it was the caliph who was under the influence of his relatives (perhaps however to a less extent than the official historians say); besides, popular discontent ascribed solely to this cause the troubles that arose, which were probably quite independent of the personality of the officials. Indeed (and it is one of Caetani’s great merits that he has called attention to this) the ʿAmīrīn system instituted by ʿOmar demanded that the plunder taken in war should increase steadily in perpetuity, the regular receipts from the taxation of the Abī al-ʿĀṣīma not sufficing for the new recruits who hastened to the provinces from the depths of Arabia. From this came the stimulus to the expeditions which in the caliphate of ʿOmar never ceased to push forward the frontiers of the Arab empire: such were the conquests of the last provinces of the Sasanian empire (the dynasty of which became extinct with the murder of the last king Yazdagird III), the occupation of Armenia, a series of expeditions along the north coast of Africa, into Nubia, into Asia Minor, and by sea into the eastern basin of the Mediterranean. If we sum up the conquests made or begun by the Arabians in the caliphate of ʿOthmān we shall see that if they do not match the expansion of those that took place under ʿOmar, they are nevertheless impressive as they mark on one side the conclusion of the initial stage of the Arab empire and on the other the preliminary to the second period of expansion, that of the Umayyads.

Nevertheless the booty produced by these expeditions was perhaps not so great as had been hoped; besides, ʿOthmān — this is another of the grievances against him — instead of assigning it entirely to the soldiers, reserved a share for his governors and for the members of his family, by developing the system of ṣafṣaf (kāṣūr), which ʿOmar had already made great use of. In this again, we should recognise not a simple scheme for enriching his relations but perhaps rather a conscientious attempt to transform domains for the state in contrast to the communal system of dividing all the booty among the combatants. The I-lāmic empire was tending from an innate necessity to give itself a regular administration, for which the Byzantine and Persian afforded models. What ʿOmar had already begun, what the Umayyads to some extent accomplished and the ʿAbdāǧids realised, the transformation of the incoherent and anarchistic grouping of the tribes into an absolute monarchy of oriental type, was also ʿOthmān’s programme. He may be reproached with not having chosen the means best fitted to realise it and described as not being fit for a task of this magnitude; but his plan was a reasonable one and only meant following up ʿOmar’s ideal. Besides, the economic crisis, the inevitable consequence of the sudden enriching of the Arab masses, very soon forced the state to make economies and to cut down the military pensions; this not unnaturally increased the number of malcontents.

One of the steps which contributed very greatly to stirring up against ʿOthmān the religious element, formed of the old Companions of humble or even servile origin (such as ʿAmmār b. Yāsir, Abī Ḍharr, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd etc.), whose influence upon the masses was very strong, was the official edition of the Qurʿān (cf. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qur’āns, ii. 47–119). What was found most odious in this process was the destruction of the provincial copies. ʿOthmān was no doubt urged to this step by considerations of a religious and liturgical nature, but nevertheless the dominant motive may have been a political one. The kūrā', who were the receptacles and of course also the expositors of the sacred text, exercised for this reason a tremendous influence on the masses, which made them to some degree independent of the central power, the latter having no way of checking whether the kūrānic passages used by the kūrā’ were authentic or not. In depriving them of this weapon and making itself the monopolist of divine revelation, the government was endeavouring to realise unity and to establish its absolute power over the state: but it is only very natural that the opposition to this tendency should have accused the caliph of having mutilated and destroyed the divine word.

ʿOthmān therefore made himself enemies in very different quarters: the turbulent elements of the ʿamīr [see Mīr] faced with economic difficulties and disposed to accuse the caliph of confiscating for his own benefit the property of the Mushīms; growing pietism to which the assertion of the authority of the state did not show the respect it demanded, and which in depicting the principles of equality laid down by the Prophet; lastly the former governors who had been dismissed and the great Companions who, removed from power, were striving for it with all their might: such were Taḥṣa, al-Zubair and ʿAlī. It may be asked if ʿOthmān, while following the line of conduct imposed upon him, as we have seen, by the necessities of state and the example of his predecessor, could have avoided the fate which overtook him and which so profoundly disturbed the unity of Islām. Although the answer to this kind of question cannot be a definite one in the field of history, it may be supposed that a more intelligent mind and a more energetic temperament than that of the third caliph (or to be more definite a real political genius such as Muḥāṣṣa would undoubtedly have revealed) if he had then been at the head of the government, might perhaps have overcome these difficulties. Perhaps also his adviser Marwān, who was thirty years later to face a situation not less difficult, lacked as yet experience and prudence. In any case, ʿOthmān, incapable in himself, was also badly advised and the Umayyads, whom he had overwhelmed with riches and honours, thought more of themselves than of their relative in the hour of danger.
The course of development of events can only be briefly indicated here. Tradition divides quite artificially the caliphate of 'Othmän into two periods of equal length: six years (23–29) of good government and six (30–35) of illegality and confusion. The change is represented symbolically by the loss of the seal of the Prophet which 'Othmän, according to the story, dropped into the well of 'Aris in the year 30. It is in any case a fact that it was just at this period that the first movements of rebellion began in the 'Iraq, the region which was suffering most from the economic crisis and the one where the turbulent elements were the most numerous. The episode of Abî Dharr, one of the precursors of asceticism in Islam, exiled to Syria with several of his companions, and later sent to Rabadha to die there in destitution, although embellished by legend is characteristic as showing the attitude of the growing piety to the secular transformation of the caliphate. Much more serious troubles broke out in Kufa in 32–33, led by the karra', who combined a religious character with a military one and formed a number of doubtful elements. In spite of severe measures taken against them, the recalcitrant elements succeeded in procuring the deposition of Sa'id b. al-Âṣ who was replaced by the former governor of Basra, Abî Mâ-a al-Âshîrî, himself a pietist and opponent of 'Othmän; Kufa was henceforth no longer under the central government. Similarly in Egypt, Ibn Abî Sarî had to yield to the violence of a group led by the young Muhammad b. Abî Hu'dhafa who although an adopted son of 'Othmän took the side of his opponents. It seems that the wily 'Amr b. al-Âṣ who had retired to Palestine after his dismissal was secretly encouraging the revolutionary movement in Egypt. The storm which had been brewing for some time burst at the end of the year 35 when bodies of rebels advanced on Medina from the provinces. The first to arrive were the Egyptians; dramatic interviews took place between them and the caliph; the grievances against 'Othmän were expounded with great bitterness of language. But the rebels were disarmed by the humble and conciliatory attitude of the caliph who gave in to all their demands, promised to annul his previous measures and to change his governors; the Egyptians left satisfied. But suddenly, on the way back at the halting-place of al-'Arîsh, a messenger of 'Othmän's was seized and a letter found upon him from 'Othmän to Ibn Abî Sarî confiscated which contained an order to put to death or mutilate the leaders of the movement on their return. The latter turned back furious and retraced their steps to Medina, determined on vengeance. 'Othmän denied that the letter was genuine, and even insinuated that it had been forged by his enemies in order to ruin him. Although official tradition shows a tendency to attribute this forger-y to Marwan, there is also the trace of other versions and even of one (preserved by al-Balâdhuri alone), which says that 'Othmân suspected 'Ali; this, by the way, is what Caetani had suspected without knowing of this text (Annali, viii., p. 159). Whatever we may think of this suspicious episode (we know well that the manufacture of false documents intended to bring ruin upon an adversary who cannot be defeated otherwise has been regularly practised in ancient as well as modern times), it is certain that, while it was the immediate cause of the tragic end of 'Othmân, events had already begun to move. A regular siege of 'Othmän's house was set up; the conduct of the old Companions who remained in veiled opposition was of the most hypocritical character; without having the courage to share in the depositions of the caliph by violence, and without the desire to help him against the rebels, they, 'Ali in particular, maintained an attitude of malevolent neutrality. 'A'isha, the widow of the Prophet, who had conducted a violent campaign against 'Othmân, preferred to slip away at the last moment on the pretext of a pilgrimage to Mecca. Reduced to the last extremity, 'Othmân mustered all his dignity and refused to abdicate. After a siege, the length of which is given differently in the different sources, a number of men penetrated into the house in the last days of 35 (June 656) led by Muhammad b. Abî Bakr (the son of the first caliph and brother of 'A'isha) who raised his hand against 'Othmân. We do not know if it was he or another (tradition gives several names and it is evident that the exact details were of course altered to give place to the caliph. His blood bowed, it is said, upon the copy of the Kûr'ân which he was reading when attacked; his wife, the Khalî Nâ'ila bint al-Furâ'îs, was wounded. The house was pillaged. During the night the body was buried with the greatest secrecy by his wife and some friends. The troops sent by Mu'âwîya from Syria (too late, says tradition, accusing him of duplicity) received the news of the murder when half way there and quickly returned home.

We know how the new caliph was elected in the midst of tumult and terror (cf. Caetani, Annali, ix., 321–342); it shows, the author of this article thinks, that there was no previous arrangement among the principal Companions, each of whom probably thought he could deal with events as they arose. The election of 'Ali was without doubt due, even more than to the prestige given him by his close relationship and alliance with the Prophet, to the support of the Anṣâr who in the confusion in the Umayyad party had resumed control over their own town. But the new government from the first was destined to be challenged either by the unsuccessful rivals or by Mu'âwîya, the only one of the Umayyad governors who had remained master of his province. Political unity, and soon also the religious unity, of Islam was now at an end and the period of schisms and civil wars had begun. The caliphate of 'Othmân and its bloody end mark a turning point in Muslim history and give to the third caliph an importance which his true personality, a somewhat mediocre one at best, would never have merited.

Bibliography: The sources and earlier works are collected and summed up in Caetani, Anna's dell'Islam, VII. and viii., Milan 1914–1918 (cf. also by the same author Chronographia Islamica, p. 279–388). The only historical text of importance still unpublished, the Anmâb al-Ashraf of al-Balâdhuri, is in course of publication by the University of Jerusalem. The part relating to 'Othmân, edited by D. S. F. Goitein (who has lent the writer in his notes corrections and complements in many points the material already available but does not supply much that is new. We may also expect shortly the publication of the long biography of 'Othmân in the Tarikh
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O'THMÁN b. MAẒÚN b. ḤABÍB . . . ABU ḬÁṢŠÁH of the Kuráish clan of Djumáh, one of the earliest Companions of Muḥammad, the thirteenth man to adopt Islaâm. He took part in the hajjra to Abyssinia, returned, like some other refugees, on the false news of a reconciliation between Muḥammad and his pagan enemies and became for some time the client of al-Ḍáli b. al-Muqghira. Soon he renounced this privilege, because he preferred to bear his share in the insults offered to his co-religionists in Mecca. On a quarrel between O'Thmân and the poet Labid see Ibn Hishâm, p. 342—344.

O'Thmân took part in the hajjra to Medina where he found lodging with Umma al-Ṭâbi'a. When Muḥammad formed pairs of "brothers" between the Muḥammad and Anṣār, O'Thmân was associated with Abu ᬏ' Ḥārîb b. al-Taiyŷhân. He took part in the battle of Badr and died in the following year, 3 A.H., according to all accounts in the year 4. He was the first Muslim buried in Baqţ al-Qaqrâd. This affection in which Muḥammad held him was seen in the grief he showed at the sight of his corpse. Nevertheless Muḥammad is said to have reproved his widow Khawâila bint Ḥakîm al-Sulamiyya for using language, more natural than theological, and saying her dead husband was one of the inhabitants of Paradise.

In Tradition O'Thmân is the most characteristic representative of the ascetic tendencies which were not entirely foreign to primitive Islaâm. He abstained from wine before this beverage was prohibited. He neglected his wife who did not fail to complain to Aţîsha whereupon Muḥammad tried to divert him from a too rigorous asceticism by suggesting that he should follow his example. The tradition is also very well known according to which he asked Muḥammad to permit him to castrate himself, a request which the Prophet did not at all consider with favour.


O'THMÁN DAN FODIO. [See Pul.]

O'THMÁN ABD BAKR DIGNA (Dikna), governor and general of the Mahdîya in the Eastern Sudan from 1883 onwards, born in Sawâkîn about 1830 (cf. Shukair, ii, 200; Dietrich, P. 509), was according to some a descendant of Kurîd b. Diyar Bakr who had come in 1517 under Sulîmân Selim to Sawâkîn and intermarried with the Hadenowa. The resulting family of the Dignâ (Dikna) settled in Erkowit (Arkowit) west of Sawâkîn. Shukair mentions several relations of O'Thmân: two brothers, Muḥammad and the slave dealer 'Ali, a half-brother Ahmad Digna, two nephews, Madani b. 'Ali and Muḥammad Fâ'î, emir of Kassala. O'Thmân gave them appointments in the army and in the administration. Ahmad Digna and Madani both fell in fighting in the Eastern Súdân.

Down to the outbreak of the Mahdist rising, O'Thmân was a trader, dealing especially in slaves between the Ḥajjâra and the Súdân. The prohibition of the slave-trade by the Egyptian government in 1877 affected not only his livelihood and his liberty — he and his brother 'Ali suffered a period of imprisonment in Djidda — but also his religious conviction that the slave-trade was a permitted one. Even then his religious fanaticism displayed itself in his joining the Egyptian besieging force of the Majdisdî. On hearing of the coming of the Mahdi Muḥammad Ahmad [q.v.], "he migrated to him" (hadinâra), met him shortly after the fall of el-Obeid (al-Usâiyid) in 1883 and took the oath of obedience to him (bâjûr). Henceforth he was blindly devoted to the Mahdîya and retained his allegiance to it until his imprisonment.

It is evidence of the Mahdî's keen judgment that he at once recognised O'Thmân's extraordinary abilities and in a proclamation to the tribes of the eastern Sudan on May 8, 1883 (in Shukair, iii, 203 sqq.) appointed him governor-general (Ca'mit 'Anna, over the till then peaceful tribes of the Beidjâ, between the Atbara and the Red Sea (with the towns of Sawâkîn, Tôkar and Kassala). These tribes who did not speak Arabic and had never been ruled by an Arab, readily gave obedience to their kinsman O'Thmân who was not only well known to them through years of friendly commerce but also knew their language and ways.

O'Thmân's activity from 1883 to 1900 falls into two periods. In the first (1883—1891) as leader of the Mahdist rising in the eastern Sudan he carried out the important task of protecting the eastern frontier of the Mahdîya against the Anglo-Egyptian government, which made it possible for the Mahdî to concentrate his forces on the Nile. In the second period (till 1900) after the loss of the eastern Súdân, he was still general of the Mahdîya along with others in the service of the Khalîfâ 'Abdullâh against the English under Kitchener.

I. The events of the first period which he opened from Erkowit with the encounter at Sinkât on Aug. 5, 1883, were at first concerned with Sawâkîn. The details of this fighting are given by Shukair, iii 200 sqq., 233 sqq., 400 sqq., 518 sqq., 601 sqq. The main object was not so much the taking of Sawâkîn and other towns as the command of the roads between Sawâkîn and Berber, the shortest and most convenient route to the Nile. O'Thmân is entitled to the merit of having for seven years successfully closed this road to the government. In contrast to this, the results of the actual fighting were of little significance on either side. O'Thmân defeated the Egyptians under Maḥmûd Pâshâ at el-Téb (Nov. 5, 1883), destroyed an Egyptian expedition at al-Tamânî (Dec. 1883), undertook the siege of Sawâkîn, Sinkât and Tôkar, defeated Bâker Pâshâ in a second battle at el-Téb (Feb. 4, 1884), on Feb. 8 forced Sinkât to surrender and on Feb. 24 Tôkar, but on Feb. 29, 1884 suffered a severe defeat at el-Téb and again itself on March 13 and 27 at Tamâl at the hands of General Graham, which checked him for a time but did not cause him to withdraw. It was not until March 1885 that he began new operations from Tamâl, Tell Hâshîm and Tôkar, with little success.
because the tribes which composed his army threatened to disperse, fearing English intervention. Nevertheless, he succeeded again and again in inspiring the undisciplined masses with enthusiasm, not by the fact that he transferred the centre of his activities to Kassala and Abyssinia. The years 1854—1855 mark the zenith of his career. He incited the people of Kassala by Mahdist pamphlets; after the death of the Mahdi on June 22, 1855 and the fall of Kassala he was sent there by the Khalifa 'Abdallahi, as the only higher official of the Mahdi (not related to the Khalifa) who had remained in his position, and from there waged war on the Amārēr and the Abyssinians. He compensated himself for the failure of his Abyssinian campaign by a savage treatment of the people of Kassala. As he was continually threatening Sawākinn and even went so far as to draw trenches round the town and begin a regular siege from Handīb, Kitchener, who was then in command at Sawākinn, forced him after a series of defeats to retire to Tūkār. Othmān's population then took refuge in a desert, alienated by his strictness and severity and the continual warfare. The exhaustion of the Mahdists was so great that the Khalifa allowed Othmān to resume trading between Sawākinn and the Mahdiya via Handīb, but this was stopped on the opening of the final struggle between the Mahdists and the Anglo-Egyptian government, and the result was famine among the Mahdists. The oppression of Kassala by Muhammad Fāi, sent there as emir by his uncle Othmān, induced the Khalifa to summon Othmān to Omdurman ['q. v.]. He returned with full approval of his conduct with his conquests, and was made a prince, and his army, which had been scattered, Othmān fled abandoned by everyone to the mountains between Kassala and Berber. The country between the Atbara and the Red Sea was lost to the Mahdists; Berber and Kassala were open to the English and Italians. Othmān was taken by the Khalifa to Adārāma on the Atbara, where in addition to buying himself with agriculture he endeavoured to raise a new army which was to hold the Atbara line.

II. When at the beginning of the decisive campaign against the Mahdiya, Kitchener conquered Berber in 1897, Othmān came to the front again. He led an army over the Nile at Shendi and joined his fellow-general Mahmūd. They were both defeated and Mahmūd was taken prisoner. In the battle that followed at Omdurman (Sept. 2, 1898) he attempted in vain to check the flight of the dervishes with a strong force between the Surghām hills and the Nile. After the defeat he accompanied the Khalifa on his flight until the latter's death at Gadid (Nov. 24, 1899), refused to surrender, escaped across the White Nile and Atbara into the Werriha mountains and endeavoured with the help of the Shaikh of the Dāmilāt to cross the Red Sea into the Hidjaz. Through the treachery of the Shaikh he fell into the hands of the authorities of Sawākinn on Jan. 18, 1900, and was sent to prison in Damietta where Shukār saw and spoke with him in 1903 (see 'Bibliography'). To the kindness of the Royal Egyptian Embassy in Berlin I owe the following data of Othmān's later career: Othmān's imprisonment took place on Jan. 12, 1900; he was brought to Rosetta, from there to Tūrūn near Wāḍī Hālā. After some years his lot was relieved; he was allowed to retain his property in Berber, but did not take any interest therein. In 1924, at a great age, he made the pilgrimage to Mecca; after his return to Wāḍī Hālā he settled outside the town, where he died in 1926; he was buried there. Othmān Digna was the model of a primitive unbroken nature. He was the type of the fanatical Mahdī, noteworthy as the only non-Arab to hold high office in the Mahdiya. He was an imposing figure as described by Shukār, iii. 200 (German by Dietrich, p. 49). Not only did he know the languages of the tribes placed under him but he also spoke and wrote Arabic fluently (a specimen of his concise style is given by Shukār, iii. 206 sqq.). Courage verging on foolhardiness and cleverness which seized upon the slightest advantage, strictness to the verge of cruelty, and a stubbornness in following up his goal, from which even the severest defeats could not turn him, were combined in him with an ecstatic piety—Shukār described his ecstatic fits in prison (iii. 204). He lived almost exclusively on a vegetables diet. From the time of the coming of the Mahdi he went without sandals and shoes and used riding-beasts only for longer journeys. He was therefore, along with Wādī Nadjīm and Abu 'Andalā, the most important Mahdī general and the most dreaded enemy of the government.

'Bibliography': Na'im Bey Shukār, Tārīkh al-Sīdān, int., Cairo 1903; E. L. Dietrich, Der Mahdī Muḥammad Ahmad vom Sīdān nach arabischen Quellen, Berlin 1925, p. 49 sqq. (with further literature). — Cf. also the article Muḥammad Atmād (Ernst Ludwig Dietrich).

'Othmān, the chief town in a 'gâd of Amasiya in the wilāyēt of Siwas ['q. v.] in Turkey in Asia, lies in a picturesque position at the foot of a volcanic hill which rises straight out of the plain and is crowned by a castle which formerly commanded the celebrated bridge said to have been built by Bâyazīd I. The settlement is probably very old as is evident from the numerous rock chambers cut out of the cliffs. The number of inhabitants according to Maercker (1893) was about 5,000 and they lived in 920 houses. It is connected by road with Merzifūn in the east and with Tosia in the west. The importance of the place however lies entirely in the part it has played in history. The name Othmān is connected with that of Othmān I ['q. v.], the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, and it is said that Othmān I took his name from this place which had been granted him as a fief. This suggestion, which is found as early as the 15th century, is probably for the first time in the Geschichte von der Türkise von Meister Jör. v. Nürnberg, Memmingen n.d. but about 1496, and again in Spandugino, von Busbeck etc.), has little claim to credibility although it has been revived in modern times e.g. by Cl. Huart, in 'J.A., ser. 11, vol. ix., 1917, p. 345 sqq. and by H. J. Kramers, in Acta Orient., vi., 1927, p. 242 sqq.; cf. thereon W. L. Langer and R. P. Blake, in American Historical Review, xxxvii. (1932), 496, note with other references. It is probable that Othmān is the arabised form of a Turkish name which may have sounded something like Atman, Asman and we must not forget Ibn 'Abdūl's assertion that the founder of the dynasty called himself Othmānikī, i.e. 'Little Othmān' to distinguish himself from the third caliph. The
Turkish sources are contradictory: Hâdîdd Khâlîfâ says that the town of 'Othmânîn signals its name from the fact that in the 8th (h) century a leader named 'Othmân conquered it. Elvîsî Çelebi (1647-1648) says (ii. 180 sqq.) that many see in 'Othmânîn the birth-place of the emir 'Othmân. This opinion had become the current one about the middle of the xviiith century, as may be seen from a passage in Les Voyages et Observations of François le Gouz (Paris 1655, p. 65). The place does not appear in the clearer light of history till 1392 when it was taken by Bâyazid I from the lord of Kastamuni, Bâyazid Kutumân, and definitely incorporated in the Ottoman empire. The fact is worth mentioning that there was evidently a considerable Bektash settlement here at an early date and the tomb of the famous Bektash saint Kûyun Baba (q.v.) in 'Othmânîzê has always been much visited. The inhabitants according to Hâdîdd Khâlîfâ belonged almost entirely to the order of the Bektashis. Cf. on this point in 1546 Le Voyage de Monsieur d'Aramon, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1887, p. 66 (where Cochyin Baba should be read Kûyun-Baba). — Makarins of Antioch mentions a place called 'Othmânîk near Ma'înash. He visited the site where there was said to have been formerly a large town of this name also mentioned Osman Dada (= 'Othmân Dede) (Travels, ii. 453 sqq.).


'ÔTHMÂN-ZADE AHMAD TÀHIR, a notable Ottoman poet, scholar and historian of the end of the xviiith and first third of the xviiiith century. The son of the rûmûnmâ (müslîm tzcrrêdîfi) of the pious foundations, 'Othmân Efendi, he took up a theological career. The year of his birth is not recorded. From 1609 (1687) he held the post of mûdîrîs in various medreses in Constantinople. At intervals he worked also in other places. For example in 1607 (1665) he went to Damascus with Kemânkeh Mehmed Pasha when the latter was appointed governor there. In 1124 (1712) he was appointed mûdîrîs at the Sultanîyé, a post he had aimed at from the very beginning. He then went as chief judge (Hâlîb mollaî) to Aleppo in 1126 (1716) and lastly as Mîr mollaî (chief justice of Cairo) to Cairo, where he died at the end of his year of office on the 2nd Râmâdzân 1136 (May 25, 1724). According to Brusali Mehmed Tahir, there is in existence a biography of 'Othmân-zade composed by Ibn al-Emîn Mahmîd Kemîl Bey.

'Ôthmân-zade was regarded by his contemporaries as the most important poet of his period. He was particularly celebrated for his chronograms (kâ'îlî) and kîfî. A chronogram on the birth of prince İbrâhîm (1133 = 1720-1721) made such an impression on Sultan Ahmed III (1115-1143 = 1703-1730) that he gave 'Othmân-zade the title kîng of poets (mûrîite [sûlûan] al-hâdîthî) and granted him a special hâdîî. 'Othmân-zade left behind him a divân of the usual type (muretteb divân) which consists of 12 kašîdas, 32 chronograms and 77 ghazels. Along with these are isolated poems, e.g. a satire (hâdîî) on Şakîk Efendi composed in 1124 (1712). He also wrote in verse a commentary on the 40 hadîîs entitled Şarîh-İ Hâdîî-İ 40, which, although also known as Şarîh-İ 40, it was written in 1125 (1715).

It is however to his prose works that he owes his fame with posterity, especially his historical works, some of which are still popular and valuable at the present day. The most important is his biographical collection Hâdîkat al-Wusûrâ, a most estimable and still important collection of lives of the first 92 grand viziers of the Ottoman empire, from 'Alî al-Dîn 'Ali Pasha to Râmi Mehmed Pasha who was dismissed in 1115 (1703). The work was composed six years before his death. It was printed at Constantinople in 1271 (1854). 'Othmân-zade's idea was later taken up by others. His biographical collection was continued by: Dilâwîr Ağa-zade 'Omar Efendi (Omar Wahtî), a friend of Rûfîhî Pasha's who wrote a Hâdîkat al-Wusûrî, also called Hâdîkat Munâmîbî-Ü Wusûrî-i 72, or Gullî Zîhî, which covers the period from the grand vizier Kowanos Ahmed Pasha to Şâd Mehmed Pasha; also by Ahmed Dâwûd Bey, who compiled a continuation entitled Wîrd al-Muṣîrû which covers the period 1172-1217 (1758-1802), from Rûfîhî Pasha to Yusuf Ziya Pasha, the conqueror of Egypt; finally by 'Abd al-Fettâh Şefkatî-Baghîddî entitled Berkî-û Feelî, covering the period 1217-1271 (1802-1854), from Ziya al-Dîn Yusuf Pasha to 'Alemdâr Muşfîl Pasha.

All three continuations are printed as an appendix to the Hâdîkat of 'Othmân-zade, while the later continuation with Rûfîf Efendi: Wîrd al-Hâdîtî appeared in a lithograph separately while the continuation with Mehmed Şâd Şerhi-zade entitled: Hâdîkat al-Wusûrî, or Gullî Zîhî or Gullîkûn-i Muîlûk, which deals with 31 grand viziers from Nihâzîmdî Ahmed or Sûlîhîdar Mehmed Pasha, to Şâd Mehmed Pasha, is still only available in MSS.

The two sketches of Turkish history by 'Othmân-zade also attained great popularity. The longer: Hâdîkat Munâmîbî (or Tewûrîhî) or Şâdîfâ-î Âlî 'Othmân deals with the first 24 Ottoman sultans, from the founder of the dynasty to Ahmed III. The shorter version: Fikristi Şihhân or Fikristî Şihhân-î Âlî 'Othmân or Muht大咖-î Tâvîkhî Şâdîfâ-î or Şâdîfâ-î Muîlûk or Hâdîkat al-Muîlûk covers the period from 'Othmân to Muşfîa II. The number of varying titles shows the popularity of the work. The book, sometime quoted as Fâdîlî-î Âlî 'Othmân, dedicated to Pândâm İbrâhîm Pasha, seems to be only a variant title of one of these books.

In the year of his death (1136 = 1724) 'Othmân-zade wrote a history of Fâdîl al-Mehmed Pasha entitled: Tâvîkhî Fâdîl Ahmed Pasha, which like most of his works is only accessible in MSS. The Munâzâra-i Dâwelethî (struggle between the two kingdoms) in the form of questions and answers is also dedicated to İbrâhîm Pasha (MS. in Vienna).
and is an interesting contribution to the very highly developed muğāra literatures.

As further independent works may be mentioned: Iğdır Nâşîh al-Hikâmâ and Taḥfât al-Nu'mân. Here we may mention his anthology Dhâmil al-Leqâ'il (a collection of anecdotes, jests etc.). His stylistic collection Muğâla'tâ Taḥf Efendi was intended for practical purposes; it is a collection of letters in three parts and a concluding chapter.

His extracts from and editions and translations of other works are very numerous. The greater part of his work is collected in his Kulliyât with an introduction by Āhmâd Ḥanîf-zâde. Some titles cited by von Hammer and Brassal Meşmed Tâhir which apparently go back to Ḥanîf-zâde, the compiler of the Kâṣîf al-Ẓamînî of Ḥâdîjî Khîlîfah, are probably not correct and refer to double or subsidiary titles. Translations by him are: Shamsîr al-Anwar and Shamsîr Sharîf, the latter entitled: Tağwîl al-Muṣâfîrî on Ḥadîth. — Extracts from or versions of other works are: Aḥkâm-i Muṣâfîn (or Muṣâhaṣa-râr-i Aḥkâm-i Muṣâfîn or Khâlîṣat al-Aḥkâh) from the works of Ḥunain b. Ṭāhâ-ghifîn, who is known as Wâdî al-Herewî (d. 910 = 1504). The actual work which was written in Persan for Mîrzâ Muḥsin b. Ḥusain al-Bâirakâra was translated by Pîr Meşmed known as Ḡhârimî, with the title Anis al-Arîfîn in 974 (1566); Aḥkâm-i ʿAlî, an extract from the work of ʿAlî b. ʿAmr ʿAlîn, known as Ibn Ḥanîfî (Kânîl-zâde) which was written for the ʿEmîr al-ʿUmârî of ʿShâm, ʿAbî Pâshâ, and therefore called after him. The Manâṣîh-i Ḳîmû-i ʿarâm, i.e. of ʿAbî Ḥanîfah. We also have from his pen a synopsis of the Ḥumâyûn-nâmê. The Anwar-i Suhaîlî, the Persian version of Ibn Maḳâfî's Arabic version from the original Indian (Pahlavi) of Ḥîdîpî was the work of Ḥusain Wâdî ʿAlînâfî, court-preacher to Ḥusain Bâirakâra of Herât. This Anwar-i Suhaîlî was translated into Ottoman Turkish by ʿAbî al-Wâṣîfî (ʿĀlî Mollâ ʿĀlî Ĉelîh b. Ṣâlih, known as ʿĀlî Wâṣîfî or Ṣâlih-zâde al-Rûmî with the title Humâyûn-nâmê and dedicated to Sulțân Sulaimân. ʿOthmân-zâde abbreviated the Humâyûn-nâmê to about a third of its length. This version was printed in Constantinople in 1256 under the title Tâmâr al-Āṣmâ. In the Kulliyât this extract is entitled Zubât al-Nâṣîhî.

The version of the Naṣîhîh (Naṣîhât al-Muṭâbîk of Re's Efendi Sarî ʿAbî ʿAlînî entitled Taḥfîṣ al-Hikam is also described as a synopsis of the Humâyûn-nâmê. A synopsis of the Maqālisîs al-Aḥkâh of ʿAlî is also attributed to ʿOthmân-zâde. Bibliography: Salim, Tristere, Constantinople 1781, 181; Pâshâ, Tristere, Constantinople 1271, p. 32; Ḥâdîjî Khîlîfah, Kaṭîf al-Ẓamînî, ed. Flugel, esp. however Ḥanîf-zâde, Novâ Opera (Aḥkâh-i new) ibid. in vol. vi.; do., Kaṭîf al-Ẓamînî, Constantinople 1321, i. 428; Thûreyyîa, Siḏîlî-i ʿoṭmânî, i. 242; Muʿallaṃ Nâḏğ, Esâmî, Constantinople 1308, p. 92; Şâmī, Khâmûs al-Ālîm, iii. 1261; Brussel Meşmed Tâhir, ʿOthmânî Mûṭâbîkî, ii. 110-117; Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 238; do., G. O. D., iv. 120-131; Babinger, G. O. W., p. 254 sqq. a. o.; The MS. Catalogues by Flugel (Vienna); Fessich (Berlin); Auum (Munich); Reiu (Boz. Museum); Uppsala, N. 292.

OTRÂ, a town on the right bank of the Sir Darya (Saḥûn), a little south of its tributary the Aris. The name is found as a geographical term for the first time in Vâqît (i. 310) as Uṭrâr but Tabari (iii. 815-816) already knows of a prince called Uṭrâr-banda as a rebel vassal of the Caliph al-Maʿmûn. The place that Maḳâdisi calls Taḥrâr Zârîk (B G A, iii. 263, 274) in the district of Isbâhân must be quite a different place. Uṭrâr may perhaps be the same as the capital of the district of Fârâb [q. v.], a town which replaced the older one of Kadar (mentioned by ʿĪsâ Ḥâfîzî and Ibn Ḥâfîzî) and called Fârâb by Maḳâdisî (Bârâb on p. 273). The town of Uṭrâr acquired a melancholy fame through the part it played at the time of Čingîz Kâhân's invasion. It was then a frontier town of the empire of the Khârîzmdâh Muhammad, who had captured it in 1210 from the Čirâh Kâhû. The town was at that time under the command of Taşi-dîn Bîlî-ḡî Kâhân who was giving trouble to his new ruler. In 1218, there came to Uṭrâr a great caravan of 450 people (Djuwainî), all Muslims, sent by the conquering Mongol to open up commercial and peaceful relations with the Muḥammadian empire. Detained at first by the commandant Inâlîk, either because he thought they were spies or simply because he coveted their wealth, they were later all massacred and the commandant seized their merchandise. One source (Nasawî) throws upon the sulṭân a part of the responsibility for this deed; in any case when an ambassador came from Čingîz Kâhân to complain of the outrage and demand the surrender of Inâlîk, he refused to hand him over and put the envoy to death. This made war inevitable. In 1219, Čingîz Kâhân appeared with a Mongol army on the Sir Darya and laid siege to Uṭrâr. The town was taken after several months' siege and Inâlîk was captured and sent to ʿAṣurarûm to be executed. It was from Uṭrâr that the Mongol armies set out which conquered the empire of the Khârîzmdâhs. Uṭrâr still existed at the beginning of the xvth century for Timûr Lâng died there in 1405 ('Ali Yârdî, Zafar-nâmê, ii. 646). The site of Uṭrâr is now only indicated by ruins.


OUĐH (AWADH), a district now forming part of the United Provinces of modern India, has an area of 24,154 square miles and a population of 12,794,979, of which 11,870,266 are to be found in the rural districts (Census of India, 1931).

From very early times Oudh and the neighbouring countries of the great alluvial plain of northern India have been the peculiar home of Hindu civilization. The ancient Hindu kingdom of Kosala corresponded very nearly to the present province of Oudh. Its capital, Ayodhya, the modern Adi-Jodhya, on the river Gogra, is supposed to have been the residence of Daqarath, the father of Rama whose
exploits are recorded in the Rāmāyana. Here too arose a number of religious reactions against the sacralotalism and the social exclusiveness of Brāhma-
nism.

The Apart from plundering raids, such as Maḥmūd of Ghaznū's attack upon Manasī and the doubtful exploits of Sāhir Maṣūd Ghāzī recorded in the Mirāž-i Maṣūd of 'Alīd al-Raḥmān čishti, it was not until the last decade of the twelfth century, in the days of Kūth-al-Dīn Aḥbāb [sic Aḥbāb], that the Muslim invaders established themselves in Oudh and annexed it to the Dīlī Supānāt. It definitely formed a province of Muḥammad b. Ṭughlūk's extensive empire, but, towards the close of the fourteenth century, it was absorbed by the Shāfīi kingdom of Dīawnpūr [q. v.]. Under the Ṭodīs [q. v.] it was once more part of the Supānāt.

In the days of Akbar [q. v.] it formed a gōra of his empire, extending from the Ganges on the south-west to the Gadak on the north-east, and from the river Sai in the south to the Tarāl of Nepāl in the north. According to Abu 'l-Fadl, it was divided into five sarkārs and thirty-eight parganas (Ādāb Aḥbāb, in Bibliotheca India, ii. 170—177 [vol. Jarrett], 1864). Local traditions in Oudh, however, agree with the Muslim accounts and declare that the Rādjiut chiefs maintained their authority practically intact throughout the Moghul period (W. C. Benett, The Chief Clans of the Roy Bareilly District, 1893). The weakness of the central government under Awrangžīb's successors gave the nawāb of Oudh an opportunity of asserting their independence, although nominally they still acknowledged the authority of the Moghul emperor.

Saḥādat Khān Bāhān al-Mulk, the real founder of the Oudh dynasty, was descended from a respectable Sayid family of Nishāpūr (Muḥammad al-Lutūd of Khāfī Khān, ii. 902). During his nawāshīp (1722—1739) he both maintained internal order and extended his dominions so as to embrace Benares, Ghāzāpur, Dīawnpūr and Čunār. His successor, Saḥīl Dīang (1739—1754), was appointed wazīr of the empire in the year 1748. It was he who invited the Mārāchās to assist him against the Rohillas, the engagements entered into at that time forming the basis of future Mārāchā claims on Rohilkhand. His son and successor, the nawāb-wazīr Shudijī al-Dawla (1754—1775), came into conflict with the rising power of the English East India Company and was totally defeated at Baksar in 1764. This left Oudh at the disposal of the Company. By the treaty of Allahābad (1765) Oudh was restored to Shudijī al-Dawla with the exception of Kora and Allahābad, which were given to the emperor for the upkeep of his dignity. British relations with this buffer state between Bengal and the Mārāchās were placed on a firmer footing by the treaty of Benares (1773) which fixed the subsidy for British troops at 210,000 rupees a month. At the same time Kora and Allahābad were sold to the ruler of Oudh for fifty lakhs of rupees, because the emperor had deserted the Company and surrendered these districts to the Mārāchās.

The ascension of the incapable Āqā al-Dawla (1775—1797) enabled the hostile majority on Warren Hastings's council to raise the subsidy to 260,000 rupees per mensem and to force the new nawāb to cede Benares, Dīawnpūr and Ghāzāpur in full sovereignty to the Company. At Čunār, in 1781, Hastings attempted to reform the wazīr's administration and to afford him relief by reducing the number of English troops in Oudh. His share in the resumption of the dīvos and in the sequestration of the fāgūn of Oudh formed one of the charges against him on impeachment.

In 1801 Lord Wellesley forced Saḥādat 'Ali Khān (1798—1814) to cede the whole of Rohilkhand and part of the 108th, the revenues of which were devoted to the payment of the subsidiary force. Saḥādat 'Ali Khān was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghāzī al-Dīn Hīdar, who was the first ruler of Oudh to assume the title of king. The remaining kings of Oudh were Nāṣir al-Dīn Hīdar (1827—1837), Muḥammad 'Ali Shāh (1837—1842), Amīndād 'Ali Shāh (1842—1847) and Wādīdī 'Ali Shāh (1847—1856).

It was a provision of the treaty of 1801 that the ruler of Oudh should introduce into his country a system of administration conducive to the prosperity of his subjects and calculated to secure their lives and property. In spite of repeated warnings nothing was done and misgovernment continued unchecked. On these grounds Oudh was annexed by Lord Dalhousie in 1856. Wādīdī 'Ali Shāh received a pension and was allowed to reside at Calcutta where he died in 1887, his title expiring with him.

On annexation Oudh was controlled by a Chief Commissioner, until, in 1877, both Agra and Oudh were placed under the same administrator, who was known as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and Chief Commissioner of Oudh. The title of Chief Commissioner was dropped on the formation of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in 1902. It was not, however, until 1921 that this administration was raised to the status of a Governor's province.

The first land revenue settlement after annexation was carried out with a lack of consideration for the great taluqdāris families of the province, who were ousted from the greater part of their estates. This was reversed after the Mutiny when Canning reverted to a talukdāri settlement and confirmed the rights of the taluqdāris by sanads.

To-day in Oudh Muḥammadans are to be found chiefly where they held sway in the past, their preference for urban life explaining their presence in the chief towns. Although the population is predominantly Hindu it is interesting to note that in the last decade Muslims have increased nearly twice as rapidly as Hindus. This is largely the result of social customs which permit Muslim widows to remarry and do not favour early marriages. Conversion has not affected these figures, for the tabīla movement on the part of Muslims was countered by the shudhī and sanāgan movements on the part of Hindus.


(COLIN DAVIES)

OUDJA (WAJDA), a town in Eastern Morocco, eight miles from the Algerian frontier in the southern part of the vast plain of Angad. It was founded in 394 (994) by Ziri b. 'Atiya chief of the great Zenata tribe of the Maghribi. We shall give a résumé of the events that led up to its foundation. In the course of the fighting between the Sanhaja and the Zenata, the latter had been driven towards the extreme Maghrib. Supporters of the Umayyads of Cordova, they had loyally defended their imperial policy in Barbary, especially in the time of the great minister Ibn Abi 'Amir al-Mansur. Ziri b. 'Atiya al-Maghrawi, who had proved himself a particularly valuable ally, was allowed to occupy with his tribe the environs of Fas. He seized the opportunity to expel from the city the Banu Ifran, another important tribe, who had established themselves there. Not however having full confidence in the Umayyad minister, of whose policy he disapproved, and not feeling secure in the vicinity of or in the town of Fas, and wishing to be in touch with the central Maghrib which was the real country of his tribe, he founded the town of Oudja and garrisoned it with his troops; he brought his possessions there and put one of his relatives in it as governor. The foresight of the founder was justified; in 424 (1033) the Banu Ifran having reoccupied Fas the emir Hammanama, one of the successors of Ziri, took refuge in Oudja.

According to al-Bakri, about the middle of the xth century (after 440—1048), a new quarter surrounded by a wall was added to the original nucleus by a chief of the Outaghnîm (r). The great mosque was outside of the two towns.

During the period of Umayyad expansion Yusuf b. Tashfin occupied Oudja in 472 (1079). In the middle of the xth century it became an Almoravid town. In the reign of the Almoravid al-Nasir, when the Banu Ghaniya, hoping to restore the power of the Almoravids, came from the south of Tunisia and extended their ravages into the region of Tlemcen, the fortifications of Oudja were repaired and strengthened (Kifr, p. 203; transl. p. 194).

It was however mainly after the installation of the 'Abd al-Wadillah in Tlemcen [q. v.] that the town of Oudja "the bulwark of the extreme Maghrib" (Ibn Khaldun) was summoned to play an important strategic part. Belonging to the kingdom of Tlemcen, it was the first place encountered by the Marrakhis of Fas when they invaded the lands of their hereditary enemies and the first victim of their attacks. In 670 (1271) the Marinid Abû Yusuf having defeated Yaghmurâsân, the king of Tlemcen, near Oudja, laid the town in ruins. In 695 (1260) the Marinid Abû Ya'kûb having fortified his own frontier town of Tahtirr seized Oudja and destroyed its defences. In the following year he seems to have wished to make Oudja a base for his future expeditions. He rebuilt it; he erected a palace there, a citadel which he called the "great Maghrib" (probably that which still exists) and began the siege of Tlemcen which lasted eight years. In 714 (1314) the Marinid Abû Sa'id delivered a fierce attack on Oudja which resisted and, presumably leaving troops in front of it to immobilise the garrison, he went on towards Tlemcen. In 735 (1335) Abu 'l-Hasan besieged Oudja: it was taken and the fortifications dismantled. In 772 (1371), Tlemcen being occupied by the Marinids and Oudja being also in their hands, the Arab tribes of the region took the side of the dispossessed 'Abd al-Waddis and laid siege to the town.

Of these Abu 'Abd Allah of the great tribe of Ma'kili, were on this occasion supporting the cause of Tlemcen, it was not always so. They were for a long time on the side of the Marinids and were a serious danger to the 'Abd al-Waddis on whose frontiers they were.

The tribes of the region, Arab as well as Berber, were also closely involved in the fighting in the xvi th down to the xix th century between the Turks of Algeria and the Moroccan suljans. In the town itself there were clans which supported each side. Authority passed from one side to the other, but it was only a relative authority, enjoyed precariously and intermittently. The dispute between the Maghrib and the suljan's orders were fully carried out, Oudja formed part of his empire; if on the other hand the country was troubled and the power of the sovereign weakened, Oudja went with the province of Tlemcen and belonged to the "Turks" (Voinot). One of the few periods during which the authority of the sherif was firmly established in this remote province was the reign of Moulay Isma'il (1082—1139 = 1672—1727), who brought to Oudja Arabs from the south of Marrakesh, formed them into a dîlah [q. v.], strengthened the defences of the town, built several kasbas around it and organised the tribes of the plain. After his death the country lapsed into insecurity and anarchy. The Turks reappeared. Finally in 1795, a Sherifian force again took possession of Oudja which henceforth remained under Moroccan rule. An 'amil (governor) represented the suljan in it.

In 1844 after the battle of Isly, the town was temporarily occupied by the French as a punishment for the help given to 'Abd al-Kadir by the suljan. The French troops reappeared (there in 1859 and finally occupied it in 1907.

Oudja, a town of old Morocco, where local government was non-existent had become a haunt of smugglers and fugitives from Algerian justice; it has been cleansed of all suspicious elements. The town, surrounded by its wall which however only dates from 1866, is surrounded by modern suburbs and beautiful gardens. The population is now about 30,000 of whom half are Europeans.

Bibliography: al-Bakri, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, ed. de Slane, Algiers 1911, p. 77—78; transl. in F.A., 1859, ii. 160; Ibn Khaldun, Histoire des Berbires, ed. de Slane, ii. 44; transl., iii. 243 and passim; Ibn Abi
P[chrift]; bā-'i ʿārum or bā-'i ʿārum: the bā with three points subscript, invented for Persian as supplemental to the soft Arabic bā and to represent the hard labial. It is sometimes interchangeable with ba (e.g. ʾash and ʾash, ʾabūr and ʾabūr) and more frequently with fā (e.g. ʿafīl and ʿafīl, ʿaṭrā and ʿaṭrā). The regular use of the letter in manuscripts is comparatively modern, but it is found in good copies of some of the ninth-tenth century while at the same time it is often omitted in manuscripts of much later date (G. I., p. 112, p. 74).

(Re. LEVY)

PĀDĪSHĀH, the name for Muslim rulers, especially emperors. The Persian term pā-dī-
šāh, i.e. (according to M. Bitner in E. Oberhamer, Die Turken und das Osmanische Reich, Leipzig 1917, p. 105) "lord who is a royalty" in which the root pad is connected with Sanskrit pad, lord, husband, fem. padī. Greek pādēs, Lat. padus (G. Correa, Griech. Etymol., p. 377), was originally a title reserved exclusively for the sovereign, which in course of time and as a result of the long intercourse of the Ottomans with the states of the west also came to be used in the south-west of Europe. In the correspondence of the Porte with the western powers, the grand vizier Kuyucu Muṣṭafā Pasha (d. Aug. 5. 1612) probably for the first time applied the title pādīshāh to the Austrian emperor Rudolf II. At the conference of Nemirow (1737) Russia demanded the title for its Czars (cf. J. de Peyster, G. O. R., vi. 498) and claimed it again at the negotiations at Bucharest (1773; cf. ibid., viii. 412). When pādīshāh came to be applied to the sultan, the pādīšāh-i ʿolūmān, does not seem to be exactly known. In any case it is found in conjunction with all kinds of rhyming words as early as the beginning of the xviith century in Ottoman documents. Pādīshāh therefore may have come to be used towards the end of the xviith century, presumably instead of ḥājāt (from ḥājāt; cf. ʾalā, ser. ii., vol. xx., p. 276 and 572), an obsolete word, as well as suḥāf (cf. ʾalā, xi. 70) already found in dervish Sūfism, and was regularly used as the end of the sultān (cf. the ety. of pādīšāhīn: ʾin or bi ʿanā, with which the sultan was until quite lately greeted by his troops and subjects).

Bibliography: St. Kekulé, Uber Titel, Amhr. Rangstußen und Amtsräden in der offiziellen osmanischen Sprache. Halle a.d. S. 1892, p. 3 and P. Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie, Strassburg 1893, p. 61, No. 266 (where however another derivation is given, from Old Persian pad, protector, and šāh, ruler; cf. thereon Horn, in G. I., p., i, 112, 309 and i, i, 41, 88, 97, 159, where the Old Persian, Pahlavi etc. forms are given).

(Franz Baringer)

PADRĪ or PADRĪS, also "Pedaries" is the name given in Dutch literature to the people who wished to carry through by force a reformation of Islam in the early decades of the xviith century in Minangkabau (Central Sumatra). In explanation of this expression it may be said that, according to one opinion, the word is connected with Padrī, a harbour on the north coast of Sumatra, while, according to another, it corresponds to the word padrī (Port. padrē) used in several Indonesian languages meaning "Christian clergyman", whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. The last derivation cannot be supported, but the second is probably correct. It may be that Malayans, when asked by Dutchmen after the troubles, accommodated themselves to the linguistic level of the interrogators by designating the instigators as padrī as they laid special stress on the religious life. Such a case would not be unique in dealings of Dutchmen with natives. The Dutchmen then adopted the word and retained it; it also occurs sometimes as padrē in native sources. The usual native name however for the people called padrī by us was uang patich- "white men", a common term among Indonesian peoples for those who take their religious duties with particular seriousness and are distinguished by their white robes (van Runkel, in Indische Gids, 1915, ii. 1103). In the official reports and Dutch Colonial literature of the time, those who did not join the Padris are called "Malays", a misleading designation as the Padris were also Malays. Padris and non-Padris were of the same stock. A better name for those who held by the old custom is the "Adat party"; they formed the party who on every occasion tried to base their action on the traditional usage.

The Minangkabaus or Minangkabau Malays inhabit the central Sumatran highlands between about 1/2° N. lat. and 1/2° S. lat. From this mountainous country they have extended eastwards over the highlands which form the transition to the eastern Sumatran lowlands. To the west they reached the coast of the Indian ocean. Here there are several harbours which gave a connection with the outer world. It is generally supposed that the country was converted to Islam from Aijeh. The Achehnese held several points on the coast when the Dutch and English Trading Companies established themselves here.

Islam was firmly established in the country when the activity of the Padris began. There was a burning zeal for the faith, in certain circles at
least. In 1785, a spiritual leader came down from the mountains with some thousands of followers and disciples in order to circumcise the Christian population of the port of Padang, then the principle possession of the Dutch, and force them to adopt Islam (T. B. G. K. IV., v. 55). The Minangkabauans managed to combine a strongly Muhammadan outlook with the retention on a large scale of their old popular institutions. Matriarchy still prevails among them. The administration of a village is conducted by the leading heads of families, the various _uku_, i.e. union of families of different descent in common council. The form of government is republican. Every matter of any importance is considered by all the prominent families, their chiefs and other leading men ( _mupakè_. Ar. _muwasaţ_). It is a wearisome process, not calculated for speedy decisions. A society organised on these lines is naturally at a disadvantage against vigorous and powerful attacks.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century three Minangkabau pilgrims came home. They had seen Wahhabí rule in Mecca (after 1806). Filled with the puritan zeal of the Wahhabís, they set out to purify the religion of their own land. They were able to win over to their views a prominent theologian of the central district of Agam named Tuanku nan Rënjëh ( _tuanku_ is a title for a theologian). He at once set to work. He first of all insisted on the exact observance of the law, particularly in ceremonial. Popular customs which in his opinion were contrary to the _ghara_ were attacked, such as cock-fighting, which was associated with betting and was the most popular pastime of the people, dice, drinking of palm-wine, opium-smoking, betel-chewing, filing the teeth, wearing long nails, smoking tobacco. All these were forbidden. The prohibition of interest was insisted upon. The men were to cut their hair, let the beard grow and wear white clothes in the Arab style. The women were to wear veils. Finally the Padris dealt a blow to the matriarchal institutions by taking their women into their houses with them, (de Stuers, i. 183, footnote 3). The prohibitions of tobacco were directly taken from Wahhabí practice, while the other prohibitions and commands all find a place in the Shâfi'í school. It is also evident from Tuanku nan Rënjëh's attitude that he did not intend to institute Wahhabism. In the same district of Agam lived a highly respected and very influential teacher: Tuanku Kotâ tuâ; he was _guru_ tascat (Ar. _javâb_), a master of mysticism; to what order he belonged is not known. Mysticism of a popular kind is much cultivated in Minangkabau; Tuanku nan Rënjëh turned to him, not to quarrel with him but to seek his cooperation. The Tuanku Kotâ tuâ agreed that a strict observance of the law should be aimed at; but when Tuanku nan Rënjëh insisted that if any one did not perform the _gâfût_ correctly he was a _murā'id_ and was liable to the penalty of death as _hadd_, Tuanku Kotâ tuâ met him with the milder doctrine that the _murā'id_ should not be put to death, unless every effort to bring him to the true faith had failed, a case which however did not exist and was not to be expected. Tuanku nan Rënjëh now went his own way. After the Minangkabau custom, he summoned an assembly which was to approve his views. He met with enthusiastic approval from the theologians but with opposition from the chiefs; for the latter recognised at once that the Padri demands attacked their positions and would overthrow the whole social system. Tuanku nan Rënjëh went vigorously forward. With his own hand he stabbed his mother's sister whom he caught smoking; the body was thrown into the forest and not allowed to be buried. The effect was considerable; his followers applauded the deed, his silent or open enemies shrank back; he who had done such an unprecedented thing as not to heed the bonds of blood must be acting under a higher inspiration; it was not cruelty but self-sacrifice; the reformation went on with fanatical zeal. Whoever omitted a _qâlât_ had to pay a fine; for a second offence the punishment was death. Opponents were overcome by force, their villages burned, themselves killed or made slaves or at least made to pay an indemnity. Soon the greater part of Agam and of the district of Tuanku Kotâ tuâ were in his power. Several villages which had already yielded to pressure and adopted the stricter teaching of Tuanku Kotâ tuâ were also plundered and burned. In the end the doings of his followers were too much for the leader and he retired after about eight years. It was only at a later date when the Dutch troops entered the country that he again placed himself at the head of the movement. He died in 1832.

The procedure adopted by Tuanku nan Rënjëh was as follows: after a village had been taken, he appointed on his own authority an _imâm_ and a _kâli_ (Ar. _kâfî_); the former was head of the mosque and had control of all religious matters; the sphere of activity of the _kâli_ is not quite clear. In any case, this proceeding was revolutionary; by constitutional law the offices were hereditary with certain limitations; important decisions could only be made by _mupakè_ (see above).

Another teacher, Tuanku Pasaman, also called Tuanku Lintau, was active in the south east in the district of Lintau. Less well known than Tuanku nan Rënjëh he in no way yielded to him in fanatical ardour. Lintau was soon in his power. He then entered the adjoining territory of Tanah Data(t). Here in the old capital lived in the once faded glory of their former greatness the descendants of the royal house of Minangkabau. Well led, their power might have resulted in a restoration of their former greatness. Tuanku Lintau had them all murdered, except one who escaped across the frontier. Burning and murdering, he brought the whole land under his rule.

A third centre of Padri activity was Alahanpandjang in the north. The movement began here at the same time as in Agam and Lintau. Very soon there came to the front here a man who is best known by his later name of Tuanku Imam, first as an adviser and then as the leading figure. We possess exceptionally a native source for the life and deeds of this important figure. Quite recently a Malay work, a kind of biography written by one of his sons, has been discovered and published (see Konkel, _Indische Gids_, 1915). The Padris of Alahanpandjang began by building a fortress which they called Bondjol. Here the strict doctrine was observed and it was the central position of their power from which they sent out expeditions in all directions. Invited by sympathisers they would go to a village, subject it, appoint a _kali_ and _imâm_, as Tuanku nan Rënjëh did, and return to Bondjol with rich booty. The bio-
graphy relates that campaigns were undertaken at intervals of about a year. This was the period of Tuanku Imam's rise to be 

"... for in many matters he was imam, imam in religion, imam in all matters requiring intelligence and reflection so that all quarrels and disputes were finally brought to him." — Four men were sent to Mecca to guarantee the purity of the doctrine After a long time they returned, even more strict. There was not yet regular spiritual intercourse with Mecca. Pilgrims were very few in number.

As soon as the Padris had overcome or driven away the supporters of the Adat, the latter tried to involve the English, who had occupied Padang in 1793 in their agitation, but they could get no help from them. It was not till 1818 that the first post was established on the highlands by Sir Stamford Raffles. But its weak garrison could effect nothing; it was attacked by the Padris but without success. When in 1819 Padang was again handed over to the Dutch, they maintained and strengthened this post. In 1822 the offensive was assumed and lasted with some interruptions for 15 years. The Dutch colonial government troops were as a rule superior to the natives in the fighting but the attacks of the latter were continually resumed. Finally in 1832 all activity by the Padris stopped. Tuanku Imam, who had till then held out in Bondjol, surrendered. He then secretly prepared a rising which broke out in the beginning of 1833. The Dutch colonial troops who were distributed in small detachments over the entire country were almost wiped out. It soon became clear that members of the party who had invited the foreigners into the country were on the side of the Padris. Historians have shown that errors of policy by the military leaders and the not always tactful conduct of officers and men contributed to produce this misfortune. The truth of this cannot be disputed, but it should be pointed out to explain the altered attitude of many Malays that the very strict rules laid down by the Padris of the early period had become less rigid in course of time. The strength of the movement had been weakened by internal quarrels. Tuanku Koutu had, at one time attacked by Tuanku nan Rentjeh's successors, was revered as a saint in 1827, soon after his death. Padri and non-Padri pilgrims continued to his tomb. With the presence of the Dutch-Indian troops the Padris could no longer deal so harshly and arbitrarily with their fellow-countrymen. Their popularity had increased. It is said in the biography of Tuanku Imam of Bondjol, the bulwark of extremism: "the country was governed according to the shari'ah; the tribal chiefs relied upon it: when disputes arose the matter was brought before the four legists, in matters of common law however, the decision was left to the chiefs". Tuanku Imam a little later told his son: "the authority of the common law shall be recognised by you, and follow as faithfully as possible the shari'ah!" [4 v.]. During the pause in the siege of Bondjol the Padris used to exchange tobacco with the soldiers; Padri and non-Padri had drawn nearer to one another. When the Padris summoned their companions to fight against the unbelievers, the appeal found a wide echo.

After the rising the colonial troops again assumed the offensive. Gradually the conquerors enforced their authority. Only the Padris of Bondjol still resisted, they now formed the war party; any one of like views joined them. When the fortress was finally stormed in 1837, the Padri movement came to an end. Tuanku Imam finally surrendered and was banished.

The object which the Padris had originally aimed at was not attained; the matriarchal institutions still survived. If the movement had exerted any influence at all, it was in the direction of a more accurate and general observance of the law, especially of ceremonial. Nothing very definite can be said about it. We have no information about the situation in the country before the rise of the Padris. The movement can hardly have passed without leaving any trace at all.

**Bibliography:**


**PAHANG.** [See MALAY PENINSULA.]

**Pāi** (Hind.), anglicé pie, the smallest copper coin of British India = 1/24 of an anna. Originally, in the East India Company's early experiments for a copper coinage, the pie as its name implies, was the quarter of an anna on piece [cf. PAISI]; since the Acts of 1835, 1844 and 1870, however, the pie has been 1/2 of a piece.

(J. Alias)

**PAISĀ** (Hind.), anglicé pice, a copper coin of British India = 3 pies or 1/4 anna. Under the Moghuls the name paisa became applied to the older dama, introduced by Sher Shah, 40 of which went to the rupee, as the unit of copper currency; the name found on the coins however is usually simply *paisa* or *pērāṇi*. Paisā is the general name for the extensive copper coinage coined in the xvnth and xviith centuries by the numerous native states which arose out of the Moghul empire (cf. J. Prinsep, *Useful Tables*, ed. E. Thomas, London 1858, p. 62 sqq.).

(PALÁHENG, P.AHLING (v.), lit. string, rope, halter, cord, is applied to the cord worn by dervishes around the neck, at the end of which hangs a many-rayed star of carnelian, the size of a crown piece, called *teslim tash*, which is given to the young dervish at the end of his discipleship. With some, especially the Bektaşıi dervishes [cf. BEKTAŞI], a number of olive-shaped, whitish-grey, transparent stones are strung on the cord; these are found in Mesopotamia and called *durri Nefjef* ("Pearls of Nefjef"). The jasper (Turkish *yedikum*) from which the *teslim* stones of the Bektaşıi maves are made is said to be found in the neighbourhood of the tomb of Hâddij Bektaşı.

**Bibliography:** Th. Ippen, *Skouts und die nordalbanische Kustenebenen*, Sarajevo 1907.
PALANPUR, a Muslim state in India now included in the Western India States Agency. The territory incorporated in this agency includes the area formerly known as Kathiawar together with the Cutch and Palanpur agencies. Its creation in October 1924, marked the end of the political control of the Government of Bombay and the beginning of direct relations with the Government of India. The old Palanpur Agency with its headquarters at the town of Palanpur was a group of states in Gudarjat [q. v.] lying between 23° 25' and 24° 41' N. and 71° 16' and 71° 46' E. It was bounded on the north by the Rājput states of Udaipur and Sirohi; on the east by the Mahā Kāntha Agency; on the south by the state of Baroda and Kathiawar; and on the west by the Rann of Cutch.

The state of Palanpur was conquered towards the end of the sixteenth century by Lohānī Pathāns, subsequently known as Dīthloris. A short account of its history under the Mughal emperors will be found in the Gazetteer of Bombay, v. 318—324, and in the Mirāt-i Aḥmadī (Ethê, No. 3599, fol. 741). British relations with this state date back to the year 1809, when, through British influence, arrangements were made for the payment of tribute to the Gaekwar of Baroda (Aitchison, vi., Ixxxix.). This engagement was further strengthened by an agreement signed on November 28, 1818 (see cit., xcl.). In 1819, an agent from the Gaekwar was abolished and the finances of the state remained under British supervision until 1874 when the ruler of Palanpur was entrusted with the management of his own finances.

Palanpur is still ruled by Lohānī Pathāns. It has a population of 264,179, of whom 245,000 speak Gudarinjāt. The distribution of population according to religion is as follows: Hindus, 222,714; Muhammadans, 28,690 and Jains, 12,542.


PALMYRA, Tadmur, now Tadmur, the ancient Tadmor, called Palmyra by the Greeks probably a corruption of the older name by a popular etymology; cf. Hommel, in Z.D.M.G., xlv. 547; M. Hartmann, in Z.D.P.V., xxii./ii. 128 sqq.) lies northeast of Damascus in the great desert in an oasis watered by two springs. The water is sulphurous but drinkable after it has settled. The climate is unfavourable, having great differences of temperature between day and night and being unbearable hot in summer and sometimes having snow in winter. What lacked in climatic conditions was compensated for by its situation which made Tadmur an important junction on the caravan routes connecting east and west, notably that from the Euphrates to Damascus. The natural supposition that the place was already of importance and settled in early times has been confirmed by several inscriptions of Tiglat-Pileser I of the sixth century B.C. because the "town of Tadmor in the land of Ammurru", which the Assyrian king mentions, can hardly be anywhere else (R. Meissner, in J. L., Z., 1923, p. 157; Dhorine, in R., B., 1924, p. 106). Otherwise the city is not mentioned till shortly before the beginning of the Christian era and in the Old Testament only in a peculiar gudproquo. While in 1 Kings ix. 18 in the accepted text it is said that Solomon built Tamar (in southern Palestine) among other towns, the Chronicler (ii. 8, 4) followed by the variants and by Josephus, *Antiquities*, viii. 6, 1, gives Tadmor instead. From this it appears that the latter in his time must have been of some fame and size and also that the later widely known legend according to which Solomon built the wonderful city, was already in existence. This story was known at a later date to the Arabs among whom it was related, in keeping with the fantastic elaboration of the legend of Solomon, that the qīnīn helped the king in the building (cf. Nasaf, v. 22, 13). In the seventh century, p. 514 and several of the Arab geographers mentioned below; according to Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, i. 166 the queen Bilkis visited Solomon in Tadmur and is buried there.

Its incorporation in the Roman empire was of the greatest importance for Palmyra. Its already busy trade increased enormously and great wealth poured into the town, surrounded by the dry sand desert (on the roads connecting Palmyra with the other world see Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*, 1927, p. 248—270). From this period dates the brief but accurate account of Palmyra by Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, v. 25). The merchants were able cleverly to use the enmity between Rome and Parthia for their own advantage, and the conditions, when the emperor Hadrian, by the clever stroke of policy of leaving Assyria and Mesopotamia to the Parthians, inaugurated a long period of peace, contributed still more to the prosperity of the town. The customs tariff of the year 136 written in Aramaic and Greek gives a vivid picture of the business life of the Palmyrene republic in this period, while the splendid ruins of the temple of the sun and of several other fine buildings show how highly developed was the artistic sense of its citizens under Greek influence. In the third century, further prospects opened up which induced the Palmyrenes for a brief period to dream of a new power in the east with their city as its centre. At the beginning of the third century arose the new Persian dynasty of the Sassanians which revived the ancient bitter feud with the Romans so that the Palmyrenes again had an opportunity to use their diplomatic ability. The Palmyrenes under Odenathus (Udhaina) II at first wanted to join the Persians under Shāpur (241—272) but, when his offer was rejected, he joined the Roman general Ballista in Asia Minor and inflicted a heavy defeat on the retreating Persians. Under Gallienus he became the actual ruler of the whole of the east and was given the title Augustus by the emperor. When in 266—267 he was murdered, his dignity passed to his son Vaballathus, but the real power was in the hands of his widow Zenobia (Zainab), a highly gifted lady who extended her kingdom, notably by the conquest of Egypt. This was done with the approval of the emperor Aurelian, but Palmyra soon rebelled against the Romans and in 270 a battle was fought in which Zenobia was
defeated. Palmyra then surrendered. When it rebelled again, Aurelian had the city with its fine buildings destroyed. Zenobia fled, was captured and brought to Rome. This queen, distinguished alike for her beauty and intellect, made a great impression on her contemporaries and her memory survived among the Arabs under the name of al-Zâdâkāi although only in fabulous tales in which little of history remains. She is said to have enticed the Arab king Dhulgharma [q.v.], and the article hitka to her and then killed him by opening his arteries. His nephew 'Amr b. 'Ahi wished to evade his obligation as avenger of blood but was forced by the cunning Kaṣr to do so and when the latter by stratagem got the cunning queen in his power, she took poison which she always carried in a ring she wore, in order not to be put to death by him.

With the fall of Zenobia, Palmyra lost its importance. The walls however were rebuilt although not on the former scale but the trade, the source of the town's livelihood, began to dry up. In this period Christianity began to spread in the town; bishops are mentioned and Justinian among others built a church there. Palmyra remained under Roman rule for about 3½ centuries until the Arab conquest put an end to it. When Khalid b. al-Walid approached the town on his celebrated campaign, the inhabitants thought of defending the town against him but abandoned the idea and capitulated voluntarily in order to secure the status of diammis [q.v.]; they seem however to have rebelled against it for it was only when Yazid sent Dihya against it, after taking the Damascans, that it was finally subjected.

Palmyra never regained its former prosperity under Muslim rule. It was inhabited mainly by Kalâbâš and was one of the towns which rebelled against Marwan II who set out with an army against it. An agreement was come to however, but according to Ibn al-Faḳīh (298 = 902), Marwan had a part of the walls destroyed. According to the legend, he abandoned the idea of destroying the town completely when he came upon the corpse of a richly dressed woman on whose forehead was a plate of gold with an inscription warning him against doing so.

Several Arab geographers mention Tadmur but very briefly. Some of them speak of the wonderful buildings and ruins, and as a rule they repeat the old legend that the town was built by Solomon with the help of the djinn. Yākūt makes the intelligent observation that people are everywhere inclined to attribute great buildings to this king. The terrible earthquake of 1157 affected Palmyra. Benjamin of Tudela (1173) makes the rather remarkable statement that no fewer than 2,000 Jews were able to bear arms in the town. Dimishk mentions along with incomparable ruins the djinn's roof of which was formed of 15 stones. The strong citadel of Kal'at al-Man north of the town is ascribed by the inhabitants to the famous Druse king Faṭḥr al-Dīn [q.v.] but this is doubtful. Palmyra disappeared in the period of great decline in the east; its inhabitants finally lived in a wretched village built on the court of the temple of the sun, quite forgotten by the west.

Not till 1678 was the once so famous city again discovered by members of the English factory at Aleppo and in 1751 it was more closely explored by Robert Wood and described in a handsome volume. When traffic began to revive again, Palmyra resumed its importance as a station on the caravan routes and in quite recent times new life has been given it by the motor, the means of transit across the desert; these give a rapid and comfortable connection between Palmyra and the cities of east and west.


(FR. BUHL)

PAMPULUNA. Sp PAMPLONA, Ar. BANBALUÑA, a town in the north of Spain, capital of the province of NAVARRE, has at the present day about 30,000 inhabitants. It was conquered by the Arabs in 121 (738) during the rule of the walī 'Oṯbā b. al-Hadjiḏād; but the occupation of the town and its territory was of very short duration. It soon became the capital of the province of Navarre when García Iūgō tried to found a small independent state; later at the beginning of the tenth century, it was the capital of the first king of Navarre, Sancho Abarca. Several expeditions were sent against Pampuluna by the 'Umayyad emirs of Cordova, in 228 (843), 240 (860), and in 260 (874). 'Abd al-Raḥmān III succeeded in taking it for a time in 312 (924) in the course of his campaign against Navarre and destroyed it. Other attempts against Pampuluna were made by the Muslims in 322 (934) and during the rule of the two 'Aмиr b. Harb b. al-Masāf [q.v.] and al-Muẓafar [q.v.]


(E. LEVI-PROVENCAL)

PANDJĀB, the land of the five rivers, is a province of modern India which, together with the North-West Frontier Province and Kashmir [q.v.], occupies the extreme north-western corner of the Indian Empire, and, with the exception of
the recently-constituted Delhi province, comprises all of British India north of Sind and Râjpûtâna and west of the river Dijama. Geographically therefore it includes more than its name implies, for, in addition to the country watered by the Dijehluin, Cina, Kâwi, Beas, and Sâlejeh, it embraces the table-land of Sirhind between the Sâlejeh and Dijama, the Sind-Sâgar Dôâb between the Sâlejeh and the Indus, and the district of Dera Ghâzi Khân. Administratively the province is divided into two parts, British territory and the Pandjâb States. British territory, which has an area of 99,265 square miles and a population of 23,580,552, is divided into 29 districts, each administered by a deputy commissioner. These districts are grouped into the five divisions of Amilâ, Lâjûndur, Lahore, Râwalpindi, and Multân, each under a commissioner. The Pandjâb States have an area of 37,699 square miles and a population of 4,910,005. The conduct of political relations with Dâjdjâna, Patawdi, Kalsi, and the 27 Simla Hill States is in the hands of the Pandjâb Government. The remaining states of Lohâna, Sirmûr, Bilsâpur, Mandi, Suket, Kapurthâla, Maler-Kotla, Faridkot, Cambâ, Bahâwâlpur, and the Phûlkiun states of Pâttali, Dînd, and Nabhâ, are directly under the Government of India.

The history of this area has been profoundly influenced by the fact that the mountain passes of the north-west frontier afforded access to the Pandjâb plains. For this reason it is ethologically more nearly allied to Central Asia than to India. The recent excavations at Harappa in the Montgomery district are evidence of a culture which probably flourished in the Indus valley about 3000 B.C., and which bears a general resemblance to that of Elam and Mesopotamia (Sir John Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, 3 vols., 1931). But the first migration of which we have any evidence is that of the Aryan-speaking peoples who established themselves on the Pandjâb plains in prehistoric times. Centuries later successive waves of invaders swept like devastating torrents through the mountain passes of the north-west. Persian, Greek, and Afghan, the forces of Alexander and the armies of Mahmûd of Ghâzni, the hosts of Timûr, Bûbur, and Nâdir Shâh, and the troops of Âhmad Shâh Durrânî [cf. these articles], all advanced by these routes to lay waste the fertile plains of the Pandjâb. All these migrations and invasions added to the heterogeneity of the existing population in the land of the five rivers. The history of invasions from Central Asia proves that the Pandjâb and the frontier zone from the banks of the Indus to the Afghan slopes of the Sulaimân range have never presented any real barrier to an entering general. The Sulaimân range itself has seldom formed a political boundary, for the Persians, Mauryas, Graeco-Bactrians, Sakas, Pahlawas, the Kshâs branch of the Yueh-chi, and the Hansu all besride this mountain barrier.

The capture of Multân [q.v.] by Muhammad b. Kâsim [q.v.], in 713 A.D., extended Arab power to upper Sind and the lower Pandjâb, but the real threat to Hindustân came from the direction of modern Afghanistan. The Ghâznawî invaders found the powerful Hindûshâhiya dynasty of Waghând ruling between Lamâghan and the Cînâb. The power of this Hindu state was completely shattered by Mahmûd of Ghâzni who annexed the Pandjâb, which became a frontier province of his extensive empire and the sole refuge of his descendants when driven out of Ghâzni by the Shâhsâbâni sulûtans of Ghôr [see Ghôrîun]. Multân and the surrounding country had remained in Muslim hands since the days of the Arab conquest, but the fact that its rulers were heretical Karâmaân [q.v.] was one reason for Mahmûd’s attack in 1006 A.D. Muhammad Ghôri annexed the Pandjâb in 1186 A.D. and on his death in 1206 A.D. it definitely became a province of the Sulûtane of Dihli under the rule of Kûrât el-Din Aîbar. With the exception of occasional rebellions and raids from Central Asia it remained under the Sulûtans of Dihli until the defeat of Itrâm Lodi [q.v.] by Bâbur at Panipat [q.v.] in 1526 A.D. paved the way for the foundation of the Moghul empire. Under Akâbar [q.v.] the modern province of the Pandjâb was included in the sîhab of Labûr, Multàn, and Dihli, a detailed description of which will be found in the *Ain-i Abkâr* (transl. Jarrett, ii, 278–341).

The persecuting policy of Akbar’s immediate successors led to the growth of Sikh political power in the Pandjâb and transformed a band of religious devotees, founded by Guru Nânak in the second half of the fifteenth century, into a military commonwealth or Khâlîa animated with undying hatred toward Muslims [cf. the art. sikhs]. The weakness of the central government and the unprotected condition of the frontier provinces under the later Moghul exposed Hindu斯坦 to the invasions of Nadir Shâh [q.v.] and Âhmad Shâh Durrânî [q.v.]. On the bloodstained field of Panipat, in 1761, the Marâthâs, who were aspireing to universal sovereignty, sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the Afghan invader. In the following year, at Barmâla near Ludhîna, Âhmad Shâh disastrously defeated the Sikhs who had taken advantage of his absence in Kâbul to possess themselves of the country around Lahore. The Sikhs, however, soon extended their sway to the south of the Satlej and ravaged the country to the very gates of Dihli, but their further advance was checked by the Marâthâs who had rapidly recovered from their defeat at Panipat. It was the defeat of the Marâthâs by Lord Lake, in 1813, which facilitated the rise of Ranjit Singh and enabled him to found a powerful Sikh kingdom in the Pandjâb. His attempts to extend his authority over his co-religionists, the cis-Satlej Sikhs, brought him into contact with the British, and, by the treaty of 1809, he pledged himself to regard the Satlej as the north-west frontier of the British dominions in India (Atchison, viii, No. iiii.). After the death of Ranjit Singh, in 1839, his kingdom rapidly fell to pieces under his successors. Revolution succeeded revolution, and during the minority of Dalip Singh the Khâlsah soldiery became virtually rulers of the country. Unprovoked aggression on British territory produced two Sikh wars which ended with the annexation of the Pandjâb in 1849.

At first the newly-conquered territories were placed under a Board of Administration. This was abolished in 1853, its powers and functions being vested in a Sikh Commissioner. In 1859, after the transfer of the Dihli territory from the North-Western (now the United) Provinces, the Pandjâb and its dependencies were formed into a Lieutenant-Governorship.

The annexation of the Pandjâb by advancing the British administrative boundary across the Indus
brought the Government of India into closer contact with the Pathan tribes of the north-west frontier and the Amir of Afghanistan [q. v.]. Because this frontier was too long and too mountainous to admit of its being defended by the military alone, much depended upon the political management of the tribes. At first there was no special agency for dealing with the tribal tracts, and relations with the tribesmen were conducted by the deputy-commissioners of the six districts of Hazara, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu, Dera Ismail Khan, and Dera Ghazi Khan. In 1870, the three northern districts formed the command of Peshawar, and the three southern ones that of the Derajat. The system of political agencies was not adopted until 1878, when a special officer was appointed for the Khyber during the Second Afghan War. Kurram became an agency in 1892, while the three remaining agencies of the Malakand, Tochi, and Wana were created between 1895 and 1896. The Malakand was placed under the direct control of the Government of India from the outset, all the other agencies remaining under the Punjab Government. This was the arrangement until the creation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1901.

The Punjab attained its present dimensions in 1911 when Dihlī became a separate province. It was not however until 1921 that it was raised to the status of a governor's province. To-day it contains 14,930,000 Muhammadans, 8,600,000 Hindus, and 4,072,000 Sikhs. Unfortunately the spirit of communal antagonism has been fanned in the province by the activities of the tazlīm, Ṣuḥāṭi ʿUlamā, and tablíqh movements organized by Muslims for the purpose of combating the proselytizing activities of the Hindu community known as the ṣuddih movement. In 1926 Swami Sharanandā, a leader of the ṣuddih movement, was murdered in Dihlī by a Muslim. Communal relations were further embittered by the murder in Lahore of a Hindu bookseller who had published a libellous attack on the character of the Prophet of Islam in his book entitled the Rangīla Rasul. Far more serious than this communal strife were the political disturbances culminating in the Diallāgo Bahā Banūgī invasion of 1919 (Sir M. O'Dwyer, India: It is Now, 1883—1925).

At least 90 per cent. of the total population live in villages and 60 per cent. is supported by agriculture, for the Punjab is a country of peasant proprietors. But the bulk of the cultivators are born in debt, live in debt, and die in debt. Almost the whole of this money has been advanced by Hindus and Sikhs who are not debarred from religion from the taking of interest, but, unfortunately, well over half of this debt has been incurred by Muhammadans. No community can hope to thrive under a system of banking and some organization to combat this evil is essential to the prosperity of the Muhammadan community.

Bibliography: In addition to the standard works on the history of India: C. U. Atchison, Treaties, Engagements, and Sounds, vol. viii., 1903; Mutilati Ali al-Din, Iʿbarat al-Maʾālim (India Office, No. 15; 3241); Census of India (1911), vol. xvii., 1933; J. D. Cunningham, History of the Sikhs, 1918; M. L. Darling, The Punjabi Peasant in Prosperity and Debt, 1925; C. C. Davies, The Problem of the North-West Frontier, 1932; C. Gough and A. D. Innes, The Sikhs and the Sikh War, 1897; L. H. Griffin, The Rajas of the Punjab, 1873; do., Ranjit Singh, 1892; Indian Statutory Commission, vol. x., 1930; S. M. Latif, History of the Punjab, 1891; do., Lahore, its history, architectural remains and antiquities, 1892; M. Macalister, The Sikh Religion, 6 vols., 1909; Ghulām Muḥyīʾ T-Din, Tarīkh-i-Pandjāb (India Office, No. 3,244); Muhammad Nāṣir, Sīrī Ṣūhāṭi Nāma (India Office, No. 3,231); I. C. Powel, Kaliṣ-i-ṣūhāṭi, 1875; H. Priestley, Hayāt-i-ṣūhāṭi, 1874; Punjab Administration Reports (published annually); H. A. Ross, A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Provinces, 6 vols., 1919.

PANDJĪDĪ, (Pandjīdeh) a village in the Turkoman republic of the U.S.S.R., situated to the east of the Kushtı river near its junction with the Murghab at Pul-i Kḥštī. The fact that the inhabitants of this area, the Sarik Turkomans, were divided into five sections, the Sotkis, Harzagis, Khurāsānīs, Baiāq, and the ʿAli Shāh, has been put forward as a possible explanation of the origin of the name Pendjeh, but it carries no weight as the Sariks were only nineteenth century immigrants whereas the name was in use in the fifteenth century.

This obscure oasis owes a somewhat melancholy importance to the "Pendjeh Incident" of 1885, when an Afghan force suffered heavy losses in an engagement with Russian troops. History proves that an ill-defined boundary is a potential cause of war. It was a knowledge of this and the Russian occupation of Merw, in 1884, that gave the necessary impetus to negotiations which ended in the appointment of an Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission for the delimitation and demarcation of the northern boundary of Afghanistan. Trouble immediately arose in this quarter for while the Russians contended that the inhabitants of Pendjeh were independent the British held the view that they were subjects of the Amir of Afghanistan. According to the British, the district of Pendjeh, which comprised the country between the Kushtı and Murghab rivers from the Band-i Nadir to Ak Tepē, together with the rest of Badghis, formed part of the Herat province of Afghanistan. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century Pendjeh had been occupied by Djamshīdīs and Hazaras. Towards the end of this period some Turkomans of the Erarsi tribe, whose settlements were scattered along the banks of the Oxus between the Čardjū and Balkh, moved to Pendjeh and obtained permission to settle there. Sarik Turkomans had also settled in this area. About 1857 the Ersaris migrated from the oasis of Pendjeh and soon afterwards the Sarik Turkomans, forced southwards by their more powerful neighbours, the Tekkes, occupied Usaband and Pendjeh and compelled the Sarik families to migrate elsewhere. Although, therefore, Pendjeh had from time to time been occupied by various tribes, they had all, whether Djamshīdīs, Hazaras, Ersaris, Sariks or Sariks, acknowledged they were on Afghan soil and paid tribute to the naʿīb or deputy of the Afghan governor of Herat. The Sarik Turkomans had even supplied the Amir with troops. The British therefore contended that the district of Badghis, of which Pendjeh formed a part, had long been under Afghan rule (Foreign Office MSS. 65; 1205).

The Russians on the other hand contended that
the people of this oasis had always enjoyed independence. Lessar, a Russian engineer, who visited Pendjeh in March 1884, discovered no trace of Afghan authority, but a Russian doctor, named Regel, who visited it in June of the same year reported the presence of an Afghan detachment. In their opinion therefore Pendjeh had only recently been occupied by Afghan troops.

The fact that the Afghans had not permanently given up this area was no proof of its independence. On the contrary, it was only natural that, in the Russian occupation of Merv and Pul-i Khutan, 'Abd al-Rahman Khan should have taken steps to indicate his sovereign rights over this area. When, therefore, an Afghan garrison occupied Pendjeh, the Russian Government immediately protested and disputed the Amir's claim to the territory. While negotiations were taking place between London and St. Petersburg events moved swiftly on the frontiers of Afghanistan. On March 29, 1885, General Komarow sent an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of the Afghan garrison. The Afghans resolutely refused to withdraw whereupon the Russians attacked them driving them across the Pul-i Khihti with the loss of some 900 men. It must be admitted that the posting of Afghan troops in Pendjeh, and the Russian advance to Yulatan on the Murghab and to Pul-i Khutan on the Hari Rud, were regrettable actions with far-reaching results. The whole incident should have been avoided, but the confusing reports of Lumsden, the British Commissioner, to the Foreign Office, and the delay of Zelenoi, the Russian Commissioner, in arriving at Sarakhs complicated matters still more.

At the time this incident seemed likely to embroil Russia and Britain in war, but, fortunately, the good sense of the Amir, who was at this critical moment on a visit to the Viceroy, and the diplomatic skill of Lord Dufferin prevented this, for even the pacific Mr. Gladstone had proposed to Parliament that £11,000,000 should be expended on preparations for war.

It was finally agreed that Pendjeh should be handed over to Russia in exchange for Dhl'l-Fikar, and by the year 1886 the northern boundary of Afghanistan had been demarcated from Dhl'l-Fikar to the meridian of Dukul within forty miles of the Oxus. After a dispute as to the exact point at which the boundary line should meet the Oxus, the process of demarcation was completed in 1888. This recognition of a definite frontier between Russia and Afghanistan led to a decided improvement in the Central Asian question.


(1) Collin Davies)

Pangulu (Jav.), pangulu (Sund.), pangolo (Madur.), literally "headman, director" used in the east Indian Archipelago as the name for secular and religious chief administrators, in the islands of Java and Madura the name of a mosque official, namely the chief in his area. The official representatives of religion are organised there on the same scheme as the native administrative officials. Alongside of the regent, the highest administrative official, is the pangulu of the regency, alongside of the head of the district is the pangulu of the district, called the pangulu naib or briefly naib, and so on. The officials of the mosque are graded in a hierarchy; the pangulu at the capital of the regency is at the head of all the personnel of the mosques of the regency. The village official in charge of the divine services is of a different origin. He is a member of the village authority for attending to the religious requirements of the villagers. He is not related to the status of the mosque. This man is exceptionally called pangulu in Bantun (Western Java); elsewhere he is known by other names.

The pangulu is the director of the mosque and the chief of its personnel; according to a juk law, he is appointed, like the rest of the staff of the mosque, by the regent, usually being chosen from the staff of his own or another mosque. This procedure does not always guarantee that the man appointed is specially qualified (see below).

Theological training is quite free from special prescriptions. The student of theology, whether he intends to take up an official position or remain a private student, studies at schools (all private institutions of which there are many in the land). Each studies as he pleases, for shorter or longer period, just as he likes; an effort is made to attend lectures at several schools.

The funerals of the pangulus are very varied, but not uniform throughout the whole regency. The office of director of the mosque has already been mentioned; in larger villages, especially at the capital of the regency, the staff is large: there the pangulu does not himself take part in the work. The pangulu has charge of marriages which are concluded in his presence: jahāb and ruqūf are pronounced by him and marriages are registered by him. The pangulu of a regency only performs this office in the case of very prominent families; in this case it is the custom to conclude the marriage in the house of the family. The pangulu also performs the ceremony when the wali of the bride appoints him wakil, a regular custom, observed by the majority without the reason being quite clear to them; to the popular mind the pangulu is the person who binds in marriage. It is therefore a very old custom to have the marriage performed in the mosque by the pangulu: this unwritten custom has now been given the force of law by a colonial enactment (since 1895, the law in question is of 1889). This law also regulates the fees to be paid at marriages, proclamations of jahāb and ruqūf, taking the old customs as the guiding principle. These fees form the most important part of the income of the pangulu and his staff; the latter also receive their share; if properly qualified they frequently act as deputy for the pangulu at marriages. Women who have no wali are married by the pangulu as walī hākim. The number of pangulus with this qualification is always less than the number of officials appointed to perform marriages. In some districts the regent appoints himself wali hākim but in practice he leaves the exercise of his rights to the pangulu.

The djakat (Ar. sakit) is of course not collected in Java and Madura by the authorities; it is, if it is levied at all, a free-will offering and in many places insignificant. Only in Western Java was the collection at one time organised and in the
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p. 831b, l. 12, instead of Saffite, to be read Saffires;
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hands of the mosque officials. The revenue went to them. To this day the djbabat is still a con-
siderable source of revenue for the panguol, especially in western Java. 

The panguol — this is true only of the panguol of the regency — is also the kend; but his jurisdiction is limited to family law and the wukab (Ar. waqf.) estates. The office of kend is his main sphere of activity. These judicial functions of the panguol have a curious history. The 
colonial authorities thought from the official position of the mosque officials that they were priests; 
they further thought that they had to deal with a collegium because the panguol sits with some 
of his subordinates to assist him when in legal session. This misunderstanding was perpetuated 
50 years ago in colonial legislation. The panguol was made president of a bench of judges; his 
assessors were appointed by the authorities and chosen from the subordinates of the panguol and 
private individuals learned in law. In this way a panguol of lower rank may be a member of a 
"priestly college". It is now intended to restore the old state of affairs. The "college" is to be 
abolished and the panguol's court i.e. one in which the panguol, sitting with assistants, will be 
sole judge, will take its place. The law is 
prepared but has not yet been put into operation (1934). The "priestly college" holds its meetings 
in a room in the mosque. Most of the cases are 
brought by women. In Western and Central Java 
it is the regular custom for the husband immedi-
ately after the wedding to be forced to pro-
nounce the tawzik in a way which, from the 
legal point of view, is not quite free from ob-
jection. If he does not fulfill the obligations which 
he takes upon himself in the tawzik formulae and 
if the wife is not satisfied she brings the matter 
before the "college" and the latter pronounces that a tawzik has taken place. These are the most 
common cases. In Eastern Java and Madura a facilitated faikk takes the place of the tawzik. We 
also find cases in the rest of Java where the "priestly college" decides questions of faikk. Women 
who are refused nafaka also apply to the "college". 
If there are difficulties after a divorce about the 
division of property acquired during marriage, or 
if the heirs to a property are dissatisfied with the 
decisions of an ordinary panguol, the matter is 
referred to the "college" for decision. The method 
of procedure is as follows. The "college" gives 
its verdict as to how the property should be 
divided according to the sharfa. If the parties 
prepare to carry this out but all are not ready to 
do so, the scheme can only be legally enforced 
when the secular court has given authority. This is 
always done if the verdict of the "priestly college" is 
formally in order; no test is made of its material 
correctness. Fees have to be paid whenever ap-
lication is made to the "college"; a considerable 
revenue is gained from the division of estates as 
in such cases the "college" gets a percentage of the 
objects in dispute, often up to 10%; hence the name 
maran. The "college" is consulted also in other matters 
of family law but these are of less importance. 
Finally there are wukab foundations the founders of which intended the revenues for mosques, schools of religion, or cemeteries. It is the task of the 
"priestly college" to decide according to the sharfa 
such disputes as arise and in general to supervise the 
administration.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, III.

The panguol in the native states are appointed by the princes; their sphere of activity is the same. 
Whenever a new panguol is appointed he is given 
his appointment as kend by an edict "in confirmation 
of my oral command", as the phrase is, in order 
to comply with the demands of the sharfa. In 
this edict the phraseology suggests that the ruler 
hands over his jurisdiction to the panguol. 

The Netherlands Indies colonial law requires the 
presence of the panguol when Muslims appear 
in the government courts as accused in civil or 
criminal cases. A number of such assessors are 
attached to each court according to its requirements. 
They are appointed by the government and chosen 
from the personnel of the mosques. It is arranged 
that the director of the mosque is at the same 
time an assessor. The right of appointing panguoL 
has thus gone out of the hands of the regents 
into those of the colonial administration. As 
the panguol is usually chosen from the lower staff, 
the government has been able to secure influence over 
the appointment of these minor officials so far as 
they are capable of being panguol. The object is 
to choose as competent men as possible, so that 
the prestige of the panguol has increased in the 
Muslim community. This is less true of their 
position as assessors at the courts; the colonial 
law intended that the court should be advised regarding 
the adat (traditional) law. The choice of the panguol 
was therefore a mistake, as the latter goes by the 
akhir books.

The word panguol as the name of a mosque 
official is not unknown outside the islands of Java 
and Madura. In some places there are panguol 
whose work resembles that of the panguol of 
Java, e.g. in the centre of the former sultanate of 
Palembang (Sumatra). The colonial authorities have 
retained the name; they have also given the name 
to the court assessors appointed by them in districts 
where the name was not previously in use.

Bibliography: C. Snouck Hurgronje, 
Verspreide Geschriften, vi/. 279 sqq., 89 sqq.; 
/vii. 366 sqq.; C. van Vollenhoven, Het Adat-
recht van Nederlandsch-Indie, II, 160 sqq.
(R. A. KERN)

PANIPAT, a town and kend in the 
Karnāl district of the Pandžāb [q. v.]. On 
three occasions has the fate of Hindustân been 
decided on the plain of Panipat: in 1526, when 
Bābur [q. v.], the Barās Turk, defeated Ibrāhīm 
Lodi; in 1556, when Akbar [q. v.] crushed the 
forces of Hīmā; and lastly, in 1761, when the 
Marāths where defeated by Alīmd Shāh Durrānī 
[q. v.]. The geographical factor combined with 
internal decay and a weak system of frontier defence 
has been chiefly responsible for this. From 
the strategic background of Afghanistan the path for 
invaders lay along the lines of least resistance, 
The Khyber, Kurram, Tochi, and Gomal passes, 
to on the Pandžāb plains, for the Indus has never 
proved an obstacle to an enterprises general. 
Checked on the south by the ports of Rādipūnā, 
incoming armies were forced to enter the Ganges 
and Djamna valleys through the narrow bottle-
neck between the north-eastern extremity of the 
desert and the foot of the Himalāyas.

Bābur's success over Ibrāhīm Lodi, in 1526, has 
long been regarded as resulting from the extensive 
employment of artillery. The source of this error 
is to be found in an inaccurate translation of the 
word 'arūbah. It is true that 700 'arūbas were used
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by Bābur, but it is incorrect to regard these as gun-carrigges, for the word simply means "carts". There is no textual or circumstantial evidence for supposing that Bābur had guns in such numbers as to demand 700 gun-carrigges for their transport. Indeed, from Bābur’s "Autobiography" it may be inferred that he possessed two guns only and Bābur himself makes his victory a bowman’s success. The importance of the first battle of Pānpat is that it decided the fate of the Lodi dynasty. Far more formidable was the resistance offered by the Rājpats at Kāhna in the following year.

The second battle of Pānpat, in 1556, when Akbar defeated Hājīm, is of outstanding importance in the history of India, for there was no Moghal empire before Akbar, only the attempt to create one. After his victory over the Marāthas in 1761, Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī made no attempt to consolidate his position in Hindustan but returned to Afghanistan. The Marāthas were only temporarily crushed, for they rapidly recovered from this defeat and, by 1771, were once more a menace to the peace of India. The importance of this battle is that it facilitated the growth of British power.


Pāra, a Turkish coin, originally a silver piece of 4 akēs, first issued early in the sixteenth century; it soon replaced the akē as the monetary unit. The weight, originally 16 grains (1.10 grammes), sank to one quarter of this weight by the beginning of the sixteenth century and the silver content also depreciated considerably. The multiples of the silver pāra were 5 (beşlik) pāras, 10 (emlik), 15 (oveşlik), 20 (yigimparalik), 20 (paralik) and 40 şirvān or piastre. Higher denominations were 60 (almilik), 50 (tehtlik) and 100 (yuluk) pāras were occasionally issued.

In the new Medjidieh currency of 1260 (1844) the pāra became a small copper coin with multiples 5 (beşparalik), 10 (onparalik), 20 (yigimparalik) and 40 (şirvān). In the later years of the Turkish empire, the larger copper pieces were replaced by nickel. The pāra under the republic is a money of account, the 100 pāra or 2 1/2 piastre piece of aluminium bronze being the smallest denomination issued.

When Serbia became independent it retained the same para for its smallest coin as did Montenegro also. The name survives in Yugo-Slavia, where the nickel 5 para piece is the smallest coin issued. During the Russian occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1711-1744 copper coins were issued with the value in paras and copceans.


Pārgana, the Indian name for an aggregate of villages. The first reference to this term in the chronicles of the Sullāmaste of Delhi appears in the Ta‘līkārī Fīrūz Shāhī of Shams-i Samā‘ī ʿAffi (Bibliotheca Indica, 1891, p. 99), for it is not used by Hasan al-Nṣāmī in his Ta‘līkārī al-Marā‘ṣir or by Muhammad al-Din in his Ta‘līkārī Naṣīr. Although it first came into prominence in the sixteenth century partially superseding the term ḥātha, it is, in all probability, based on still more ancient divisions in existence before the Muslim conquest. The exact date of its creation is therefore uncertain.

An account of the internal working of a pārgana occurs in the chronicles of the reign of Shīr Shāh who learned the details of revenue administration in the management of his father’s two pārganas at Sasrām in Bihār. When he became ruler of Hindustān he organized his kingdom into administrative units, some of which were divided into villages termed pārganas. Each pārgana was in charge of a āmin or military police officer who supported the amin or civil officer. The āmin had for his civil subordinates a āmin-i āhad or treasurer and two kārāns or clerks, one for Hindi and the other for Persian correspondence. It does not seem correct to hold the view that in this respect he was an administrative innovator, for the provincial officials and institutions which he has been credited with creating were already in existence before he ascended the throne. This remained the administrative system until Akbar organized the Moghal empire into sāhs (provinces) which were divided into sarārs (districts) The smallest fiscal unit under Akbar was the pārgana or mahāll. Thus, for example, the sāḥ of Oudh was divided into five sarārs and thirty-eight pārganas (Āmin-ī Akbari, in Bibliotheca Indica, ii, 170-177 [tr. Jarrett, 1891]). Under the Moghal emperors the chief pārgana officials were the sāḥnāg, the āmin, and the āmin-i wakil, who were responsible for the pārgana accounts, the rates of assessment, the survey of lands, and the protection of the rights of the cultivators. Similarly in each village a patwāri or village accountant was appointed whose functions in the village resembled those of the sāḥnāg in the pārgana. It must not be imagined that the pārgana was a stable and uniform unit. Not only did it vary in area in different parts of the country, but often a new land settlement was followed by a fresh division and re-distribution of these fixed areas. The extentiveness of a pārgana with the possessions of a clan or family has given rise to the suggestion that it was not only a revenue-paying area, but that it was founded on the distribution of property at the time of its creation.

The Twenty-four Pārganas: a district of Bengal lying between 21° 31' and 22° 57' N. and 88° 21' and 89° 06' E. It derives its name from the number of pārganas comprised in the zamindāri extended to the English East India Company in 1757 by Mir Jafar, the Nawb of Nāgin of Bengal. This was confirmed by the Moghal emperor in 1759 when he granted the Company a perpetual heritable jurisdiction over this area. In the same year Lord Clive, as a reward for services rendered to him by Mir Jafar, was presented with the revenues of this district. This grant which amounted to £ 30,000 per annum, made Clive both the servant and the lord of the Company. The sum continued to be paid to him until his death in 1774, when, by a deed sanctioned by the emperor, the whole proprietary right in the land and revenues reverted to the Company.

Bibliography: given in the article. (C. Collin Davies)
PĀRŚĪS. Under this name (Pahl. pāršīk, Mod. Pers. pārsī literally “inhabitant of Pār”) are known the Zoroastrian Iranians, who, after the Arab conquest, refusing to adopt Islam per se and after various vicissitudes finally settled in India in Guḍarj, where they now form an ethnical and religious group of 100,000 persons (105,778 according to the census of 1921). At the present day the name Pārīs is beginning to be used also for the Zoroastrians remaining in Iran instead of āfa, the somewhat contemptuous significance of which [cf. Mārg.] is no longer in keeping with the spirit of tolerance which is increasing every day in Iran.

What we know of the wanderings of the Pārīs before their arrival in their present abode in India is based principally on two narratives: Kīšāb-i Sandjān, written in verse by a Zoroastrian priest named Bāman Kābūd of Nawsāri in the year of Yazdagird 569 (1600 A.D.) and Kīshāb-i Zir-tahtyin-i Hindustān ou Bayān-i Aṭāt-i Bābār-i Nawsāri, a work written at the end of the xvith century by the Dastur Shūpūrdji Manockdji Sandjāna (1735–1805).

According to these sources, the first group was composed of Zoroastrians who about a century after the Arab conquest went from Khurāsān, where they had sought refuge, to the south, reaching the island of Hormuz at the mouth of the Persian Gulf (754 A.D.). After a short sojourn there they crossed to Īrān on the Gulf of Cambay to the south of the coast of Khūshāvar (756) and remained there 19 years. Continuing their journey southwards they landed at Sandjān (785) and installed the sacred fire there. According to the tradition of the Pārīs priests, before obtaining permission to settle there they drew up for the lord of Dūr, Uṣdhūdī Rānā, a series of 16 šokbas the principal articles of their faith. In these šokbas, of which several versions exist in Sanskrit and Guḍarjī, several points of contact between Hinduism and Zoroastrianism are cleverly brought out. At Sandjān they were twice joined by other bodies of refugees and these formed a community which prospered rapidly and spread to Cambay, Barīw, Bānākān and Ankleśwar. After the year 1000 Pārīs are also found in upper India, but it is probable that these were isolated bodies who came directly from Iran.

In 1490 A.D. the Pārīs who had made common cause with the Hindus were forced by the troops of Sulṭān Mahmuḍ Bigara to abandon Sandjān and take refuge with their sacred fire among the mountains of Barhūt. When the Muslim pressure ceased, the Zoroastrian community resumed its development. According to the date given in Kīshāb-i Sandjān, the sacred fire was installed at Nawsāri in 1491 after the sack of Sandjān, and after a brief period at Barhūt and Bānād it was brought back in 1516.

The sacred fire was installed at Sūrat in 1733 as a result of the raids of the Pindāris but the settlement of the Pārīs in the town dates from the second half of the xvith century. We do not know the exact date when the Pārīs went to Bombay, which is now the principal centre of the Pārīs community in India.

The Pārīs were able to settle in India without meeting any opposition mainly owing to the excellence of the moral principles of the Mazdæan religion observed in the threefold rule of kūstān, hūsta, hvarshīt—“good thoughts”, “good words”, “good works” — which is found in the Avesta. Although they have always abstained from any proselytising activities, they had the good fortune to attract the great emperor Akbar to the Mazdaean religion. Trustworthy and active, assisted by the fact that the social character of their religion does not prevent adaptation to the forms of western life, they are at the present day a flourishing and well organised community much appreciated for the high standard and dignity of their lives.

The old religious inheritance of Zoroastrianism has been preserved by the Pārīs with remarkable piety. In the xvith century on the initiative of the dāstār Cāngā Ass of Nawsāri a mission was sent to Persia to obtain from the Zoroastrians who had remained there information regarding certain details of the religion. As a result the study of the manuscripts of the Avesta and of the exegetical literature was intensified and at the present day Pārīs scholars are displaying a laudable activity in the publication of the old texts.

The sacerdotal class still occupies a predominant place in the community; its hierarchy (dastār, mohād, hūrd) is a hereditary one.

The interests of the community are managed by a board (khānūd) composed of 6 dastārs and 12 mohāds but with incorporation in the public life of British India the functions of such a committee are gradually diminishing.

The mass of the faithful (bhākū) conform — with a few concessions to the demands of modern life — fully to the ritual prescription of Zoroastrianism. Birth must take place on the floor of the house to show detachment from the things of the world. At the age of 7 there is the investiture with the kūstān, the sacred cord formed of 72 threads which winds three times round life. The funeral rites consist of exposure of the corpse on the tower of silence which is frequented by vultures (dāshīm). In the ceremony of marriage, which tends to monogamy and the marriage of full rights (Pahl. zānīk-i fāšihshāvah) to the exclusion of secondary marriages, Hindu customs have prevailed.

The prohibitions regarding contamination of the sacred elements of fire, water, earth are still scrupulously observed and the greatest care taken in purification after contact with impure objects, especially corpses. The Zoroastrian principles of morality are faithfully observed in all activities of life; hatred of falsehood, honesty in all dealings, assistance of the poor are the regular rules of piety.

The Zoroastrian community in India is keenly interested in the lot of their co-religionists in Iran and it was through the intervention of the Pārīs “Persian Zoroastrian Amelioration Fund” that the drisya paid by the Zoroastrians of Yazd and Kirrān was abolished in 1882 by the Persian government. As a result of the decline of religious intolerance in Persia, there has been an increasing intercourse with the Zoroastrian communities still existing in Iran and the Pārīs community has frequently sent appeals to the Muslims of Persia to ask them to return to the ancient religion.

While as regards doctrine perfect harmony still exists in the community, as regards ritual controversies have not been wanting and are not lacking within it. In 1686 the question of precedence was raised between the priests of Nawsāri and those
of Sandžán. Another question which has been a subject of controversy even since the xviii\textsuperscript{th} century, is the question whether the use of the padān — i.e. a kind of veil placed in front of the mouth to prevent the sacred fire from being contaminated by the breath — should also be put on the dying, thus violating the laws of piety.

Much more serious however is another controversy, that regarding the calendar; it goes back to the xviii\textsuperscript{th} century and divides the community into two sects: the Shahenshāḥi and the Kādīmās.

According to the Avestic calendar adopted by the Pārsis, to make up for the loss of a quarter of a day each year, a month is added every 120 years but this system was not observed during the period of persecution following the Muslim conquest. In 1745 a group of the faithful felt the need for a reform of the calendar; but this group, which took the name of Kādīmās, was opposed by those who wished to adhere to the Hindu system of calculating the months and who took the name of Shahenshāḥi. The result is that the calendar adopted by the latter is a month behind that adopted by the Kādīmās. The Pārsis follow the era of Yazdīgīr which dates from the accession of the last Sāsānīd (June 16, 632).

then have their midday meal, the santri of each pondok forming one mess; this is practically speaking their only meal. All then go to chapel to the salat al-juhr. They are summoned to three further salat in the course of the day. The intervals between them are devoted to lectures and study. The more advanced students are taken together by the teacher; he reads the Arabic text, translates it and adds any necessary notes of explanation. After the salat al-ghfir the day's work is over and the students retire for the night. Some santri may still be engaged on little tasks which may bring them in something, soon these also stop and quiet reigns over all.—Friday brings a variation in this monotonous round; all go to the nearest Friday mosque to attend the salat ad-djunum. Harvest is also a busy time for the santri; they work in the rice-fields or beg for zakat. Many santri go home in the month of the fast.

Fiqh is the primary subject of study in the pasantrens; the Arabic works used are those in use in other Shafi'i lands. There are also a large number of Javanese works; those based on Arabic sources or theological works taken from Arabic are known as kitab. Javanese is the language of the pasantrens; in the Sundanese speaking districts (western Java) Javanese works are more and more replaced by Sundanese. At the same time dogmatics are also studied. Here no particular maqalhab is followed, nor are the works used written only by Shafi'i. Orthodox mysticism is less studied. There is, it is true, a popular form of mysticism tinged with pantheism; but this is less and less taught in the pasantrens. The santri calls the main fiqh book used by him in the pasantren kitab pethik without further qualification (he hardly knows its title) and work on dogmatics kitab usul. Small books for elementary instruction on the duties of religion and dogmatics are also called kitab usul.

The method of instruction is one peculiar to the pasantren. As soon as he has finished the elementary text-books, the student is introduced to more important Arabic texts. He reads them, sentence by sentence, under the supervision of the teacher who himself has perhaps never studied Arabic properly and has only his memory to rely upon for the vocalisation. The sentence is translated into Javanese and paraphrased by the teacher. Finally the student is so far advanced that he can translate easy texts from Arabic into Javanese (a list of the texts most used [at the time] is given in T.E.G.K., W., xxxii. [1886], p. 518 sqq.). This takes a long time; the joy however at seeing his knowledge steadily increasing and the pleasant feeling of being able to read texts in the original spurs the student on. Under Mecca and Hajjramawt influence, however, this method is being gradually driven out by another which begins with Arabic grammar. It certainly seems the more logical; one disadvantage, however, is that the study of Arabic offers so many difficulties to the Indonesians that many lose heart before they succeed in reading texts.

Study at the pasantrens is quite free. Diplomas are neither sought nor given. The student comes and goes as he pleases. The majority when they enter the pasantren have already had an elementary education at home. The desire to increase their knowledge of the faith, the wish among rich and prominent families to see one of their sons devoting himself to the study of religion and among others the hope of gaining a livelihood, bring young men into the pasantren. The santri endeavour to attend the lectures of a number of teachers, each on his special subject. They therefore go from one school to another; some indeed travel about all their lives studying. Others when they think they have acquired sufficient learning settle somewhere, but not in their own districts, as teachers or become assistant teachers in a pasantren or they may prefer to remain "independent scholars". There are no offices for which study in a pasantren is a requisite preliminary; in general the theologians are averse from anything official or belonging to the state but the higher mosque officials have usually studied for a time in a pasantren.

It is considered very reprehensible to give instruction in sacred learning for an agreed fee. Nevertheless, most of the teachers are well to do. Pious gifts are liberally given to them on account of the blessing they bring. The teacher is a most welcome guest at religious feasts, of which there are many in Javanese life. All appeal at all times to his learning or for his intercession; gifts accompany these appeals. New arrivals among the students, if they can afford it, make their offerings; sons of the better situated parents bring back presents when they go home, and poor students work in the teacher's fields.

The majority of the students are poor and indeed live by begging. On certain days they go round the district; their begging is not considered a nuisance; they are assisted readily for they are acquiring sacred learning; to give to them brings a blessing. Work on the land, the copying of Qur'an etc. also bring them in the little they require for their frugal life. The colonial government only troubles about the pasantren in so far as it exercises a general supervision over them; the foundations of new ones are reported to the authorities and the principal has to keep a register of the names of the students and of the titles of the books used.

The spread of schools on the European model has dealt a blow to the pasantrens in recent years. Only the pasantrens could give religious instruction as the public schools instituted by the colonial authorities gave none. On the other hand, only the latter prepared for everyday life. This has resulted in the growth of private schools intended to do both. These are called madrasas and are intended to be schools for all. Attached to the madrasas are schools for higher education; in these religious instruction plays a very prominent part. In these schools which owe their origin to circles influenced by modern ideas, the method of instruction is taken from European models; but their outlook is not by any means broader than that of the old pasantrens. The name madrasa points to Egypt or perhaps Arabia; the organization, apart from the religious instruction, is modelled exactly on the government schools.

In the country of the Minangkabau Malays (Central Sumatra) there are theological seminaries which correspond on the whole with the pasantrens; they are called surau, a name also given to elementary schools, chapels, houses for men, and also to the separate buildings of the institution called surau. The students' houses are not divided into cells; the occupants have a common lecture- and sleeping-room.

Atjeh also has seminaries comparable with the
Javanese. The method of instruction however, which in Java may be called the new one, is the only one here; Malay takes the place of Javanese there; a knowledge of this language is therefore indispensable for students in Atjeh. The lodgings of the students (ranggang) have the same plan as the pondok of Java; just as the pondatens are also called pondok, so the name ranggang in Atjeh is also applied to the whole institution.

**Bibliography:** C. Snouck Hurgronje, *De Atjehers, Batavia* 1894, ii. 1 sqq.: *De Islam in Nederland-Indië, in Gesammttliche Schriften*, iv/ii. 377 sqq.; *De maaridjo in indische godsdienstscholen in de Palaangoesse bovenlanden, in I. G.,*, (1888), 318 sqq. (R. A. Kern)

**PASE, the name of a district on the north coast of Atjeh (Sumatra) which according to the prevalent native view stretches from the Djambō-Ajē river in the east to the other side of the Pasē river in the west. The whole area is divided up into a number of little states each with an adilulang or chief. Pasē at one time was a kingdom known throughout eastern Asia. The north coast of Atjeh was in the middle ages on the trade route by sea from Hindustan to China. Islam followed this route and firmly established itself from India on this coast, the first point in the east Indian archipelago which it reached. In the xiiith century we know there were already Muslim rulers here. One of these was Malik al-Ṣalīḥ (d. 1297), according to native tradition founder of the state and the man to make the country Muslim; his tomb made of stone imported from Cambay (India) has been discovered along with several other gravestones on the left bank of the Pasē river, not far from the sea. The capital of the kingdom is said to have been here; it was a second capital rather more to the west was Sumadra; it was the royal residence when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in the middle of the xiiiith century twice visited the land, on his way to China and on the return journey. The present name of the island of Sumatra, by which it is known in the west, comes from Sumadra — in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa: Sumatra. Pasē was then a flourishing country on the coast; the ruler was king of the port; who himself sent out trading-ships; a ship belonging to him was seen by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in the harbour of Phukien (Fukien) in South China. Life at the court was modelled on that of the Muḥammadan courts of India. The ruler at this time was an ardent Muslim, who took a great interest in learning. He waged a victorious dīkāh on the natives in the hinterland. Leaders coins struck in the country and Chinese crude gold were the means of exchange. The chief food was rice.

Shortly after Ibn Baṭṭūṭa left the country the king had to recognise the suzerainty of the Javanese Hindu empire of Madjapātī (before 1365). A tomb of a queen or princess found near Lhōd Sukan has an Arabic inscription, dated 791 (1389) at the top of the stone and at the bottom an inscription in much weathered old Javanese script. It has not yet been read. The Chinese envoy Cheng Ho remarked in 1416 that the land was involved in continual war with Nago (Pidie). He mentions rice, silkworms and pepper as its products. The last-named attracted the Portuguese there. From 1521 they had a fortified settlement in Pasē but in 1524 they were driven out by the sultan of the rising kingdom of Atjeh (i.e. Great Atjeh). Henceforth Pasē was a dependency of Atjeh. The tombs of the rulers of the former kingdom were still an object of pilgrimage to the most famous sultan of Atjeh, Iskandar Sbēnī, as late as 1048 (1638–1639); at the present day even the memory of the old kingdom is extinct. The mouth of the Pasē river is silted up and the place where the capital stood is no longer recognisable.

Pasē exercised through the years a considerable influence in the Malay Archipelago through its Muslim scholars and missionaries. Javanese and Malay tradition have preserved their memory.


(R. A. Kern)

**PASHA (T., from the Pers. pādišāh, probably by Turkish başbā), the highest official title of honour (umwān or laḥāf) in use in Turkey until quite recently and still surviving in certain Muslim countries originally parts of the Turkish empire (Egypt, Ḳaṣr, Syria). It was always accompanied by the proper name like the titles of nobility in Europe but with this difference from the latter, that it was placed after the name (like the less important titles of bey and efendi). In addition, being neither hereditary nor giving any rank to wives, nor attached to territorial possessions, it was military rather than feudal in character. It was however not reserved solely for soldiers but was also given to certain high civil (not religious) officials.

The title of pasha first appears in the xiiiith century. It is difficult to define its original use exactly. The word had in any case early assumed and lost the vague meaning of "seigneur" (*dominus*) (cf. Diwān-ī Ṭurkī-i Sulṭānī Wālī, p. 14; text of the year 712 = 1313, where Allāh himself is invoked in the phrase *Ey Pāshā*!). At this same period the title of pasha like that of sulṭān was sometimes given to women (cf. Ismā‘īl Ḥakīm, *Ḳūtibeh*, 1927, index, s.v. Kadim pasha, Seljuk pasha), a practice which recurs only once again, and then exceptionally, in the xivth century in the case of the mother of the Khedive (cf. Wālīde Sulṭān).

Under the Saljūḳs of Anatolia the title of pasha (in as much as it was an abbreviation of pādišāh and always by analogy with that of sulṭān) was given occasionally to certain men of religion who must also have at the same time been soldiers and whose history is not yet well known. To judge from the genealogy which ʿAṣhir-pasha-zađe claims for himself, the title of pasha was already in use in the first half of the xivth century. Mḥltī Ḳulābī al-Dīn Mūsā Baha, alias Shāhī Mūkhlīs or Mḥltī Pasha had, according to ʿAli Efendi, seized the power before the Kāramāñghmū and in the same region, after the defeat of the Sulṭān Ghiyāth al-
In the provinces they were, and became, more numerous, and two classes of pashas were distinguished: 1. the pashas of 5 horse-tails (ługh) or ważir (a rank which became more and more one of honour and extending to the provinces gradually absorbed that of beylerbey); 2. the pashas of 2 horse-tails or mir-mirân (rank at first the Persian synonym for the Turkish beylerbeyi and the Arabic amîr al-ûmara but gradually became a lower rank). Besides, the old sandzâk-beys had in principle a right to only one horse-tail were promoted mir-mirân and thus became pashas in their turn.

After the Tanzimat the title of pasha was given to the four first (out of 9) grades of the civil (1. ważir, 2. bâlî, 3. iltî, 4. sâhîye şefî ewevet) or military (1. mûshir, 2. birîngi ferî, 3. ferî, 4. ilvî) hierarchy and to the notables (3. râmet beylerbeyi, 4. mir-mirân), with in practice unjustified extension to the fallen mir-al-ûmara, in this case to the purely honorary rank of the sixth grade.

The table of ranks having been abolished after the fall of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish Republic retained the title of pasha for soldiers only. It has just been abolished by the Grand National Assembly of Ankara (Nov. 26, 1934). Instead of pasha one now uses general and in place of mûshir, mareşal.

In western usage the word was at first pronounced başha (the pronunciation pasha does not appear till the xvith century): Ital. bascia, Low Latin basca, Fr. bacha or bassa, Eng. bashaw, to say nothing of variant spellings. In Greek on the contrary, the form pasha is the oldest (xvith century) but probably under western influence we also find başha (xvith century); cf. Ducange, Glossarium medicæ et intimæ Graecitatis, s. w. pashas.

The pronunciation as başha by Europeans is due either to the influence of Arabic in Egypt or to a confusion with the old Turkish title of başha (cf. at the end of the article).

The etymology of the word pasha: we shall examine the various etymologies that have been proposed.

1. Pers. pâshâ “foot of the sovereign”. This explanation, which was based on the fact that in ancient Persia there were officials called “eyes of the king”, is found already in Trévoux’s Dictionary (s. v. bacha) and was revived by G. v. Hammer. — It is to be rejected.

2. Turk. baş “head, chief” already suggested by Antoine Geffroy (Brieve description de la Cour du Grand Turc, 1542) and by Leunclavius (Lowenklau), Pandæstæ historiae turciciæ, suppl. to his Annales (1588). Cf. also Trévoux’s Dict. and Barbier de Meynard, Sûppl. — It is to be rejected. — Cf. the following word.

3. Turk. baş-ašha taken (for the purposes of proof) in the meaning of “elder brother”. This is the etymology accepted in Turkey until lately (Mehmed Thureyya, Sûdûl-i Othmânî, iv. 738; Shams al-Dîn Şâmi, Kâmîsî türkî, s. v. pasha) and based on the fact that Sultanāmeh Pasha and Ala‘î al-Dîn Pasha were the elder brothers of Orkhan and Othmân respectively. ‘Ali Efendi in his Kûthi ul-Abhâr written in 1593–1599 (v. 49, 29) and Othmân-zade Ahmed Tâhir (d. 1724) called attention to this use of the word pasha among the Turkomans (Hâdîkah al-Wâzarâ‘, Istanbul 1271, p. 4, 16). Heidborn (Manuel de Droit Public et Administratif Ottoman, Vienna 1908, p. 186, note a) also says that pasha
means “elder brother” among the Greeks of Karmania, but there seems to be nothing to confirm these isolated statements. Some Turkish lexicographers like Ahmâd Wefik (under شَكَّ) and Şaliánh have admitted this etymology but by two stages: pašâ comes from the Turkish title başka which is for başkâş. The title of başka to be discussed below does really seem to come from başka-şâh but, contrary to what I at first thought, has nothing to do with pašâ.

4. Pers. دَبَّسَ “sovereign”. — Etymology, the only admissible one (with however the possibility of the influence mentioned under 5), proposed by the Turkish-Russian dictionary of Bougakov (1869) and later revived by the Russian Encyclopaedia of Brockhaus and Efron. It had previously been proposed by d’Hebelot (under pašâ, à propos of the spelling with final h). This explanation is based on the use of the words șultân and șâdâr, as the titles most often placed after the names when applied to individuals of high rank in the religious world (dervishes). Cf. Giese, in Türkîyât Muşâmidî, i., 1925, p. 164. It seems that one can even explain by șâdâr the obscure phrase used by Orkhan to șâh at-Alî d’In Pašâ in șâh-i șâh-șâh-șâh (ed. Giese, p. 34–35) before the latter asks leave to retire (cf. above). Orkhan says “You will be pašâ for me” Now a few lines earlier he had asked him to be a șâh-șâh-șâh, i.e. a shepherd for his people. On the other hand, it will be noted that the title of pašâ is often used not only as an alternative for șâdâr but also for șâh. Here are a few examples:

Shudâ- at-Alî d’In Sulamân, of the dynasty of Kızîl Aḥmedî, is called Sulamân șudâr in Ibn Bahâjî as (ed. Defremery and Sanguineti, ii. 343) and Sulamân Pašâ in Şâhî at-Alî d’In b. al-Őmari at-Tûsî fi l-l-Muqtašâl al-ṣârîf, Cairo 1312, p. 4; written șâbî, following the Arabic script) and in Movâmîdîn Bašî (iii. 30). The son and successor of this ruler, Ibrahimî, is called Şâhî in Ibn d’Alî-Őmari and Pašâ in Movâmîdîn Bašî. — In the Dastür-nâme-i Enâver (ed. Mukrîm Khâlid, p. 83–84) Sulamân Pašâ, son of Orkhan, is called Şâhî Sulamân (with poetical inversion). — șâh b. Čîçek (Čeçek), the Iklîânî governor of Baghdâd (dl. 1336), is called șâh Pašâ by Ibn d’Alî-Őmari. According to Navîzîdî (Gulshîn-e Khâliťa, Constantinople 1143), he is also found in some MSS as șâh Şâhî. He is also called șâh Pašâ (Şâhî, Histoirie de Bagdad, p. 10). — In the original dialects the title of șâh is taken in the form, not to pašâ but of paša (Kırghiz) and șâhâ (Ozbek).

5. Turk. başka (variants başkaş ș. başkaş ș.) “governor, chief of police” (Dictionary of Pâvet de Courtelle and under başkaş in that of Bougakov). This word of the “Khârîzîmî language” according to Vullers came into use in Persia (Ikhânîd). Among the Mongols it meant the commissioners and high commissioners sent by them to the conquered provinces (of the west only); notably in Russia. The accepted etymology is from the verb başkaş, “to press, crowd, oppress, impress”, whence the meaning “oppressor, extorter” for başkaş; an official, it is noted (cf. the Russian and Polish encyclopaedias), whose main duty was to collect taxes and tribute. However extraordinary such an explanation of an official title may appear it seems to be confirmed by the parallelism with the Mongol equivalent of başkaş which is daruqâha or daruqâha [q.v.] and which may be compared with daruqâh, a Mongol verb, synonymous with basmaš in the sense of “to impress”. These may however be popular etymologies.

Schefer in his edition of the Voyage de M. d’Aramon (p. 238, note 3) says “The etymology of the word pašâ given by Geoffroy (from the Turkish back) is wrong. Pašâ is a softened form of the word basqaq or pašqāq which means a military governor”.

Carpini renders the Mongol başkaş by baschati (variants in the MS; bascato, bastaci; cf. The texts and versions of John de Pl. Carpini…, London, Hakluyt Soc., 1903, p. 67 and 261 notes). In the edition of 1598 (Hakluyt) there is a marginal note “Basha, vox Tartarica qua utuntur Turci”. This also implies a confusion between the words başkaş and pašâ.

It is not impossible that there was actually some confusion among the Turks themselves between șâdâr (pašâ) and the title başkaş, the synonym of the Mongol daruqâha. We had thought of this even before we saw the notes of Schefer and Hakluyt. It may be noted that the title of pašâ (which is not found in Persian sources, as Muhammâd Kâzîmî kindly informs us) was applied either to Anatolians, subject in fact or in theory to the Mongols, or to officials of the Mongol İklîanî (like the governor of Baghdâd mentioned above; cf. also șâh-ș. Iklî Pašâ alluded to in the Bezm-u Kema of Azîz b. Arâdšâh Astâbâdî [ed. Kopula, p. 249, 8]). The confusion could be explained the more easily as one finds (I think it is true) the form başkaş (Djuwântî, Tavishi-i İklînân-Qâhî, 1260, ed. Muhammâd Kâzîmî, ii. 83, note 9; in this passage there is a reference to a Khârîzîmî official of 609, i.e. before the Mongol conquest).

It may be suggested that but for the influence of this confusion with the title başkaş that of pašâ would never have attained such importance.

The Turkish title of başkaş. — This title which is not to be confused with the preceding, nor with the Arabic or old eastern pronunciation of it, was also put after the proper name but was applied only to soldiers and the lower grades of officers (especially janissaries) and it, seems, also to notables in the provinces [Meninski, Thesaurus, i., col. 662 and 294, l. 18, Onomasticon, col. 427; d’Herbelot, s. v. pašâ; Viguier, Éléments de la langue turque, 1799, p. 218, 309, 327; Zenker, p. 164, col. 2 (probably following Meninski); De La Mottayre, Voyages, 1727, i. 180 note 1; cf. Ewliya Čelebi, v. 107, 218; Naîmî, v. 71; Ismî‘îl Haşkı, Kiâvetî, s. v. pašâ, 27, 41 and 8)]. De La Boulaye-Le-Gouz (“Le Voyages, 1657, p. 59 and 552”) also distinguishes the title of başkaş (given by Chloros, s. v. paša) it comes from the spelling paşâ (cf. e.g. Aḥmad Wefik Paša, Zaraki Taḥh, act ii., sc. 2, ironically applied to a woman) but Meninski pronounces başaş, even with this spelling.

As the lexicographers have sometimes confused
basha and pasha, some have thought that basha also meant "elder brother" (Mehmed Şalāh, Kamûsi-i ʾothmânî, ii. 291 sqq. followed by Çloros). I think we have two separate problems and that basha is really for basha-ağa but with the meaning of "aga (the shah, or sultan). The Janissaries or yatâbâ (according to Roehrig). On the other means of basha-ağa and in general for more details on some of the points dealt with here see Deny, Sonmaire des Archives turques du CAIRE.

Note on the accentuation.—In the word pasha the tonic accent is on the last syllable (pasha). In the word basha it is on the first (basha) as is shown by the weakening of the final vowel in the pronunciation bâšî, already mentioned.

(J. Deny)

PASHALIK (r.), means 1. the office or title of a pasha (q. v.); 2. the territory under the authority of a pasha (in the provinces).

After some of the governors called sanjak-beyi (or mir-ievê) had been raised to the dignity of pasha, their territories (sanjak or ievê; q. v.) also received the name of pashalik.

Early in the sixteenth century of 158 sanjakas 79 were pashaliks. Of these 25 were pasha sanjakas, i.e. sanjakas in which were the capitals of an eyalet, the residence of the governor-general or wali of a province. For further details, cf. Mournadéa d’Ohsom, Tableau général de l’Empire Othoman, vii. 307.

(J. Deny)

PASHTO. [See ARZIHNISTAN, i. 149 sqq.]

PASIR. The sultanate of Pasir in S. E. Bornœ comprises the valley of the Pasir or Kendilo river, which, rising in the north on the borders of Kuate runs in a southeasterly direction along the eastern borders of the Beratos range and turning east finally reaches the straits of Malacca through a marshy district. The country, about 1,125 sq. km. in area, is still covered by primitive forest, in so far as the scanty population, which is found mainly in Pasir, the residence of the sultan, and in Tanah Grogot, that of the official administration, has not cleared the trees to make ricefields. Although some gold, petroleum and coal are found in Pasir, Europeans have not exploited them, still less do they practice agriculture. A European administrative official was first stationed in 1901 at Tanah Grogot at the mouth of the Kendilo river. Pasir is therefore a good example of the Bornœ coast state which as regards Islam has developed independently of European influence. The population of the sultanate is estimated roughly at 17,000. It consists of-dayaks who live by growing rice, of immigrant Bandjarese and Buginese from Celebes, who control the trade; they are found chiefly in the flat country at the river mouth. On the coast the Badjoes, a people of fishermen, live in their villages built on piles in the sea. Of the 9,000 Dayaks, about 4,000 have adopted Islam, while 5,000 in the highlands are pagans. The 5,000 Buginese have a predominating influence in view of their large numbers and their prosperity: the 1,200 Bandjarese are of less importance. There are very few Europeans and about 50 Chinese and Arabs in Pasir.

Half of the population are therefore foreigners, but like the Dayaks they belong to the Malay race and mix with one another.

Pasir is despotically ruled by the sultan and the members of his family; the people have no voice in the government. Alongside of the sultan and his presumed successor there is a council of five notables which the sultan consults on important occasions; this is also the highest court of the country. These notables and a number of other members of the sultan’s family have estates as fiefs. Since 1844 each sultan on his accession has concluded a treaty with the Netherlands Indian authority. In 1906 they declared themselves vassals of the Netherlands Indian government. In 1900 the right to collect duties on imports and exports and taxes, as well as the monopoly of opium and salt, was ceded to the government in return for compensation. This amounts to 16,800 gulden yearly of which 11,200 go to the sultan and 5,600 to the notables.

The sultan still collects the following taxes: a poll-tax from adult males; 1/10 of the yields of the rice-fields and forest products, 2 cocoanuts from each fruit-bearing tree; also military service. He also has an income from the administration of justice in the capital.

From the very legendary history of the country it may be gathered that this despotic government which is foreign to the Dayaks was introduced from eastern Java. Under the ruling caste are the chiefs of lower rank, priests and landowners and freemen as a middle class. At the beginning of this century there were still slaves and debtorslaves as the lowest class in Pasir; although slavery had long been abolished in other states of the Indies under Dutch influence. As is usual among other Dayak tribes, slaves go about like free men, take part in all festivities and games, may own property and are not even distinguished by dress. If their debt is paid to their master by some one, they go over to the latter. Slaves are not sold.

As the social condition of the Muslim Buginese, Bandjarese and Badjoes have already been described elsewhere, the following remarks are confined to the pagan Dayaks and their Muslim relatives, the Pasirese.

According to tradition, an Arab (Tuan Said) brought Islam to Pasir. His marriage with the daughter of the reigning chief did much to further the progress of Islam in the country.

As to the Pasirese, their social life was only superficially affected by Islam. In their daily life a pagan conception of the worship of the deity and of the world of spirits still prevails. The old belief in the important influence of spirits on the fate of man and reliance upon their signs are evidence of this. The fact also is significant that throughout Pasir there is only one muisizit and a few smaller places of worship. The number of Muslim priests and hajjis is also small nor is the enthusiasm to make the pilgrimage to Mecca great. On important occasions appeal is made for assistance to the spirits; this is particularly the case with illness among the Pasirese, who hold the pagan biaun feasts, which are also celebrated in South Bornœ. Amid a great din of gongs and drums which can be heard a long way off, the pagan priest (balian) becomes possessed by the spirits which then communicate to him the remedy for the illness. Even in the capital Pasir, exclusively inhabited by Muhammedans, the advice of the balian is sought; only during the month of Ramadân the sultan forbids this.

How attached the upper classes of Pasir still
are to animistic views is evident from the legend still current according to which Sultan Adam in the middle of the last century used to isolate himself for several days in the year on the mountain of the spirits, Gunung Melikat; he had concluded, it was said, a marriage there with a female djinn from which a son named Tendang was born. This son, who has the gift of making himself invisible, is said to live on the island of Madura where he married a princess of the djinn. He appears from time to time in Pasir, when he is invited by a great sacrificial feast (formerly also human sacrifice). These feasts are still celebrated occasionally, especially in order to free the land from misfortune and sickness. In the village of Jusun a house has been built for Tendang with a roof in three parts, which is built on a large pole and thus resembles a dove-cote.

The revenues of the priests consist of what they collect at the end of the month of fasting in cæleri and pancia, everyone giving what he can and the chiefs exercising no control. A priest also receives a small fee at a marriage or divorce.

The calendar now in general use in the sulphate is the Muhammedan. As elsewhere among the Dayaks the tilling of the fields begins when a particular constellation becomes visible in the heavens.

The family life of the Pasirese has developed to some extent according to Muslim ritual. Among the followers of Islam, marriage is performed through the intermediary of a priest, with the father or another man as wašli, but only after an agreement has been come to about the very considerable dowry. This is paid to the parents of the bride; she herself only receives a small part of it. According to Dayak custom young people are allowed to meet very freely before marriage. A marriage feast is marked by a very considerable consumption of palm-wine. The man remains for at least a year in the home of his parents-in-law before he can take a home of his own. Divorce is very frequent because attention is seldom paid to the wishes of the woman in the negotiations between the parents. Man and woman retain their property after marriage; after a divorce this goes back to the family. Property acquired during marriage is divided into two equal portions between husband and wife. After the death of one or the other the survivor inherits all. Only a few families follow the Muslim law. The followers of Islam are buried with Muhammedan rites.


PASSAROWITZ. [See Pozarevac.]

PASWAN-OGHULU (written پیاسن اوغلی; cf. Kamis al-‘Alam, ii. 1467) or Paswan-Oghulu (پژفان اوغلی) in ‘Abd al-Rahman Sharaf, Tarikh, ii. 280) or, according to the new orthography, Pasvantoğlu (Hüyük ve Mahsin, Türkiye Tarıhi, p. 423) but on his own seal “Paswan-zade ‘Othmann” (in Oreşkən, see Bibl.), the rebel Pasha of Vidin (1758–1807). His family originated in Tuzla in Bosnia, but his grandfather Paswan Agha, for his services in the Austrian wars, was, granted two villages near Vidiu in Bulgaria about 1739. Othmann’s father ‘Omar Agha Paswan-Oghulu not only inherited these villages but as bairakar etc. was also a rich and prominent man (ajân); on account of his defiant attitude, however, he was put to death by the local governor.

Othmann himself only escaped death by escaping into Albania, but after taking part in the war of 1787–1789 as a volunteer, he returned to his native town. Very early he was in the field again and fought with distinction, returning to Vidin in 1791. From there he organised with his men raiding expeditions into Wallachia and Serbia. When the sultan wanted to punish him for this, he cast off his allegiance in 1793, took to the mountains and at the end of 1794 captured Vidin with his robber band and became the real ruler in the pasha’s there. Vidin, which he fortified again, thus became a meeting-place for robbers and discontented janissaries who were driven out of Serbia in 1792, and he himself became the popular leader of all those who opposed the reforms of Selim III.

In 1795 Paswan-Oghlu even attacked the governor of Belgrade, Hadji Muṣṭafâ Pasha, a supporter of the reformers, who had been given the task of disposing of him; strong bodies of troops were sent by the Porte but without success. In consequence negotiations were begun at the end of 1795 but Paswan-Oghlu remained practically independent in the whole of Upper Bulgaria.

But since the Porte did not also formally recognise him, Paswan-Oghlu drove the official governor out of Vidin and in 1797 attacked the adjoining pashaliks: in the east his forces occupied or threatened a number of places in Bulgaria (but they were defeated at Varna) and in the south they attacked Nish [q. v.] without success; in the west they advanced up to Belgrade, occupied the town but were driven back from its fortress by the resistance of the Turks and Serbs whom Hadji Muṣṭafâ had armed. As a result of this and because of Paswan-Oghlu’s negotiations with France and Russia the Porte in 1798 sent an army of 100,000 men against him under Admiral Kulek Husain Pasha. He besieged Vidin in vain until October and had to withdraw with heavy losses. This defeat and Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt induced Turkey to come to terms, nominally at least, with Paswan-Oghlu and give him the rank of Pasha of three tails (1799).

Nevertheless he declared himself against the reforms, against the central government and even against Selim III; he also sent several expeditions to plunder Wallachia (1800 and 1801) and incited the janissaries who had in the meanwhile returned to Belgrade to occupy the fortress (in the summer of 1801) and to murder Hadji Muṣṭafâ Pasha (at the end of the year).

At this time he repeatedly asked the Czar to number him among his faithful subjects and also offered his services to France. The Porte, which shortly before had forgiven Paswan-Oghlu everything, from 1803 declared war on him again, but the Serbian rising of 1804 diverted their attention. Paswan-Oghlu himself had to fight in the western part of his territory against Pintzo’s rising (1805). The appearance of the Russians on the left bank of the Danube (1806) induced him to offer his services to the Porte but the latter instead gave the supreme command to the commander of Rusiçk. This embittered him so much that he resolved to defend only his own territory against the allied Russians and Serbians but he died soon afterwards on Jan. 27, 1807.
That Paswan-Oghlu was able to hold out so long was due to the state of the Ottoman empire at the time, to his personal ability and foresight (he never abandoned Vidin!) but for the most part to luck. Within his area he collected customs and taxes, ruled strictly and despotically, although not entirely without mildness and justice. Although his health was rather poor as a result of too great mental strain, ambition led him to aim at independence as evidence of which we have the coins struck by him and known as Paswanleta.


(Fejih Bajraktarević)

**PATANI, an administrative district of Siam in the extreme south of the kingdom on the east coast of the peninsula of Malacca; it is bordered on the south by the Malay states of Kêlantan and Kélah, both under British protection. The whole district is made up of seven Malay petty states, each with its own native chief who is assisted by a Siamese official. Malay forms of government are allowed to remain. In the capital of the same name resides the Siamese High Commissioner of the district. His advice has to be obeyed by the rulers of the states.

The native inhabitants are Muslims. Friday and other mosques are distinguished. The latter are called *surau* and have their own staffs. All the states have law-courts: the *shari'a* is followed in matters of family law, Siamese law in other cases.

Patani is a very mountainous country. There is only a strip of plain on the coast. The area is about 13,000 sq. km. and the number of inhabitants about 350,000; the great majority are Malays, the remainder being Siamese and Chinese. There are few roads. The railway which connects the Siamese Southern railway with the English lines in Malacca cuts through the country a short distance from the coast. Agriculture is of little importance; only in the environs of Patani and in Nawng-Chik rice is cultivated. A large number of the people live by fishing; the fish caught are salted with salt obtained locally. Tin-mining is increasing. The exports include dried fish, salt, cattle, elephants and tin. Intercourse with Bangkok and Singapore is maintained by small steamers. The revenues amount to £45,000, of which one third is allotted to the Malay rulers as private income for themselves and their families, one third goes to administration, and a third set aside for special purposes, is also as a rule used for administrative purposes.

Fra Odorico of Pordenone in 1323 mentions a place called *Pater* in this region, which he identifies with Thalamasy. It is doubtful whether the reference is to Patani. The first certain occurrence of the name is in the xvth century when the Portuguese began to come here to trade. Patani has for centuries belonged to Siam. Advancing southwards the Thai reached Ligor about 1284 (on the coast, a little N. W. of Patani; Sukhotai inscription); in 1350 the whole of the peninsula of Malacca was under Siamese rule; the conquest of Patani took place between those dates. The *Nāgarakṛāgamā* in 1355 mentions Djähr, the modern Djiring, one of the seven states of the district with its capital on the sea, a little east of the town of Patani, as conquered by the Javanese kingdom of Madjapati. Soon after the conquest of the town of Malacca in 1511, the Portuguese began to trade in Patani. Many Portuguese settled here. About 1600 the Dutch and English appeared; Patani at this time was a prosperous centre of trade, a station between Malacca and China and a depot for the exchange of goods from China on the one side, and the most important harbours of the East India Archipelago on the other. When this last activity began to decline about 1620, the place lost its importance and the Europeans abandoned their settlements.

It is not definitely known when Patani became converted to Islam. About 1600 it was a Muhammadan country; the queen ruling at this time had succeeded her husband fifteen years before; in all probability the country was already Muhammadan at an earlier date when Mendez Pinto (1534, 1540) visited it. According to native tradition, the conqueror of the land, Chow Sri Bangsa, a son of the Siamese king, converted the country to Islam, after adoptting it himself and taking the name and title of Sultan Ahmad Shah. He is said to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Malacca; this suggests that Malacca was the power that caused the conversion. Malacca, as is well known, was during the xvth century the predominant power in the Malay peninsula.


(R. A. Kern)
PATHAN. [See AFGHANISTAN, I. 149 seq.]

Paula, the name given in the Moghul Emperor Akbar's monetary system to the 1/4 din (1/4 paisa). (J. ALLAN)

PECENEGS, a people of Turkish stock of the middle ages. Their name occurs in numerous variants (Bağınak, Paçan, Paçošiazt, Paçošaž, Paçošaxa, Paçinaclae, Patzinacae, Pecinigi, Un-cemakiti, Pecenaci etc.; also Bysseni, Besi, in Hungarian Besenyő, etc.). There is no longer any doubt that they were a branch of the Turkish race. Rashid al-Din (xiii century; see AFGHANISTAN) and Mahmud Kâşghari (1073) number them among the Ghuzz (q.v.); the latter (Dirîm Luchîd al-Turk, i. 27; cf. K. Cr. A., i. 36) puts them in the northern group of Turkish peoples, to which the Kipčak, Oghuz, etc. belong and describes them

as next to the Khomaens" i.e. the most westerly Turkish tribe.

In all probability the Peceneqs separated very early from their brethren in the original home of the Turks in Turkestan. Their early hotme is said to have been the Embar-Ural-Volga region, which according to Bakri and Gardinzi was a "days' journey in length and breadth. Where they remained probably for a considerable time, their neighbours being the Khazars in the S.W., and the Oghuz in the S.E., and they traded with Persia and Kazima.

But by 860 the Oghuz began to move westwards and to drive the Peceneqs from the Ural region. Towards the end of the ixth century the Oghuz (Uzen, Oônga) came to terms with the Khazars and drove the main body of the Peceneqs from their old home, so that in 922 Ibn Fadlan found only a small remnant of the Peceneqs there; according to De administrando imperio (p. 166), the latter remained there of their own accord.

The fugitive Peceneqs came up against the Magyars, drove them into Hungary and occupied their lands, at first the territory between the Don and the Dniester and later as far as the Danube. Constantine Porphyrogenitos (c. 950) says that this took place "fifty years ago"; but the chronicler Regno (d. 915) dates it exactly in 889. The power of the Peceneqs in the end extended from South Russia over Besarabia and Moldavia up to the Eastern Carpathians.

Warlike and powerful as they were the Peceneqs were a constant danger to their neighbours. Here however we can only briefly mention their relations with Hungary, Russia and Byzantium. In the course of the ixth and xith centuries they frequently attacked Hungary from the Eastern Carpathians or settled peacefully in various Hungarian districts (cf. the map of their settlements in Németh, Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Miklos, l. Editage). In the xiith century the Peceneq settlements in Hungary still enjoyed certain special political privileges. They finally became merged in the Komans.

With the Russians, the Peceneqs were early on friendly terms (according to the De administrando imperio, p. 69, they sold them cattle, horses, and sheep); sometimes they were their allies against Byzantium and Bulgaria (in the time of Igor, 941), but more frequently they were attacking the Russians. In the year 968 they besieged Kiev, in 971 they killed the Grand Duke Sviatoslav on his way back from Bulgaria and the Russians had to build a number of fortifications against them. Their last attack (1034) was completely repulsed. A little later (1065) they were being hard pressed by the advancing Uzen and moved more and more towards the Danube and later also back to the Balkan peninsula.

The Byzantine imperial historian in De adm. imp. (p. 68) recommends the maintenance of peaceful relations with the Peceneqs and there was actually an alliance with them but by 970 we find them fighting with the Russians against Byzantium. Henceforth the Peceneqs were continually at war with the Byzantines until the emperor Alexius I in 1091 routed them completely at the mouth of the Maritza and in 1122 John II inflicted another heavy defeat upon them. Of the remnants of the Peceneqs some were taken into the military service of the Byzantines and some settled in the Balkan, especially in Bulgaria.

The Gagauz (q.v.) are sometimes regarded as what was left of them but their present language gives very little evidence of this (cf. vol. iv., p. 932). Nevertheless a number of Balkan place-names still recall the fact that the Peceneqs were once there.

With the nomadic nature of the Peceneqs it is obvious that the tribal organisation was an important factor. According to C. Porphyrogenitos the Peceneqs were divided into eight tribes (four beyond and four on this side of the Dniester) with as many great chiefs and into 40 clans with petty chiefs. The names of the tribes according to Németh were mainly derived from the names of horses and from titles of the supreme chief e.g. Seromuakthi = siru Kalhey, i.e. "the tribe of Kül-hey, with grey horses". The three tribes who were prominent for bravery and distinction are called Kangar (Kâgâyq) by Porphyrogenitos. Of the names of chiefs of that of the tribe of Julia (Ilia), namely Korkut (q.v.), is probably the most remarkable.

In the time of Kedrenos (ii. 581–582) there were thirteen Peceneq tribes "each of which had inherited its name from its ancestor and chief".

We know very little about the religion of the Peceneqs. According to Bakri they were formerly fire-worshippers (Magians) but according to other sources there were already a considerable number of Muslims among them by the beginning of the tenth century.

As to the Peceneq language, Anna Comnena (xiith century) already asserts its identity with that of the Komans [see KİVÇAK]. Until recently its scanty remains consisted almost entirely of the names of the Peceneq tribes, chiefs and fortresses listed by C. Porphyrogenitos. But even in 1931 Németh succeeded in deciphering the inscriptions of the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklos, it became evident to him that the gold and silver vessels contained in it belonged to the Peceneq chief Botu-al Calban (c. 900–920) and that we had here further specimens of the Peceneq language; for these he concluded that the language of the Peceneqs was closely connected with that of the Komans in Hungary and that of the Codex Cumanicus. The characters of these inscriptions may be called Peceneq runes, which belong to the family of the Kok-turk script and are closely connected with the Hungarian runes.

In conclusion, from the fact that there are two baptismal fonts in the treasure of Nagy-Szent-Miklos it may be assumed that several Peceneq chiefs were converted to Christianity. Very
little more is known of the Pechenegs; cf. however the index to K. Dieterich (s. Bibl.).

Arabic: 'Al-Bakri (Ibn Rusta and Bakri) and Persian (Gardisi) records of the Pechenegs are based on Djiâmi (tenth century) and on a source of the first half of the twelfth century so that they only refer to the earlier home of the Pechenegs; Mas'ud’s account however includes the period after they were driven from the Volga region. Both groups of sources have been used by J. Marquart and W. Barthold. — Also: Constantinios Porphyrigenetos, ed. Bonn, vol. iii. (1840) see index historicus (the whole of ch. 37 deals with the Pechenegs); P. Golubovskiy, Pecheny, toriki i polevoj do najavstvogo tatar, Kiev 1884; Sh. Sâmi Bey, Kâmil es-Salam, ii. 1906; K. Krumbach, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, 1897, p. 1105; G. A. Encyklopädisches kritisches. Byzantinische Eprom, vol. xxiii.; St. Petersbserg 1808, p. 538 sq.; M. Malinov, Osowieczdânská war i osowieczdânská. Ścieżka, Leipzig 1903, ed. index; K. Râvi Nâgi Léxibona, vol. iii., Budapest 1911, s. v. Besenyö; K. Dieterich, Byzantinische Quellen zur Land- und Volkerkunde, 1912, part ii., esp. p. 51–58. 147 and 186; N. 'Âsim and M. 'Ârif, 'Othmâni Târîkhi, vol. i., Constantinople 1335. p. 75 sq.; E. Oberhumer, Die Türken und das Osmanische Reich, Leipzig and Berlin 1917, s. index; Z. Gombovec, Über den Volksnamen besenyo, in Turán, Budapest 1918, p. 209–215; W. Bang, Über den Volksnamen besnyo, op. cit., p. 436–437; G. Fehr, Die Petschenegi und die ungarnischen Hunsungen in K. C. A., i. 123–140 (assumes among other things that the royal family of the Abas is descended from Cseba or from the Pecheneg tribe Tûzû). Gy. Czebe, Turco-byzantinische Mischten (x), in K. C. A., i. 209–219 (rejects Fehr’s hypotheses, approves Német’s linguistic deductions and analyses once more the Pecheneg chapter in Porphyrogenetos); W. Barthold, Orta Asya Türk Târîkhiine hakkinda Dersler, Istanbul 1927, p. 23 and 92 sq.; J. Német, Zur Kenntnis der Petschenegi, in K. C. A., i. 219–225; do., Die petschenegischen Stammsnamen, in Ungarische Jahrbücher, vol. x., 1930, p. 27–34; do., Die Inschriften des Schatz von Nagy-Szent-Miklos, Budapest-Leipzig 1930, especially p. 36 and 45–59; Huseyn Namik, Pêçenêlek (Turkish), Istanbul 1933.

Pecheni, intham, Ottoman historian. Ibrahim was born in 982 (1574) in Fundkirchen (Hungary, Hung. Pásztor, Turk. Pçêvêt, i. e. Pierrevolt) whence his epithet Pèçeveti (cf. Pechevi, Tûrîkhi, i. 268 and ii. 433; also J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., iv. 5, note). His ancestors were holders of fiefs in Bosnia and Hungary. Pechevi has not recorded his father’s name (cf. Tûrîkhi, i. 87); he was in any case already domiciled in Fundkirchen. His mother was a member of the celebrated family of Sokolović (Sokolovi). Of Pechevi’s early years, we know that at the age of 14 he was taken as an orphan into the house of his uncle Ferhâd Pasha, governor of Ofen, and later went to another relative Lâlâ Mehmed Pasha (cf. his Tûrîkhi, ii. 323); he spent 15 years in the latter’s entourage. In 1602 (1593) he joined the army, took part in the Hungarian campaigns of Sinân Pasha, was an eye-witness of the siege of Gran (cf. Tûrîkhi, ii. 136, 180), of the Erlau campaign and the siege of Peterwardein. The next few years he spent mainly on the staff of Lâlâ Mehmed Pasha who had been grand vizier since 1613 (1604). He gives a detailed account in his history of the various offices which he held. After the death of his patron Lâlâ Mehmed Pasha (1624 = 1615) he was sent by his successor to Anatolia where he had to prepare a description of several sanjâjs. He was next defterdar for a short period in Tokât, went in the same capacity to Rumelia and finally was given the office of Anatolia as ‘alams’. He spent the rest of this life in his native district. He became muteşgal of Stuhlweissenburg, then defterdar of Temesvár. In 1641 (1631) he retired from office and went to Ofen. He spent his last years here and in his native town engaged in writing his history. The date of his death is not exactly known. He must however have died about 1660 (1650).

Ibrahim Pechevi, who from his youth upwards displayed a marked turn for history, is the author of a work which is one of the best Ottoman sources for the years 926–1049 = 1520–1639. While for earlier events he relies upon the accounts of his Turkish predecessors, and as N. v. Istvânyi and K. Heltai have shown, also Hungarian sources, for the later period he writes from his own observation or information. His work, which is written in lucid and simple language, survives in numerous manuscripts (to those detailed by Babinger, G. O. W., p. 195 may now be added two others in Upsala, University Library, cf. Zettersten, Katalog, p. 335 and a manuscript in Rhodes in the possession of Hâfit Ahmâd, No. 445), but so far we have no critical edition. Several preliminary drafts seem to exist which vary considerably in the periods covered and were presumably later expanded. The Stambul printed edition of the Tûrîkhi-Pêçeveti in two parts (1553 and 1554 pp. and 7 + 487 pp., printed 1285; cf. J. A., 1688, i. 471 and 481 and F. v. Kraelitz, in Ist., viii. 259) covers the period from the accession of Sulaimân the Magnificent to the death of Murad IV in 1049.


PECHINA, Arab. Bâdjiûnâ, formerly an important town in the south-east of Spain, to the north of Almeria (q. v.) (originally Mârijât Bâdjiûnâ), from which it is about six miles distant. Towards the middle of the ninth century it was the centre of a kind of maritime republic founded by Andalusian sailors, who had also a colony on the Algerian coast at Tenes (q. v.). It consisted of several quarters separated by gardens, becoming the capital of a âanat of the same name. Pechina was later supplanted by its neighbour Almera, to which its inhabitants soon migrated.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)
PELEH ład, Muhammud B. Íldegíz, Shams al–Dín, A'ábesg of Adhár báidján. His father Íldégíz [q.v.] had in course of time risen to be the real ruler in the Saljúq empire; the widow of Sultan Tughhril [q.v.] was Pelewán’s mother and Arsán b. Tughhril [q.v.] his step-brother. In the fighting between Íldégíz and the lord of Maágha, Ibn A’ás Sânjúr al–Amáldíz, Pelewán played a prominent part [cf. the article MÁÁGHa].

From his father he inherited in 568 (1172–1173) Arís, Á🏻xáábarádáján, Ádádán, Hamáádáján, Isááfádán and al–Ráí with their dependent territories and after a few years he also took Tughhril, which he gave to his brother Kísíl Arís [q.v.]. Like Íldégíz, Pelewán also became the real ruler. Sultan Arís b. Tughhril was completely under his control as was also his young son Tughhril [q.v.] whom Pelewán put on the Saljúq throne, after Arísán had been disposed of by poison. Pelewán died in Dhu ‘l–Hádáján 581 (Feb.–March 1186) or the beginning of 582 (1186) and his brother Kísíl succeeded him.

Ibn al–Áfhir (xi. 346) pays a high tribute to Pelewán’s statesmanlike qualities and during his tenure of office peace and prosperity prevailed in his governorship. After his death however, bloodshed and unrest broke out. In Isááfádán the Sháfíis and Hanáfís fought one another and at al–Ráí the Sunnís and Sháfíís until order was gradually restored.


(K. V. Zetterstéen)

PENDIDH. [See PENDIDH.]

PERA. [See CONSTANTINOPLE.]

PERAK. [See MALAY PENINSULA.]

PERSEPOLIS. [See ISÁÁFÁDÁJÁN.]

PERSIA.

I. HISTORICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL SURVEY.

J. H. Kramers

II. LANGUAGE AND DIALECTS.

(H. W. Bailey)

III. MODERN PERSIAN LITERATURE.

(E. Berthels)

I. HISTORICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL SURVEY.

NAME. The name PERSIA is of Western origin and probably only in the Middle Ages began to be used for the countries occupying the Iranian plateau (in Plautus Persia is found once instead of Persis). It is derived from the Greek–Roman appellation “Persae” for the Achamanids, an appellation that goes back to the name of the region of Persis in the west–south, named in its turn after a tribe that is probably identical with the Parsu, known by the Assyrian inscriptions as having occupied formerly a part of Media (oldest mention 844 B.C.). The name Fárís (New Persian: Pásr) in the Middle Ages was applied to the same region of Persis only, but Faráí was already at an early time used for one of the types of language spoken in the Iranian provinces (cf. Fáhrís, ed. Flügel, p. 13), which language since the 6th century became the written literary language that we call Persian.

Equally the appellation al–Furs, found in early Arabic literary sources, denoted the whole of the people of Persia, but was restricted in use to the Persians of pre–Islamic times or to those who had kept to their ancient traditional and religious views. This meaning is often synonymous with the Arabic expression al–ísháám.

The form Irán is of Pehlevi origin and goes back to an earlier form Arian, originally an adjective (á invoke in the younger Avesta) meaning “Aryan”, that was the name of a tribe of the state of the Sásánids, who styled themselves “kings of Ístán and Anárán”, and it occurs in the early Arabic historical and geographical sources in the form Irán–sháh, meaning the country of Irán (cf. i. a. Yákút, i. 417 sqq.).

In Muhammadian times the name became popular again by the revival of the ancient traditions in the Sháh–náma, but the use of the word Irán for the modern kingdom of Persia is probably not older than the sixth century, when the Persians began to call themselves Irániyán (about 890 there existed already a newspaper called Irán). Nor does the use of the words “Iranian” or “Iranisitic” in scientific publications appear to be older than the second part of the sixth century (Spiegel’s Etrusche Altertumskunde was published since 1871, and Darmesteter’s Études iraniennes in 1883).

Geographical survey. Throughout the Middle Ages Persia was neither a geographical nor a political unity. In treating the Persia of Muhammadian times we therefore must choose an arbitrary delimitation of the country, namely the territory comprising present Persia, Afghanistan and Balúčistán and in addition the region of Marw as far south as the present Persian frontier. The territory thus circumscribed may represent the actual Achaemenid and later the Sásánid empires, excluding the territories of al–Irák, Mesopotamia and Armenia, which during both periods belonged to those empires; Babylonia was called even in Sásánid times Dílí Iránsháh (B. G. A., vi. 5).

The greater part of Persia thus circumscribed consists of a plateau, very mountainous in parts, with the coastal regions of the Caspian and the Persian Gulf. With the exception of these coastal regions the waters of Persia have no outlet to the sea. The consequence is that there are hardly any great streams, the only rivers deserving that name being the Hílmand, which falls, like many smaller streams, into the depression of the Sístán lake, and the Herí–Rúd, which ends in the northern steppe. The many small streams allow only of a limited cultivation in the mountain valleys and on the fringes between the mountains and the deserts. This circumstance gives even to the inhabited mountainous stretches of the plateau the character of a series of oases, which are larger or smaller as the irrigation system (mostly effected by the subterranean aqueducts called kahríz) is more or less developed. The territory between the oasis towns and villages is steppe, which, in central Persia, become real desert, the soil of which is more or less saltish. The steppes, as also the higher mountain regions, support nomad life only, as they are only habitable during certain periods of the year, to which cause is added the very considerable variation of temperature in many regions. Nomads or semi-nomads have therefore
always lived together on the Iranian plateau with the settled population; the proportion has considerably varied on account of the frequent invasions of nomad peoples. Persia consists of a number of regions of very different character, which accounts for the lack of political unity during long periods of history. Each of these regions has formed occasionally an important political and cultural centre and the Islamic geographers in describing Persia give for each of them its own description. Their division is mainly traditional and at the same time geographical, but disregards the very variable and ephemeral political frontiers.

The regions may be divided into a western and an eastern group, separated by the great central Iranian desert, which extends from the Caspian Sea south-eastwards practically as far as the Indian Ocean in Mārkān. This desert, called by the geographers Mafṣafat Khorāsān, Mafṣafat Fāris, Mafṣafat Kirmān or Mafṣafat Sīstān, depending on the parts particularly taken into consideration, varies in breadth and character. Its level is on the whole considerably lower than the eastern and western parts of the Iranian plateau. The northern part is a large salt desert, where vegetation is hardly possible. To the south, to the east of Fāris, begins the region called on modern maps Dasht-i Lū; here, and further to the south-east there are not a few oases, which form important resting points on the many caravan ways that have linked up since olden times Fāris and Kirmān with Khorāsān and Sīstān. In the southern regions of Tūrān and Mārkān, with which it linked the large desert to the south of the Hīmand river, the desert or steppe character is prevalent. This series of deserts, though not forming an impassable barrier between east and west, has often coincided with political frontiers; only in the north in the region of Kūmās, east of al-Ra’i (later Teheran) and along the Caspian coast, a more continuous cultivated stretch links up Media with Khorāsān.

The central part of the western regions is Media, called al-Dījābīl in Muḥammadan times and later ʿIrāk, consisting of a plateau all covered by mountain ranges running mainly from E. to S. and bordered on its south-western side by the Zagros mountains; the most important towns are here Hamadān and Isfahān. To the north-west Aḏharbājīdān forms a continuation of al-Dījābīl, from which it is separated by the desertlike region of Ardabīl. Aḏharbājīdān is still more mountainous, being a transition to the Armenian and Caucasian mountain systems; it is also richer in water-courses; the river Araxes (al-Rass) may be considered its northern boundary. Its chief geographical feature is the big salt lake of Urmīya. In early Muḥammadan times Ardabīl was here the most important place, succeeded in modern times by Taβriz. The small coastal border to the east of Aḏharbājīdān belongs to the South Caspian regions, known in Islamic geography as al-Dīl, al-Dalīl, and further Tābārīstān, now Gīlān and Mīzandārān. This region consists of a narrow coastal stretch, widening somewhat towards the east and contrasting with the rest of Persia by its moist climate and rich vegetation; to the south it slopes rapidly upwards to the high range of the Elburz that forms the northern border of the central plateau; alongside the southern slope of this range stretches a narrow cultivated and inhabited area, in which al-Ra’i was the most important town and through which ran the main route to Khorāsān, passing, after al-Ra’i, Sāmān, al-Dīmāgāhān and Bīstān. At the south-eastern corner of the Caspian the route passed south of the mountain region of Dūrājān, which region, owing to the fact that its waters — the rivers Dūrājān and Atrek — flow towards the Caspian, does not belong geographically to Khorāsān.

In the south of al-Dījābīl the Lurīstān mountains are a transition to the low country of Kūzīstān, the ancient Elam and the modern Ṭūbāristān. It is very similar to al-Irāk, from which it is separated by desert stretches. The river of Ahwāz, now the Kūrān, fed by its tributary the Kerḵān, in the early Middle Ages flowed directly into the Persian Gulf, and later into the Shāṭ al-ʿArab. To the east of Kūzīstān and south-east of al-Dījābīl begin the mountain ranges of Fāris with their many mountain lakes and their fertile valleys, which find their continuation in the similarly shaped mountain region of Kīrmān, where, however, the desert areas are not so numerous. The chief town of Fāris in medieval and modern times, Shāṭ al-ʿArab, has replaced the ancient towns of Dūrājān and Lizākh, which the medieval towns of Kīrmān, al-Sīrādān and Dījrūf, have disappeared. The present town of Kīrmān being comparatively young. The coastal region of Fāris and Kīrmān is barren; here were the very important ports of Tawwaja, Sinīz, ʿIrāf and Hurmūz, now replaced by Būshīr and Bandar ʿAbbās. The geographers distinguish in Fāris and Kīrmān a southern hot zone (gūrārūn, gardak) and a northern colder zone (gūrārūn, isarad), a distinction important to nomads and pertaining to the climate and the vegetation; “hot regions” are found, however, also in the north-eastern parts of Kīrmān, where the land descends to the level of the central desert. The oasis of Yazd and environs is generally counted a part of Fāris. The country east of Kīrmān as far as the Indus, occupied by several mountain ranges, is poor in cultivated areas and has not much importance as a passage to the Indus region. It consists of the coast region of Mārkān and the parallel inner zone of Tūrān, forming together the present Balucūstān.

The north-eastern part of the Iranian plateau consists of three main regions, of which Sīstān with al-Rukk kād (Arachosia) is formed by the basin of the Hīmand; these waters flow into the Sīstān lakes, which have considerably changed their form in the course of history. The principal medieval towns were Zaranj and Bust. The mountain ranges become higher towards the north of this region and run mostly north and south; the eastern border is the water-shed of the Indus valley. To the north of Sīstān stretches the large region of Khorāsān. Its main features are a series of mountain ranges running east and west, bordered in the east by the Hindū Kush; between these mountains flow a number of rivers, mainly from the south-eastern ranges to the north-west or the north, where they lose themselves in the desert bordering the south bank of the Lījahān (Amū Darya) and continuing in a western direction towards the Caspian. The largest river is the Her-Rūd, on which is situated Herān, then the Marghāb with Marv al-Rūd and Marvān, and the river of Balkh. The westernmost section of Khorāsān with Isfārāyīn, Nīsābūr and Tūs (Meshhed) receives its waters from the western mountains that form a
not quite complete watershed between Khūrāsān and Djuhrān. Though certainly presenting a geographical unity, the large extent of Khūrāsān allows the division into smaller regions, such as Bādghīs, al-Djezhādān, Tūkhrīstān and others. The present frontier between Persia and Afghānistān cuts from north to south right through Khūrāsān and Sīstān. Finally the basin of the Indus and its tributaries forms a region of its own, although the part with Kābul to the south of the Hindū Kūsh and Ghazna (Zābulistān) was often counted by the Islamic geographers to Khūrāsān. The more southern part of the Indus valley is separated from the Hilmand system by the Sulaimān range and the deserts of Wazirīstān and is, owing to climate, poor in cultivated areas.

All over the Iranian plateau a system of secular caravan roads links up the many cultivated centres. The chief connections with the surrounding countries were the passage of the Araxes towards the eastern Caucasus (al-Kīn), the passes west of Urmia to Armenia, the pass-ways of Shahīrizā and Hulavān to Mesopotamia and al-Irāk, and the road from al-Baṣra to Aḥwāz. The sea-ports on the Persian Gulf maintained regular intercourse with the coast towns of Arabia, India and even Eastern Africa. Towards Ṭamoxanā (Mīr wārī al-Nahr) the chief passage was by Tirmīd on the Oxus, while the roads from Kābul and Ghazna to Mūltān were the chief connections between the Iranian plateau and the Islamic parts of India. The Caspian ports maintained a small traffic with the Volga mouth.

Historical survey. The relations between Arabia and Persia date from long before Islamic times. Arabs settled in southern Persia from the time of Shāhīr I, and the Sāsānids were masters of southern Arabia up to the time of Muḥammad. Then began, under the caliph ʿUmar, the Arab conquest of Persia, which inaugurated the Islamic period in the history of that country. The political and psychological prelude to this conquest was the taking of the capital of the Sāsānian empire, al-Madāʾin, in 637, after the battle of al-Kādisiyā. Although the exact dates of the different conquests and battles are not known, the early historical sources allow a reliable survey of the phases of the amazingly rapid progress of the Arabic invaders all over the Iranian plateau. For, with the exception of Mūrḵan and Kābul, all regions had been reached, as far as Balāz̄, before the death of the caliph ʿOṯmān (656). We may distinguish different chief expeditions that were directed primarily from Madīna, and secondarily from Kūfā and Medina; and the governors of those two garrison towns. The first expedition under Muḥammad, however, the conquest of the greater part of al-Djīdāl and south-eastern Adhārbaḏān, was the immediate consequence of the capture of al-Madāʾin by the army of Saʿd b. Abī Waḵṣās. It was followed, probably in 638, by the battle of Djallūlā and the conquest of Ḥulavān, Karmāsin (Karmāsinī), and, after reinforcement had been sent from Kūfā, by the famous battle of Nihāwand. These events caused the flight of king Zeidegerd by the way of Isfahān, Isfāhān, Kirmān, Sīstān, to Marv, where he was killed by the Masʿūb Māḥūya (651). Immediately after Nihāwand came the capitulation of Ardabīl (about 641), together with raids into Djuhrān. The further conquest of Adhārbaḏān, however, started from Mūsul, taken in 641 by ʿOṯbā b. Fārḵad, who, in the course of his expedition, took Shahīrizā, Urmīya and several other places in Adhārbaḏān. Nihāwand remained the base from which, under the direction of the first governors of Kūfā, were conquered al-Rāy and the towns of Kūmīn (after 641), and about the same time Hamadān, Ḵazwīn and Zābul. In the following years several expeditions were necessary in this region against the Dailamīs and other mountaineers. From Kūfā started also the first invasion of Kūhūzīstān under the governor al-Muẓhir b. Shuʾbā, but the real conquest of this region began in 638 under the famous governor of Baṣra ʿAbd Mūṣā al-ʿAṣārī. The subjugation of this very near neighbour did not take much time, the most serious resistance being met at Tawadī (Ṭūṣā). Kūhūzīstān remained ʿAbd Mūṣā’s base, from which he conquered the remaining towns of al-Djīdāl, namely al-Sīrwan, al-Ṣaimara, Kumm and Kaḥṣaṭā, an. Finally, in 644, by means of his lieutenant ʿAbd Allāh b. Būt, al-Iṣfāḥān.

The latter was also the first to move in the direction of Khūrāsān by forcing the towns called al-Ṭabāsān to capitulate. About the same time took place the first invasion of Fāris, not, however, from Kūhūzīstān, but from the opposite Arabian province of al-Bahrān, whose governor ʿOṯmān b. Abī ʿAṣ was an encounter with the marṣūbān on the island of Abarkawīn and subsequently took Tawadī, from where he began raids on the other towns of Fāris. His brother al-Ḥakam defeated the marṣūbān of Fāris near Kīshahr on the coast, in 640, in a great battle, which, according to al-Ḥalābīshī, was equal in importance to that of al-Kādisiyā. Then ʿAbd Mūṣā was ordered to join forces with ʿOṯmān b. al-ʿAṣ. Together they conquered between 644 and 647 a number of towns: Arradān, Shāhūr, Kirmān, Sīnīs, Dārkalīd, Fasā; ʿAbd Mūṣā penetrated far into Kirmān. Shāhūr became here the principal Arab garrison. It was from here that, in the caliphate of ʿOṯmān, started the great campaigns of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr, after his appointment as governor of Baṣra. In 649 he took the not yet conquered towns of Iṣfahān and Djuhrān, and in 650 he set out for the conquest of Khūrāsān; the reason of this is said to have been an invitation by the marṣūbān of Tūṣ, addressed equally to his colleague of Kūfā, Saʿd b. al-ʿAṣ; but while Saʿd did not go beyond Ṭabārisṭān and Djuhrān, where the mulkā was made tributary, ʿAbd Allāh became the real conqueror of Khūrāsān. He had already dispatched his lieutenant Muḏḏštīb b. Masʿūd towards Kirmān, in pursuit of Yezdegerd; this first expedition having failed, Muḏḏštīb was sent a second time to Kirmān in 650, where he conquered the principal towns: al-Sīrwan, Barmān and Djuhrān. Battles were fought near Kīshahr and in the Kūf mountains. A similar minor expedition was sent by ʿAbd Allāh to Sīstān, under the-Rabīʾ b. Ziyād, who crossed the desert from Ḵafādī and conquered with considerable difficulty Zarandī, the capital of Sīstān, where he remained several years. His successor having been expelled from Zarandī, ʿAbd Allāh dispatched ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Samūra, who reconquered the country and penetrated as far as Dāwar, Bust and Zābul. In 650 ʿAbd Allāh had in the meantime proceeded to al-Ṭabāsān, already conquered, and sent from there al-ʿAḥnāf b. Kaws to the conquest of Kūhūzīstān. He himself reached Nisībūr, which surrendered after a siege. From there several
towns were subdued by him and by his lieutenants, and with the marzubān of Tūs a treaty was concluded. Marw capitulated without a fight. A secondary expedition to Herāt under Aqs b. Thā'labā resulted in the capitulation of the ruler of that town, while finally eastern Khurāsān was raided by al-Aḥnāf b. Kāis, who fought a decisive battle near Marw al-Rūgh and conquered the region of al-Dhujajdān and the town of Bakh, continuing from here this advance as far as Khwārizm. When ʿĀmir b. ʿĀmir returned, he left Kāis b. al-Hāfīz as the first governor of Khurāsān.

This was the military situation at Ōṯmān’s death. The conquests were by no means secure, least of all in Sīstān and Khurāsān, but the placing of garrisons in Nihāwand, al-Ahwāz and Shīrāz, enabled the Arabs to complete their conquests after the civil wars were over. The people and the authorities with whom the Arabs had to deal in Persia were very different. After the royal army had been destroyed at al-Kādisiya and Nihāwand, it was chiefly the marzubāns who opposed the Arab invaders with their local troops and concluded on their own account treaties (wangībābā), which guaranteed freedom of religion and the possession of private property against payment of kharāj. Where a town or a region had been taken by force, the Arabs became proprietors of the soil, as in the Medīn regions Māh al-Kūfa and Māh al-Bayra. Wholesale acceptance of Islām, as is reported of Kāzin, was rare; the Zoroastrians continued the practice of their religion, notably in Fāris and Aḥbarbāḏjān, but from Fāris many of them took refuge in Sīstān and Mārkūn, and about 700 took place the first emigration of Zoroastrians to Kathiawar in India. In the town of Dārābāḏjār it was the local herβāš who treated with the Arabs. On the other hand, many Persians were taken as captives to Irāk and Arabia, where they became mushāli, while also entire groups, such as many knights (astavirā) of Yezdgerd’s army, and different elements of the population of southern Persia (the Zog, Sayhūdja and others) joined forces with the Arabs. The mountaineers, however, in Fāris and al-Dūbāl, and especially those of al-Dīlān and Dailam, long remained unconquered, living under petty local dynasties. In Kūhāsān and Khurāsān, the Arabs had to deal with remnants of the Hephthalites (Hyaṭṭa), still further east with polytheists (mushyrākān), probably Buddhists and, in Khurāsān, often with Turkish auxiliaries. On the other hand, the conquests introduced a contingent of Arab Muslims in the Persian towns, where they generally began by establishing a mosque; they increased by colonisation in Umayyad times and among them were many bearers of the traditions (hadith) about the Prophet and other religious matters and in this way was prepared the gradual islamisation of the population, favoured at the same time by economic conditions.

The civil war, in which not a few Persians took part in Irāk, crippled for some time the Arab progress; the emissaries of ʿAli’s governors in Kūfa and Bayra had great difficulty in maintaining themselves and the whole of Khurāsān rebelled, in spite of the reported visit of the marzubān of Marw to the fourth caliph. Bakh was even for some time under Chinese control. It was only under the energetic governors of Irāk under the Umayyads, Ziyād and al-Hadjajdāj, that the conquest was taken up with renewed vigour. Under Muḥāwiya ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀmir had been again appointed governor of Baṣra (662) and he sent again ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Samura to Sīstān, and then the Arabs reached Kūhāl, although he and his successors experienced greater difficulties in their dealings with the Kūhāl-Siḥā and the different rulers of Zabūlīstān who are called zambl (according to Marquart, Eränisahr, p. 248). These difficulties continued throughout the Umayyad period and became less only when Sīstān was joined administratively to Khurāsān, and the Arab domination grew stronger in the latter region. Ibn ʿĀmir was also the first to begin the reconquest of Khwasān by his lieutenant al-Kāis b. Hāfīz (contemporary of Ibn ʿĀmir’s buthead); it was continued by Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān (from 666), under whom Marw was made a strong Arab garrison, and shortly afterwards 50,000 Arab colonists were established with their families in Khurāsān. Al-Hadjajdāj operated in Khurāsān through his able generals al-Muhallab b. Abī Sufra, Yazid b. al-Muhallab, and finally Kūtābī b. Muṣlim. One of the greatest difficulties was, in his time as many times afterwards, the clearing of the main road to Khurāsān by al-Raṣī, Kūmīs and Tābaristān, where many battles were fought with the mountaineers. The transfer of a considerable Arab contingent to Khurāsān under Ziyād had been a consequence of tribal wars that had started during Muḥāwiya’s reign. The new comers soon began to infect the Arab soldiers of the garrisons, while at the same time the political and religious parties born from the civil war began to gain adherents in Persia, first among the Arabs and soon among their Persian clients. Prominent were the Khāṭiris, who, under their leader Kaṭari b. al-Fudjā’a (killed ca. 697), found a refuge in Kirmān and made from there raids to the north and the west. And towards the end of the Umayyad period, Ḥašāfān with parts of Fāris and Kūhāsān were temporarily in the power of ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥāwiya (744–746). The main object of the Umayyad administration was the collection of the ḍiyā and the kharāj and, until the time of al-Hadjajdāj, the books were kept by native scribes in Persia, after the custom of the Sīsānids. Under al-Hadjajdāj the language and the script of the administration were changed to Arabic in Irāk, and we must assume that gradually Arabic came to be the administrative use in the Persian provinces; nevertheless the first Arab governors, and among them Kaṭari, had coins struck with Pehlevi and Arabic legends. A considerable advance in the islamisation of Persia was due to the financial policy of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Aziz and Ḥiṣām; after ʿUmar’s edicts had induced many Persians to adopt Islām in order to get rid of the ḍiyā, the taxing of Muslims and non-Muslims alike by Ḥiṣām brought about an assimilation of the different elements of the population, from which there emerged at this time a reliable class of Islamic-Persian functionaries. Only the mountain people under their local chiefs remained unruly. But notably the remote province of Khurāsān, though revolts were not rare, and notwithstanding the continuous tribal feuds of the Arabs, remained under firm government control, owing to the presence of the strong garrison at Marw, where the governor resided, and in a not less degree to the successes of the Muslims in Transoxania under Kūtāba.

This makes comprehensible why the anti-Umayyad propaganda, directed by al-Abbasids in Syria, chose Khurāsān as the field of operation for their
emissaries. Making use of the animosity between the Arab tribes and of the general dissatisfaction with the existing rule, this propaganda resulted fairly in the revolt of Abū Wālid in 747 and his victorious entrance into Marw and soon afterwards into Nāṣīrābād. So it was to the Arab legions in Persia and their Persian helpers that the 'Abbāsids owed their final victory in 750. This, of course, brought about a completely new orientation of Persia within the empire of the new dynasty, the more so as the 'Abbāsids transferred their residence to 'Irāq, where the centre of the last national Persian dynasty was formerly situated. Persian attitude to life and Persian tradition became dominant in the new centre of Arab political power and soon of Islamic civilization in the newly founded Bagdād (762). A symptom of this Persian cultural influence is the translation into Arabic of products of Philippine literature by authors like Ibn al-Muṣaffā. Further, powerful families of Persian origin, gained as the Barmakids, and afterwards the Ismā'īlids, such influence as viziers on the affairs of state. This was also the time when the racial sentiment of the Persians began to assert itself in the šāh niyāṭa movement and when the manifestations of the Persian szindik aroused the anxiety of religious circles. The caliphs themselves showed more interest in their Persian provinces than the Umayyads had ever done; they were moreover compelled to do so, as events had shown what a powerful commander might be available to undertake against the central authority. In the south-western provinces — al-Djhālā, Kūhārān and Fāris — revolts of this kind were not to be feared, but farther away and in the mountainous authority could only be maintained by repeated expeditions. So when the governor of Kūhārān showed signs of disloyalty, the caliph al-Mahdi sent his son al-Mahdi with the general Kūhānī b. Kūzama to restore order and afterwards to subjugate a local dynasty in Tabaristān. Then al-Mahdi took up his residence in al-Ra'ī until his accession. Hārūn al-Rašīd undertook himself at the end of his life an expedition against Kūhārān and Transoxania, during which he died at Tūs (809). His son al-Ma'mūn, who had accompanied him, remained in Kūhārān, even after he had become caliph (813), until 817. During this time the expedition of the imām 'Ali al-Kāda [q.v.]. In the same early 'Abbāsid period the tentative nature of the Persian population towards Islam had changed in so far as notably the revolt of Abū Muslim had induced many Persians of the better class (the dīkhānīs) to become Muslims, but at the same time the lower classes were liable to outbreaks of religious fanaticism, in which Islamic and pre-Islamic views were intermingled. In Kūhārān a number of false prophets made their appearance: Šōbālan, the Magian (754—755), Ostādāb (760—765), Yūsuf al-Bām, al-Muḥamadāb (777—780). To the same kind of religious movements belonged the prolonged rebellion of the Khurramites under Bālak (816—838) in Adharbājān. The caliphs were justified in repressing these movements with great severity, because they were generally accompanied by aspirations towards political independence. The revolt of the Abī Yaḥṣāb b. 'Abd Allah in Daulān in 793 showed likewise that it was already possible to operate in Persia with Islamic devices, and for this reason the caliph Harūn had to proceed with much circumspection in its repression.

Under al-Ma'mūn begins the political loosening of Kūhārān and neighbouring provinces from the 'Abbāsīd caliphate, not by the action of the ancient Persian nobles or princes, nor by the popular movements already described, but by the Kūhādīs or 'Abbāsid propaganda, but by the action of 'Abbāsīd, Muḥammadān, governors, not of ancient noble lineage, but nevertheless animated by national feelings, preparing in this way the Persian Muḥammadān political and cultural renaissance. Tāhir b. al-Husayn, general of al-Ma'mūn, was appointed in 820 governor of Kūhārān. His descendants, the Tāhirīs, were nominally governors of the caliphs, but the latter had to leave to them an almost independent authority over Kūhārān with the regions to the east as far as the Indus and to the west as far as al-Ra'ī. Those regions never came back under the caliphs' full authority, for the Tāhirīs lost their power, and their territory in 873 in the struggle against the 'Abbāsīds, a dynasty of still less noble descent, who in 867 had begun to make themselves masters of Sīstān under Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥaith and his two brothers. Their territory comprised for some time Kūhārān with the regions of Kābul and al-Rukh- kābūd — where the 'Abbāsīd power had never been well established — and even Kīrmān and Fāris, but the position of the Tāhirīs as leading power in Persia soon came to an end, when they were beaten in 879 in Kūhārān in their endeavour to attack the caliph in Bagdād. The cultural and religious position of the Tāhirīs is not well known, but their exploits remained famous in Persia long after their extinction. During the same period the caliphs had to suffer the establishment of other more or less independent dynasties, such as the Dulāfīs in al-Karadž in the southern part of Media (842—897), and the Rudānī family in Adharbājān. Far more important is the rise of the Sāmānī dynasty in Kūhārān and Transoxania. This dynasty originated in Kūhārān: they had been at first faithful servants of the Tāhirīs and occupied already a powerful position in Transoxania when the troubles in Kūhārān, after the fall of the Tāhirī power, enabled them to establish their power in Kūhārān in 892, under the nominal suzerainty of Bagdād. Under Naṣr b. Almā'ét (913—943) they governed also in Sīstān, Kīrmān, Lūrdjānī, al-Ra'ī and Tabaristān. The immense cultural importance of this dynasty for Persia lies in the fact that a revived national but Islamized Persian spirit found an opportunity to develop itself in Kūhārān, as is revealed to us by the beginnings of the New Persian Islamic literature [cf. infra, i. 11]. This development certainly goes back at least as far as the time of al-Ma'mūn. The Sāmānīs, residing in Transoxania and had Kūhārān governed by governors, so that they were not the neighbourhood of the brilliant court alone which favoured the Persian form of Islamic culture; this was due rather to the general prosperity which began to reign and which brought into existence a class of wealthy landowners who were able to patronize literary and scientific activity, for Arabic literature also began to flourish in Kūhārān (al-Pākūr and others). It is further noteworthy that the Persian renaissance did not take place in the traditional centres of Persia, Fāris and Adharbājān, where about this time the ancient conditions had not much changed, but rather in a (culturally speaking) new country, where new forms could more easily come into existence.

In western 'Īrān the manifestation of the Per-
sian national spirit took other, less refined forms, as the promoters were the never entirely subjected peoples of Dailam and Džilân. Here the Zaidite ʿAlid propaganda, begun under Hârûn al-Rašîd, had supplied popular opposition to the Caliphate with an Islamic badge. Several petty local dynasties were still in existence in Dailam at the beginning of the 8th century and from here started predatory expeditions, whose first aim was the town of al-Raïy. The brigand chiefs became generals and some of them became rulers of countries with continuously changing frontiers, owing to their warfare with each other and with the Sâmânids. The most stable of the dynasties thus formed were the Ziyyârîs (928–1042), who ruled for some time in al-Raïy, Isfâhân and Ahwâz, but were replaced in the end in the territories of ʿTabaristan and Džurdžân. In al-Džibâl, Fâris and Khûţîstân they were soon replaced by the much more successful Buʿyîds, their former Dailamite confederates. The independent rise of the three brothers ʿAli, ʿHasan and Ahmad, sons of Bûya, began about 935 and soon nearly the whole of western Persia had ceased to pay taxes and tribute to the Baghdad government, where, moreover, the caliphs were dominated by military commanders. This situation enabled Ahmad b. Bûya, already master of Khûţîstân, to occupy Baghdad in 948 and to incorporate the seat of the caliphate in his possessions. The caliphate was allowed to survive under the political power of this Persian Shî`ite dynasty. The other Buʿyîd brothers resided at al-Raïy and at Shîrûzâ, and the most brilliant reign was that of Aṣud al-Dawla, son of ʿAli of Shîrûzâ, who in his turn became master of Baghdad in 978 and reigned until 983, while his son Bahî b. Dawla (989–1013) continued to reign in ʿIrâq, Fâris and Kirmân. At the same time the north-western part of Persia had fallen, after the semi-independent reign of the governors of the Sâdîd family in ʿAbharbâdûn (890–929), into the hands of Kurdish dynasties, such as the Musâhirîs, the Shâdîddîs, the Kawwâdis and others.

On account of these grave political disturbances which slowed somewhat the process of assimilation of the specifically Persian cultural development that had started in Khurāsân, but towards the middle of the 8th century, when conditions became more settled, there clustered around the Buʿyîd courts and in other large centres a class of Persian-Islamic writers—such as Ḥamza al-Iṣâfânî (d. c. 970)—and scholars, among them such brilliant personalities as the Buʿyîd wazirs Abu l-Faṭîr b. al-ʿAmîl and ʿIsâʾîl b. ʿAbbâd. At the same time the different religious currents of the time filtered through into the classes of the continually increasing Islamic population, one centre preferring Shî`ite doctrines, another Muʿtaṣûlim, another traditionalism (ahl al-hadîqâ), and so on (cf. the geographers passim). Karâmatism was, however, severely suppressed, when it appeared in Khurāsân at the end of the 8th century, and though the Karâmat propaganda had been strong in south-western Persia, its political successes were realised only on the opposite coast of al-Bahrîn. Shûfîsm likewise became widespread in its different forms, developing peculiar types of Persian Shûfî as early as the 8th century; the life story of al-Hallîjî shows equally the fertility of south-western Persia for Shî`i propaganda. All these gers were destined to bear fruit in later centuries, but on the whole the political distribution of forces had already brought it about that western Persia, situated between Sunni Eastern Persia and Sunni ʿIrâq and Mesopotamia, tended towards the Shî`a.

The 8th century witnessed the rise of the Turks in Persia. Turkish troops had already formed large contingents in the armies of the governors and princes who disputed with each other parts of Širvânian soil, not excluding the mountaineers who needed horsemen alongside their local foot-soldiers. It is true that already in Sâmânîd times sections of Turkish tribes had been established south of the Džurdžân in Khârâhîstân, but the main role of the Turks in Persia had always been that of soldiers and military commanders in the service of local governors and princes. In the Sâmânîd state several Turks had risen to high military and administrative functions, and, as the military power of the Sâmânîd began to weaken, these Turkish commanders aspired to political leadership, relying on their Turkish troops and using their natural capacity for military organisation. In this way the Turkish vassal of the Sâmânîd, Subûkchâk, founded his independence in the newly conquered region of Ghaznav and Kâbul, where until then local Hindu rulers had been able to maintain themselves; his power soon became a menace to the Sâmânîd themselves, who, in Transoxania, were continually losing ground to the Turkish Tîkânâs. Subûkchâk had been a Sâmânîd governor in Khurasân, and it was after his death (997) that his son Mahmûd of Ghaznav (990–1030) took the opportunity of establishing an independent power in Khurasân, choosing Bahkh for his capital at the outset. He extended his sway in Persia over Sîstân and as far as eastern Media, while his conquests in India and Transoxania gave a strong backing to the consolidation of his power in Iran. Mahmûd had asked the caliph for a diploma of investiture and was noted as a champion of Sunnîsm. Under his reign the new cultural Persian-Islamic tradition of the Sâmânîd was continued; his court was a centre of Persian court poets and his personal relations with Firdawsi may have been, they show at any rate that his states were to the congenial soil for the renaissance of Persian traditions. The name of al-Bîrûnî is sufficient to show also that the noblest and highest form of Islamic scholarship could flourish under his reign. And his immense popularity in later Persian Shî`i poetry has made this Turkish ruler a cultural Persian hero. The final islamisation of the Kâbul country was the work of the Ghaznavids. In western Iran in the meantime, the later Buʿyîds were able to maintain themselves with less brilliance; apart from the Ghaznavids they were seriously weakened in Fâris by the Shâbânkâra Kurds in the first half of the 8th century. Yet conditions did not hinder the prosperity of Persian literature and science (Avicenna).

The rise of the Ghaznavids was only the prelude to the Turkish invasion under the house of Selîdîk, by which Selîdîkîd rule became established in Persia and beyond. This time the Turks, mostly called Ghuzz, had begun, since 1029, to migrate into eastern and southern Persia, in spite of the opposing measures of the Sâmânîd and the Ghaznavids. Within seventeen years from his first appearance in Khurasân (1035), their leader Taghhrî Bek had overrun the whole north of Persia, and made his entrance into Baghdad (1055).
At the same time the power of the remaining Ziyārids and of the different Būyid dynasties was entirely crushed; the Iranian possessions of the Ghaznavid power were considerably reduced, and thus nearly the whole of Persia was united again under the Turkish dynasty of the Seljūks, whose members divided amongst them the different provinces: Khorāsān, Sīstān with Herāt, Kirmān, Fāris, and Ardabīlān. Tughril Bek fixed his residence at Ray and his successors being called the Great Seljūks, in contrast to the minor Seljūk dynasties. The last Great Seljūk, Sanjar (1117–1157), though an able ruler, was real master only in Khorāsān and had already to face new factors in Persia, which, after his death, brought about a political disintegration that could only be arrested by the Mongol conquest.

The Turkish invasion, which brought nomadic Turks into nearly all parts of Persia, where they found conditions suited to their mode of life, and which in many respects may be compared with the Arab invasion, did not make of Persia a Turkish country, as it was the case with Transoxiana and Afghanistan, but the Seljūks were only the ruling Seljūk dynasty. The young Persian cultural Renaissance had gathered enough vital force to assimilate the ruling Turkish elements, and this to such a degree that, until the xiiith century, the Seljūks continued to spread Persian culture in Asia Minor. The nomadic Ghuzz did not find the opportunity, as elsewhere, to assert themselves otherwise than as a very turbulent element, which in the xiiith century became threatening even to the Seljūks themselves. The influence of their certainly not very orthodox Islamic religious views on the religious history of Persia has certainly not a little contributed to the spreading of Shiʿite ideas. The Seljūks themselves continued the tradition of the Sāmānids and Ghaznavids by becoming champions of Sunnism. The minister Niẓām al-Mulk is an outstanding figure among the many personalities of Persian descent who were the pillars of the political, religious and literary currents of the time. Under his patronage worked al-Ghazālī, the scene of whose later activity was Niẓāhpār in Khorāsān. Persia had acquired at this time an importance as a seat of Islamic culture equal to that of Iran and other parts of the Islamic world. The theological colleges founded by Niẓām al-Mulk (Baghdad and Niẓāhpār) were the crowning work of the Sunni Islamic civilisation, but involved at the same time a consolidation by which religious and cultural ideals were fixed and anchored for the centuries to come. The early Seljūk period shows also a continuation of the best of Muhammadan scientific activity in Persia, for which we have to quote only ʿUmarī Khiyām.

Western Persia, however, asserted her non-Sunnite tradition by the Ismāʿīlī propaganda which resulted in the capture of the stronghold of Alamūt near Kāzvin by Hasan-i Sabbat in 1091. The sources of this propaganda were in the East (Nāṣir-i Khusraw) and the West (Egypt) alike, but both its real political effects were concentrated, as far as Persia is concerned, in al-Dījābāl, Fāris and Kūstāinān and, in a less degree, in the east in Kūstāin, where about the same time a number of fortresses were acquired by the Ismāʿīlīites. Hasan-i Sabbat and his successors became a political power in western Iran, especially in al-Dījābāl, against which the Seljūks were more and more powerless, and which was crushed only by the Mongol invasion.

The Seljūks had established in their dominions a system of hereditary military fiefs (ābāk) with the object of being able to dispose of an army commanded by reliable chiefs. The consequence of this system was the loosening of the central power which was supplanted in course of time by a number of independent military governors, who are known in history as ābākūs. On Persian soil the chief ābāk dynasties were those of Ardabīlān (since 1146), of Luristān (since 1148), of Vazd (since 1170), and the ābāk dynasty of the Salgharids in Fāris (since 1137), who annexed also Kirmān after the extinction of the ruling Seljūks of Kirmān. In the southern parts of Fāris and Kirmān the Shahānkuš continued their irregular authority. In Khorāsān the Seljūks were eclipsed after Sanjar's death by the Khwārizmshāhīs, and simultaneously these rose into prominence the Ghūrid dynasty, originating in the mountains of al-Ghor and al-Dīyarwar. It was the Khwārizmshāhīs who, by taking Ghazna in 1149, put an end to the Ghaznavid influence in Persia, except for the province of Fāris, and the country of Būst, and to the north, Bāmīyān and eastern Khorāsān. Later on they too lost the greater part of their possessions to the Khwārizmshāhs. Sometimes the Ghūrids were allied with the wandering Ghuzz, and sometimes they fought the latter; on the whole the devastations wrought by the Ghūrids and their temporary allies mark the beginning of the cultural decline in north-eastern Iran.

This decline was hastened by the Mongol invasions. After the Khwārizmshāh Muhammad had come into conflict with Čingiz Khān (1218), the Mongols first took possession of his lands in Transoxiana, of which their appearance in Khorāsān was the political and military consequence. In the campaign of 1220–1221 the Mongol generals Ujbe and Subutai conquered Khorāsān and the northern part of western Persia as far as Ardabīlān, driving the Khwārizmshāh Muhammad to the island of Abūbūn in the Caspian, where he died, and forcing his son Ujjaal al-Dīn to cross the Indus. The great towns of Khorāsān were devastated in a way that made it impossible for them to recover their ancient splendour; the population must have been considerably reduced by the wholesale massacres, and the works of art and literature were destroyed. The conquered cities were immediately placed under Mongol administration; where the population revolted, as in Hamadhan, there followed a pitiless massacre. The conquered territories were annexed to the part of the Mongol empire given to Čagha Khān. Southern Persia was spared for the moment; in Kirmān the Mongol emmissary Burāk Ḥadjitīb founded in 1224 an almost independent state. Soon afterwards Djalal al-Dīn reappeared from India to make his turbulent way to Ardabīlān and Armenia without being able to drive out the Mongols. Then, in 1256, came the second invasion of Mongol armies under Hulagu, brother of the reigning Khān Mangū. This expedition had been carefully prepared and was directed against the Ismāʿīlī heretics in Persia and against the caliphate in Baghdad, which was exterminated in 1258. Whatever the real political and religious motives for the expedition of Hulagu, the friend of the Christians may have been, its results were of immense consequence for eastern Islam in general.
Persia was entirely subdued and came to form the greater part of the dominions of the non-Islamic Mongol dynasty of the Ilkhan s, who resided most of the time in Adbharbadjian (after 1306 in Sulthaniya). By the end of the xivth century the smaller existing dynasties, such as the Salgharid, tabeks of Fasis and the Kutugh Khans of Kirm mân were also extinguished.

By the terrible devastations in Khurassan these regions ceased to be a hearth of national Persian Islamic culture and this role now was taken over by the west. At the same time these political events had loosened the ties with the western Islamic centres which at the time were wholly absorbed by the action against the Crusaders. Moreover by the extermination of the Ismâ'îlîs power and the uncertain attitude of the Ilkhâns towards Islân and its different aspects, Persian Islâm passed in this period through a profound crisis, and many conflicting currents were at work. In this period lived in Ardâbîl the Shaikh Safi al-Din (1252—1334), the ancestor of the Shàfawid dynasty. Still the Persian national character maintained itself and assimilated the many new foreign elements, mostly Turkish, so far as these were capable of advance to a higher cultural level. Great Persian poets (Sa'di) flourished, and the Ilkhâns showed an interest in the achievements of Islamic science (Naqîr al-Dîn Tusì) and literature (Rashíd al-Dîn).

During the Ilkhân period (1265—1337) Persia was considered by the European Christian powers as their ally against Egypt, now the chief champion of Islâm in the west. But although the political opposition between the Ilkhân empire and western Islâm became a living reality, any attempt to organize and propagate Christianity in Persia by the institution of bishoprics was fruitless. Persia was opened, however, to closer contact with the European world than ever had been the case in Islamic times, not so much by the series of well-known travellers who passed through Persia on their way to the centre of the Mongolian Empire, as through the establishing of commercial settlements by the Italian republics in Adbharbadjian for the overland commerce from their establishments on the Black Sea (Trebizond) through Armenia and Persia to Central Asia.

After the death of Abû Sa'id (1335) the dynasty of the Ilkhâns came to an end in the quarrels between the Djalâ'îr and Cubân families. Abû Sa'id had already had great difficulty in maintaining the unity of his state, especially in his struggle against the influential amir Cubân. Further the later Ilkhâns had already had to suffer the existence of semi-independent dynasties, such as the Kure dynasty at Herât, the only large town in Khurassân that had escaped Mongol devastation. Other powerful commanders, who had served the Ilkhâns, found during the troubles after Abû Sa'id's death opportunity to aspire to political independence; the most successful were the Muzaffarids of Fasis and Kirmân, a dynasty of Arab extraction, who from about 1340 until their destruction by Timür in 1392 held sway in southern Persia and for some time as far as Persia (Ihrâb) and Adbhurbadjian. Further Adbhurbadjian was now in the power of the Khân of the Golden Horde and in that of the Djalâ'îr dynasty of Baghdad. Eastern Persia was mainly divided between the Kure dynasty of Herât already mentioned and the Serbedjar clan who had their centre in Sebezwâr.

In these chaotic times, when the authority of political power was waning, the more popular and, in a way, democratic elements in Persia, gained more opportunity of asserting themselves, as may be seen from the rather independent way in which the citizens of different towns behaved in the quarrelling rulers. This self-assertion of democratic elements is also to be observed in Asia Minor, but on the culturally more fertilized soil of western Iran, it bore the fruit of a brilliant literary development in the xivth and xvth centuries, which at first sight may seem astonishing in such unfavourable political surroundings. This development was accompanied by an intensification of the religious currents that were at work among the population, where it was strongly influenced by the lower forms of Shàfism as propagated by derwishes. In the case of the Serbedjar in Khurassan the derwish activity had even political consequences and here also is a striking parallel with conditions in Asia Minor. Higher Shàfism was confined to the upper classes and expressed itself in literature, by which we are able to follow the different trends of thought. From the poems of Hâfiz we learn that the Shàf睿 creed of the i'tbâna atshâriya was already widely spread and that the tomb of 'Ali al-Ridâ in Meşhed had become an object of national veneration.

At the end of the xivth century followed a fearful political reaction in the conquest of Persia by Timür Lang, another foreign intervention which for the last time held up the development of a national state in Persia. Timür, after conquering for himself an empire in Central Asia, founded on his descent from Çingiz Khan a claim to the domination of Persia. In 1370 he had already conquered Balkh; in 1380 he subdued Khurassan, Sistan and Mazandaran, and in 1383—1384 he completed the conquest by taking Adbharbadjian, Persian I'rák, and finally Fasis by exterminating the dynasty of the Muzaffarids (1392). The Serbedjarôs had already been swept away and in 1389 disappeared the Kure dynasty at Herât. The most bloody event during this conquest was the sack of Isfahan in 1387. Timür never resided for long in Persia, but confined his government to some of his sons, notably Shàhrûkh, who became "king" in Khurassân and Sistan as early as 1397. In Adbharbadjian reigned Mirânghân, not altogether to the satisfaction of his father. After Timür's death (1405) the political unity of the empire was on the whole preserved under Shàhrûkh (d. 1447), who sought to repair much of the devastation wrought by his father's campaigns. Shàhrûkh still recognized nominally as his suzerain the emperor of China. After his death different descendants of Timür, the Timurîs, disputed with each other parts of Persia, while after 1450 the dynasties of the Kara Koyulu emerged from the west to dominate large parts of Persia. The best known Timurîs in Persia was Sultan Husain Bahârî, who ruled from his capital Herât over Khurassân, Sistan and Djûrân from 1468 to 1506.

Timür's reign in Persia meant also a Sunni reaction, but in western and middle Persia this reaction was not lasting. Among the many heterodox religious manifestations of this time is the appearance of the Huîfî sect, one of whose adherents tried to murder Shàhrûkh in Herât in 1426. This religious movement was suppressed by the government, but it had, like similar currents,
strong connections towards the west, through Ḍāhīrābādjān into Asia Minor, where at this time the Sunni power of the Ottomans was re-establishing and strengthening itself to oppose the heterodox influence emanating from Persia. Mean-time Persian cultural life continued to manifest itself in the important literature produced in western Persia, while also in the Caucasian countries and Muḥammadānādī Asia Persian cultural and literary influence was reaching its climax. This was not the case in Khorāsān; here, in the intellectual centre of Herāt, developed at this time the eastern Tur-khish Caghatay literature, promoted by Ṣāḥib Shīr Naufī at Hāsain Baḵīrā’s court at Herāt. Although the Persian-Islamic tradition continued, its influence in these regions, eastern Persia begins to be culturally separated from the west under influence of the Turkish and local elements; a development similar to that witnessed at the same time in Asia Minor and the regions of Arabic tongue in Mesopotamia and Ḥiraḵ.

The events that preceded the rise of the Šafawid dynasty have Ḍāhīrābādjān as their chief scene of action. It was in Ḍāhīrābādjān that Kār Tūsī, the Kār Koyunlu dynasty began its career by taking Tabriz in 1406, and that his successors had the centre of their empire, which, under Ḍjāhān-shīr (1435–1467), extended over nearly all western Persia and in the east as far as Herāt. And it was through Ḍāhīrābādjān that ʿUzun Ḥasan of the ʿAk Koyunlu penetrated Persia, after his victory over Ḍjāhān-shīr in 1467. Then he defeated the last Timurīd Abī Ṣafīr and became master of western Persia, inaugurating in the meantime the series of wars with the Ottoman Turks, that were to last for three centuries. The successors of ʿUzun Ḥasan had already come into conflict with the Šafawid leaders. Shāh Ṣafīr and Sultan ʿAlī, who about this time had acquired enormous influence in Ḍāhīrābādjān and Asia Minor. The Šafawid movement began indeed in a much more democratic way than the preceding dynasties. Its chief adherents belonged to seven tribal groups of Turkish origin, amongst whom Shiʿite convictions had been spread by means of Sufī propaganda methods. This ever-increasing flock acquired at this time the celebrated nickname of ʿḲīzīl-Baḵsh. Thus their political rising under Shāh ʿImārī was again a reaction against the official orthodoxy of the ruling classes, a reaction in which it was not difficult to enlist the Persian town population of western Iran, since old times ready to accept non-official and unorthodox religious views, by which at the same time they showed their dis-like for foreign rule. These different elements gave a Persian “national” character to the Šafawid dynasty, although their leaders were Turks from türceizados Ḍāhīrābādjān. Shāh ʿImārī, on emerging from his hiding place in Ḏiylân, gained his first success in the Caucasus against the king of Shirvān, and this made him strong enough to turn his arms against the last ruler of the ʿAk Koyunlu, whom he defeated in the battle of Shurār (1501). By 1510 he was master of western Persia, and in addition of Armenia, Mesopotamia and Ṣarḵāz (Baghdād taken in 1508) with the holy tombs of the imāms in Naṣāf and Karbālā. He then turned to eastern Persia, where a new invasion from Transoxania was threatening, after the death of Sultan Ḥusain Baḵīrā at Herāt (1506), by the rise of the ʿUzbek power under Shāh-bān Khan. The latter had already invaded Khorāsān, and had not been defeated and killed in the battle of Marw (1510) by Shāh ʿImārī, Persia might have experienced a fourth wave of conquest from Central Asia. Then followed in 1514 the famous battle of Cādirān; the defeat suffered here by Shāh ʿImārī from the army of Selim I showed where the political frontiers of the Šafawis were henceforward to be; the wave of sympathy that had spread west from Ḍāhīrābādjān far into Asia Minor was ruthlessly suppressed by the Ottoman Sultan and Cādirān showed that any political extension of Persia in this direction was impossible.

Thus the important events of ʿImārī’s career determined the field of action of the Šafawī dynasty, which was to last until 1736. Religious and cultural traditions and geographical necessity gave this dynasty the character of a “national” dynasty, and the long period of its existence, together with the religious isolation of their empire, contributed not a little to the coming into existence of a real Persian “nation”, that overcame the troublesome period of the xviiith century and asserted itself ever more vigorously during the xixth. The nature of the country, however, was not favourable to a rapid development in this direction. The many nomadic elements of Ḫurānī, Turkish and Arab origin kept much longer to their own traditions, and the dis-connectedness of the various inhabited centres could not but weaken the authority of the government. Throughout Šafawī rule, the kings had to reckon with the existence of half independent governors and tribal formations, from which came the powerful nobles and courtiers. In the time of Tāḥmāš I some Geşānīgī nobles, relatives of the king, were in a dominant position, but on the whole it was the ʿḲīzīl-Baḵsh clans who formed at times a dangerous power in the state, while nevertheless the kings were dependent on these elements for the defence of the country. It was only during the reign of ʿAbbās I that something of a royal militia (the Shīta-sewan) could be formed, while on the other hand the army was reinforced by European artillery. Therefore the civil and military administration of the country never acquired even such a regularity and a cohesion as is witnessed in the Ottoman Empire; the Šafawids had to suffer for instance the permanent establishment of the Portuguese in Hormuz (1507–1622) and afterwards of the English, but this did not yet conflict with the state conceptions of that time. Governmental authority could only be maintained in the interior by the utmost severity, as was practised notably by ʿAbbās I. For the same reason the frontiers of the Šafawid empire in east and west were never very stable, although gradually a demarcation takes place. The eastern part of Khorāsān and the regions to the south of it, long since culturally disconnected from western Persia, never returned to the Šafawids. Bahāk and Marw were under the almost unbroken domination of the ʿUzbeks (ʿAbbās I only temporarily occupied Bahāk in 1598), while Kābul and Kandāhar belonged from the beginning to the empire of the Great Mughals of India, Kandāhar being only temporarily held by the Šafawīs. Only Herāt was for most of the time under their control and was far more than in the xixth century Persia had not abandoned her claim to this town. All this makes clear why eastern Iran, after the extinction of the ʿUzbek and the Mughal power did not return to Shīta Persia, but came to form at last an independent state
under the Afghan rulers. Only western Khorasan, with the shrine of Meshhed, and Sistan remained an integral part of Safavid and consequently of modern Persia. In the west the Ottoman Turks and the Persians disputed with each other in a continual series of campaigns, interrupted by temporary peace, the large band of territory stretching from the Persian Gulf to Georgia. In the 16th century the Turks won and occupied Adharbaijian, Mesopotamia and Iraq. Under Abbas I most of the lost territory was recovered, but the recapture of Baghdad by Murad IV in 1638 made an end of Persian domination in the Tigris valley, while Adharbaijian and parts of Armenia and Georgia remained to Persia. In 1668 took place the first conflict with Russia through a descent of Cossacks upon Mazar-ul-Rahim.

Since the beginning of Ismail's career the Sh'ite creed had been forcibly imposed on the settled population and a regular persecution of all Sunni theologians had begun. This persecution was accompanied by a repression of all Shi'a manifestations, whereby the newly established religion took at last the aspect of a fanatical and intolerant church, whose ministers, the Sh'ite divines, repressed all utterances of free thought. Browne ascribes to this development the sudden poverty of literary production in Safavid Persia. In these circumstances Persia became much isolated from the surrounding Islamic countries, but on the other hand the enemies of the Ottoman power in Europe looked upon Persia as a valuable ally in their common efforts to crush that power. To this was due the forming of friendly diplomatic connections with European powers, such as Venice and Spain, who, in addition, sought to profit by commercial relations. These relations, together with the political necessity of securing their colonial establishments in India and beyond, led other European states also to take up friendly relations with the Safavid court, namely the English, the Dutch and the French, after the Portuguese had been driven from the Persian Gulf. The European envoys, amongst whom the Shelley brothers are most notable during 'Abbās I's reign, were well received, and established the first real contact between Persia and European civilization. These relations also provoked the sending of some memorable Persia embassies to Europe. The political reasons that had brought the European sea powers to the Persian Gulf prevented Persia, however, from ever becoming a maritime power; even the endeavour of 'Abbās I to make of the newly founded Bender 'Abbās a great maritime commercial town remained unrealized.

Most of the Safavid kings had very long reigns, for which the not uncommon practice of killing possible pretenders amongst the royal family was probably responsible. The most brilliant reign was that of 'Abbās I (1587–1629), who transferred his residence from Kazvin to Isfahan, which, by his buildings, became a splendid royal city. His successors profited by his work. After the middle of the 17th century Persia was passing through a peaceful period, owing mainly to the weakening of its neighbours. Conditions at this time are well known by a series of European travel accounts. The same peaceful conditions had allowed, however, the establishment at Kandahar in 1709 of a Sunni rebellious movement, which was opposed in vain by the Safavid king Husain and was the beginning of the Afghan state. In 1722 the Afghan army of Mir Muhammad conquered Isfahan, after which the Afghans were masters in Persia for about eight years. At last the Safavid successors of Husain were able to liberate the country through the help of their general Nādir Kuli of the Afshar tribe who, in 1736, made himself king of Persia as Nādir Shāh. At that time he had already restored to Persia the cities in Adharbaijian and Georgia that had been taken by the Turks and likewise Rasht and Baku, occupied by Russia. After his coronation he set out on his invasion of India and the Afghan country, but his reign had brought so little stability that, after his murder in 1747, there followed a period of general lawlessness in Persia. The Afghans regained strength, but allowed Nādir's blinded grandson Shāhukh to reign over Khorasan.

The failure of Nādir Shāh to establish a lasting dynasty was also due to his endeavours to abolish the Sh'ite religious practices, but in this he met a determined opposition from the people and their spiritual leaders. After Nādir's assassination there was hardly any question of restoring a Safavid to the throne. The real power devolved on Karim Khan Zand, who resided mostly in Shiraz and who succeeded in uniting Persia during a benevolent reign; in his time the troubles on the 'Irāq frontier led even to the conquest of Başra.

His death in 1779 occasioned a dispute for the throne among his descendents. Agha Muhammad Khan of the Kajar tribe round Ashtarabad profited from these troubles by bringing with much cunning and much cruelty the entire empire under his control. He was finally enthroned in Tehran in 1796 and was assassinated in 1797. With him began the Kājar dynasty, which reigned until 1925.

At the beginning of Afghan rule Russia had occupied Derbend and Rasht, while Turkey had invaded the country as far as Hamadhān; the Afghan ruler Ashraf, however, and after him Nādir Shāh succeeded in recovering the occupied territories. A second Turkish attack in 1740 was equally thrown back by Nādir. During the second half of the century Russia and Turkey were too much occupied with each other to pay attention to Persia. The political development in the north-east had eliminated direct danger from the Uzbek states, but now the lawless Turcomans in the north of Khorasan had become by their raids the terror of the Persian population; Agha Muhammad Khan inflicted serious blows upon them. With the coming of the Kājars, however, the international situation grew more difficult, owing to Persia's becoming involved in world-wide political struggles. Until 1814 the alliance of Persia was an object of dispute between England, whose position in India made Persian friendship a vital question, and the France of Napoleon, who schemed an invasion of India with the aid of the Russian army. In 1814 the French threat disappeared and England concluded a treaty with Persia. But the struggle with Russia for the possession of Georgia, which had begun already in 1812, soon led to military disasters and finally to the loss of all territory to the north of the Araxes by the peace treaty of Turkmenčai (1828). From this time on began the rivalry between Russia and England, the latter country's policy being to prevent Persia, now politically under strong Russian influence, from gaining strength. Great Britain opposed for this reason any extension of Persian territory in
Afghanistān; it prevented the capture of Herāt — a cherished Persian ideal — in 1838, and, when Herāt was really taken in 1856, went even so far as to declare war on Persia and to land troops in the Persian Gulf; at the peace treaty of 1857 in Paris, Persia had to abandon her claims. In the meantime Russia’s position grew ever stronger; a Russian naval base was founded in the bay of Astārābād, and by the Russian conquest of Khiwā and Būkhārā, completed by the subjugation of the Tekke Turkomans in 1881, and the acquisition of the Marv oasis, the Russian Empire had attained an enormous military and political ascendency over Persia, to which was added the Russian influence in northern Afghanistan and Turkish Armenia. Persia was not able to assert entirely its political freedom, but it gained for the first time well-defined frontiers; difficulties with Turkey in Trāk (massacre of Persians at Kerbelā) had led to the fixing of the Turkish-Persian frontier in 1843 (followed by a rectification in 1913), while the eastern frontiers with Afghanistan and Baluchistān were defined by the Anglo-Persia-Afghan boundary commission in 1872; these measures had been mainly necessitated by the establishment of a telegraph line through Persia to India. During the long reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1848–1894) international conditions remained stable, to which the on the whole untroubled domestic situation also contributed, but when, under his successor, conditions became less secure, owing to internal political and financial troubles, the intervention of the two great Powers became more menacing. It took the shape of the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907, which practically divided Persia into a northern and a southern sphere of influence. During the 19th century indeed the Kāḏjār dynasty had been able to rule Persia in the traditional way, succeeding in checking the action of the troublesome tribes and their chiefs by profiting from their eternal discord. The influence of the higher Shī‘ī religious leaders, over whose nomination the government had no authority whatever, and who resided for the greater part in the religious centres of Kerbelā and Najaf, was supreme among the population, although some divergent theological trends had developed, such as the Shaḵī’s, since the beginning of the sixteenth century. This more spiritualized sect finally paved the way for the appearance of the Bāb in 1844; the Bābī movement for some years took the aspect of a religious-political rebellion, which the government had to suppress with bloody measures. Since then Bābism and afterwards the movement of the Bahāʾī’s to which it gave rise, disappeared from the surface, but remained all the time a living factor in the national-religious life of the Persians. This contributed not a little to the awakening of a more independent political attitude among the more educated classes of the population, who generally found the higher divines at their side in their increasing criticism of government actions. The pan-Islamic propaganda of Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī also furnished elements to the awakening public opinion. Thus the bad inner conditions that had developed under Muzaffar al-Dīn Shāh and the consequences of the foreign loans contracted by that ruler brought about a popular action that led to the granting of a constitution and the opening of the first National Assembly (Mādžlis) in October 1906. The succeeding Shāh’s reactionary policy ended with his dethronement in 1909, but the troubles connected with the accompanying revolutionary movement gave opportunity to the Russians to occupy Tabrīz and Kāzwīn, while at the same time the Persian government was obliged to use foreigners in different branches of its administration (gendarmerie, finances, customs). During the world war Persia was officially neutral, but the German scheme of attacking Great Britain in India gave rise to an at first successful German propaganda in Southern Persia in 1915. On the other hand Russian troops were landed at Enzeli and these opposed the Turkish advance into Persia, which had begun in 1916 by the taking of Kirmānshāh. In this same year began the British counter-action in Southern Persia by the formation of the South Persian Rifles. When by the Russian revolution the action of the Russian troops was crippled, British troops landed in the Gulf and succeeded in checking the Turkish advance in the western frontier region and in repressing, together with Russian troops, the local opposition of the Jangalis in Gilan. Finally in 1918 the British had great difficulty in opposing a similar national rising in Shāhrūz, headed by the Kāshkāy tribe.

Persia was evacuated after the war and became from the outset a member of the League of Nations. A treaty with Great Britain in 1921 re-established British influence, but the coup d’état of that same year suddenly changed Persia’s internal and external policy. Saʿīd Diyāʾ al-Dīn and Riāż Kān assumed forcibly the leadership of the government. Riāż Kān became minister of war and proved to be the strong man needed. His chief achievement during the following years was the subjugation and disarmament of the turbulent tribes, and the forming of a reliable army of 40,000 men. In 1923 he became Prime Minister, Aḥmad Shī‘ī Kāḏjār left the country and was deposed in October 1925 by the Mādžlis, whereby the Kāḏjār dynasty was brought to an end. At the end of the same year the scruples of many sections of the population against a new dynasty were dispelled and the dictator became king of Persia under the name Pahlāvī; he was crowned on April 25, 1926.

Persia’s internal situation has been much improved by the action of the present king, while the exploitation of the oil wells in ‘Arabistān has secured the government a profit that has not a little contributed to its financial liberty of action. The finances have been moreover controlled by an American adviser since 1925 and since 1928 by a German adviser. As to the currents of spiritual culture, the intellectual classes are abandoning the traditional religious views and this secular movement is favoured by the government; in connection therewith the influence of the divines is declining. On the other hand, the interest awakened towards the history of the sixteenth century for pre-Islamic Persia has given a new direction to national sentiment, expressing itself amongst others in literary occupation with ancient Iranian subjects and a great interest in excavations, the results of which are no longer allowed to leave the country.

The present ethnographical structure of Persia is quite different from what it was before the Arab conquest, owing to the repeated invasion of foreign elements during the thirteen centuries of its Islamic history. The combined existence of a sedentary and a nomadic or semi-nomadic population, however, is a feature proper to the geographical conditions of the country and has continued up to the present
day. The general tendency of the nomadic elements to become settled, which can be observed all the time, was repeatedly countered by fresh invasions of nomads, chiefly from the north-east. At present the proportion of the nomads to the settled population is estimated to be 20%. The development of urban settlement is a feature proper to Islamic times; it began with the expansion of the population outside the walls into the rababs (cf. al-Baladhūrī, p. 324). From that time on the Persian name for a town became ṣaḥr, which word has designated originally an entire region or country. The Arabs often placed their garrisons in less important places, which subsequently overshadowed the ancient centres. In the course of history many towns were devastated, but were generally rebuilt on or near the site of the ancient ruins. Since the later Middle Ages great Islamic towns like al-Raiy and the towns of Kirmān have disappeared, to be replaced by formerly less significant places; among the latter are Teherān, Tabriz and Mašhad, at present the largest towns of Persia. The townspeople, composed of craftsmen and merchants, have been in history the passive and suffering element, together with the rural population of the villages clustered together in the oases. This settled population was generally regarded with scorn by the tribesmen, who were the aristocrats, and from whom until modern times were recruited the ruling classes and the high officials. From the tribes have also been recruited the best soldiers in the armies.

At present the largest towns in Persia are Teherān (210,000 inh.), Tabriz (300,000), Iṣfahān (90,000) and Mašhad (70,000). The town population has been constituted in the course of centuries from the very different invading ethnic elements. They now constitute the most stable element in Persia and speak, with local dialectic variations, the New-Persian language, which runs more or less parallel with the written New Persian. Only in Adharbājjaḵ Adhari Turkish is the language of the townsfolk and the peasants.

The rural population of the villages around the towns have kept many particular local features of their own and amongst them many remnants of other Iranian dialectal groups have been preserved, a fact which is already noted in ancient Islamic historical and geographical sources. In north-eastern Persia the different dialectal groups of these peasants are called Tāj, while in southern and eastern Persia they are often designated as Tājījkaḵ. Among the rural population, however, and in a less degree amongst the townsfolk, there are many elements that are conscious of their allegiance to tribal formations, mostly so in regions where the population of the neighbourhood still possesses the tribal organisation. These settled members of the tribes are often called ṣaḥr-nisḵšā, dīn-nisḵšā and ṣaḥrā-nisḵšā.

As to the tribes themselves, called ʿilājār in Persia, they nearly always occupy a definite territory nowadays, on which many members of the tribe have become entirely settled, while the others are no more than semi-nomads who, in summer, go with their cattle to the higher mountain regions. Nomadism is not extinct, however, and anywhere in the Persian steppes the black tents of nomads may be seen occasionally.

The origin of the tribes is an extremely complicated problem. In almost every region they have resulted from a mixture of pre-Iranian, Frā man, Arabic and Turkish-Mongol elements. In northern Persia the Turkish element is no doubt the dominating, as judged by the language; here the redoubtable mountainers of the Dailing and the Djil, who so long withstood Islamization and had still in the Middle Ages a language of their own, have mostly been türkized, in so far as they have not been assimilated by the Iranian settled population. In the mountain region stretching from Aḏharbājjaḵ to Fāris and Kirmān, the Iranian element is largely prevalent, again so far as we can judge from the languages spoken there. The local traditions circulating among those tribes, and about those tribes among the neighbouring populations, have often preserved the memory of extensive migrations that betray a part of Turkish or Arab origin. Some groups are even known as Turkish, although they speak Iranian dialects. Other tribes are still conscious of their Arab origin, although they no doubt have already been türkized for centuries; only a few tribes in Kūhīstān and Khorāsān have preserved the Arabic language. But those local traditions, which never go back more than a hundred years at most, often do not square with what we may regard as established facts from historical sources. It is true, however, that even in recent historical times more or less important migrations of Iranian tribes have taken place. The movement of the Balūći from the North-West to Kirmān and afterwards to modern Balūcīstān had already begun in the early Middle Ages. In addition, reasons of military policy induced several rulers of the Avākīb and sixth centuries to transplant some Kurdish tribes to the North-East; best known is the settlement of Kurdish tribes by Nādir Shāh on the Khorāsān frontier around Kučān and in Māzandārān, where they have still preserved their own features and their language. The only possible description of the tribes in Persia has therefore to be based on their geographical distribution.

With the mediaeval Arab geographers all the tribes in al-Djībāl and Fāris are included under the designation of Aḵrād, i.e. Kurds, but this general term has hardly any ethnographical value. At the present day the name of Kūrds is generally restricted to the tribes inhabiting the environs of Kirmānshāh and further to the north into western Aḏharbājjaḵ. South of Kirmānshāh begin the Lār tribes, to the west of whom, in the mountains between Persian ʿIrāk and Aʿrabīstān live the Bāḵtiyārīs. The northern mountains of Fāris are occupied by the Kūrgel and the Māmāsīn tribes. South of these, round Shīrāz, live the Kāshkāyā, who still speak a Turkish dialect. In Aʿrabīstān, where in the Middle Ages the local bāšāt language was not yet extinct, the Aʿrab element of the settled population is strong; the Arab tribes here belong to the Kāb division and consist for the greater part of Aʿarbīs transferred here from Naḏī under ʿAbbās I. The tribes on the Gulf fringe, in Persian Balūcīstān, and in Sīstān are Balūcı who, since their immigration, have absorbed such considerable local elements as the Kūfs, known from medieval sources. Further to the north there are Aʿarbīs in Kūhīstān, notably around Kān. There is further a not unimportant part of the population, who claim descent from the Prophet, and consequently an Arab origin; these sayids abound especially in Māzandārān, where there were ʿAlīd dynasties at an early period. In Persian Khorāsān there are also Aʿarbīs,
a few Afghan elements and the already mentioned Kurds on the frontier. Finally there live all along the northern frontier of Kürsün Türkish tribes, some of whom have been there since the later Middle Ages, such as the Afgahs and the Kâdîjas (found Asterabâd), while the more recent element is composed of Turkomans.

Other ethnic elements are the Armenians in Persian Armenia in Adharbâjûn, and the large Armenian colony in the suburb Djalma of Isfahân transplanted there by 'Abbâs I. The Nestorian Christians east of the Urmiya Lake have nearly disappeared as a result of the war. In Arabistan there are still remnants of Mandaics, and finally there are reported to be about 40,000 Jews in Persia, who for the greater part are probably descendants of the Jews who lived already in Persia in the beginning of the Islamic period and among whom notably the Jewish colony of al-Yahudiya at Isfahân was well-known.

The great mass of the inhabitants of Persia, including in the first place the townspeople and the settled population, but also many members of the tribes of ancient Turkish origin, belong to the Iranian (Shi'ite) or the IKhâni 'Ashâyi (and follow the madkhâl called Dîfâr). Their number is estimated at little less than 7 millions. About a million of them are the so-called AKBârîyân, living in Hamadhân and al-Ahwâz and environs, who recognize only the authority of the traditions of the Prophet and the Imams. Other Shi'ite sects are the Shâhiyya (about 250,000) and the Nuktâyîya (about 100,000 in Gilân, of Zaidite origin). The Babis and the far more numerous Bahâ'is are represented in all towns and reach together about the number of 700,000. The extreme Shi'ites called 'Aliâhâ or Ahl al-Hâkî are found among the Kurds round Kirmânshâh, among the Lurs, and partly in Mâzandaran and Khurâsan; their number amounts to 500,000. Half that number is given for the adherents of the Ismâ'ilî Hurufî sect, spread all over Persia. There are also some Yazidis on Persian soil near Mîrê Sanûn (Shîrûkî) Muhammedan are found only among the Kurds, the Arabs, the Turcomans and the Afghans, these latter being (Jânâfîtes about 85,000). Finally there are still remnants of the Zoroastrian creed at Yazd, Kirmân, Teherân, Shâh and Kâdîjân.

The entire population of Persia is given as 12,000,000. This last figure is given on the authority of the last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica; the other figures given are derived from the Annuaire du Monde Musulman, 3rd edition 1929.

Bibliography: In view of the general character of the above article it is sufficient to refer for all detailed bibliographical information to the historical, geographical and ethnographical articles dealing with Persia, and to the general bibliographical works on Persia: M. Schwab, Bibliographie de la Perse, Paris 1875, and A. T. Wilson, A Bibliography of Persia, Oxford 1930. (J. H. Kramer)

II. LANGUAGE AND DIALECTS.

Introduction. The Persian language is one member, now the most widely extended member, of a group of languages which are spoken over a region stretching from the River Euphrates to the East of the Hindu Kush, with branches in the Caucasus and in the Masandam Peninsula, 'Oman. It is convenient to group these languages, which in turn form one group within the Indo-European languages, under the name Iranian, a designation from Iran, the modern national name of the Persians, as it was also earlier, in Sasanian (avâ}ân, 伊朗), and Achaemenid times (avâ}št), and which is used also by the Ossetes (lr., 伊朗), Formerly these Iranian dialects were more widely extended, to the north of the Caspian Sea, from Chorasmia (Khwârizm) to the west of the Black Sea (see M. Vaser, Vermischte Mittheilungen über die altesten Wohnsitze der Slaven, in: Die Slavonische Sprache in den älteren Schriften, 1923), and also to Sogdian colonies in Northern Mongolia (see O. Hansen, Zur sogdischen Inchrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal von Kuyalshagama, in: J. S. F. O., xxiv., 1930).

Earliest Sources. 1. Saka. Three divisions of the Saka are referred to in the Achaemenid inscriptions: Sakâ hamusvargâ, Sakâ tigravandâ, Sakâ bârâ pravastraya (on the tomb inscriptions published in J.R.A.S., 1932, p. 374: Saka pravrâstraya). They are the Sakas of Herodotos, and the Sacae of the Latin writers. At a later period they are attested in Sakastân (modern Sistân), and in the Saka kings of India. Names of Sakas are preserved in Old Persian, and the Middle Saka dialect is now largely known.

2. Chorasmia and Sogdiana. Both these countries are named in the Avesta (xviruzm, 俘虏) and the Old Persian inscriptions (xwardnistan, 俘虏), but the dialects are known only in later times.

3. Media. The Medes (Madaî, Amadâ) appear first 835 B.C. in the inscriptions of Shulmanu-ashtâdî II. (see H. Hommel, Ethische und Geographie des alten Orientes, 1926, p. 194). Names and some words are known in Greek (Herodotos quotes spâka 'sheep'), and there are loanwords in Old Persian (vîspâana, cf. the danâ-îch of the Elamite version).


5. The Avesta. To avoid too definite implications, it is usual to employ the designation 'language of the Avesta' (Pahl. ʃīr r, 'language', avâ}št, avâ}št, Arab. abastât, abastât, abastât, abastât, bstâh) for the language preserved in the oldest Zoroastrian texts. The considerable extent of these texts makes them the most important witness to the Old Iranian stage of the dialects, although they have been preserved in a late orthography (a).

In spite however of continued discussion (see P. Telesco, in: M. O., xxv. 55 sqq.; H. Reichelt, Iranistik, p. 29, in: Geschichte der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, ii., 1927; G. Morgenstierne, (a) For convenience the transcription of the G. 1. Ph. is here followed, but a revised orthography, more conformed to that of the Old Persian texts and the Greek and Akkadian transmissions, would represent the Old Iranian form more satisfactorily (as e.g. ahta for aityh).
The Kāfīr dialects of Kātī, Ashkun, Prasun, Wāqīgal, are known only in a modern form from the sixth century, and adequately only this century (see Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, 1926, p. 59 sqq.; do., Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-Western India, 1932, p. 46 sqq.; do., The Language of the Ashkun Kāfīrs, in N.T.S., ii, 192–289). The evidence of the Kāfīr dialects is important for the Indo-Iranian period, in particular for the history of the sounds represented by the Kāfīr 7 and 3, corresponding to the Avestan 7 and Old Persian 3, respectively. Thus Kātī has dātā ‘ten’, dasta ‘autumn’, dast, uts ‘I’.

Periods of the Iranian dialects. The extant documents, of widely different character, and in many scripts, are sufficient to allow the distinction of three periods: Old, Middle and New Iranian. In the west of the Persian empire, the change to the Middle Iranian stage (marked by loss of large part of the old inflexion) is attested already in the later Achemenid inscriptions.

Old Iranian. The Old Iranian stage of development is known in the Old Persian inscriptions, the Avesta, and the names of Medians and Sakas. The two dialects Old Persian and Avestan, in spite of the restricted number of texts, and hence little known vocabulary, agree closely, but yet are clearly distinct. In phonology Old Iranian has p, 3 unchanged before and between vowels (i.e., ‘to run’, ‘to be hot’, ‘to fly’, ‘to make’, ‘aha ‘bad’), but they are represented by spirants before consonants (boksha ‘true’, rasfin ‘sleep’, nasta ‘spoken’); before and between vowels 7 is represented by h (Old Persian hada ‘with’). In comparison with the Northern-Western dialects is excluded.

It is possible that other dialects developed in the cities of Carmania (Strabo, xv. 2. 14 speaks of the dialects of the Caspian), Arachosis, Aria and Margiana, but nothing survives.

Relationship with Indo-Aryan and Kāfīr dialects. The Old Iranian dialects stand in close connection with the Indo-Aryan languages of India, which are known in their oldest form (apart from the words of uncertain position within Indo-Iranian history preserved in the Mitanni and Hitite documents, see N. D. Mironov, Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the Second Millennium B.C., in Acta Orient. 1933, 3. Freedstein, Reallexikon der Assyriologie, 1929, i. 144 sqq.; A. Christensen, Die Iranier, 1933, p. 209 sqq.) in the Vedas, and with the modern Kāfīr dialects of Kāfīrīstān. The vocabulary of Indo-Aryan and Iranian is largely identical (āp ‘water’, vak ‘speak’, marvandik ‘man’, kar ‘do’, ā ‘up to’, pār ‘around’, invan ‘though’, ka ‘who’), so also is the morphology of verb and noun. Differences do however exist in vocabulary (Iranian yar ‘year’, gārd ‘speak’, gād ‘pray for’, snāt ‘to snow’), and in morphology (Iranian -st 2 sing. pret. middle, as Greek -se). In phonology the two groups have diverged in the oldest texts. To Sanskrit 7 ch j h (dasta ‘hundred’, chand ‘to appear’, jam ‘to know’, deh ‘to form’) correspond Avestan s e (sato, san, dari ‘to appear’, dam ‘know’, dēturn ‘fortress’); Sanskrit g ḍh, d ḍh, b b, to Avestan, Old Persian g ḍh b; Sanskrit hh th ph to Avestan, Old Persian x ḍh f; Sanskrit ed ḍh, i ḍh, u ḍh to Avestan oṣḍ, iḥḍ, uṣḍ; Sanskrit t dḥh to Avestan rd ḍh.
with personal terminations in singular, dual and plural, and in addition participles present, aorist, future, and perfect. These cannot all be illustrated here. The following Avestan forms may be quoted: baraiti 'he bears', yasaite 'he worships', conj. pres. barat 'he will bear', opt. pres. ayat 'he shall be', opt. perf. jarymyn 'I would have come', imperat. bara 'bear', baratu 'let him bear', idi 'go', khrysta 'make'. The infinitive has no single form, but is expressed by oblique cases of verbal nouns of action: avazastō 'fall down', azlīyō 'to choose', apayhastē 'remove'. There is an aorist passive (vält 'was spoken', jaini 'was struck), confined to the 3rd sing. The personal terminations differ in pres., perf., and imperat. In the present are found: barāmī, barakhi, baraiti, dual 3 barātī, plur. barāmasti, zayāštī, barotiti; in the imperfect: barom, jazom 'thou canest', barat, dual 1 jāvē 'we two live', 3 jazastī 'they two came', plur. barāmā, jazastī, barōm. The present base was formed either with or without suffix, or by reduplication: asti 'be ix', dadati 'he gives', bavasti 'he becomes', horostē 'they remove', ūrīnīmi 'I bless', har∽nōiti 'makes', irināxiti 'leaves', hināxiti 'pours out', jōyēnixi 'I pray for', tīpāyēti 'heats'. The aorist was formed direct to the base (vādlē 'he created') or with the suffix -s (dārētē 'he held'), the perfect was either reduplicated (vāsala 'has spoken') or not (vādlē 'has known') with special terminations, the pluperfect was expressed by the use of preterite endings to the perfect base (vāsolt 'had said'). The active present and perfect participle was formed by the -ant- suffix, and the passive preterite participle usually by the suffix -ta-. Of these present bases and of these and other participles examples are preserved in New Persian. The comparison of adjectives could be expressed in two ways (suffixes -yah, -iata- and -tara-, tama-): vahn- 'good', vayhak-, vakhiata-; and -dād-, akhara, hastam 'best'. Three morphological series (mas, fem., neut.) are expressed in nouns and adjectives. Of the many suffixes may be named the noun of agent in -tar-, noun of action in -dēt-, abstract noun in -īt-. Compounds are of many forms: aspatā- 'horses and men', irānā- 'slaying men', dakhypati- 'lord of a country', pūrnhārāta 'possessing many brothers', axīnu- 'up to the knee', dāryavastāta 'holding a chariot'. This of whole elaborate Old Iranian system but small part has survived to the present day.

Middle Irānian. Since 1904 when F. W. K. Müller published the Handschriften-Reste in Estrangeld-Schrift aus Turfan, Chinese-Turkestan, 1. (S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1904), ii. (Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1904), the middle period of Irānian linguistic history has been increasingly enriched with new material. It is now possible to describe five forms of Middle Irānian, of which Middle Persian forms one, from numerous documents in a variety of scripts. Early loanwords are preserved in Aramaic (see Hubschmann, Aramische Grammatik, i., 1897; R. Gautschi, Iranica, M. S. L., xix. [1915]; A. Meillet, in M.N.L., xviii. [1916]; H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch des Persischen, ii., Glossar, 1931). These are particularly important as being written in a script possessing vowels. A document dated 22-21 B.C. was found at Awramān (Minns, in J.H.S., 1915, p. 38 sqq.; Urvāla, in B.S.O.S., l. [1920] 125-144; H. S. Nyberg, in M.O., xviii. [1925] 182-230; E. Herzfeld, Paikuli, 1924) is known, accompanied by another document dated 88 B.C. with almost illegible writing. Coin legends of Fārs (about 250 B.C. and of the later Parthian and Sasanian kings, Kushano-Sasanian coins, Sasanian royal and official inscriptions in two dialects, and on gems and seals, a large Zoroastrian literature, mostly religious but including some secular pieces (in Pahlavi), and texts in two western dialects from the Manichean documents of Central Asia, some being in the Chinese script (F. W. K. Müller, loc. cit.; K. Salesmann, Manicheische Studien, i., 1908, and other texts in Manichaica, illi, Ischola Acad. Nauk., 1912; Andreas-Hennig, Mitteleuropäische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, i., S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1932, ii., ibid., 1933, iii., ibid., 1934; Waldschmidt-Lenz, Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus in Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1926; do., Manichaica Dogenkat aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten, 1933) fragments of a version of the Psalms with the Canons of Mar Ābā translated from Syriac into Middle Persian (Andreas-Barr, Bruchstücke einer Pseudo-Übersetzung der Psalmen, in S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1933) have combined to disclose the character of the Western dialects. The Zoroastrian texts are written with an historical orthography, through which the phonetic development rarely appears, with the exception of the frequent transcription of "Pahlawi" words into the fully vocalised Avestan alphabet. The Manichean writers rejected the old orthography. Eastern dialects are represented by Sogdian texts, letters of the 6th century a.d. (H. Reichelt, Die soghischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums, ii., 1931) found in Chinese Turkestan, and other letters not yet published, found in Sughd (preliminary report by A. Freiman, in Sogdissi sbornik, in Acad. Nauk. S. S. R., 1934), besides many Buddhist texts (Gautschi, J. A., 1912; M. S. L., xvii., 1912; Gautschi-Beveniste, Le Sūtra des Causes et des Effets, 1926; H. Reichelt, loc. cit., i-iii; F. Rozenberg, Un certain genre de lontaines bouddhique du moyen-orient, in Ischiola Acad. Nauk., 1927; R. Gautschi's Essai de grammaire sogdienne, 1914-1923 was completed by Beveniste 1929), by Manichean Sogdian texts first made known in F. W. K. Müller's Handschriften-Reste, ii., and later in Waldschmidt-Lenz, loc. cit, and by Christian Sogdian texts in F. W. K. Muller, Sogdische Texte, i., Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1913 and Muller-Lenz, Sogdische Texte, ii., 1934; and by Saka texts, business letters (A. F. R. Hoernle, A Report of the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia in J. A. S. Bengal extra-number to LXV, 1902; do., Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan, 1916), an official document from Sācū (F. W. Thomas and S. Konow, Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, 1929), and Buddhist translations and original compositions (E. Leumann, Zur nord-iranischen Sprache und Literatur, 1912; do., Buddhistische Texte und die Originalquellen der Lützow, 1920; do., Das nordiranische [saka]ische Lehrgesicht der Buddhismus, 1933-1934; S. Konow, Saka Stuudios, 1932, with reference). Certain words of the dialect of the Saka invaders of India are known (S. Konow in S. B. Pr. Ak. W., 1916 p. 799 sqq.). On the Sogdian and Saka phonology it must suffice to refer to the books cited: Sogdian ʌtā 'fire', ʰāž, pāl 'foot', yotā 'to praise', kara- 'city,zewān 'life', asv 'I'; Saka kanthā 'city', yānde 'he knows', hastama- 'best', satī- 'year', baurā- 'snow', ayu 'I'.
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The Sogdian verbal system has present (durative expressed by adding 'sk'on, 's'om, and future by adding 'km', 'k'n), imperfect (n'qos 'thou hearest'), ē-preterite (g'ar'i 'they bore'), durative kīrṣ- with 'sk'ōw (n'qos askārān 'they went'), conj. present (wānān 'I will do'), perfect (zēnāk dārām 'I have given'), āyātim 'I have come'), optative (g'ārī l. sing.), imperative (g'ār, gāwār, infinitive (wēnak 'to pull', wārt 'to eat'), participles active present -ān, -āk, -andk, passive preterite -t (g'ārāt 'given'), adjectival form -tak (māgātak 'prepared'). The augment -a is prominent, see H. Reichelt, Beiträge zur sogdischen Grammatik, 1931. In Saka there is present (dīte 'he sees'), pres. injunctive (hautta 'he will know'), pres. conj. (hāmāc 'he will be'), optative (yānīyī 'he would do'), imperative (tu 'go'), the preterite is expressed by imperfect participle (vītī, fem. vītā 'was', plural vītā, fem. vītī 'were'), compound tenses (dīṣī yē 'he was seated'), participles (mānātu- 'resembling', ṣāmā- 'lying down', jātā- 'slain', kūnā- 'to be spoken'). The noun is fully inflected in Saka in three genders, and in Sogdian traces of nominal inflexion are preserved (see P. TeDESCO, in Z.f.L., iv. 94 sqq.; E. Benveniste, Gram. sogd., ii. 77). Since the Indian Brāhmi script is used in writing Saka, vowels as well as consonants are fully known.

Chorasmian is still little investigated. Apart from words quoted in Arabic writers, particularly from the calendrical teras to be found in al-Būrānī (Chronology, ed. Sachau, p. 47, 173, 192), material has been collected by Ahmet Zeki Validi (Hūrārīmsche Sätze in einem arabischen Fihh-Wörter, in Islamica, iii., 1922). Here ẁā'ī 'milk', cf. Sogdian aṣēf 'milk'; ẁaḏ 'deep', cf. Avestan yafra- 'deep'; ẁt 'nose', cf. Sogdian nē' 'nose'. An exhaustive study is still awaited.

Middle Ossetic is known in names (see Ws. Miller, Ossetenisch: Etymol., iii. 39 sqq.; M. VASNEX, loc. cit.) such as Boroipet, Bakaratop, Xaratan, and in loanwords in Hungarian (circa 800 A.D.) such as govt 'care', būdad, gazdag 'rich', kara 'sword', réesg 'drunk' (see H. Skold, Die ossetischen Lehrwerke im Ungarischen, 1925). They suffice to indicate the phonology of this period.

In the West two Middle Iranian dialects are known, which can be assigned to North and South respectively. The southern dialect is closely related to literary New Persian. Phonology and vocabulary distinguish these two dialects sharply (see P. TeDESCO, Dialektologie des nordwestiranischen Turfanfragmente, in M.O., xx., 1925; W. Leutz, in Z.f.L., iv. 251 sqq.): in the North 'san 'woman', das 'ten', ḍhī 'three', qāfar 'four', bāwī 'second', kirā 'reave', kāwā 'kawa (ašušmān, 'make' with the South: san, daḥ, ḍhī, ṣāhār, ḍnā, ḍl, kān). Other dialect influence can be detected, as e.g. in the change ṡī- to gu- (cf. New Persian gānū 'sin'). Nominal inflexion is absent from the Manichean texts. It is possible that the frequent final -y of the Sāsānian inscriptions represents the remains of the old oblique case in -s. The ān ending (in Old Persian -ānān is gen. plur.) appears as nom. plur. (ardvān 'the righteous'). The verbal system of the southern dialect agrees largely with that of early Persian of the Muslim texts (see Henning, Das Verb zu den Mütterbischeyen der Turfan texte, in Z.f.L., ix., 1933). The Old Iranian present bases are represented by klī- 'leave', sīv- 'live', qāvar- 'fly', zan- 'strike', ḍrā- 'shine', vind- 'find', dān- 'know', kūn- 'make', ṁīn 'gather', sāy- 'bring forth'. The trans. preterite is expressed by the participle in -t in passive sense: qāvarān kōm 'and you have clothed me', but the form kīnd kōmd 'they have done' (as in New Persian kārdānd) is found. A passive is expressed by -yxh: -iṣāyīkā is 'raised'. Beside the present indicative with the endings -ām, -etk, ḍh, -ām (and -on), -tā, -ānd (and -and), a full present conj. is attested with the endings -ān, -yā, -āk, -ām, -ād, -ānd. An optative 3rd sing. in -ēt occurs. The infinitive is in -tan, the present participles in -ān, and (adjectival) -andāy. The vocabulary has many words lost to New Persian lexicography.

New Iranian. The third period may be dated from the introduction of a new orthography by the writers in Arabic. In the early Arabic books many Iranian words and names, Persian, Sogdian and Chorasmian, are recorded, stripped of the old historical spelling.

The Arabic alphabet was long insufficient to represent the Iranian sounds, while certain signs were superfluous (ṣ y t s). Hence some symbols had double employment: ƿ f j ɻ ɢ f v (beside  gerçekten) In final position, the guttural (which was written, e.g. in Pahlavi kt 'house', Turfan texts gd 'house', and has moreover survived in some New Iranian dialects, Kummārī hawū 'fuel', as in Turfan texts 'yang 'fuel', Balōzī W. hāmāg, E. īmārī 'raw') was indicated by ɻ or ɻ (sfnān- 'jag' and medially by ɻ (sfnān- 'jag'). To indicate vowels a new system was adopted in accord with Arabic usage. The older Aramaic system did not distinguish the quantities of i a (and only partially of v), nor the qualities of ẓ ẓ. Alif y v, served to express ṭ t ṭ. But in the Arabic script alif ra, served mediately for ṭ (sometimes ṭ, ṭ, ṭ (the Arabic diphthongs ai, au).

New Persian, with which is closely connected the colloquial language, deviating widely from the literary norm, of the western cities, and the Ṭadjik of the eastern Iranian region, Afghanistan, the Pamirs, Turkestan (see the references in W. Leutz, Pamiër-Dialekte, i. 29 sqq.), is in strict accord with the language of the Old Persian inscriptions (Old Persian pṣa- 'son', dān- 'know', New Persian pū, dān-), and the southern dialect of the Sāsānian inscriptions and the Manichae texts, but from its earliest monuments after the introduction of Islam it appears as a dialect largely mixed with forms of other dialects. The mixture had been brought about already in Sāsānian times. As successors of the Parthians whose dialect was northern type the Sāsānians took over part of the official vocabulary (e.g. sahr 'country', ṣahr- 'king's son' as proper name). Forms of both dialects occur in the Zoroastrian books and among the loanwords in Armenian. A few words entered from the eastern dialects (sfgīr 'divine son' as title of the Chinese emperor). Hence New Persian has two forms side by side: bāz, bīj, bāz 'tribute', dānā, farzānāh 'wise', zāmīn, dānīk 'earth'. In the vocabulary of New Persian, the Iranian verbs have been greatly reduced in number. Verbs which are found still
in use in other dialects have disappeared or survive only with preverbs or in nominal derivatives. Such is the case with *a-* 'breathe', *va-* 'speak' (in *šun ciš, manad nomaštan, darb cient, darsafan, sew* [in dars *dast, darš *taylor, dil *enclosure], *vor- *send, *yag-* 'lead', *val-* 'lead', *daw-* 'bind', *build', *vind-* 'find', *barr-* 'hold', *vaid-* 'throw', *shoot', *gund-* 'dress', *daw-* 'throw', *mank-* 'put on', *bawm-* 'weep', *ar-* 'griaf', *gan-* 'come upon', *fand-* 'find', *hakt-* 'make wet', *vaz-* 'pull out', *kap-* 'fall' (cf. kuku *old', Turfan Texts kosfom, *ke*-*see', snag-* 'snow', *vor-* 'perish' (in gunah *sin*), *tirp-* 'steal', *harr-* 'go', *tard-* 'split' (in šifallan 'to split'), *zod-* Old Persian *yadd-* 'take away' (in zidan 'loss'), *vor* 'to wind'. Nominal forms have also been lost: Farsi dialect of Büringgan pok 'small cattle', Ossetic sred 'bridge', Balšč *gir *house', Zikda *vir *milk', Pashto *vir *known'. These and others are not represented in New Persian. Arabic has continually encroached upon the vocabulary. The Italic character of New Persian is however still easily recognised in its morphology (plur. of nouns *an-, hā-*; pronouns *man, tu, mi*, mā, inā, kēh, iš, an, in; verbal forms, pers. tense *kunun, kunad, kunim, kunand*, pret. *kard*, the verb substantive *am, i, ast*, and). New Iranian dialects have been preserved by their isolation, although, except Ossetic and Kunzāri by reason of their position, they are everywhere yielding to the prestige of New Persian. Recent research has brought knowledge of most of the existing Iranian dialects. Isolated places may, as perhaps in the Khal-i Tafsūn region, still conceal unknown dialects, elsewhere and especially in the Fâmir's information has been largely increased. These dialects have so widely diverged from Old Iranian that the whole complex development cannot be indicated here. It must suffice to point out in the various groups certain developments in phonology and morphology.

**Phonology.** The developments of Old Iranian *w*, *hir-, der-, *z-, *z-, *f-, *r-, *r*, may be here selected to illustrate the divergence.

1. Ossetic (in two dialects, Digoron and Iron, in Ossetia in the Caucasus): (Digoron) nad 'storm', *vor-* 'self', *door =* 'door', *zar-* 'heart', *zun-* to know *; wun-* 'hundred', *yad-* 'window', *dakhar* 'open-eyed', *mard-* 'dead', *zarta* 'three', *surt-* 'son'.

2. Yaghân (in the Yagâh valley between the Zaubâng and Hâng ranges): *vott* 'willow', *vatt-* 'wind', *sep-* 'self', *diwâr* 'door', *bizz-* 'to know', *pa-* 'to cook', *vusted* 'I live', *ñî* 'flour', *ti-* 'three', *pul-* 'son'.

3. Shugāni (in the Pâms): *vott* 'willow', *kurn-* 'to eat', *dev-* 'door', *yâng-* 'food' (Yânglaitum dev-), *ogpor- *gir, *dev- ñan-* 'to know', *wun-* 'I, *piz-* 'to cook', *sîd* 'knife', *pul-* 'son'.

4. Ishkâmî (in the Pâms, closely with Sang, *kîn*): *vin-* 'to see', *xar-* 'to eat', *var-* 'door', *piz-* 'to know', *sîr-* (Sangâlî *sir*) 'brother', *sûj-* 'woman', *kîf* 'knife', *pul-* 'three'.


6. Mundzî (in Mandzân, in the Pâms, related to Vâdghâ): *zvon-* 'I see', *vîsî-* 'willow', *sîr-* 'I eat', *woni* 'mother-in-law', *bîl-*

'door', *wô-* 'to know', *purâ** - 'to sow', *zî* *Zun* 'I strike', *kîrî* 'knife', *sirî* 'three', *pul* 'son'. A development peculiar to Mundzî (and Vâdghâ) is that of *sî* to *sî*: *men* *likem* 'I saw'. Initially and medially replaces *dîr* 'daughter', *kîli* 'when'.

7. Pashtî (in several dialects, with a more isolated dialect Wânêti): *sîlâ* 'willow', *wini* 'he sees', *swâd* 'sweet', *wini* 'mother-in-law', *sîr-* 'door', *sî* *Zun* 'I, *sir-* 'heart', *pîr-* 'father', *sîm-* 'day', *sûj-* 'life', *sûj-* 'knife', *wûn-* 'dead', *sî-* 'three', *sû-* 'fire'.

8. Ornûri (in two dialects, of Logar and Kâniuram, Afgânastân): *vor-* 'to rain', *wâci* 'self', *bîr-* 'door', *bîz-* *other*, *sî* *Zun* 'I, *sir-* 'heart', *sûj-* 'fire', *pîr-* 'father', *sîm-* *mor* 'day', *sûj-* 'life', *sûj-* 'knife', *wûn-* 'dead', *sî-* 'three', *sû-* 'fire'.

9. Parâtî (in the Hindu Kush): *sî* *wind*, *sî-* *willow*, *sî-* 'to eat', *bîr-* 'door', *sir-* 'heart', *bî-* 'bridge', *rûsî* 'smoke-hole', *piz-* 'to cook', *sî-* *mor* 'to kill', *bûr-* 'bore', *sûj-* *mor* 'flour', *sî-* 'three', *sû-* 'son'.

10. Balâšî (in several dialects: the following forms are from the western dialect): *gûâr* 'wind', *sîlun* 'to choose', *wârâg* 'to eat', *wâci* 'self', *sûm-* 'son-in-law', *sûj-* 'heart', *bîr-* 'brother', *sîr-* 'day', *piz-* 'to cook', *sîm-* 'to strike', *sûj-* 'dead', *sî-* 'three', *sû-* 'fire'.

11. Khûrî (in the district of Bûkhân, Central Persia): *gûâr* 'wind', *sîlun* *I see*, *sûm-* 'sun', *dûr-* 'to eat', *bîr-* 'door', *sîr-* 'heart', *sûj-* 'fire', *bûr-* 'tree', *bû-* 'burn', *sûj-* 'woman', *bûhurdun* 'I bore', *sû-* 'son'.

12. Yazdî (from material written down in Yazd, at the dictation of a Zârudy in 1932): *sâj-* 'I see', *sûm-* 'willow', *sû-* 'I,xre', *sû-* 'I eat', *bîr-* 'other', *bîz-* 'again', *mî* *mor* 'I know', *sûj-* 'white', *sî-* *mor* 'day', *sûj-* 'life', *sûj-* 'knife', *sû-* 'self', *sûj-* 'needles', *pîr-* 'women', *sû-* 'bowstring', *mîsûr-* 'I bore'.

13. Nâîni (closely connected with Anârak and Yazdî): *mî* *mor* 'I see', *sû-* 'I,xre', *sî-* 'I eat', *bî-* 'other', *mî sî-* 'I know', *sî-* 'wind', *sû-* 'hundred', *mî* *mor* 'I say', *mî *mor* 'I burn', *bû-* 'borne', *sû-* 'I,ast* 'he had', *sî-* 'son'.

14. Nâtânzi (closely with the dialects of Yaran and Farizând): *sî-* 'willow', *sû-* 'I see', *sû-* 'I,xre', *bîr-* 'door', *bî-* 'other', *sû-* 'son', *sî-* 'wind', *sû-* 'I say', *sû-* 'woman', *bî-* 'bore', *sî-* 'self', *pîr-* 'son'.

15. Sî (from material collected in Isfâhan and Sûh in 1932): *mî* *mor* 'he has eaten', *bî-* 'other', *sû-* 'he knows', *sûj-* 'white', *sû-* 'he says', *sû-* 'he,cooks', *sû-* 'woman', *sû-* 'he,strikes', *sû-* 'he,flies', *sû-* 'he,has done'.

16. Khûnsâri: *bî* *mor* *I see him*, *bî-* 'I,xre', *sî-* 'I eat', *bîr-* 'door', *mî sî-* 'I know', *sî-* 'wind', *sû-* 'I burn', *bû-* 'he struck', *mî-* 'man', *bî-* 'bore'.

17. Gâzî (near Isfâhan): *sû-* 'he sees', *sû-* 'he eats, falls', *bî-* 'other', *sû-* 'he, knows', *sî-* 'white', *bû-* 'he,arived', *sû-* 'he pours', *bû-* 'he burns', *bû-* 'he,cooks', *sû-* 'he, alive', *sî-* 'gum', *bû-* 'he,looked', *sû-* 'he, had', *sî-* 'son'.

18. Sâwândî (in Fâs): *sî-* 'wind', *sî-* 'willow', *sû-* 'small', *bû-* 'door', *sî-* 'yesterday', *mî-* *mor* 'I cook', *sû-* 'woman', *bî-* 'he made'.
19. Simnâni (in North Persia, east of Tihrân):

via 'willow', 
vi 'wind', a munârân 'I eat',
bar 'door', ma wâm 'I know', rûz 'day', a dumârân 'I pour', janâla 'woman', zâna 'wife',
kârd 'knife', ma babârân 'I bore', fîr 'son', hârî 'three'.

20. Sangâri (related to the dialect of Lâzârî):

evi 'willow', bâxâr 'I eat' (Aor.), sînê 'knee', sa hundrân, rûz 'day', bûsü 'I say' (Aor.),
zen 'woman', bekûn to 'strike', ârê 'four', sa 'three', fîr 'son'.

21. Talâtî (on the west of the Caspian Sea):

va 'snow', han 'sleep', hânê to sing', ha 'door', as t 'one to know', daraan 'needle',
ka 'house', sîpî 'white', rûz 'day', tê 'to live',
en 'woman', bard 'bridge', ka'ro to do.'

22. Gilaki (closely connected with Mâzârânâni and the dialect of Gôrâkhôn): varf 'snow', sêrêm 'I eat', sâmâ 'son-in-law', hârân 'brother',
sonam 'I burn', pâm 'cooking', wân 'to strike', baz 'I bore'.

23. Gûrân of Kandûla (dialects of Kandûla, Pîwa, Aurâmân, Rîjûd, Bâjûlân, Talahedeshk are recorded):

wân 'rain', wârv 'snow', wûr 'sun', wîrm 'sleep', zî 'heart', sâmâ 'son-in-law',
mûrân 'he pours out', rôwân 'window', zî 'bowsting', zân 'woman', sî karâ 'he made'.

24. Kurdi (in several dialects: the following is from the Mukh):

bâfr 'snow', xwârê 'eat',
dark 'door', daxâmân 'I know', sipî 'white',
rûz 'day', daxâmân 'it is burnt', zîn 'woman',
kirt 'done', bûmk nûr 'I sent', se, sê 'three'.

25. Zârâ (dialects of Siwerek, Bîxâd, Cabûshkûr, Kîshî, Kûr, Cemûqûl and Palû are recorded): xawar 'snow', wûyô 'wind', wârê 'to eat', bar 'door',
zûn 'to know', xêrê 'fire', rûz 'to flow', rûz 'day', pamm 'to cook', wîf, wêz 'to say', jand 'to strike'.

26. Kumârî (in the Masâmân Peninsula, Omân):

bûram 'rain', gûnây 'hunger', xir 'the ate',
xwûrân 'sleep', dezâmân 'winter', sur 'anger', zamiyo 'earth', sîpî 'white', bur 'happened',
sînên 'needle', rôwân 'window', zank 'woman', bûz 'strike', mûrân 'man', xûrin 'food', dûs 'sickle', fêz 'son'.

27. Têti (on the Ashêrân Peninsula): varf 'snow', bûyô 'widow', xwar 'sister, dar 'door',
dûmân 'son-in-law', duzûmân 'to know', zu-
mustân 'winter', zuhân 'tongue', bûran 'be',
dûvân 'to see', bûrân 'brother', por 'autumn',
xwûlân 'I sift', rûz 'day', sa'n 'woman', zîn 'to live', xûrân 'to eat'.

28. Farsi (dialects of Somghân, Pûpûn, Mâsarn, Bûrûngîn and Iwâmân Isfâhân):

mûnân 'I see', bîz hûrân 'to send', xwûlân 'I sleep', nûvîn-
âmân 'I do not know', sînê 'knee', dûz 'given',
pîmûzân 'I cook', sa 'struck', bûn 'bure'.

29. Luî, Bakhtûrû: bûfr 'snow', bûhû 'ent',
swûânân, xûrân 'to eat', dûzê 'son-in-law', sî 'tongue', xwûlân 'white', dî 'smoke', bêd, bêl 'willow',
bes- 'to sift', rûz 'day', sa'dân to 'strike', zîn 'woman', or 'four'.

pûzan 'I cook', bûzân 'I sift', sêd 'four',
kûrd 'made', mûrd 'died', sin 'three', pûs 'son'.

The following general tendencies may be especially noticed: t 'it' is replaced by a guttural in

Balû, Khûrî, Ormûrî, Parâcî and partly also in New Persian; 2. the correspondence of Ossetic h-
(Iron dialect g), v, d, Yâghnîbî g, v, d, Shughî and Yâzgûlûmî g, v, b, Mûndî g, v, l,
Paštû g, v, l. In contrast to Ossetic and Parâcî g, b, d, marks a distinction within the eastern group; 3. g tends to be modified in the eastern dialects: Ossetic has, gis 'ear', Ormûrî gos, Parâcî gos, Mûndî gos, Paštû gos, Wagíp gos, Shughî gos, Iškabûmî gos, Sarîkûl gos, Rûshânî gos, Barîngûlî gos, Yâzgûlûmî gos, contrasting with New Persian gos (gû).

Relationship of the Dialects. The larger divisions among the New Iranian dialects are results of old differences, originating in the earliest period. Two great groups, an Eastern and a Western, are distinguished by phonology, morphology and vocabulary (see G. Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, p. 31 sqq.). The eastern group is itself divided by old differences into subordinate groups. Ossetic, isolated in the Caucasus, has developed a morphology which separates it sharply from the Yâghnîbî, with which however it shares, for example, the plural -te, Yâghnîbî -t. Yâghnîbî is in turn isolated as the only surviving Sogdian dialect. In the Pamirs Shughî forms a group with Oroshori, Yâzgûlûmû, Rûshânî, Barîngûlî, Sarîkûl, and the now extinct Wanûl; similarly Iškabûmû and Sangîlî. Mûndî in several dialects (see the classification by G. Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to North-West India, p. 70) has close relations with Yudhû. Wakhû stands alone, noticed by its phonology (3 in 'in dog' = yûdôg, zu 'iron', in murî 'dead', in pîr 'son') from Ossetic and Parâcî, though now widely different, yet have common phonological traits, in particular b, g, d, and the replacement of g by y. Paštû is known in several dialects (G. Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, p. 11).

In the Western group subdivisions are similarly to be recognised. Zâzâ, Gûrânî, Kurdi, Khûrî, Balû, Gilaki (with Talâtî, the dialect of Gôrâkhôn, and Mûzârânûn) form sharply distinct groups. The southern dialects, Luri, Farsi, Kumârî, and the literary New Persian show clear descent from a dialect similar to, and probably identical with, the Old Persian. To these Têti belongs as the dialect of garrisons settled in the region of Darbâd.

In the central district lying between Tihrân, Isfâhân, Hamadân and Yazd, are found a number of dialects which have not yet all been fully investigated. They share a common vocabulary. The formation of the present affords a means of grouping them. The Sangîsâri, Lâzîrî and Shamanzârî agree in forming the present with the infix of a nasal -n, -nd (possibly representing the Old Iranian -an/participle; similarly in Zâzâ): Sangîsâri sinendî 'I strike', Lâzîrî kam zândâm 'we say', Shamanzârî kâfûn 'he falls'. Shahanzârî to the present mûznân 'I know'. The dialects of Wonishûn (Wânîshân), Mahallât and Khûnsûr agree in having its (ats, -t) in the pres.: Wonishûn xtemérûn 'I break', Mahallât âtîwân. Khûnsûr îthamûnûn. Nâtnanî, Fatirzandî and Yaranî form one group: in the pres. Nâtnanî koren 'I do', Fatirzandî akarôn, Yaranî akarôn. Sî (akeron), Meimeî (akero 'the does'), Kohrudî (akerûn), Keshi...
Verb. The divergence from the Old Iranian system, already marked in Middle Iranian, has developed further in New Iranian. New verbal systems have been evolved. In spite of independent growth, a general resemblance is found, for example, between New Persian and Ossetic. In New Persian means are to hand to express active and passive, indicative, conjunctive, optative, imperative, infinitive, present (punctual and durative), imperfect, perfect, perfect (punctual and durative), pluperfect, future, and conditional.


Present tense. In Old and Middle Persian indic. and pres. conj. are clearly separated. Both modes of thought are expressed in New Persian. Conj. pres. inflexion, distinct from indic. pres., is preserved in Yaghbiji (kunti ‘he does’, conj. kunna) and Ossetic (kuni ‘does’, conj. kama). Other dialects have one form of present inflexion, which therefore serves to express both present and aorist (with meanings of fut. and conj. pres.). In certain dialects, as in early New Persian kunna ‘do’, Mundji xarim ‘I eat’, Yaghbij xarim ‘I plur., Oroshori kiniim ‘I do’, Shughnut xarim ‘we eat’, I plur., Sangisari xarim ‘I plur., this form appears alone in both senses. But greater precision was attained by use of prefixes, suffixes and periphrastic forms marking off the present. So in Khuri (the verb ‘I eat’), Kurdi Malik d-a (dahki-pan ‘I fall’), Kurmandi a (abaron ‘I fall’), Abdi ti (tiyaron ‘I bear’), Khurani (ti (tiyaron ‘I bear’), Mehali (a) (a) (a) ‘I come’, Nami a (mi (a) (a) ‘I bring’), lez (leza (a) (a) ‘I run’,) Luri Bakhtiaran (ti (tiyaron ‘I do’), Varani a (abaron ‘I bear’), Farzand a (abaron ‘I bear’), Soi a (a) (a) (a) (a) ‘he grinds’), Guriun Kandilai ma (makar ‘I make’, New Persian hami, mi (mikunim ‘I do’), Yaghbij ye (me vipe (a) (a) ‘I cook’), Gazi (a) (a) (a) ‘he grinds’), Zazai of Siwerek (a) (a) (a) (a) ‘I weep’,) Lazgiri (a) (a) (a) ‘I say’, Zowar ‘they say’, Sangisari (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) ‘I say’, Orurui ku, b (a) (a) (a) ‘I take’, bu ku ‘he makes’). Periphrastic forms are used in Parahi: d-nem xarim, in xarmin ‘I eat’. Gilaki has amondaram ‘I am coming’ (infinite amon ‘to come’ with daram), beside the durative preterite amonite harr ‘I was coming’, and Balochi kanyaa ‘I am doing’, Zazai kurtyan ‘I am doing’. Natanzi boren ‘I bear’ and Gilaki birem have no prefix. The aorist (in meaning fut. and
conj., pres.) may equally be defined. Parātī jačem (‘I strike’) is without preverb but the present indic. is formed periphrastically. Similarly in Zāzā the aor. I sing, birān is distinct from the indic. bānān; in Gūrānī (Kanduliā) I sing, birā beside indic. mākārū; in Gāzī birān I sing, beside indic. bārāne. But most commonly the aor. is marked by the preverb be-: New Persian (colloquial) bākānām, Gilaki bābāram, Zāzā bābārām, Simnānī bābārān; Murki Māk bēkām ‘I do’, Pāštō has su (su krm, but also krm, beside the indic. kawm). Shughnī has a preverb tso: (tā sāwī ‘if thou go’), Sanglécti a suffix -a: as lom-a ‘I go’, Wakhī and Sarikoli many suffix -ā. Apart from Yaghma which has a preterite with augment (akwunm ‘I did’), all New Iranian dialects employ forms of the -i participle (representing the Old Iranian -a-part.) to express the preterite. In accordance with the original distinction of this participle in transitive and intransitive, a twofold form of expression was developed: for transitive verbs passive in construction, for intransitive active, as, for example, in Gāzī bimāl ‘I saw’, but bēbūyān ‘I became’. This passive transitive preterite is well maintained in the dialects Tālīšī, Simnānī, Gāzī, Sū, Kūrdī, Gūrānī, Wakhī, Nātanzī, Nānī, Sivandī, Fārsī dialects, Bālūchī, Ormūnī, Pātāl, Pashtō, Mundī, Wakhī, and others, and is known in early literary New Persian (girfēsā ‘he took’). When the personal suffixes accompanied the participle, they usually preceded, but in some cases tended to be affixed, as in Gāzī hadī ‘thou sawest’, but dārūt ‘he had’, Simnānī tā bākārdāt ‘thou madest’, Aurāmānī dāt ‘thou gavest’, dāt ‘he gave’, Mundī mā līm ‘I gave’, tā ṭay ‘thou gavest’. The intransitive was expressed by the participle with the verb substantive. The two forms remained then sharply distinct. But in New Persian (and traces of the development are found in the Middle Persian of the Turfan texts) the transitive preterite is modeled on the intransitive, and both are made identical: kardām ‘I made’, kōrd, kōrd as āmād, āmād, āmād ‘I came’, etc. In the original passive construction there is no affix to the participle, as in Zāzā mīn (ū, a, mā, ūmā, ūdān) kārd ‘I made’, etc., but ādām ‘I came’, ūmā, ūmā, mā ūmād, ūmā ‘I have done’, ūmādāk bādām ‘I have done’, but in New Persian the perfect and perfect, alike transitive and intransitive, are identical in form: kārdah am ‘I have done’, kārdah bādām ‘I had done’, as ūmādah am ‘I have come’, and ūmādah bādām ‘I had come’.

1) See K. Barr, in Iranische Dialektuntersuchungen aus dem Nachlass von F. C. Andreas, herausg. und bearbeitet von Arthur Christensen, K. Barr und W. Henning, Kürdische Dialekte, Gurrāl, § 37, note 1. THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ISLÂM, III.
with Persian. Persian became the language of the upper classes of these peoples, just as French became in the xviii\textsuperscript{th} century for various peoples in Europe. The result is that Persian literature in the wide sense includes not only the literature of Persia, but also the literature of Central Asia, and to some extent of Turkey, India and Afganistan. Although down to the xvi\textsuperscript{th}—xvii\textsuperscript{th} century these literatures were very slightly differentiated, in modern times the differences between them have become so strongly marked that their literatures can no longer be considered as a single whole. This circumstance makes a comprehensive survey of all the literature which may be called Persian an impossible task and forces the student to set more precise limits, which must also apply to this article. Here therefore by Persian literature we mean only the literature of Persia, and such writers as belong to Central Asia, India or Afganistan will be more or less disregarded.

The beginnings. It has so far not been possible to trace the initial stages of Persian literature exactly. There is, it is true, no lack of speculations relating to these first steps but they are so obviously unreliable that they are hardly worth consideration. It is of course natural that these early stages could only have been recorded by chance, as from the point of view of later ages they appeared of very little value.

Nevertheless the fragments that have survived make it possible to put forward certain hypotheses which are probably not too far from the actual truth. The early centuries after the Arab conquest saw a gradual decay of Pahlavi literature. At first sight it might appear that literary activity in Persia ceased completely. But this was not the case. If we turn to the Arabic literature of this period we find that a large number of Persian poets and scholars were writing in Arabic. The valuable anthology of al-Tha\‘alibi (d. 1038), Yatmat al-Dahr (pr. 1885), contains most interesting information which shows that already in the ix\textsuperscript{th} century Arabic had become the literary language of the upper classes in Khur\‘as\‘an and Transoxania. But at the same time there were signs of activity in the opposite direction. The political situation of Persia, whose rulers were trying to cast off the Arab yoke, and the gradual exhaustion of the caliphate demanded not only political opposition to the Arabs but also the ending of the domination of the Arabic language in the field of literature. But the 150 years of the supremacy of Arabic did not pass without leaving a trace. Pahlavi had become a dead language; there was therefore only Persian to oppose to Arabic as a literary language. On the other hand, there prevailed, especially in poetry, Arabic forms (ka\‘shi, ghazal) and the Arabic quantitative metre (\textit{ara\‘ud}), which so firmly established rhyme, probably foreign to Pahlavi, that a return to the poetical technique of the Sasanian period was impossible. Arabic poetry had however to submit to certain changes, such as the introduction of the very long syllable into prosody, which was not possible in Arabic at all and probably arose in the process of inserting Persian words into Arabic lines. How and when the first lines of verse entirely in Persian arose it will hardly be possible to ascertain with certainty. Persian sources profess to consider the fragments that survive of a ka\‘shi by ‘Abb\‘as Mar\‘w\‘az said to have been composed in Marw (Sog) in honour of
Ma'mūn, son of Hārūn al-Rashīd, as the oldest poet in Persian. Unfortunately it is still somewhat difficult to express a definite opinion on the genuineness of these lines. The anthologies (tāḥkīra) and dictionaries (notably Asādī's valuable Lughat-i Furs) contain isolated lines from poets like Abū Ḥafs Sughdī, Ḥanẓala Bādgīshī, Maḥmūd Warrāḵ Harawī, Firūz Mashtikī, Abū Sallīk Gurgānī, etc. of whom some may possibly be as early as the viith century. These fragments however are but miserable remnants, which give evidence of the existence of poetry but do not enable us to obtain a clear idea of Persian verse in its earliest period.

xth—xiiith century. As early as the tenth century we find these early efforts attaining a very high degree of artistic perfection. The courts of the various princes around whom the poets gathered formed centres of literary activity. But as the poets were usually directly dependent on their patrons and had to some extent to adapt themselves to their taste, it is quite natural that almost every dynasty in Persia was surrounded by a group of poets who present a certain unity, especially from the point of view of style, so that the classification of Persian poets by dynasties, as has been usual in Persia from early times, has a certain amount of justification in literary history. In order to give some lucidity to our account of the rather complicated process of the literary evolution of Persian poetry, we shall retain this classification, at the same time subdividing our account according to the various kinds of poetry so that the links may not be broken. In the first section the following kinds of poetry are mainly concerned: a. lyrical court poetry, b. epic, c. mystic. Prose hardly comes into consideration at all in this section, as the older Persian literature scarcely ever uses prose for belles-lettres. Prose is for old Persia the language of scholarship only. But it is to be noted that for the pre-Mongol period the language of scholarship is predominantly Arabic so that even in this field a higher degree of development of Persian prose is only slowly attained.

a. The Court Lyric. While as early as the time of the Tāhirīds and Saffārīds we can recognize the first approaches to the formation of a characteristic court style, we do not see it in its full perfection till the time of the Sāmānīds (875—999), whose capital was Buḫhārā. Although here also the devastation wrought by time has left us only a few remains, it is still absolutely clear that at this time a flourishing literary activity in Buḫhārā was in full swing. Round the Sāmānīd court gathered a large number of distinguished poets, who on the one hand were engaged in singing the praises of the rulers in sonorous kaṣidas and on the other in titulating themselves with one another for pre-eminence, a struggle carried on with poetic weapons also, i.e. satires (khaṭīra, ḥāzi'a). Of all these poets the greatest was the celebrated Rūdāki [q. v.] of Samārḵand. His kaṣida Mādār-i muṣī is an unsurpassed masterpiece. Rūdāki seems to be the first creator of the type of the Persian poet which all others endeavoured to copy: poet, aristocrat, liberal, frivolous, amorous, wine-loving, chivalrous, devoted only to the joys of life, never touching its gloomier sides. In the field of didactic poetry also he won great fame by a version (which has unfortunately not come down to us) of the Kāfīla wa-Dīmān. But he introduced another theme into Persian poetry, the lament for lost youth, which he expressed in moving language. His younger contemporary Kīsā'i [q. v.] (b. 953) of Marw dealt with the same theme. It may be assumed that these lamentations were not simply exercises in style but had a genuine foundation in the circumstances of the Persian poet. His duty was to adorn the court of his prince, to share his pleasures and to amuse him; a sour old greybeard was not suited for this and was no doubt, little appreciated in spite of former services. No less characteristic are the laments of the famous Shāhīd of Bālkh who is said to have been the first to collect a complete Diwān. He laments principally the injustice in the distribution of the world's goods, which clearly points to his lack of success at court. The language of all these poets is clear and lucid; they are still very moderate in the use of poetic artifices and observe the limitations of poetry. Of second class (or perhaps by chance less known) names of this circle of poets the following may be mentioned: Ma'rūfī Bālkhī (c. 954—961), Abū Shu'āb Harawī, Abū Zarrā'a Djugānī, Abū-Farīr Khurāwānī, Djūyā'bī, Bakhrā'tī, Abū Aghādžī, Bakhrā'tī, Rawnaqī, Ma'navt, Abū-'I-Fath Bustī (known also from his poems in Arabic) and 'Ammāra Marwāzī.

After the fall of the Sāmānīds a new literary centre arose in Ghazna at the court of the celebrated Sulṭān Maḥmūd (q. v., 998—1030) and his successors. This school received its key-note from the famous poet 'Uṯūrī (q. v., d. 1050) of Bālkh. His kaṣidas, which celebrate the sulṭān and his campaigns and endeavours to prove his claim to the throne of Persia by theological hair-splittings, are very fine examples of the more serious court poetry. Rūdāki's frivolity would have been out of place at the court of the rigidly orthodox sulṭān. Two other poets who were mainly active at the court of his brother Amīr Naṣr recall in their joie de vivre more the poetry of the Sāmānīd period. They are Mīnūčhīrī (q. v., d. c. 1050) of Dāmghān, who has given us in several poems fine specimens of bilobed humour and liked to make allusions to pre-Islamic legends, and Farrukhī of Sistān (q. v., d. 1037—1038), whose Persian literary historians are fond of comparing with the master of the Arabic kaṣīda al-Muṭanabī [q. v.]. The glowing colours of his descriptions of nature are really marvellous expressions of the imagination. As a theorist also he is known for his treatise Tarjumān al-Balāẓa. No less important is Asādī (q. v., d. between 1030—1041) of Tūs, who was the first to enrich the varieties of court poetry with the munzara or disputations (like the tenzone of Southern France). Two poets of this name are usually distinguished; the younger, author of the Garḥoq-nīma, is said to be a son of the elder. But there are reasons for thinking such a distinction unnecessary and the existence of two Asāsīs doubtful. Under the successors of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, who were no longer able to hold together their father's gigantic empire, poetry was still held in high honour. Of the poets who adorned their courts the master of the kaṣīda Abū 'I-Farād Rūnī (d. the end of the viith = xiiith century) and his pupil Ma'sud-i Sa'd-i Salmān (d. 1131) were specially prominent. The latter in particular, who spent a great part of his life in prison, created a new kind of poem, the Ḥabīṣīyāt (prison kaṣīdas), in which he lamented his cruel
endevoured to check Anwari's influence with the work of Rashid al-Din Wafts (q.v.; d. 1182-1183). This poet, who is also entitled to credit for his work as a theorist, is distinguished by unusually caustic language but as a poet he can scarcely be compared with Anwari, beside whom only the characteristic figure of Kha'kani (q.v., d. 1199), who sang the praises of the Shafs of Shir
dan, remains unfaded. The difficulty of the language of this original poet is proverbial in the east but nevertheless he is recognised to this day as the greatest master of the kashida. Sama'ani of Samarkand (d. 1173-1174) was alo a occasional panegyrist of the Saljuq but he was known chiefly for his satires and parodies which are often obscene but very witty. Women also wrote poetry; for example we have a few lines by Sultan Sandjar's friend Mahisti, which show great talent although they unfortunately contain unusually cynical expressions. Nizami Arudi (q.v.) of Samarkand was a poet at the Ghurid court; he is chiefly notable for his Cabir Mahalla, one of the most important sources for the biographies of poets. The end of this period is marked by the two last great poets of kashidas, Zahir al-Din Faryabi (q.v., d. 1202), whose poems in spite of facility of technique show in comparison with Anwari a certain decline of the court style, and Kamal-i Ismai'il called Kalilak al-Mal'ami or "Creator of Spiritual Ideas" (d. 1237). This last poet turned in his later years from the court style and preferred the contemplative life of a Sufi shaikh to success at court. His best work is already full of the spirit of Sufi mysticism and in this field also he succeeded in creating real masterpieces.

b. Epic. The first essays in epic poetry, a genre which had been practically unknown to the Arabs and which, so to speak, represented the Iranian national element in Persian literature, were made by Persian poets even before the time of the Sasanids, in the period of the first wars against their Arab poetical masters. In this field therefore the Persians had no foreign models and were completely dependent on pre-Islamic tradition and to some extent on popular poetry. Unfortunately once more only fragments of the oldest works have come down to us, which do not permit us to gain anything like a clear idea of their character. In this field it was again the old master Rukaki who created the first work of any size, namely the celebrated version of the Kalila wa-Dimna of which only some 50 baits have come down to us. At the same court the talented young and vivacious poet Dakhiki (q.v.) undertook a larger work, namely a metrical version of the official Sasanian book of kings, the Khudai-nama. His premature death prevented him from carrying out this grandiose scheme. All that he left was about 1,000 baits, which seem to have given the stimulus to the greatest achievement of Persian poetry, the Sheh-nama of the celebrated Abu 'l-Kasim Firdawsis (q.v.) of Tus (born c. 934, d. between 1020-1026). This gigantic work, which according to the poet himself contains 60,000 baits and combines the whole epic tradition of Persia into an artistically perfect whole, became the foundation for a long series of later poems or matnakashi, as this genre is called, from an Arabic technical term. Firdawsis's second work, finished when he was well over seventy years of age, namely his Yamaq n-Zulakhba, is from the artistic point of view little

late. No less important is Ummun Mihri (d. about the middle of the viii - xth century) in whose poems the learning of his time gradually penetrates into poetry. The other dynasties who shared the power with the Ghaznavids, but were hardly on the same level, also endeavoured to attract poets of talent to their courts. Mention must thus be made among the poets of the Buyids (932-1055) of Kamal al-Din Bundar of Raify, who in addition to literary Persian used the dialect of Raify for his poems. The celebrated Katuran Djabili (q.v., d. 1072-1073) also sang the praises of the Buyids, but he was for the most part in the service of the rulers of Daudal of his poems were long thought to be the work of Kudaki. Even beyond the Oxus among the Turkish Ilak-Khan (931-1165) Persian poetry flourished. The best poet of this school was the brilliant Amak (d. c. 1148), who shared his fame with Rashidi and Naghibi Farghana. Amak's kashidas are especially distinguished by their unusual freshness and joyous nastrin, which are full of unexpected turns of speech.

As already mentioned, prose played very little part at this period in the life of the court. But we must mention at least three works of the greatest importance for the history of the development of Persian prose style, namely the universal history in Persian of the Somanid vizier Aba 'Ali Balam (q.v., d. 996), the highly interesting history of the Ghaznavids by Aba 'l-Faqir Bahiaki (q.v., d. 1077-1078) and the Kha
inferior to his masterpiece. The story of Joseph, which with later poets ( fís) became a song of songs of mystic love, becomes in his hands a moving lament of the boy carried off to a strange land, which may well describe the feelings of the aged and homeless poet in Baghdad. Firdawsi's first successors followed his example closely and wrote regular epics, among which the already mentioned Gargâr-nâmâ of Asâfâr and works like the Barâb-nâmâ, Sâm-nâmâ etc. may be particularly noted. But very soon the character of the epic changes and it gradually becomes a romance of chivalry. Thus for example the Wâmîk wa-Adhrâ, now lost, of the already mentioned 'Unsârî, in spite of its many descriptions of fighting, is mainly concerned with the love-story of the hero and heroine. This transformation is still more evident in Fa'âr al-Dîn Gurgânî's [see FURJânî] celebrated Wîs u-Râmîn (written about 1048), the Persian counterpart of the European Tristan story, in which the hero, regarded from the point of view of the heroines of old Persia, is almost entirely devoid of knightly qualities. The court epic attains its zenith in the quintette (Khamîn) of the great Nižâmî [q.v.] of Gânda (about 1125). Some of his poems have really very little connection with the old epics and are, like Lâlî u-Mašîqânîn, predominantly lyrical and romantic in tone. After Nižâmî the Persian court poets hardly ever attempted to treat of new subjects and remained within the bounds already laid down for them.

c. Mysticism. We have so far been mainly concerned with the court poetry, but the other current in Persian literature has its source in very different circles. Sûfîsm [see TÁŠAWWU], arising on Arab soil, entered Persia also and spread among the artisans and to some extent also among the merchants who populated the towns of Persia. In its quite early stages Sûfîsm became connected with the fûtûwâ movement [q.v.] and the mystical tone became more and more emphasised. So far as we can judge, the oldest Sûfî lyric arose from the demand for a poetry of their own which should brighten the public meetings of the Sûfî bodies. Isolated lines, quatrains and kâ'âs of pronounced Sûfî colouring arose as early as the tenth century, but the first more or less extensive collections belong to the first half of the x1th century. While the famous Bâbâ Tâhir 'Uryân [see TÁHÎR; d. 1019] expresses pronounced Sûfî views only in his prose works and in his quatrains follows the model of the popular poetry (even in language, for a number of them are written in dialect). Bâbâ Kuhrâ Shirâzî [d. 1050] is already a mystic through and through in the full sense of the word. His Divân which has come down to us is, it is true, much corrupted, but the theories of the x1th century are quite apparent from his verses which are interspersed with kûrân verses and hadîths. Until quite recently it was generally thought that the earliest Sûfî poet was the celebrated Shâhîb Abû Sa'id of Ma'hâna. But there is no longer any doubt that he only once in his life composed a quatrain on the spur of the moment. All the other poems ascribed to him are either forgeries, or possibly were really declaimed by him during his sermons without having been composed by him. The mystical lyric attains a higher degree of perfection in A跋sâr [q.v.] also called Pir-i 'Anşâr or Pir of Herât (1006—1088), whose principal work is the celebrated Mumâjdât, ardent prayers full of feeling in rhymed prose. The soil was now sufficiently prepared and Persian mysticism began to bear its finest flowers, which have given Persian poetry world-fame. But before we pass to these great masters we must briefly mention two names which it has hitherto been the custom to mention in connection with Sûfîsm. These are the famous scholar 'Omâr Khâyâm [q.v.; d. 1123] and the preacher of Ismâ'îlî Mâ'sîr-i Khâshâ'î [q.v.]. To return to orthodox Sûfîsm we must first mention Sânâyî [q.v.; 1048/1049—1141], the poet of Ghazna. If his Divân, half secular, half mystical, reveals further development along the path laid by 'Anşâr [q.v.], his didactic poems, among which we may mention the Ḥadîthat al-Ḥâfizû, represent the first attempt to enliven the theories of Sûfîsm by inserting parables of a popular character. This device, only sparingly used by Sânâyî, is brilliantly exploited by his successor, the celebrated Fârîd al-Dîn 'Âţîr [see Â'TÂR; 1119—1230]. In his poems the inserted tales attain full development and frequently display the greatest artistic perfection in their simplicity. The climax of this ascending series is formed by the parable and gigantic work of the great Djâlîl al-Dîn Râmî [q.v.; 1207—1273] also known as Mâwî-yi Râmî. His didactic poem, which bears the proud title of Majmû'at, i.e. "the poem" par excellence (perhaps with allusion to al-Kûrân), is the finest thing that Oriental mysticism with its unlimited riches has produced. The famous Sa'di [q.v.; 1184—1292] is also usually reckoned among the mystics, although really only a few of his works have a distinctly mystical tinge. Sa'di is rather a teacher of practical wisdom; he endeavours to show his readers the way by which in his troubled period the all too heavy blows of fate could be softened.

d. Prose. We have already observed that classical Persian literature was accustomed to clothe belles-lettres with a metrical garb, and preferred to repeat for learned works. The prose literature of this period is therefore not so rich as the poetry is. Along with the already mentioned work of al-Qâ'âfâr we may also note the famous Aâbû 'Ali b. Sâ'im (Avicenna; [q.v.]), who in addition to his works in Arabic wrote an encyclopedia of philosophy in Persian, the Dânînh-nâmâ-yi 'Âţî'. The dialect of Tabaristan was used at the end of the tenth century by Mâzbân b. Rustâm [q.v.] for the Marzbân-nâmâ, a version of the Kalîla wa-Dimnâ [q.v.]. Unfortunately this work is now lost and known only from Sa'd Warâwînî's Persian translation (written between 1210—1215). The Siyâsat-nâmâ of the Salâdî wazîr Nižâm al-Mulk [q.v.; d. 1092] is an important book, which besides containing valuable historical material well reflects the political ideas of the period. This list of the most important works shows quite clearly that there is practically no belles-lettres proper. The first work that we can put in this class is the Persian translation of the Kalîla wa-Dimnâ finished in 1144 by Abu 'l-Mâ'âlî Nâşr Allîh [see NÂŞR AL-LÎH]. But here again it must be pointed out that the book was not then regarded as light literature but as a kind of "mirror for princes", that is to say as a learned work. The aim of the Persian translation of the Farâdî bâ'ld-al-Shâdâ completed in 1155 by Hûsâîn al-Mu'âyîdî was similar, but with particular stress on the didactic element. The end of the x1th century
brings a series of romances of chivalry and versions of pre-Islamic material, the greater part of which is known only in later versions, often only in the form of popular romances. We may mention here the romance *Kitāb-i Samakʿ Yār* by Ṣadāka Ẓirāzī composed in 1189, the fantastic and enormous romance of Amir Ḥamza, the *Bāghhūrān-nāma* and the romance of the Bedouin hero *Jāzīm Tāyīr*. To conclude this section, we may mention that in this period we already find a certain development of historical writing, a series of works on poetics, and the first attempts at anthologies (*taḏḥīḥāra* among them *ʿAwrī* [q.v.] valuable *Lubāb al-ʿAlhāb*). But as this compressed survey of Persian literature is forced to confine itself to belles-lettres such works cannot be dealt with here.

From the Mongols to the sixteenth century.

The early years of Mongol rule were a period of tribulation for Persia. Although later Mongol rulers took an interest in the restoration of the country the destruction done in the early invasions was so vast that the land could only recover slowly. In the general havoc it could hardly be expected that Persian literature would continue on its earlier lines. Yet it is this period that produces the great series of eminent historians whose works form the foundation of all research by European scholars. Without going into further details we must at least briefly mention the more important names. These are *ʿAṭṭā Malik Dūwainī* [see Dūwainī], *Wāṣfū* [q.v.], the great *Rahūd al-Dīn* [q.v.], *Fadl Allāh* and *Ḥamīd Allāh Mustawfi Kādī al-ʿAlī* [see Kādī al-ʿAlī]. Poets on the other hand became rare and they seek comfort mainly in mysticism. Court poetry after the destruction of the brilliant court life survived mainly in outlying parts of the country which had suffered less in the general destruction. But this poetry could not, for the most part rise above the level of the classical period and seeks to surpass its predecessors in dexterity of technique. Several poets who knew that they possessed a certain perfection of style left their native land and sought refuge with the rulers of India. For example *Badr-i Cācā*, a fairly skilled master of the *kāštā* dialect, left Central Asia to become court poet of Muḥammad b. Tughluq (1325—1351); there he was followed by Ḍānī Ṭūḥ who however afterwards went to Asia Minor. An endeavour to give new life to the court language, which had become arid and formal, by the addition of Mongol and Turkish loan-words was made by *Pūr Bāhā-yi Djāmī* Ṣafā al-Dīn Kāshānī (c. 1207), who also can claim mention as the author of several treatises of a philosophical character. Among all these quite a special position is occupied by *Nizārī Kūhīstānī* (d. 1320). Although an Ismāʿīlī, like Nisārī Khūrawī at an earlier date, he is distinguished from the latter by sarcastic outbursts against orthodox Islamic scholars with such drastic effect that almost all authorities declared his writings heretical and hostile to religion. As a result manuscripts of his works are very scarce. Some of his longer poems (like *Mushir u-Azhār*) read like deliberate parodies of *etymology of Saʿdī* and the court epic.

If Persian literature in the Mongol period had fallen into a kind of lethargic trance, under Timūr and his successors (1370—1405) it experienced a renaissance. The reason for this is probably that, with the decline of Mongol sovereignty, a large number of petty local dynasties arose who were all anxious to restore the ancient usages of court life and to adorn their courts with poets. This period therefore became a new flowering-time of Persian poetry and it may well be called the second classical period. Although the greater part of its poetry lacks the freshness and vigour of the pre-Mongol period, some of its poets succeeded in surpassing their predecessors. Of the masters of this period the following may be mentioned: *Ibn Yāmīn* [q.v.], *Zākānī* (d. 1371), one of the most original figures of Persian literature, whose occasionally rather bold parodies contain ruthless criticism of and contempt for the Persian aristocracy. *Salīm* [q.v.], *Ṣāwādji* (d. 1376), celebrated for his difficult play on words, witticisms and technical skill, and lastly *Lūsīn al-Ghāib Khwādja Ḥāfīz* [q.v.] Shirāzī (d. 1389), the incomparable master of the ghazal, who was able to combine the greatest freshness and depth of feeling with the elegance demanded by the taste of the age and brought the ghazal to the height of its development, never again reached by any one after him. Two less talented parodists must be mentioned as characteristic representatives of the period: *ʿAbū ʿIṣāhāk ʿAṭīma*, the poet of cooking, and *Kārī Yazdī* (second half of the xvth century), the tailor poet. Their works show that the grand style of the court poetry was already in decline and a new wave was about to break which revealed its weaknesses and made new "etiological" objects the subject of its art. Among the prose writers we may here mention *Diyā al-Dīn Nakḥshābī* [see Nakhsī], whose book of the parrot (*Tūṭī-nāma*, 1330), a version of the old and now lost *Sinūdīd-nāma*, had a great success and was utilised by several later writers. His short prose romance *Gulvāz* should also be mentioned.

Under Timūr's successors the striving after artificiality increases still further. The poet's object is not to be generally understood. On the contrary his aim is to write only for a few select connois-
seurs who are able to appreciate his difficult tours de force. Outwardly this aim finds expression in the widespread use of a new form of poem, the mu'ammāt [q.v.], a kind of riddle on names in verse. The best poets of this period were not ashamed to devote their attention to the mu'ammāt and even the mystic Dālī, who had cut himself off from the world, wrote a treatise on the theory of it. The authors of this period are all more or less influenced by Ṣūfīsm, which was probably a result of the years of trial and of the great invasions, which had clearly shown even to the great ones of the earth the transitoriness of worldly fortune. The famous shaikh and much honoured saint Ni'mat Allāh Kirmānī [see Ni'mat Allāh Walī; d. 1431] who founded a dawrā order which bore his name, left, in addition to some 500 short prose treatises, an extensive Dīwān which is not without a certain beauty. The mystic Kāsim al-Anwār [see Kāsim al-Anwār; d. 1435-1434] is important; in his Dīwān he used not only Persian but also Turkish and even the dialect of Gīlān. Kālibī [q.v.] Niḥāpūrī (d. 1434-1435) rejoiced in the scheme of the mu'ammāt but almost all five of his parts are pervaded by mystical allusions and endeavour to conceal a certain adherence to stereotyped pattern by artifices of technique. 'Arifi of Herāt (d. e. 1449) achieved great fame by his celebrated Hāfīn-nāma also called Gūy u-Ca Médān. Iṣmāl Buḥārā'ī (d. 1425-1426), who was able to work up an old Sūfī legend in his Adham-nāma to a beautiful work of art, is also of interest. Husain Wā'iz Kāshfī [see Kāshfī] (d. 1504—1505) occupies a prominent place; he achieved great fame by his version of the Kitāba wa-Dīnma called Awnār-i Suhālī and set the pattern which has never been equalled for a highly artificial and unusually difficult prose style. The greatest master of this period is undoubtedly 'Abd al-Rahmān Dīmā'ī [see Dīmā'; d. 1492], a prolific poet who in addition to great maḥn-numāt an extensive Dīwān and many treatises. In spite of great versatility and a certain depth of feeling (as, for example, in his celebrated Vīsūf u-Zulaikha or Lailī u-Madīnīn) all his work shows traces of decline, which is especially apparent when his poems are compared with works of the classical period. In this period also the writing of history flourished, and out of a number of distinguished historians we may mention Ḥāfīz-i Abrū [q.v.], 'Abd al-Razzāk [q.v.] Samarkandi (d. 1482), Mirkhwand [q.v.; d. 1498] and Khwāndamir (d. after 1534).

It has been the custom in Europe to close the history of Persian literature with the Timūrid period. The Šafawī period is, it is quite true, a period of great decline in Persian poetry. As these rulers did not encourage praise of the secular government, the poets of this period sought in their ḵaṣāds to celebrate the supposed ancestors of their rulers, the ʿimāms of the Šāhī, who gave the poet Muḥtaşām Kāshānī (d. 1588) the opportunity to compose his famous Hafīlān in honour of the ʿimāms. Many other names could be mentioned such as Ḥāfīz [q.v.; d. 1520-1521], Bābā FIGHĀNĪ [see FIGHĀNĪ; d. 1519],ūmīdī (d. 1519 or 1523-1524), the two Aḥlīs, Tūrsīzī (d. 1527-1528) and Shīrāzī (d. 1555-1556), Hilālī [q.v.; d. 1528-1529], Līsānī (d. 1533-1534), Wakhshī [see Wāzhīk] (d. 1583). But it must be confessed that very little attention has so far been paid by orientalists to these poets and practically nothing has been written about most of them. It seems however that isolated works, such as the Farkhād u-Shīrin of Wakhshī, deserve attention and might afford quite interesting material for the student.

A characteristic feature of the xviith and also of the xviiith century is the migration of Persian poets to India, attracted by the brilliant court of Akbār and his successors. The result was that a second centre of Persian poetry arose in India and gradually a peculiar Indian style developed, which in turn exerted a considerable influence on the literature of central Asia. The best known of these Indo-Persian poets are 'Urī [q.v.] Shīrāzī (d. 1590—1591), who endeavoured to replace bombastic rhetoric by impressiveness and "sweetness" (halawat), and his teacher Faidī (d. 1595), a distinguished scholar, who studied the religious doctrines of India and even translated several works from Sanskrit into Persian. The xviiith century again shows a long series of names, among which we mention those of Saḥābī (d. 1601-1602), the last great master of the aquanian, Zulīf [q.v.; d. 1613]. Among the most longish poems of which the most notable is Makānī u-Ayyāz, Tālib-i ʿĀmulī (d. 1626—1627), the author of an interesting romance of adventure in verse, and lastly the Ḥāfīz of the xviith century: Shābī [q.v.] Tabrīzī (d. 1677—1678) who is still much read in India and Central Asia. Ṣūfīsm, which was mercilessly persecuted by the Šafawīs, falls almost completely into the background in this period, but instead a very copious theological literature also was considerably enriched by the works of the great Mollā Šādār (see ŠADR AL-DIN; d. 1640—1641) and his successors.

The Kādjār a n d m o d e r n P e r s i a. The Kādjār monarchy established at the end of the xviith century brought with it a literary revival in Persia. While Fath Āli's court poets still followed the old traditions and produced little of value, a distinct change becomes apparent in the second half of the xixth century, the result of a closer contact with the European powers who were vying with one another for predominance in Persia. Fath Āli's court poets, like Naṣāt [q.v.; d. 1828—1829] with his tender lyrics, Šābā (d. 1822—1823) with his Shāhān-shāhnāme, an imitation of Firdawī, which celebrates the wars of ʿAbbās Mīrzā with the Russians, or the "Dīmān of the xixth century", Wīsāl, all have much that is admirable in their credit, but nevertheless they are only epigones who lack originality completely. Quite a new note is struck in the works of the three great masters of this period: Kānī (d. 1853—1854), Šahībānī [q.v.; d. 1888] and Vaghabān [q.v.; d. 1860]. Although Kānī studied both French and English and translated several books from these languages, his ḵaṣāds are still, broadly speaking, repetitions of the long obsolete court style. But in the nasīls of these bombastic exercises in style there are many wonder-
fully realistic scenes which would be quite impossible in the "golden age". Şahîbânî, who suffered great injustice from the Ködjhâr, strikes a gloomy and pessimistic note and bitterly laments the rottenness of the whole structure of the Ködjhâr monarchy. Yaghmâ, perhaps the most interesting of all three poets, whose life was an unbroken chain of sorrows, attacked the Persian notables in bitter satire and ended with even blacker pessimism and a complete denial of the possibility of a happy life. His efforts to purify the Persian language of Arabic loanwords is of interest. A great influence on later development was exercised by the Dar al-Funun (1852), the first educational institute intended to further the study of western learning, the teachers in which were almost exclusively Europeans. The work of this institute required the translation of a series of western textbooks. This task however revealed that the rhymed prose of the classical period could not be used for such a purpose. The works of these first translators, who in addition to the textbooks also translated several novels, chiefly from the French, was of tremendous importance for the literary language of Persia and prepared to some extent the way for the literature of contemporary Persia. The Dâr al-Funun was also of great significance for learning in Persia. Its first director Rîdâ Kûlt Kân (q.v.; d. 1871), who used the taḥakkûl Hîdâyât for his poetry, was one of the greatest literary historians of Persia. Among his pupils were the famous historian Šâmâl al-Dawla, later known as Îltihâm al-Saltâna (d. 1896), whose works are still one of the most valuable sources for the history of modern Persia. The efforts of the Dâr al-Funun also produced a widespread desire to help in making known the achievements of European science. Remarkable in this respect is the work of Mirzâ 'Abd al-Rahmân Nadjîdîr-Zâda who under the name of Tâlib of published a series of popular works which dealt with the most varied subjects. Of these works the most important are the Kîrahî Ahdâr and Mâlîkî al-Mushînîn. Of the greatest importance for Persian literature of the xixth century was the introduction of printing (first print in Tabriz in 1816–1817), which also made newspapers possible. But the first newspapers were intended only for court circles. It was not till 1851 that the first newspaper of any size appeared. The press made remarkable progress during the great struggle for the constitution (mâzârîf) especially after the opening of the Majdîs.

This struggle hastened the literary revolution, which had been prepared for by the work of the writers of the xixth century. The political struggle made quite new demands upon the participants. Literature was no longer to be the special property of the aristocracy but had to speak clearly and intelligibly to the masses. Satirical poetry, which was particularly cultivated during these years (1906–1909), therefore broke away from the old tradition; instead of the old literary language which was difficult to understand it uses the language of the street and of the bazaar, instead of the dry old classical forms it sets out to imitate the street ballad (tâzîf). The vernacular also found its way into prose. 4 Ali Akbar Dîkhûdâ (Dâkhûdâ), the great master of the feuilleton, wrote his biting and humorous pamphlets Ėrând-parând, which brightened the revolutionary paper Sûrî Irâfîl. This style was also adopted by later writers and influenced two of the best satirical works of recent years, namely the incomparable collection of stories Yâkû biy yâkû na-biy ("Truth and Fiction") by Âghâ Saiyîd Mûhammad 'Ali Djamâl-zâda (1922) and the trilogy by Mûhammad Mâsûd (M. Dîhâlî) the last part of which appeared in 1934 under the title Ashraf-î Mârîbâqâ ("the Crown of Creation").

In the war against the antiquated, the dramatic form, unknown to the classical literature, was also used. While old Persia had had only scenes (wandering poets) and religious mysteries (tâzîva [q.v.] or zâzâ), the comedy after the European model made its appearance in the form of Persian translations of the famous works of the Adhrbâidînî author Fath 'Ali Aitchen-kân, which were translated by Mirzâ Dîfâr Kârajdâghî. These plays obviously served as models for the original plays by the well known politician and founder of freemasonry (farâmîsh-khânâ) in Persia, Mirzâ Malkûm-Khân. If the theatre was influenced on the one hand by Adhrbâidînî literature, on the other acquaintance with the Turkish drama made possible the appearance of versions of Molîère's plays, among which we may mention Le médecin malgré lui, Le Misanthrope and Tartuffe. The lack of a regular stage in Persia however made the further development of the drama impossible for the time being. Only in recent years have tragedies appeared in Persia, among which the historical Dâssînî-ê Khâmîn (1926) by Saiyîd 'Abd al-Rahîm Khâl-khâlî, Akhtîrân yad-dîr Nâdir-dâkh (1927) by Saiyîd Nafisi and Farûnî (1931) by Sâdîk Hîdâyât may be mentioned. The wave of satire in the first decades of the xixth century also produced the first satirical novel Sîyâhât-nâmê-i Irâhîm-khâ at Hâdjî Râzîn al-'Abdîn of Marâghâ (d. 1910). This work, planned in three parts on the model of the Divina Commedia, had a fabulous success and is still of value as a characterisation, exaggerated it is true, of the defects of old Persia.

The Presen Day. In order not to destroy the continuity we have already been compelled to mention some of the most recent works. It would be very difficult to give at this time a comprehensive sketch of the last few decades. The period after the War and the great changes that have taken place in Persia naturally have also had their influence on literature. Yet it is not so easy for Persian literature, particularly poetry, to cast off the thousand-year-old traditions of the classical literature. The struggle with these traditions found expression mainly in two ways: on the one hand prose attempts to gain predominance over poetry and thus to reverse the old proportions, and on the other the new poetry endeavours both in form and matter to break through the old limitations. This second task is the more difficult as it requires unusual ability to prevent the efforts of the innovators appearing as mere schoolboys' work alongside of the perfection of the classics. For this reason the greatest of the modern poets still adhere rather tenaciously to the traditional forms, even if as regards matter they are far removed from the old models. The greatest of the modern poets, Saiyîd Mûhammad Adîb-i Pîshâwâri (d. 1931), can hardly be distinguished as regards form from the classical poets, of whose
technique he has a complete mastery, but as regards matter his poems with their glowing hatred of England and echoes of the World War are something quite new for Persia. The same may be said of the celebrated Malik al-Shu'ara' Bahār, whose great ḵaṭādas in spite of their traditional style are almost entirely political in content. On the other hand, Aбу-1-Kāsim ʿArif Ḫaẕimī (born c. 1879–1880) has cast off the old tradition to a considerable extent. Of classical forms he prefers the ghazal, but has attained his greatest fame by popular īsfānīs, some of which played a great part during the fighting in the Persian Revolution. The poems of Ḳrādjmīrā (d. 1926) are very famous; his main theme was the fight for the liberation of the Persian woman. Unfortunately his works are characterised by a repulsive cynicism which is quite irreconcilable with the loftiness of his ideals. Among the younger poets first place must be given to Ṣafīd Yāsīmī (born 1897), whose tender lyrics distinctly betray the influence of European poetry. Yāsīmī has also distinguished himself as a literary historian. Ṣimā is endeavours to create new forms and in his Māḥāz ("prison") he succeeded in impressively depicting the tragic lot of the Persian peasant. Mention must also be made of Ḳājār Wāfā, author of two short maṭnkhānās which the European reader will feel to be too sentimental. The Ṣarguḏḵašti-ʾArdsāḏ is interesting; its author, Ṣahīd Daṣḵtārdī, is editor of the Ḥamgānān, the best Persian literary monthly. There are also women-writers and the rather naive verse of the poetess Parwīn shows that we may hope for success in this field also.

Revolutionary tendencies in Persian poetry are represented by Mīr-żāda ʾIštāḵī (killed in 1925), noted for his poem Šaḵā-ḵo Ḯimarrān-i Dīḵānā, and Ḳāsim Ĺāḥūtī, now working in the USSR (b. 1887), who has with great skill been able to overcome the old traditions and to give his revolutionary poems artistic forms most effectively.

If the Persian poetry of recent years is still feeling its new way only very tentatively, the prose can show remarkable achievements. The first years after the War gave the Persians their first historical novel Vįk u-Salṭānat (printed 1919) by Shāhīk Mūṣa Ḥamadānī, the chief hero in which is the Achaemonid Cyrus. The episode of Ḫishān and Manṭiz from Firdawīsī's Šāh-nāma was worked up into a long novel by Aghā ʿIr̄za Ḥasan-Qān Čaḍī; the story of Masdak was used by Ṣanʿatī-zāda Kirmānī, who also wrote a novel from the life of Mānū (pr. 1927). The most interesting of all these historical novels is the Šams u-Tāfghā (in three parts: written in 1909) of Muḥammad Bāker-ʾIr̄za Khushrāwī, who describes the condition of Fārs under Mongol rule (13th century). Kāmālī's novel Jāzāk (1931) is outspokenly nationalist. If the historical novels are intended to remind the Persian reader of the departed greatness of his country and arouse his national pride, the second group of modern novels is devoted to the criticism of present conditions. The difficult position of women in Persia is dealt with by Aḥbāb Ḫalīlī in his Rīgīrār-i siyāsā (2nd ed. 1925). The same author has written a number of shorter novels and stories, among which we may mention Intīḵām, Ḥanadān and Ḳoṣār-i Ṣūrā. The hard lot of the working classes and the criminal conduct of the Persian bureaucracy before the revolution of 1921 are described by Ṣafā Mūṣfīḵ Khāzimī in his Thīrān-maḥṣūf (2nd ed. 1924). The same author has also published several shorter novels, Aḥmad-ʾĀl-Ḵān Khudādād deals with the sufferings of the peasant in his Ṣūzī-stīḵāh-kūrgār (1927). The novel Madjīmā-ʾĪwānān (1925) of the already mentioned Ṣanʿatī-zāda is fanciful and Utopian; the same author in 1934 published another Utopian novel, Rustām dar Kār-i bīst mordwīnum, in which he endeavours to demonstrate the inadequacy of the old ideals of chivalry.

This compressed survey, which can only mention more important works, shows that modern Persian prose has developed much more vigorously than poetry. If we consider the difficulties which the Persian moderns had to overcome, there can be no doubt that the next few years must produce an ever greater literary revival and that new Persia will soon produce works of art, which will be able to take their place beside the noble creations of the classical period in the literature of the world.
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(E. Berthels)

II. PERTEW MEHMED SADR PASCHA, OTTOMAN dignitary and poet. He was of Tatar descent and was born in the village of Daridja near Umia. In his early youth he came to the capital Stambul and entered upon an official career. In Maharram 1240 (Sept. 1824) he became beshikci efendi, i.e. State referendary and in Shaban 1242 (March 1827), head of the imperial chancery (hâris al-kutübat). Two years later he lost the post of chancellor and went on a special mission to Egypt. On his return he became in 1246 (1830) assistant (kāmāna) to the grand vizier. On the 23rd Dhu-l-Ka'da 1251 (March 12, 1836) he was appointed minister for civil affairs (muftiyye nizîr) and given the title of marshal (muçik) in the spring of 1836 he was given the title of Pasha but was dismissed by the autumn. In the beginning of Sept. 1836 he was banished by Mahmud II to Scutari in Albania. Pertew Pasha set out a few weeks after his banishment to his place of exile but did not reach it. He died in Adrianople three hours after a banquet which the governor there, Mustafa Pasha, gave in his honour (according to Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 333: Emin Pasha). No one doubted that his sudden death was due to poison and public opinion ascribed the crime to Mahmoud himself. On his family see Sidiqli-i othmani, ii. 38. His son-in-law, who shared his views, was the intriguing private secretary to Mahmud II, Wazif Bey, a highly educated man but lacking in character and accessible to bribery, who lost his office about the same time as Pertew Pasha and was banished to Tokat in Anatolia; cf. G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, i. Leipzig 1866, p. 255 sqq. Pertew Pasha's successor was his political opponent Akit Pasha, cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 357 sqq. — As a statesman Pertew Pasha took up a pronounced anti-Russian attitude and was no less hostile to the Christians, whom he oppressed with long obsolete and forgotten laws. His feeling against the Christians increased with advancing years.

As a poet, Pertew Pasha composed a Divân, which was esteemed as a model of the poetical art of the period of Mahmud II. There are two editions of it: Bâlâk 1253 (89, 91 pp.) and Stambul 1256 (88, 130 pp.). On other works by Pertew Pasha see Brussâf Mehemeth Tahir, Othmanli Mu'eltefire, ii. 114 sqq. — His valuable library, rich in manuscripts, is now in what was formerly the Selimiye monastery in Scutari.

Bibliography: G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, i. Leipzig 1866, p. 255 sq.; Gibb, H. O. P., iv. 332 sqq. with references to Johannin and J. van Carver, Turquie, Paris 1843, for an account of the death of Pertew Pasha in Adrianople; Mehemeth Thureiyi, Sidiqli-i othmani, ii. 38; Sâmi Bey Frâsheter, Kûmînî al-A'lam, p. 1494 sq.; Brussâf Mehemeth Tahir, Othmanli Mu'eltefire, ii. 114. — This Pertew Pasha is not to be confused with the statesman and poet Pertew Edhem Pasha who died on the 17th Dhu l-Ka'da 1289 (Jan. 6, 1873) as governor of Kastamoni [q. v.], a number of whose poems have been published e.g. a Shâhnâme and Lâhiq, i. (= Stambul) n.d., and İsfâhân al-Afkâr fi 'Abd al-'Abîr, Stambul 1304. On him cf. Mehemeth Tahir, op. cit., ii. 114 sqq. (Frantz Babinger)

PESANZREN. [See PESANZREN.]

PESHAWAR, a district, tahsil, and city in the North-West Frontier Province of British India. The district which lies between 71° 25' and 72° 47' E. and 33° 40' and 34° 31' N. has an area of 2,637 square miles and a population of 947,321 of whom 92 per cent are Muslims (1931 Census Report). It is bounded on the east by the river Indus, which separates it from the Pindars and Hazara, and on the south-east by the Nibal Ghagra range which shuts it off from the district of Kohat. Elsewhere it is bounded by tribal territory. To the south lie the territories of the Hasan Khel and Kohat Pass Afriðis; westwards, the Khaiser Afriðis and Mullaghars. Farther north, across the Kabul river, the various Mohmand clans stretch to the Swat river. The northern boundary of the district marches with the territories of the Ümân Khel, the Yúsufzais of Swat and Buner, the Khudum Khel, Gaduns and Uñmánzais. Mountain passes famous in frontier history connect it with the surrounding tribal tracts. In the north-east, the Mora, Shâko, and Malakand passes lead into Swat. The historic gateway of the Khaiser connects it with Afghanistan, while to the south, the Kohat Pass runs through a strip of tribal territory, known as the Dżwâki peninsula, into the neighbouring district of Kohat.

References to the district occur in early Sanskrit literature and in the writings of Strabo, Arrian, and Ptolemy. It once formed part of the ancient Buddhist kingdom of Gandhâra, for, from the Khaiser Pass to the Swat valley, the country is still studied with crumbling Buddhist stupas. Here, too, have been unearthed some of the best specimens of Graeco-Buddhist sculpture in existence, while one of Aśoka's rock edicts is to be found near the village of Shâhâzgardar in the Yúsufzai country. Both Pachien, in the opening years of the sixth century A.D., and Huen Tsang, in the seventh century A.D., found the inhabitants still professing Buddhism. It is also on record that Purushapura was the capital of Kanîshka's dominions. Through centuries of almost unbroken silence we arrive at the era of Muslim conquest, when, between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, numerous Pathân tribes from Afghanistan spread over and conquered the country roughly corresponding to the modern North-West Frontier Province (T. C. Flodven, Kal-i Afghâni, chap. i. —v., Selections from the Târikh-i Murâ'ga).

Towards the end of the fifteenth century, according to local tradition, two large branches of the Pathân tribes, the Khakhai and the Ghûrîya Khel, migrated from their homes in the hilly country around Kabul to the Džalâlahâl valley and the slopes of the Safid Köh. The most important divisions of the Khakhai were the Yûsufzai, Gusâyi and Târkâmî; the Ghûrîya Khel were divided into five tribes, the Mohmands, Khellis, Dâ'ûdzais, Carkânâs and Džarzâns. The Yûsufzais, advancing into the modern Peshâwar district, expelled the inhabitants, known as Diläzaks, and finally conquered the country north of the Kabul river and west of Hoti Mardân. By the opening years of the sixteenth century, the Ghûrîya Khel had also reached the Khaiser area. Eventually these powerful tribes dispossessed the original inhabitants, driving some to the Swat Köhistan and forcing the Diläzaks across the Indus. Later, the Ghûrîya Khel attempted to oust the Khakhai
branch but were signally defeated by the Yúsfúzis.

Since the modern Peshawar district lay athwart the route of invading armies from the direction of Central Asia, much of its history resembles that of the Pándjáb. The Pásháns of this part of the frontier proved a thorn in the side of the Muslim rulers of India, and although nominally incorporated in the Mughal empire, they were never completely subjugated, even Akbar and Awanzíb contenting themselves with keeping open the road to Kábul. With the decline of Mughal power this area became a part of the Durránt empire founded by Ahmad Shah Abdárí. Disintegration set in under his weak successors and eventually in the early nineteenth century Peshawar was seized by the Sikhs of the Pándjáb. Sikh rule was of the loosest type, and Peshawar groaned under the iron heel of the Italian General Avitaile. With the annexation of the Pándjáb in 1849, the Peshawar valley came permanently under British control and remained an integral part of the Pán vlah until the formation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1885. (A detailed examination of British administration and of the various expeditions against the frontier tribes will be found in The Problem of the North-West Frontier by C. Collin Davies.) In recent years this area has been the scene of the activities of Abad al-Qáffár Káñan, the founder of the “Red Shirt” movement, which, although ostensibly based on Gandhi’s creed of non-violence, has seriously disturbed the peace of the Peshawar valley.

Peshawar City, the capital of the North-West Frontier Province, has a population of 87,440 and is situated near the left bank of the Bárá river about 13 miles east of the Kháiber Pass. Its importance as a trading centre on the main route between India and Afganístan has increased since the construction of the Káiber railway in 1925. It has 16 gates which are closed every night and opened before sunrise. The richest part is the Andarshahr where the wealthier Hindus have taken up their abode. In this quarter, conspicuous on account of its high minarets of white marble, stands the mosque of Mahábat Káñan who was governor during the reign of Sháh Díshán. On the north-west the city is dominated by a fort known as the Bálá Híshár. The Sháhi Bégí with its spacious and shady grounds is a favourite resort of the inhabitants in the spring. The fame of the Kísa Khání or Storytellers Bazaar is known throughout the length and breadth of the frontier and beyond.

Two miles to the west of the city are the cantonments (population 34,426), the principal military station in the province. Some three miles to the west of the cantonments is the famous Islamia college which, although essentially a Muslim college, opens its doors to students of all castes and creeds.

**Bibliography:** C. Collin Davies, The Problem of the North-West Frontier, 1932; do., British Relations with the Afridis of the Khyber and Tirah, in Army Quarterly, January 1932; M. Foucher, Notes sur la géographie ancienne du Gandhara, 1902; Frontier and Overseas Expeditions from India, vol. i., 1907; Supplement A, 1910; Imperial Gazetteer of India, s.v. Peshawar; H. R. James, Report on the Settlement of the Peshawar District, 1865; North-West Frontier Province Administration Reports (published annually); W. H. Paget and A. H. Mason, Record of Expeditions against the N. W. P. Tribes since the annexation of the Punjab, 1885; Punjab Administration Reports (published annually); Peshawar District Gazetteer, vol. A, 1933; T. C. Plowden, Káhi Afghání, 1875; H. F. R. von Hügel, Hayári Afghání, 1874.

(C. Collin Davies)

**Peshwa.** [See Peshwa.]

**Peterwardein.** [See Petrovaradin.]

**Petrovaradin** (Hungarian Pétervárad, Turkish Varadin), a famous fortress and town in Sirmia (Yugoslavia) on the main railway line Belgrad—Petrovaradin—Novi Sad—Subotica—Budapest, lies on the right bank of the Danube opposite Novi Sad (Neusatz), chief town and headquarters of the Danube banate, with which it is connected by two bridges and since 1929 also administratively. There are two fortresses, an upper one which rises 150 feet above the Danube on rocks of serpentine surrounded on three sides by the river (forming the most northerly spur, 400 feet high, of the Fruska Gora) and a lower one which stands at the foot of the cliffs on the north. In the upper fortress there are no private houses but only military buildings, including the celebrated arsenal with many trophies from the Turkish wars, while the other fortress has a fine market, a main and two side streets. Numerous trenches have survived within the area of the two fortresses which have room for 10–12,000 men. The town proper lies half on the Danube and before its union with Novi Sad it had over 5,000 inhabitants (1921). There are many vineyards in the vicinity.

There was a settlement here even in Roman times called Cumus in which definite traces of the cult of Mithra have been found. According to one legend, the settlement received its later name Petricum from Peter the Hermit, who assembled the armies for the First Crusade here. In any case the town was known as Petrikon in the wars of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Commenos (1143–1180) with Hungary. After belonging for a brief period to Byzantium, Petrovaradin returned to the kings of Hungary, and Bela IV in 1237 presented the town and the royal palace to the Cistercian abbey there of the B. M. V. Belefontis de monte Varadinipetri. This abbey survived throughout the middle ages until 1521 but from 1436 it and the town of Petrovaradin passed under the control of the ban of Maća.

In Sulaimán I’s second campaign against Hungary, the first blow was dealt at Petrovaradin: the grand vizier and brother-in-law of the sultan, İbrahim Pasha (cf. Süjjid-i ‘othmání, i. 93–94), stormed the town on the 15th and the fortress after a brave resistance on the 27th July. The Turks held Petrovaradin till 1687 when they began to withdraw gradually after the fall of Oefen. Soon afterwards the town was occupied by the Austrians (finally in 1691) and after Surmeli ‘Ali Pasha had besieged it in vain for 23 days in 1694 (from Aug. 29) it was definitely ceded to them by the peace of Carlowitz 1699. But it is from the war of 1716—1718 that Petrovaradin is best known. The grand vizier Shahid ‘Ali Pasha (on him cf. ‘Abd al-Ráhman Sharaf, ii. 138 and Süjjid-i ‘othmání, iii. 528–529) with an army of 150,000 men encountered Prince Eugène de Savoy near the town and tried to begin
a regular siege. The Austrian general however foiled this attempt and instead fought a five hours pitched battle with his 64,000 men which ended in the defeat of the Turks (Aug. 5, 1716). This battle, in which ‘Ali Paša himself fell, with the fall of Temesvár and Belgrade (1717) brought about a decision in the war and led to the peace of Požarevac [q.v.] which established the Turkish frontier much farther south of Petrovaradin (indeed over the Save). A little later the empress Maria Theresa built the new fortress. In the Hungarian war of independence (1848–1849) Petrovaradin was for over nine months in Hungarian hands until it surrendered to the Austrians in Sept. 6, 1849. On the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1918 the town passed to Yugoslavia.

**Bibliography:** (in addition to references in the article): Ewliya Celebi. *Sevketname*, vii. (Stambul 1928), p. 145—147 (gives a very full account of the capture by the Turks; the other statements are rather vague as most of the figures are left unfilled in); Hammer, *G.O.R.*, ii. 50; iii. 866 und iv. 145; Zinkeisen, *G.O.R.*, ii. 652 and v. 533—534; Sh. Sâmi, *Kâmiu al-A‘lam*, ii. 1490 (wrongly thinks, that Petrovaradin remained Turkish down to the reign of Ahmad III [1703–1730]); ‘Abd al-Rahmân Şarâf, *Ta‘rikh-i Divlet-i Esmâ‘îliyye*, ii. 143; Meyers Reisebibliothek: *Turkî et al.*, Leipzig—Vienna 1898, p. 331; J. Moldesit in *Narodna enciklopedija*, iii. (Zagreb 1928), p. 336—337 (where some further literature is given); Almanah krajevine Jugoslavije, Zagreb 1931, p. 531; Glavni istorijski društva u Novom Sadu, vol. vi., Heft 1—2, Sremski Karlovci 1933 (special number devoted to Novi Sad and Petrovaradin with important contributions and several old plans [from 1688] of the latter town).

FEHMÍ BAJRAMAŘEVIC

**PHARAO.** See [FINRAH].

**PIJLE PAŠA.** Ottoman Grand Admiral, came according to St. Gerlach, *Tagge-Buch* (Frankfurt a/M. 1674, p. 448), from Tolna in Hungary and is said to have been the son of a shoemaker probably of Croat origin. Almost all contemporary records mention his Croat blood (cf. the third series of the *Relazioni degli ambasciatori Venezi al Senato*, ed. E. Alberì, Florence 1844—1845, and esp. iii/ii. 243: *di nazione croato, vicino ai confini d’Ungheria*; p. 357: *di nazione croato*; iii/iii. 294: *di nazione ungherese*; p. 418). Following the custom of the time his father was later given the name of ‘Abd al-Rahmân and described as a Muslim (cf. F. Balinger, in *Litteraturdenkmale aus Ungarns Turkenzeit*, Berlin and Leipzig 1927, p. 35, note 1). Pijle came in early youth as a page into the Seraî in Stambul and left it as *kapuši pashâ* [q.v.]. The year 961 (1554) saw him appointed Grand Admiral (kapudan pashâ: [q.v.], with the rank of a *şeyhâbed* and four years later he was given the status of a *heverîel* (J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 406). He succeeded Sinán Paša, brother of the grand vizier Rustan Paša [q.v.], in the office which he had held from 955—961 (1548—1554). When following his capture of Djerba and other heroic achievements at sea he thought he might claim the rank of vezir with three horse-tails, Sultan Suleiman, thinking it too soon for this promotion and regarding it as endangering the prestige of the vezirate (cf. Hâddji Khalîf, *Tabût al-Kijr*, first edition, fol. 36 and J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 406), married him to his grand-daughter Djuwher Sultan, a daughter of Selim II (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 392: summer of 1562). It was not till five years later that he received the three horse-tails as a vezir related by marriage (dâmuâd) like Mehmed Şokollu Paša. In the meanwhile he had carried out several of his great exploits at sea and attained the reputation of one of the greatest of Ottoman admirals. Along with Torghud Reis, at the instigation of the French ambassador d’Aramon, he had harassed the coast around Naples, besieged and taken Reggio and carried off its inhabitants into slavery. In 982 (1555) he endeavoured in vain to besiege Elba and Piombino (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 418) and finally took the fortified harbour of Oran in Algeria with 45 galleys. In the following year with 60 warships he occupied the port of Bizerta (Bent-Zert) and a year later ravaged Majocca with 150 galleys and burned Sorrento near Naples. In 985 (1558) he lay inactive with his fleet, 90 in number, before Valona in Albania in order to watch the enemy fleets there which were preparing an enterprise against Djerba and Tripolis. July 31, 1560 saw his greatest exploit at sea, namely the capture of Djerba which had shortly before been taken by the Spaniards: this he did with 120 ships setting out from Modon. On Sept. 27, 1600, he held his triumphal entry into Stambul, to which he had come in advance of the news of his victory by a galley (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 421 sqq.). The Grand Admiral did not take the sea again till four years later when in Aug. 1564 he took the little rocky peninsula of Peñón de Vélez de la Gomera from the Spaniards and in order to prepare for the conquest of Malta, which the sultan’s favourite daughter Mihrimâh [see *KUSTEM PAŠA*] was conducting with all her resources. This time however fortune no longer favoured him, for the siege of Malta in June—July 1565 failed against the heroic courage of the Christian defenders who performed miracles of bravery and inflicted heavy losses on the Ottomans. During the Hungarian campaign of Sulaimân in the spring of 1566 Pijle Paša was placed in charge of the harbour and arsenal of Stambul (cf. J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 438), after previously undertaking a successful raid on Chios and the Apulian coast (ibid., iii. 506 sqq.) in which the island of Chios and its harbour passed into his hands (Easter Sunday 1566). Under Selim II, his father-in-law, he was disgraced and deprived of office of Grand Admiral because, it was alleged, he had kept the greater part of the booty of Chios for himself (according to the report of the embassy of Albrecht de Wijys of May 1568 in J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iii. 782) and replaced by Mu‘ezzin-râde ‘Ali Paša. He at once endeavoured to regain the imperial favour by new exploits at sea. In April 1570, he set sail with 75 galleys and 30 galleots, landed first of all on the island of Tine which he captured and next took part in the conquest of Cyprus. On January 20, 1578 — according to the Ottoman sources on the 12th Dhu ‘l-Qa’dâ, 985 (Jan. 21, 1578) — he died in Stambul according to Stephan Gerlach (cf. his *Tagge-Buch*, Frankfurt a/M. 1674, p. 448). His vast estates passed some to the imperial treasury and some to his widow and children. His widow later married the third vezir Mehmed Paša and his second son became Sandjak Bey of Klis (Clissa) above Split (Spalato in Dalmatia) in 1584 (cf. the Italian record quoted by J. v. Hammer, *G.O.R.*, iv. 104, note 1: *La*
PIÄLE PASHA — PIÎK MEHMET PASHA

Sultana fo moglje di Piale ora di Mobmedusa terzo vezir, ha ottenuto dal Sign. il Sangiaco di Clissa per il secondo suo figlio con Piale. Piale Pašha is buried in Stambul in the Kâsim Pašha quarter in the mosque founded by him (cf. Hâfiz Ûsayin, Hâdiṭkât al-Djawâmi‘i, ii. 25 sqq.).

Bibliography: In addition to works quoted in the text the histories of Zinkeisen and Iorga, and Râmîz Pašha-zâde Mehmed Efendi, Akhari-i Kap mâ-lûn Dersî, Stambul 1285; also Hâfiz Ûsayin, Hâdiṭkât al-Djawâmi‘i, ii. 25 sqq., and Mehmed Tâhirîyâ, Sîfîâ-ı ı而出im, ii. 41 sq. (Frâz Bârînîk)

PIÄLE STR. [See GURŠI.]

PIE. [See PÂI.]

PINANG or Pulau Pinang, an island on the western shore of the Malay Peninsula, lying in latitude 5° 24' N. and longitude 100° 21' E. The area is 276 km²; it is separated from the mainland by a channel from 3 to 16 km. broad. The town of Pinang is built on the northeastern promontory, 4 km. off the shore of the mainland. The official names, Prince of Wales' island and Georgetown, never became popular and exist only in official documents. — The island was acquired in 1786 for the East India Company against a yearly payment from the Sultan of Kedah by an agreement with Capt. Light, who founded the colony in the same year. He hoped the place would become an emporium of the eastern seas. It was practically uninhabited at the time and was made a penal settlement shortly afterwards. It remained the penal station of India till 1857. In 1805 it became a separate Presidency. When in 1826 Singapore and Malakka were incorporated with it, Pinang continued to be the seat of government; in 1837 Singapore was made the capital. In 1867 the Straits Settlements were created a Crown Colony; since that year Pinang has been under the administrative control of a resident responsible to the Government of the Straits. He is assisted by officers of the Malay Civil Service. Unofficial members of the legislative council of the colony, which holds its sittings in Singapore, are appointed with the sanction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to represent Pinang. — Pinang has an excellent harbour and is important as a port of call; there is regular steamer-communication with the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, (British) India etc. The terminus of the Federated Malay States' railways is on the mainland opposite. Trade is adversely affected however by the proximity of Singapore, there are not port duties. — The island is now well opened up, the population has rapidly increased; it is largely Chinese and Tamil, though Malays and well presented from the Peninsular and Sumatra; all of them are Muḥammadians of the Şāhî’s rite. — Wellesley Province, a strip of land opposite on the mainland, forms part of the settlement of Pinang. It was acquired in 1800 from the Sultan of Kêdad against a yearly sum paid for it and includes a district which was purchased in 1874 from the Sultan of Perak. The soil is well cultivated; there are large estates owned by Europeans and Chinese. Until recently a second strip of territory on the mainland and adjoining islands, known as the Dindings, formed part of the settlement; it was ceded by Perak and has now been restored to that state. — The population of the whole settlement, Dindings included, was 304,000 according to the census of 1921, that of the town 123,000; the number of Muḥammadians is not known.


(R. A. KERK)

PIR (P.), elder. In the Sūfī system he is the murâdî, the "spiritual director". He claims to be in the direct line of the interpreters of the esoteric teaching of the Prophet and hence holds his authority to guide the aspirant (murâdî) on the Path. But he must himself be worthy of imitation. "He should have a perfect knowledge, both theoretical and practical, of the three stages of the mystical life and be free of fleshly attributes". When a pir has proved — either by his own direct knowledge or by the spiritual power (wilâyat) inherent in him — the fitness of a murâdî to associate with other Sūfîs, he lays his hand on the aspirant's head and invests him with the kîrşâ. The murâdî need not necessarily receive his investiture from that pir who gave him instruction, who is called the pîr-i şuhat. Pir also is the title given to the founder of derwish orders.


(R. LEVY)

PIÎK MEHMET PASHA, an Ottoman grand vizier, belonged to Amasi and was a descendant of the famous Djalal al-Dîn of Akârîy and therefore traced his descent from Abû Bakr. He took up a legal career and became successively kâdi of Sofia, Siliwî and Galâta, administrator of Mehmed III's kitchen for the poor (simûret) in Stambul and at the beginning of the reign of Bâyazîd II attained the rank of a first defterdâr (baş defterdâr). In the reign of Selim I he distinguished himself by his wise counsel in the Persian campaign (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. Rü, ii. 412, 417 sqq.), was sent in advance to Tabriz to take possession of this town in the name of the sultan, and at the end of Sept. 1514 was appointed third vezir in place of Muṣṭâfa Pašha who had been dismissed (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. Rü., ii. 420). He temporarily held the office of a kâ’ınmaḵâm of Stambul and after the end of the Egyptian campaign was appointed grand vizier in place of Yûnus Pašha, who had been executed on the retreat from Egypt in 923 (1517). In this capacity he took part in the conquest of Baghşî in 1521. Soon after the occupation of Rhodes, Pirî Pašha fell from the sultan's favour as a result of the slanders of the envious Ağmâd Paša who coveted his office, and was dismissed with a pension of 200,000 aspers on the 13th Shâhîn 929 (June 27, 1523). His successor was İbrahim Paša [q. v.], a Greek from Parga. Pirî Mehmed lived another ten years and died in 939 or 940 (1532-1533) at Siliwî, where he was buried in the mosque founded by him. One of his sons, Mehmed Beg, had predeceased him in 932 as governor of Iç-il. Pirî Mehmed Pašha created a number of charitable endowments, among them a mosque in Stambul called after him (cf. Hâfiz Ûsayin, Hâdiṭkât al-Djawâmi‘i, i. 308), a medrese and a public-kitchen as well as what was known as a tâb-khâné. — While his laḫab was Pirî, he used Resmi as a makâhî for his
poems, which are of moderate merit (cf. J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst, ii. 337 sqq. with the wrong year of death and also i, p. 157 under Piri without the identity of the two being recognised, also Latifi, Tazhikria, p. 168 under Reis).

Bibliography: Mehmed Tharayia, Siyilli Siyammai, i. 43, more fully in "Othmanzade Mehmed Tahir, Hadjiat al-Wuzur", Stambul 1274, p. 22 sqq and the Ottoman chronicles of the xvith century. — Brusil Mehmed Tahir, "Othmanli Muhellifleri", i. 111 sqq. deals with Piri Mehmed Pasha as a literary man. According to him he wrote a small collection of poems (Divanize) and an exposition of a part of the Mehlmedar and of the Shahidi entitled Tuhfi Mit but both works are described as still in MSS.

PIRI MUHYI L-DIN REIS, OTTOMAN NAVIGATOR AND CARTOGRAPHER, was probably of Christian (Greek) origin and is described as nephew of the famous corsair Kemal Reis (on the latter see the Bonn dissertation by Hans-Albrecht von Buski. Kemal Reis, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der türkischen Flotte, Bonn 1928 and especially J. H. Mordtmann, Zur Lebensgeschichte des Kemal Reis, in M. S. O. S., xxxii, part 2, Berlin 1929, p. 39-49 and p. 231 sqq.), who was probably a renegade. His father is said to have been a certain Hadji Mehmed, while he himself in the preface to his sailing-book calls himself the son of Hadsji Hadji, which is perhaps only to be taken as a name chosen to rhyme with Piri (cf. Sinan b. Abd al-Manman or Dawad b. Abd al-Wadad and similar rhyming names of fathers of renegades usually formed with "Abd"). As Hejari cannot be an "adam" but at most a maşqalay, the pure Turkish descend of Piri is more than doubtful, if he was not called simply Hejari Mehmed, i.e. borne a name for which there is evidence, for a later period it is true, in the Siyilli Siyammai, i. 239. The same source (ii. 44) says that the corsair's full name was Piri Muhyi l-Din Reis. In any case it may safely be assumed that Piri is to be taken as a tashkala, while the real name ("adam") was probably Mehmed — the combination Piri Mehmed was quite customary in the xvith century — i.e. an "adam" to which Muhyi l-Din corresponded as khatib (cf. Ist., xi, 1921, p. 20, note 3). Of the life of Piri Reis, who made many voyages under his uncle Kemal Reis (d. 16th Shawwal 916 = Jan. 16, 1511) and later distinguished himself under Khair al-Din Barbarossa (q.v.; July 4, 1546) we only know that on these raids he had acquired an unrivalled knowledge of the lands of the Mediterranean. He afterwards held the office of kapudan of Egypt and in this capacity sailed from Suez on voyages to the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea. In 945 (1547) he occupied Aden (cf. Die osmanische Chronik des Rustem Pascha, ed. by Ludwig Forrer [Turk. Bild., xx., Leipzig 1923], p. 174 sqq. with full commentary). In 959 (1561) he lost on the coast of Arabia several of his 50 ships, took the port of Masha'ar and carried off a number of its inhabitants as slaves. He then laid siege to Hormuz but raised accepted bribes and so set sail (according to Peçewi, "Ah, Hadji, Khala, Tawfat al-Khur, first edition, fol. 28 according to J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., iii. 415). A report that an enemy fleet was approaching decided him to return hurriedly home with only 26 galleys but with all the treasure he had collected. He was wrecked on the island of Bahrain, but succeeded with two ships in reaching Suez, then Cairo. Khâlid Pasha, the governor of Baṣra, had in the meanwhile reported to the Porte that the expedition had been a failure, which resulted in an order for the execution of Piri Reis being sent to Cairo. He was beheaded there, in 962 (1554-1555), it is said, but probably rather in 959 or 960 and his estate sent to Stambul. After his death envos are said to have arrived from Hormuz representing the plundered inhabitants to demand the return of the treasure he had carried off; they were naturally not successful. The post of kapudan of Egypt was given to another noted corsair, Murâd, the dismissed sandjak-bey of Katif (probably the same as survives in the proverb, according to H. F. v. Diez, Denkwurdigkeiten von Ägypten, part i., Berlin 1811, p. 55, as Murad kapta). Piri Reis is generally known as the author of a sailing-book of the Aegean and Mediterranean known as Bahriye in which he describes all the coasts he had voyaged along with an account of the currents, shallows, landing-places, bays, straits and harbours. Piri Reis had already begun the work in the reign of Selim l (d. Sept. 1520) although he says in the preface that he did not begin it till 927 (end of 1520), in order to make the dedication to Selânum the Magnificent more impressive. He presented the completed atlas (as the latter in 930 (1523). Paul Kahle has published an edition with text and translation based on the known manuscripts, entitled Piri Reis, Bahriye. Das türkische Segelhandbuch für das Mittelmeer und die Welt von Jahren 1521 von dem so far (middle of 1935) vol. i., text, part 1 and vol. ii., part L section 1-28 have been published, Leipzig and Berlin 1926. Separate sections had been previously published, e.g. H. F. v. Diez, op. cit.; E. Sachau, Stiilien, in Centurion delle Nascita di Michele Amari, ii., Palermo 1910, p. 1 sqq.; R. Herrog, Ein türkisches Werk über das Ägäische Meer aus dem Jahr 1520, in Mitteilungen des Kaiserl. Deutschen Archäolog. Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, xxvili., 1902, p. 417 sqq.; E. Oberhammer, section Zypern, in: Die Insel Zypern, Munich 1903, p. 437-434 — Other sections in Carlier de Pinon, ed. E. Blochet (with pictures) and K. Foy, in M. S. O. S., part ii., xi, 1908, p. 234 sqq. Cf. thereon E. Taeschner in Z. D. M., lxvii. (1923), p. 43 with other references.

The so-called " Attempts, found in October 1929 by Khalil Edhem Bey in the Seray Library in Stambul, according to his signature on it of the year 1513, seems also to go back to Piri Reis; it is in Turkish in bright colours on parchment, 85 by 60 cm., and represents the western part of a map of the world. It comprises the Atlantic Ocean with America and the western strip of the Old World. The other parts of the world are lost. It has been supposed that this is the same map as Piri, according to a statement in his Bahriye, presented to Sultan Selim in 1517 which would explain its preservation in the Imperial Library. On it cf. Paul Kahle, "Un mapa de América hecho por el turco Piri Reis, en el año 1523, basándose en una mapa de
PIRI MÜHYİ 'L-DIN RETİŞ — PİŞHWÄ


(P. RAEINER)

PİŞHWÄ, the title given to one of the ministers of the Bahmani sultans of the Deccan; the chief minister of Shiwâdji; the head of the Marâthâ confedâracy.
(Persian "leader"; Pahl. pîshâpay; Arm. pishapoy.
For older forms see Husbachmann, Armenische Grammatik, i. 230.)

Shiwadji, the founder of Maratha political power in the Deccan, was assisted by a council of ministers known as the Ashna Pradhan, one of whom was the Pishwâ or Muhhya Pradhan. The office of Pishwâ was not hereditary and the nature of Shiwadji’s autocratic rule can be gauged from the fact that his ministers were not even permitted to select their own subordinates or nâibs, all of these being appointed by Shiwadji himself. Next to Shiwadji the Pishwâ was the head of both the civil and military administration, placing his seal on all official letters and documents. During the reign of Râdjaram the power of the Pishwâ was eclipsed by that of the Pant Pratinidhi. It is usual to regard Bâldiştî Visvanâth (1714—20) as the first Pishwâ because he was the real founder of a line of rulers who gradually supplanted the râdjas of Sâtara as heads of the Maratha confedâracy. But there were really six pîshwâs before his time, namely, Shâmârdî Nilkanth Rozekar, Moro Trimbak Pingle, Nilkanth Moreshwar Pingle, Pratibhrâm Trimbak Pratinidhi, Bhario Moreshwar Pingle, and Balkrishna Vásudev.

Bâldiştî Visvanâth Bhat (1714—1720), the founder of the dynasty of the pîshwâs, was an able Çitpâ or Konkanast Brahman whom Shâtâ (1708—1749) appointed as chief minister. The difficulties facing Shâtâ, the political confusion in Maharashtra, and the weakness of the later râdjas of Sâtara were the chief factors underlying the growth of the power of the pîshwâs. The imprisonment of the Pratinidhi Dâdoba (Djadji-vanâro) at the time of Shâtâ’s death removed another obstacle to their advancement and marks the end of Deshast Brahman political influence in the Deccan. Bâldiştî Visvanâth found the country torn by civil war: he left it peaceful and prosperous. By complicating the revenue accounts he increased Brahman control over the state finances. During his period of office the Mughal emperor, Muhammad Shâtâ, recognized the right of Shâtâ to levy laksh, a contribution of one-fourth of the land revenue throughout the Deccan, and permitted him to supplement this levy by an additional tenth of the land revenue, called surdeniâkâ. His son, Bâldiştî Râo I (1720—1740), adopted a policy of territorial aggrandizement. The year before his death, a treaty, principally of a commercial nature, was concluded with Law, the Governor of Bombay (Aitchison, vi., N°. 3). The third Pîshwâ, Bâldiştî Râo (1740—1761), entrusted the government to his cousin, Sâdshîv Bhat, the Bhishma, and the command of his armies to his brother, Râgchnâth Râo, better known as Raghoba. His period of office was marked by the rapid extension of Maratha power, his armies ravaging the country from the Carnatic to the Pañjab until their crushing defeat at Pâñipat [q. v.] in 1761. As a result of an agreement in 1755 an Anglo-Maratha expedition crushed the power of Angria, a pirate chief whose depredations were a constant menace to the shipping of the Konkan coast. At the end of this expedition a treaty (Aitchison, vi., N°. 9, iii.) was made with the Pîshwâ which provided for the exclusion of Dutch traders from the Maratha territory. Dissenions broke out after the death of this pîshwâ which seriously impaired the strength of the Marâthâs. Power now passed to the Maratha generals, Sindha of Gwâtior, Bhosla of Naçpur, Holkar of Indore, and the Gaekwâr of Baroda.

During the rule of Mâdhu Râo (1761—1772) Sindha, in 1771, once more re-established Maratha influence in northern India, and Shâtâ Alam, the Mughal emperor, who had deserted the English, became a puppet under Marâthâ control. Mâdhu Râo was succeeded by his brother, Narâyân Râo (1772—1773), who was murdered at the instigation of his uncle Raghoba. For a time the Maratha confedâracy was divided into two hostile camps, the supporters of Raghoba, who was a pretender to the pîshwâship, and the Court Party under Nânâ Phadnavis, who supported the claims of Mâdhu Râo Narâyân (1774—1795), a posthumous son of Narâyân Râo. The action of the Bombay Government in supporting the claims of Raghoba led to war between the English Company and the Marâthâs which ended, thanks to the exertions of Warren Hastings, with the Treaty of Sâlbâ in 1782. This treaty which virtually recognized the independence of Sindha secured peace between the English and the Marâthâs for twenty years. Maratha history now becomes a struggle between Nânâ Phadnavis (Bâldiştî Djanardhan), who attempted to bolster up the power of the pîshwâ, and Mahâdâjdi Sindha, who strove to control the Pîshwâ in order to use him as a cloak to cover his aggressions.

The seventh and last Pîshwâ was Bâldiştî Râo II (1796—1818). During the governor-generalship of the Marquis Wellesley, after the death of Nânâ Phadnavis, in 1800, there followed a struggle for supremacy at Pânî between Holkar and Dâwlat Râo Sindha who had succeeded Mahâdâjdi Sindha in 1794. During this struggle the Pîshwâ fled to Bassein where they threw himself upon the protection of the English. In 1802, by the Treaty of Bassein (Aitchison, vi., N°. 13) Wellesley constituted himself protector of the Pîshwâ who agreed to accept a "subsidiary" force and to permit the
English to mediate in his disputes with the other Indian princes. This naturally did not prove acceptable to the other members of the Marathā confederacy. Unfortunately Bādgī Rāo came under the influence of an unprincipled favourite, Trimbakdā, who was privy to the murder of the Gaekwar’s emissary who had been invited to Pūna under a guarantee from the English of his personal safety. When Elphinstone, the Resident, reported that the Pishwā was secretly conspiring to form a Marathā coalition against the English, the Pishwā was forced to come to terms and sign the Treaty of Pūna (1817), which completed the work of Basseyn. But Bādgī Rāo’s promises were written in water, for when Lord Hastings proceeded to crush the Marathās, the Pishwā rose in revolt and plundered the British Residency. Eventually his forces were defeated and the pishwāshāp was abolished. Bādgī Rāo, however, was granted a pension and allowed to reside at Bīthūr where he died in 1851. His adopted son, Nānā Sāhib, disappeared in 1858.

**Bibliography:**

**PIST** (P), a kind of food compounded of the liver of gazelles or almonds etc. A daily portion of the size of a pistachio (pistāh) is taken long enough and others who undertake long fasts, go to the bāla or forty-day fast, and is sufficient to maintain life.

**Bibliography:** Vullers, Lexicon Persico-Latinum, s. v. pist, sīla. (R. Levy)

**PLATO.** [See Aflāṭūn.]

**PLEVEN** (Plevna, Plevna, Turkish Plevne 담라위, an important town in Northern Bulgaria, 350 feet above sea-level, in a depression formed by the little river Tăčenica (c = tz), which flows not far from the town on the right into the Vid, the right bank tributary of the Danube. Surrounded by hills and at the intersection of the high roads to Vidian, Nikopol, Sofia and the passes of the Balkans, Plevna has long been a place of strategic importance; it is now also crossed by one of the main railway lines (Sofia–Plevna–Sumen–Varma). This busy town, the capital of a circle, where the chief business is in cattle and wine, and which has museums, which recall the Russo-Turkish War, is rising rapidly and in 1926 had 29,063 inhabitants.

Although in the vicinity of Plevna there are the remains of Roman settlements, the town really arose only under the Turks. We have however very little definite information about this period of the town’s history. Ewliyā Celebi’s statement that Plevna was built by the Wallachian ban Ladka (ليدى) has of course to be taken with caution; on the other hand, his assertion that “in the year 720 (1320) in the time of the Ghāzi Khudāwendīgīr it was taken by Mīhāl-Beg”, is not free from objections on chronological grounds. According to the same writer, Plevna after the conquest was an arpašet-āb of the sons of Mihāl-Beg and at a later date was still within the sphere of influence of the noble family of the Mīhāl-oglu [q. v.], who had several buildings erected there. According to Ewliyā Celebi and other Turkish sources (cf. vol. iii., p. 495a and Glašnik Slovenske narodne družbe, xiii. 73 and 81), the town was the last resting-place of Mehmed Beg, a son of Kose Mīhāl, who died in 825 (1422), as well as of the celebrated Ali Beg Mihāl-oglu who is said to have died about 1507. According to Ewliyā Celebi, Ali Beg was buried in the mosque founded by him. That Plevna was the capital of a district in the sandjak of Nikopol we know not only from Ewliyā Celebi but also from Ladka Khaliya (Rumei und Bosna, transl. by v. Hammer, Spomenik, xvi. 23). In the xviiith century, when Ewliyā Celebi visited the town, it had 2,000 houses, a ruined fortress, a college founded by the above mentioned Ali Beg, 7 schools, 6 tekkes and 6 inams etc. — In the first days of Turkish rule, Plevna had, according to Sh. Škini (Kūmās al-Ālam, ii. 1532—1533), 17,000 inhabitants and 18 mosques but, as many Muslims migrated after the Russo-Turkish war, the population sank to 14,000 and most of the mosques were described in 1889 as in ruins.

But it was not till the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—1878 that Plevna became world famous. When the Russians after crossing the Danube on July 19, 1877 appeared before Plevna, they met with the unexpected resistance of Othmān Pasha, who had come up from Vidian. They attacked unsuccessfully on July 20 and 30 and suffered heavily. As Plevna was not fortified, Othmān Pasha now had strong and extensive earthworks thrown up around it. On Sept. 11 and 12 the Russians with the help of the Rumanians, whom they had summoned to their assistance, made a third attempt to take Plevna by storm and were again repulsed with great losses. After all these and further failures (on Sept. 18 and Oct. 19) the allies decided upon and began a regular siege of the town which was conducted by Tottleben, the defender of Sebastopol, in person.

In spite of all Othmān Pasha was not yet shut in on his west side and received munitions and supplies from there until Oct. 10. In the middle of November he was completely surrounded and on the morning of Dec. 10 he undertook a last desperate sortie in an attempt to break through the western lines of the besieging army of 120,000 men (including the Czar). This bold effort was accompanied by success for a few hours but in the meanwhile the heroic Othmān Pasha (the “Lion of Plevna”) was himself wounded, and towards midday on the same day was finally forced to surrender with some 40,000 men. The Russians
had already forced their way into Plevna, the five
months' siege of which had cost them and the
Rumansians over 40,000 men. This name was only given to
Serbs converted to Islam; the truth seems to be however
that this name is limited to Turks in the
two countries (cf. H. Vasilevich, Muslimani..., p. 34 and Elezović, in Srpski književni glasnik, xxviii., 1929, p. 610—614 and in Rednikslovsko-
metoškog dijajek; ii. 449). No more correct is the
statement that apovci is the name given to
Serbian Muslims in Southern Serbia; for this seems
to be a name applied to one another only by
Albanians who are closely related to one another
(brothers and cousins, according to H. Vasilevich,
Muslimani..., p. 34).

The origin and the etymology of these names
are in part more or less obscure and arbitrary.
The usual explanation that the name Pomak comes
from the verb pomoci “to help” and means helper
(pomogati) i.e. auxiliary troops of the Turks,
was first given by F. Kanit (Donau-Bulgar
der Balkan, vol. ii., Leipzig 1882, p. 182) but
was soon afterwards (1891) declared by Jireček
(see Bibl.) to be inadequate. Another equally im-
probable popular etymology is that which explains
Pomak by the Bulgarian word mok = “torment, force”;
and justifies this etymology by saying that the
conversion of the Bulgars to Islam on a
considerable scale was carried out by force and con-
strain (Ichirko, ii. 15). Quite recently I. Lekov
(see Bibl.) has explained the name Pomak from
poturnjak (lit. “one made a Turk”). Whether the
word potomak which in Turkish means “club, cudgel”,
in Uigur “Muslim” and in South Russia “pedlar”
(cf. Barthold, Orta Asia... , p. 82—83), is in any
way connected with Pomak, or has been influenced
by the Bulgarian poturnjak or confused with it
has still to be investigated.

The history of the conversion of the “Pomaks”
or “Torbesi” is very little known in detail. In
any case the adoption of Islam did not take place
everywhere at once but was gradual and at different
periods. A beginning was made immediately after
the battle of Marica (1371) and after the fall of
Tnovo (1393): many Serbs and Bulgars at this
time, especially as Jireček thinks, the nobles and
the Bogomils among these, adopted Islam. After
these first conversions under Bayazid II considerable
numbers of converts were made according to
native tradition in the reign of Selim I (1512—
1520); for this purpose he is said to have sent
his ‘favourite Sinan Paša’ into the territory of the
Šar-mountains. The highlands of Čepino (in the
Rhodopes) were converted according to local
histories in the beginning of the xviiith century,
according to Jireček (Fürstenthum, p. 104) however,
not till the middle, in the reign of Mehmed IV
(1648—1687); the grand vizier Mehmed Koprulu
is said to have taken a leading part in the work.
The conversion to Islam of the Danube territory
(Loče etc.) is put in this period. Towards the
end of this century (xviiith) further conversions
took place among the Serbs in the Debar region.
In some districts Islam only gained a footing on
a large scale in the course of the xixth century
and sometimes not till the beginning of the xixth
(e.g. in Gora, south of Prizren).

Until recently one was very often inclined to
believe that these conversions to Islam were made
under compulsion, even by force of arms, but now
the view is beginning to prevail that the authorities
sometimes to be said (most recently by A. Urošević,
in Glasnik Srpskog naučnog društva, vol. v., 1929,
a 319—320) that this name was only given to
never took any direct steps to proselytise them or to convert their subjects; conversion was on the contrary voluntary and for quite different reasons except in a few exceptional cases (cf. e.g. H. Vasilević, *Muslimi...*, esp. p. 53-61).

Towards the end of the sixteenth century when the process of conversion had ceased for decades everywhere, the great majority of the Slav Muslims (Bulgars and Serbs) were to be found in the Rhodopes and the mountains of eastern Macedonia and in groups of considerable size up and down Macedonia as far as the Albanian frontier, a wide area which stretched from the north of Plovdiv (Philippopolis) to Salonika in the south and in the east from the central course of the Arda over the Vardar and even beyond the Cni Drim, i.e. across the districts of Ohrid, Debar, Gotovac, and Prizren to the west. At that time only a small part of this territory which was interspersed with Christian areas belonged to the principality of Bulgaria; the greater part was still Turkish and only after the Balkan War passed to Serbia or after the World War to Yugoslavia. — In addition to the main body of Muslim Bulgars in the Rhodopes mountains, there were at the same time also sporadic groups north of the Balkan range in the Danube territory, in the circles of Loveč, Pleven (Plevna) and Orheovo (Rahovo).

Since then however the boundaries of the “Pomaks” have receded considerably. During the siege of Plevna almost all the Bulgarian Muslims fled from the Danube districts to Macedonia; although they returned in 1880 they soon afterwards migrated into Turkey. After the union of eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria in 1885 the Rhodopes “Pomaks” also began to emigrate. — The frontiers of the “Torbesi” likewise were not unaffected. The Balkan War and the World War brought about certain changes which resulted in the migration of some bodies of Serbian Muslims out of Southern Serbia.

As a result of various wars and the territorial changes that followed them, the statements regarding the number of Muslim Slavs in Bulgaria, Macedonia (in Southern Serbia) and Thrace as well as about their total number differ considerably and are often unreliable. For example Jireček (1876) estimated the total at about 500,000 including 100,000 in Loveč and Plevna (see *Bibliya*). At the beginning of the twentieth century Gavrilović (see *Bibliya*) estimated the total at only 400,000 and Ishirkoff at about the same (1917).

As regards the distribution of these Muslim Slavs according to countries the following statistics may be quoted. In what used to be the principality of Bulgaria Jireček estimated (1891) their number at most 28,000 souls and before the Balkan War there were within the old frontier of Bulgaria (according to official statistics of 1910) 214,143 (0.49% of the population). In the lands acquired in the Balkan War in Southern Bulgaria there were however many more Pomaks, mainly in the regions of the rivers Arda, Mesta and Struma so that the official census of 1920 makes their number 88,399 (1.82% of the whole population). A somewhat higher figure is given by the *Annuaire du Monde Musulman* for 1929 (p. 305), namely 16,000 Pomaks in Bulgaria proper and 75,337 in Thrace, i.e. 91,337 in all. Finally the latest published statistics (1926 census) give 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims in Bulgaria, i.e. 1.87% of the population, while the number of Muslims in Bulgaria without distinguishing their languages was then 759,296 or 14.41% of the population. — Of these 102,351 Bulgarian speaking Muslims only 5,799 lived in the towns and the remaining 96,552 in the villages; the proportion of men to women was 1,000 to 1,065.

Literate Pomaks in the whole of Bulgaria in 1926 numbered only 6,659 in 1926 (of whom 5,534 were men).

The number of Pomaks (in reality of Muslim Slavs) in Macedonia was according to S. Vercović (1889; see *Bibliya*) 144,051 men (this figure is therefore doubled in *Dernier travaux sur l'ethnographie de la Macédoine*, publ. by the Comité national de l'Union des organisations des émigrés macédoniens en Bulgarie, Sofia 1928, and amounts to 288,092 [with an error of minus ten souls]), according to G. Weigand (*Die nationalen Bestrebungen der Balkanvolker*, Leipzig 1898) 100,000 men, according to V. Kančov (1900; see *Bibliya*) 148,800 and according to VI. Sis (Macedonien, Zürich 1918) 150,030 souls.

As regards the number of Serbian speaking Muslims in Southern Serbia, they were estimated by H. Vasilević (*Musulmani...*, p. 11 sqq.) whose calculations are however to some extent based on the situation before the Balkan War, at 100,000 souls; now (1935) the figure is put at 60,000 and the number of Serbo-Croat speaking Muslims in the whole of Yugoslavia at about 900,000 (exact figures cannot be given because the statistics according to religions have not been published).

For Thrace the figure of 75,337 Muslim Bulgars has already been given from the *Annuaire* and in Western Thrace there were according to the intercalated census (of March 1920) 11,739 (cf. *La question de la Thrace*, ed. by the Comité suprême des refugiés de Thrace, Sofia 1927).

On these statistics the following observations may be made. The Bulgars (e.g. Kančov) usually include as “Pomaks” all the Macedonian Slavs of Muslim faith, i.e. including Serbs from Southern Serbia. On the other hand its account on their religion these Muslim Slavs are sometimes carelessly counted with the Turks. Moreover some statistics are not completely free from chauvinistic and political bias. The European estimates finally are based on approximations or are quite arbitrary.

In spite of the fact that the Pomaks and Torbesi are occasionally included among the Turks and in spite of the fact that they sometimes call themselves Turks, they are nevertheless the purest stratum of the old Bulgarian or Serbian population as the case may be who have preserved their Slav type and Slav language (especially archaic words) very well, sometimes even better — as a result of their being cut off from the Christians and their isolation in outlying districts — than their Christian kinsmen, who have been constantly exposed to admixture from other ethnic elements. They have a certain feeling of aversion for the Turks whose language they do not understand. It is only in the towns that we find that in course of time some of these Slavs have adopted the Turkish language. What bound them to the Ottomans was not language but principally a common religion with its prescriptions and customs (e.g. the veiling of women) which along with Turkish rule naturally imposed upon them many Arabic and Turkish.
words. In spite of this there survived among them many pre-Islamic customs and reminiscences of Christianity (observation of certain Christian festivals etc.).

That the Bulgarian Muslims in particular occasionally (esp. in 1876–1878) fought with the Turks against the Christian Bulgars may be ascribed to the fact that as a result of their low cultural level they made no clear distinction between nation and religion and that their Christian fellow-countrymen treated them as Turks and not as kinsmen. These mistakes were repeated in the Balkan War when the victorious Bulgarian troops and the orthodox priests were led to so far as to convert the Pomaks in the Rhodopes and other districts to Christianity mainly by pressure and force of arms. But on the conclusion of peace they returned to Islam again. This is frankly admitted by the Bulgarian geographer Isirkov (Ishirkoff) and the Bulgarian writer Iv. Karaynov (in his Bulgarian periodical *National Education*, Kusnetz 1931, according to Cemalović [see Bibliography]).

Fifty or sixty years ago the songs and ballads of the "Pomaks" were the subject of much dispute. A Bosnian ex-cleric, Stefan Verković (1827–1893), an antique dealer in Seres, published under the title of *Veda Slavona* (i.e. the "Veda of the Slavs") Belgrad 1874, vol. i) a collection of songs which were alleged to have been collected mainly among Pomaks and which celebrated "pre-Christian and pre-historic" subjects (the immigration into the country, discovery of corn, of wine, of writing and legends of gods with Indian names, of Orpheus etc.). A Chodzko, A. Doron (Chants populaires bulgares infilites, Paris 1875; cf. also *Recue de littorale comorić*, xiv, 1934, p. 155 sqq.) and L. Geiter (*Poesie et folklore Thrakien i Bulgarie*, Prag 1878) also strongly supported belief in this "Veda": it was even assumed that the Pomaks were descended from the ancient Thracians, who had been influenced first by Slav culture and then by Islam.

But of ballads on such subjects neither the Muslim nor the Christian Bulgars knew anything and Jireček, who investigated the question on the spot, repeatedly described this "Slav Veda" as the fabrication of some Bulgarian teachers (*Fürstenthum*, p. 107). We now know that Verković’s chief collaborator was the Macedonian teacher Iv. Gologanov (cf. Pentscho Slawejkoff, *Bulgarike Volkslieder*, Leipzig 1919, p. 15).

In view of the fact that the Muslims in question consist mainly of conservative dwellers in the mountains and villages — who are very industrious, honourable, and peaceful — they are for the most part illiterate and there could be no possibility of any literary activity among them. The only people among them who can write are the köhdjas, who frequently use the Turkish language and Arabic alphabet when writing. They also frequently use the latter alphabet when writing their mother tongue. Of earlier generations of Bulgarian Muslims who distinguished themselves in the Turkish army or otherwise in the Turkish service. The modern generation who have been educated in the state schools have more national consciousness and are more progressive but are too few in number to make themselves felt in politics or otherwise.


**PONTIANAK, the name of a part of the Dutch residency "Westert-Afdeeling" of Borneo, also of the Sultanate in the delta of the river Kapuas and of its capital.**

As a Dutch province Pontianak includes the districts of Pontianak, Kubu, Landak, Sanggau, Sekadau, Tajan and Meliau. The administration is in the hands of an assistant-resident whose headquarters are in Pontianak where the Resident of the "Westert-Afdeeling" also lives. The Dutch settlement is on the left bank of the Kapuas, where also is the Chinese commercial quarter. The Malay town lies opposite on the right bank. The sultanate of Pontianak with its capital of the same name is independent under the suzerainty of the Netherlands and is 4,545 sq. km. in area. In 1930 the population consisted of 100,000 Malays and Dayaks, 562 Europeans, 26,425 Chinese and 2,378 other Orientals. The term Malays includes all native Muhammadans among them many descendants of Arabs, Javanese, Buginese, and Dayaks converted to Islam. The Dayaks
in the interior are still heathen. Roman Catholic missions are at work among the latter and the Chinese. This very mixed population is explained by the origin and development of Pontianak.

The town was founded in 1772 A.D. by the Sharif 'Abd al-Raḥmān, a son of the Sharif Ḥusayn b. Ahmad al-Ḵāḏrī, an Arab who settled in Matan in 1735 and in 1771 died in Mampawa as vizier revered for his piety. In 1742 'Abd al-Raḥmān was born, the son of a Dayak concubine, and very early distinguished himself by his spirit of enterprise. He attempted to gain the ruling power, successively in Mampawa, Palembang and Bandjarasmin, from which he had to retire with his band of pirates, although the sultan had been his patron, after he had taken several European and native ships. By this time he had married a princess of Mampawa and Bandjarasmin and possessed great wealth. On his return to Mampawa his father had just died. As he met with no success here, he decided to found a town of his own with a number of other fortune-seekers. An uninhabited area at the mouth of the junction of the Landak with the Kapuas, notorious as a dangerous haunt of evil spirits seemed to him suitable. After the spirits had been driven away by shots of cannon fire he was the first to spring ashore, had the forest cut down and built rude dwellings there for himself and his followers.

The favourable position of the site and the protection which trade enjoyed there soon attracted Buginese, Malay and Chinese merchants to it so that Pontianak developed rapidly and Sharif 'Abd al-Raḥmān was able by his foresight and energy to hold his own against the neighbouring kingdoms of Matan, Sukadana, Mampawa and Sanggau.

He appointed chiefs over each of the different groups of people and regulated trade by reasonable tariffs. He was able to impress representatives of the East Indian Co. in Batavia to such an extent that they gave him the kingdoms of Pontianak and Sanggau as fiefs after the company had bought off the claims of Banten to Western Borneo. As early as 1772 the Buginese prince Radja Hádžih had given him the title of sultan. After his death in 1808 his son Sharif Kāşim succeeded him. He was the first to change the Arab ceremonial at the court for more modern ways.

According to the treaty concluded with the Dutch Indies government in 1855, the sultan receives a fixed income from them while they administer justice and police of the country. The relationship to the Dutch Indies government has now been defined in a long agreement of 1912, which also settles the administration of justice and the taxes. From the local treasury, then constituted, the sultan receives 6,800 gulden a month; he also receives 50% of the revenue on agriculture and mines.

In keeping with the nature of its origin Pontianak is predominantly Muslim in character and a relatively large number take part in the pilgrimage to Mecca. For these pilgrims who are known as Djāwa Punītiana, the sultan when he performed the pilgrimage in the 80s founded several ḫabīf houses in the holy city.

The main support of the whole population is agriculture and along with it trade in the products of the jungle. The exports are copra, pepper, gambir, sago, rubber and roten, especially to Singapore and Java. Rice, clothing and other articles required by Europeans and the more prosperous Chinese and Arabs are imported. The import and export trade is mainly in the hands of the Chinese. They live together in the Chinese quarter in the European half of Pontianak on the left bank where also the other foreign Orientals have settled. This is therefore the centre of trade and commerce in the valley of the Kapuas.

The Chinese traders maintain with their own steamers connections with the Chinese merchants farther up the river and also over seas with Singapore, both in competition with the Royal Paketfairt Co.

In the swampy lands of Pontianak, intercourse with the outer world is almost exclusively by water. Only in recent years have motor-roads been laid over the higher ground from Pontianak to Mampawa and Sambas, to Sungei Kakap and from Mandor to Landak.

It may be particularly mentioned that Pontianak is a healthy place for the town is very often inundated and it is so far from the sea that there is no malaria.


POON. [See PUNA.]

PORT SA'ID, a Mediterranean seaport of Egypt at the entrance of the Suez Canal on its western bank, in 31° 15' 50" N., 35° 18' 42" E. 145 miles from Cairo by rail via Zagzig and Ismāʿīliya, 36 and 125 miles from Damietta and Alexandria respectively along the coast. It was founded in 1859, as soon as the Suez Canal was decided, during the reign of Sa'id Pasha [q. v.], Viceroy of Egypt, and was named after him. Except for the strip of sand which, varying in width between 200 and 300 yards, separates Lake Manzala from the Mediterranean, the site of the present town was under the water. This site was selected by a party of engineers under Laroche and de Lesseps, not on account of being the nearest point across the isthmus to Suez, but because the depth of the water there corresponded most favourably to the required title of sultan. As soon as work was started on the Canal, fine wooden houses were constructed above the water, supported on massive piles and equipped with a bakery and a water-distiller for the use of the pioneers. A year later, dredgers began to deepen the waters of the newly established harbour, and the mud thus raised was immediately utilized for more buildings which soon numbered 150 houses, 150 cottages, one hospital, one Catholic and one Orthodox Church, and one Mosque, besides the workshops, covering 30,000 square metres in all. This, however, did not suffice for the rapid growth of the population to keep up the work on the Canal progressed towards Ismāʿīliya. To meet this emergency and in the absence of stone quarries within reasonable reach of Port Sa'id, the manufacture of artificial stones capable of resisting the action of sea-water was begun by Messrs. Dussaud in 1865. Details of this process are given in 'Ali Pasha Mubārak's Kitāb (x. 38–40). These stones weighed about 22 tons each and were used both for the construction of the two huge breakwaters of the outer harbour and for the creation of further building ground. In the same year, mail boats sailed up the Canal to Ismāʿīliya while others brought imports to Port Sa'd. In 1868 the breakwaters were finished, and in 1869 the Canal was completed. As a result,
the town was thronged by consuls and representatives of many nations, and the population reached 10,000.

Like most Eastern foundations of this period, Port Sa'id was from the beginning markedly divided into Egyptian and Turkish quarters. The town has grown up in the west and south-west around the mosque, officially inaugurated on Friday 14th Sha'bân 1300 (1883); and the second is situated near the Canal entrance and the beach towards the north and north-east. A regular water-supply now comes from the Nile by the Ismâ'îliya Canal and the pipes leading to a large reservoir (château d'eau) capable of holding several days' supply. The rapid growth of the town may be illustrated by the increase of its population, numbering 49,884 in 1907.

The town quickly rose to eminence as an emporium of Egyptian trade — second only to Alexandria in that country, and it also became one of the most important stations for sea-borne traffic between the East and the West. Its outer harbour, covering an area of 570 acres, its two moles or breakwaters built in such a way as to protect the Canal from the continuous onrush of sea-water and sand-drifts, and its docks numbering originally 30 on the western bank, all had to be extended. A large floating dock (259 ft. long, 85 ft. wide and 18 ft. deep, with a lifting capacity of 3,500 tons) was constructed; and, further, in the years 1903—1909, new docks were established on the eastern bank. To accommodate the workmen on these docks, the new town of Port Fu'âd, named after the present King of Egypt, has sprung up on the east side.

To safeguard the ships approaching the Canal by night, the Khedive Ismâ'îl ordered four lighthouses to be erected at the expense of the Egyptian Government at Rosetta, Burullûs, Burjî el-Îzba near Damietta, and Port Sa'id. The last is 174 ft. high and its beam is distinct from those of the other three and is visible at a distance of 20 miles. It lies at the base of the western mole which, at its seaward extremity, carries a colossal statue of Ferdinand de Lesseps by E. Fernier, unveiled in 1899.

Among the notable buildings of Port Sa'id are the offices of the Suez Canal Company. The town has a very cosmopolitan population and is noted for no special industry. Small dealers live on the sale of Oriental wares and curios to tourists on their passage to the East or to the West.

Bibliography: The chief contemporary source is 'Ali Pasha Mubârak: al-Khaulat al-Ta'wîfiyya, 20 vols., Cairo (Bûlûk) 1305—1306. — See also 1. publications on the Suez Canal and its history; 2. the annual Ta'kâms, Annuaire statistiques et the Trade Returns issued by the Egyptian Government and the Suez Canal Company; 3. guides to Egypt such as Besedeker's, Murray's (ed. Mary Brodick) and Cook's (ed. Sir E. A. Wallis Budge). (A. S. ATIVA)

POTIFAR. [See KITFIR.]

POZAREVAC (pronounced Pôzhârevatz; in the French orthography Pojarévât; Passarovitza is a corruption like the Turkish Pasarofça), a rising commercial town in Yugoslavia (in the Danube banate), headquarters of the district of the same name in the fertile plain between Morava and Mlava, only 10 miles from the Danube port of Dubrava with 13,731 inhabitants (1930).

The town, the name of which is popularly connected with the Serbo-Croat word pôžar ("fire") (M. D. Milicević, Književna Srbija, Belgrade 1876, p. 172 and 1058), is first mentioned towards the end of the 17th century. It must however have been previously in existence and have been Turkish like the surrounding country in 1459. According to the Turkish treasury registers of Hungary of 1565 (A. Velic, Magyarországi török köztársaság, Budapest 1890, p. 734), Pôzârevac belonged to the Turkish sandjak of Semendre (Semendria, Smederevo), and in the middle of the 17th century Hâddîji Khalîfa describes it as the seat of a judge (bâbî, cf. Spomenik, xviii, Belgrad 1892, col. 26). Towards the end of the century many Serbs migrated from Pôzârevac and at the beginning of the 18th century it is sometimes mentioned as a village.

Pôzârevac was however destined soon to become famous through the peace which ended the Austro-Turkish war of 1710—1718. At the end of 1714 Turkey had already, declared war on Venice on the pretext that the peace of Carlowitz was not being observed and in 1715 occupied Morea and some of the Ionian Islands, Austria, which at first intervened to negotiate as an ally of Venice, in 1716 entered the war herself and her armies led by Prince Eugene won three great victories, at Peterwardein, Temesvár and Belgrad, so that England intervened to secure peace. After long preparations (cf. von Hammer, G. O. R. 2, iv. 159—164) the congress of Pôzârevac was convoked. The negotiations at which the plenipotentiaries of Turkey, Austria, Venice with England and Holland as mediators took part began on June 5, 1718 and the Treaty was signed on the 21st July.

Peace was concluded on a basis of the country actually held by the opponents at the time (uti possidetis): Austria retained the eastern part of Sirmia, the banate with Temesvár, the whole of N.E. Serbia, with Belgrad, Pôzârevac etc. and Little Wallachia; Venice also retained a few places she had taken on the Dalmatian and Albanian coasts, received certain commercial preferences and the island of Cerigo (Turkish Kişçö) and had to restore to Turkey the whole of the peninsula of the Morea and the south-eastern districts of the Herzegovina. By a commercial agreement which was also concluded in Pôzârevac on July 27 Austria secured certain trading and other privileges in the Ottoman Empire.

Following the traditional formalities observed after the conclusion of a treaty of peace the first Turkish plenipotentiary Ibrahim Pasha went to Vienna with his retinue and Count Wirmont, the Austrian representative in the negotiations, to Constantinople. A member of the Turkish embassy wrote in 1726 an interesting account which has been published by Fr. van Kralitz in text and translation (Bericht über den Zug des Gross-Botschafters Ibrahim Pasha nach Wien im Jahre 1725, in S.B. Ak. Writ., vol. 158 [1908]; in T.O. E.M., v. ii, [1832—1916], 211—227, the Turkish text of this edition was reprinted by A. Reifka.)

During the Austrian occupation (1718—1739) Pôzârevac was the most important place in this territory. In the Serbian war of independence against Turkey it was besieged for a long period, and had finally to surrender to the Serbs (1804). In 1813, the town again fell into Turkish hands but became Serbian again in 1815.
In the years of peace that followed (1815—1915) Požarevac developed. Prince Miloš in 1825 made it his second residence and had two konaks (palaces) built there. Shortly afterwards a Prussian officer visited the town and left interesting notes on the conditions there (Otto v. Pirch, Reise in Serbien im Spätherbst 1829, Berlin 1830, part i., p. 119—171). In the second half of the sixteenth century the population increased steadily but otherwise the town offered "little of interest" (F. Kanit, Serbia, Leipzig 1868, p. 13).

At the beginning of the sixteenth century Požarevac was one of the most important towns in Serbia. In the Great War it was occupied by the Germans in 1914 and by the Bulgarians (from Oct. 1916) but in the autumn of 1918 it was again occupied by the Serbs. Since then it has belonged to Yugoslavia.

Bibliography: (In addition to the references in the text) V. Bianchi [the Venetian pleni- potentiary at the peace negotiations], Istoria relazione della pace di Passovia, Padua 1719; Abū al-Raḥmān Shārāf, Turāḥi-Develi-ethmānīye, ii. (1312 = 1894), 140—147; G. Noradunjan, Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'empire ottom- an, vol. i. (Paris 1897), p. 61—62 (No. 308 and 309), 208—216 (Latin text of the treaty of peace with Austria) and 216—220 (French résumé of it); Drag. M. Pavlović, Požarevčki mir (1718, g.), in Letopis matice srpske, Novi Sad 1901, part 207, p. 26—47, and part 208, p. 45—80 (good historical study on the peace of Požarevac); V. Popović, in Narodna enciklo- pedija, vol. iii. (Zagreb 1928), p. 428; Almanah kraljevine Jugoslavije, Zagreb 1930, i. 561; M. A. Purković, Požarevac, Požarevac 1934 (first attempt at a monograph on the town and its history).

PRANG SABIL, the name of the dhīhād [q. v.] in the East Indian archipelago; prang (Indon.) = war.

The course of history has made it impossible for Muslims to fulfill their duties with respect to the dhīhād. The representatives of the law however still teach and the masses readily believe that arms should only be allowed to rest against the kāfr so long as any success must be despaired of. In a Muslim country under non-Muslim rule, like the Netherlands Indies the teachers however prefer to be silent. At most they say that under the prevailing conditions there is no legal inducement to conduct the dhīhād in view of the superior forces and the comparative freedom enjoyed by believers. Or on the other hand, they expound particularly those texts which remove the more serious feuds between Muslim and kāfr to the next world. — When political events, cata- strophes, misfortunes of any kind result in disturbances, it is not at all uncommon for the Muslim population of the East Indian Archipelago to look at these things from a religious point of view. It may happen on such an occasion that the feeling of being bound to fight the unbeliever is aroused again. If the leaders utter the war-cry "prang sabil", it finds a ready answer. It is true that according to the law, the signal for the dhīhād should be given by the imām. There is now no imām; but even in the time when the sultān of Turkey was still recognised as imām any misgivings were easily overcome if the imām remained inactive. Outside the boundaries of the territory in which the holy war is proclaimed, the silent sympathy of the believers is with the fighters. Any forcible conversion which takes place, anywhere in the Archipelago is generally praised by Muslim chiefs and represented as a fulfillment of the more solid obligations of the dhīhād.

This practical teaching of the prang sabil was of particular importance in Atjeh in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Circumstances were very much in its favour. The Atjehese were a self-satisfied people, convinced of their own superiority and also of a warlike disposition. Non-Muslims were everywhere hated or at least despised. At the same time those individuals who were in any way connected with divine worship were held in great honour. These qualities were however not in themselves sufficient to conduct a prang sabil with success against a disciplined attacking power. A military leader was necessary. There was indeed a sultān in Atjeh but he was a negligible factor as regards the situation in the country. The chiefs, the real rulers of the land, preferred to confine themselves to their own territory; they were not fitted for co-operation. Bands of armed men ravaged the country doing the kāfr as much damage as possible but they could raise no claim for general co-operation and assistance as they were not waging war in the way Allah had willed. The law lays down the sources from which the costs of the dhīhād can be met; pillage and plundering, as was the practice of these bands, could never be blessed by Allah. In addition the organisation of these bands was such that they never held together long. In these circumstances it was the 'ulama' (also used as a singular) who took in hand the organisation of the war; among these the most prominent were the 'ulama' of Tiro, from olden times a centre of study of sacred lore. They reproached the chiefs with their sloth- fulness and the people with preferring worldly advantages to heavenly rewards. Going up and down the country they preached the doctrine of the dhīhād and there was no one who could openly oppose them; indeed they represented the divine law. In order to be able to wage war a war-chest was needed. The 'ulama' claimed the share of the zakāt set aside for Allah's purpose, the 'ulama' of Tiro in particular used it to train a strong force of duly converted recruits. The 'ulama' were for a long time the soul of the war. It is however clear that the authority which they had gained over the secular rulers could only last so long as they were able to inspire the people to continue fighting. When the war was over, they returned to their old still very influential position as representatives of the holy law. — Various writings which together form a regular war literature, proved an effective means of inspiring their warriors with enthusiasm. They were an accompanying feature of the prang sabil. 'Ulama' wrote pamphlets and tractates in which attention was called to the duty of waging the holy war; emphasis was laid on the heavenly reward that awaited the shahid, and the kāfr to be overcome were painted in the blackest colours. An elaborate poem, the Hikayat Prang sabil(s), of which there were many versions, was specially intended to be declaimed in order to increase the courage and contempt for death of those who heard it.

Bibliography: C. Snouck Hurgronje, De Atjehers, Batavia 1893—1894, i. 183 sqq.; ii.

PUL (FULBE), a West African tribe, originally pastoral nomads, now to a large extent settled and agricultural. Fulbe, their name for themselves, is the plural of Pulo; they are called Fulani by the Hausa, Felata by the Kanuri, and by French writers Peul. Their language is called by themselves Fulfulde.

They appear to have come in from the northeast, perhaps ultimately from Fezzân, but their lines of migration in more recent times have rather been from west to east. Migeod, in 1923, found them in what is now the British Mandated Territory of Camerouns, which they had penetrated during the lifetime of persons whom he met. Their main centres of distribution are Futadjallon in French Guiana and Massina in Haut-Sénégal-Niger.

Ethnographically, though various theories have been advanced, they are now accepted as Hamitic by race. Meek (vol. i, p. 94) points out that they have a strong resemblance to the Proto-Egyptians. Delafosse was disposed to class them as hybrids between some mysterious Beni-Israel (not yet satisfactorily accounted for) and the tribe or tribes whom they found already in occupation: according to one account, the Tek气氛 (now the Toucouleur [q. v.]), Frobenius (Op. cit., p. 165) says they migrated to the S. W. from Fezzân in order to escape the oppression of the “Garai”, identified by himself and others with the Garamantes of Herodotus. He finds them spoken of in Soninke tradition under the name Bororo (still retained by the Nomad Fulbe in Adamawa at the time of Passarge’s visit in 1893) or Borowgo, as a despised subject race. He finds no originality in the legends collected from their “singing men” (mabube), but holds that, so soon as they become independent they adopted the traditions of their former overlords. In passing, it may be remarked that Frobenius in 1915 expressed a hope when he says (1915): “Schon Barth identifizierte sie mit den Leucaethopien”.

Barth’s own words are (ii. 505): “Darum aber mochte ich sie nicht (!) fur die Leucaethopien der Alten halten.” Barth’s own view is that they are half-way between a mixed Arabo-Berber and a pure negro stock. His reference, in the same passage, to indications of a connection between their language and that of the “Kaffer Sudafrika” is must be based on the existence of noun-classes in both, a fact which will be dealt with in a later paragraph.

Meek, after considering various hypotheses, comes to the conclusion (i. 98), that “the Fulani are probably a very ancient Libyan tribe whose original home was Egypt or Asia.” He considers the nomad Fulbe as the purest representatives of the Hamitic element in Nigeria (i. 26).

Their physical characteristics are perhaps best summed up in the following quotation from Meek (i. 26), which agrees in the main with the accounts of Mungo Park, Barth, Nachtigal, Passarge and other travellers:

*Their colour varies from a light to a reddish brown*; — Passarge says “heirlößlich gelb” —
*their physique is slender and sinewy, and sometimes even effeminate; the face oval, the lips thin, the head dolichocephalic, the forehead rather receding towards the temple, the nose straight or even pouting, and often slightly rounded at the tip. There is little or no prognathism; the hair is ringlety and often straight…” On his chin a man wears a scrappy tuft of beard. The eyes are almond-shaped and overhung by long black silken lashes. The beauty of countenance and graceful carriage of Fulani women are well known. In character the Fulá is distrustful and shy, shrewd and artful. No African native can equal him for dissimulation and finesse”.

This estimate coincides on the whole with that of the observers previously mentioned. Passarge calls them “eine ritterliche Nation”, in the sense that they despise both manual labour and trade, regarding war, the chase and the care of cattle as the only occupations worthy of a man. They have more dignity and force of character than the negro; at the same time, “traue ich dem Fulla (sie) mehr überlegte Hinterlist zu. Er ist der grösste Charakter, aber auch im gegebenen Moment der grössere Schurke”. Barth, also, says (ii. 505): “Die liebenswürdige Seite im Charakter der Fulbe ist ihre Einsicht und ihre Lehnhaftigkeit, während sie andererseits einen ausserordentlichen natürlichen Hang zur Bosheit haben und bei weitem nicht so gutmütig sind wie die eigentlichen Schwarzen”.

Passarge describes them as “fanatical in religion”, but, as the nomad Fulbe are still, at any rate to some extent, pagan (Meek, i. 200 and elsewhere), this must refer to the settled Fulbe, called by the Hausa Fulanin Gidda, who would seem to have been converted to Islam, like the other tribes of Nigeria, about the eleventh century (Meek, ii. 1—11). Those settled Fulbe are “by free inter-marriage and wholesale concubinage with the races whom they have conquered, fast being absorbed by the negro. Their noses are broadening, their lips are thickening, their hair is curling, their build is coarsening, and the prophallosmouth of the Negro type is beginning to appear. While they have profoundly modified the Negro type of those with whom they have settled, this modification must, in the absence of fresh infusions of Fulani blood, tend rapidly to disappear… they do not intermarry with the nomad pagan Fulani” (Meek, i. 28).

According to Labouruet, nomad Fulbe are scattered over the country in small colonies “généralement installées à côté des villages sédentaires pour en garder les troupeaux”. They supply the settled population with dairy products: Fulbe women selling milk and butter are a familiar sight to travellers.

The Fulbe reached the Upper Senegal region about 1500 A.D., when the Ghana empire was at the height of its power. About 1400, a section of the tribe, coming from Termes in the north-west, established themselves in Masina, under chiefs of the Djallo family. This kingdom was conquered by Askia Omar, the Songhai chief, in 1494. About the same time or not much later, a Pulo chief (arabs) named Tengaella revolted against Omar, but was killed in 1512. His son, Koli, set up an independent pagan kingdom in Badiar, on the Upper Gambia, and his descendants, known as the Deniânke dynasty, remained in power from 1559 to 1776.

The Fulbe entered Bornu during the xvith century and, as they had done elsewhere, gradually penetrated
the country in the guise of inoffensive herdsmen, until, watching their opportunity, "by a sudden coup, they made themselves its political masters" (Meek). Towards the end of the xviii century, Shehu Usman dan Fodio (born 1754) initiated a religious revival which ended in the conquest of Northern Nigeria. Usman established his capital at Sokoto (built by his son Belo in 1810) and before his death in 1817 was acknowledged as Sarkin Musulmi or spiritual head of the Muslims within his empire. He was succeeded by his son Belo, the "Sultan Belo" visited by Denham, Clapperton and Oudney in 1821. He had his capital at Sokoto and later at Warno, while his uncle Abdulahi ruled at Gando.

Meanwhile, in the west, a Pulo marabout, Seku Hamadu, had converted the Masina Fulbe to Islam about 1810. seized Djenne and even (1826) made himself master of Timbuktu; but the dominion founded by him was short-lived, his grandson being overthrown by al-Hajj Omar in 1862. Before this, in 1776, the Muslim Tekron, in Futa Toro, had revolted against the Fulbe Denianke and established a "theocratic elective monarchy" (Delafosse) which lasted till the French annexation in 1881. - Omar, at the head of another section of the Tekron, had conquered the local Fulbe and continued to give trouble to the French authorities till his death in 1864 (Delafosse).

The settled Fulbe do not differ greatly in customs from other Islamized tribes, though even these appear to retain some traces of their pagan ancestry. Animal tabus, which may or may not be connected with totemism, are observed by some Muslim families (Meek, i. 174); apparently Hausa are meant, but it would seem as if the statement were intended to include at least one "Fulani Muslim sub-tribe". Moreover, when Muhammad al-Tunsi says (Meek, i. 99): "In Sudan it is related that they descend from a chameleon", this, so far from being "a fable invented for the purpose of contempt" may reflect a real totemic belief.

One system of casts, otherwise unknown in Negro and Bantu Africa is common to the Fulbe, Wolof, Malinke, Marka and Bamana, with this difference that, with the Fulbe, the "casts" originated in tribal distinctions ("werden durch bestimmte Völker gebildet"); Frobenius, p. 166), and therefore are rigid, whereas, among the Mande, "werden die Kasten durch Sippen gebildet, die in ihrer Kastenzugehörigkeit schwanken". The casts of the Fulbe are:

- **Nobles**: Rimbe (plural of Dinu)
- **Serfs**: Rimaibe
- **Traders and Herdsmen**: Diawanke
- **Singers and Weavers**: Mabube
- **Leather-workers**: Sakebe (elsewhere Gargassabe)
- **Wood-workers**: Laobe (elsewhere Sekeabe)
- **Smiths**: Wailbe (plural of Baulu)

It is noteworthy that the Fulbe, unlike the other tribes mentioned, did not recognise a separate class of slaves. The serfs (called "Horige" by Frobenius) were the descendants of the Rimbe by captive women. The wood-workers' and traders' casts are peculiar to the Fulbe; the rest are common to all the other tribes.

In contrast to the Galla, Somali and other pastoral Hamitic tribes, the Fulbe do not seem to have any special customs or ritual connected with milk. They keep two distinctive breeds of cattle, one or both of which they are believed to have brought with them in their southward migration. Some particulars concerning their cattle are given by Meek (i. 115—118).

The Fulfulde language was long thought to be absolutely unique. If Barth found in it "Andeutungen eines Zusammenhanges dieses Stammes mit den Kaffern Südafrikas", he must have had in mind the system of noun-classes, which, in some respects, resembles that of the Bantu speech-family, though both more complete and more logical than the latter. F. Müller placed the language in a class by itself, forming one division of the "Nuba-Fulah group", for which he could discover no other affinities. A. W. Schleicher (1891) attempted to connect it with Somali, relying chiefly on verbal coincidences, entirely disregarding the system of noun-classes, and admitting that one important grammatical feature of Fulfulde is not to be found in Somali. In so far as he classifies the language as Hamitic, he is partly in agreement with Meinhold, who, somewhat later, came to the conclusion that it represents a pre-Hamitic stratum, from which were developed, on the one hand, the Hamitic languages as known to-day (Shilha, Saho, Galla, etc.) and on the other, the Bantu family.

In addition to the class-system already mentioned (in which the plural is formed by a change, not, as in Bantu, of prefix, but of suffix), Fulfulde exhibits a remarkable cross-division into a. human and non-human; b. large objects and small objects. Here, the plurals are formed by a change of initial consonant according to certain fixed rules summed up by Meinhold as the Law of Polarity. From this latter classification, Meinhold worked out a hypothesis as to the origin of grammatical gender, which has much to commend it. This is set forth in his *Sprachen der Hamiten* (1912). More recently, however, he has found reason to modify his view of Bantu origins, and considers it at least possible that the class-system is not a primitive feature in Fulfulde, but might have been taken over from some Bantu or "Semi-Bantu" language (Westermann prefers the term "Klassensprachen" for the latter and would extend it to include those languages that have been enumerated in H. H. Johnston's *Comparative Study*). It has also emerged that Fulfulde is less of an isolated phenomenon than had at first appeared. It has points of contact with Serer and other adjacent languages, and in particular, with the little-known Biafada of Portuguese Guinea, studied by G. A. Krause as long ago as 1895. Two important essays by A. Klingenheben in *Ztschr. f. Eingeborenen- 
sprachen, 1923—1924 and 1924—1925 are calculated to shed new light on a complicated problem. Fulfulde, like Hausa, possesses a written literature, for which the form of Arabic script, locally known as *ajemi* (Ar. 'adjami), has been used, probably, since the introduction of Islam. This script has peculiarities which cause it to differ markedly from that in use by the Swahili.

Some excellent facsimiles are to be found in Captain F. W. Taylor's *Fulani-Hausa Readings*.


PUÑA, a city and district of British India in the Central Division of the Bombay Presidency. The district has an area of 5,332 square miles and a population of 1,169,798 of whom 54,997 are Muslims (Census Report, 1931) It was included in the powerful Andhra kingdom of the Dakhan which came to an end about the middle of the third century A.D. The available evidence also points to the fact that later the Western Câlukyas, the Rashtrakutas, and the Deogiri Yadavas ruled over this area. With the Khalâjî and Tughluk [see MUHAMMAD TUGHLUQ] invasions of the Dakhan it came under Muslim control. An interesting account of Puña when it formed part of the Bahman kingdom has been recorded by the Russian traveler Athanasius Nikitin (1468-1474), who appears to have been the first foreign traveller whose impressions have been preserved for us since the visit of the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-hien, in the beginning of the fifth century A.D. (R. H. Major, India in the Fifteenth Century, Hakluyt Society). Puña remained under Muslim rule until the growth of Marâthâ power in the latter half of Arawangâ's reign. The district is therefore associated with the beginnings of Marâthâ history and closely connected with the career of Shiwâdji. Under the Pishwâs [q. v.] it became the centre of Marâthâ power until the British conquest in the early nineteenth century.

Puña city, which is situated at the confluence of the Mu[hâ] and Mula rivers, has a total population of 250,825, of whom 28,925 are Muhâmâdans (Census Report, 1931). When but a village it was included in the jâgir of Mâlôdji Bhonji, the grandfather of Shiwâdji. Later, Shiwâdji finding Puña too exposed transferred his capital to Râiggâd where his coronation took place. Puña was the scene of his daring attack upon Shâyista Khân. With the growth of the power of the Pishwâs Puña once more became the capital and centre of the Marâthâ kingdom. The fortified palace of the Pishwâs, known as the Shânavâri, was destroyed by fire in 1827. It was at Puña in the year 1885 that the first meeting of the Indian National Congress took place.


PUST or POST (P), skin; Turkish: póstak; a tanned sheepskin, used as the ceremonial seat or throne of a pîr or shâkh of a dervîsh order. The head, sides and foot had mystical significances ascribed to them. It corresponds to the Arabic bâšt. According to Ewliyâ Celebi (Stambol, i. 495), the murid, after passing the test by the pîr, is called shâkh pust. On ceremonial occasions amongst the bâktaši order, the hall or convent was set out with twelve pûsts of white sheepskin in remembrance of the twelve imâms.


PUWASA (Skr. ४४४६४४४४४), in the East Indian Archipelago the name for the month of Ramadâân and for fasting in this month or at other times. The Arabic names however are not unknown. Fasting is in Indonesia generally a favourite pious practice not only on the days prescribed or recommended by law but also as a means of attaining a desired end. The observation of the fast in Ramadân is here as elsewhere
regarded as the most important of the pillars of Islam; here also we find the popular belief prevailing that it can atone for the sins of the whole year. Not all however continue the fast to the end of the month; if any one finds it difficult he satisfies his conscience by fasting on the first and last days of the month. Nevertheless, such people as even those who do not fast at all have the same elevated sentiment which fills all and which stamps Ramadān as the Muhammadan month like no other. Students, merchants, all whose business takes them away from home endeavour to spend this month at least in the family circle. In many districts the approach of puwasa is remarkable for the increase of slaughtering in the last days of the preceding month. The meat is preserved for use; meals in puwasa are somewhat heavier than usual in order to strengthen for the strain of fasting. The markets are also more animated towards the end of the month; this is the time to make purchases in view of the approaching end of the fast. The beginning of the month is publicly notified; e.g. the drums which form part of the equipment of the houses of prayer are beaten in a special way. The beating of the drums is repeated throughout the whole month at particular times of day, especially after sunset and shortly after midnight in order to warn the faithful that the time for eating is nearly over so that they can prepare the morning meal (Ar. ṣalāḥ). Finally at the end of the month when the period of abstinence is over, the drums are beaten with particular vigour. The ascertainment of the end and beginning of Ramadān usually leads to friction every year. Those who are free-thinkers in religious matters use the calendar and do not hesitate to announce the end of the fast in advance; all who demand that the law should be strictly followed and these include the modernists, stick to ṣaʿāda (evidence of the senses). The tawāzuh (Ar. tarāzūl) service is held in the public houses of prayer immediately after the ṣaʿāda; it is also eagerly attended by people who on other occasions do not observe the legal obligations of religion. The lack of seriousness and the unifying conduct of many participants induces the devout to avoid this tawāzuh service and to observe it elsewhere with a small company of similarly minded people. It is worst in Atjeh; the tawāzuh service here is simply a caricature (Snouck Hurgronje). A special importance is usually attached to the last five odd nights of the month devoted to religious exercises in connection with the ṣalat al-khudār. They are not agreed as to which of these nights is most probably the correct one; but 25th and 27th are preferred but the practice varies in different localities. Part of the ceremonies of the observation of these nights consists in having illuminations in front of the dwelling-houses. In Java special emphasis is laid on the eating of meals together. Every one, if he can at all do it, gives a religious feast every evening. Later they go round their friends; open house is generally kept and time spent in rejoicing until far into the night. Besides these private entertainments there are meals of an official nature. The people of the village come to the house of the village headman to a religious feast; every one brings his share. The higher officials, especially the administrative officials, give a feast to their subordinates. The most splendid observance of these five nights however is found in the palaces of the Javanese princes. According to ancient custom, these feasts took place in great splendour after sunset; the broad forecourts of the palaces give an excellent opportunity for them. These feasts known as maʿālūman, with which many legends are associated, follow one another in a hierarchical succession. First the prince has his on the 25th; next come the crown-prince, the princes of the blood, the governors and ministers; the dishes are intended for the host's subordinates. In recent years these maʿālūman have become restricted so that only the first of them retains its official character. The "little" feast is a day of rejoicing far surpassing the "great" feast. After the fitra has been performed on the last day of Ramadān or even earlier and ablations have been taken with special care, in which the Javanese sometimes includes his cattle, a feast is prepared in the house in the evening after the breaking of the fast. The more devout make a modest meal precede this within the month of the fast to take farewell of the spirits of the deceased who wander about during Ramadān and now return to their abodes. The ceremonial feast on the last Shawwāl is little observed in Atjeh but is a great ceremony in other places; there is no ṣalāt in the whole year which is better attended; many, who otherwise never enter a mosque never fail to be present on this occasion. In Java the regents, the highest native government officials accompanied by the whole of the staff of the regency, all in full dress go in the early morning before sunrise from the regent's house to the mosque in order to take part in the ṣalāt there. After the end of the ṣalāt they return in the same way. The regent then receives the homage of all. The same custom prevails in the southern Celebes; except that here the native princes take the place of the regents. On this day the young people let off fire-works. After the ceremonial ṣalāt people set out in new clothes to visit relations and friends; congratulations are given or the successful conclusion of the fast and pardon is asked for any sins committed deliberately or involuntarily in the past year. It is a widespread custom to visit on this day the tombs of ancestors which have previously been cleaned, and there to spend some time scattering flowers and incense in pious devotion. In Java again we have the custom for the higher officials to treat their subordinates to what are called "mountains of food" (dishes of all kinds arranged in artistic forms). In the native states, at the end of the fast, one of the three public holidays is observed, the essential feature of which is the public representation of the unity of the kingdom in the person of the prince. The three feasts are on the 23rd, 25th and 27th of Ramadān. The prince appears in oriental splendour and shows himself in the outer court of the palace before the assembled people. Large supplies of food have already been prepared in the royal kitchens and are ceremonially piled up into mountains of food of exactly defined form and preparation. These "mountains" which are so large that it takes several persons to carry one, are carried to the place of audience as soon as the prince has taken his seat and at his command taken on to the mosque. Here the food is distributed after the chief supervisor of the mosque has offered a prayer for prince and country. On account of the blessing associated with it it is lucky to get any of the food. The six days' fast in Shawwāl recommended by law is only observed
by a few very pious people; a minor festival is observed on the 8th of the month to mark its conclusion.


(R. A. Kern)

QUETTA (Pashtu: Kwatta), a toshgil and town in the Quetta-Pishin district of British Baluchistan [q. v.]. The district, which contains the toshgils of Quetta and Pishin and the administrative sub-division of Chaman, has an area of 4,806 square miles and a population of 147,541, of whom 197,415 are Muslims. Nearly all these Muslims are Pashtu speaking Puthans, only a very small minority speaking Brahui and Baluchi. The district, which is very mountainous, is bounded on the north-west by Afghan territory, on the east by the Zhob and Sibi districts, and on the south by the Baluchistan Pass district and the Sarawan division of Kalat.

The toshgil of Quetta, which is held on lease from the Khan of Kalat, has an area of 548 square miles and a population of 76,649. The town of Quetta was destroyed by earthquake in 1935. In 1931 it had a population of 60,272, of whom 25,391 lived in the cantonment (Census of India, 1931, vol. iv., Baluchistan).

Until the middle of the eighteenth century, when Quetta finally came under Brahui control, the history of Quetta-Pishin is probably identical with that of Kandahar [for early history see the art. BALUCHISTAN and KANDAHAR]. Quetta was temporarily occupied by the British during the First Afghan War, 1839-1842 (see W. Hough, A Narrative of the march and operations of the army of the Indus in the expedition into Afghanistan, 1840). Its strategic importance was first recognized by General John Jacob who urged Lord Canning, in 1856, to garrison this important point of vantage (Views and Opinions of General John Jacob, ed. Pelly, p. 349). The proposal was rejected on the grounds that, surrounded by hostile tribes and cut off from its true base, the isolated position of the garrison would be extremely precarious. Ten years later, Sir Henry Green, the Political Superintendent of Upper Sind, seeking to improve the British scheme of frontier defence, proposed that Quetta should be garrisoned and connected by rail with Karakul. Unfortunately for those who desired an advance into Baluchistan the proposal had to face the united opposition of Lord Lawrence and his Council, all of whom were champions of non-intervention. Ten years passed. The exponents of "military inactivity" were no longer predominant in the Viceroys council chamber; Khiwa [see KHIWA] had fallen before the Russians, who were drawing nearer and nearer to the gates of India; and, more dangerous still, the estrangement of Sir Ali had brought the Amir of Afghanistan and the Government of India to the brink of war. It was therefore decided, in 1876, to occupy Quetta. The British right to despatch troops into Kalat territory had been recognized by the treaty of 1854 (Aitchison, xi. 212-213). Chiefly owing to the efforts of Major (afterwards Sir Robert) Sandeman, this treaty was renewed and supplemented on December 8, 1876, by the Treaty of Jacobabad (Parl. Papers, 1877, lxiv., c. 1808, p. 314-316). In return for an increased subsidy the Khan granted permission for the location of troops in, and the construction of railways and telegraph lines through, Kalat territory. This was followed by the formation of the Baluchistan Agency, for on February 21, 1877, Sandeman was appointed Agent to the Governor-General with his headquarters at Quetta.

The strategical importance of Quetta is now almost universally recognized. Protected on the south-west by the lofty Chiltan range and on the north-east by the Zar Qen plateau, it dominates all the southern approaches to the Indus valley.


(C. Collin Davies)
RĀ, tenth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 200. For its paleographical evolution see the article ARABIA, plate i. It belongs to the group of the liquids and is frequently interchanged with ḥ and n. It regularly corresponds to the r of other Semitic languages. It is not guttural but lingual.


(A. J. Wessinck)

RĀBĀB, the generic name in Arabic for the violin, or any stringed instrument played with a bow (kaww). The origin of the name has been variously explained: a. from the Hebrew lābab (lād r being interchangeable); b. from the Persian rubāb (rāwāwāwā), which was played with the fingers or plectrum; and c. from the Arabic rabāb (to collect, arrange, assemble together). The first derivation is scarcely feasible. The second has a rasion d’être, although the mere similarity in name must not be accepted without question. In spite of the oft repeated statement that the Arabs admit that they borrowed the rabāb from the Persians, together with the word kamūn for the bow, there is not the slightest evidence for it. No Arabic author (so far as the present writer knows) makes an admission of this kind, nor have the Arabs adopted the word kamūn for their bow, their own term kaww having been considered sufficient. It is true that we read in the Maṣūḥ al-Ujm (xth century) that “the rabāb is well-known to the people of Persia and Khūrāsān” (237), but this author was writing in hither Persia, and we know from al-Fārābī that the rabāb was also well-known in Arabic lands. One argument against the alleged borrowing from Persia is that the rubāb with the Persians has ever been a plucked and not a bowed instrument. Still, the Arabs may have borrowed the plucked instrument and adapted it to the bow. On the other hand, the Arabic root rabha as the patent of the word rubāb has much in its favour. As the Arabic musical accousticians point out, plucked instruments such as the ʿūd (lute), ʿumbūr (pandore), etc. gave short (manṣuk) sounds, but bowed instruments such as the rabāb gave long or sustained (manṣuq) sounds. It was application of the bow which “collected, arranged, or assembled” the short notes into one sustained note, hence the term rabāb being applied to the violin (see Farmer, Stud., i. 99).

The rabāb is mentioned as early as the Arabic polygraph al-Dābiq (d. 685) in his Maqāmāt al-Raṣūl. Yet we cannot be sure whether this was the bowed rabāb or the plucked rubāb. At any rate, it already had a legendary history when he wrote. According to the Kašf al-Hamīm (xvth–xvith century) it is first found in the hands of a woman of the Banū Tayl (fol. 263). Turkish tradition ascribed its “invention” to a certain ʿAbd Allah Fārābī (Ewliyā Celebi, Siyāhat-nāme, i/ii. 226, 234). An Andalusian legend places its invention within the Iberian peninsula (Delphin and Guin, Notes sur la poésie et la musique arabes, p. 59). One thing is certain even if we have iconographic evidence of the violin in the viiith or ixth century (cf. infra), the earliest literary evidence of the use of the bow comes from Arabic sources, i.e. from al-Fārābī (d. 950), the Ikhwān al-Safā (xth century), Ibn Sinā (d. 1037), and Ibn Zaīlī (d. 1048), as I have fully demonstrated elsewhere (Stud., i. 101–105).

Seven different forms of viol are known to Islāmic peoples, viz.: 1. The Rectangular Viol, 2. the Circular Viol, 3. the Boat Shape Viol, 4. the Pear Shape Viol, 5. the Hemispherical Viol, 6. the Pandore Viol, and 7. the Open Chest Viol.

1. The Rectangular Viol. This consists of a wooden frame, more or less rectangular, over the face (wāṣf) and back (ṣahr) of which is stretched a membrane (djīla). The neck (ṣīnāk) is cylindrical and is of wood, whilst the foot (riḍf) is of iron. It has either one or two strings (astūr), generally of horsehair. Al-Khallīl (d. 791) says that “the ancient Arabs sang their poems to its [the rabāb’s] voice [or sound]” (Farmer, Stud., i. 100). In the Kašf al-Hamīm (fol. 267) we read that it was used to accompany the pre-Islāmic ḥaṣīda and the elegiac poēm. Probably the pre-Islāmic rabāb was of this rectangular form. Lane (Lexicon, p. 1005) held this latter view. Ibn Ghaibī (d. 1435) [q.v.] describes this viol of the bedouin as rectangular (murābāb) and with a membrane face and back and one string of horsehair (fol. 78v). Niebuhr (l. 144) says that it was still called the murābāb in the xvith century. We certainly have a rectangular instrument shown in the frescoes of Kuṣār ‘Amra (Musil, pl. xxxiv), but it is played with the fingers and not with a bow. Yet even in modern times the rabāb of the desert was to be found played in this way as well as with a bow (Crichton, ii. 380; Burckhardt, Bedouins, p. 43; do., Travels in, i. 389; Burton, Personal Narrative, iii. 76). Niebuhr (Tab. xxvi, F) delineates a rectangular viol of two strings, although he says that he saw a viol of one string in Cairo. Villette (722–724: 913–918) distinguishes between the two instruments. In Egypt, he says, the rabāb al-ṣāfīr (poet’s viol) had one string, whilst the rabāb al-mughamānī (singer’s viol) had two strings. Lane (Med. Egypt., chaps. xviii, xxii) also describes them. These instruments never form part of a concert orchestra, being relegated to the folk. For other delineations of the instrument see Félix (Hist., ii. 145), Engel
2. The Circular Viol. The modern instrument of this form consists of a circular wooden frame or pan, the face, and sometimes the back, being covered with a membrane. There is no foot. There is no special reference to this form in Arabic literature nor is there any definite iconographic evidence of it earlier than the xvith century when it is described and delineated by Niebuhr (i. 144; Tab. xxvi, G) who found it at Baṣra. It had but one string. It is still found among the folk of Palestine (Sachse, p. 30, 40, Tab. 3, 17) and the Maghrib (Chottin, p. 50) where it is still known as the rabāb or riḥab. For other delineations see Lavignac (p. 2790) and Chottin (pl. vi). 3. The Boat Shape Viol. This form is confined to the Maghrib. It consists of a piece of wood hollowed out into the shape of a boat. The chest (ẓadr) is covered with thin metal or wood pierced with ornamental rosettes (muṣawwar), whilst the lower part is covered with a membrane. The head (rub') is at right angles to the body, and it is generally furnished with two strings. It seems to have been used by the Arabs and Moors of Spain since their invasion of the peninsula. It is praised by their poets and singers. The neck is of wood, generally cylindrical, and there is a foot of iron, although sometimes there is no foot. It is often known in Arabic as the kāmānja or more rarely as the ḥāshāk. The former is derived from the Persian kāmān (dim. of kāman, "bow") whilst the latter is derived from the Persian and Turkī ḥāšāk, ḥāthāk, ḥīshāk, ḥīlāk, ḥīlāk, ḥīlāk, etc., which may have had their origin in the Sanscrit ḍhāṣāka, an instrument mentioned in the pre-Christian Nāṭya-chōtra (cap. xxxiii.). I believe that the words ḥāšāk and ḥūnān mentioned in the Iṣkāwān al-Ṣafad (Bombay ed., i. 97) and al-Ṣalah (fol. 12) respectively, are copyist's errors for ḥāšāk and ḥīlāk. The work kāmānja is first mentioned in Arabic by Ibn al-Fakih (ca. 903) who says that it was used by both the Copts and the people of Sind (B. G. A.). Of course this need not mean that the instrument was a hemispherical viol, because, being a Persian by origin, the author may have used the word kāmānja in its Persian generic sense meaning a viol. That Egypt had an early liking for the kāmānja is borne out from various sources. Although in Egypt the hemispherical viol is nowadays called the rabīb miṭrī (Egyptian viol), in earlier days it was acknowledged that Egypt borrowed the instrument from Persia (Kašf al-Humūm, fol. 106). The kāmānja was certainly popular at the courts of the Ayyūbid al-Kāmil (d. 1235) and the Mamlūk Baibars (d. 1277); see al-Maqrīzī, i/1, 156; Lane-Poole, Hist. of Egypt, p. 249. In the Persian Karn-'At-hāf (xvith century) the hemispherical viol is described and figured as the ḍhāšāk, but in Ibn Ghāthi (d. 1435) where both the ḍhāšāk and the kāmānja are described, the former is a larger type of the latter, having, in addition to its two ordinary strings, eight sympathetic strings (Karn-‘At-hāf, fol. 261); Ibn Ghāthi, fol. 78). In the xvith century the kāmānja is delineated by Russell (i. 152-153, pl. iv.), and Niebuhr (i. 144, Tab. xxvi., E). Both Villette (p. 900, pl. BB) and Lane (Mod. Egypt', chap. 18) give minute details.
of the construction and accordion. Mushāka also describes the Syrian ḫamarqā (kamārqa) of his day (M. F. O. B., vi. 25, 81). For the modern Persian instrument see Advielle (14 and pl.) and Lavignac (p. 3074). Turkomanian instruments are given by Fittat (p. 45) and Belneve (p. 54). For Malaysia see Kaudern (p. 178); for India Lavignac (p. 349) and Féret (ii. 295). For other designs see Farmer (Stud., i. 76); Féret (Hist., ii. 136-137), Chouquet (p. 203), Sachs (Reallex., p. 207).

6. The Fandore Viol. This form is practically a tambur, stîrî, or the like, which is bowed instead of being plucked by the fingers or a plectrum. The two best known examples from India are the ērī and ērī. The former is a membranophone, its face and has five strings played on with the bow together with a number of sympathetic strings. The latter is practically identical with the former but is adorned with the figure of a peacock (hence its name) at the bottom of the body of the instrument. See Lavignac (p. 351) and Mahillon (i. 131) for designs and details. With the Persians and Turkomans we see various kinds of pandoros used with the bow. See Advielle (p. 14), Lavignac (p. 3074), Mironov (p. 27), Kinsky (p. 26).

7. The Open Chest Viol. This is unknown to the peoples of North Africa and the Near East, although it is popular in the Middle East. Unlike the preceding forms of the viol, the upper part of the face of the body or sound-cast is left open. The best known example of this is the ṣārīnā of India which has three strings. See Féret (i. 296), Lavignac (p. 351), Mahillon (i. 157) and Mironov (p. 27), for designs and details. In Turkomania a similar instrument known as the ḫūdīs is very popular. It has two strings. See Belnav (p. 52), Mironov (p. 25), Fittat (p. 43).


RABĀD (A. pl. arbaʾā), district of a town, quarter, situated outside the central part or şehrā of [q.v.]. The term, which is very frequently found in the Arab historians of the middle ages in east as well as west, is the original of the Spanish word arrabal which means the same. Rabād also means the immediate vicinity of a town. The rabād usually had a name of its own. This is how there have been preserved for the Cordova of the caliphat of the 8th century the names of twenty-one of the suburban districts. Rabād ʾAlaṣqunda [q.v.] or al-Rabād (for short) was the southern quarter of Cordova, on the other side of the Guadalquivir where in 1908 (914) the famous "reburb of the suburb" broke out which was stifed in blood by the emir al-Ḥakam I [q.v.] and earned him the epithet of al-Rabādī. The name rabādī was also given to the exiles who migrated at this time to the rest of al-Andalus, Morocco and to the east. In the castles (ṣijīn or ṣahāra) of Muslim Spain the name rabādī was given to the Muslim janissaries and the strictly military quarters. Rabād was also the name given in the towns of the west to the lepers' quarter and to that of the prostitutes.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

RABAH. Zubair-Pasha, Egyptian governor of Bahr al-Ghazal in 1875, being recalled to Cairo left his son Sulaimān in charge. The latter thinking he was threatened by the hostility of Gordon, then Governor-General of the Sudan, joined Hārin, the dethroned sūlīn of Dār-Fūr, in order to rebel against Egypt. His chief lieutenant was a certain Rabāh, son of a negro who had been his father's nurse and was therefore his foster-brother. Gessi-Pasha, sent by Gordon inflicted a severe defeat on Sulaimān and Rabāh took to flight with the remnants of his master's army and to revictual his forces began a series of raids on the tribes of the northwest of Bahr al-Ghazal (1878). Then pushing westwards he entered the land of the Banda in 1879 and in 1883 fell back on the Dār-Kūtī, installed a native chief named Sanīsī there as sūlīn, attacked Bagirmi in 1892 and in 1893 seized its capital which then was Bugūman. In the same year he attacked Hāsim, sultan of Bornū [q.v.], defeated and slew him (Dec. 1893). He then attacked Gober or Tassāwa where Abū Bakr, nephew and successor of Hāsim, had taken refuge; checked by the army of the sūlīn of Sokoto he turned against the small forces in the south of Lake Chad, took Gulley from the Buso, Kusri from the Mandara, Logone from the Koto, again invaded Bagirmi in 1898, burned Maseīya, the old capital, pursued the king.
or mbang as far as Kuno, was there held up with his 8,000 men by some thirty Senegalese soldiers under the district commissioner Bretonnet and only overcame the resistance of this handful of heroes after eight hours fighting (July 18, 1899). On April 22, 1900, he was defeated at Kusri on the lower Chari by Commandant Lamy: Rabah and Lamy both fell in the battle. His extraordinary career had lasted 22 years and ruined a whole region of the Central Sudan.

(Maurice Delafosse)

RABAT, AR. RIBAT, VOLG. RHIBAT (ethnic Ribât, vulg. Râbat), a town in Morocco, situated on the south bank at the mouth of the Wadi Abû Rakrâk (Wed Bu Regreg) opposite the town of Sale [cf. Sâla]. Since the establishment of the French protectorate it has been the administrative capital of the Sharifian empire, the usual residence of the sultan of Morocco, and the headquarters of the madkhen [q.v.] and of the French authorities. The choice of Rabat as the administrative centre of Morocco has brought this town considerable development in the place of the somnolence in which it was sunk a quarter of a century ago.

The foundation of Ribât al-Fath was the work of the Almohads [q.v.]. The site of the “Two Banks” (al-Idwâtan) of the estuary of the Bu Regreg had previously been the scene of Roman and pre-Roman settlements; the Phœnician later Roman Sâla was built on the left bank of the river higher up at the site of the royal Marinid necropolis of Chella (Shâlla; q.v.). The Muslim town of Sâla on the right bank had, from the beginning of the tenth century, to protect itself against the inroads of the Berghawâta [q.v.] heretics at the time when it was the capital of a little Ifnânid kingdom, fortified on the other side of the Bu Regreg a ribât [q.v.], which was permanently occupied by devout volunteers who in this way desired to carry out their vow of djihâd [q.v.]: the geographer Ibn Hâwâl is authority for its existence at this date (cf. R. G. A., i. 56). But we know very little of the part played by this ribât in the course of the sanguinary wars later fought between the Berghawâta and the Almoravids. It is not even possible to point out its exact situation. It was perhaps the same fortified spot that is mentioned in the middle of the xith century under the name of Kes Bani Targh by the geographer al-Fârâbî.

The final and complete subjugation of the Berghawâta meant that a different part was to be played by the ribât on the estuary of Bu Regreg. In 545 (1150), the founder of the dynasty of the Muʿminid Almohads, ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, chose the fort and its vicinity as the place of mobilisation for the troops intended to carry the holy war into Spain. A permanent camp was established there and he provided for a supply of fresh water by bringing a conduit from a neighbouring source, ʿAin Ghâbûla. The permanent establishments, — mosque, royal residence — formed a little town which received the name of al-Mahdiyya. On several occasions very large bodies of men were concentrated around the ribât, and it was there that ʿAbd al-Muʿmin died on the eve of his departure for Spain in 558 (1163).

The development of the camp went on under ʿAbd al-Muʿmin’s successor, Abû Yaʿkûb Yûsûf (558—580 = 1163—1184), but it was the following prince of the Muʿminid dynasty, Abû Yûsûf Yaʿkûb al-Manṣûr, who at the beginning of his reign gave the orders and opened the credits necessary for its completion. In memory of the victory gained in 1195 by the Almohads over Alfonso VIII of Castile at Alarcos [q.v.] it was given the name of Ribât al-Fâṭî. The camp was surrounded by a wall of earth flanked with square towers enclosing with the sea and the river an area of 450 hectares. The wall is still standing for the most part and is nearly four miles in length; two monumental gates, one now known as Bab al-Kuwâlah (Bahr Er-Rûbul), the other which gives the title of ḥasaba (Kasha of the Oudaya), date from this period. It was also Yaʿkûb al-Manṣûr who ordered the building inside Ribât al-Fâṭî of a colossal mosque which was never finished; rectangular in plan it measured 610 feet long by 470 feet broad; the only mosque in the Muslim world of greater area was that of Sâmarra [q.v.]. It was entered by 16 doors and in addition to three courts had a hall of prayer, supported by over 200 columns. In spite of recent excavations more or less successfully conducted this mosque still remains very much a puzzle from the architectural point of view. But the minaret, which also remained unfinished and was never given its upper lantern still surprises the traveller by its unusual dimensions. It is now called the Tower of Hassân (burj Hassân). Built entirely of stones of uniform shape it is 156 feet high on a square base 55 feet square. Its walls are eight feet thick. The upper platform is reached by a ramp two yards broad with a gentle slope. This tower in its proportions, its arrangement and decoration is closely related to two Almohad minarets of the same period: that of the mosque of the Kutubiyya at Marrakesh [q.v.] and that of the great mosque of Seville [q.v.], the Girâlda.

Yaʿkûb al-Manṣûr’s great foundation never received the population which its area might have held and the town opposite, Sale, retained under the last Almohads and in the xith and xith centuries all its political and commercial importance. Rabat and Sale in 1248 passed under the rule of the Marinids and it seems that Rabat in those days was simply a military station of no great importance, sharing the fortunes of its neighbour which had gradually become a considerable port having busy commercial relations with the principal trading centres of the Mediterranean. But a chance circumstance was suddenly to give the town of the “Two Banks” a new aspect. The expulsion of the last Moriscos [q.v.] decided upon in 1610 by Philip III brought to Rabat and Sale an important colony of Andalusian fugitives who increased to a marked degree the number of their compatriots in these towns who had previously left Spain of their own free-will after the reconquest. While the population of the other Moroccan cities, Faz and Tétouan principally, in which the exiles took refuge, very quickly absorbed the new arrivals whom they had welcomed without distrust, the people of Rabat and Sale could not see without misgivings this colony from Spain settle beside them, for they lived apart, never mingled with the older inhabitants and devoted themselves to piracy and soon completely dominated the two towns and their hinterland. Rabat, known in Europe as “New Sale” in contrast to Sale (“Old Sale”), soon became the centre of a regular little maritime republic
in the hands of the Spanish Moors who had either left of their own accord before 1610, the so-called "Hornachuelas", or had been expelled in 1610, the so-called "Moriscoes", the former however being clearly in the majority. This republic, on the origin and life of which the documents from European archives published by H. de Castries and P. de Cenival have in recent years thrown new light, hardly recognised the suzerainty of the sharia who ruled over the rest of Morocco. While boasting of their ghāād against the Christians, the Andalusians of the "Two Banks" really found their activity at sea a considerable source of revenue. They had retained the use of the Spanish language and the mode of life they had been used to in Spain. They thus raised Rabat from its decadence. Their descendants still form the essential part of the Muslim population of the town and they have Spanish patronymics like Bargāṣ (Vargas!), Palámito, Moreño, López, Pérez, Chiquito, Dinya (Span. Dénia), Runda (Span. Ronda), Múllin (Molino) etc.

The spirit of independence and the wealth of the Spanish Moors in Rabat soon made the town a most desirable object in the eyes of the sultāns of Morocco. Nevertheless the little republic with periods of more or less unreal independence, was able to survive until the accession of the 'Alīd sultān Sa'īyidī Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh in 1171 (1757). This prince now endeavoured to organise for his own behalf the piracy hitherto practised by the sailors of the republic of the "Two Banks". He even ordered several ships of the line to be built. But the official character thus given to the pirates of Sale very soon resulted in the bombardment of Sale and Larache [q.v.] by a French fleet in 1765. The successors of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh had very soon to renounce any further attempt to wage the "holy war" by sea. The result was a long period of decline for Sale which found expression not only in the gradual diminution of its trade but also in a very marked hatred of each town for the other. At the beginning of the 19th century, Rabat like Sale had completely lost its old importance. They were both occupied by French troops on July 19, 1911.

Rabat is one of the towns of Morocco, the population of which is both Naqashīya, i.e. essentially town-dwelling, and maqāshanīya, i.e. used as residence by the sultān of the Sharīfīn empire. The non-European population has increased in a marked degree since the establishment of the protectorate and its choice as permanent capital of the sultān. The number of inhabitants at the census of 1931 was 27,986 Muslims and 4,218 Jews (20,452 and 3,676 in 1926; Sale wich is a separate municipality had in 1931 22,145 Muslims and 2,837 Jews). They live almost entirely in the madīna, which is in the shape of a trapèzoid, and its annexes formed by the Jewish mellāāq [q.v.] and the ḫashba of the Īdāyā, a separate walled area with its own mosque, originally inhabited by contingents of the gīdh tribe [q.v.; Ar. ǧāis]. of this name (Kašba of the Oudaya). The chief mosques of Rabat are the foundations of 'Alīd sultān, Mawlāī al-Rashīd [q.v.] and Mawlāī Sulaimān (Moulāi Slimān); the mosque near the imperial palace, the Dījānī al-Sunna, was built in the second half of the 18th century. Besides the monumental gates there are several other entrances in the Almohad enceinte: the Bāb al-Ullī (Bāb al-Alou) admits from the madīna to the cemetery and the cliffs which rise up from the ocean; the gate called Za‘rī (Bāb Za‘īr) is in the immediate vicinity of the Marinid royal cemetery of Chella (Shella).

The French town of Rabat built outside the madīna is developing rapidly: the palace of the Resident-General, the public offices, fine esplanades, villas surrounded by gardens give the new town a particularly attractive appearance. French Rabat at the present day is a masterpiece, famed throughout the world, of successful town planning and architecture. It is connected by railway to Casablanca and Marrakesh in the south, Tangier in the north, Fas and Algiers in the east. Since October 1935 it has been the final resting-place of Marshal Lyautey to whom it owes its position as capital and its reconstruction.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

RABB (A.), lord, God, master of a slave. Pre-Islamic Arabia probably applied this term to its gods or to some of them. In this sense the word corresponds to the terms like Ba'āl, Adon in the Semitic languages of the north where rabb means "much, great". — In one of the oldest sûras (ev. 3) Allāh is called the "lord of the temple". Similarly al-Lat bore the epithet al-Rabbī, especially whenever she was represented in the image of a stone or of a rock. — In the Kur'ān rabb (especially with the possessive suffix) is one of the usual names of God. This explains why in Ḥadīth the slave is forbidden to address his master as rabbī, which he must replace by sayīda'tī (Muslim, al-Asfīzī min al-Adāb, trad. 14, 15, etc.). — The abstract rubūsīya is not found in either Kur'ān or Ḥadīth; it is in common use in mystic theology.
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Details about his administration are scanty, but it is certain that he was an able, industrious, temperate and tactful man of affairs. Even al-Mahdi, who was never lavish in showering favours on al-Rabi', once described him as the model of a good administrator (Ya'qūbī, ii. 456). The literary sources, however, do not single him out as a patron of letters, a quality which both his Abbasid masters and his Barmak successors possessed with distinction.


RĀBI'A AL-'ADAWĪYA, a famous mystic and saint of Bāṣra, a freedom woman of the Āl 'Atik, a tribe of Kāṣī b. 'Adī, known also as al-Kaisiyā, born 95 (713—714) or 99, died and was buried at Bāṣra in 185 (801). A few verses of hers are recorded: she is mentioned, and her teaching quoted, by most of the Sūfī writers and the biographers of the saints.

Born into a poor home, she was stolen as a child and sold into slavery, but her sanctity secured her freedom, and she retired to a life of seclusion and celibacy, at first in the desert and then in Bāṣra, where she gathered round her many disciples and associates, who came to seek her counsel or prayers or to listen to her teaching. These included Malik b. Dīnār, the ascetic Rābāh al-Kāṣī, the traditional Sufyān al-Thawri and the Sūfī Shākiṭ al-Balikhi. Her life was one of extreme asceticism and otherworldliness. Asked why she did not ask help from her friends, she said, "I should be ashamed to ask for this world's goods from Him to Whom it belongs, and how should I seek them from those to whom it does not belong?" To another friend she said, "Will God forget the poor because of their poverty or remember the rich because of their riches? Since He knows my state, what have I to remind Him of? What He wills, we should also will". Miracles were attributed to her as to other Muslim saints. Food was supplied by miraculous means for her guests, and to save her from starvation. A camel which died when she was on pilgrimage, was restored to life for her use; the lack of a lamp was made good by the light which shone round about the saint. It was related that when she was dying, she bade her friends depart and leave the way free for the messengers of God Most
High. As they went out, they heard her making her confession of faith, and a voice which responded, "O soul at rest, return to thy Lord, satisfied with Him, giving satisfaction to Him. So enter among My servants into My Paradise" (Sura lxxxix. 27-30). After her death Rabi'a was seen in a dream and asked how she had escaped from Munkar and Nakir, the angels of death, when they asked her, "Who is your Lord?", and she replied, "I said, return and tell your Lord, 'Notwithstanding the thousands and thousands of Thy creatures, Thou hast not forgotten a weak old woman. I, who am with Thee in all the world, have never forgotten Thee, that Thou shouldst ask, Who is thy Lord?'"

Among the prayers recorded of Rabi'a is one she was accustomed to pray at night upon her roof: "O Lord, the stars are shining and the eyes of men are closed and kings have shut their doors and every lover is alone with his beloved, and here I am alone with Thee." Again she prayed, "O my Lord, if I worship Thee from fear of Hell, burn me therein, and if I worship Thee in hope of Paradise, exclude me thence, but if I worship Thee for Thine own sake, then withhold not from me Thine Eternal Beauty". Of Repentance, the beginning of the Sufi Path, she said, "How can anyone repent unless his Lord gives him repentance and accepts him? If He turns towards you, you will turn towards Him". She held that Gratitude was the vision of the Giver, not the gift, and one spring day, when urged to come out to behold the works of God, she rejoined, "Come rather inside to behold their Maker. Contemplation of the Maker has turned me aside from contemplating what He has made". Asked what she thought of Paradise, Rabi'a replied, "First the Neighbour, then the house" (al-djër thumma 1-l-djër) and Ghazâlî, commenting on this, says she implied that no one who does not know God in this world will see him in the next, and he who does not find the joy of gnosis here will not find the joy of the Vision there, nor can anyone appeal to God in that world if he has not sought his friendship in this. None may reap who has not sown (Ihyâ', iv. 269). The otherworldliness of her teaching is shewn in her declaration that she had come from that world and to that world she was going, and she ate the bread of this world in sorrow, while doing the work of that world. One who heard her said darsively, "One so persuasive in speech is worthy to keep a rest-house" and Rabi'a responded, "I myself am keeping a rest-house; whatever is within, I do not allow it to go out and whatever is without, I do not allow to come in. I do not concern myself with those who pass in and out, for I am contemplating my own heart, not mere clay". Asked how she had attained to the rank of the saints, Rabi'a replied, "By abandoning what did not concern me and seeking fellowship with Him Who is eternal".

She was famed for her teaching on mystic love (mashâ'ikh) and the fellow with God (musk) which is the pre-occupation of His lover. Every true lover, she said, seeks intimacy with the beloved, and she recited the lines:

1. have made Thee the Companion of my heart,

But my body is present for those who seek its company,

And my body is friendly towards its guests.

But the Beloved of my heart is the guest of my soul".

(Ihyâ', iv. 358, margin)

She demonstrated the need for disinterested love and service by taking fire in one hand and water in the other and saying, when asked the meaning of her action, "I am going to light fire in Paradise and to pour water on to Hell, so that both veils may be taken away from those who journey towards God, and their purpose may be sure and they may look towards their Lord without any object of hope or motive of fear. What if the hope of Paradise and the fear of Hell did not exist? Not one would worship his Lord or obey Him" (Alfâkî, Mânâbîb al-ârîfîn, India Office, No. 1070, fol. 114a). Questioned about her love for the Prophet she said, "I love him, but love of the Creator has turned me aside from love of His creatures", and again, "My love to God has so possessed me that no place remains for loving any save Him". Of her own service to God and its motive-force she said, "I have not served God from fear of Hell, for I should be but a wretched hireling if I did it from fear; nor from love of Paradise, for I should be a bad servant, if I served for the sake of what was given me, but I have served Him solely for the love of Him and desire of Him". Her verses on the two types of love, that which seeks its own ends and that which seeks only God and His glory, are famous and much quoted:

"In two ways have I loved Thee, selfishly, And with a love that worthy is of Thee. In selfish love my joy in Thee I find, While to all else, and others, I am blind. But in that love which seeks Thee worthily, The veil is raised that I may look on Thee. Yet is the praise in that or this not mine, In this and that the praise is wholly Thine".

Ghazâlî again comments, "She meant, by the selfish love, the love of God for His favour and grace bestowed and for temporary happiness, and by the love worthy of Him, the love of His Beauty which was revealed to her, and this is the higher of the two loves and the finer of them" (Ihyâ', iv. 267). Like all mystics, Rabi'a looked for union with the Divine (waâf). In certain of her verses she says, "My hope is for union with Thee, for that is the goal of my desire", and again she said, "I have ceased to exist and have passed out of self. If I have become one with God and am altogether His"

Rabi'a, therefore, differs from those of the early Sufis who were simply ascetics and quietists, in that she was a true mystic, inspired by an ardent love, and conscious of having entered into theunate life with God. She was one of the first of the Sufis to teach the doctrine of Pure Love, the disinterested love of God for His own sake alone, and one of the first also to combine with her teaching on love the doctrine of Kadhî, the unveiling, to the lover, of the Beatitude Vision.

When the vizier Abū Shūqār Muhammad al-Rūdhāwari [q.v.] made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 481 (1089) he appointed his son Rabīb al-Dawla and the naṣibi al-mukhabār Tiṭūd b. Muhammad al-Zainabi his deputies and in 507 (1113-1114) on the death of Abū l-Kāsim ‘Alī b. Fakhr al-Dawla Muhammad b. Djiḥār [see the article Ibn Djiḥār, 3] Rabīb al-Dawla was appointed vizier of the caliph al-Mustaʿẓir [q.v.]. In Dhu l-Hijja 511 (April 1118) the fourteen year old Mahmūd b. Muhammad succeeded his father as Saḥīḥ satāfīt and, when he was looking around for an able vizier, he was recommended to choose someone who had had the necessary training in the service of the caliph (min tarbiyat dār al-Djiḥārī), because there was no suitable man in the train of the young sitāfīt. The choice therefore fell upon Rabīb al-Dawla who was at once summoned from Baghdad to Isfahān and, as we know from al-Bundari also, proved himself in every way fit for his difficult task. But his tenure of office was of short duration; he died in Rabī‘ I 513 (June-July 1119); according to another statement he died as early as 512 (1118-1119).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Ṭahir, al-Kamīl (ed. Tornberg), x. 111, 349, 373, 387, 394; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljoucides, ii. 115-126. (K. V. Zetterstén)

RAPĪTṬA. [See RāṭṬa.]

RADĀ‘ or Radd, also Radda (A.), sucking; as a technical term, the sucking which produces the impediment to marriage of foster-kinship. It is to be supposed that the idea of foster-kinship was already prevalent among the ancient Arabs (cf. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arābīs, p. 176, 196, note 1); this is evident from, among other things, the way in which the prescription of the Kurān regarding this is interpreted in Tradition. In Sūra iv. 23, among the female relatives with whom marriage is forbidden are the foster-mother and the foster-sister. This must correspond exactly to the old Arab usage, which regarded blood-relationship also in these two degrees as an impediment to marriage (cf. Robertson Smith, loc. cit.). But as the Kurān in the passage quoted extends the circle of prohibited relationships beyond that of blood-relationship, foster-kinship was treated accordingly contrary to the unambiguous language of the passage. To justify this, it is frequently laid down in traditions, in keeping with the principle of the old Arab attitude, that foster-kinship is an impediment in the same degrees as blood-relationship. The isolated case, which is decisive for the principle, that of the prohibition of marriage with the daughter of a foster-brother, is brought into close personal relationship with the Prophet. Through the prohibition of marriage laid down in Tradition between the foster-children of two wives of the same man, relationship by marriage becomes included in foster-relationship, and in the tradition which expounds the verse of the Kurān quoted, foster-kinship is given among the impediments to marriage on the ground of relationships in law. As a justification for this prohibition it is stated that the semen genitalis (which the milk has produced) is the same; against the view that blood-relationship is not to be combined with foster-kinship, so that the brother of the husband of the foster-mother is not to be regarded as a foster-relations, there is a polemic in a tradition (Kans al-Ummāl, iii., No. 3911). The question of the amount of sucking necessary to produce foster-relationship is a very old point of dispute; some traditions do not consider isolated sucks by the sucking or one or two acts of sucking as sufficient, others demand not less than seven acts of sucking, others again say that the child must be fed entirely; on the other side, one group of traditions says the prohibition of marriage is the same whatever the amount of sucking that has been given. There is even said to have been a passage in the Kurān which in the older, later abrogated, version demanded ten feedings and in the later version five. This story which was obviously only intended to support this view is not trustworthy (cf. Noldeke-Schwalbe, Geschichte des Qurāns, i. 253 sq.; Kans al-Ummāl, No. 3,923 sqq.). That the practice of sucking adults in order to establish an artificial foster-kinship existed is certain; it is recognised by several traditions and by others directly or indirectly denied (by the legal maxim: al-raḍā‘a min al-maḍā‘a, “sucking demands hunger”). The chief case for the validity of such an act of sucking is described as a privilege granted by the Prophet personally (Kans al-Ummāl, No. 3,919) and even the sucking of children to establish an impediment to marriage is in an isolated case described as illegal (ibid., No. 3,885). To prove foster-kinship many traditions are content with the testimony of the foster-mother or even without oath or with the testimony of a woman simply or with that of a man and of one woman; in refutation of this anomalous practice, however, at one time permitted, another group of traditions demands the normal testimony of two men or of one man and two women. These points of difference found in tradition are continued in the differences of opinion among the older jurists. The views of the principal authorities are given in al-Shawkāni, Naṣil al-Aʿwarī, Cairo 1345, vii. 113 sqq. The most important new point in dispute, discussed in this later period but scarcely touched upon in the traditions, is the period within which foster-kinship can be established by a child; sometimes it is said to be the period till weaning, sometimes the whole of childhood without an exact limitation, sometimes the fixed period of two years, or 3 or 7 years; for the period of two years the authority of the Kurān is quoted, Sūra ii. 233 (“Mothers shall suckle their children two full years if they wish to carry through the sucking to its end”) (on the details of al-Shawkāni, op. cit., p. 129). The four regular Sunni law-scholars are agreed that foster-relationship exists between a man and all his descendants on one side and his nurse, all her foster- and blood-relatives, her husband and all his foster- and blood-relations on
the other; on the other hand, no foster-relationship is assumed between a man and the ascendants or lateral relatives of his foster-brothers and sisters and between the nurse and the ascendants or lateral relatives of her foster-child. The Hanafis and the Malikis demand no definite minimum period, the Shafi's however five acts of sucking. The period for feeding is in either the Malikis (unless previously weaned), the Shafi's and Hanbalis two years, with the Hanafi 2½ years; the Zahiris also recognised the sucking of an adult. To establish the foster-relationship the Shafi's are content with the testimony of four women, the Malikis with the evidence of two, if the fact is well known, and the Hanafi with the evidence of one woman. Prominent Meccans have retained since before Islâm to the present day the custom of having Beduin nurses for their children (cf. Lammens, La Mosquée à la veille de l'hégire, p. 101). The custom very common in the early period of Islâm of hiring nurses in return for food and clothing has resulted in this arrangement, which is not in itself in accordance with the demands of the law, becoming recognised. In one tradition it is recommended that gratuity should be given to a nurse by giving her a slave, male or female. The sucking of children by the mother or a hired nurse in a case where the marriage is dissolved is fully regulated on the basis of the Kur'anic passage, Sûra ii. 233.

Bibliography: Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition, s. v. Nursing; Juyboll, Handbuch des islamischen Rechts, p. 219; do., Handlindung, p. 185; Santillana, Istituzioni di diritto musulmano malechita, i. 161; for the Imâmis: Querry, Droit musulman, i. 657 sqq.

Râdhânpûr, a Muslim state in India now included in the Western India States Agency and situated in the south-west of Fâlanpur.

The rulers of Râdhânpûr trace their descent from a Muslim adventurer who came to India from Isphâhan about the middle of the xvith century. His descendants became fawqîbâtars and farmers of revenue in the Mughal province of Gujârat [s. v.]. Early in the xvith century Djiwân Mard Kûhâ Bâbî, the head of the family at that time, received a grant of Râdhânpûr and other districts (Mirâ'î Ahrâmî, Ethê, N. 3599, fol. 742). With the decline of the Mughal empire these districts passed into the hands of the Mariâsâm, but the Bâbî family were confirmed in the possession of Râdhânpûr by Dâmâdî Râ'î Gāekwâr.

British relations with Râdhânpûr date back to the year 1813 (Aitchison, vi., c.). Some years later the British were called upon to aid Râdhânpûr of plundering tribes from Sind who were committing serious depredations in the Mâwhâ's territories. In return for this the nawâb agreed to become a tributary of the British government, but a few years later this tribute was remitted because it was felt that the state was unable to bear the expense. After the Mutiny, in 1852, the ruler of Râdhânpûr received an adoption sonâd from the governor-general (op. cit., cii.). It was not until 1900 that the Djirowâ 'risi, currency previously in use was discontinued and replaced by British currency.

To-day Râdhânpûr covers an area of 1,150 square miles and supports a population of 74,530, of whom only 8,435 are Muhammadans. The town of Râdhânpûr, the capital of the state, has a total population of 11,225, of whom 3,694 are Muhammadans (1911 Census Report).

Bibliography: see Râdânpûr.

(C. Collin Davies)

AL-RâDI BI LLâH, ABU 'L-'ABBâS AHRAM (MUHAMMAD) b. AL-MUKHTâR, THE twelfth 'Abbâsîd caliph. He was born in Râbi' II 297 (Dec. 909); his mother was a slave named Zâlam. He was proposed for the caliphate immediately after the assassination of his father al-Mukhtâr [s. v.] but the choice fell upon al-Kâhir [q. v.]. He was subsequently chosen, after the fall of al-Kâhir, he was released and put upon the throne (Djumâdâ I 322 = April 934). As his adviser in this difficult period al-Râdi chose al-Mukhtâr's vizier 'Ali b. 'Isâ [see the art. IBN AL-DJâKKARî, 2] who however asked to be excused on account of his great age, whereupon Ibn Mûkla [q. v.] was given the office. The most influential official however continued to be Muhammad b. Yâkût [q. v.] and only after his fall in Djumâdâ I 323 (April 935) did Ibn Mûkla gain control of the administration while the caliph himself fell completely into the background. But Ibn Mûkla's position did not last long; in Djumâdâ I 324 (April 936) he was seized by al-Musaffâr b. Yâkût, brother of the above-mentioned Muhammad, and the impatient caliph had to dismiss him and in the same year summon the governor of Wâsît and Bayra, Muhammad b. Râ'î [q. v.], to Baghâd and entrust him with complete authority as amîr ul-muwattâ'. This meant a complete breach with the past; the caliph was only allowed to retain the capital and its immediate vicinity and to abandon all influence on the business of government, while Ibn Râ'î in combination with his secretary decided all the more important questions. Ibn Râ'î held power for nearly two years; his name was actually mentioned in the al-mu'âdthra for the reigning dynasty along with that of the caliph; in Djuh âl-Kâ'da 326 (Sept. 938) however, he was replaced by Bedjîkem [q. v.].

To the financial difficulties and the constant quarrels of the viziers and emirs there was now added war with foreign foes. In 323 (935) al-Râdi endeavoured to remove from office the governor of al-Mavûl Nâsîr al-Dawla [q. v.], but failed, and a few years later Bedjîken, accompanied by the caliph, attacked the Hamdânis in order to force them to pay tribute levied upon them but had to make peace because the fugitive Ibn Râ'î suddenly appeared in Baghâd. The war with the Byzantines was also continued; the Hamdânis however in this war came forward as defenders of Islâm. In Egypt Muhammad b. 'Uthmân founded the dynasty of the Khâhidâs [q. v.] and at the same time Bedjîken had to fight with the Bûyids who were advancing on several sides and a few years later victoriously entered Baghâd.

In the capital itself al-Râdi had to take measures against the fanatical Hanbalis (323 = 935), who had many followers among the common people and committed all kinds of excesses. They entered private houses, destroyed musical instruments, ill-treated women singers, poured away wine that they found, interfered in business, annoyed passers-by in the streets, beat Shâfi'is and generally behaved as arbitrarily as if they represented a kind of tribunal of the Inquisition.

Al-Râdi died in the middle of Râbi' I 329 (Dec. 940) of dropsy. The Arab historians praise his
piety, justice, clemency and generosity as well as his interest in literature and it is said of him, for example (Ibn al-Tikājā, al-Fābīrī, p. 380): *He was the last caliph, by whom a collection of poems exists, the last who retained his independence as a ruler, the last to preach a sermon from the pulpit on Fridays, the last to mix freely with his friends and to welcome men of learning, and the last who followed the principles of the earlier caliphs as regards rank, tokens of favour, servants and chamberlains*. This characterisation may well be correct in its main lines but al-Rādī was not independent; he was on the contrary a ready tool in the hands of his vizers and emirs.


**RADIF.** [See REDIF.]

**RADJA.** [See REDJ.]

**RADIJAB (A.), the name of the seventh month in the Muslim calendar.** In the Djarīliya it introduced the summer half year until, as a result of the abbreviation of the intercalated months, the months ceased to fall regularly at the same season of the year [see al-Muḥārram and Ṣaḥīl]. The month was a sacred one; in it the 'umrā (q.v.), the essentially Meccan part of the pre-Muhammadan ceremonies of pilgrimage, took place. The peace of Allah therefore prevailed in it; the forbidden war which was fought in Radjab between Kurāsh and Hawāzin and in which the young Muḥammad took part is called Fādūr (perīdū) (q.v.).

In the Kurān, as recorded in the article al-Muḥārram, only the "holy month" is mentioned and not the four which have become traditional from the sole reference ix. 36. If the reference in Sūra v. 2, is to the 'umrā we can therefore understand why the commentators in part identify the holy month mentioned in this verse with Radjab.

In Islam the month attained great importance through the memory of the Prophet's night journey to heaven which in later times was put on the 27th of the month (on the original dates see Mihrāj). This night is therefore called Lailat al-Mīrāj and is celebrated with readings of the legends of the ascension.


(M. Plessner)
and return in procession to Mecca (ifaṣa). This last rite prepares the sexual deconsecration; the three others together abolish the prohibitions of the ḥadīṣ but the legists are not agreed on the order in which they have to be accomplished. The ḥadīṣ say that the Prophet replied to the pilgrims who were worried, not having followed the order in which he had himself followed them: 'iṣṣa haraḍa: "no harm (in that)"' (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣ, b. 125, 150 etc.). It is explained that the Prophet on this day of rejoicing did not wish to hurt the feelings of the ignorant Beduins. We may imagine that these 'Arab did not follow the customs of the Kuranī and that Muḥammad had neither the time nor the inclination to impose his own choice between the varying customs.

Muḥammad began with the lapidation at al-ʿAḵaba. After the ḥalq, the sacrifice and the ifṣaḥa, he returned to spend the night in Minā. Then on the 11th, 12th and 13th, he cast 7 stones at the three ʿdjamarat ending with that of al-ʿAḵaba. The pilgrims imitating him ought therefore to throw 7 + (7 × 3) = 70 stones. But in general they take advantage of the liberty (ruktah) given them by the ḥadīṣ to leave Minā finally on the 12th and therefore only to throw 7 + (7 × 2) = 49 stones. It is probable that there was no ancient usage; the presence of the bodies of the sacrificial victims made Minā a horrible place. It is difficult to see how Wavell (Pilgrims, p. 202) threw 63 stones, i.e. (7 × 3) 3; this is however the number of victims which, according to tradition, Muḥammad sacrificed with his own hand, one for each year of his life.

The stoning of al-ʿAḵaba is done on the 10th by the pilgrims in ḥirām; those of the three days following by the deconsecrated pilgrims. The whole business is not a fundamental element of the pilgrimage (ruktah).

Little stones are thrown, larger than a lentil, but less than a nut, what the old Arabs called ḥaṣa 'l-khaddāf which were thrown either with the fingers or with a little lever of wood forming a kind of sling (mikkhaba: Tirmidhī, iv. 123). A ḥadīṣ forbids this dangerous game, which might knock out an eye but is not strong enough to kill an enemy: it must therefore have had something magical or pagan in its character. The stones have to be collected of the proper size and not broken from a rock. Gold, silver, precious stones etc. are condemned; but some texts allow, in addition to date-stones, a piece of camel-dung or a dead sparrow which we find are the means used by the women of the Ḥijābiyya at the end of their period of isolation to remove the impurity of their widowhood and prepare a new personality. — It is recommended that the 7 stones for the lapidation of al-ʿAḵaba should be gathered at the masqar al-karam at Muzdalīfa, outside of Minā. As a rule the 63 others are gathered in the valley of Minā, but outside of the mosque and far from the ʿdjamarat to avoid their having already been used (Ibn Tainīya, p. 383). Besides it is thought that stones accepted by Allāh are carried away by angels. — Stones collected but not used should be buried; they have assumed a sacred character which makes them dangerous.

The model pilgrimage of the Prophet fixed the time of the ʿdjamarat al-ʿAḵaba for the day of the 10th. It shows him beginning the ifṣaḥa of Muzdalīfa after the prayer at dawn (faḍr) and casting the stones after sunrise. But by survival of an ancient custom more than for reasons of convenience other times are allowed by law. Al-Ṣaḥḥī, against the three other imāms, permits the ʿAḵaba ceremony before sunrise (Risāla, i. 115); in general, the time is extended to the whole morning (dhuḥr), till afternoon (zawāl), till sunset, till night, till the morning of the day following: these infractions of the normal routine are atoned for by a sacrifice or alms, varying with the different schools. — The ʿdjamarat of the three days of the tashriḳ take place in the zawāl: here again there are various opinions (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣ, b. 134). — In fixing the time of the lapidations the law has always endeavoured to avoid any Muslimube, e.g. prayer, coinciding with one of the three positions of the sun by day, rising, noon, setting. A. J. Wensinck has shown (E. L., ii. 200) the probability of the solar character of the pagan ḥadīṣ.

Muḥammad made his lapidation at al-ʿAḵaba from the bottom of the valley, mounted on his camel, turned towards the ʿdjarna, with the Kaʿba on his left and Minā on his right, standing at a distance of five cubits (eight feet). But there are other possible positions. — Risāla (i. 328) gives the ʿdjarna the following dimensions: 10 feet high and 6 feet broad on a rock 5 feet high (see the photographs, ibid). It is said to have been removed at the beginning of Ḥisām and replaced in 240 (854—855) (Azraḳ, p. 212). — Muḥammad made the lapidations of the other two ʿdjamarat on foot turning towards the kaβla. In brief, the stones are cast in the attitude one happens to be in. The position facing the Great Devil is explained by the nature of the ground, but would also be in keeping with the idea of a curse cast in the face of a fallen deity. The position which makes the pilgrim turn towards the Kaʿba is due to the Muslim legend of the tempter Satan and to the rule of the takbīr which will be explained below.

According to the suuana, the stones are placed on the thumb and bent forefinger and thrown, one by one, as in the game of marbles. However the possibility of the stones having been thrown together in a handful has been foreseen and it was decided that this should only count as one stone and that the omission could be made good. — The stone should not be thrown violently nor should one call "look out! look out!" (Tirmidhī, iv. 136), a pagan custom which the modern Beduins still retained quite recently (Risāla, i. 89). It seems that Muḥammad put some strength into it for he raised his hand "to the level of his right eyebrow" (Tirmidhī, iv. 135) and showed his armpit (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣ, b. 141).

In Ḥisām the casting of each stone is accompanied by pious formulæ. It is generally agreed that the takbīra is no longer pronounced at ʿArifa or at least before the lapidation of al-ʿAḵaba (Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣ, b. 101); some writers however approve of it after al-ʿAḵaba. The takbīrī and takbīrī are permitted, but it is the takbīr which is recommended (Ibn Tainīya, p. 382; Bukhārī, Ḥadīṣ, b. 138 and 143). The spiritual evolution of the rites even sees in this the essential feature of the rite, the throwing of the stone and the figure formed by throwing of the thumb and forefinger forming an 'ukb which represents 70, being no more than symbolical and mnemonic figures. "The throwing of the stones was only instituted to cause the name of God to be repeated" (Tirmidhī, iv. 139).
To Ghazālī (Ihya', i. 192) it is an act of submission to God and of resistance to Satan who seeks to turn man away from the fatigue of the ḥadīṯ but the rite is without rational explanation min ghairi ḥaṣi′n li l-ʿaṣīl wa l-nafs ṣāḥi (cf. Goldziher, Richtungen, p. 252). — The devout man adds a prayer (duʿāʾ) which is as a rule quasi-religious. The usual one is: Al-aḥkam ḥaddijān mabrūrān wa-dhakhan maghfīrān wa-sāfān maghfīrān “Lord, make this pilgrimage a pious one, pardon our sins and compensate our efforts”!. There is, as matter of fact, after the stoning a halt, a wukāf, before the two higher djamarāt, that at the second being especially long: the duration is calculated by the recitation of the sûra of the Cow (II), or of Joseph (XII), or of the family of Ḣūmān (III) by altering the indication in the hadith (Bhukārī, Hadīẓ, b. 135, 136 and 137). This would take the place of an ancient ceremony of imprecation.

Breaches of the rules for the performance of these diverse ceremonies, especially as regards the number of stones thrown and the time when they are thrown (Uṣūr, iv. 767 sqq.; Rīfī, i. 113), are punished by admonitions the exact nature of which the legislators delight to vary from the sacrifice of a victim to the giving of a maddi of food in alms.

The Muslim teachers have sought to explain the lapidations of Minā. Some exegists (e.g. Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, xxv. 167) have seen quite clearly that they represent ancient rites and have compared the rām of the tomb of Abū Ridaḍ. Others are known: for example at the well of Dhu ʿl-Hulās (Lammens, Betyles, p. 94). The works quoted (E. I.) show the spread of this rite and the cases in which we are certain that it is a question of the driving away or the expulsion of evil; they might be further added to. Stones used to be thrown behind an individual whom one wished never to return (Hamadhānī, Maḥammad, ed. Bārīrī, p. 23). At Alexandria, tired people used to go and lie down on a fallen pillar, throw seven stones behind them on a pile “like that of Minā”, then go away, returning to the place of sacrifice which is their own way to the explanation of Sūra lxvii. 5 (cf. above).

One would like to be able to locate the lapidations among the rites of the pre-Islamic pilgrimage. One would first have to have a clear idea of the meaning and details of the ceremonies and of the part played by lapidations and sacred piles of stones in Semitic and Mediterranean antiquity. — Stoning seems to have been a rite of expulsion of evil which coincided with the consecration of the pilgrim and seems to have returned to everyday life. It is possible that lapidations at one time followed the sacrifices which perhaps took place at ‘Arafa and Muzdalīfah.

**Bibliography:** Add to the Bibliographies of the articles quoted: Ibrahim Rīfī al-Ṣāhba, Mirāṭ al-Haramain, Cairo 1344, 2 vols.; Ibn Taimiyya, Risālat Manāṣik al-Hadīẓ, dans Madīnit al-Rasāʿīl al-kubrā, Cairo 1323, i. 355.

**Gudefrov-Deombynes**

Rāḍḍāṭūs, inhabitants of India, who claim to be the modern representatives of the Kṣatriyas of ancient tradition. (From the Sanskrit rāḍḍāṭra "a king's son". For the connection between Rāḍḍāṭa and Kṣatriya see Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, i, s. v. Kṣatriya). The term Rāḍḍāṭā has no racial significance. It simply denotes a tribe, clan, or warrior-like class, the members of which claim aristocratic rank, a claim generally reinforced by Brahman recognition.

The origin of the Rāḍḍāṭa is a problem which bristles with difficulties. The theory which at present holds the field is that propounded by Bhandarkar, Smith and Crooke. According to this theory the Rāḍḍāṭas can be divided into two main classes, the foreign and the indigenous. The foreign clans, such as the Cauhāns, Cāluṣyas, and Gurdjāras, are the descendants of invaders of the vi and vii centuries of the Christian era. The indigenous Rāḍḍāṭas include the Gāndhārīs of the Deccan, the Rādhars of Rāḍḍāṭa Bahar, the Dandīs and Bundelas of Bundelkhand.

The theory that certain Rāḍḍāṭ clans are of foreign extraction is chiefly based on Rāḍḍāṭ legends and folklore. It is based on the assumption that there are two branches of Rāḍḍāṭs: the Sūrāṭs, or Solar race; the Cāṇḍāla, or Lunar race; and the Agni Kula, or Fire-group. The legend relates how the Agni Kula Rāḍḍāṭs, that is, the Cauhāns, Cāluṣyas, Parīhās (Prathīrās), and the Prāmaṇa, originated in a fire-pit around Mount Abu in southern Rāḍḍāṭa Bahar. From this it has been concluded that the four clans in this group are related and that the fire-pit represents a rite of purification by which the taint of foreign extraction was removed. Since these writers believed the Parīhās to be invaders of Gūdjar stock, it was concluded that the other three Agni Kula clans were also invaders.

According to Smith the Gurdjaras were invaders who founded a kingdom around Mount Abu. In the time of the ruler of this kingdom who were known as Gurdjaras, Prathīrās conquered Kānawād and became the paramount power in northern India about 800 A.D. Smith contends that the Prathīrās were a clan of the Gurdjar tribe. This seems to be the chief evidence produced by these writers for the foreign extraction of certain Rāḍḍāṭ clans.

It seems wrong to base this theory of foreign descent principally upon the Agni Kula legend, for Waidya and other writers have proved this to be a myth first heard of in the Prathīrās rāṭān of the poet Cānd who could not have composed this work before the xii century A.D. Recent research has brought to light the fact that the inscriptions of the Prathīrās and Cauhāns before the xii century represent them as Solar Rāḍḍāṭs, while the Cāluṣyas are represented as of the Lunar race. The Agni Kula legend does not therefore deserve the prominence given to it by Smith and other writers. Even the contention that the Prathīrās were a branch of the Gurdjar tribe has met with much hostile criticism.

According to the orthodox Hindu view the Rāḍḍāṭs are the direct descendants of the Kṣatriyas of the Vedic polity, but this claim is based on fictitious genealogies. The Kṣatriyas of ancient India disappear from history and this can probably be explained by invasions from Central Asia which shattered the ancient Hindu polity. It is accepted that these invading hordes, such as the Vībhu and Hūnas, became rapidly Hinduized, and that
their leaders assumed Kshatriya rank and were recognized as such. Out of this chaos arose a new Hindu polity with new rulers, and the families of invaders who became supreme were recognized as Kshatriyas or Rādjputs. In later times many chiefs of the so-called aboriginal tribes also assumed the title of Rādjput.

It is therefore safe to assert that the Rādjputs are a very heterogeneous body and probably contain some survivors of the older Kshatriyas. A mass of legend arose assigning to the various septs a descent from the sun and the moon, or from the heroes of the epic poems. These are the legendary pedigrees recorded in great detail by Tod. The main argument which can be brought forward in support of the foreign descent of certain Rādjput clans is the incorporation of foreigners into the fold of Hinduism to which the whole history of India bears testimony. Even though the Agni Kula legend be discredited it is still possible to argue that the Rādjputs are not a race. Anthropologically they are definitely of mixed origin. That some Rādjputs were of foreign origin can be proved by the acceptance of the Hīnas in the recognized list of Rādjput tribes.

Whatever may be the origin of the Rādjputs we know that disorder and political disintegration followed the death of Harsha, and that until the Muslim invasions of northern India the chief characteristic of this period was the growth and development of the Rādjput clans. Except for about two hundred years, when the Gurjara-Pratihāras were the paramount power in Hindustan, there was constant internece warfare between the various Rādjput kingdoms. This weakness considerably facilitated the Muslim conquest. It was not however until the days of Muḥammad of Ghōr that the Rādjput dynasties in the plains were finally overthrown [see above, iii. 742 b]. Driven from Dhillī and Kanwād they retreated into modern Rādjputāna where they eventually built up a strong position and were able to resist the Muslim invader, for it cannot be said that the Sultans of Dhillī ever really subdued the Rādjputs of Rādjputāna. Nevertheless, throughout this period there was constant warfare, fortresses and strongholds frequently changing hands. The Rādjputs nearest to Dhillī were naturally the weakest because the eastern frontier of Rādjputāna was exposed to attack. The Sultans of Dhillī appear to have realized the value of communications with the western coast and we find that the route between Dhillī and Gudjrāt via Adjamār was usually open to imperial armies. The chief menace to the Rādjputs was not from Dhillī but from the independent Muslim kingdoms of Gudjrāt [q. v.] and Mālwā [q. v.].

The outstanding feature of the period from the end of the so-called Saiyid rule to the final invasion of Bābur was the growth of Rādjput power in northern India under Rāṇa Sanga of Mewār. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Lodis under Ibrāhīm [q. v.] and of the war between Gudjrāt and Mālwā he had extended his sway over the greater part of modern Rādjputāna. The battle of Khaṇna in 1527, when Bābur shattered his powers, marks a turning point in the history of Muslim rule in India, for the Rādjputs never again attempted to regain their lost dominions on the plains and contented themselves with remaining on the defensive. After Khaṇna the place of the Sesodias in Rādjput politics was taken by the Rāthsors, the growth of whose power under Mālwā of Mārwār was facilitated by the struggle between Humāyūn [q. v.] and Shāh Shāh. Akbar’s Rādjput policy was based on conquest and conciliation. The fall of Cītār and Ranthambhōr made him master of the greater part of Rādjputāna, with the exception of Mewār which was not completely subdued until the reign of Dāhāngir [q. v.]. The reversal of Akbar’s conciliatory policy produced the great Hindu reaction of Awrangzīb’s reign, when, faced at the same time with the Rādjputs of the north and the Marāthās of the Deccan. Awrangzīb [q. v.] was unable to concentrate on either campaign. But internal dissensions once more prevented the Rādjputs from taking advantage of the decline of Mughal power, and, in the second half of the eighteenth century, they proved no match for the Marāthās who easily overran their country. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century when the British were at war with the Marāthās that they entered into political relations with the Rādjput states. Before the end of the year 1818 the group of states which now comprise Rādjputāna had been taken under British protection.

To-day India contains 10,743,091 Rādjputs distributed throughout the country as follows: United Provinces, 3,756,936; Pandījāb, 3,561,560; Bihār and Orissa, 1,214,240; Rādjputāna, 669,516; Central Provinces and Berār, 506,087; Gwāljūr, 393,976; Central India, 388,942; Bombay, 352,016; Dīnmū and Kashmir, 256,020; Western India States, 227,153; Bengal, 156,978; Baroda, 94,893; and Haidarābād 88,434 (1931 Census Report). It will be noted that in Rādjputāna only 669,516 Rādjputs are to be found out of a total population of 11,225,712. The states of Rādjputāna are ruled by Rādjputs, with the exception of Tonk which is Muslim, and Bharatpur and Dholpur which are Dījāt. The chief Rādjput clans in Rādjputāna are the Rāthrā, Kačhwāhā, Čauhān, Dādān, Sesodia, Ponwar, Parhār, Tonwar and Dāhā. Rādjasthān is the mother tongue of 77 per cent. of the inhabitants of this area. It is interesting to note that in some parts of India Rādjputs have embraced Islam, as for example the Manhas, Kaṭūls, and Sahlāria of the Pandījāb.


(C. Collin Davies)
RAF - AL-RĀĞHBĪB AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ

RAFĪ al-Dīn, MAWLĀNĪ SHĀH MUḤAMMAD, B. SHĀH WALĪ ALLĀH B. "ABD-AL-RAḤĪM AL-"OMĀRĪ (after the Caliph 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb), was born in 1163 (1750) in Dihlī, in a family which enjoyed the highest reputation in Muslim India for learning and piety, from the xviiith century onwards, and produced a number of eminent "ulama" up to the "Mutiny" (see Sīdīk Ḥasan Kāhnī, Ḥadīs al-Yubūsī), Cawnpur 1285, p. 296 sq. J. A. S. B., xiii. 310). He studied hadith with his father, who was the most celebrated traditionist in his time, in Dihlī.

After the death of his father in 1176, he was brought up by his elder brother Shāh "Abd al-"Azīz (1159—1239 = 1746—1823) with whom he completed his studies in the usual sciences, being specially interested in hadith, kalām and ʿusūl. When about twenty, he entered upon his career as muḥti and mudarris, and later succeeded in these capacities his brother and teacher, who, in his old age, had lost his eye-sight, and had indifferent health. He died on the 6th Shawwal 1233 (Aug. 9, 1818), at the age of 70 (lunar years), of cholera, and was buried in their family graveyard outside the city of Dihlī.

He wrote about 20 works, mostly in Arabic and Persian, and a few in Urdu. He is praised for the subtility of his ideas and the conciseness of his style. Among his works are:

In Urdu: 1. a translation of the Kurān, interlinear to the Arabic text, which it follows closely and faithfully. He and his brother 'Abd al-Kādīr [q.v.] were the pioneers in this field, though their work was considerably facilitated by their father, Shāh Walī Allāh's Persian translation of the Kurān (entitled Fath al-Rahīmīn fi Tārīqat al-Kurān). The first edition of Shāh Rafī al-Dīn's translation appeared in Calcutta in 1254 (1838—1839) and another, in 1265 (1849—1850). For some of its numerous editions (from 1866 onwards) see Blumhardt, Cat. of the Hindustānī Printed Books of the Libr. of the British Museum, London 1889, p. 290 sq., and the Supplement to the same, London 1900, p. 403.

In Arabic: 2. Tākūmīl al-Sīra or Tahkīl li-Sīra all-'Aḥdānī, dealing with a. logic, b. täkhīl, i.e. principles of dialectics, teaching, learning, authorship and self-study, c. Makhāthīn min 'Alīr al-'Asma (some metaphysical discussions) and d. Tābīth al-Ārū (i.e. an inquiry into the causes and the criteria for judging conflicting opinions in religious matters). A considerable portion of the work has been quoted in the Aḥkām al-Ulmīn, p. 127—135 and 235—270; 3. Muxāṣāmat al-ilm, see Aḥkām al-Ulmīn, p. 124; 4. Risālat al-Muḥabbā, a discourse on the all-pervading nature of love; see Aḥkām al-Ulmīn, p. 254; 5. Tafsīr Ayat al-Nīr, a commentary on Sūrā xxiv. 35; 6. Risālat al-'Arūd wa l-Ka'yā: see Aḥkād, p. 915; 7. Dāmaq al-Muṭīl, dealing with some abstruse problems of the ilm al-lākūfi; 8. a gloss on Mr. Zāhid al-Ḥarawī's commentary on Kūf al-Dīn al-Raūzī's Risālat al-Tauqawwūl wa l-Tașrīḥ (see Brockelmann, ii. 209); 9. Bihāṣ al-Barāšīn al-ḥikmīya ʿalī Īr al-Ulmīn. Nrs. 4—9 are unpublished.

In Persian: 10. Rizāmat Nāmēh (Lahore 1339; Haidarābād, undated ed.), on the last judgment, also called Maḥṣar Nāmēh (see Browne's Supplementary Handlist, p. 189). For the two poetical versions, in Urdu, of this popular work, viz. Aḥkām-i Muḥabbā (chronogrammatic name, which gives 1250 as the date of composition), and Aḥkām-i Kaṣīm, see Sprüner, Oudh Catalogue, p. 624, and Blumhardt, Cat., p. 290, and for an Urdu prose version, Kāvāmat Nāmēh or Dāl al-Aṣrār, see Blumhardt, loc. cit.; 11. Fudāʾīnī, Dihi 1232; 12. Madīnati Ta'sī Rālī, Dihi 1314, small treatises on religious and mystical topics; 13. Šāh al-Ṣūdār bi-Shāh Ḥāl al-Maftūh wa l-%ubār, an eschatological work, covering ff. 2002 of a small size, in a MS. copy in the Dār al-Ulmīn, Deoband, which institution also possesses the MS. of his 14. Ḥāfīz al-Kāmīs, a mystical work (ff. 32).


MUHAMMAD SHAFFI

AL-RÂĞHBĪB AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ. ḤABU' L-KÂSIM AL-HĀJIRI B. MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD-AD (according to others: al-Fadl, in al-Suyūṭī, ib. cit., wrongly: al-Muḥaffāẓ b. Muḥammad), a rab theo logical writer, of the details of whose life nothing is known beyond that he died at the beginning of the viith (xiith) century, perhaps in 502 (1108). Some regarded him as a Muʿtazili but Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī in his Asār al-Tafsīrī established his orthodoxy. His work was concerned with Ḳūṣīnic exegesis and edifying literature. His studies on the Kurān from which al-Baṣrīawi is said to have taken a great deal were opened with a Rūṣūd munâbīhī ʿalī ʿFāwi ʿalī al-Kurānī now lost, perhaps identical with the Muxāṣāmat al-Tafsīr, pr. at Cairo 1329 at the end of Abd al-Dhāḥābīl Tanzīl al-Kurānī ʿl-Majīdīn. He next compiled an excellent dictionary of the Kurān arranged alphabetically according to the initial letters entitled Kitāb Muṣāfat Al-Fazīl al-Kurānī, which in addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L. i. 289, survives in many others in Stamul (see e.g. M. O., vi. 106, 127) and in Bankore (Cat., xviii. 1454) and under the title al-Muṣāfat fī Khāriṯ al-Kurānī was printed on the margin of Ibn al-Athir's Vihāya, Cairo 1322 and edited by Muhammad
al-Zuhri al-Ghumrāwī. Cairo 1324. In the preface he holds out the prospect of a second work which was to deal with the synonyms of the Kurān (al-Alfāz al-mutaraddaša‘a la‘l-Muṣa‘a wa-l-wāḥiḍ va-nā bainahā min al-Furūq al-ğhimmā). The Tafsir al-Kurān, Aya Sofā 212, perhaps came to be compiled in this way. The reference might however be to the Dārārat al-Toṣūl, on the Kurān verses found in more than one passage although expressed differently, Br. Mus. Or. 5784 (Descriptive List, by A. G. Ellis and E. Edwards, p. 3) which is probably identical with the Hall Mutaddabīhāt al-Kurān, Stamπoul, Raghib 180. As a quotation in the preface shows he had already written his principal work on ethics Kitāb al-Dhārah ‘alā Makārim al-Sharī‘a, before the Kitāb Munfradāt; al-Dhazzālī is said to have always had a copy of this by him. In addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L. it is also preserved in Br. Mus., Or. 7016 (Describ. List. No. 62) and in Stamπoul (see e.g. M. O. B. vii. 101—102; M. F. O. B., v. 469) and printed Cairo 1299 (‘Sarkis 1899), 1324. The Kitāb Tafsīr al-Na‘qūdīn wa-Tafsīr al-Sā‘īdūtīn, pt. Cairo n.d., ed. by Tahir al-Da‘īrī from the Jerusalem MSS. Khalidiyya, No. 734, ed. of 963 A.H. Barāḍī 1319, 1323 is a companion work on both works, see also Alpacįnos, Ateherzam de Córdoba, i. 19. His most popular book was the work on ādab: Muḥāḍārat al-Uṣūl wa-Muḥāḍārat al-Shīkārī wa-l-Bulaqah or simply Kitāb Muḥāḍārat, which is divided into 25 ḥuṣud, which are again divided into 77 ḥuṣud and ābāwāb, which deal with the usual ādab themes beginning with human and stupidity and ending with angels, djinn and animas in quotations in prose and verse; in addition to the MSS. mentioned in G. A. L., it is also preserved in Stamπoul Selīm Āghā, No. 987; Damascus, ‘Umulma‘īs, Siyāṣī, 86, v. 7; in Cairo, Fihrist 2, lit. 334. A synopsis by al-Suyūṭī, ibid., p. 345; an anonymous Berlin, No. 8250 and Damascus, loc. cit., 86, v. 8. In Europe the work was first made known in the part edited by G. Flügel as "Der vertraute Gefahr des Einsamen in schlagenden Gegenden: von Abu Mansur Abdulmelmik ben Mohammed ben Ismail Ettevilias aus Nisabur mit einem Vorwort von Jos. v. Hamme", Vienna 1829 (see Gildemeister, Ö. D. M. G., xiii. 171). The work (with Ibn Ḥijdijīnas ‘Zāmarāt al-‘Awāb on the margin) in 2 vols., is printed in Bāzik 1284, 1287, 1305; Cairo (without the edition on the margin) 1310, 1324, 1326. ‘Ībrāhīm Zādān published in Cairo in 1902 a synopsis, which only contains 12 ḥuṣud, which lacks 10 and 13 of the Vienna Mss., and is abbreviated in other ways. A Persian translation entitled al-Nawādir by Mu‘ammad Sāliḥ b. Mu‘ammad Bā‘kīr al-Kazwini is in Teheran (see Y. Etessami, Cat. de la Bibliothèque du Madjīres, ii. 308). Lastly there is also an ādab al-Shīrāzī in Kāsan (see Menzel, in Lit., xvii. 94). The work on ādab: Taḵkīs al-‘Awāy (language and writing, ethics, dogmatics and philosophy, ‘ اللغة والمؤلفات‘ cited in the preface of the Kitāb al-Shīrāzī is found in Maqḥād, 5 (Οκτά), Fihristi Kutubhārīn-numb.941-Astāni Kudi Ridāvi, 1845, l. 24, No. 56).


RAGUSA (Ramsūn), a town in Dalmatia, formerly a free state (now Dubrovnik), on the south side of a peninsula which runs out into the Adriatic, picturesquely situated (50 feet) at the foot and on the slopes of Mount Sergius with about 14,500 inhabitants, mainly Croats, was founded in the viith century by Romance fugitives from Epidaurus which had been destroyed by the Slavs, later belonged to Byzantine Dalmatia which had been settled by a Romance population. At the end of the tenth century the town, which had become strong and rich through its prosperous maritime trade, was paying homage to the Venetians under whose suzerainty it remained after various interludes continuously from 1204 to 1358. In this year Ragusa passed to Hungary and soon attained such power through its flourishing trade that it formed a free state with an aristocratic form of government. Authority was in the hands of the nobles (Grand Council) who chose the Senate (45 members). The latter chose the Little Council (10, later 7 members) which chose every month a Rector (rettore) as head of the state. Al-Idrisī [q. v.] mentions Ragusa in his Kitāb al-Rodger as (other readings: كوس, روس) and is evidently quoting Frankish sources (cf. thereon Wihl. Tomascek, Zur: Kunde der Hamus-Halbinsel: II. Die Handelswege im XII. Jahrh. nach den Erkundungen des Arabers Idrisi, Vienna 1887 = S. B. Ak. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. xxiii., fasc. 1). In the Ottoman period the Slav name Dubrovač is found exclusively, in place of Ragusa. Ragusa’s relations with Islam, at first completely hostile, go back to a remote date. When the Arabs in the ninth century conquered Sicily and established themselves on the mainland in Bari (Apulia) they besieged Ragusa on one occasion which defended itself bravely and was relieved by the navy of the emperor Basil I (867—886). Under the emperor Romanus III (1028—1034) the Ragusans distinguished themselves in the seafights between Byzantines and Arabs. It was not till a later date that relations became more peaceful when Ragusan commerce, which extended to Egypt and Syria, to Tunis and as far as the Black Sea, began to flourish. As early as the thirteenth century, corn was exported and goods from Ragusa from the harbours of Anatolia and the relations to the petty states (يئرنيا, يئرنيا) in Anatolia were well established. The first documented relations between Ragusa and the Ottoman empire belong to the period of Bayezid I. Vildiriri (1389—1402; q. v.) as the relations of the free state to Orhan [q. v.] and Murad I [q. v.] mentioned in later Ragusan histories will not bear serious investigation. It is however certain that at quite an early date it became necessary for the Ragusans to remain on good terms with the Ottomans, who were advancing westward, for the sake of their trade. They were able to deal with tact and skill with their new neighbours. Ragusan trade in Turkey developed considerably as the many frontiers and customs offices of the numerous petty rulers of the Balkans, who had been disparaged by the Turks, disappeared and the Turkish duties were uniform and low. Articles manufactured in Ragusa itself, like cloth, metal, soap, glass, wax etc. or goods imported from Italy for the Balkan peninsula were taken into the interior on safe roads. There was a caravan trade which went from Ragusa via Trebinje, Tien-
tiste, Foča, Goražde, Plevje, Prijopej, Trgoviste, Novibazar [q. v.], Niš, Sofia, Philippopolis to Adri-anople and later to Stambul (cf. C. J. Jireček, Die Handelstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters, Prag 1879, p. 129). Von Ragusa nach Niš). In the interior of the Peninsula there were the factories of the Ragusans like Rudnik, Prizren, Novy Brod, Pristina, Zvornik, Novibazar, Skoplje, Sofia with many other settlements extending as far as the mouths of the Danube. On May 12, 1392 the Little Council of Ragusa gave the nobleman Teodoros Gisla in Novy Brod orders to travel to the Turkish sultan and to make representations about the capture of some Ragusan merchants. There is a Turkish safe-conduct (literna securitas) of June 20, 1396 prepared for Ragusan merchants. In 1397 Sultan Bayazid I allowed the Ragusans to trade unhindered in the Ottoman empire, and a few years later (1399), the first Ottoman embassy led by Kelifa Feriz (Firiz)-Beg arrived in Ragusa from the citadel of Zvitan (in Kossovo) (cf. F. v. Kraizlet-Greifenhorst, op. cit., p. 272). The first embassy from Ragusa to the Sublime Porte was however not sent until 1430. It was received by the sultan in his court at Adrianople and received from him the first extant charter of trading privileges, dated Adrianople, Dec. 6, 1430 (cf. Čiro Truhlček, Turtsko-slovenski spomenici dubrovačke arhite, in Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo, vol. xxiii. [1911], No. 2). To protect her widespread trade on the Balkan Peninsula Ragusa, after the first temporary conquest of Serbia by the Ottomans, found herself forced to offer the Porte an annual present of 1,000 ducats in silver plate (argentarius) but when Georg Branković restored the independence of Serbia in 1444 this promise was promptly withdrawn; on the final subjection of Serbia by the Turks in 1459 this tribute (šarādat) became a regular institution. From 1459 it was 1,500 ducats and gradually increased to 15,000 ducats. From 1481 it was 12,500 ducats and was annually brought to the imperial court by special pratori tributi with very detailed instructions (cf. the text of one of these commissiones for the Paladiani Marino de Gondola and Pietro di Luccari of 1458 and of a later one for the ambasciatori del tributo Gior. Mar. di Resti of 1572 in Lujo knez Vojnović, Dubrovnik i osmań-ko carstvo, Prva knjiga: Od prvog ugovora s portom do usvojenja Hercegovine, Belgrad 1898, p. 118—155 and p. 256—266); cf. C. J. Jireček, Die Bemühungen von Ragusa etc., note 49. A number of the earliest documents relating to these missions have been published by F. Kraizlet-Greifenhorst, in his Osmanische Urbekunde in türkischer Sprache aus der zweiten Hälfte des XV. Jahrhunderts (S. B. A. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. 197, Vienna 1922); they come without exception from the archives of Ragusa, south of the Turkish portion of which is still present in Belgrad.

On their journey the envoys had to give all kinds of presents, for example to the Sandjakbeys of the Herzegovina in Sarajevo [q. v.] and the Beglerbeg of Rumelia whose headquarters were in Sofia. The readiness with which the Ragusans adapted themselves to the requirements of dealings with the infidel Turks did not at first find approval at the Holy See. Paul II in 1468 gave the Ragusans express permission to trade with the heathen Ottomans (cf. W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii., Leipzig 1885, p. 347 sq. with further references to Ragusan trade with the Ottomans). The lands of the free state of Ragusa which stretched from the mouth of the Neretva to the Gulf of Cattaro (Kotor), thanks to the skilful policy of its leaders, thus remained intact till its end in 1808. Only occasionally the Ragusans had to suffer from the covetousness of Ottoman rulers, e.g. about 1667 when Kara Muṣṭafâ [q. v.] demanded from the Ragusan envoys 150,000 talers "blood money" for the Dutch ambassador G. Crook who perished in the great earthquake in Ragusa (April 6, 1667) (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 201 sq.), or when ten years later the same grand vizier endeavoured to extort the same sum and threw the ambassadors of the free state into prison (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 346). When Ragusa had fallen several years behind with the tribute, it had in 1695 to pay a considerable sum in compensation (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vi. 616). In 1722 a similar case occurred (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 313 sq.) which was paid within three years in arrears. It is however a fact that Ragusa cunningly used every opportunity to avoid its oppressive obligations (cf. the significant saying in the Levant quoted by von Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 29: Non siano Christiani, non siano Ebrei, ma povery Ragusi), until the peace of Carlowitz (1699) made it possible for the Ottomans to collect the tribute again (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. K., vii. 29). From 1703 it was paid every three years and in 1804 delivered for the last time in Stambul by the envoys Paul Gozze and Blasius Menze.

In the Turkish wars of 1683—1699 and 1714—1718 the Venetians occupied the hinterland of Ragusa and Trebinje but at the peace of Carlowitz and Passarowitz the Ragusans, protected by Austria and the Porte, negotiated so skilfully that Turkey was not only left the land as far as the Ragusan frontier but also two strips of territory on the coast (Klek and Sutiorina) so as not to become direct neighbours of Venice. This was the last great coup of Ragusan policy.

With the decline in Ragusan trade, which came about for the same reasons as the general decline of Italian trade in the Levant, the political decline of the republic set in. In 1808, Napoleon sent General Marmont, afterwards Duc de Raguse, to dissolve the Senate and a year later made Ragusa a province of Illyria. In 1815 the town passed to Austria and since 1918 it has belonged to Jugo-Slavia.

The Ottoman traveller Ewliya Celebi [q. v.] in his Siyahname (vi. 443 sqq., esp. p. 445—453) gives a full description of Dobro Vodnik which he contrasts with Bundužani Venetoli, i.e. Venice (cf. on these terms F. Babinger, Aus Südosteuropas Türkentin, Berlin 1927, p. 38 note and H. v. Mähl, Beiträge zur Kartographie Albaniens, in Geographia Hungarica, series geologica, tomus III, Geograph 1929, p. 159 = 19, note 88). In 1874 (1663) he came via Livno to Popovo Dubrovnik from which he went on to Castelnuovo (Hercegnovi). On Hungarian and Serbo-Croat translations of this section cf. Babinger, Ewliya Celebi's Reisezwege in Albanien, Berlin 1936, p. 1 and note 8.

Statistics regarding the population of Ragusa in the older period are not available. The town had 800 houses. The whole district had 50,000 inhabitants. With the prosperity and long period of peace, a literary life began: poetry — Latin
and Slav — was definitely cultivated from the end of the xvith century. Latin was used in the offices for over 1,000 years, in recording the proceedings of the Senate till 1808. Within its walls Ragusa frequently sheltered illustrious fugitives from Turkish persecution (e.g. Skanderbeg).

The archives of Ragusa, kept in the Rector's palace, still await thorough study and contain a large number of unpublished Turkish documents and countless documents of value for the history of Turkish rule in S.E. Europe. Cf. Friedrich Giese, Die eisenacht-turkischen Urkunden im Archiv des Rektorenpalastes in Dubrovnik (Ragusa), in Forschungen für Georg Jacob zum siebzigsten Geburstag, Leipzig 1932, p. 41—56. Cf. also J. Gelich (Djelich), Dubrovacki arhiv, in Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini, xxii., Sarajevo 1910, and Milan v. Resetaer, Dubrovacki arhiv, in Narodna enciklopedija, i. 584 sqq.

Ragusa had busy commercial relations with other Muslim states besides Turkey. In 1510 for example, Ragusa received from Kâşûl al-Qâbrî [or Vlahar (now which gave its trade with Egypt) protection and freedom (cf. Giacomo Luccari, Copio ristretto degli Annulli di Ragusa, Venice 1605, p. 126 and thereon Fr. M. Appiendi, Notizie sulle istorico-critiche antichità, storia e letteratura de’ Ragusani, Ragusa 1802, i. 213 with erroneous conclusions). The relations were, this is true, not always of a peaceful nature as the “state of war” in 1194 (1780) between Ragusa and Morocco showed (cf. thereon F. Bihanger, Ein marokkanisches Staatschreiben an den Freistaat Ragusa vom Jahre 1194 (1780), in M. S. O. S., xxx., Berlin 1927, part ii., p. 191 sqq. and ibid., xxxi., p. 95 sq.). The archives of Dubrovnik contain further unpublished Moroccan documents of the end of the xvith century, e.g. a government document of the 9th Rabi II. 1195 (April 4, 1781).

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned in the text cf. also the older travellers in so far as they describe the road through the Balkan Peninsula (Slavonia), especially Jean Cheseau, Les Voyages de Monseigneur d’Aravon (1542), Paris 1857, ed. by E. Scherer: Sieur D’Hayes de (Fourmein), Voyage du Levant fait par le commandement du roy en l’an 1621 par le Sieur D. C. F. Paris 1632; Les Voyages de M. Quillet à Constantinople par terre, Paris 1664 and frequently; Sir George Wheler, Journey into Greece, London 1682 or French translation Voyage de Dalmatie, de Grece et du Levant, Amsterdam 1689, 2 vols. — A scholarly account, particularly one based on the documents, of the relations of Ragusa with the Ottoman Empire is still lacking as is a full commercial history of the republic. — The principal work on the history of Ragusa is the Geschichte des Freistaates Ragusa, Vienna 1807, by Johann Christ. v. Engel (1770—1814). On other relations between Ragusa and the lands of Islam see Vladislav Mažuranić, Sudslaven im Dienste des Islam, X. (bis ins XVI. Jahrhundert), transl. into German and pub. by Camilla Lucerna, Zagreb-Leipzig 1928, 55 p., a work which however does not on every point stand the test of strict examination. — On the coinage of Ragusa see Milan v. Resetaer, Dubrovačka numismatika, 2 parts, 1924—1926. — Of the Ragusan historians of the older period in addition to S. Razzi, La storia di Ragusa, Luca 1588 and Jun. Resti, Chronica Ragusina (in the Monumenta Slav. Merid., vol. xxv., Agram 1893), Giacomo di Pietro Luccari (= Jakov Lukarević [1551—1615]) most deserves mention, but a thorough study of the probably unreliable sources of his Copio ristretto degli annulli di Ragusa (Venice 1605, xxxvi., 176 p., 4° and Ragusa 1790, xxiii., 325 p., 8°) is still a desideratum; cf. for the present Vl. Mažuranić, Izvori dubrovačkoga historika Jakova Lukarevića, in Narodna Starina, Zagreb 1924, No. 8, p. 121—155. — An excellent and exhaustive bibliography on Ragusa is given in the introduction to the work of Ivan Dučev, Avvisi di Ragusa. Documenti sull’Impero turco nel secolo XVII e sulla guerra di Candia, Rome 1935, which is also of great importance for the history of relations between Ragusa and Turkey. — There is no collection or edition of the surviving reports of Ragusan envoys on their journeys to the Porte on the lines of the long available Venetian relations. The only possible exception is the Relazioni della religione nelle parti d’ Europa sottoposte al dominio del Turco of Matthäus Gundulić (Gondola) who was in Turkey for 28 months until July 1674 written in Rome in 1675, ed. by Banduri, Imperium Orientale, Paris 1711, vol. ii. Annotazioni in Constant. Porphyrog. de administrazione imperii, p. 99—106 (cf. thereon Drinov in Periodisch Spisanje van Braia, ii. 65, who did not know this edition and published extracts from another manuscript). Nor is there a list of these envoys available (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 318) among whom we find representatives of almost all the noble families of Ragusa, like the Bona, Caboga, Gozze, Gondola, Menze, Pozza, Resti etc. Ragusa being a tributary country the Porte never sent ambassadors to it but only commissioners (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 331), so that we have no Turkish reports at all.

(FRANZ BAHINGER)

AL-RAHBA, RAHAT Mlik B. TAVK OF RABAT AL-SHAM, A TOWN ON THE RIGHT BANK OF THE EUFRATES, THE MODERN AL-MIYADIN.

Hardly anything definite is known about the history of this town before the Muslim era. In the middle ages it was usually identified as the Rehobot han-Nāḥah of the Bible (Gen. xxxvi. 37) i.e. Rehobot on the river (Euphrates) especially in the Talmud and by the Syriac authors (e.g. Mich Syr., cf. index, p. 64: T. Barbeccus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 273 and passim), who usually call it Rahab, Rahab (M. Haithman in Z. D. P. V. xxii., p. 42 note 1). A. Musli (The Middle Euphrates, New York 1927, p. 340) takes it to be the Thapsakos of Ptolemy, which he — certainly wrongly — wants to distinguish from the well-known town of the name at the bend of the Euphrates (ibid., p. 315—320) instead of seeing only an erroneous location by the Alexandria geographers (cf. the article THAPSAKOS in Pauly-Wissowa, R. E., v., A. col. 1272—1280). The name al-Rahba is explained by Yaḥyā (Muḥjam, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 764 following the grammarians Naṣīr b. Shumail as the flat part of a wādī, where the water collects (E. A. Hering, Archäolog. Reise in der Euphrat- und Tigri-Gebirge, ii. 382: cf. A. Socin, in Z. D. P. V., xxii. 45).

According to Arabic accounts it seems at one time called Furdat Nu‘um (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 917) or simply al-Furda (Ibn Miskawayh, Taqrib, ...
ed. Caetani, p. 87); in the vicinity was a monastery, Dair Nu’um (Yākūt, ii. 704; iv. 797).

According to al-Balādhūrī (ed. de Goeje, p. 180), there was no evidence that al-Raḥba below Ḫarrān, Sarūq, al- Ra’ākha and al-Khābir to Muḥammad b. Ǧharaf al-Dawla (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 105). In 849 (1065) Karbūkha of al-Hila seizes and plundered the town (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 177). After his death it passed (1103–1105) to Ǧayyūmī, a former general of Aḥmad b. Ḫurṭ, then to the Ṣarḥan. It was taken from him by the sūltān of Damascus, who sent the Ṣhaibānīd Muḥammad b. al-Ṣabbās to govern it (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 249). On May 19, 1107 Džawwāl, the general of Ǧamāl al-Dīn Ṣanjl, took the town through treachery (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 297; Ibn al-Ḳalānīsī, ed. Amedroz, p. 156 sq.; Michael Syrus, transl. Chabot, iii. 193; iv. 592; Barhebræus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjaj, p. 273). Ǧiz al-Dīn Māsūd b. al-Burjūkī took it in 1127 shortly before his death (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 360 sq.; Mich. Syr., ii. 228 = iv. 610; Barhebr., Chron. Syr., p. 287). His successors killed one another fighting for the succession and al-Raḥba then passed to Ǧiz al-Dīn’s young brother for whom Džawwāl governed it as vassal of Ṣanjl (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 453 sq.). Ǧubb al-Dīn, son of Ǧanjl, in 544 (1150) occupied the town (Ibn al-Atlīr, x. 439). On Aug. 12, 1157, al-Raḥba with Ḫamāh, Shāizar, Salamyā and other towns were destroyed by an earthquake (Ibn al-Ḳalānīsī, ed. Amedroz, p. 344; Mich. Syr., iii. 316; Barhebr., Chron. Syr., p. 325 sq.). The Ḳasfādī tribe who in 1161 had plundered the district of al-Ḫilla and al-Ḳūf returned to Raḥbat al-Ṣaḥam followed by the government troops where they were reinforced by other nomads and scattered the enemy (Ibn al-Atlīr, xi. 182 sq.). Nūr al-Dīn granted the Kurū Ḫādī al-Dīn Širkhā b. Aḥmad b. Ḫādī of Dīn, Salādīn’s uncle, in 559 (1164) al-Raḥba and Ǧimṣ (Mich. Syr., iii. 325; Barhebr. Chron. syr., p. 330). The latter entrusted the government of al-Raḥba to an officer named Yūsf b. Maṭliḥ. Širkhā built Raḥbat al-Ḵadīdī with a citadel about a farsākh (3 miles) from the Ephrates because the town of Raḥbat al-Ḵālī was in ruins (Abu ’l-Fida', Taḏkir al-Bulūḥ, p. 281; Ḥadīṯ al-Khālīfa, Liphān-nun, p. 444). The new town of Raḥbat al-Ḵālī became an important caravan station between Syria and the Ḥark, as we learn from Ibn Baṭṭūta among others (Ṭahf, ed. Défrémery and Sanguinetti, iv. 315) who travelled from there via al-Sukhna to Tadmūr.

The town remained for a century in Širkhā’s family until in 1264 Baibars installed an Egyptian governor there (Ibn al-Atlīr, xii. 189; Abu ’l-Fida’, Annales Musulm., ed. Reiske-Adler, iv. 142; v. 16). Sonṣor al-Šākhar of Damascus who rebelled against Ǧalā’ān in 678 (1279) fled after a defeat to al-Raḥba to the emir Ǧisā and from there appealed to Abaḵa for protection (Barhebr., Chron. syr., p. 543).

The Mongols under Ḫarḥānba besieged Raḥba in 712 (1212–1213) on their way to Syria. On his return Ḫarḥānba left his siege-artillery behind; hereupon was taken by the defenders of the town into the citadel (Abu ’l-Fida’, v. 268 sq.; al-Ḥasan b. Ḫabīb b. Ǧūyār, Duwar al-Aslāk fi Duwal al-Airāk, in H. E. Weyers, in Oriëntalia, ed. Juyboll, ii. Amsterdam 1846, p. 319). Its governor at the time, Ibn al-Arkaqī, died in 715 (1315–1316) in Damascus (Abu ’l-Fida’, v. 300). Muḥanna and his family, the Ǧisā, were driven from the district of Salamiyā in the spring of 1320 and pursued by the Syrian troops as far as
Rahba and Ana (Abu ‘l-Fida’, v. 340 sq.); the town was perhaps destroyed on this occasion.

In 1331 the Euphrates inundated the country round al-Rahba (Ibn al-Athir, Vienna MS. in Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 3, note 3).

According to the Muslim geographers, al-Rahba lay on the Euphrates (Kauhdh, in B. G. A., vi. 233; al-‘Akhdh, in B. G. A., iii. 138; al-Idrisi, transl. Jaubert, ii. 137 sq.; al-Dimishki, ed. Mehren, n. 93; Abu ‘l-Fida’, ed. Reinaud, p. 51) and also on the canal which led off from it at Fam ‘as near the right bank, which rejoined the Euphrates below the town, the gardens of which it watered, and above al-Dailiya also called Dailiyat Malik b. Tawq (Suhaili, ed. v. Mi‘zik, in Bibl. arab. Histoire de Gogouv, v. Leipzig 1930, p. 123; Yakuti, iv. 840; Abu ‘l-Fida’, Ta‘izziya, p. 281). The town lay 3 farsaks from Karkisiya (al-Azizi, in Abu ‘l-Fida’, ed. Reinaud, p. 281) and, according to al-Makdisi (B. G. A., iii. 149), a day’s journey each from this town, al-Dailiya and Bira (the latter statement is quite inaccurate; cf. Musil, op. cit., p. 253 sq.). Musil (ibid., p. 250) wrongly takes al-Dailiya to be al-Sidhiya, which is impossible as 8—10 miles above it the Euphrates flows close to the foot of Lijbal Alu ‘l-Kasim, so that the Sa’id canal must have flowed north of it back into the Euphrates (cf. the Karte von Mesopotamien of the Prussian Survey, Feb. 1918, i. 400,000 sheet 5c; ‘Ana; Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos, Paris 1926, Atlas, pl. i.: Cours de l’Euphrate entre Circeium et Doura-Europos d’apres l’Aéronautique de l’Armée du Levant on the same scale and the map in Sarre-Hezfeld, Arch. Reise). The town of al-Rahba was a Jacobite bishopric (a list of the bishops in Mich. Syr., iii. 502); that it — for a time at least — was also a Nestorian bishopric is shown from a life of the Katholikos Eliya I (on him see Baumstark, Geschichte der syr. Literatur, p. 286 sq.) who shortly before his death on May 6, 1049 appointed a bishop to this town (Assemini, in B. O., iii. 263).

In the statements of the Arab geographers, it is clear that the old Rahbat Malik b. Tawq lay on the bank of the Euphrates (al-‘Akhdh, in B. G. A., i. 13, 72; Ibn Hawqal, B. G. A., ii. 138; al-Makdisi, B. G. A., iii. 138; Yakuti, Mus‘jam, iii. 860; Ibn Khuradhdhibh, B. G. A., vi. 235) i.e. presumably corresponded to the modern al-Miyadín (plur. of mu‘addan) (G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syr. Akten pers. Martyris, p. 165; E. Herzfeld, Arch. Reise, iii. 382, note 1; A. Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 233, 240) while the new al-Rahba, as we saw, was built a farsakh from it, where in the S.W. of al-Miyadín there still are the ruins of the citadel al-Rahba or Raha. According to Abu ‘l-Fida’ (ed. Reinaud, p. 281), towers were still standing among the ruins of the old town. Opposite al-Rahba on the left bank of the Euphrates stood a fortress, taken by Marwan II (744—750) in the fight with Hisham b. Manbij, by Marwan II, Kitab al-‘Ursawin, ed. Vasuher, in Patr. Oriental., vii. 517 sq.). In this fortress Musil (op. cit., p. 338 sq.) has recognised al-Zaituna (al-‘Abdallahi, ed. de Goeje, p. 180; Tabari, ii. 1457 sq.; Ibn Khuradhdhibh, ed. de Goeje, p. 74) and the ancient Zadd which is still called al-Marwaninya after this caliph, but really is not opposite al-Miyadín, but fourteen miles farther down.

Ibn Hawqal (B. G. A., ii. 155) praises the fertility of the well-watered region of Rahba, where the orchards on the east bank of Euphrates also produced date-palms; their quinces were also famous (al-Makdisi, in B. G. A., iii. 145). The Karte von Mesopotamien (i: 400,000 map) at ‘Mejdina’ (the first (most northerly) palm) dates only too well in specially favourable weather in the region of Albu Kamal (Musil, op. cit., p. 342). According to al-Istakhri (B. G. A., i. 77), Rahbat Malik b. Tawq was larger than Karkisiya; al-Makdisi (B. G. A., iii. 142) calls it the centre of the Euphrates’ district (camal al-‘Farat or nahiyat al-‘Farat) as in the early Mohammedan period the fertile plain from Dair al-Zawr to Albu Kamal with the towns of al-Rahba, Dailiya, Ana and al-Hadiitha was called (Herzfeld, op. cit., ii. 382). According to him the town was built in a semi-circle on the edge of the desert and defended by a strong fortress.

Yakuti visited the town, which according to him was eight days’ journey from Damascus, five from Halab, 100 farsaks from Baghdad and a little over 20 farsaks from al-Kaṣṣa. In al-Dimishki (ed. Mehren, p. 202) it is called Rahbat al-Furaitya. In the time of Khalil al-Zahiri (Zahiri, ed. Rashid, p. 50) it belonged to Halab. According to al-Umari, Syria, to be more exact, its eastern marches with the capital Hims, reached as far as al-Rahba; he mentions there “a citadel and a governorship and there are Bahri’s, cavalry, scouts and mercenaries stationed there” (al-Umari, transl. R. Hartmann, in Z.D.M.G., lxx., 23, 39). Ibn Battuta (op. cit.) calls the town “the end of al-‘Irak and the beginning of al-Sham.” Ḥadidjî Khalîfa reckons from ‘Ana to al-Rahba three days’ journey and from there to al-Dair one day’s journey (Ziakhân-numa, Stambul 1145, p. 483; cf. thereon Musil, op. cit., p. 257).


Piero Delli-Scipioni (Viaggi, Venice 1544, p. 571) saw the town of “Rachba” at some distance from the Euphrates and heard that there were some old buildings there. Tavernier (Les six voyages, i., Paris 1676, p. 285) mentions a place called “Machel-raba”, i.e. Maşhad al-Rahba (six miles S.W. of al-Rahba).

In modern times al-Miyadín and the ruins of al-Rahba (the usual formation) have been repeatedly visited (see Bibl.). The plan of the castle forms a triangle with flattened angles; pictures of the castle will be found in Musil, The Middle Euphrates, p. 7, fig. 2 or Sarre-Hezfeld, Arch. Reise, iii., pl. lxiv, sq. (Bibliography: al-Istakhri, in B. G. A., i. 77; Ibn Hawqal, B. G. A., ii. 155; al-Makdisi, B. G. A., iii. 142, 145; Yakuti, Mus‘jam, ed. Westenfeld, ii. 734, 744; Saff al-Din, al-Mardid al-‘Irdris, i. 464; al-Baladhuri, Poste al-Baladun, ed. de Goeje, p. 180; Ibn Djabir, ed. Wright, p. 250; Kalkashandi, Daw’i, Cairo 1324, p. 291; cf. Gaudefoy-Demobynnes, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 77—80, 183, 245 sq., 254, 259; R. Hartmann, Die geographischen Nachrichten über Palastina und Syrien in Khalil al-Zahiris Zubdat Kashf al-Mamalik, dissert. Tubingen 1907, p. 62; K. Ritter, Erd-
RAH巴NIYA (A.), monasticism. The term is derived from rähbî [q.v.]; it occurs in the Kur'an once only, in a passage (sûra livi. 27) that has given rise to divergent interpretations:  
"And we put in the hearts of those who followed Jesus, compassion and mercy, and the monastic state, they instituted the same (we did not prescribe it to them) only out of a desire to please God. Yet they observed not the same as it ought truly to have been observed. And we gave unto such of them as believed, their reward; but many of them were wicked doers".

According to some of the exegists the verb "we put" has two objects only, viz. compassion and mercy; whereas the words "the monastic state" are the object of "they instituted". Accordingly the monastic state appears here as a purely human institution, which moreover has been degraded by evil doers.

According to others, however, the object of the words "and we put" is: compassion, mercy and the monastic state. According to this exegesis monasticism is called a divine institution. Professor Massignon has pointed out that this exegesis is the older one; the younger one expresses a feeling hostile to monasticism, which coined the tradition "No rahbäinya in Islam".

This tradition does not occur in the canonical collections. Yet, it is being prepared there. When the wife of Ösmân b. Ma'âlûq [q.v.] complained of being neglected by her husband, Muhammad took her part, saying: Monasticism (rahbäinya) was not prescribed to us (Ahmed b. Hanbal, vi. 226; Dîrîmi, Nikâh, bâb 3). The following tradition is less exclusive: Do not trouble yourselves and God will not trouble you. Some have troubled themselves and God has troubled them. Their successors are in the hermitages and monasteries, "an institution we have not prescribed to them" (Abû Dâwûd, A'dâb, bâb 44).

Islam, thus rejecting monasticism, has replaced it by the holy war: "Every prophet has some kind of rahbäinya; the rahbäinya of this community is the holy war" (a tradition ascribed to Muhammad in Aḥmad b. Hanbal, iii. 266; to Abû Sa'îd al-Khadrî, ibid., iii. 82). Cf. also Târiqâ, Zuhd.

Bibliography: L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, p. 123 sqq.; the commentaries of the Kur'an on sûra livi. 27; Ibn Sa'd, Taḥâfûṣ, ed. Sachau, iii/1, 287; Hariçtî, Ma'âlûm, ed. de Sacy, p. 570—571; Zamakhshârî, al-Fâlîbûkî, Hâdîrâbâd 1324, i. 269; Ibn al-Âthîr, Nikâh, s.v.; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, i. 389; Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, ii. 394; do., in R. H. R., xvi. 193—194: xxxvii. 314. (A. J. Wensinck)

RAHîl (A., plur. râhîn, râhîbûn, râhîbîn, râhîbâna), a monk. The figure of the monk is known to pre-Islamic poetry and to the Kur'an and Tradition. The pre-Islamic poets refer to the monk in his cell the fight which the traveller by night sees in the distance and which gives him the idea of shelter.

In the Kur'an the monk and the eisîs, sometimes also the âkhîr, are the religious leaders of the Christians. In one place it is said that rabbis and monks live at the expense of other men (Sûra ix., 34) and that the Christians have taken as their masters instead of God their âkhîr and their monks as well as al-Masîh b. Maryam (Sûra ix. 31). In another passage the Christians are praised for their friendship to their fellow-believers which is explained from the fact that there are priests and monks among them (Sûra v. 87). In Hadîth the râhîb is frequently encountered in stories of the nature of the âbiyâ al-âniyâ (cf. Bukhârî, Abû-yi, bâb 54; Muslim, Zuhûr, Tr. 73; Tawûbû, Tr. 46, 47; Tirmîdî, Taṣfîr, Sûra 85, Tr. 2; Nâqîbî, Tr. 3; Nasîrî, Masâbîqû, Tr. 11; Ibn Mâdî, Fiânûn, Tr. 20, 23; Dîrîmi, Šafa'il al-Kurân, Tr. 16; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, i. 461; ii. 434; iii. 357; 347; v. 4; vi. 17 bîc). From the fact that in the Muhammadan literature of the early centuries A.H. the epithet râhîb was given to various pious individuals it is evident that there was nothing odious about it. Cf. however the article RAHBAâNYA.

Bibliography: cf. that of RAHBAâNYA.

(A. J. Wensinck)

RAHîl, in the Bible Rachel, wife of Jacob, mother of Joseph and Benjamin, is not mentioned in the Kur'an. There is however a reference to her in Sûra iv. 27: "Ye may not have two sisters to wife at the same time; if it has been done formerly God now exercises pardon and mercy". This is said to allude to Jacob's marriage with Liyâ and Râhîl; before Moses revealed the Tora, such a marriage was valid. Tabari gives this explanation in the Annals, i. 356, 359 sq. Ibn al-Âthîr, p. 90, adopts it. But already in Taṣfîr, iv. 210, Tabari explains the verse correctly: Muhammad forbids for the future marriage with two sisters; but he does not dissolve such marriages concluded before the prohibition. — Islamic tradition generally adopts the view that Yâkûb only married Râhîl after Liyâ's death. So already in Tabari, i. 355, Zamakhshârî, Ba'idâwî, Ibn al-Âthîr etc. Al-Kisâ'î even thinks that Yâkûb only married Râhîl after the death of Liyâ and of his two concubines. Here again Muslim legend differs from the Bible, in making him not marry Râhîl until after 14 years of service; in the Bible, Jacob serves seven years, marries Leah and after the wedding week Rachel
and serves another seven years. — Yâkûb's wooing and Laban's trick by which he substitutes Liya for Kahlil as "neither lamp nor candle-light" illuminate the bridal chamber, is embellished in Muslim legend.

Kahlil is also of importance in the story of Yûsuf. Yûsuf inherits his beauty from Kahlil; they had half of all the beauty in the world, according to others two-thirds, or even according to the old Haggadic scheme (Kiddushin, 40b), nine tenths (Thalâbi, p. 69). — When Yâkûb left Lâban, he had no funds for the journey; at Rachel's suggestion, Yûsuf steals Lâban's idols. — As Yûsuf, sold by his brothers, passes the tomb of Kahlil he throws himself from his camel on the grave and laments: "O mother, look on thy child, I have been deprived of my coat, thrown into a pit, stoned and sold as a slave." Then he hears a voice: "Trust in God." The old Haggada does not know this touching scene. But it has found its way into the late medieval book of stories Sefer Hayazhar (ed. Goldschmidt, p. 150). The Jewish-Persian poet Shahin (5th century) adopts this motif from Firdawsi's Yâsîq u-Zâmîqî in his book of Genesis.


(B. HELLER)

RAHIM. [See ALLAH, i. 303, 304.]

AL-RAHIM. [See KURSAW FURU']

RAHMA, compassion [see ALLAH, i. 303b, 306.]

RAHMÂN. [See ALLAH, i. 303b, 304.]

RAHMÂNIYA, Algerian Order (farîka) called after Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Gushtalî al-Djingûrî al-Ãzahrî Alû Kibrînîn, who died 1208 (1793-1794). It is a branch of the Khalwatiya and is said to have at one time been called after Muḥâfîz al-Bakri al-Shahî. At Nefta, in Tunisia, and some other places it is called "Arzûyana after Muḥâfaṣâ b. Muḥammad b. 'Azîzû.

Life of the Founder. His family belonged to the tribe Ait Smâîl, part of the confederation Gash-tula in the Kabylia Djurdjura; having studied at his home, and then in Algiers, he made the pilgrimage in 1152 (1739-1740), and on his return spent some time as a student at al-Ãzahr in Cairo, where Muḥâfîz b. Sâlim al-Hafawî (d. 1181: Sîlîk al-Dwâr, iv. 50) initiated him into the Khalwati Order, and ordered him to propagate it in India and the Sudan; after an absence of thirty years he returned to Algeria, and commenced preaching in his native village, where he founded a zâwiya; he seems to have introduced some modifications into Khalwati practice, and in his Seven Visions of the Prophet Muḥammad made some important claims for his person and his system. Immunity from hell-fire was to be secured by affiliation to his order, love for himself or it, a visit to himself, stopping before his tomb, bearing his dirâr recited. His success in winning adherents provoked the envy of the local murâbiṭîn, in con-

sequence of which he migrated to Hamma in the neighbourhood of Algiers. Here too his activities met with opposition from the religious leaders, who summoned him to appear before a madîjîs under the presidency of the Mâlikîte Mufît 'Ali b. Amin; through the influence of the Turkîsh authorities, who were impressed by the following which he had acquired, he was acquitted of the charge of unorthodoxy, but he thought it prudent to return to his native village, where shortly afterwards he died, leaving as his successor 'Ali b. 'Iṣâ al-Maghribî. His corpse is said to have been stolen by the Turks and buried in a great pomp at Hamma with a febbâ and a mournful song over it. The Ait Smâîl however maintained that it had not left its original grave, whence it is supposed to have been miraculously duplicated, and the title Aîû Kibrînîn "owner of two graves" was given him.

History and propagation of the Order. 'Ali b. 'Iṣâ al-Maghribî was undisputed head from 1208 (1793-1794) to 1251 (1836-1837); his successor died shortly after, and from the following year, though the Order continued to win adherents, it divided into independent branches. This was owing to the objections raised by the Ait Smâîl to the succession of al-Haḍîjî Bahšîr, another Maghribî; in spite of the support of 'Abd al-Kâdir (the famous enemy of the French) he had to quit his post, which was held for a time by the widow of 'Ali b. Iṣâ, who, however, owing to the dwindling of the revenue of the zâwiya had ultimately to summon Bahšîr back. Meanwhile the founders of other zâwiya were assuming independence. After the death of Bahšîr in 1259 (1843-1844) her son-in-law al-Haḍîjî 'Ammâr succeeded to the headship. Finding his influence waning owing to his failure to participate in the attack on the French organized by Bû Baghla he in August 1856 called his followers to arms and obtained some initial successes; he was however compelled to surrender in the following year, and his wife (or mother-in-law) at the head of a hundred ßhûân shortly after. Bahšîr retired to Tunis, where he endeavoured to continue the exercise of his functions, but he was not generally recognized as head of the order, and his place among the Ait Smâîl was taken by Muhammad Amîlân b. al-Hâddâd of Sâddâkîn, who at the age of 80 on April 8, 1871 proclaimed jâhîd against the French, who had recently been defeated in the Franco-Prussian War. The insurrection met with little success, though it spread far, and on July 13 Ibn al-Hâddâd surrendered to General Saussier, who sent him to Bougie. The original zâwiya was closed as a precautionary measure.

His son 'Azzîn, who had been transported to New Caledonia, succeeded in escaping to Djidda, whence he endeavoured to govern the community; but various muqaddâmîns who had been appointed by his father, as well as other founders of zâwiya, asserted their independence. Lists are given by Depont and Coppolani of these persons and their spheres of influence, which extend into Tunisia and the Sahara. In their work the numbers of the adherents to the Order have been reckoned at 1856, 1804 (1807). Rinn notices that the Rahâniya of Tâfa regularly maintained good relations with the French authorities.

Practices of the Order. The training of the murîd consists in teaching him a series of seven
character of the security is in general allowed; but exceptional cases are recognised in which the debt is extinguished by the disappearance of the security i.e. the risk passes to the taker of the pledge. While the ownership of the pledge remains with the debtor, he has no power of disposal over it and possession passes to the creditor; the latter has the right to sell it to satisfy his claim if the debt becomes overdue or is not paid. Mortgage is unknown as well as a graded series of rights to the same object of pledge. To be distinguished from the pledge is the detention (habis) of a thing to enforce fulfilment of a legal claim, which represents a concrete right afforded by the law in individual cases so that it has contacts with the legal right to pledge.


RAIS AL-KUTTAB, RA’IS Efendi. [See Refs.]

RAIY, the acent Ragha, a town in Media. Its ruins may be seen about 5 miles S.S.E. of Teheran [q.v.] to the south of a spur projecting from Elburz into the plain. The village and sanctuary of Shā‘Abd al-‘Arîm lie immediately south of the ruins. The geographical importance of the town lies in the fact that it was situated in the fertile zone which lies between the mountains and the desert, by which from time immemorial communication has taken place between the west and east of Iran. Several roads from Mazandarân [q.v.] converge on Raiy on the north side.

In the Astvâ, Widzodată, i. 15, Ragha is mentioned as the twelfth sacred place created by Ahura-Mazda. Yasna, xix. 18, calls it ša‘nur tâs Ragha zarâbudistī “Zoroastrian Ragha possessing four degrees of hierarchy” because at Ragha the representative of the prerogatives going back to Zoroaster (Zarâbudist) held also the powers of a prince (ratâs dahyûrûmû) while elsewhere these two dignities with the three categories of chief subordinates, formed five degrees of hierarchy. The Middle Persian commentary deduces from this that Zoroaster must have belonged to Ragha. The town is also called bia-satni (Wîdžodât, i. 15), which Bartholomae interprets as possessing “three districts” (drei Gaste besitzend) although the explanation of the Middle Persian commentary is: “possessing three estates (social classes) for the priests, warriors and cultivators there were good” (cf. Bartholomae, Altinan. Worteüch, col. 579, 811, 1497; cf. Marquart, op. cit., p. 122). The later commentators put Raiy in Atropatene in conformity with the late tendency to localise events in sacred history in this province.

In the Old Persian inscriptions (Bh. 2, 10-18) Ragâ appears as the province of Media in which in the autumn of 521 B.C. the false king of Media Frawartish sought refuge in vain; from Raga also Darius sent reinforcements to his father W≪phispa when the latter was putting down the rebellion in Parthia (Bh. 3, 1-10).

Rages is also mentioned in the apocrypha. Tobit sent his son Tobias from Niniveh to recover the silver deposited in Rages with Gabael, brother of
Gabrias (Tobit, i. 14). The book of Judith (i. 15) puts near Ragau (if it only were Ragha') the plain in which Nebuchadnezzar defeated the king of Media, Arphaxad (Pharoetes').

In the summer of 330 B.C., Alexander the Great following Darius III took 11 days to go from Ecbatane to Rhagae (Arrian, 3. 20, 2). Dio-dorus relates that Antigonus passed near Rhagae after his victory over his rival Eumenes (316 B.C.). According to Strabo, x. 9, 1, and xii. 13, 6 Seleucus Nicator (312–280) rebuilt Rhagae under the name of Európos (in memory of his native town in Macedonia) and that near Európos the towns of Aeadica, Apamaea and Heraclea were placed with Macedonians. After the coming of the Parthians the town was renamed Arsakia. It is however possible that all these towns although situated in the same locality occupied slightly different sites for they are mentioned side by side in the authorities. Rawlinson (J. G. S., x. 119) would put Európos at Wartimn [q.v.]. Athenaeus in Deipnosophistae, says that the Parthian kings spent the spring at Rhagae (in Tavăi Suppose) and the winter at Babylon (see the details in A. V. W. Jackson, and Weissbach). The Greek popular etymology which explain the name Rhagha as alluding to earthquakes seem to reflect the frequency of this phenomenon in this region so close to Damawand.

In the Sasanian period Yazdagird III in 641 issued from Raï his last appeal to the nation before fleeing to Khurâsân. The sanctuary of Bibi Shahr-Bâna situated on the south face of the already mentioned spur and accessible only to women is associated with the memory of the daughter of Yazdagird who, according to tradition, became the wife of Ťusian b. 'All. In the years 486, 499, 553 A.D. Raï is mentioned as the see of bishops of the Eastern Syrian church.

Arab conquest. The year of the conquest is variously given (18–24 = 639–644). It is possible that the Arab power was consolidated gradually. As late as 725 (646) a rebellion was suppressed in Raï by Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas. The Arabs seem to have profited by the diversions among the noble Persian families. Raï was the fief of the Mihran family and, in consequence of the resistance of Siyavaksh b. Mihran b. Bahram Cushân, Nu'amir b. Muqarrin had the old town destroyed and ordered Farruqân b. Zainab (Zainidi)  b. 'Ula (cf. MAŠMUXXN) to build a new town (Tabari, i. 265/5).

In 71 (690) again a king of the family of Farruqân is mentioned alongside of the Arab governor.

The passing of power from the Omayyads to the 'Abbasids took place at Raï without incident but in 136 (753) the 'Abd Allah ibn Majid, seized the town for a short time. The new era for Raï began with the appointment of the heir to the throne Muḥammad Mahdi to the governorship of the east (141–152 = 758–768). He rebuilt Raï under the name of Muḥammadiya and surrounded it by a ditch. The suburb of Mahdi-ibâb was built for those of the inhabitants who had to give up their property in the old town. Hârûn al-Râshid, son of Mahdi, was born in Raï and used often to recall with pleasure his native town and its principal street. In 195 (910) Ma'mûn's general Tâhir b. Husain won a victory over Amîn's troops near Raï. In 250 (865) the struggle began in Raï between the Zaidi 'Alids of Tabaristân and first the Tâhirids and later the caliph's Turkish generals. It was not till 272 (885) that Adhgu-'tegin of Kazvin took the town from the 'Alids. In 261 (804) the caliph Mu'tamid wished to consolidate his position appointed to Raï his son, the future caliph Muktaфи. Soon afterwards the Sâmânis began to interfere in Raï. Isma'il b. Ahmad seized Raï in 289 (922) and the fact accompli was confirmed by the caliph Muktaфи. In 296 Ahmad b. Isma'il received investiture from Muktafinity in Raï (Gardizi, p. 21–22).

In the tenth century Raï is described in detail in the works of the contemporary Arab geographers. In spite of the interest which Baghdad displayed in Raï the number of Arabs there was insignificant and the population consisted of Persians of all classes (akhib, Ya'kubî, in B. G. A, viii. 276). Among the products of Raï Ibn al-Falîkhi, p. 253, mentions silks and other stuffs, articles of wood and "lustre dishes", an interesting detail in view of the celebrity enjoyed by the ceramics "of Rhages". All writers emphasise the very great importance of Raï as a commercial centre. According to Iṣâkhi, p. 289, the town covered an area of 1 1/2 by 1 1/2 farsakhs, the buildings were of clay (gaz) and the use of bricks and plaster (gâzi = gaz) was also known. The town had five great mosques and eight large bazaars. Mûkaddasî, p. 391, calls Raï one of the glories of the lands of Islam and among other things mentions its library in the Rûdha quarter which was watered by the Sûrkhân canal.

Dailami period. In 304 (916) the lord of Adhâbârshân Yusuf b. Abû 'Udâd occupied Raï out of which he drove the Dailami Muḥammad b. 'Ali Şuṭûk who represented the Sâmânis (Ibn al-Âthîr, viii. 74). This occupation, commemorated in coins struck by Yûṣûf at Muḥammadâya, was the beginning of a troubled period. Raï passed successively into the hands of the Dailâmi 'Ali b. Waḥâbshân, Waṣîf Bektâmûrî, the Dailâmis (Ibn Ahmad b. 'Ali and of Muḥîf, slave of Yûṣûf (in 513 = 925; cf. R. Vassier, O monétagh Sâdîjod, Baku 1927). Lastly the Sâmânis encouraged by the caliphs succeeded in bringing Raï again within their sphere of influence but soon their general Asfâr (a Dailâm) became independent in Raï. In 318 (930), Asfâr was killed by his lieutenant Mardâwîdî (q.v.) (a native of Gîân and one of the founders of the Ziyârirî dynasty) who took over his master's lands (C. Huart, Les Ziyârirîs, 1922, p. 363 [= 11]).

After the assassination of Mardâwîdî (123 = 925) the Bûyids established themselves in Raï, which became the fief of the branch of Ruḵân al-Dawla which held out there for about 100 years. In 390 (1000) the last Sâmânis al-Muntasâk made an attempt to seize Raï but failed. In 420 (1027) the Bûyd Majd al-Dawla was ill-advised enough to invoke against the Dailâmis the help of Muḥyîd of Ghaznî, who seized his lands (cf. Muhammad Nazim, Sulûk Muḥyîd, 1931, p. 80–85). The brief rule of the Ghaznawids was marked by acts of obscenity, like the destruction of books on philosophy and astrology and the atrocious persecutions of the Karmâshâns and Mu'tazîlis (Gardizi, p. 91; Ibn al-Âthîr, ix. 262).

The Sâdîjodks. The Ghizis laid Raï waste in in 427 (1035) and in 434 (1042) the town, where Majd al-Dawla still held out in the fort of Tabarâk (Ibn al-Âthîr, ix. 347), fell into the power of the Sâdîjodks and became one of their principal cities. The last Bûyd al-Malîk al-Râhîm died a prisoner.
in Tabarak in 450 (1058) (or in 455; cf. H. Bowen, in "J. R. A.S.," 1929, p. 238) and the new lord Tughril [q. v.] also died at Raiy in 455 (1063). Henceforth Raiy is constantly mentioned in connection with events relating to the great Saldjuks and their branch in Persian 'irāk.

From the reign of Ghiyāšt al-Dīn Masʿūd (529-547 = 1133-1152) Raiy was ruled by the amir Inandj, whose daughter Inandj-Khatun became the wife of Pahlawān, son of the famous atabeg of Adharbādjūn, Ildegiz. When the latter put on the throne Sulṭan Arslan-Shāh (whose mother he had married) Inandj opposed this nomination but was defeated in 555 (1160). Inandj withdrew to Bušān but with the help of the Khvārezmshāh il-Asrāl he recaptured Raiy. He was finally murdered at the instigation of Ildegiz who gave Raiy as a fief to Pahlawān. Later the town passed to Kutluğ Inandj b. Pahlawān who, like his maternal grandfather, brought about the intervention of the Khvārezmshāh Tughril III who killed Kutluğ Inandj but the country remained with the Khvārezmshāns. In 614 (1217) the atabeg of Fars ʿAfdal b. Zama succeeded in occupying Raiy but was almost immediately driven out by the Khvārezmshāh Djalāl al-Dīn (cf. Nasawi, ed. Houdas).

Civil wars. Muqaddasī, p. 391, 395-396 mentions the dissensions (ʿaqābyār) among the people of Raiy in matters of religion. Under 582 (1186-1187) Ibn al-ʿAthir, xi. 237, records the damage done in Raiy in the civil war between the Sunnis and Shīʿis: the inhabitants were killed or scattered and the town left in ruins. Vāḵšt who, fleeing before the Mongols, went through Raiy in 617 (1220) gives the results of his enquiry about the three parties: the Hanafis, the Shāhīs, and the Shīʿis of which the two first began by wiping out the Shīʿis who formed half the population of the town and the majority in the country. Later the Shāhīs triumphed over the Hanafis. The result was that there only survived in Raiy the Shāhī quarter which was the smallest. Vāḵšt describes the underground houses at Raiy and the dark streets difficult of access which reflected the care of the inhabitants to protect themselves against enemies.

The Mongols. The Mongols who occupied Raiy after Vāḵšt's visit dealt it the final blow. Ibn al-ʿAthir (xii. 184) goes so far as to say that all the population was massacred by the Mongols in 617 (1220) and the survivors put to death in 621 (1224). It is however possible that the historian, echoing the panic which seizing the Muslim world, exaggerates the extent of the destruction. Djawaini (ed. Muḥammad Ḥān Kārazwī, i. 115) only says that the Mongol leaders put many people to death at Khvārezm and (in the country inhabited by Shīʿis?) but in Raiy they were met by the (Shīʿī?) Kāši who submitted to the invaders (il ʿaṣhl), after which the latter went on. Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. Bèrèzine, in "Truṭl V. O.," xv. 135 [transl. p. 89]) admits that the Mongols under Jelje and Subuday killed and plundered (kūkhīk wawgūrat) at "Raiy" but he seems to make a distinction between Raiy and Kūm, in which the inhabitants were completely (ba-kulli) massacred.

The fact that life was not completely extinguished at Raiy is evident from the dates of pottery which apparently continued to be made in Raiy (cf. Guest, "A dated Raoy bowl," in Burlington Magazine, 1931, p. 134-135; the painted bowl bears the date 640 = 1243). The citadel of Tabarak was rebuilt under Ghāzān Khān (1295-1304) but certain economic reasons (irrigation?) if not political and religious reasons, must have been against the restoration of Raiy and the centre of the new administrative Mongol division (the timarān of Raiy) became Warāmīn [q. v.] (cf. Nūḥāt al-Kulīb, in G.M.S., p. 55). After the end of Hūlagū's dynasty, Raiy fell to the influence of Tughrā-Timur [q. v.] of Āstārābād. In 1354, Timur's troops occupied Raiy without striking a blow but this must mean the district and not the town of Raiy, for Clavijo (ed. Srezenovsky, p. 187) who passed through this country in 1404 confirms that Raiy (Xaharārpay = Shahr-i Raiy) was no longer inhabited (agera deshabitata). No importance is to be attached to the mention of "Raiy" in the time of Shāh-Rukh (Maṭlaʿ al-Sulṭān, under the year 841 = 1437) or of Shāh Ismāʿīl, Ḥabīb al-Siyār.

The ruins of Raiy. Olivier in 1779 sought them in vain and it was Trulhiher and Gardane who first discovered them. The earliest descriptions are by J. Morier, Ker Porter and Sir W. Ouseley. The first has preserved for us a sketch of a Sassanian bas-relief which was later replaced with a sculpture of Fath 'Ali Shāh. The description and particularly the plan by Ker Porter (reproduced in Sarre and A. V. W. Jackson, "Persia," are still of value because since his time the needs of agriculture and unsystematic digging have destroyed the walls and confused the strata. Large numbers of objects of archaeological interest and particularly the celebrated pottery covered with paintings have flooded the European and American markets as a result of the activity of the dealers. Scientific investigation was begun by the universities of Philadelphia and Boston in 1934 (cf. The Illustrated London News, June 22, 1935, p. 1122-1123; E. F. Schmidt, The Persian Expedition [Raiy], in Bulletin University Museum, Philadelph. -v., 1935, p. 41-49; cf. p. 25-27). In the citadel hill, Dr. Erich Schmidt found a great variety of pottery and the remains of buildings among which the most interesting are the foundations of Mahdi's mosque (communication by A. Godard to the Congress of Persian Art at Lenin-grad in Sept. 1935). In an interesting passage, Muqaddasī, p. 210, speaks of the high domes which the Būyids built over their tombs. According to the Siyāsat-nāma, p. 145, in the time of Fāḵr al-Dawla a rich Zoroastrian built an ašōbān with double roof (sulūdān ʿa-du pūzhīt) on the top of the hill of Tabarak, above the domed tomb (gūbad) of Fāḵr al-Dawla. The ašōbān, turned to a new use received the name of dīda-yi stāḥpārdārān "fort of the commandants" and was still in existence in the time of Nīẓām al-Mulk. The two towers now to be seen among the ruins of Raiy [both are round in plan, but the one repaired under Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh has rubbed flanks] are attributed to the Saldjuks but may continue the Dailami type of building. The hill of Tabarak on which was the citadel (destroyed in 588 [1192] by Tughrīl III) according to Vāḵšt was situated to "the right" of the Kūrāsān road while the high mountain was "the left" of this road. Tabarak therefore must have been on the top of the hill opposite the great spur (hill G in Ker Porter's plan: *fortress finely built of stone and on the summit of an immense rock which commands the open


**RAKY**. (See *)

**RAKĀSH**. (After *Abān b. 'Abd al-Hamīd*.)

**RAKIM**. (See *Aṣḥāb al-Karb*.)

**Raḵā**, capital of Diyyā Muḍar in al-Dzara on the left bank of the Euphrates, shortly before it is joined by the Nahır al-Balikh (Bābāsi, Bābāsi, Bābāsi). The town was in antiquity called Kallikinos. Kallikison is to be located in the same region (Strabo, xvi. 747; Isidoros of Charax, in *Geoq. Græci Min.*, ed. Müller, p. 247; Dio Cass., x. 13; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, v. 86; vi. 119; Ptolemy, *Geoq.*, v. 17; Stephen Byz.); but its usual identification with Kallikinos is certainly wrong and it may be a case of two adjoining towns as with the “black” and “white al-Raḵā” of the middle ages. Kallikon was, according to Appian (Syra., p. 57), a foundation of Seleucus 1 Nikator; later it was ascribed to Alexander the Great (Pliny, *Nat. hist.*, vi. 119; Isid. Char., c. 1) who can hardly have been here and is hardly likely that towns were founded so shortly before the battle of Gaugamela (cf. Pauli-Wissowa, *Re. E.,* v., A., col. 1274, s. v. *Thapakhe*).

Kallikinos owed its name to Seleucus II Kallikinos, who founded the town in 244 or 242 B.C. (Chron. Pasch., ed. Dindorf, i. 330; Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv. 78). Libanius (*Epíst.*., p. 21, 5; *Opera*, ed. Förster, x. 19, 8—9) wishes to derive the name from the suffix Kallikonos who was murdered there; it is however hardly likely that the town's name, the name of which (Syrac. Kalonikos, Kallikonos) the Christian Syrians retained in the middle ages, was called after a pagan orator, and in any case, if it were so, we would expect a name like Kallinikela. In any case the site of Kallikonos corresponds to that of the mediaeval al-Raḵā, with which the Syrian historians always identified it. In the time of the emperor Julian, Kallikonos was a strong fortress and an important commercial centre (Amnian. Marcell., xxi. 3). In the year 393 a Jewish synagogue was burnt in the *Castrum Callinicum*; the emperor Theodosius therefore ordered the bishop of the town to rebuild it (Ambrosius, *Epíst. ad Theodosium*; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, xvi., col. 1105 sq.). The emperor Leo in 777. Sel. (466 A. d.) rebuilt Kallikonos in Osroene, called it Leontopolis and appointed a bishop there (probably the successor of the Damianos mentioned in 451 and 458) (Edessene Chronicle, ed. Hallier, in *Texte u. Untersuch.,* i, 1, Leipzig 1893, p. 116, 152; Barhebr., *Chron. syr.*, ed. Bedjan, p. 77; Leontopolis: Hierokl., *Synkêmem.,* p. 715; *Geoq. Cypr.*, ed. Gelzer, p. 897). Towards the end of the year 503, Timostates bravely defended the fortress against the Persians and took one of Kawādš 1’s officers prisoner but had to release him as the king threatened to destroy the town completely (Joshua Stylites, ed. Martin, in *Abb. K.-M.*, vi, 1, Leipzig 1876, p. 1xv.). The Persian church historians from the beginning of the 8th century frequently mention the monastery at al-Dair Zakki, Arabic Dār Zakki, the angle formed by the Nahır Balikh and the Euphrates or the Nahır al-Nīl Canal not far from Kallikonos (Vitae viror apud monophysites celebr., ed. Brooks, in *C. S. C. O.,* ser. iii., vol. xxv., Paris 1907, p. 38; Mich. Syr., iv. 414 sq.; Shaboushti, *Khāb al-Diyārār*, cod. Berol., fol. 95v; Yākūt, *Muṣjam*, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 664; iv. 862). Between al-Raḵā and Bālîs lay the celebrated monastery of Dair Ḥannîn not far from Surra (G. Hoffmann on Zacharias Rhetor, transl. Ahmed-Krumey, p. 159, 201; Johann. v. Ephes., iv. 22; Mich. Syr., iii. 361; iii. 453 and *passim*; Barhebr., *Chron. ecelz.,* ed. Abbelous-Lamy, i. 244, 250; F. Nau, in *R.O.C.,* xv, 1910, p. 63, note 1; Yākūt, iii. 350 and *passim*; often wrongly called “monastery of Ḥanā’ah”, e.g. in Musil, *The Middle Euphrates*, p. 329). In 529, Justinian enacted that trade with the Persians should be conducted at the frontier towns of Nisibis, Kallikonos and Artaxata (*Cod. Iust.,* ed. Kruger, iv. 65, 4, p. 188; Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, ii, 1923, p. 3). Khusraw I on his third campaign against Syria (542) took the town without difficulty (Procop., *Bell. Pers.*, ii. 21, 31; *Anecd.,* iii. 31) because at the time the walls had been partly taken down in order to be rebuilt. The town was destroyed but later fortified again by Justinian with walls and bulwarks and “made impregnable” (*Proc., De aed.,* ii. 7; James of Edessa, *Chronol. Canon.,* ed. Brooks, in *Z.D.M.G.*, iii. 300; Mich. Syr., ed. Chatob, iv. 287). The *sēhās* *Arashā* Maurikios in 580 had to retire to Kallikinos before Abdarmahmur but put him to flight there (Theophyl. Sim., iii. 17, 8 sq.; Chapot, *La Frontière de l’Euphrate*, p. 289; Barhebr., ed. S. Hertsfeld, *Archäol. Reise*, i. 159 make the “emperor” Maurikios flee to the fortress before Hormisdae.

The Arabs in 18 (639) or 19 (640) under ʿĪyād b. Ḥannencamped before the N. W. gate of the town, Bāb al-Ruḥā; after 5 or 6 days the Patriarchs who governed the town asked for peace and surrendered it to him and the inhabitants
were promised security of life and property. Their churches were not to be destroyed or occupied so long as they paid their tribute and committed no act of hostility; on the other hand they were not to build new churches or sacred places and not to observe Christian customs or festivities publicly (al-Balādhrī, Futūḥ al-Balād, ed. de Goeje, p. 173 sq.; Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, ii. 439). On the death of 'Iyāḍ, Sa'īd b. 'Amr b. Djičiyam became governor of al-Djazira; he built a mosque in al-Rāfiq (al-Balādhrī, p. 178; Hersfeld, Arch. Reis., ii. 353). It was built of bricks of clay and marble taken from ancient buildings (Hersfeld, op. cit., with fig. 324–329); its Manārat al-Manṣūrīr still marks the ruins that represent the ancient al-Rāfiq.

In the great battle of Sīfīn in 636 (656) 'Ali crossed the Euphrates at al-Rāfiq on a bridge of boats, which he ordered the inhabitants to build, with his infantry and whole equipment to the Syrian bank (al-Tabarī, i. 3459; Ibn Miskawayh, Tağārīb, ed. Caetani, p. 771). According to the Dīwān of 'U바bā Allāh b. Kais al-Rukayyjāl, who died in 690 (ed. Rhodokanakis, in S. B. Ak. Wies., cxliv, x., Vienna 1902, p. 222), al-Rāfiq and al-Kalas (?) were then in ruins and practically uninhabited but this is poetic exaggeration (Musul, The Middle Euphrates, p. 329 sq.). He calls the town (p. 283) al-Rāfiq al-Sawdā' to distinguish it from al-Rāfiq al-Bailad, which is mentioned in the Dīwān of al-Akhtal for example (ed. Sāhlī, p. 304). The name al-Rāfiq itself may be of Arabic origin ("swampy marshes on a river with periodical inundations"); the similarity of the names of al-Rāfiq and al-Rāfiq to those of two Arab tribes of the Assyrian period, Rakhiqū (sic!) and Rapiqū (Hersfeld, Arch. Reis. i. 159, note 9), is no doubt quite accidental.

On the south bank, opposite the town between two canals (al-Hāni 1a 'I-Mart), 372 were the suburbs of Wāṣit al-Rāfiq, where Hāshāb b. 'Abd al-Malik built two palaces and a bridge over the Euphrates (Yākūt, ii. 802; iv. 880, 994; Ps.-Dionys. of Telmahrē, ed. Chatot, p. 26, 31; Mich. Syr. iv. 457; Barhebr., Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 118). The governor of al-Rukayyjāl, the Kais Manṣūr b. Dji'wana b. al-Hāfīth al-'Amīri, after whom Hisn Manṣūr was called, was executed after his rebellion in 141 (758–759) by the amīl of Abu 'l-Abbās, al-Manṣūr, in al-Rāfiq (al-Balādhrī, p. 192).

The caliph al-Manṣūr in 155 (772) built along side of al-Rāfiq a new town al-Rāfiq and settled Khurāsānians there who were devoted to his dynasty (Ibn al-Fakhri, in B. G. A., i. 132). The superintendence of the building of the new town was given by him to al-Mahdī, the heir-apparent. It was planned in the shape of a horse-shoe and was in many respects modelled on the round city of al-Mansūrīr in Baghūr (al-Tabarī, i., 372 sq.; Ibn Hawkal, in B. G. A., ii. 115; al-Ya'qūbī, Kitāb al-Buldān, in B. G. A., vii. 238; Tārīkh, ed. Houtsma, i. 430; Ibn al-Fakhri, in B. G. A., v. 132; Yākūt, Muṣā'jam, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 734 sq.; Mich. Syr., i. 526. ii. 10. 297 = iv. 476, 483, 640; Ps.-Dionys. of Telmahrē, p. 120 sq.; Hersfeld, op. cit., i. 160). Two canals were led from the Euphrates and from the region of Sarādjīq to supply the new town with water (Mich. Syr., ii. 10). This new town to which the name al-Rāfiq came to be transferred from the old town now falling into ruins, had, according to Arab authors (e. g. al-Balādhrī, p. 179), no remains of antiquity and indeed the modern al-Rāfiq, the "horse-shoe city", except for a few fragments built into the walls seems to possess no ancient ruins. The ancient Raklinicos has therefore wrongly been located here (Sachau, Reise in Syrien u. Mesopot., p. 242; Chapot, La Frontière de l'Euphrate, p. 259 sq., where fig. 8 "Nicephorium-Catilinicum" is really the plan of the mediaeval al-Rāfiq).

Between al-Rāfiq (al-Hamār of Musli's map) and al-Rāfiq there soon rose a suburb with bazaars to which the markets of al-Rāfiq (including the largest, Sāk Hāshām al-'Atīk) were transferred by 'Ali b. Sulaimān b. 'Allī, governor of al-Djazira, and as a result the two adjoining towns gradually developed into a twin city (al-Rāfiqātān) (al-Balādhrī, p. 179; Yākūt, ii. 734, 802; Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 115). This suburb was burned in 1123 Sel. (812) by the rebels 'Amr and Naṣr b. Shabath along with the adjoining pillared monastery (Mich. Syr., iii. 26). 'Abd al-Malik b. Sāliḥ [q.v.] died in the same year in al-Rāfiq. In the fighting that followed, the 'Afdāyī (of al-Rāfiq) became lords of al-Rāfiq and the Persians of al-Rāfiq (Mich. Syr., iii. 30). In the reign of Ma'mūn in 816 Tāhir built a wall between al-Rāfiq and al-Rāfiq (Mich. Syr., iii. 36).

The walls of the old town fell into ruins almost a year's date (Aḥmad b. al-Ṭayib al-Sarākhī in Yākūt, loc. cit.), and in 795 (985–986) the old al-Rāfiq was only a suburb of the western town. As the name al-Rāfiq came into use for the latter (Yākūt, loc. cit.), in the end it became no longer possible to distinguish between al-Rāfiq and al-Rāfiq (also al-Maṣḍis, cf. F. Hersfeld, Arch. Reis., i. 160, note 7, p. 161). At the beginning of the xiiith century the old al-Rāfiq was completely in ruins (Yākūt, iii. 31; ii. 802; Ibn Rusta, p. 90; al-Maṣḍis, p. 20, 54, 141). It was also called "crooked al-Rāfiq" (al-Aḍāgā) and corresponds to the present ruins of al-Rāfiq al-Samrā. Badr al-Din 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṭalabakki (Ahlwardt, v. 413, on No. 6104) wrote a Risāla on al-Rāfiq.

According to Hersfeld, the following larger groups of ruins lie in the area of al-Rāfiq in addition to Hiraqār which is in the neighbourhood:

1. The "horseshoe town" with high walls, still standing, which form a semicircle on the north, while in the south they run in a straight line along the banks of the Euphrates and enclose an area of 1.92 sq. km. (Hersfeld, Arch. Reis., 356 sq.: plan: plate lixii.). It corresponds to al-Rāfiq founded by Maṣḥūr, to which the name al-Rāfiq was later transferred. Roughly in the centre of the northern round part of this part of the town lie the ruins of a large mosque, the "mosque intra muros" the front of the court of which with a round minaret (Sarre-Hersfeld, ii. 359; iii., pl. lxxv.–lxxvi. and fig. 33–340), according to an inscription, was restored by the Zangid Nūr al-Dīn Mahāmūd in 616 (1165–1166) (van Berchem in Sarre-Hersfeld, i. 4–6). Nūr al-Dīn occupied al-Rāfiq in 554 (1159) and gave it from 562 (1167) to 566 (1171) to his brother Māwddā
(Ibn al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, xi. 167, 216; Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, in R. O. L., iii. 532, 550.) Yākūt mentions a gate called Bāb al-Djinmān (Yākūt, i. 443; ii. 125). The gate on the S. E. corner of al-Faṣlī, a brick building on the inner side of the ditch, is still standing (Hersfeld, ii. 358; iii., pl. lxv.; fig. 330—332). Not far from it is the so-called palace, a plaster-covered brick building with cramps of wood without inscriptions (Hersfeld, ii. 363; pl. lxix. sq.; fig. 342—344). On the S. W. corner of this area of ruins is the modern village of al-Raḳḳā.

2. East of the S. E. corner of the preceding area is a smaller site (called al-Ḥamrā‘ on Musil’s map) the feature of which is a high quadrangular minaret called Ma‘dīn ham Matnū‘īrīq which belonged to the “mosque extra muros” (Hersfeld, i. 156; ii. 354, fig. 327). This area of ruins corresponds to the ancient town.

3. An hour farther east on the Balikh are the ruins of “grey Raḳḳā” (Raḳḳā al-Samra‘).

4. A little further north, still on the left bank of the Balikh is the high Tell Zādīn now Tell Zēdān, according to Hersfeld (i. 157, note 3; ii. 350) and Musil (The Middle Euphrates, p. 91, note 9) certainly the ancient Zenodotion.

In the area of these ruins are a number of Muslim saints’ graves including those of the tābi‘ī [q. v.] ‘Uways al-Ḳarant and ‘Umrār b. Yāsir, whose names however were differently given to Sachau (Reise in Syr. u. Mesop., p. 242 sqq.) and Hersfeld (i. 157; ii. 350) in some cases.

The area of the “horseshoe town” is, according to Hersfeld, “burrowed through and through by treasure-seekers who search here for the Raḳḳā ceramics which fetch exceedingly high prices” and also find glass and bronze, pieces of marble etc. (Hersfeld, i. 158). The blue glazed antique vases which look as if they were enamelled, in the form of amphorae in the Louvre, said to have been found in al-Raḳḳā, therefore certainly came from the eastern old town (Sarre in Sarre-Hersfeld, iii, and iv., cf. Littérature; H. Rivière, La céramique dans l’art musulman, 2 vol., 1912—1913; F. Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos, Paris 1926, text, p. 460 sqq.).


RAḳḳĀDA, residential city of the Aghlabid emirs of Ifriqiya about 6 miles south of Kairawān, was founded in 263 (876) by Ibrāhīm II, seventh prince of the dynasty. Until then the Aghlabids had resided in ʾAbhāsīya [q. v.] nearer the capital. A chance trip into the country by Ibrāhīm, it is said, determined the site of the new residence. The emir was suffering from insomnia and on the advice of his physician, Iṣḥāq b. Sulaimān, went out to take the air. Stopping in a certain place he fell into a deep sleep and decided to build a palace there which was called Raḳḳāda, the “soporific”. The story is probably based on a popular etymology of the name, which is found elsewhere in North Africa. Another explanation, equally suspect, is that which attributes the name to the memory of a massacre of the Warfalajūn by the ʾIbādī chief Abu l-Khaṭṭāb [q. v.] in 141 (758) and the many dead left lying there.

In the same year that the work of building was begun, Ibrāhīm settled in Raḳḳāda in the Castle of Victory (Kaṣr al-Fath). He was to live there the rest of his life, as were his successors, except for the stays the emirs made in Tunis. Raḳḳāda became a regular town as al-ʾAbhāsīya had been before it. Besides Kaṣr al-Fath (or Kaṣr Abī l-Fath) there were several other castles in it: Kaṣr al-Bāḥr (the castle on the lake), Kaṣr al-Saḥn (castle of the court), Kaṣr al-Mukhtār (castle of the elect) and Kaṣr Bāgh-dād, a large mosque, baths, caravanserais and sūqās. Al-Bakrī says that it had a circumference of 24,040 cubits (over 6 miles), al-Nuwaib makes it smaller (14,000, nearly 4 miles). A wall of brick and clay surrounded this vast area, and this wall was renovated by the last Aghlabid with a view to a final effort at resistance. Al-Bakrī further tells us that the outer part of the enceinte was filled with gardens. The soil was fertile and arable. The emirs and their followers enjoyed in Raḳḳāda a liberty of movement which would have caused a scandal in Kairawān. The sale of nabīldī [q. v.], forbidden in the pious old city, was officially permitted in the royal residence.

It was from Raḳḳāda that Ziyādāt Allāh III, the last of the Aghlabids, fled on the approach of the Ǧīḥātīs. The victorious Abū ʿAbd Allāh [q. v.] installed himself in Kaṣr al-Saḥn. His master, the Mahdi ʿUbaīd Allāh, lived in Raḳḳāda until 308 (920) when he moved to al-Mahdiyya. After being deserted by the ruler, Raḳḳāda fell into ruins. In 342 (953) the caliph al-Muʿizz ordered what was left of it to be razed to the ground and ploughed over. The gardens alone were spared.
A few traces of the Aghlabid foundation are still to be seen at the present day. A great rectangular reservoir with thick walls strengthened by buttresses may be identified with the lake (ba'dr) which gave its name to one of the palaces. A pavilion (l) of four stories stood in the centre. Nothing is left of it, but on the west side of the reservoir may be seen the remains of a building which must have been reflected in the great mirror of water. Three rooms may still be distinguished with their mosaic pavements. The technique and style of decoration closely connect these Muḥammadan buildings of the third century a. h. with the Christian art of the country.


RAMADĀN (A.), name of the ninth month of the Muḥammadan calendar. The name from the root r–m–r refers to the heat of summer and therefore shows in what season the month fell when the ancient Arabs still endeavoured to equate their year with the solar year by intercalary months [see Naft].

Ramādan is the only month of the year to be mentioned in the Kurān (Sūra ii. 185; eastern numbering): “The month of Ramādan (is that) in which the Kurān was sent down”, we are told in connection with the establishment of the fast of Ramādan. The discussion on the origin of this edict cannot yet be considered ended; what has been said in the article Şawm have to be added the researches of F. Goitein, Zur Entstehung des Ramādan, in Isr., xviii. (1929), p. 189 sqq., who in connection with the above mentioned verse of the Kurān calls attention to the parallelism between the mission of Muhammad and the handing of the second tablets of the law to Moses, which according to Jewish tradition took place on the Day of Atonement (‘Ashūrā, the predecessor of Ramādan’) and actually was the cause of the institution. Goitein suggests that the first arrangement to replace the ‘Ashūrā’ [q.v.] was a period of ten days (al-waḥm bi'-dār, Sūra ii. 184), not a whole month, which ran parallel with the ten days of penance of the Jews preceding the Day of Atonement and survives to the present day in the 10 days of the ‘tikāf’ [q.v.].

If we consider further that the Muslim ideas of the Lailat al-Kadr which falls in Ramādan, in which according to Kurān lxixii. 1, the Kurān was sent down, coincide in many points with the Jewish on the Day of Atonement, we must concede a certain degree of probability to Goitein’s suggestions, in spite of the undeniable chronological difficulties (alteration of the length of the period of the fast, within a very short time) and although the final settlement of the term as a whole month is not thereby satisfactorily explained. On the other hand to strengthen Goitein’s position, it ought perhaps to be pointed out that the Lailat al-Burā’ [q.v.] precedes Ramādan in the middle of the preceding month of Sha’bān. The ideas and practices described by Wensinck in the article Şawm, which are associated with this night really to some extent resemble Jewish customs associated with the New Year—which precedes the Day of Atonement by a rather shorter interval than the Lailat al-Burā’—Ramaṭi—Ramādan—that the connection between the latter and the Day of Atonement is thereby strengthened. If we try to connect the so far unexplained word Burā’a with the Hebrew burā’a “creation” and reflect that according to the Jewish idea the world was created on New Year’s Day (numerous references in the liturgy of the festival) we have perhaps a further link in the chain of proof; but first of all the age of the ideas associated with the Lailat al-Burā’a must be ascertained.

The legal regulations connected with the fast of Ramādan are given in the article Şawm [cf. also Tabāwi]. Of important days of the month, al-Bīrūnī, among others, mentions the 6th as birthday of the martyr Ḥusain b. ‘All, the 10th as the day of death of Khadīja, the 17th as the day of the battle of Badr, the 19th as the day of the occupation of Mecca, the 21st as the day of ‘All’s death, and of the Imam ‘Ali al-Ridā’s, the 22nd as birthday of ‘Ali and finally the night of the 27th as Lailat al-Kadr [q.v.].

The name of this night is Kurān; Sūra xcvi.2, is dedicated to it. It is there described as a night “better than a year’s months” in which the angels ascend free from every commission (bi-idn Allah min kull amr) and which means blessing till the appearance of the red of dawn. The revelation of the Kurān, as already mentioned, is expressly located in it. The same night is obviously referred to in Sūra xliv.2 as a “blessed” one. The date, the 27th, is however not absolutely certain, the pious therefore use all the odd nights of the last ten days of Ramādan for good works, as one of them at any rate is the Lailat al-Kadr [cf. ‘Titikīf].

Trade and industry are largely at a standstill during Ramādan, especially when it falls in the hot season. The people are therefore all the more inclined to make up during the night for the deprivations of the day. As sleeping is not forbidden during the fast, they often sleep a part of the day; and the night, in which one may be merry, is given up to pleasures. In particular the nights of Ramādan are the time for public entertainments, the shadow of festivities [cf. Khāvāl-i Zill] and other forms of the theatre.

On the termination of the fast by the “little festival”, cf. ‘Id al-Fitr.


(M. Plessner)
RAMADĀN-O GhULLARĪ, a petty Anatolian dynasty. The earlier history of the Ramadān-Oghullarī is, like that of most of the minor Anatolian principalities (tevâ pigment), wrapped in obscurity. According to tradition, this Turkoman family came in Ergöhrül’s time from Central Asia to Anatolia where they settled in the region of Adana and founded their power. Their territory comprised the districts of Adana, Sis, Aysăs, a part of the territory of the Warskah Turkomans. Tarsūs, etc. The date of the earliest known prince of the dynasty, Mir Ahmad b. Ramadān (see below), is put at 780–815 (1379–1416). Nothing definite is known about the real founder, Ramadān-Beg. The French traveller Bertrand de la Broquière thus characterizes Mir Ahmad b. Ramadān: “lequel estoit tresgant personne d’homme et treshardy et la plus vaillante espée de tous les Turcz et le mieux ferant d’une mache. Et avoit esté fils d’une femme crestienne laquelle l’avoir fait baptiser à la loy gregisique pour luy enlever le flair et le senteur qu’ont ceux qui ne sont point baptisées. Il estoit nebon creolien ne bon sarazin” (cf. Le Voyage d’Omerter de Bertrand de la Broquière, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1892, p. 90 sq.). Mir Ahmad was succeeded by Ibrāhīm Beg (810–830 = 1416–1427). The beginning of his reign is put by some, e.g. Mehmēd Nūzhēt Bey, as early as 810, while its end is put in 819. Khalīl Edhem Bey was the first to propose a new chronology, which is here followed. Ibrāhīm Beg was deposed before his death (831) by his eldest son İzz al-Dīn Ḥamza-Beg, who reigned from 830. He was succeeded by his uncle Mehmēd Beg b. Mir Ahmad and the latter’s brother-‘Ali, who seem to have reigned jointly. Of his successor, his nephew Ayslān Dāʾūd b. Ibrāhīm, we only know that he fell in 885 (1480) in a battle in the vicinity of Dīyarbakr. His body was brought to Aleppo and buried there. The history of the Ramadān-Oghullarī now becomes a little better known. His son and successor, Gharṣ al-Dīn Khalīl, known from a number of inscriptions (cf. Max v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, Leipzig 1909, p. 109 sq., Nrs. 141–145 of the years 898, 900, 906, 913) ruled for 34 years with his brother Mahmūd-Beg and died in battle in 916 (1510). The date of his death (beginning of Djamādī I 916 = beginning of Aug. 1510) is known with certainty from his epitaph in Adana, in M. v. Oppenheim and Max van Berchem (op. cit., p. 110, No. 145). His son Piri Mehmēd Paşa, who appears as ruling from 916–976 (1510–1568), distinguished himself as an Ottoman vassal, fighting against the rebels of Tc-el (Anatolia; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 71) in May 1528 (Sha‘bān 934) as well as in the civil war between the princes Bāyazid and Selim at Konya (May 1559; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 368 sqq.). He died in 972 (1568) in his capital Adana. He had an equal command of Persian and Turkish and composed a Divān. His son Derwīs-Beg, who had been mutezarif of Tarsūs in his father’s life-time became after his death governor (ważīl) of Adana but died young in 986 (1578). He was succeeded by his eldest brother Ibrāhīm Beg, who had previously been sandjak-beyd of ‘Aintāb. He acted as governor at his father’s capital till his death in 1002 (1594). His son Mehmēd Beg was the last dynast of the Ramadān-Oghlu but he can only have had a nominal rule. The family of the Ramadān-Oghlu however has survived to the present day. The following is the genealogical table:

**Ramadān**

1. **Ahmad**

2. Ibrāhīm I

3. Hamza

4. Mehmēd I

5. Daʿūd

6. Khalīl

7. Mahmūd

8. Piri Mehmēd

9. Derwīs

10. İbrahim II

11. Mehmēd II

12. Khalīl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mehmēd Pasha</td>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>Sulaimān</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>d. 940</td>
<td>d. 959</td>
<td>Iskender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Franz Binger)
AL-RAMĀDI, whose full name was Aḥū 'Umar (wrongly Aḥū 'Amr) Yūsuf b. Ḥabīn al-Kindī al-Kurṭubī al-Ramādī, poet of Muslim Spain, who lived in the fourth (tenth) century and died early in the fifth (eleventh) century in 403 (1013), on the day of the 'Alawīya or Feast of St. John (June 24), according to Ibn Haiyān (in Ibn Bashkwāl, cf. Biṣb.), in 413 (1022—1023), according to al-Makkiṣī (quoting the same Ibn Haiyān); he was buried in the cemetery of Cordova known as Makkārat Kala'.

The ethnic al-Ramādī is explained in two ways: 1. the poet is said to have come from al-Ramādā, a little town between Alexandria and Barqa; this explanation is to be rejected for al-Ramādā (with gemination of the mim — and this orthography is attested by the geographers who mention the place, e.g. al-Ya'kūbī, al-Bakrī and al-Idrīsī —) would not give an ethnic like al-Ramādī (with one m); 2. the second explanation which derives Ramādī from rāmād: "ordinary ashes" or "ashes for washing", is the only possible one; the poet perhaps in his youth followed the trade of an ash-merchant; in confirmation of this we may call attention to the Romance surname which was originally given him: Aḥū Qamis (wrongly Aḥū Sāḥib in the Yatimāt al-Dahr), i.e. padre centus, "father cinders" or "cinderman".

Ar-Ramādī, a native of Cordova, spent all his life in his native town except for a brief period of exile in Saragossa. His life was dominated by three great factors: his attachment to Aḥū All al-Kalī, his devotion to the cause of the ḫājdīb Aḥū 'l-Ḥasan al-Muṣḥafī and his love for Khalwa. Aḥū 'Ali al-Kalī, summoned from the east to Spain by the Umayyad caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nāṣirī (300—350 = 912—961) had from his arrival in Cordova in 330 (942) no more faithful disciple than al-Ramādī who studied under him. His direction the Kitāb al-Nāwādatīr ("the book of philological rarities"). The young scholar's admiration found expression in a poem which has remained famous (rhyne li, metre kāmil) of which some thirty lines are preserved in the Yatimāt al-Dahr of al-Thālībī and the Muttāḥ al-Anfus of al-Ṭahīb b. Ḥāfṣūn (cf. Biṣb.). It is a poem which gained him the title of Mutanabbī al-Gharb (which had already been given to Ibn 'Hānī al-Andalusī and which was later to be given to Ibn Darrādī al-Kalītī and to Aḥū Thālib 'Abd al-Djabbār). Al-Ramādī studied also under an Andalusian scholar named Aḥū Bakr Yahyā b. Hudajjī al-Kaffī or al-A'mā ("the blind"), of whom we know very little. What we know of his powers, al-Ramādī became laureate to the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II al-Muṭṭasirī (350—466 = 961—976), then to his son and successor Ḥākim II al-Muḍayyad (366—399 = 976—1009), but his attachment to the cause of the ḫājdīb Aḥū 'l-Ḥasan Djaḍfar b. 'Ubdūn al-Muṣḥafī and his participation in the plot fomented by the envious Djaḍwar to overthrow Ḥākim II and proclaim another caliph under his son Ḥākim brought down upon him the wrath of the great minister al-Maṣrūk Ibn Abī 'Amīr. Thrrown into prison at al-Zahrā', he suffered all sorts of ill-treatment: during his imprisonment, he wrote the most touching verses (including a poem in ḫī, metre fawil, and another in ḥuṭa, metre fawil) and he prepared a poetical work on birds, the description of which concluded with a poem in praise of the heir-presumptive Ḥīghām II. Liberated through the intercession of friends he had to go into exile. He went to Saragossa to the governor 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Tudjībī whose merits he celebrated in a poem in miṣm. Amnestied by al-Maṣrūk he was able to return to Cordova, but on condition that he did not go into society. Finally pardoned, he entered the entourage of the all powerful hājīb as a pensioner (muṣṭaṣīf) and it was in this capacity that he took part in an expedition against Barcelona in 375 (985). During the ṣīnā which was to lead to the collapse of the Umayyad caliphate and the formation of petty independent states ruled by the mūḍāk al-ṭawāfīf, al-Ramādī led a miserable existence and it was in the greatest distress that he died in the early years of the fifth (eleventh) century.

Al-Ramādī became celebrated chiefly for his chaste love for the enigmatic Khalwa (wrongly: Halwa or Hu'lwa) whom he met one Friday in the public gardens of the Banī Marwān on the left bank of the Guadalquivivir at the end of the bridge but was never able to see again. It was Abū Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhirī, whose ascetic tendencies on this subject are well known, who did most to spread this love-story; but it seems that the memory of Khalwa occupied the heart or mind of the poet only very little; if it still possessed him at Saragossa to the extent of inspiring all the nasīb of the panegyric in honour of the Tudjibī governor, on his return to Cordova, it disappeared completely for we see al-Ramādī henceforth completely overwhelmed by a new passion, the object of which is not a woman but a Mozarab boy to whom the poet gives the name of Yahyā (John) or Nusair (Victor?).

The Dirāwīn of al-Ramādī never seems to have been collected; of his book on birds, Kitāb al-Ta'īr, written in prison, there survives only the Lamiya in which he described the falcon hunting; the more important fragments that have survive have already been mentioned. A pupil of Aḥū 'Ali al-Kalī, al-Ramādī is inclined to imitate the poetry of the east, but after Ibn 'Abd Rabbībi and before 'Ubāda b. Mā al-Samā', he shows a marked fondness for the muwaqkaḥ into the construction of which, he introduced several innovations. In spite of its classical structure, his verse has a very personal character, especially when he calls upon Khalwa or describes his sufferings in the prison at al-Zahrā'. The few lines in which he alludes to the weakness of Ḥīghām II and to his complete domination by his mother Šudīb and by the hājīb al-Maṣrūk, those in which he speaks of Djaḍwar's plot are not without historical interest; finally the information which he gives about Mozarabs (worship and costume) in connection with his favourite enable us to check what Aḥū 'Amīr Ibn Shuhaid says on the same subject and for this reason of some documentary importance.

executed in Rām-Hormuz, but Taβāri, i. 834, says that Mānī was exposed on the “gate of Mānī” at Dūndū-Šāhīr (cf. also al-Birūnī, Chronology, p. 208). The Nestorian bishops of Rām-Hormuz are mentioned in the years 577 and 587 (Marquart, Eränjahr, p. 27, 145). Mukaddasi, p. 414, says that ʿAḍud al-Dawla built a magnificent market near Rām-Hormuz and that the town had a library founded by Ibn Sawwār (according to Schwarz, the son of Sawwār b. ʿAbd Allāh, governor of Bāṣra, who died in 157 = 773), and was a centre of Muʿtazilite teaching. According to Ibn Khurdābdīhī, p. 42, Rām-Hormuz was one of the 11 kūras of Kūzīstān (Kūdāmā, p. 242, and Mukaddasi, p. 407: one of the 7 kūras). Its towns (Mukaddasi, pp. 243, 245; sanabil-ī Ḥaḍrāt (q.v.), Tyruq (f.), Bāzān, Lādh, Ghurāw) (f.), Bābādji, and Kūzāk, all situated in the highlands. To these Vādīt, i. 185, adds Arbuk (with a bridge, 2 farsaksas from Hāwīz). On the other places in the kūra of Rām-Hormuz (Āsak, Bīstān, Sāsān, Tāshān, Īr) see Schwarz, op. cit., p. 341—345. According to Mukaddasi, p. 407, Rām-Hormuz had palm-groves but no sugar-cane plantations (in the sixth century however, Mustawfī, Nuṣḥat-ī Kūlī, p. 111, says that Rām-Hormuz used to produce more sugar than cotton); among the products of Rām-Hormuz (q.v.) mentions silks (ṭiyāb abrīsam) and Dimishkī, p. 119 (transl. p. 153) the very volatile white naphtha which comes out of the rocks. At the present day the Anglo Persian Oil Company possesses deposits above Rām-Hormuz.

Bibliography: J. MacDonald Kinneir, A geographical Memoir, London 1813, p. 457; Rawlinson, Notes on a March from Zohāb, in T R G S. 1839, ix. 79 (region of Mungashk, in the N. E. of Rām-Hormuz); Bode, Travel., London 1845, i. 281 (Behbehān-Tāshān-Mandānīk-Tūl-Malāmīr-Shāhshāh), ii. 39, 76, 82 (distribution of tribes); Layard, Description of Kūzīstān, in T R G S. 1846, p. 13 (country round Rām-Hormuz; in the town 250 families, taxes 3,000—5,000 tomans), p. 66 (valley of Dārāshā); Herzfeld, Eine Reise durch Luristan, in Pet. Mit., 1907 (Hāwīz-Šāhirk-Dūlūb-Mūdlī, ʿMir-baṣa?)- Rāmūz (sic) -Palm-Dūljāyīn-Behbehān); Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 145—152; Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, i. 332—345; cf. also the index; Le Strange, The Land of the Eastern Caliphat, p. 243, 247.

V. MI[NORSKY]

Al-Āmārī, whose full name was Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Sharaf al-Dīn, a Persian stylist. No details of his life are known; even the few chronological references that we possess are rather vague. His importance lies in his well known work Anis al-ʿUṣūlā-k, a treatise on the most common poetical figures for describing the different parts of the human body. According to his own statement, the author made up his mind to compile this work while he was in Mārāgha on a visit to the observatory of the famous Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī. The book is dedicated to Sultān Abu l-Faḍl Uways Bahādūr (1356—1373). Ikhwān al-Ḥarābīdānī, and according to Ḥādīdī Khlīfā (ed. Flügel, i. 488) was finished in Shawwal 826 (Sept. 1423) —this is in obvious contradiction to chronology for at this date Ḥarābīdānī had belonged to the Timūrid Shāhrukh since 823 (1420). The author further mentions in this work the poet Aḥwādi (d. 738 = 1337) as his contemporary and a certain
Hasan b. Mahmūd Kāshfī (d. 710 = 1300) as his teacher. It may therefore be assumed that Hājdījī Khālīfa’s statement is based on a misunderstanding and that the version was written not later than 1373.

The work is divided into 24 chapters which begin with the hair of the head and end with the feet and deal with the human body from head to foot. Besides this book, which is of great value for the study of classical Persian poetry and was used by the great Turkish commentator Muṣṭafā b. Shaḥbāz Surūrī (d. 909 = 1561) in his Bahr al-Maʿrif, Shāraf al-Dīn Rāmī also prepared a commentary on the well-known work on poetries of Rashīd al-Dīn Waṣwāt, Hādījī al-Sīr (new edition of the Persian text by ‘Abbās Ikhlāsī, Teheran 1930) entitled Hādījī al-Hadījīāt or Sanā’ī al-Badā’ī (Hājdījī Khālīfa, iii. 77), a work called Hulūl al-Muddā’ah of which nothing else is known (Hājdījī Khālīfa, iii. 112) and a Divān, which consisted of qaṣidas, ḵītās and qaṭrins, but as early as Dāwlatshāh’s time it could only be found in the Īrāk, Ashgharbadjān and Fārs. Nothing of all these works has come down to us except the Anis al-ʿUdshāḥā. There is said to be a ḵūstā of Rāmī’s in the Dīwān al-ʿArūs (compiled in 840 = 1438-39) of Shaikh Adhari (d. 886 = 1481-2), which is called the Dīwān of Dāwlatshāh (Dāwlatshāh, Taḏkārat al-ʿArūs, ed. E. Browne, p. 308).


Rāmī Muḥmēd Pasha, an Ottoman grand vizier and poet, was born in 1065 or 1066 (1654) in Eiyūb, a suburb of Stambûl, the son of a certain Hasan Agha. He entered the chancery of the Reʾs Efendi as a probationer (chayva) and through the poet Vissuf Nābī (q.v.) received an appointment as maʿṣūf khāja (i.e. secretary for the expenditure of the palace). In 1095 (1684) he was appointed to the ʿām of the state and in 1102 (1699) he became Reʾs Efendi. He took part in his chief’s journeys and campaigns (against Chios) and on his return to Stambûl became Reʾs khālib (i.e. overseer of the viziers). In 1102 (1699) he was appointed Beylkīdī, i.e. Vice-Chancellor and four years later Reʾs Efendi in place of Abû Bakr, in which office he was succeeded in 1108 (1697) by Kūzūk Muḥmēd ʿĀbā. After the battle of Zenta (Sept. 12, 1697), he became Reʾs Efendi for a second time and was one of the plenipotentiaries at the peace of Carlowitz by the conclusion of which “he put an end to the ravages of the Ten Years War but also for ever to the conquering power of the Ottomans” (J. v. Hammer).

As a reward for his services at the peace negotiations he was appointed a vizier of the dome with 3 horse-tails (rūz ghé) in 1114 (1703) and in Ramaḍān 6, 1114 (Jan. 24, 1703) appointed to the highest office in the kingdom in succession to the grand vizier Dātal-bān Muṣṭafā Pasha. In this office he devoted particular attention to the thorough reform of the civil administration, through the structure in which he saw the security of the state threatened (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 64). “By lessening the burden of fortresses on the frontiers in east and west, by raising militia against the rebel Arabs, by securing the pay of the army from the revenues of certain estates, by making aqueducts, by restoring ruined mosques, by taking measures for the safety of the pilgrim caravans and for the security of Asia Minor, by settling Turkmen tribes, by ordering the Jewish cloth manufacturers in Selânik and the Greek silk manufacturers in Brīzā in future to make in their factories all the stuff hitherto imported into Turkey from Europe” (J. v. Hammer), he exercised a most beneficent activity, which however soon aroused envy and hatred, and, especially as Rāmī Muḥmēd Pasha as a man of the pen entirely and not of the sword, was unpopular with the army, particularly the Janissaries, finally was bound to lead to his fall (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., v. 72). In the great rising in Stambûl which lasted 17 weeks, beginning with the imprisonment of Sulṭān Muṣṭafā and ending with his deposition (9th Rabiʿ ii, 1115 = Aug. 22, 1703), his career came to an end. He was disgraced, but pardoned in the same year and appointed governor, first of Cyprus, then of Egypt (Nov. 1704). His governorship there terminated as unhappily as his grand viziership (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 133 succeeding Rāshīd and La Mottraye). In Lujmādā i 1118 (Sept. 1706) he was dismissed and sent to the island of Rhodes, where he died in Dhuʾl-Hijdījā 1119 (March 1707) either under torture or a result of it (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 134 quoting the interminutus Talman). Rāmī Muḥmēd Pasha is regarded as a brilliant stylist, as the two collections of his official documents (inshāʾ) containing no less than 1,400 pieces, distinguished by their simple clear and elevated style, amply show (cf. the MSS. in Vienna, Nat. Bibl. Nos. 296 and 297 in G. Flugel, Die arab., pers. u. türk. Hiz., i. 271 sq.). Rāmī Muḥmēd Pasha also left a complete Divān of which specimens are available in the printed Tārīkh of Salīm (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 272 sq.: Stambol 1315). His poetical gifts were inherited by his sonʿAbd Allāh Reʾf (cf. Brūsāl Muḥmēd Tāwīr, ʿOthmānī Muʾāṭṭir, ii. 187). His son-in-law was the tāhir of Salīm (q.v.).


(Franz Baringer)

**AL-RAMLĂ, capital of Filāṣṭīn.** 25 miles E. N. E. of Jerusalem. The Umayyad caliphs liked to choose little country towns, usually places in Palestine, to live in rather than Damascus. Muʾāwiyah and after him Marwān and others frequently resided in al-Ṣinnābra on the south bank of the Lake of al-Taḥbārīya, Yaḥyā I in Hawwārin, Abīrāt, Abī al-Malik in al-Dābiya, Walid in Usāis (now Tell Sais S. E. of Damascus) and al-Kāratain and his

In the reign of al-Walid his brother Sulaimān was governor of Fīlaṣṭīn. Stimulated by the examples of ‘Abd al-Malik, the builder of the Kūbat al-Ṣakhr in Jerusalem, and of his brother who had restored the mosque of Damascus (Ya‘qūb, *Muṣafām*, ed. Wustenfeld, ii, 818), he founded the new town of al-Ramla and removed to it the seat of the provincial government which had been in Ludd since the “plague of Amūsā” [q. v.] in 18 (638–639). As caliph also he continued to live in al-Ramla (96–99 = 715–717).

The whole population of Ludd was transferred to the new capital of the ḪAN of Fīlaṣṭīn and the latter fortified, while the city was allowed to fall into ruins. Sulaimān first of all built his palace (fār) then the “house of the dyers” (dūr al-ṣabāḥāqin) which was provided with a huge cistern; at a later date it was confiscated for the use of the Umayyad caliphs and came into the possession of the heir of the Ḫābāsid, Sālīḥ b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh. Sulaimān also began to build the mosque and continued it when caliph. It was finished under ‘Omar b. ‘Abd al-Azīz although not on the scale originally intended. The financial management of the building of the palace and of the chief mosque was in the hands of a Christian of Ludd, al-Batrīk b. al-Naka (al-Baladhūrī), ed. de Goeje, p. 143 sq.; var.: Batrīk b. Bakka in Ibn al-Faḳīh, *R.G.A.*, v. 102, and Ibn Batrīk in Ya‘qūb, ii, 818). According to Ya‘qūb (ii, 817) the latter asked the people of Ludd to give him a house near the church, and when they refused, he decided to pull down the church; according to al-Maḏṣīsī (*B.G.A.*, iii 164 sq.), the caliph Hīṣam threatened the people of Ludd that he would destroy their church if they did not hand over the marble columns, which they had intended for a splendid building and concealed. Sulaimān also began to bring a canal called Barada to the new town and to dig wells of fresh water, as it was 12 miles distant from the nearest river, the Abī Ṣufūr (Ya‘qūb, *R.G.A.*, vii, 328). The considerable cost of keeping up the canal was later taken over by the Ḫābāsid Caliphs and at first voted annually but from the time of al-Mu'tasim included as current expenditure in the budget.

The advantages and disadvantages of the new town are vividly described by al-Maḏṣīsī. Rich in fruits, especially figs and palms, good water and all foodstuffs, it combined the advantages of town and country, those of a position in the plain with the proximity of hills and sea, of places of pilgrimage like Jerusalem and coast fortresses. It had a splendid chief mosque, fine ḥanām, comfortable baths, commodious dwellings and broad streets. On the other hand in winter, it was like a muddy island, in summer a sandbank and as it was not on a river the ground was hard and without grass, and the lack of ample running water was the chief defect of this otherwise so favoured town; for the little drinking water in the cisterns was not accessible to the poorer part of the population. The town covered an area of a whole square mile. Its buildings were of fine building stone and brick. The town’s wares were exported chiefly to Egypt.

The chief gates of al-Ramla were: Darb Bit’ al-Askar (called after the al-Askar quarter; cf. Ya‘qūb, iii 674; Sāfī al-Dīn, *Marāji‘*, ii, 258). Darb Maṣjīd ‘Annāba (as it was called, as de Goeje conjectured, from the town elsewhere however called ‘Annāba 4 miles E. of al-Ramla), Darb Bait al-Maḏdīs, Darb Bit’ al (i.e. Bī‘a‘ or Bīlgha‘ or Kārīyat al-Ta‘b, the ancient Kīrat al-Ba‘ala now Abū Qawāh‘), Darb Ludd, Darb Yā‘fā, Darb Māṣr and Darb Dāḏjūn, the latter called after a neighbouring town with a mosque, mainly inhabited by Samaritans (Bī‘a‘ Dagon, now Bait Dāḏjūn).

In the centre of the market-place of al-Ramla was the chief mosque (ṣbī‘a) al-Abyāḍ, the miḥrāb of which was regarded as the largest of all that were known, the pulpit of which was second only to that in Jerusalem and whose splendid minaret was much admired.

Whether there had been an older town on the site of al-Ramla is problematic. The old attempts to identify it with Arimathia, Ramathu or Ramathaim have now been generally abandoned. An ancient *παραμύθιον*, “Camp”, should rather be considered, a place-name particularly frequent in Palestine, which was borne for example by the camp of Jerusalem (Ḥebra, xii, 11, 13; Act. Apost. xxii, 35–xxvii, 35) and bishoprics in Palestine (now Bit’ al-Zara‘a, cf. Féderin in *Gén.*, *Vie de S. Euthyme le Grand*, p. 104–111) and in Ibuq and Abyla (R. Aigrin, art. *Arabes*, in *Dict. d’hist. et de géogr. eccl.*. iii, 1194–1196); for the Egyptian al-Ramla 4 miles N.E. of Alexandria corresponds to an ancient Nicopolis and later Parembole. But the Arabic writers say there was no town previously on this site but only a sandy area after which the town was named (al-Baladhūrī, p. 143 sq. et al.).

The population of al-Ramla was in the time of Ya‘qūb (B.G.A., viii, 327 sq.), a mixture of Arabs and Persians (on the settlement of Persians in Syria cf. al-Kindi, *Governors of Egypt*, ed. Guest, p. 19); the clients were Samaritans.

The great cistern of ‘Uṣayyitī (ʿAnṣiyī) to the N.W. of al-Ramla near the road to Ya‘fā, known as the cistern of St. Helena, has a Kufic inscription of Dhu Ḥijjah 172 (May 789), i.e. of the time of Hārūn al-Raṣīd (van Berchem, *Inscr. arabes de Syrie*, Cairo 1897, p. 4–7; M. de Vogué, *La citerne de Ramla*, in *Comptes rendus de l’Acad. des Insct. et Belles-lettres*, xxxix, 1911, p. 362 sq.–493 sq.).

By the Frankish pilgrims the town is first mentioned in 870 as ‘Ramula’. The Crusaders made it a bishopric. In the 12th century was built the beautiful church of the Crusaders, now the mosque (*Qāmār al-Kabīr* in the east of the town) with its noble Gothic portal, which was later added a very skilfully an inscription of Sulṭān Katbūgha. It also has an inscription, according to which its square tower (now replaced by a round minaret) was built or restored in 714 (1314–1315) by Sulṭān Muḥammad.

The old “white mosque” was restored by Saladin in 587 (1191) and given by Bāhrūs in 666 (1267–1268) two domes, above the minaret and the mihrāb, and the gateway opposite it (Muḍjir al-Dīn, *Biltûk*, p. 418; transl. Sauvage, p. 207; the inscription in van Berchem, *op. cit.*, p. 57–64). The minaret, the so-called “tower of al-Ramla” or “Tower of the 40 martyrs”, was, according to Muḍjir al-Dīn and an inscription over its gateway, rebuilt in
Al-Ramla — Rampur

Shebān 718 (Oct. 1318) (Zwei arabisch Inschriften in Jerusalemer Werte, ixix., 1913, p. 100 sqq.): the mosque as well as the minaret have both been wrongly taken for the work of the Crusaders (cf. against this van Berchem, op. cit., p. 63 sqq.).

Nasîr-i Khushraw who visited al-Ramla in Ramūsān 438 (1047), calls it a large town with high and strong walls of stone and gates of copper; the inhabitants had a receptacle for the collection of rain-water at the door of each house. There was also a large ditch for general use in the middle of the Friday mosque.

An earthquake of Mubarram 15, 425 (Dec. 10, 1605) destroyed a third of the town and its mosque fell into ruins (cf. also Ibn al-Athir, ix. 298).

Most of the public and private buildings were built of marble and adorned with fine sculptures and ornaments. Figs were the chief export of al-Ramla. The name of the province of Filastīn was also given to the capital al-Ramla (Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'Arch. Orient., vi. 101).

Saladin in 583 (1187) destroyed the town so that it might never again fall into the hands of the Franks and it remained in ruins (Yākūt, i. 818; Sāfi al-Dīn, Marqājd, i. 483). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited it in 756 (1355); he mentions the Ḏumān-i Al-Abayd in which, he was told, 300 prophets were buried. A Latin monastery was founded in 1420 in al-Ramla by Duke Philip the Good, and restored at a later date by Louis XIV.

In 1798 the town was Napoleon's headquarters.

The modern al-Ramla has about 6,500 inhabitants; it has a healthy climate and fertile country round it.


(R. H. Ongmanz)

**Rampur, an Indian state in Rohilkhānd under the political supervision of the government of the United Provinces. It is bounded on the north by the district of Nainī Tal; on the east by Bareilly; on the south by the Bissauilī tāqṣīl of Budān; and on the west by the district of Morādābād.

The early history of Rampur is that of the growth of Rohilla power in Rohilkhānd. After the establishment of Muslim rule in India large bodies of Afgān or Pathāns settled down in the country. So powerful did they become that they were twice able to establish their rule in northern India, under the Lodis [q. v.] in the second half of the 15th century, and under the Sūrs [q. v.] in the time of Shīr Shāh. After the death of Awrangzīb and with the decline of the Moghul empire Afgān settlements increased until in the words of the Sīyar al-Mulūk al-Khārjīn they seemed to shoot up out of the ground like so many blades of grass. The name Rohilla was applied to those Afgāns who settled in what is now known as Rohilkhānd.

The real founders of Rohilla power were an Afgān adventurer, named Dāūd Khān, who arrived in India immediately after the death of Awrangzīb, and his adopted son, 'Ali Muḥammad Khān, who succeeded him as leader of a band of mercenary troops. It was during the lifetime of 'Ali Muḥammad Khān that his possessions came to be called Rohilkhānd or the land of the Rohillas. In course of time 'Ali Muḥammad Khān became so powerful that he refused any longer to pay his revenues to the central government, in which course he was encouraged by the anarchy consequent upon the invasion of Nādir Shāh [q. v.]. The growth of his power so alarmed Sāfīr Dāng of Oudh [see Oudh] that he persuaded the emperor to send an expedition against him, as a result of which 'Ali Muḥammad Khān surrendered to the imperial forces and was taken prisoner to Dihlī. After a time he was pardoned and appointed governor of Surhind. In 1748, according to the Gultāns-i Rhāmat, he was transferred to Rohilkhānd, but it seems more probable that he took advantage of the invasion of Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī [q. v.] to recover his former possessions. Two factors contributed to the growth of Rohilla power: the weakness of the central government and the fact that they were able to take advantage of the internal struggles between the various Rajput chiefs and zamindārs of Rohilkhānd.

'Ali Muḥammad Khān left six sons, but the absence of the two eldest in Afgānistan, combined with the extreme youth of the other four, meant that all real power remained in the hands of a group of Rohilla vārdārs, the most important of whom were Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān, and Dūnd Khān. This naturally produced intrigues and disputes and eventually weakened the Rohilla power.

In 1771 the Mārāthas turned their attention to the conquest of Rohilkhānd, whereupon the Rohillas applied for aid to Shudžā al-Dawla, the nawāb-wazīr of Oudh. It was agreed that Shudžā al-Dawla should receive forty laks of rupees for his services (Alteison, i. 6-7), but the Rohillas later refused to abide by their pecuniary engagements. In accordance with his promise at the Conference of Benares in 1773, Warren Hastings agreed to assist the nawāb-wazīr in expelling the Rohillas from Rohilkhānd, for which he was to receive forty laks of rupees. On April 23, 1774, the Rohillas were defeated and their leader, Hāfīz Raḥmat Khān, slain. At the end of this war Fāsulālah Khān, a son of 'Ali Muḥammad Khān, concluded a treaty with Shudžā al-Dawla at Lal-dang (India Office MSS., Bengal Secret Consultations, October 31, 1774; see also extracts from the Persian interpreter's journal, February 14, 1775).

By this treaty Fāsulālah Khān received a dāng consisting of Rampur and other districts with a
revenue estimated at approximately fifteen lakhs of rupees. To prevent him from becoming a menace to Oudh he was not allowed to retain in his service more than 5,000 troops. After the death of Shuddha al-Dawla, in 1775, Faizullah Khan was informed that his engagements with the late nawab-wazir still continued in force with his son, Asaf al-Dawla (Bengal Secret Consultations, April 17, 1775). Draft correspondence with the Country Powers, No. 34).

In 1780 the English Company needed additional troops and Hastings urged Asaf al-Dawla to demand from Faizullah Khan the 5,000 horses he had engaged to supply by treaty. This demand for cavalry was an unwarrantable interpretation of the Treaty of Laidang for which no justification has ever been attempted. In 1781 Hastings empowered Asaf al-Dawla to resume Faizullah Khan’s jagir but fortunately this order was never carried out, and it was eventually decided to solve the problem by means of a fresh agreement whereby the obligation to provide troops for the nawab-wazir’s service was commuted under the Company’s guarantee to a cash payment of fifteen lakhs of rupees. In 1801, on the cession of Kohilkhând to the British, Faizullah Khan’s descendants were continued in their possessions. For his services in the Mutiny of 1857 Muhammad Yusuf Ali Khan, the ruler of Râmpôr, received a grant of land and was assured by sanad that, on the failure of natural heirs, any succession in his state, which might be legitimate according to Muhammadan law, would be upheld by the Government of India.

Modern Râmpôr has an area of 893 square miles and supports a population of 452,223, of whom 217,297 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report). It is divided for administrative purposes into six tahsilis: the Huqor, Shakhbazar, Mitak, Bilsupur, Suar and Tanda (Administration Report, 1932-1933). Its rulers are patrons of Oriental learning. The celebrated Madrasa ‘Aliya, an Arabic college, which is maintained from state funds, attracts students from all parts of India and even from Central Asia. Râmpôr city, which has a population of 74,080, possesses a fine library containing an exceptionally valuable collection of manuscripts. Almost every Pathan clan is represented in modern Râmpôr, the most numerous being the Yûsufzais and Orzkais. There are also large numbers of Khattaks, Bunerwals, Muhammadzais, and Afridis.


RANGIN. Several Indian poets have used this taqâllûs. The Râyîd al-wasâf of Dhu ‘l-Fikr ‘Ali, biographies of Indian poets who wrote in Persian, and the Tadkhira of Yusuf ‘Ali Khan (analysed by Spranger, A Catalogue of the Arabic, Persian and Hindustani Miss. of the King of Oudh, i. 168 and 280) mention live of them. The first, a native of Kashimir, lived in Dihli in the reign of Muhammad Shah (1719–1748); his gazeyes were sung by the dancing-girls. The most celebrated, however, was Sa’âdat Vâr Khân of Dihli. His father, Tahtâsî Beg Khân Târânî, came to India with Nadir Shah and settled in Dihli where he attained the rank of khaft-basârî and the title of Muâshkîm al-Dawla. In his turn, Sa’âdat Vâr Khân entered the service of Mirzâ Sulaimân Shikhu, son of the emperor Shâh ‘Alam, who lived in Lucknow. He was a good horseman and able soldier; for a time he commanded a part of the artillery of the Nizâm of Haidarâbâd but he gave up this post to go into business. He was in his youth a friend of the poet Inshâ in Lucknow; a pupil of the poet Muhammad Hotim of Dihli (cf. Ram Babu Saksena, A History of Urdu Literature, p. 48; Spranger, op. cit., p. 233), he afterwards submitted all his poems to the criticism of Nîshâr (cf. Spranger, p. 273), then of Muṣafîr Saksena, p. 90; he died in 1251 (1835) aged eighty (or a year later; cf. Garcin de Tassy). — The following are his works in Urdu: Malhotnâ Dâfsir, a poem of romantic adventures (1213 = 1798); Lîjdî-i Rângin, a makhânwâ of fables and anecdotes (Lucknow 1847 and 1870); another makhânwâ of anecdotes: Mâghar al-’Aṣârîb or Ghârâb al-Maṣżûr (Ith. Agra and Lucknow); four divâns collectively known as Naw Katan (the Nine Jewels), the two first lyrical, the third humorous and partly in râkhti (language peculiar to women), the fourth in this same language with a preface by Rângin explaining the principal words (on the development of râkhti and Rângin’s skill in this licentious genre, cf. the article Urdu in vol. iv., p. 1026), 1. i–11, and Saksena, op. cit., p. 94); in prose treatise on horsemen (Fa’arâ-nâm, 1210 = 1755; several times edited); a collection of critical observations on a number of poets, entitled Majdîl-i Rângin. In Persian (if the work is really his; cf. Spranger, op. cit., p. 54, No. 462), Rângin under the title Mîhr u-Mâh, sang of the adventure of a son of a saiyid and of a daughter of a jeweller, based on an incident that occurred in Dihli in the reign of Djahangir (cf. Gr. I. Ph., ii. 254).

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: Garcin de Tassy, Litt. hindoue et hindoustaneîs, i. 45 and iii. 2; Pertsch, Die Handschrift-Verschickungen der Konigl. Bibl. zu Berlin, iv., index, p. 1157; Blumbhart, Cat. of the . . . Hindustani Miss. in the British Museum, No. 74, vol. iv. (M. Massé).

RANGOON, a city in the Pegu division of Burma lying on both sides of the Hlaing river at its point of junction with the Pegu river and the Pazundaung creek, twenty-one miles from the sea.

Legend, not entirely undocumented, relates that the great pagoda at Rangoon (Mon, Kyak Lagun; Burmese, Shwe Dagon) was founded during the lifetime of the Buddha and was repaired by the emperor Anpo (J. B. R. S., xxiv. 4 and 20).

History proper begins with the establishment of Pegu as the capital of a Mon kingdom in 1369.
A convenient port was required for this kingdom. Bassein, which had been the chief port of Burma in the early middle ages, was too distant and too difficult to control. Martaban on the Gulf of Sittang was nearer but had no good river connection with Pegu. It was natural, therefore, that the Rangoon or Hlaing river, of which the Pegu river is a tributary, should come into prominence as a line of approach for over-seas trade. Syriam, to the southeast of Dagon at the mouth of the Pegu river, and Dhalá, now part of Rangoon on the opposite bank of the Hlaing, were the chief ports. But the Shwe Dagon pagoda standing on the last spur of the Pegu Yomas was a landmark to shipping coming up the river and was chosen by a succession of kings for the exercise of their petty.

An inscription on the Dagon pagoda hill, engraved by order of King Dhammazedi in 1845 A.D., records additions to the pagoda by his royal predecessors for a century back, as well as by himself (J. B. R. S., xxiv. 8). Similar works of merit by subsequent kings are recorded in the histories (by this period fairly reliable) culminating in the rebuilding of the pagoda by King Bay in Naung after it had been damaged by an earthquake in 1568 A.D. There are also frequent references by early travellers, such as Ferdinand Mendez Pinto, Caesar Frederick, and Gasparo Balbi to Dagon and its celebrated pagoda.

It was the customs revenue of the Rangoon river that financed the Portuguese adventurer de Brito, who rose to power in Syriam between 1660 and 1612. Later in the xviith century the Dutch, French and English had time to time maintained trading stations at Syriam.

The capital was transferred from Pegu to Ava in 1635 and royal authority gradually declined, but even the weakest kings contrived to keep control of the Irrawaddy and the now important customs station of Syriam. With the seizure of Syriam by the Pegu rebels in 1740 the kingdom of Ava, deprived of its revenues, necessarily came to an end.

The recovery of Syriam was one of the first objects of Alaungpaya, the founder of the dynasty which ended with King Thibaw. His siege operations were for some time unsuccessful and he had to be content with the capture of Dagon in 1755. It is recorded that as he had been successful over all his enemies (yan okon) he changed the name of the town to Yangon (Rangoon). Syriam fell in 1756 and was destroyed. A governor was appointed at Rangoon, which now replaced Syriam as the principal sea-port of Burma.

The policy of the early kings of the Alaungpaya dynasty was to encourage foreign trade. A British factory was established at Rangoon and maintained till 1782. Parsi, Armenian and Muslim traders settled here and flourished. But with the weakening of the local government the exactions of the local officials increased and constituted a serious discouragement to commerce. Symes describes Rangoon, as a flourishing port in 1795 and estimates its population at 30,000 (p. 214).

Rangoon was first captured by the British in 1824 during the first Burmese war but was evacuated in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Yandabo at the end of the war. According to the Kon-baung set Maha-yazawangji (vol. iii., p. 15), a Burmese history of the Alaungpaya dynasty, King Tharawaddy visited Rangoon in 1841 (1205 B.E.) and founded a new town south and west of the Shwe Dagon pagoda, to which the population of the old town on the banks of the river was ordered to remove. The order was not at once obeyed, but, by the outbreak of the second Burmese war in 1852, the transfer of the population was pretty complete and the British government was unimpeded in the measures, which it lost no time in undertaking, for the reclamation and lay-out of the riverine area. In the space of three years Rangoon rose from a squalid collection of huts into a thriving and populous town. [For improvements to Rangoon and development of Pegu, see Kythe's Early Past and Present, ii., appendix G). To-day it is the capital of Burma and has a population of 400,415, of whom 70,791 are Muhammadans (1931 Census Report).


(C. COLLIN DAVIES)

RAPAK (Jav.; Ar. raf') is a technical term used among the Javanesse, in this one case only, for the charge made by the wife, at the court for matters of religion, that the husband has not fulfilled the obligations which he took upon himself at the t'iv'ik of talâk [see TALÂK]. These obligations are of a varied and changing nature. Among the conditions the following always occurs: "If the man has been absent a certain time on land or (longer) over seas" i.e. without having transmitted nafaqa [q.v.] to his wife. A clause that is never omitted is the following: "If the wife is not content with this". She is therefore at liberty to be quite satisfied with the husband's non-fulfilment of his vows, without taking steps for a divorce. The work of the court is only to ascertain the fulfilment of the condition and the arising of talâk. As above, the talâk is still entered in a register. — It is evident that this procedure guarantees the integrity of the law otherwise endangered.


(R. A. KERN)

RAS AL-'AIN ('AIN WARDA), a town in al-'Alîjizra on the Khâbûr. In ancient times it was already known as Resain-Theodosiopolis (Netitia dignitatum, or. xxxvi. 20) or P'ousa (Steph. Byz.), Syriac Râf 'Ainâ. On account of its position at the sources of the Khâbûr it has been identified with the road-station Fons Scabara of the Tabula Peutingeriana (fons Chabura in Pliny, Nat. hist., xxxi. 37; xxxii. 16) (E. Herfeld, Reise im Empiriat-
u. Tigrio-Gebiet, i. 191; A. Poidebard, La Traite de Rome dans le duché de Syrie, p. 151 sq.). According to Ioannes Malalas (Bonn, p. 345 sq.) in whom the form Πανκρατία is probably due to a confusion with the Syrian Kaphaneia, the town in 383 (according to the Edessene Chronik, ed. Haltert, in Texte und Untersuch., 7. Gesch. d. altchristl. Literatur, 1841, p. 102, 149, No. 27, 1) as early as 692 Sel. = 380–381) received from Theodosius I city rights and the name Theodosiopolis, a name borne also by the Armenian town of Karin (Erzrūm) probably from the time of Theodosius II. As its new name was generally used without any distinguishing epithet, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish which of the two towns is intended. For example the siege of Theodosiopolis by Bahram V Göur in 421 (Theodoret, Hist. eccl., v. 37, 2) which Weisbach (Paulus-Wissowa, K. E., v. A, p. 1925, s. v. Theodosiopolis, No. 2) refers to the Armenian town, is told by Michael Syrus (transl. Chabot, ii. 13 = Barhebr. Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 70) of Rās ʿAmān; the Syrian chronicler (Mich. Syr., ii. 372; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 92) further records that Khosrow II gave back to the Byzantines Dārā and Rās ʿAmān, while the other sources mention only Dārā and Martyropolis in addition to Armenia. The Persian general Adharnasian thrice (578 and 580) destroyed the city of this town (Mich. Syr., ii. 322 sq.). In the reign of Phocas the Persians took Rās ʿAmān from the Byzantines (The Chronological Canon of James of Edessa, transl. Brooks in Z. D. M. G., i., 1899, p. 323, No. 284). In the year 19 (640) 'Īyād b. Ǧīhān was shortly after the participation of Oshoehne marched against the province of Mesopotamia and by ʿOmar's orders sent ʿUmar b. Saʿd against the town of ʿAin Warda or Rās al-ʿAin, which was besieged and stormed by him (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 175–177). When a portion of the town had abandoned it, the Muslims confiscated their property. Among the rebels who rose against the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik about 700 was ʿUmar b. Ḥuṣab of Rās al-ʿAin (Abū ʿArād), Kīrāb al-ʿĀgbīl, Ḫūra; xx. 127; Ibn al-ʿĀbir, ed. Tarnitz, iv. 254 sq.; Mich. Syr., ii. 469; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 111). In the reign of Māmūn, Ḥubab took the town in 1125 Sel. (814 a.d.) (Mich. Syr., iii. 27; Barhebraeus, op. cit., p. 137). The Jacobite patriarch Yūḥannān III died on Dec. 3, 873 in Rās ʿAmān (Mich. Syr., iii. 116; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., ed. Abboeos-Lamy, i., Lyons 1872, coll. 357). After their campaign against Dārā and Ṣafīb (942 a.d.) the Byzantines in 943 took Rās al-ʿAin, plundered it and carried off many prisoners (Ibn al-ʿĀbir, viii. 312). A man from Rās al-ʿAin, ʿAlmād b. al-Ḥusayn ʿAṣāf Tagḥībī, called al-ʿAṣāf, disguised as a dervish, in 935 (1005) with a body of Arabs made a raid into Byzantine territory as far as Ṣuḫarāz arid Maḥrūz near Ṣuḫarāz but was driven back by thePartucios Blāhās. The governor Nicephorus Uronos in the same year undertook a punitive expedition to the region of Ṣuḫarāz, defeated the Bāb Nūmār and Kīlāb and had al-ʿAṣāf thrown into prison by Luʾluʾ, lord of Ḥalab in 397 (1007) (Yahyā b. ʿAbd al-ʿAntākī, in Patrol. Orient., xxiii., 1932, p. 466 sq.; Georg. Kedren-Skytiz., Bonn, ii., 454, 81; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 229). About the year 523 (1129) the Franks were lords of the whole of Syria and Dīyār Mūjiʿār and threatened Amid, Nisibin and Rās al-ʿAin. The latter was taken by Joscelin and a large part of the Arab population killed and the remainder taken prisoners (Mich. Syr., ii. 228; Barhebr., Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 289). But the Franks cannot have held the town for very long.

Saʿf al-Dīn of Mawṣīl and ʿĪz al-Dīn Masʿūd of Ḥalab in 570 (1174–1175) attacked Ṣaḥār al-Dīn and besieged Rās al-ʿAin but were soon afterwards defeated by him at Kaṭrūn Ḥamā. In 581 (1185–1186) Saladin crossed the Euphrates and marched via ʿAbd al-ʿAin and Dārā to Ḥalab on the Tigris. His son al-Mustāfī in 597 (1200–1201) received from al-ʿĀlid the towns of Samaṣīt, Sarāḏī, Rās al-ʿAin and Dūmānīn; when he then marched on Damascus, Nūr al-Dīn of Mawṣīl and Kūṭ al-Dīn Muḥammad of Senādīr again took the Djazīra from him but fell ill in Rās al-ʿAin in the heat of summer and concluded peace again. In 599 (1202–1203) al-ʿĀlid took from al-Mustāfī the towns of Sarāḏī, Rās al-ʿAin and Dūmānīn (other fortresses also are mentioned). When the Kurṭī (Georgians) who had advanced as far as Ǧīḥāt in 609 (1210–1210) learned that al-ʿĀlid had reached Rās al-ʿAin on his way against them, they withdrew (Kamāl al-Dīn, transl. Blochet, in R. O. L., vi. 46). Malik al-Asḥāfī, who had defeated Ibn al-Mashṭūh in 616 (1219–1220) forgave him for rebelling and gave him Rās al-ʿAin as a fief (Kamāl al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 61; according to Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 439, however, Ibn al-Mashṭūh died in prison in Ḧarrān). Saladin's nephew al-ʿĀṣfīr in 617 (1220–1221) was fighting against the lord of Mārdīn. The lord of Amidt made peace between them, when Rās al-ʿAin was ceded to al-ʿĀṣfīr, Muwazzar and the district of Ǧubakhtān (around Dūnaisīr) to the lord of Amidt. In exchange for Damascus, al-Asḥāfī, in 626 (1229) gave his brother al-Ḵāmil the towns of al-Ruḥā, Ḥarrān, al-Raḵṣā, Sarāḏī, Rās al-ʿAin, Muwazzar and Dūmāīn (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vii.; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 458) who occupied them in 634 (1236–1237) (Kamāl al-Dīn, op. cit., p. 92). After the defeat of the Khwārizmīs at Dīǧab al-Daulamūn near al-Ruḥā, the army of Ḥalab in 638 (1240–1241) took Ḥarrān, al-Ruḥā, Rās al-ʿAin, Dūmāīn, al-Muważzur, al-Raḵṣā and the district belonging to it (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 12). But in 639 (1241–1242) the Khwārizmīs, who had made an alliance with al-Malik al-Muṣaffar of Māriyāḏīrīn, returned to Rās al-ʿAin, where the inhabitants and the garrison, including a number of Frankish archers and crossbowmen, offered resistance. An arrangement was made by which they were admitted to the town by the inhabitants, whose lives were promised them, and captured the garrison. When al-Malik al-Manṣūr had returned to Ḥarrān and Muṣaffar had retired to Māriyāḏīrīn with the Khwārizmīs, they sent their prisoners back (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 14). In the same year also the Tatars came to Rās al-ʿAin (ibid., p. 15). When the Khwārizmīs and Turkmens raided al-Djazīra, the lord of Ḥalab under the emir Djamāl al-Dawla in Dūnāmūlī II 640 (1242–1243) went out against them and the two armies encamped opposite each other near Rās al-ʿAin. The Khwārizmīs combined with the lord of Mārdīn and finally a peace was made by which Rās al-ʿAin was given to the Ortōqīd ruler of Mārdīn (Kamāl al-Dīn, in R. O. L., vi. 19).
In a Muhammadan cemetery in the North of Râs al-'Ain, M. von Oppenheim found an inscription of the year 717 (1317–1318). The Syrian chroniclers mention Rêsh 'Ain as a Jacobite bishopric (11 bishops between 793 and 1199 are given in Mich. Syr., iii. 502) in which a synod was held in 684 (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccI., i. 287). Towards the end of the sixth century the town was sacked by Timûr.

Râs al-'Ain is built at a spot where a number of copious, in part sulphurous, springs burst forth, which form the real "main source" of the Khabûr (al-Dimashqî, ed. Mehrein, p. 191). The Wadî al-'Urdjîb, which has not much water in it and starts further north in the region of Wîrûbêhîr, and which may be regarded as the upper course of the Khabûr, only after receiving the waters from the springs of Râs al-'Ain becomes a regular river, known from that point as the Khabûr. According to M. von Oppenheim (cf. his map in Petrie and Maitland, 1911, ii. pl. 19), the springs at Râs al-'Ain are called Ain al-Hasan, Ain al-Kebîr, and Ain al-Zarkûz; according to Taylor (J.R.A.S., xxviii. 349, note) "Ain al-Bâjdâ" and "Ain al-Hasan are the most important; he also gives the names of 10 springs in the N.E. and 5 in the S. of the new town.

The Arab geographers talk of 360, i.e. a very large number of springs, the abundance of water from which makes the vicinity of the town a blooming garden. One of these springs, "Ain al-Zâhîriya, was said to be bottomless. According to Ibn Hawâšel Râs al-'Ain was a fortified town with many gardens and mills; at the principal spring there was according to al-Makdisi a lake as clear as crystal. Ibn Rusta (B.G.A., vii. 106) mentions Râs al-'Ain, Karkîsîya, and al-Rakkâ and as districts of al-Djazira. Ibn Djibarîn in 580 (1184–1185) saw two Friday mosques, schools and baths in Râs al-'Ain on the bank of the Khabûr. According to Hamd Allah al-Mastuflî (xivth century) the walls had a circumference of 5,000 paces; among the rich products of Râs al-'Ain, he mentions cotton, corn, and grapes. The historical romance Fathûdîn Râbi' of "Ardîyûr Banû (xivth century) wrongly ascribed to al-Wâkû, which contains much valuable geographical information, mentions at Râs al-'Ain a plain of Muthakhab and a Murdj al-Tir (var. al-Durî); it also mentions a Nestorian church in the town and several gates (in the translation by B. G. Niebuhr and A. D. Mordtmann, Schriften der Akad. von Hamburg, i. part iii., Hamburg 1847, p. 76, 87: the "gate of Istacharem in the east and the "Mukthaius or gate of Chabur" not precisely located. I have not been able to see the Arabic text of Psa-Wâkîdî, ed. Ewald, (Gottingen 1827)."

Râs al-'Ain were the Jacobite monasteries of Bîth Tirai and Spekoulos (speculâr; Ps.-Zacharias Rhet., viii. 4, trans. Ahrens-Krüger, p. 157; so also for Asphulos in Mich. Syr., iii. 50, 55, cf. ii. 513, note 6; Saphyllos in Mich. Syr. iii. 121, 449, 462; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccI., ed. AbboIlos-Lamy, i. 281 sq.; Soophelis, ed. 397 sq. probably so to be read throughout)."


(E. Hönigmann)


On the 2nd Rabi‘ I, 513 (July 13, 1119) the caliph Al-Mustâshid [q.v.] had homage paid to his twelve-year-old son Abû DJâ'far al-Mânsîr as the heir-apparent and in Ðubu l-Kadhâba 529 (Aug.– Sept. 1135) the latter was acclaimed caliph under the name Al-Râshid bi 'llâh. When the Saljuq Sultan Mas'ûd b. Muhammân [q.v.] soon afterwards demanded 400,000 dinars from him, Al-Râshid refused, because, as he said, he had no money. Mas'ûd's envoy then attempted to search the caliph's palace and seize the money for his forces; but the resided the Sultan's troops were scattered and his palace plundered. Several emirs also withdrew their homage from the sultan. His nephew, Dâwûd b. Ma'âtnûd, advanced from Aḏâbâr and reached it in the beginning of Safar 530 (Nov. 1135). In the meanwhile the number of the caliphs supporters increased. He was joined among others by the Atâbeg of al-Mawjîl 'Imâd al-Din Zengî [q.v.] and Dâwûd was proclaimed sultan in Baghêdîd. On hearing this Mas'ûd prepared for war, advanced on Baghêdîd and laid siege to it; he did not succeed in taking it, so after some fifty days he withdrew to Nahrawân [q.v.] and then went to Hamadân [q.v.].Toronto, governor of Wâsît, then appeared and placed a sufficient number of boats at his disposal so that he was able to cross the Tigris and occupy the western bank. The result was that the allies separated. Dâwûd returned to Aḏâbâr and Zengî with the caliph to al-Mawjîl, while Mas'ûd in the middle of Ðubu l-Kadhâba 530 (Aug. 1136) entered the ancient city of the caliphs, where he forbade looting and other excesses and restored order. He then summoned an assembly of judges and lensmen who declared the fugitive caliph unworthy of the throne. The latter was accused among other things of having broken his oath to the Sultan; he was said to have solemnly promised Mas'ûd never to take up arms against him nor to leave the capital; he was also accused of other crimes. In his stead, his uncle Abû 'Abd Allah Muhammân Al-Muktafî b. Al-Mustâshîr [q.v.] was appointed commander of the faithful.
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Al-Rašid however did not stay long in al-Mawsīl but went to Adharbājān where he joined Dāwūd. Several emirs, dissatisfied with Māsūd, also made common cause with Dāwūd with the object of restoring al-Rašid to the throne; the latter however took no part in the military operations [see also the article Māsūd]. On Ramaḍān 25 or 26, 532 (June 6 or 7, 1138) the former caliph, who had not quite recovered from an illness, was murdered by Assassins near Isfāhān.


(K. V. Zettersten)

**Rašīd, Mehmed**, an Ottoman imperial historiographer, belonged to Stambul, where he was born as the son of the Kaḍī Mūlī Mustafā, a native of Malātiya. He completed his studies in his native city where he was appointed official historiographer (waqāʾīt muwāṣ, q.v.) in 1126 (1714). He held this office till his appointment as Kaḍī at Aleppo in 1134 (1720). Later on he went as ambassador to Persia with the rank of Kaḍī of Mecca, became in Şahrāb 1142 (Feb. 1730) Kaḍī of Stambul, was dismissed a few months later and on 1st Djamād 1147 (Oct. 1734) appointed ʿāshir of Anatolia. He died on 18th Shawr 1148 (July 10, 1735) in Stambul (cf. Subhi; Taʾrīkh, fol. 13, 22, 66 (remarkably brief) and was buried opposite the mosque of Atfālāzāde in the Kāra Gurnaș Street. On his tombstone see Braşalî Mehmed Tāhir, ʿOthmānî Miʾellεfîi, iii. 55 note.

Mehmed Rašīd in continuation of Naʾmā [q.v.] wrote a history of the Ottoman empire from 1071 (1660) to 1134 (1721) usually called briefly Taʾrīkh-i Rašīd (cf. Hāṣid Maḥfīls, No. 14, 1526) which is the authoritative source for this period. His successor in the office of imperial historiographer was Ismāʿīl ʿAṣim, known as ʿUkūl Ceiling-žade (cf. Rašīd, Taʾrīkh, iii., fol. 114).

In addition to numerous MSS. (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 259 to which we have to add ʿUṣūla, No. 667—668 [Rašīd’s autograph] and Stambul Lāla ʿĀmilī, No. 378) Rašīd’s history has been twice printed (folio, Stambul 1153; 4 vols.; octavo, 6 vols., Stambul 1282; cf. thereon ʃ. 4., 1868, i. 477). Portions have been translated by M. Norberg, Türkische rikets annaler, Hernossand 1822, ii. 635—1079, and J. S. Sekowska, Collectanea d. Deisipovw Tureckhi, ii., Warsaw 1825, p. 1—208.

**Bibliography:** cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 269 sq. (Franz Babinger)

**Al-Rašīd.** [See ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Ḥarūn.]

**Al-Rašīd (Mawla) b. al-Sharīf b. ‘Ali b. Mūḥammad b. Allī b. ʿAlī al-Sulṭān of Morocco and the real founder of the dynasty which still rules the Shaṭṭān empire. He was born in 1040 (1630—1631) in Taṭfīlāt [q.v.] in the south of Morocco, where his ancestors, the Ḥasanī Shaṭṭānis (Sharīfī [q.v.] of Sidjīmāṣā [q.v.], had founded a flourishing ʿāmilī [q.v.] and gradually acquired a fairly considerable political influence, which increased with the decline of the ʿAṣāʾirī [q.v.] dynasty.

Morocco being at this time plunged into anarchy, the Sharīfī of Taṭfīlāt were able rapidly to become masters of the great tracts of steppe-like country to the north of the cordon of oases which formed their appanage. The eldest son of the chief of the ʿāmilī, Mawla Maḥmūd, having successfully fought the marabout of the ʿāmilī of Ilīh in al-Ṭāṭārwalāt (S. W. of Morocco), ‘Alī Abū Ḥāṣin, who had political ambitions of his own, assumed a royal title in 1050 (1646). He did not however yet succeed in crushing the power of the marabouts of the ʿāmilī of al-Dīlāʾ in central Morocco; he had to be content, after a very brief occupation of Tāzā and Fās in 1650, with effective sovereignty over eastern Morocco only.

On the death of Mawla al-Sharīf in 1069 (1659) his son, Mawla al-Rašīd, not trusting his brother, Mawla Maḥmūd, left the ancestral ʿāmilī for the rival ʿāmilī of al-Dīlāʾ where, in spite of a superficially warm welcome, he was soon given to hint to go; he proceeded to Azīr, then to Fās, which, regarded as an undesirable by the lord of the city, the adventurer al-Durāṣī, he was not allowed to enter. He next went to western Morocco, and very soon succeeded in gaining a large number of followers, particularly, in the important tribe of the Banū ʿIznāṣīn (Beni Snassen), the Shaṭṭān al-Lawātī, a religious dignitary, then of great influence. At the same time he attacked a very rich Jew, who played the regular lord and lived in the mountains of the Banū ʿIznāṣīn, at the little town called Dar Ibn Maḥfīl; al-Rašīd slew him and seized his wealth. This coup vividly impressed the imagination of the people of the district and was to give rise, as P. de Ceuval has brilliantly shown, to a legend, the memory of which still survives in the annual festival which follows the election of the “ṣulṭān of the ʿāmilī” at Fās. Mawla al-Rašīd by this murder not only acquired considerable material resources, but also a real ascendancy over the people of the neighbourhood. In 1075 (1664) the large tribe of the Angād rallied to his authority, and he set up in Uṣūla [q.v.] as a regular ruler. On the news of the proclamation of al-Rašīd, his brother Mawla Maḥmūd, much disturbed, hurried from Taṭfīlāt to eastern Morocco; his troops were met by those of al-Rašīd, and Mawla Maḥmūd having been killed early in the battle, his men then went over to the surviving prince. Thenceforth Mawla al-Rašīd went on from success to success.

He very soon seized Tāzā without difficulty, and directly threatened Stambul, but he first of all took care to secure his power solidly at Taṭfīlāt, the cradle of his line, and added to his lands the mountains of the Rif [q.v.] on the shores of the Mediterranean, which were then ruled by an enterprising individual named Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad Abū Allāh Aʾarrāṣ. This shaikh had made an agreement, first with the English and then with the French, for the establishment of factories on the Rif bay of Alhucemas (transcribed in the documents of the period as Albourême). Mawla al-Rašīd deprived him of the Rif in March 1666, just when the Maréchaüs Roland Fréjus, having obtained from the King of France the privilege of trading in the Rif, was landing on the Moroccan coast. Fréjus then went to see Mawla al-Rašīd at Tāzā, but the negotiations into which he endeavoured to enter with the shaikh soon collapsed.

Al-Rašīd without delay turned his attention to...
the capital of northern Morocco, Fas, which still withstood his authority. He laid siege to it and took it by storm on the 3rd Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1076 (June 6, 1666); the adventurer in command there, al-Duraidi, took to flight. Al-Rashid took vigorous steps to punish certain of the notables of the town, and the people proclaimed him sultan. He was at the same time able to rally to his side the important group of Idrisid Shorfa in the capital.

The years that followed were used by Mawli al-Rashid to extend his possessions towards west and south. He first made an expedition against the Gharb, out of which he drove the chief al-Rahiq Chahlab, and seized al-Kas al-Tabib (Alezarquvair [q. v.]); he also took Meknes [q. v.] and Tetuan [q. v.] as well as Taza, the inhabitants of which had rebelled. In 1079 (1668) he took and destroyed the Sufiyya of al-Dul in having routed its chief Muhammad al-Hadjid at Ba från al-Rumman. The same year, Mawli al-Rashid seized Marrakesh and put to death there the chief 'Abd al-Karim al-Shabani, surnamed Karun al-Hadjid. In 1081 (1670) he undertook an expedition into Sus [q. v.] where agitators still disputed his authority. He took Toudant [q. v.] and the fortress of Iligh and returned to Fas, now lord of all Morocco. At this time, says the chronicler al-Frani, "all the Maghrib, from Tiemcen to the Wadi Nal on the borders of the Sahara, was under the authority of Mawli al-Rashid."

The next year the sultan went from Fas to Marrakesh where one of his nephews was endearing to set up as a pretender to the throne. During his sojourn in the southern capital, Mawli al-Rashid, not yet 42, died as the result of an accident on the 11th Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1082 (April 9, 1672): the horse he was riding having reared, he fractured his skull against a branch of an orange-tree. He was buried at Marrakesh, but later his body was brought to Fas where he was interred in the chapel of the saint Ali Ibn Hirzihim (vulg. Sidi Harram). His brother, Mawli Isma'il [q. v.] who succeeded him, was proclaimed sultan on the 15th Dhu 'l-Hijjah in the following year.

The brief political career of Mawli al-Rashid was, we have seen, particularly active and fruitful. The Muslim historians of Morocco never tire of praising this ruler whose memory is still particularly bright, especially in Fas. It was he who built in the town the "Madrasa of the Rope-makers" (Madrasat al-Sharrati'n), the bridge of al-Rasif, the kasa of the Sharada (Casba of the Cherares) and 2/2 miles east of Fas, a bridge of nine arches over the Wadi Sarbil (Sebou).


RASHID AL-DIN SINAN (or, as the Isma'ili themselves usually call him, Sinan Rashid al-Din), the famous leader of the Syrian Isma'ilis in the second half of the xiiith century, is better known to the world as Shaikh al-Djibal, or the "Old Man of the Mountain". His full name was Abu 'l-Hasan Sinan b. Sulaiman b. Muhammad. He was born near Bassra, educated in Persia, and, in 558 (1163), was appointed by Imam Hasan of Alamut as the head of the Syrian Isma'ili (Nizaris) community. This post he occupied till his death at an advanced age in Ramadan 589 (Sept. 1193), at Masjaf. He played a prominent part in the Syrian and Egyptian politics of his time, successfully defending his people from the continuous pressure of the orthodox Muhammadan rulers, especially the famous Saladin [q. v.], on the one hand, and against the Crusaders on the other. The fact that this small community still continues to exist (in the villages near Hamah), in spite of the persistently hostile attitude of its neighbours, must to a great extent be attributed to the solid foundations laid by him. References to him are to be found in the works of all historians who deal with the events of his period, but the most detailed account is given in the paper by Stanislas Guyard, Un grand maître des Assassins, au temps de Saladin (J. A., 1877, p. 324-489). It gives the original Arabic text of the Fa'il, a genuine Isma'ili work probably by a contemporary of Sinan, containing the maqamid about him, i.e. various anecdotes based on the oral tradition of the sect. This text is accompanied by a French translation and an introduction containing a detailed review of the historical information about Sinan, and the Isma'ili sect in general, which, in the main, still preserves some value. The Fa'il appears to be now unknown to the Syrian Isma'ili; they do not appear to have any reliable and genuine histories of their own community. The recently published al-Fadak al-dawwari fi Sima'il al-Ismi'mat al-ahmar, by an Isma'ili author, Abu Allah b. al-Murtada from Khwābī (Aleppo 1352=1933), shows no trace of such local tradition, and the account of Sinan given in it is entirely based on well-known general histories, such as those by Ibn al-Aqhir, Abu 'l-Fidā', etc.

The stories connected with Sinan chiefly centre around his organisation of maqama, which he used as an instrument for removing his political opponents by assassination. Undoubtedly there is some grain of truth in these stories; but it is obvious that excited bazaar rumours greatly exaggerated them, wrongly attributing to him and his organisation many exploits for which they were not responsible. Many historians state that
he was regarded as the supreme and superhuman head of the sect. Unfortunately, he is never referred to in any available genuine works of the Persian Isma'ilis, and it is difficult to ascertain what was his real position in the sectarian hierarchy. Most probably he occupied the highest rank after the Imām, i.e. that of the ḫudūqrat, which, according to the reformed Nūzāri doctrine, implied a considerable "dose" of the superhuman. In any case, there is no reason to think that he either claimed to be, or was regarded as an Imām, although, just as in the case of other eminent Isma'ilis, such as Nāṣīr-i Khusraw and Ḥasan b. al-Sabbāḥ, popular tradition furnished him with noble descent from 'Ali himself.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. Ivanow)

RASHID AL-DIN TABIĪB, one of the greatest historians of Persia. Fadl Allah Rashīd al-Din b. 'Imād al-Dawla Abu l-Khair was born in Hamadān about 1247. He began his career in the reign of the Mongol ruler Abaqa Khan (1265—1282) as a practising physician. But as in addition to a remarkable knowledge of medicine he was an exceedingly talented and farseeing statesman, he rose under Ghāzān Khan (1295—1304) from his earlier position to the rank of a sadr (and also grand vizier) which was given him after the execution of Sādir-i Djiḫān Sa'd al-Din Zandjānī (May 4, 1298). In 1303 he accompanied his sovereign in this capacity on a campaign against Syria. Under Uljaiṭū (1304—1316) Rashīd attained the zenith of his career. He used his enormous income for a number of charitable buildings. For example in order to beautify the new capital of the Mongols in Persia, Sulṭānābād, he built a whole new suburb, called after him Rub-i Rashīdīya, which consisted of a mosque, a madrasa, a hospital and several thousand houses. At the same time he was working steadily on his history of the world, the first volume of which he presented to his sovereign on April 14, 1306. At this period there was no limit to his influence. He even succeeded in converting Uljeiś to the teaching of the Shāfi'is. Two eminent Baghdad scholars, Shīhāb al-Dīn Ṣahrūwārdī and Djamāl al-Dīn, who were accused of negotiating with Egypt and were expecting death, were rescued by him. In 1309 he resumed his building activity and erected a new suburb near Ghāzānīya, east of Tabriz, the water for which he provided by a great canal from the Sarasād. But his high position now procured this great man a number of enemies. In 1315 he experienced considerable unpleasantness through the shortage of money which prevented the soldiers being paid. After Uljaiś's death his enemies exerted every effort to destroy Rashīd al-Dīn. In October 1317 he was dismissed from his high offices and the death of his patron Amir Sāvandjī (Jan. 1318) deprived him of his last support, until finally he was executed with his young son Khwaḍja Ibrāhīm on a false charge of having poisoned his former master Uljeiśū (July 18, 1318). His corpse was exposed to every contumely, his pride, the Rub-i Rashīdī, destroyed and plundered. His elder son Ghiyāth al-Dīn, however, succeeded in retaining a high office even after his father's death, but in 1336 he also was sentenced to death. Even after death Rashīd's body was not allowed to rest in its grave, for eighty years later Timūr's son, the mad Mirām-

shāh (1404—1407), had his bones dug up and buried in the Jewish cemetery (1399).

As already mentioned, Rashīd owes his fame to his immoral history, Djamāl al-Tawūrīshī, a history of the Mongols which he began by command of Ghiyāth Khan (wherefore it is sometimes also known as the Tāruśshī Ghiyāthī). Uljeiśū ordered the work to be continued and to be completed by a general history of the world of Islam and a geographical appendix. The work, according to the original plan, was to consist of two main parts: 1. History of the Mongols and II. General History and Appendix. But when the work was finished in 1310—1311 it took the following form:

Vol. i. 1. History of the Turkish and Mongol tribes, their divisions, genealogy and legends. 2. Cingiz-Khan, his predecessors and successors down to Ghiyāthī.

Vol. ii. Preface, Adam, the Muslim and Hebrew Prophets.

1. The old Persian Kings.
2. Muḥammad and the caliphs to 1258. History of the ruling dynasties of Persia. The eastern and western Isma'ilis. The Oghuz and the Turks, Chinese, Jews, the Franks, their emperors and Papes, India, Buddha and his religion.

Rashīd had intended to add the history of Uljaiśū's reign also, the beginning of which (1306—1307) was to open the second volume and the end to close it. Whether he did so is not yet known, as that portion as well as the geographical appendix is lacking in all extant manuscripts. The most remarkable feature of this great work is the conscientiousness with which Rashīd went to work and endeavoured to find the best and most reliable sources. Although the Mongol chronicles, the celebrated Altān daştār, could hardly be accessible to him as a Persian, he obtained the necessary facts from them through his friend Pālād-čink-sank and partly from Ghiyāthī himself, who had a remarkable knowledge of his people's history. The information about India was furnished him by an Indian bāḥīkā, about China by two Chinese scholars. The many-sidedness of Rashīd al-Dīn's learning is simply astounding in a medieval scholar of this time. He knows of the struggles between Pope and Emperor, even knows that Scotland pays tribute to England and that there are no snakes in Ireland.

Rashīd al-Dīn was well aware of the importance of his work and endeavoured in all possible ways to ensure its survival. He ordered copies to be made for his friends and for different scholars; the works, written in Persian, were translated into Arabic and vice-versa. Every year he sent copies to the libraries of the great cities and allowed anyone to copy them freely. Yet all these measures proved in vain, for no single complete copy has come down to us.

Besides his great history, he also wrote: 1. Kitāb al-Āhāy wa l-Āḥār in 24 chapters, which discussed questions of meteorology, agriculture, beekeeping, suppression of snails and other pests, etc., and also notes on architecture, fortification, ship-building, mining, and metallurgy. No copy has yet been found. 2. Tawūrīshī, a mystic theological tractate in 19 chapters. 3. Mīrāf al-Tafṣīṣīr, on the eloquence of the Kur'an, its commentaries etc. 4. al-Risālāt al-sulṭānīya (finished on March 14, 1407), the result of a theological disputation in the presence of Uljaiśū. 5. Lajūf al-Ḥašāīb,
Already in his last years at school he showed a fondness for art and literature and therefore decided to become a writer, and to this profession, or, as he himself calls it: the Sublime Forte Road (Bāb-i 'alā Qiāddesi), he has remained faithful, untroubled by all the political changes that have taken place. Like many other writers he began as a journalist, and almost all the more important Turkish papers received contributions from his pen, such as the Lürder-i Hawâdî, Teryümân-i Hâkûhâ, İhâm, Şahâ, Tarîb, Şedêde, Mâlûmât, Taşvîr-i Aflûk and Hâkûhâ, and periodicals like Tharmet-i Fânun and Reimli Gazette. He afterwards collected his numerous articles and essays, for example in the two volumes “Articles and entertaining Sketches” (Mašâliyat ve-Mufrâhât, 1325) and in the four volumes “Life of a man of Letters” (Cemâri Edebi, 1315—1318). The latter is not an account of his life but reflects his spiritual development and his feelings and emotions reflected in publications of different years.

Ahmad Râsim's output became in time very extensive; in all there are said to be over 500 works of larger or smaller size from his pen. Nevertheless he was not a polygraph in the bad sense of the word, but before he dealt with a subject he always first studied it thoroughly and then wrote on it seriously, sometimes also in the lightly humorous fashion of which he is a master, or again in a pleasing conversational way, but always with artistic feeling and in a particular style which is his own. He always well knew the taste of his readers and he had great success with them. His style was a new one and independent of existing schools and coteries; he created a school himself and his influence must long and strongly be felt in Turkish literature.

His literary work covers the fields of the novel, long short story and tale, e. g. his early novels, “Heart’s Inclination” (Mail-İ-Dil, 1890) and “Life’s Experiences” (Tağâbir-i Hayât, 1891; short analysis of both in Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Modernen, p. 46 sq.), also his patriotic novel “The Difficulties of Life” (Motâhhâ-ı Hayât, 1908), the stories “Inexperienced Love” (Têşîb-i Îşık, 1311), “My School-friend” (Mekteb Arîkûzâhîm, 1311), a little later “The Unfortunate Man” (Nâkâm, 1315) and another patriotic novel “A Soldier’s Son” (Asker Oğlû, 1315) and somewhat more lyrical “The Book of Grief” (Kîâbî-i Gham, 1315) and “Nightingale” (Anâlîz, in verse).

At the same time he had from the first a preference for history. He does not, of course, in any way claim to further the study of history by independent research but rather sees it his duty to use his name in history among his countrymen by presenting it in popular form, and from this point of view his historical writings may be regarded as carefully prepared compilations. In his early period he wrote a history of ancient Rome (Æski Komâltar, 1304), a short history of civilisation (Tâ'ârikh-i muqâbat-i Beşker, 1304), on the progress of knowledge and culture (Târekâyât-i 'ilmiyye ve-mîldeyî, 1304). later essays on similar subjects entitled “History and Author” (Tâ'ârikh ve-Muhrîr, 1320 = 1911), a history of Turkey from Selim III to Murâd V, entitled İstihdâm-i hâkimî-ı millîye in two volumes, 1341—1342, and a meritorious general survey of the history of Turkey, ‘Othmânî Tâ'ârikh in 4 volumes, 1326—1330. A valuable supplement to these historical works is
formed by the four volumes of "City Letters" (Sheikh Mekâlî, 1328–1329), in all 216 epistles, which we have an unsurpassed description of: all South Persia and the land's heart, written moreover in a very stimulating and vivid, sometimes bantering, fashion which makes it one of his best works. In "Islam's Pages of Honour" (Manâbh-i Islam, 1325), the Muslim festivals, mosques and other religious matters are dealt with.

It seems to be only recently that our author has turned to the history of literature, e.g. in his book on Shiism [q.v.], which is intended to be an introduction to the history of the Turkic Moderns (Mabûyat Ta'Rikhine Memlu! Îb bûyûk Muhammur-rilerden Shiismi, 1927), while his personal recollections of Turkish writers are collected in another book (Mabûyat Kâbul-i Ritmân, Muhammur-r, 1924), also recollections of his own school days and the old system of education in general, in his "Bastinado" (Fatâkah, 1927).

Ahmad Râsim was also prolific as a writer of schoolbooks on grammar, rhetoric, history etc. He also wrote a letter-writer (İslâmi Khatirn-i Mekâtî yahod murkemmel Muhâfizât, 5th impression, 1318). In all his works are to be found translations, and a large collection from his early period is called "Selection from Western Literature" (Mabûyat-i hârbiyeden bir Nâbû, 1887).

For this great literary activity Ahmad Râsim required considerable freedom, such as did not exist under 'Abd al-Hamid and such as he could hardly have had at all as a state official. He was however twice a member of a commission of the Ministry of Education, Conseil de l'Instruction Publique (Endûmümeni Tefsîr ve Mu'tâyana), but only for a very short time. He showed his interest in religious matters in 1924, when after the abolition of the caliphate he wrote an article in Wa'lî on March 4, 1924 on the relics (amâni, muhabbâ) of the Prophet, cloak (hârka), banner (hâ_ATTRIB), praying-carpet (sanduq'da), etc., which also appeared in Cairo and Damascus in Arabic. He proposed to make these relics accessible to the public in a Museum (cf. Nallino, in O. M., ii, 1924, p. 230 sq.).

In recent years Ahmad Râsim has so far been politically active as to be a deputy for Istanbul along with men like 'Abd al-Hâjî Hamid and Khalil Edhem (cf. O. M., vii, 1927, p. 416 and xi, 1931, p. 227 and Mehemmed Zeki, Encyclopédie biographique de Turquie, i., 1928, p. 23 and ii., 1929, p. 88).


RASSIDS, name of a dynasty. Zaidi historians make no distinction between the Zaidi imams in Dailâm [q.v.] and those in the Yaman [q.v.]; this article deals only with the Yaman. For some periods the Zaidi historians are detailed.
At the beginning of the rule of the Tahirids an imam in San'a fought against them; he was at last beaten, was captured as he fled by some townspeople, and handed over to Mu'tahhar. Another imam. The Tahirids took San'a and made a son of the imam governor of towns and castles. In 869 (1164-1165) the imam Muhammad b. al-Nasir retook San'a and in the following year al-Malik al-Zahir al-Tahirid was slain there.

Vašyī Sharaf al-Dīn began in a small way in 912 (1506-1507). Later he called in Egyptian troops from Kamarān [q.v.] to help him against the Tahirids. They took Ta'izz [q.v.] and San'a, but at the end of the year they then left Egypt broke their spirit, they were soon driven out again. In spite of the Tahirids and recalcitrant sharifs the imam conquered most of the highlands and even took Dījjān and Aḥbār 'Arish [q.v.] but failed to take Aḍan [q.v.] and Aḥbār [q.v.]. Soon the Turks took Dījjān, Ta'izz and San'a, being helped by quarrels between the imam and his sons. The Karmatians (i.e. Ismā'īlīs) were still dangerous enemies; eleven camel-loads of their books were captured and the imam's chief followers studied them so as to warn the common folk of the dangers in them. In 953 (1546-1547) the imam divided his realm among his sons. Though one of them, Mu'tahhar, had submitted to the Turks he led an insurrection against them in 974 which was at first successful. This provoked the Turks to a systematic conquest. Al-Mu'tahhar was defeated and obliged to retire to Sa' đa with a Turkish garrison. Then an imam from a different family rose and maintained himself for seven years till he was taken prisoner. In 999 (1590) the conquest was complete. In 1006 however al-Kāsim, the ancestor of the present imams, declared himself. After varying fortunes his son drove out the Turks in 1045 (1635-1636) and since then the government has remained in this family. Sometimes a disputed succession has been settled by argument and some-times by the sword, an unworthy imam has been deposited, and a son has taken the place of his deceitful father. About 1150 (1737) Aḥbār 'Arish broke away from the Yaman and in 1219 (1804) the imam in San'a became independent. The history of the imams from this point is in the article YAMAN. Now the Wahhābi king has confined the imam to the Yaman in a narrow sense of the name, and 'Asir is under the influence of Najd. Many of the imams were industrious writers on things religious.

Bibliography: C. van Arendonk, De Opkomst van het Zaiduïtische Imaamaat in Yemen, Leyden 1919; F. Wüstenfeld, Yemen im XI. Jahrhundert, 1884; N.E., iv. 412-537; A. Rutgers, Historia Yemenae sub Hasano Pasha, Leyden 1838; C. Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung, 1774; H. A. S. Tritton, Ritz of the Imams of San'a, 1925; H. F. Jacob, Kings of Arabia, 1923; H. C. Kay, Oman's History of Yemen, 1892; Admiralty Handbook of Arabia; H. Nützel, Münzen der Rasūliden, 1891. For unpublished material see van Arendonk, Kay and Tritton, and see also the Bibliographie to the text mentioned in the text.

(A. S. TRITTON)

RASUL (A., plur. rasūl), messenger, apostle. The word is found in Arabic literature with the profane sense of envoy, messenger. Here we are only concerned with its religious acceptance. According to the Kur'an, there is a close relation between the apostle and his people (ummat; q.v.). To each umma God sends only one apostle (Sūra x. 48; xvi. 38; cf. xxi. 46; xl. 5). These statements are parallel to those which mention the witness whom God will take from each umma at the Day of Judgment (Sūra iv. 45; xxviii. 75 and cf. the descriptions of the rasīl who will cross the bridge to the other world at the head of his umma: Buhkārī, Adhān, bāb 129; Kiftāk, bāb 52).

Muhammad is sent to a people to whom Allāh has not yet sent an apostle (Sūra xxviii. 46; xxi. 2; xxiv. 43). The other individuals to whom the Kur'an accords the dignity of rasīl are Nūh, Lūt, Iṣrā'īl, Mūsā, Shū'āb, Hūd, Šālīh and Iśa. The list of the prophetic Messiahs [cf. Sūra lxxvi] was a longer one; it contains, besides the majority of the apostles, Biblical or quasi-Biblical characters like Ishhām, Ishāk, Ya'kūb, Hārūn, Dāwūd, Sulaimān, Ayyūb, Dhu 'l-Nūn. Muhammad in the Kur'an is called sometimes rasīl, sometimes nabi. It seems that the prophets are those sent by God as preachers and nādir to their people, but are not the head of an umma like the rasīl. One is tempted to imagine a distinction between rasūl and nabi such as is found in Christian literature: the apostle is imagined to have the power of God in a time that is at the same time a prophet, but the prophet is not necessarily at the same time an apostle. But this is not absolutely certain, the doctrine at the basis of the Kur'anic utterances not being always clear.

As to the close relation which exists between the rasûl and his umma, it may be compared with the doctrine of the Acta apostolorum apocrypha, according to which the twelve apostles divided the whole world among them so that each one had the task of preaching the Gospel to a certain people.

As regards the term rasûl, account must be taken of the use of the word apostle in Christianity, as well as of the use of the corresponding verb (shahad) in connection with the prophets in the
Old Testament (Exodus, iii. 13 sq.; iv. 13; Isaiah, vi. 8; Jeremiah, i. 7). The term rasul Allāh is used in its Syriac form (gēlēkēv drafta) pāsim in the apocryphal Acts of St. Thomas.

Post-Karānic teaching has increased the number of apostles to 313 or 315 without giving the names of all (Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, i/2, 10: Fikh Akhbar III, art. 22; Reland, De religione moham- medica, sec. ed., Utrecht 1771, p. 40).

The doctrine that they were from mortal sin is part of the faith [see ʻima]. For the rest, the difference between rasul and nabi—apart from the considerable difference in point of numbers—seems in later literature to disappear in the general teaching about the prophets. Thus, in the ʻAṣida of Abū Ḥāṣm ʻUmar al-Nasafi the two categories are treated together and the author makes no difference between rasul and nabi. Similarly al-Idji deals with prophets in general, so far as can be seen, including in them the rasulis. If one difference can be pointed out, it is that the rasulis, in contrast to the prophet, is a law-giver and provided with a book (commentary on the Fikh Akhbar II by Abu l-Mantaha, Ḥaḍarabah 1321, p. 4). According to the catechism published by Reland (p. 40–44), the rasul-lawgivers were ʻAdān, Nāḥ, ʻIbrahīm, Mūsā, ʻIsā and Muḥammad.

In the catechism of Abī Ḥāṣm ʻUmar al-Nasafi, the sending of the apostles (riṣāla) is called an act of wisdom on the part of God. Al-Taftūzaa’s commentary says what iṣdāb, not in the sense of an obligation resting upon God but as a consequence arising from his wisdom. This semi-rationalist point of view is not however shared by all the scholastics: according to e.g. al-Sanṣāf (cf. his ʻImām al-Bo- ṭāla) it is ʻadās in itself but belief in it is obligatory.


RASULIDS, name of a dynasty. The family of Rasul came to the Yaman [q. v.] with Turānsāh, the Aiyūbīd [q. v.] conqueror. Rasul was probably a Turkmen though descent from the royal house of Ghassān [q. v.] was claimed for him; he got his name because a caliph employed him as ambassador. ʻAli b. Rasul and his three sons became important. The last Aiyūbīd Masʿūd put two of the sons in prison in 624 (1227) but the third Nūr al-Dīn ʻUmar, who had already been governor of Mecca, was made ṣāḥib [q. v.] and, on the death of Masʿūd, governor of the Yaman. Masʿūd died on his way to Egypt so ʻUmar prepared to make himself independent. ʻAbd b. Rasul had captured many places in the hills, such as Ṣanʿāʾ [q. v.], Taʾizz [q. v.], and Kawkabān [q. v.]. After two temporary successes he took Mekka in 658 and held it for fifteen years. In 628 he made peace with the ʻAzīdī šarifs and there was little fighting till the imām Ahmad b. Ḥusain declared himself in Ṣaḥa [q. v.] in 646 (1248–1249). ʻUmar may have declared himself independent in 628 but he was not recognised by the caliph till 632. In 645 his nephew, Asad al-Dīn Muḥammad, quarrelled with his uncle and fled to Dhamār [q. v.]. He allied himself with the imām but was soon reconciled to his uncle and fought against the ʻAbbāsīs, the descendants of the imām ʻAbbās Allāh b. Ḥumāz. ʻUmar was murdered in 647 by mamliks in al-Djanad. His kingdom stretched from Mecca to Ḥaḍramawt though many places in the hills were independent. He was a great builder of schools and mosques and a patron of letters like most of his family. His reign is an epitome of the dynasty; family quarrels, wars with the imām and the šarifs, who were often at variance with the imām.

The murderers won over the rest of the mamliks, proclaimed a nephew of the dead man, and marched on Zabīd. Palace intrigues had banished al-Musaffar ʻYūsuf, the sulṭān’s eldest son, to Mahdijam. With 450 horse he too marched on Zabīd where he was inspired resistance to the pretender. He gathered troops as he advanced and the mamliks surrendered to him the murderers and the pretender. He had to reconquer the country, for his two brothers each hoped to be sulṭān, Asad al-Dīn Muḥammad was in a strong position at Ṣāḥa, and the imām, Ḥamād b. ʻUsān was active; even the caliph was disturbed at his power. At the end of three years Ṣāḥa, Taʾizz, and the strong fortress of Dumlū’u had been retaken and peace made with the imām, who broke it by joining Asad al-Dīn: though the latter soon returned to his duty. In 648 he joined many of his kin in prison, staying there till his death. ʻAbda was taken in 652 but could not be held. The imām Ahmad had been appointed with the approval of the family of his predecessor but dissensions arose so the šarifs with the help of the sulṭān fought and killed him in 656. One imām was captured in 658, another was taken and blinded in 660, and a third was proclaimed in 670. The šarifs were tribal or territorial chiefs, sometimes the enemies and sometimes the allies of the sulṭān. In 674 rebel mamliks in Ṣāḥa joined the imām and šarifs but the combination was signally defeated. ʻAzāf [q. v.] in Ḥaḍramawt was taken in 678 and an embassy came from China. ʻYūsuf was a strong and successful ruler, and al-Kharrajī calls him cabīr at the end of his reign. He died in 694 (1294–1295).

His son and successor reigned only three years and encouraged the cultivation of palms round Zabīd where others had tried to introduce. His brother, the governor of Shihār [q. v.], took ʻAden [q. v.] and tried to make himself sulṭān but was defeated and imprisoned. From prison he was called to rule as al-Muʿayyad Dāwwād in 696. His reign was a succession of small fights both in the hills and the plains, the same places and opponents recurring again and again. In 697 (1247–1248) he took two castles from the Karmaṭjīn [q. v.]. In 709 the Kurds in Dhamar rebelled, joined the imām and attacked Ṣāḥa and later some of the Kurds killed some of the Ghuzz. In 712 peace was made with the imām Muḥammad b. Mushir for ten years at a price of 3,000 dinārs yearly. Five years later the sulṭān broke the treaty. Warfare was savage and usually accompanied by the destruction of houses and trees; the heads of the slain were cut off. In 718 the army was reorganised on the Egyptian model. Towards the
end of the reign governors were changed frequently, perhaps a sign of weakness. It was easy for a foreigner to rise to high rank. More than once the same man was chief minister and chief kaši. In 721 a son, al-Mu‘ājžid ‘Ali, succeeded but he was soon in prison where he stayed four months only till he was set free by his friends and the usurper took his place. In 724 he was a small kingdom; ‘Aden was lost, one cousin al-Zāhīr was independent for ten years, other relatives set up for themselves in Bait al-Fakhti [q. v.], mamliks attacked Ta‘izz and took Zabīd; it was not till they had been in rebellion some months that their pay was stopped. Sharifs defeated the mamliks; troops came from Egypt but did so much damage that all were glad when they soon left. The imām’s death in 728 removed a dangerous enemy, and the small kingdom re-established some sort of order. Sons and other relatives rebelled as did the mamliks because their pay was in arrears. The small kingdom crushed the Ma‘āzib, a tribe of the plains or foothills, and made a woman chief of what was left. In 736 (1335–1336) the peasants fled from the district of Zabīd because of a combination of taxes and a new coinage. An officer touring to collect taxes used his Ghuzz escort to put to death an insubordinate chieflain. The small kingdom went on pilgrimage in 751 and was carried off to Egypt, being allowed to come back a year later. From this time on the Arabs of the plain gave trouble. Normally the tribes kept each other in check but the small kingdom had so weakened one side that now the Ma‘āzisba could raid at will, they even cut communications between Zabīd and the north. The government policy was to deprive them of their horses. A tyrannical governor was killed and the murderer was not punished. Mahdīm was captured by a sharif, a rebel governor deposed the small kingdom for two years, and three sons of the small kingdom rebelled. Al-‘Afdal al-Abbās succeeded in 764. One of his sons joined the imām, attacked Hārad, and later ‘Abd al-Malik was taken by the Arab tribes, other places by sharifs, the small kingdom Ṣa‘īd al-Dīn raided as far as Zabīd, there was fighting round Dhamār, and the small kingdom died in 778. Al-Aṣraf Ismā‘īl was chosen as successor. The mamliks mutinied, a sharif was lord of Ṣa‘īd, and the small kingdom was actively hostile till his death in 793. His son ‘Ali was driven out of Ṣa‘īd by a rival and made Dhamār his capital. The imāmate seems to have been hereditary in one family for at least five generations. In 798 the small kingdom’s Ali sent presents to the small kingdom. It is clear that much of the highland was lost and there was continual trouble in the plains. Yet the small kingdom was still powerful; he kept a firm hand over his officials and received letters, presents, and embassies from India and Abyssinia. He died in 803 and is called a good ruler. The next small kingdom, al-Nāṣir Ahmad, worthily upheld the state. In the north he made Hall [q. v.] accept him as overlord, in the south he defeated the small kingdom who had attacked his vassals, the Banū Tāhir, and in Bawāth he captured forty castles. Rich gifts came to him from Mecca and China. A brother rebelled and was blinded. At his death in 827 the state rapidly went to pieces. A series of short reigns with many rebellions of the mamliks ushered in the end. The land was ravaged by plague, the small kingdom died of it in 840 leaving his authority to a daughter. In the same year died another small kingdom, Ahmad b. Yahyā, who was a prolific writer. Civil war was complicated by attacks by the Arabs, who sacked Zabīd in 846. A new imām, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, strengthened his position by marrying a granddaughter of ‘Ali of Ṣa‘īd. The Banū Tāhir joined in the fighting and took Bawāth and ‘Aden, till in 858 (1454) the last small kingdom abdicated before them and went into exile at Mecca.

Most of the small kingdom were builders of mosques and madrasas, some were writers. In the heyday of the dynasty the small kingdom regularly spent a holiday in the palm groves of Zabīd (these were called sultāt) and at the sea. The land was governed by officials or by vassal chiefs who paid tribute. In all big towns were two officers, one called wālī or amīr and another called nāṣir, simām, or musḥidd. High officials regularly went on tour to collect the taxes. The army consisted of the cavalry of the gate, mamliks both Khurs and Ghazz, and levies. A thousand horse and ten thousand foot made a big army. A man’s horses were sometimes slain at his funeral.

Rātib (A. pl. rawātīb), a word meaning what is fixed and hence applied to certain non-obligatory sālāts or certain litanies. The term is not found in the Ǧūrān nor as a technical term in Ḥadīth. On the first meaning see the article Nāfīla, p. 826. As to the second, it is applied to the dāhir which one recites alone, as well as to those which are recited in groups. We owe to M. Snouck Hurgronde a detailed description of the rawātīb practised in Athchin.

Rāṭl, unit of weight dating from pre-Islamic times, varying with countries and periods. Māṣrī (p. 3, 5) says that, except for the mitja‘l, which had remained uniform, the pre-Islamic weights were equal to the Islamic ones, and that the rāṭl contained 12 ʿūqīya or 144 dirhems. In medieval Damascus it equalled 600 dirhems and in Aleppo 720 dirhems. In modern Egypt it is uniform = 1/100th ḫanṭar = 12 ʿūqīya = 144 dirhems = 0.449 kg. = 0.99 lb. avdp. 2.75 rāṭl = 1 ʿōkka = 1.248 kg. = 2 lb. 11 oz.

Rāwalpindi, a division, district, tahsil, and town in the north-west of the Punjab. The division has an area of 21,347 square miles and a population of 3,914,849 of whom 3,362,260 are Muhammadans. The district, which is divided for administrative purposes into four
RAWALPINDI — RAWANDIZ RUIYNDIZ

This section discusses the geography and history of Rawalpindi and Rawandiz Ruiyndiz. It mentions the city's location, historical significance, the Muslim invasion, and the territories under British control.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the works cited in the article on Rawalpindi, a few key references include: J. H. Marshall, *Archaeological Discoveries at Taxila*, 1913; *Guide to Taxila*, 1918; *Rawalpindi District Gazetteer*, 1907; A. A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, 1919, and others.

**Rawandiz Ruiyndiz** (the first word is composed of two elements: *rawandiz* of uncertain etymology and *ruiyndiz* meaning fortress; the second means "fortress of iron"). Capital of the *kābār* of this name in the *wilāyāt* of Mawṣil on the caravan route, halfway between this town and that of Sāwdī-Bulāk [*q.v.*], including the following *mahalls* (the names and figures given in brackets are those of the corresponding Kurd tribe and the number of the hearths: *n.* nomad; *s.* settled): Halwa (Zarrā, *n.*, 500); Ḥarir (Helfi, *n.*, 800; Māmsāl, *n.*, 2000; Māmsāl, *s.*, 500); Wellās (Bālek, *s.*, 2000); Dergel (Dergelī, *s.*, 700); Dēshī Dīyān (Dīyānī, *s.*, 800); Pīresniyān (Pīresni, *s.*, 1000); Rawundūk (Rawundūk, *s.*, 600); Darādost (Darādost, *s.*, 1000); Beresīyān and Mergesīr (Mīris, *s.*, 2000). The *Sidān* and the Serbāt, two subdivisions of the powerful tribe of the Herkī, number about 6,000 hearths and have their winter-quarters between Rawandiz Ruiyndiz and Arbil (IV in Kurdish) while the Mūdān, the third section of this tribe, spend the winter around Ākrā. The summer pastures of all three are in Persia at Mergawar. Under the Kurd feudal system the district of Rawandiz Ruiyndiz contained the following subdivisions: Hēvdīyān, Shētehēn, Dūlemerī, Sidekān, Ḥakārkī, Pīresni, Dēshī-Sīrān, Bālpishīyān, Rawundūk, Akīān, Bālekān. After the League of Nations (Dec. 1925) had given Mawṣil to the Ḥawr Rawandiz Ruiyndiz became definitely a part of the mountainous Kurdish zone running along the Persian frontier which was given the name of Southern Kurdistan at the establishment of the British mandate. The figures given for the population here are only approximate, the tribes having in some cases been decimated by war and influenza in 1918—1919. According to the census of 1935 the town of Rawandiz Ruiyndiz had 2,176 inhabitants and the *kābār* 35,342.

**Topography:** The district of Rawandiz Ruiyndiz, which roughly speaking lies on the other side of the bend made by the Great Zāb when it leaves the mountainous part of its course (running westwards to the Tigris), consists of parallel valleys and chains which rise gradually as they approach the Persian frontier and which have a general orientation from N.W. to S.E. The average height may be put at over 1,500 feet. The two principal watercourses of the region, the Rūbār Rawandiz and Rūbār Rūkūrūk, left bank tributaries of the Great Zāb, have their sources on the Persian frontier. The roads are naturally more practicable in the direction N.W. to S.E. except the passages in the vicinity of the Great Zāb with its deep gorges. The Great Zāb is 500 feet above the level of the sea. Rawandiz Ruiyndiz, at the present day an insignificant little town, owes its importance mainly to its position with relation to the roads of Kurdistan.

**Road system.** It would be in a way wrong to mention, in the matter of high roads which from all time have connected the Iranian plateau with the adjoining countries in the west, only 1. the silk route in the north (Justi, *Geschichte Iran's*, p. 476) going from Trebizond via Khi to Lithinos Pyrgos (the modern Tağh Kurgan), and 2. the southern road, that from the Median gate or the defile of the Gyandes (Diya). Besides these two main arteries of traffic, axial to the route always taken by commercial and cultural relations and in time of war, and lying between them is the road which went from Niniveh to Media and forked twice at Arbīl and Rawandiz. At Arbīl the road entered Persia by the pass of Gomesbān, Khi Sandīkā, Rāniya, Serdest and thence by the pass of Kurtek at Sāwdī Bulāk [*q.v.*] via Afān.

The Achaemenid royal road also passed this way (Justi, *op. cit.*, p. 475). It was, we believe, the southern section, running towards the land of Elam, while, according to Th. Reinach (*Un peuple oublié, les Mattiennes, in Rev. des Et. Gr.*, vii., 1894), the main highway from Sardes ran through modern Armenia and central Kurdistan, although we cannot say exactly on which side of the Zagros it lay. Among the Arab geographers, Yākūt alone gives a few notes on the road through Rawandiz Ruiyndiz (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 441). The road Arbil-Margḥā was known to the Mongols after their occupation of Arbil (1258). The itinerary by the pass of Garū Shīkā (Zinwe-Shaikā) has been described by Perkins (*J. A. O. S.*, ii., 1853, p. 83 sq.) and Thielmann (*Streifzüge im Kaukasus*, Leipzig 1875, p. 321 sq.). The latter (cf. Yākūt) mentions as stages, starting from the pass: Rāyaṭ; Dergala (ruins of a fortress); Rawandiz; Kān-Atāmān (Kān Wātān?); Dere Brūsh (ford on the Great Zāb, between Girmēnānā and Kāzān; Tēz-Kēbeh; Mawṣil, in all seven stages from Sāwdī Bulāk. According to information received from Russian soldiers who took part in the expedition against Rawandiz Ruiyndiz (summer of 1916), the pass of Garū Shīkā (6,000 feet) is a kind of promontory with valleys on either side starting from the ruins of Khāneh (Persian Lahijān), and joining on the other side in Turkish territory. There is a *ziyāret* there under the Našīḥbä Shāikh Dīmāl of the influence of which is to be attributed the parti-
emption of the neighbouring Kurdish tribes in the 
djîhâd. The name of the pass Zime Shîkh is 
explained by the presence of this zîyêt. The 
actual site of Rawândîz Ruyîndîz is described in 
M. Bitner (Der Kurdenbau Uschnje und die 
Stadt Urmianje, Vienna 1895). In the month of 
May the corn ripens at Rawändîz Ruyîndîz, the 
arable land being on the right side of the Rîbîrî 
Ruyïndiz. Like Arbul, Ruyîndîz is also a point of 
 bifurcation of roads. We have just mentioned the 
road over the Gateway Shînka pass. Another, farther 
north, goes via Sidakan, Topzawa, pass of Kelî 
Shîn (4,000 feet with a famous stele), Durno to 
Usbnî. J. de Morgan (Mission scient. en Perse, 
ii. 46) wrongly thinks this is the only road from 
Persia to Mawsil besides that which goes via 
Serdesht.

Lastly there is a road from Ruyîndîz to Shamp 
Dînernâ, of which there are four variants: 1. Shaitâm, 
pass of Khadjûtî, Kânî Rash, Cumur; 2. Shaitâm, 
pass of Garau Cariya, Kekla, Begûnîe; 3. Shai 
tâm, pass of Morgészûr, Kekla: 4. the route of the 
Turkish telegraph line by Rîbîrî-Dibur and 
Cumûr. The first of these is the best and was 
taken in 1916 by the Russian column which came 
down the Kûa pass to the support of the movement 
converging via Garû Shînka on Ruyîndîz.

History. From what has already been said it 
will be evident that Rawândîz Ruyîndîz, situated 
at the intersection of the communications of Kur 
distân as well as of roads leading farther afield, 
has always owned its importance to its position. 
It should also be remembered that in the period of 
prosperity of the Nestorian church all this country 
played a great part, mainly on account of the in 
fluence of the Metropolitan see of Arbil. We may 
mention (cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge) the names of 
Dara, Hanitha, Shaklawa (from which came one 
of the MSS. which enabled M. l'Abbé Chabot to 
establish the text of the Synclitons Orientale, Paris 
1902) as well as the fact that there were many 
monasteries in these parts. According to the late 
Metropolitan Mar Hamânisho, the mahall of Bara 
dost (not to be confused with the Barakost of the 
Shîkâ Kurds to the north of Tergawar; cf. Urmîya) 
before the war had still a few Christian communities. 
From the point of view of Kurdish history the 
destinies of Ruyîndîz have been frequently those of 
Shehhrizâr of which it formed part at certain 
times. The Persian historian S. A. Kesrewi Tabrizi 
(Mehriûân e Gonêmân, ii., Rawiûldan, Têhrêrân 
1309 = 1929) gives us some notes (p. 125, 133- 
136) on Ruyîndîz, in the time of the Atûbek 
under the Âmmedî (501-624 A.H.) the last re 
presentative of whom, a woman, became the wife of 
Djîlal al-Dîn Khwarîmshâh. A local history of the 
seeds of Ardelain, a resumé of which I published 
(in the R.M.M., xlix. 70 sqq.), also contains some 
information about the families ruling in Ruyîndîz 
down to 1249-1250 A.H. It may be added that (Shref 
Nâmeh, ii., p. 105), the brothers of Abek 
Soulîhan released Shawkân Mounzâr of the Ismîlî 
big from the castle of Royîndîz where he had been 
imprisoned by order of Soulthân Abekh (904 = 1498-1499). A Persian text in my pos 
session enables me to give a few details about 
the last lord of Ruyîndîz. The beks of Ruyîndîz 
are said to be descended from an Arab of the 
tribe of Shammar (again this fondness for inventing 
an Arab descent which we frequently find in Kurd 
genealogies). For some years this ancestor was a 
humble shepherd in the dehêt of Ruyîndîz in the 
villages of Badîlîn and Bâpshâtân (should we not 
recognise in the these ba prefixes the remains of 
the Semitic bet? [cf. e.g. Bâdjamî]). Becoming rich — some say by having found a 
treasure —, the ancestor established himself at 
Badîlîn, acquired houses and fields and became 
major there. His heirs in time became âqâ, then 
êg. Arrogant and rapacious, they had at 
the same time the reputation of being patrons of 
learning (îlim u-munâîrât). At the beginning of the 
sixth century, one of them, Memed Bek the 
Blind, established at Rawändîz, was honoured by 
Sulîhân Meğjiî who gave him the title of pasha, 
whence his sobriquet of Pasha-i Kûra. He had 
some claims on Mergawar and Şînû in which he 
met with the resistance of 'Azîz Bek of Letân 
next possession of Arbul Kerku, Sulaimânya, 
Shamdimân, 'Akrâ, 'Amadiya. The resistance he 
encountered in the tribe of Zîbûrî and notably 
that of its hero 'Azîz of the village of Sawti has 
become legendary. Taken prisoner, 'Azîz is said to 
have replied to the offer to take him into his 
service by the Pasha, who had no son, that he 
would make him one. The Pasha built several 
fortified towers the ruins of which can still be 
seen (Sidakan, among the Şîrwanîyan; 'Akrâ, 
Rawândîz, Darz). He also repaired the road in the 
pass of Ruyîndîz "with nails of iron". He built 
many schools. In his time plunder, robbery and 
rapine disappeared. "The grapes hang above the 
roads till autumn and no one dares to touch them". 
Justice was administered by 'ulama. Finally in 
1836 the Pasha was defeated by the Turks after 
a siege of four months and died soon afterwards 
in Constantinople, or others say in Cyprus. Of 
the descendants of the Pasha his grandson Sa'd Bek was kâmînâqâmât of Ruyîndîz. He was murdered 
by his servants. Yûsif Beg, son of Muşatîf Beg, 
at Badîlîn, aqâh of the tribe of Pireşûnîan, was of 
the same line and in constant rivalry with Sa'd Beg 
of Ruyîndîz. The memory of the Pasha seems to 
have been kept alive in the tribe of Mûkri where 
F. de Morgan records a curious game of this 
name, in which one of the players pretends to be 
the "Blind Pasha". A Kurdish work (Mîrzâ 
Sîrânî by Saiyid Hussain Êusni Mûkramî, Ruyîndîz 1935) 
gives a full account of the story of the Pasha, his 
struggle with the Turks, his relations with Persia 
and with Mehmîd 'Alî Pasha of Egypt, giving as 
its principal source, a Kurkish MS. (Mellîkâya 
by Mirzâ Muhammedi Wekgîye) Nîzîr). The Pasha 
struck coins in his own name: darâta ft Rawändig 
al-Amir al-Manjûr Muhammed Bîg. — During 
the Great War the Rawändig road was used in 
the winter of 1914-1915 by Halîl Bey's troops 
advancing on Urmîya (contrary to H. Grothe, Die 
Turken und ihre Gegenwart, Frankfurt a. M. 1915) 
and later in July 1916 by the Russian Ribâltenko, 
a column which Major K. Mason (Central Kurdistan, 
J. R. G. S., 1919) wrongly accuses of massacring 
5,000 Kurds, women, children and old men at 
Ruyîndîz. After the armistice and during the period 
till Dec. 1925, when the League of Nations made 
its decision, Rawändig was occasionally the head-
quarters of an English political officer; sometimes it slipped from the English and was a centre of concentration for hostile Kurdish elements. Thus in Sept. 1922 (cf. B. Nikitine, L'Iraq économique, in Rev. des Sc. Pol., July–Sept. 1923) the English were forced to withdraw their feeble forces from the mountains and to occupy the line Arbil–Kirkuk–Kifri. A Kurdish government was then proclaimed in Sulaimaniyye with a "Pâdashâh of Kurdistan", a role assumed by a certain Şâli̇kh Mahmûd, of a noble Kurd family. Driven out by the English in 1919 after the rising, which he had led, he was pardoned in 1922 and his followers proclaimed him Pâdashâh. Threatened by English aeroplanes and without resources, Şâli̇kh Mahmûd retired to Rawândiz to the Turkish emissaries. Finally, in April 1923, Rawândiz was taken by the Anglo-Metopotamian troops composed almost exclusively of Assyro-Chaldean highlanders. Two months later in the name of H. M. King Faisal a more tractable Kurdish administration was installed there as throughout southern Kurdistan (cf. above). The first governor thus appointed was a certain Saiyid Ṭa of the family of Sadûte Nehri [cf. Shâmînîn]. A brief history of Rûyîndîz since the war is given in Mîrvânt Sûrîn. At the present moment the Persian government is considering a system of roads which may give Rawândiz a certain importance. It is a question of a carriage road connecting Taurus to Mawût via Rawândiz. The Teherân government is anxious to have an outlet without the necessity of going through Transcaucasia.

Human Geography. The route through Rawândiz as well as the roads leading from it have never played a part comparable to that of the two historic arteries of traffic. This is explained by the lack of security, which is the first condition for the making of a trade route. Now this region has always lain between two hostile states: Assyria and Media, Mûsûţîr and Zâmûa, Turkey and Persia, Turkey and the Šîrâz. The configuration of the country, the mode of life of its people contribute rather to break them up than bind them together. The road, the means of communication, has here the character of a weapon or line of defence except for brief periods of peace.

Language. Kurdish is the language spoken in this region, except by the town dwellers (Arab, Altûn Kêpré, Kûrük etc.) of Turkish origin. With the establishment of the Kurdish administration and the opening of Kurdish schools following the decisions of the League of Nations, Kurdish will probably develop still more and we may look for the creation of a Kurdish intellectual centre. According to O. Mann (Die Mundart der Mûkri Kurdish, ii. 205), the dialect of Rawândiz is very like that of Shâmînîn, but E. B. Soane does not share this opinion (Kurdish Grammar, London 1913). F. Jardine's manual, Bahûman Kurmanji, a grammar of the Kurmanji of the Kurds of Mosul division and surrounding districts of Kurdistan, London 1922, is more particularly devoted to this dialect.

Cartography. The Government of India Survey is preparing a revision of the maps of this region. Until their results are published as well as those being prepared for other reasons by the Turkish Petroleum Co., there is accessible the excellent geographical material in the Report presented in 1925 to the League of Nations by the Commission of Enquiry whose task it was to collect material of an ethnographical and economic nature regarding the wilayet of Mawût (League of Nations, Question of the Frontier between Turkey and Iraq. Report submitted by the Commission instituted by the Council of September 30, 1924 [C. 400 M. 147, 1925, viii]).

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text: Spiegel, Erân (p. 27–28); Rawlinson in J.R.G.S., x. (p. 22 seq.); M. Streck, Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften..., Kurdistan, in Z.A., x.v., 1900 (p. 267, 382), on the ancient and Sûsânid periods; Hammer, Itchanen (ii., p. 125 and 337), on the Mongol period. The Sheref Namîh, St. Petersburg 1866 (i., introd.) mentions the castle of Rûwîn (read Rûyun).

AL-RAWDÁ. One of the series of large islands in the bed of the Nile before it divides into the Damietta and Rosetta branches. Situated near Old Cairo and extending to Kâş al-'Ain, it is separated from the right bank by a narrow canal known as al-Khalîlî, while the river runs to full width on the other side between the Island and Giza (Dîzâ). In early medieval times, it was used for three purposes: 1. as a convenient site for the Nilometer [cf. Mîrvânt] on the S. E. side, rebuilt in the reign of al-Mustûnîn (862–866); 2. as a dockyard for the construction of the fleet (Masûûdi calls it "the island of shipbuilders") until the reign of the first Ikhshîdî, who transferred the docks to the Miṣr bank of the Nile further north in the direction of the present port of Bûlûk, which developed at a still later date; and 3. as a naturally fortified resort in case of danger on the mainland, by destroying the customary bridge of boats which connected it with the fort of Babylon. Muãkawas did so when he wished to preserve his freedom in negotiating with the Arabs. Realizing this, too, Ibn Tûlûn built a fort on the Island (c. 877) and al-Sûlîh Ayîyûb built another where his body was concealed after his death by his wife Shadjar al-Durr [q.v.] until the defeat of the French at Manṣûra (1249). As a fortification, al-Rawûdã reached its high-water-mark under the Bahri Mamlûks who returned to it after the death of al-Sûlîh Ayîyûb and, entrenched behind the water of the Nile, ruled Egypt for nearly a century and a half. They further strengthened the defence of the Island by building walls and towers along its shores. In earlier times it was occasionally used as a pleasure resort where spacious gardens were planted and magnificent palaces erected, such as the Hâwçîdajo built c. 1125 by the Caliph al-Amîr for a Bedouin mistress. During the Bahri Mamlûk period, noble buildings increased in number to house the rulers of Egypt and a mosque and a madrasa (whose remains are still to be seen) were established for the use of the inhabitants.

During the Burdi Mamlûk period, Miṣr and the quarters outlying the Citadel were better favoured, although at the time of the Ottoman conquest Selim I found in the Island a safer residence. When Egypt became an Ottoman province, Miṣr and the Citadel became the seat of the Turkish governor, while the Mamlûk forces took to the Dîzâ side of the River. As a result, al-Rawûûda was deserted, its fortifications ruined, and it furnished robbers and highwaymen with a refuge.

The Island did not again attract the rulers of Egypt until the time of Muãhûmâd 'Alî, whose
son Ibrāhīm Pasha ordered large gardens to be planted there. At present it has become an Egyptian residential quarter connected with Cairo by two bridges and with Dīlūza by a third. The facilities of modern means of communication have brought it within easy reach of the centre of the capital.

The construction of a new large hospital is planned as a substitute for the antiquated Qāṣr al-ʿAynī on the northern extremity of the Island.

**Bibliography:** See Bibliographies of articles on Cairo and Mīkāyās. An elaborate account of the Island and especially the Mīkāyās may be found in ʿAlī Pasha Mābārak: al-Khaṭāb al-Tawfiqīyya, 20 vols., Cairo 1306, xviii, 2–111; Ibn Dūmān, Description de l’Egypte, ed. Vollers, Cairo 1893, iv, 109–120. (A. S. ATYA)

RAY (A.), opinion. As a technical term denoting the purely intellectual function it is used in the system of Islam in opposition to such terms as ʿilm, sunna, Kitāb Allah, din, and hadith. See the art. FIHK.

**RAWSHANIYA, Afghan sect founded by Bāyazīd b. ʿAbd Allāh, who took the title Piri-Rawshān:** called by their enemies Tārīkhān.

1. **Life of the Founder.** Bāyazīd was born at Djujliｕdār in the Pandjarāb about 931 (1525), his father’s native place being Kaniguram, an Afghan town, whither his parents returned. When his mother Banū was divorced by ʿAbd Allāh, Bāyazīd became alienated from his father, who disapproved of his seeking the solution of religious difficulties from a poor relation, the ascetic Ismāʾil; he started earning his living by transporting goods from Samarkand to Hindūstān with Turkish horses. In the town Kalīngjār, S. W. of Allāhābād, he became acquainted with one Mullā Sulaimān from whom he imbibed Ismāʾilī doctrine. Returning to Kaniguram he lived as a hermit in a cave, and evoked eight precepts for his followers; he was in consequence attacked and wounded by his father. Thence he fled to Nīngrahar, where he was given protection by a Mohmand chief Sulṭān Aḥmad, and presently won adherents among the Ghoria Khel in the neighbourhood of Peshawar from the Khalīl and Māḥmūḏ Zādī, who had recently overruled the Peshawar plain. He established himself at Kalīdhar in the territory of the ʿUmarīs, and sent out missionaries who were also raiders. At this time one Saiyīd ʿAlī Tirmīdhī aided by Akhūn ʿAbd al-Derezezh (one of the authorities for his biography) started controversies with him; they were unsuccessful, and Bāyazīd, who at some time had taken the title Piri-Rawshān (Luminous Shaikh, parodied by his enemies as Piri-Tārīk), conceived the idea of annexing the empire of Akbar, on whose treasury he presently issued drafts. He was arrested by Mūḥsin Khān Khāzī, governor of Kābul, whither he was taken. He was there accused of heresy before the ulama, who however, for a consideration, acquitted him. He retired first to Točīn, then to Tirāh, where he proposed to substitute a new religion for Islam. After a time many of his Tirāh followers reverted to Islam, and were expelled by him; they fled to Nīngrahar, and were attacked by Bāyazīd, who however was defeated with great slaughter by Mūḥsin Khān. He fled to a village in Kalāpāni, where he died (993 = 1585).

2. **Later history of the community.** Bāyazīd’s activities were resumed by the eldest of his five sons, ʿUmar, who attacked the Vīsūfānīs, a tribe which had followed Bāyazīd, but reverted to Islam; in the battle which ensued ʿUmar was killed, as was also his brother Khair al-Dīn; another brother, Nur al-Dīn, was put to death by the Gudjars. The youngest son, Djālāl al-Dīn, was captured by the Vīsūfānīs, who surrendered him to Akbar in 989 A. H. Escaping from Akbar’s court he returned to Tirāh, where he assumed the role of sovereign of Afghanistan, and Akbar found it necessary to send an army against him in 994. This army met with a serious defeat, which was repaired by a later expedition (995). The numbers of the Rawshānīs are given on this occasion as 20,000 foot and 5,000 horse. A further expedition was sent in 1000 A. H. (or 1001) which captured some 14,000 men (according to Badaoni) with Djālāl al-Dīn’s wives and children, but not apparently himself; since in 1002 he took Ghazni, but was unable to maintain himself there, and on retiring was attacked by the Hāzāra, wounded and put to death. This last affair is by some assigned to a son of his bearing the same name.

The next head of the community was Djālāl al-Dīn’s son Aḥdād, who figures in the history of Dīlahārī. In 1020 A. H. he surprised Kābul in the absence of its governor Khān Dāwrān. The attack was beaten off with great loss to the raiders, yet in 1023 Aḥdād was again in the field, but sustained a serious defeat at Fīs Balūgh. After a series of enterprises with varied success he was besieged in the fortress of Nūnghar, and killed by a musket-shot.

The historian of Shāh Dīlahān, Mūḥammad Sāliḥ Kambo, asserts that in the second year of his reign (1038) that monarch took effective steps to suppress the heresy started by Bāyazīd; nevertheless in the following year he records how the Afghān Kamāl al-Dīn was joined in the attack on Peshawār by ʿAbd al-Kādir, son of Aḥdād, and Karimād, son of Dīlahāh (Djālāl al-Dīn). The place was relieved by Saiyīd Khān, and ʿAbd al-Kādir induced to submit; in 1043 he was recommended by Saiyīd Khān, “who had caused him to repent of his evil deeds” to Shāh Dīlahān, who gave him a command of 1,000 horse. Other members of Aḥdād’s family received honours and rewards in 1047. In the same year Karimād, who had taken refuge in the Mohmand country, but had been recalled by the tribes of Bangash, was attacked, captured and executed by Saiyīd Khān. It is asserted that some relics of the community still exist in this region. A branch of the sect, called ʿIsāwī, was founded at Swat by one Saiyīd ʿIsā of Peshawār (T. C. Powdén, translation of the Kālid-i Afghānī, Lahore 1875).

3. **Doctrines of the sect.** According to the Dīlahānīs, which is friendly to the sect, Bāyazīd’s doctrine was extreme pantheism; “if I pray” he said, “I am a muṣṭafī; if I pray not, I am a kāfīr.” He marked eight stages (maṣāḥif) in religious progress: sharṭa, ṭaḥrīra, ṭabkīra, mawṣila, ṭurba, waṣṭa, wahrā, sukūnā; the last four are said to be technicalities of his system. The explanation of these stages, quoted from Bāyazīd’s Ḥulānām, inculcates lofty morality, e. g. to hurt no creature of God. The account which follows is inconsistent with this, as noxious persons were to be killed because they resembled wild creatures, harmless persons who did not possess self-knowledge might be killed, because they resembled domestic animals. They might be regarded as dead, and their property...
might be seized by the "living". Further he advocated the direction of prayer and the preliminary ablution. Other details are furnished by a hostile writer, the historian of Shāh Q Jahān quoted above, copied in Muntakhab al-Lubāb. Marriage, he says, is without a contract, there being merely a feast at which a cow is slaughtered. Divorce is ratified by placing some pebbles in the wife's hand. The widow is deprived of inheritance, and indeed is at the disposal of the heirs, who may marry her themselves or sell her to some one else. When a son is born to one of them, an incision is made in the ear of an ass, and the blood dripped on the infant's tongue. This is in order to ensure that the infant shall be bloodthirsty and have the mind of an ass. Any stranger who falls into their hands is enslaved and can be bought or sold. Daughters receive no share in the inheritance. They massacre whole tribes when they conquer them. Even on the Day of Judgment their victims, though martyrs, will not hold them to account. — According to others, however, they recognized neither Paradise nor Hell.

4. Literature of the sect. Bāyazid is said to have written much; works by him cited in the Nabshān are the ʿIḥānāmī or autobiography, mentioned above, and Khaīr al-Bayān, the sacred book of the sect, in the style of the Kurān, addressed by the Divine Being to Bāyazid. This was issued in four languages: Arabic, Persian, Hindi and Pushto. A work in Arabic, Maṣūd al-Muʿminīn, by him is also mentioned.

Bibliography: The account of the sect given by J. Leyden, in Asiatic Researches, xi. 363-428, London 1810, based on the Nabshān al-Mašāḥihī (p. 247-253 in ed. Bombay 1929) and the Pushto work Maḥzān al-Īslām of Akhund Derwezech, furnished the material for the account of the sect in Graf T. A. von Noer's Kātir Aḵār, Leyden 1885, ii. 179 sqq., and largely for that in Glossary of the Punjabi Tribes and Castes, Lahore 1915, iii. 355 sqq. Notices of the sect were also got from Indian historical works; from the Aḵār-nāme (printed, Calcutta 1881) by M. Elphinstone, History of India, London 1846, p. 517 etc.; from the Tabātabāi Aḵbār (lith., Lahore 1929) by H. Elliot, History of India, London 1873, v. 450; from the Tawākī-ī ʿIḥānāngī, transl. A. Rogers and H. Beveridge. London 1909 by Beni Prasad, History of Jahangir, Oxford 1922, who also uses the ʿIḥānāmī ʿIḥānāngī, Calcutta 1865. For Shāh Q Jahān's time the ʿIḥānām-nāme called Ḥamal-ī Sāḥib of Muhammad Sāliḥ Kambo, ed. Ghulam Yazdani, Calcutta 1923 and 1927, is the chief authority. The printed text of the Buʾātibāh-nāme (Calcutta 1867, 1868) which, according to Muntakhab al-Lubāb (Calcutta 1869), should contain an exaggerated account of the atrocities of the sect, has very little about it.

(D. S. Margoliouth)

Al-Razi, Abu Bakr Muḥammad b. Zakariya, a celebrated physician, alchemist and philosopher. Almost nothing is known of his life. He was born in 250 (864) at Rayy. There he seems to have studied deeply in mathematics, philosophy, astronomy and belles-lettres. He perhaps also studied alchemy in his youth. It was only after attaining a rather advanced age that he devoted himself to medicine. Entering the service of the ruler of Rayy, he soon became head of the new hospital in this town and later we find him in the same capacity in Baghdād. We do not know exactly how long he remained there. The reputation of being the greatest physician of his time brought him from one court to another. The fickleness of the favour of princes as well as the uncertainty of the political situation are the causes of his unsettled life. He returned several times to his native town where he died in 313 (925) (according to al-Biruni on 5th Shabān 313) or in 323.

We are not better informed regarding Razi's teachers. Several Arabic biographers regard him as a pupil of the Iranian 'Ali b. Babballāh Attar which is chronologically impossible. As his teacher in philosophy the Fihrist mentions a certain Balkhi (not the geographer Abu Zaid al-Balkhi) from whom Razi is said to have taken some ideas. Naṣīr-i Khusraw says the same thing about a rationalist philosopher with the curious name of Eranshahrī (cf. Žād al-Muṣṭārin, p. 73, 98; cf. also al-Biruni, Ḥinī, p. 4, 326; al-Ṭabarī, p. 222, 225), it is very probable that the two sources refer to the same individual. Although the influence of Razi was considerable, we know nothing of his pupils. The philosopher Yahyā b. Ḍīn, an Aristotelian, Jacobite and disciple of Fārābī, is said to have begun to study philosophy with Razi (cf. Maṣ′īdī, Kitaḥ al-Ṭanbūh wa-l-Ḥaṣbū, and a later source (Hudjwī, Kitaḥ al-Maḥābīb, transl. Nicholson p. 150) speaks of connections between himself and the mystic al-Haḍīḍī. It was in Shīʿa circles that the philosophical doctrines of Razi left the deepest mark Abu ʿIsābī Ṭabārānī b. Nawbakht, a theologian of the "Twelver" Shīʿa, borrows from him, in his Kitaḥ al-Yaḥṣūʿ, his theory of pleasure, and the ʿIsmāʿīlīs Abū Ḥāfirīm al-Razi (d. 322 = 926), Kirmānī (d. after 412 = 1021) and Naṣīr-i Khusraw (q. v.) attempted to refute certain parts of his philosophical system. Among the other authors who combated his views may be mentioned Fārābī, Ibn Ḥaṭīḥ, 'Alī b. Ṭīwān and Maimonides.

Razi is above all a physician and he is rightly regarded as the greatest physician of Islam. In addition to numerous monographs on various maladies of which the most famous is his treatise on smallpox and measles (Kitaḥ al-Ḍarbāb wa-l-ʿIṣāfāb) he wrote several large manuals of medicine which were the most remarkable since the middle ages knew. A number of his works were translated into Latin and down to the xvith century the authority of al-Razi was undisputed. His Muḥājir (Libārʾ Almansiros) is dedicated to Muḥājir b. ʿIsābī, governor of Rayy, and his Muḥājir (Regius) to 'Ali b. Wēh-Sūkīn of Tabaristan. The Ḥāwī (probably the same as the Ḫāsimī), is the largest medical encyclopaedia in Arabic. Razi is said to have devoted 15 years of his life to writing it and seems to have died before finishing it. The book is a compilation of extracts from all the Greek and Arab physicians on every problem of medicine and Razi concludes by giving the results of his own experience. While accepting earlier tradition, Razi is the least dogmatic of the Arab physicians and in the field of medical practice surpasses the knowledge of the ancients. We still possess his clinical notebook in which he describes very carefully the progress of his patients.

The same empirical spirit is found in the other branches of science which he studied. In chemistry, about which we are better informed, Razi, rejecting
all occultist and symbolic explanations of natural phenomena, confined himself exclusively to the classification of substances and processes as well as to the exact descriptions of his experiments. In spite of the statement of the Fihris, Rāzī does not seem to have been acquainted with the alchemical writings attributed to Džābār b. Ḥayyān. Pseudo-Maḍḍriti in his Kitāb Ruzbat al-Ḥakīm, endeavoured to reconcile the alchemy of Rāzī with that of Džābār. Of his writings on mechanics we only possess a synopsis of his treatise on the balance (mizān ta'bī). All his works on physics, mathematics, astronomy and optics, of which a large number are enumerated by the bibliographers, have perished.

It is the same with his metaphysical works of which we only have a few fragments preserved in later authors. Besides the Shī'ī theologians mentioned above, we must make particular mention of al-Birūnī, who in his various works frequently refers to Rāzī. He also devoted a complete risāla to a study of the life and works of Rāzī.

The following are the characteristic features of his metaphysics: Rāzī asserts the existence of five eternal (ka'bī) principles which are the Creator, Soul, Matter, Time and Space. The eternity of the world is, according to Rāzī, the necessary corollary of the concept of God, the unique and immutable principle (the line of argument of the Aristotelian philosophers). Now Rāzī denies this eternity. Only the plurality of the eternal principles, their opposition and combination, can explain temporal creation. The origin and destinies of the world are imagined by Rāzī under the form of a myth with gnostic affinities. The Soul, the second eternal principle, possessing life but not knowing, is seized with the desire to unite with matter, and to produce within itself forms susceptible of procuring corporeal enjoyments. But matter is elusive. The Creator then in his pity creates this world, with its durable forms in order to permit the soul to enjoy it and to produce man. But the Creator also sends the intelligence (ṣabī) partaking of the substance of his divinity to awaken the sleeping soul in its abode (ka'bāl) which is man and to teach that this created world is not its true home, the place of its happiness and of its peace. To escape the bonds of matter there is only a single means for every man, which is the study of philosophy. When all human souls have attained liberation the world will dissolve and matter deprived of forms will return to its primitive state.

In his physics, Rāzī, an opponent of the Aristotelians and mutakallimīn, relies on the authority of Plato and the pre-Socratic philosophers. Hylomorphism, fundamentally different from the parallel-theories of the kalām, is related in many ways — an exceptional case in medieval philosophy — to the system of Democritus. In Rāzī’s view matter in the primitive state before the creation of the world (ka'bāl muta'ābī) was composed of scattered atoms (dīnus la yatajāzzu). Atoms possessed extent. Mixed in various proportions with particles of the Void — of which Rāzī against the Aristotelians affirms the positive existence, — these atoms produced the elements. The latter are five in number: earth, air, water, fire and the celestial element. All the properties of the elements (lightness and heaviness, opaqueness and transparency etc.) are determined by the proportions of Matter and Void entering into their composition. Earth and water, dense elements, tend towards the centre of the earth, while air and fire in which particles of the void predominate, tend to rise. As to the celestial element, a mixture of Matter and Void, circular movement is peculiar to it. Fire springs from the striking of iron on stone because iron as it moves cools the air and rarifies it so that it is transformed into fire.

Rāzī distinguished universal space (ma'ānī kulli) or absolute space (ma'ānī muṣaf) from partial (dīnī) and relative (muṣaf) space. Absolute space, denied by the Aristotelians, is pure extent, independent of the body which it contains. It extends beyond the limits of the world, is infinite. There is reason to believe that Rāzī affirms the plurality of worlds. The term relative or partial space is applied to the size or extent of any particular body.

In his theory of time, which he says is Platonic, Rāzī differentiates in analogous fashion absolute (muṣaf) and limited (ma'ānī) time. It is only limited time that the Aristotelian definition of time, considered as a number of moments (in the first place of movement of the celestial spheres), is applicable, according to the Prior and Posterior Analytic. Absolute time is an independent substance which flows. It existed before the creation of the world and will exist after its dissolution. Abandoning a distinction made in the Timaeus and handed down by the Neo-Platonists to the Arabic philosophers, Rāzī identifies it with eternity (dahr, ṣaww). To attack the Aristotelian conceptions of space and time, Rāzī makes use of the view of the man in the street with a healthy mind not broken in to philosophical subtleties.

In his ethics, Rāzī, in spite of his pessimistic metaphysics, is against excessive asceticism. Socrates, whom he regards as his model, far from being the ascetic of cynical tradition, took an active part in public life. According to the maxim of Aristotle, blame cannot be attached to the human passions but only to their excessive indulgence. At the basis of his moral teaching is a special theory of pleasure and pain. Pleasure (ḥaṣṣ) is not something positive but the simple result of a return to normal conditions, the disturbance of which has caused pain (ṭarā). The sira falsaṣṣya (βλές ψυχός) aspires, according to the saying of Plato (Thætætæ, p. 176a), to resemble the Creator to be, like him, just towards man, indulgent to his faults.

In view of the individualistic ethics of Rāzī, we can understand his critical attitude to established religion. In many writings he refuted the Mu'tazili theologians (Džāhī, Nāshī, Abu 1-Kāsim al-Balkhī, Misma'ī (= Ibn Aḥbīl Zurrān)) who attempted to introduce scientific arguments into theology. Nor was he sparing in his criticism of the extreme Shī'a (refutation of Ahmad al-Kājīl) and of the Manichaeans. Among his adversaries in philosophy we find, besides the Dāhī Abū Bakr Husain al-Tammar al-mu'taļabbīhī, the Sabæan Thābit b. Kurra, the polyhistorian Mas'sūdī and Ahmad b. al-Taiyib al-Sarākhsī, a pupil of al-Kindī.

Unlike the Muslim Aristotelians Rāzī denies the possibility of a reconciliation between philosophy and religion. Two heretical writings figure in his bibliography: the Maṣḥūrīh al-Anbīyā, or Ḥīṣīh al-Mu'tanābīyīn was read in heretical circles in Islam and notably among the Karmātians (cf. Baghdādī, Pārī, p. 281). It seems even to have influenced the famous theme of the Dr Tribus,
Importus, so dear to western rationalists from the time of Frederick II (cf. L. Massignon, in R. H. C., 1920). The second, Fı Nakb laal-Adyan is partly preserved in a collection, the Khatib Al-A'm al-Nabawi of the Isma'ilî Abû Hatîm al-Râzî. The principal theses of this book are as follows: all men being by nature equal, the prophets cannot claim any intellectual or spiritual superiority. The miracles of the prophets are impostures or belong to the domain of pious legend. The teachings of religions are contrary to the one truth: the proof of this is that they contradict one another. It is tradition and lazy custom that have led men to trust their religious leaders. Religions are the self-subsisting illusions which ravage humanity; they are hostile to philosophical speculation and to scientific research. The alleged holy scriptures are books without value. The writings of the ancients like Plato, Aristotle, Euclid and Hippocrates have rendered much greater service to humanity. — Râzî’s book undoubtedly contains the most violent polemic against religion that appeared in the course of the middle ages. It takes up to some extent the arguments of the contemporary Manichaens against positive religions but above all it seems to be inspired by the criticism of religion in antiquity.

Râzî believed in a progress of scientific and philosophical knowledge. He claims to have advanced beyond most of the ancient philosophers. He even thinks himself superior to Aristotle and Plato. As regards medicine, he had attained the level of Hippocrates and in philosophy he feels himself close to Socrates. But after him there should come other learned men who would reject some of his conclusions just as he had sought to supplant the teachings of his predecessors.


(P. Kraus and S. Pines)

AL-RÂZÎ, the name of three historians of Muslim Spain. 1. MUHAMMAD B. MUŠA B. BASHÎR B. DIYÂNÔD B. LAKİT B. AL-KINÂNI AL-RÂZÎ, who took his nishâ from the town of al-Ra‘î in Persia where he was born, came from the east to Cordova about the middle of the third century A.D. (864 A.D.) to trade there. His high degree of Arabic culture gave him a welcome in intellectual circles in the Umayyad capital and the emir Muhammab b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân entrusted him on several occasions with diplomatic missions in the east or in Spain itself. His successor, his son al-Mandîrî, showed him the same confidence. It was on his return from an embassy to Elvira [v. v.] for this prince that al-Râzî died in Rab‘î II 273 (Sept. 5—Oct. 3, 866).

We would have known nothing of Muhammab al-Râzî as an historian but for a statement by Muhammab Ibn Muzain reproduced by the Moroccan writer Muhammab al-Wâzîr al-Ghassânî in his account of an embassy to Spain in 1691, entitled Alâh al-Wâzîr fi ‘Isâb al-Aṣîr (cf. E. Lâvi-Provençal, Les Historiens des Chorfa, Paris 1922, 284—286). Ibn Muzain there says that in 471 (1079—1080) he found in a library in Seville a little book by Muhammab b. Müsâ al-Râzî entitled Khatab al-Râzî, relating to the conquest of Spain by the Muslims and giving details of the Arab contingents, each distinguished by its standard (ruya) who entered the Peninsula with Müsâ b. Nuṣîr [v. v.]. The passage of Ibn Muzain has been reproduced in the Madrid edition of the Fath al-Andalus of Ibn Kûyiya (cf. the Bibl.). However little we know of this work of Muhammab al-Râzî, we cannot but regret its loss bitterly.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Abbâr, Tawqihat al-Silâ (B. A.H., v.), Madrid 1887, No. 1048; al-Makârî, Nafh al-Tib (Anecdotes), vol. ii., p. 76 (reproduces the notice of Ibn al-Abbâr); R. Dory,
introduction to his edition of al-Bayān al-
maghrib of Ibn Iṣḥāq al-Marrākushi, p. 22.
J. Ribera, Historia de la conquista de España
de Almódâvia el Córdobés, Madrid 1926, p. 197
of the text and p. 170 of the transl.; Pons
Boigues, Ensaiu bio-bibliogràfiu sobre los histori-
dores y geògrafos aràbigo-espanyols, Madrid 1898,
No. 4 and the references cited p. 45, note 2;
A. González Palencia, Historia de la literatura
aràbigo-espanyola, Barcelona-Buenos Aires 1928,
p. 130.
H. Ahmad b. Muḥammad, son of the preceding,
surnamed al-Taʾrīḵi (“the chronicler”), the
first in date of the great historians of
al-Andalus. He was born in Spain on the
10th Dhu l-Ḥijjah 274 (April 26, 888) and died on
the 12th Rajab 344 (Nov. 1, 955). He was the
pupil of Cordovan scholars of repute like Ahmad
b. Khālid and Ḥāṣim b. ʿAbdAllah. He wrote several
monographs on the history of Spain: a Taʾrīḵ
Mulūk al-Andalus; a description of Cordova (Kitāb
fi Ṣinaʿat Qirtuṭa) written on the plan of the
description of Baghdad by Abu ʿl-Faḍl Ibn Abī
Ṭāhir; a book on the Spanish masāʾil; lastly a
voluminous work on the genealogies of the Arabs
of Spain, Kitāb al-Isṭaʿāb, which was to form one
of the essential sources of the Djamārat al-Ansāb
of Ibn Ḥazm [q.v.]. These various works have
unfortunately not come down to us and until quite
recently we had only a few quotations from Ahmad
al-Razi preserved by later writers. The recent dis-
covery of a fragmentary manuscript of a chronicle
relating to the 10th century in Spain now puts at
our disposal quite extensive extracts from this
author and from his son Ḥāṣim (see iii.); these
passages are collected in Documentos inéditos d’histoire
hispano-umayyade, to appear shortly.

The majority of Ahmad al-Razi’s biographers
do not attribute to him any geographical work,
but some, e.g. al-Dbabi and Yṣkūṭ, notice a Spanish
geographer whom they call Ahmad b. Muḥammad
al-Taʾrīḵi who is clearly Ahmad al-Razi; this
individual, according to these authors (al-Maʾkṣari
attributes it directly to Ahmad al-Razi), wrote a
lengthy work on the routes (masāʾil) of al-Andalus,
its anchorages (marāṣiʿ), its principal towns (umma-
ḥāt al-mudun) and the six Arab ajums [q.v.]
which were settled there after the conquest. This
description of Spain has been preserved in a
Castilian translation published in 1580 by P.
de Gayangos as an appendix to his Memoria sobre
la autenticidat de la Crónica denominada del Mon
Ruso (supplemented by R. Menéndez Pidal, Catá-
logo de la Real Biblioteca. Manuscritos. Crónicas
generales de España, Madrid 1898). The description
forms the first part of this Crónica and in its
present Castilian form comes from a translation
into Portuguese, now lost, prepared by order of
King D. John II of Portugal towards the beginning
of the xivth century by a clerk named Gil Pérez;
the latter was no doubt the author of the second
part and in the third he confined himself to summing
up very briefly the historical work in the strict
sense of Ahmad al-Razi.

The description of Spain by al-Razi, in
spite of the many difficulties offered by the fact
that it has passed through two translations, both
very often inaccurate and corrupt in the place-
names, is nevertheless a very important document
from the geographical, as well as the political
and social point of view for the Muhammadan part
of Spain in the reign of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III. After
a number of general reflections on al-Andalus, its
situation with regard to the rest of the inhabited
world, and its climate, we have an individual
description of each of the principal districts, of
which special use was made by Yṣkūṭ [q.v.] for
the Spanish references in his Muḥājir al-Buldān.
A comparison of the Spanish text of al-Razi’s
description with that of Yṣkūṭ enables us to discover
a close relationship between the two works. They
both give the same number of administrative titles
(laçus) in Umayyad Spain of the xth century, 41 in
all: Cordova, Cabra, Elvira, Jaen, Tudmir, Valencia,
Tortosa, Tarragona, Lérida, Barbitania, Huesca,
Tudela, Saragossa, Calatayud, Barbastro, Mérida,
Shantabanya, Racapel, Zorita, Guadalajarada,
Toledo, Oreno, Faṣa b. ʿAl-Ballūṭ (Llano de las bellotas),
Ferrish, Mérida, Badajoz, Bése, Oconosoba, Santarem, Cotbrua,
Extinția, Lisbon, Niebla, Sevilla, Carmona, Moron,
Sidona (Shadhāna), Algéciras, Reijo, Ecija and
Tácoronan.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Faḍlān, Taʾrīḵ
Umāl al-Andalus (B.A.H., viii.—viii.), Madrid
1892, No. 135; al-Dbabi, Baḥya b. Mūlamīs
(B.A.H., iii.), Madrid 1885, No. 329 and 330;
al-Maʾkṣari, Naṣīḥ al-Tib (Analectes), ii. 177,
Yṣkūṭ, Irshād al-Arīb, ed. D. S. Margoliouth
(G. M. S., vi. 2), Leyden 1909, p. 76—77; R.
Dozy, cf. above; Pons Boigues, Ensaimo, No. 25;
A. González Palencia, Hist. de la lit. ar. esp.,
p. 130—131; J. Alomany Bolufer, La Geografía de
la Península Ibérica en los escritores árabes,
Granada 1921, p. 29 sqq.

iii. Ḥāṣim b. Ahmad b. Muḥammad, son of ii.,
grandson of i., continued his father’s Umayyad
chronicle down to his own time and extended the
portions dealing with earlier periods by using
sources which had not been available to Ahmad
al-Razi. He has not been the subject of notice by
any of the Spanish biographers already published
but is frequently quoted by later historians,
notably by Ibn Ḥaṣān [q.v.], Ibn Saʿīd [q.v.]
and Ibn al-Abbār [q.v.]. According to the latter,
he also wrote a monograph on the Ḥaḍīṣ of [q.v.]
of the Umayyad court of Cordova: Kīrāb al-
Iṣbikhāb liʾl-Khulāfaʾ bi-l-Andalus.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥaṣān, al-Maktāb,
Oxford ms. “passim”; Ibn al-Abbār, al-Hallat
al-siyara”, in Dozy, Notices sur quelques manuscrits
arabes, Leyden 1847—1851, p. 74; al-Maʾkṣari,
Naṣīḥ al-Tib (Analectes), ii. 671; Pons Boigues,
Ensaimo, No. 41; A. González Palencia, Hist. de
la lit. ar. esp., p. 131.

E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL

AMĪN AHMAD RĀẒĪ, a Persian biographer.
Hardly anything is known of his life. He belonged
to Ray to where his father Khwāja Mirzā Ahmad
was celebrated for his wealth and benevolence.
He was in high favour with Shah Ṣahmās and was
appointed by him kālim ārāf of his native town.
His paternal uncle Khwāja Muḥammad Shāh
was vizier of Khurāsān, Yazd and Iṣfahān, his
cousin Chiyāth-Beg a high official at the court
of the Emperor Akbar. Amin himself is said to
have visited India. The work to which he owes
his fame is the great collection of biographies
Haft Khīlim (finished in 1002 = 1594). For many
years he collected information about famous men
until finally he yielded to the entreaties of one
of his friends and arranged his material in book
form. The final editing of it took six years. The

The Encyclopédia of Islam, III.
biographies are arranged geographically according to
the 7 climes. In each clime the biographical
part is preceded by a short geographical and
historical introduction which is followed by notes
on poets, ulamas, famous šahāhs etc. in chrono-
logical order. The work is of special importance
for the history of Persian literature, as the bi-
ographies of poets contain numerous specimens
of their works, some of which are very rare. It con-
tains the following sections: Clime I: Yaman,
Bilad al-Zanj, Nubia, China. Clime II: Mecca,
Medina, Yamama, Hamma, Dakhkan, Azerbaijan,
Daralatabid, Golkonda, Ahmadabad, Sūrat, Bengal,
Orī-san and Kūsh. Clime III: 'Irāq, Baghdaḏ, Kūfah,
Najaf, Basra, Yazd, Fārs, Sistan, Kandahār.
Oman, Lāhūr, Dihi, India from the oldest
times down to Alkhor, Syria, Egypt. Clime IV: Kūhārān,
Balkh, Herāt, 'Eḏem, Māshhād, Nishapūr, Sabravār,
Isfārān. Isfāhān, Kāšān, Kūn, Suzā, Hamadān,
Tehrān and Fārsān, 'Eṣfān, Tabaristān, Māzandarān,
Gilan, Kāzvin, Ardabīl, Qazvin, Varamān, Nūrābād,
Tabrīz, Būljābās. Clime V: Shirwān, Ghurja, Kīwārūm, Mā wārā al-Sahr, Samarkand, Bukhara,
Farghān. Clime VI: Turkestan, Farāb, Varḵand, Kūk, Cornerstone, Kūn, Clime VII: Balkh,
Salūk, Vāḏyāl, Mādūz. Unfortunately this
valuable work has not yet been published. Maw-
lawī Aḥmad al-Muṣṭafā began his edition in the
Fihrista al-İmlās, but so far only one part
has appeared (Calcatta 1918).

Bibliography: Ren, Catalogue 335; E.
G. Browne, A History of Persian Literature in
Modern Times, Cambridge 1924, p. 448; II.
Eftekhār, Neukirchener Literatur, in Gr. d. Ph., ii.
213.

Łoź (L. Berthezi)

Łoź (Ar.-radīf), *what follows immediately
after a person or thing (Fagnan, Additions); one
mounted on a group, pilon-rider*: for use in the
figurative sense in a compound epithet in Turkish (Persian); *mīrār, fāzaf-żer-żer-radīf*; the victorious
army (one which has victory on its group) (Turkālī
Līfīk, 1272 A.H., t. 22). The synonyms terafīd
and, more rarely, radīf, *the act of causing to flow
or join, to make are also sometimes
used in Turkish as well as the words terqafā and
radīf*. As a technical term radīf, pronounced
remīss, has been used: 1. In Persian and Turkīsh
prosody; 2. In the Ottoman army.

1. Persian and Turkish Prosody. — Radīf
is a kind of *hypermeter* (taking this word in a
wider sense than in classical or even English prosody).
It is the part of the line which follows the rhyme
(kāfīr in Neo-Turkish: yaqī) or more exactly
the last syllable of the latter (ratī), or which
comes between two words forming a rhyme. The
śabīd may consist of one or more suffixes, particles
or independent words. The old theorists however
disputed the quality of radīf to repeated suffixes
and gave different names to each of the (Arabic)
letters representing them: šafī (first letter); šēflūfīd
(second); māṣfīd (third); nāfīd (fourth). In Persian
and Turkish prosody the same radīf is repeated
at the end of all the lines of a piece of poetry.

Although it made its appearance in Turkish as
early as the 6th century, the radīf is an especially
Persian invention. Indeed in the national Turkish
poetry (syllabic metre) suffixes or particles repeated
at the end of the lines count as rhyme (Kowalski,
ZŁOź-radīf and ḥawma ḥawma, Hawma ḥawma,
Cracow, 1922, p. 32). The radīf existed in classical
Arabic only in an emotive form and
under another name (Garcin de Tassy, Rhétorique,
p. 143). The redīf fell into disuse in Turkey in the
6th century, probably under the influence of
French poetry.

In addition to this special use in prosody the
name redīf is sometimes given to the second term of
an irād, i.e. of a hendādīs (muṣaffat) of which the
two terms rhyme or are alliterative; as for example, Pers. ʃuₐlu-šāmān, dastʿ uda-a, khåh šavādān, Türk. şar-a şar-a, 'al a 'al (Bu'rakān-
šīh), Türk. transl. p. 128, 323, 328, 371). Mutāwīdīd
(mutāwīfīd) means *synonym*.

2. Turkish Military Usage. — Mahānī II
gave the name of redīf (azar of redīf-e meqāre) to the
reserve army created in 1534 (Jouannin and van
144) speaking of the project for this army,
under the year 1549 (May 21 1533—May 9 1544)
explains the meaning of the term by saying that
it was a force that “came after” the regular army
(muṣaffaṣeṣe redīf olarūk). They were therefore
not soldiers who had, at need, to mount behind
the cavalry on the croup, like the Roman velites.
Redīf was contrasted with nuṣūm or ‘azar-i nuṣūm
from the first that the regular army (standing army
and with ībīsā ‘reserve of the regular army’). For
the lack of an exact equivalent we may say militia in
English and *armée de réserve* or “garde nationale”
in French. The German term “Landwehr” is per-
haps nearest it but in the Prussian rather than
the Austrian sense. Sometimes the redīf are included
in the nuṣūmīe, taking the latter term in a wider
sense of regular or disciplined troops (synonym
muṣaffaṣeṣe). Fūtī (loc. cit.) calls the redīf bir nevē
‘azar-i nuṣūmīe *a kind of regular troops*.

The characteristic feature of the redīf army was the
existence of permanent cadres, whence its mixed
character. It was linked with the regular army by
its officers and with the reserve by its men (fūrād-
redīf). It was the object of its creators that this
army should provide a large number of men if
necessary without imposing too long a period of
service on the rural population (Fūtī, op. cit.)

It was decided from the first that the redīf
should consist of battalions (tabūr) and indeed this
organisation by army depots (tabūr ṣuwar) remained
in force as long as the redīf existed. The
commanders of these battalions (biyāzūkhān) were
at first chosen from the chief local families
毛病 (mâjallī) ḥōmānīn). The first
battalions formed in 1250 (May 10 934 to April 28 935)
were those of the sandalāk (q. v.) of Karabash Şişib,
Ankara, Kangī (Cankī), Siroz and Menteshe.
Ismaʿīl Bey, hereditary Kurd governor of Palu, was
appointed colonel of the three battalions in the
year 935 known as those of the “Imperial Mines”
(musallamī hāmsū) in the eyālet of Siwās (Fūtī,
iv. 171). There were three to four battalions to
the sandalāk, or 10 to 12 to the eyālet. The officers
received a quarter of the usual pay, but were only
expected to serve and wear uniform two days a week
(Mussafat Nūr Pāša, Ḳatāfāl al-ḵawālīs, iv.
109).

In 1252 (April 18, 936 to April 6, 937), the
redīf was organised in wide groups with a high
command: musallam (māḥal-shīp) *māḥal-
shīp* [cf. muṣaffaṣe] of redīf, conferred upon the
vals. The first were those of the eyālets of
Karaman (Konya), Kudawandīrgūz (Brussa: guard or
kālēt), Ankara, Aydın, Erzurum, Edirne. At
the same time plans were made to raise the money required for this purpose. The wall-marshals were given the ḥawāni (ḥarmāni) or cloaks of their new rank. Just as the troops of the line (muṣṭafā) were divided from those of the guard (ḥāṣaf) so there were redif-i muṣṭafā and redif-i ḥāṣaf. The appointment of commanders of divisions was to follow (for details see the Tekke-i Şir or report of the grand vizier Mehmed Emin Ra‘ūl Paşa in Lütfi, v. 165—170). If we may believe the ḥāṣaf-i humayyin promulgated on this occasion by Mahmūd II, these first steps gave every satisfaction (ibid., p. 74).

When the Military School (mektek-b-i hārbiye) instituted in 1251 began to supply officers, the redif in arms was converted into active forces and the officers were sent back to their oldjaks (Nerā'ī al-Wā'īfāt, iv. 109—110). The service as redif (ḵabīmt-i redif) was now definitely to assume the character of a kind of period of service in the reserve or intermittent service the duration of which (μιδδί-μάρτυρ) was to be fixed under conditions which we shall explain below.

In the ḥāṣaf-i humayyin of Gülhāne (Nov. 31, 1839) there is an allusion to an approaching improvement in the system of regional recruiting. In 1838, five years had been fixed as the period of service in the regular army, previously practically unlimited (one saw young married soldiers leaving their families for life), but this measure did not immediately make its effect felt (cf. von Moltke, Lettres sur l'Orient, n.d., p. 311, letter no. xiv. 1).

On Sept. 6, 1843 the military law of the so‘āker Ribā Pāsha (Engelhardt, i. 71) was promulgated, a law of fundamental importance, half French and half German in character, the principles of which have survived even in the most recent legislation. It confirmed the period of regular service at five years (later reduced to four), to be followed by a period of seven years during which a redif could be recalled to the colours for a month each year (later every two years). Each ordv (army corps) was to have its redif contingent (ṣin-f-i redif) placed in time of peace under the orders of a brigadier-general (liqāt, brigade) who lived at the headquarters of the ordv. In 1853 (Ubcini, i. 456) the redif were organised into 4 (out of 6) ordv, namely those of ḥāṣaf (Souats: [Asya] and Smyrna), Derese-ādett (İstanbul and Ankara), Rumeli (Mənaṣir) and Anatolia (İrāpur). The ordv of 'Arabustān and the İrāq were still to be organised. Ubcini adds this observation: “By means of this organisation the government has secured a force at its disposal equal to the regular army and capable of being moved in a few weeks either to the line of the Balkans or to any other point in the empire”. According to Branci (Guido de la conversation, 1852, p. 230), the organised reserve (māreṭṭet redif) was then 150,000 men compared with 300,000 of the regular army.

Hussein 'Avni Pāsha's law of 1869, more clearly French in character (Aristarchi, iii. 514; Engelhardt, ii. 37 sqq.), provided for 4 years active service and one of ḥāṣaf or in the active reserve, a period of 6 years in the redif in two bans (ṣif-i muḥaddem and ṣif-i tālī) of 3 years each (according to Engelhardt of 4 and 2 years respectively). In practice in 1877 there were 3 bans, the third (ṣif-i ḥāṣaf) being represented by the territorial army (muṣṭafā) then mobilised (Zoibinski, p. 98). A conscript who obtained a lucky number in the draw was drafted directly into the redif army (art. 17).

The law of 27th Şāfār 1304 = 13th Teshrin-i Ḥānî 1302 (Nov. 25, 1886; resumed by Lamouché, p. 72 and Young, ii. 394) was prepared by a commission of reorganisation which included Muftafar Walī Riḥā Paşha and von der Goltz Paşha, fixed the period of redif service at 9 years, but was soon afterwards followed by a special law (redif kanumā) of 10th Muḥarram 1305 (Sept. 28, 1887). According to this, which was however not put into force till 1892, the period of redif service was 8 years. The ranks in the redif were the same as in the regular army from general of division down to sergeant-major. These officers formed at the same time the personnel of the recruiting offices for the whole army.

According to the law regulating the uniforms of the army on land (elben-i askeriye nişān-namesi) of the 29th Djamādā 1327 = 5th Hazīrān 1325 (June 18, 1909), the redif soldiers wore as distinctive badge a dark green (redif) piping (ṣt, Pers. sīh, Arab. sīţ) at the bottom of the collar (ṣajā) of the tunic (ṣajāt) or şekeš, modern spelling: ceket, şekeš). The officers wore a piece of cloth of the same colour 7 centimetres in length fastened on the collar of the lower tunic (ṣajāt) or the full dress tunic (ṣajāt, older spell: of Pers. sāret) (Dustūr, Tertib-i Ḥānî, i. 276; A. Bilotti and Ahmad Sedād, Législation ottomane, Paris 1912, p. 171 sqq.).

The redif system was abandoned by the Young Turks. The law of 18th Ramadān 1330 = 18th August 1328 (Aug. 31, 1912) without proclaiming the dissolution of the corps ordered the formation of units of muṣṭafā with elements furnished by the battalion depots in the second inspection (muṣṭafā) of redif (Dustūr, Tertib-i Ḥānî, iv. 615). The Young Turks have been reproached with this measure and some have even seen in it the cause of the Turkish defeat in the Balkan War.

Bibliography: 1. Garin de Tassy, Rithorique et prosodie des langues de l'Orient musulman, Paris 1873, index under rīd, rādīf, tārīdīf, murādīf; Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols de Perse, p. 28, note; Mu'āllim Nādīj, Liqā'āt-i elebye, Istanbul 1307; s.v. rīdīf, redīf, murādīf, p. 78, 84 and 86. Cf. also the Bibliography of the article 'Arabīt.

2. Léon Lamouché, L'organisation militaire de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1895; H. Zobinski, Armée Ottomane (lois de 1869), Paris 1877; L. v. Schoenitz, Das turkische Heer, Leipzig n. d.; Ubcini, Lettres sur la Turquie, Paris 1853; Ed. Engelhardt, La Turquie et le Tamanat, Paris 1882; Arstarchi Bey, Législation Ottomane, publ. by Demetrius Nicoladés, part 3, Constantinople 1874; George Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, vol. ii., Oxford 1905. (The collections of Turkish laws or dustūr generally refrain from including the principal laws relating to the army and the two works just mentioned contain only a very few).

(J. Deny)

REFİI, an Ottoman poet and Hürфи. Of REFİI's life we only have a few hints from himself; the Ottoman biographers and historians do not seem to mention him at all. He himself describes how in his youth he studied many branches of knowledge but did not know what he should believe, and how sometimes he turned to the Sunna, sometimes to philosophy and sometimes to
materialism. He often travelled a great distance to visit a particular scholar but was always disappointed. The poet Nesimi [q.v.] was the first to teach him the grace of God and the truth, and ordered him to teach this truth in his turn to the people of Kâna, and for this purpose he had to speak in Turkish. He therefore wrote his Beşgül "et-nâmé, "the message of joy", which he finished on the first Friday of Ramadân 811 (Jan. 18, 1409). This work is not yet printed; it is quite short and written in the same metre as 'Ashîk Pasha's Gharîbînâmé, a remêl of six feet with irregular prosody. The Hurüfî teaching is expounded in a very prose style, the merits of the names and letters, the sacred number 32, the prophets, the throne of God, the human countenance, the splitting of the moon, Faîl Allah [q.v.], the founder of the Hurûfist sect—all this is dealt with from the usual Hurûfî point of view. As sources an 'Arîgânî, a Qâmûşiânâmé, and a Maḥqûkhâmé are quoted; the first and third are probably the works of the same names by Faîl Allah, the second according to Rieu was written by 'Abd-Allâh (d. 707 = 1307).

Another of Refî's works is the "Book of Treasure" (Göngûnâmé). It is printed in the Stambul edition of the Diwan of Nesimi. The Göngûnâmé is better as poetry and on the whole less Hurûfî than generally Sûfî in tone. Man from the Hurûfî and philosophical point of view, Faîl Allah and Aḥmîd ( = Muḥîn), the 72 sects, the greatest Naṣîr-i dînî, the water of life etc. are discussed in it.

Nesimi and his pupil Refî seem to be the only Ottoman Hurûfî poets of importance, and while the sect, in spite of all persecutions, continues to exist long after and even had connections with the Bektâşiye, these two poets as such do not seem to have produced any school. So far as I am aware no historian of Turkish literature has taken any interest in Refî, until quite recently Koprulu-Zâde Mehemd Fuâ'd, who has even promised us a special study of him.


REFî (url-kuttâb or Rêfî Efendi [Ar., used in Turkey], properly "chief of the men of the pen", a high Ottoman dignitary, directly under the grand vizier, originally head of the chancery of the Imperial Diwân (devân-i humâyûn), later secretary of state, chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs. According to d'Herbelot he was called also Rêfî kish.

This office, unlike many others, is purely Ottoman, at least as regards the particular line of development that it took. Establishing itself at the expense of the functions of the nishânpî [q.v.], we may say that it owes nothing to the influence of the more or less iriscized 'alîjahî or to the Byzantines. It seems rather to be connected with a more general and more vague institution of the East, one which deserves more profound study: that of the secretaries of the diwân or chiefs of the secretariat of the diwân. This office is found in different Muslim countries under different names: persânî among the Mongols of Persia, diwân ûfî among the Timurids, mumji in Persia, (cf. Chardin, vi. 175; 'Ewîya Çelebi, ii. 267). In the Ottoman provinces there was attached also to the valî an important official known as the diwân efendi; in Egypt under Mehemd 'Ali, the diwân efendi became a kind of president of the council of ministers. The reis url-kuttâb were in brief the diwân efendi of the capital. It is perhaps to this that we owe the use of the title reis efendi, by which they were more commonly known. We know that the term efendi was generally applied to people of the pen. The connection seems to have already been noticed by E. Blochet (Voyage en Orient de Charles Pinot, Paris 1920, p. 85).

Until the time of Sulaimân the Magnificent, the title reis url-kuttâb (or reis efendi) was not used. At least this is what we are told by Ahmed Resmi, who quotes in this connection the Bedâî-i 'Urfî of the historian Köyda 'Hüsîn Efendi of Sarajevo (cf. Babunger, G.O. W., p. 186). The latter, who was himself reis url-kuttâb, says that before Sulaimân, the official correspondence was in the hands of the evnî ahlâm or "depository of the decisions (of the Diwân)" along with the nishânpî. This point of view has been adopted by other historians (v. Hammer; cf. also the Sâhîn-i Meşrûr-i 'Abîdîyye).

There is however no agreement as to who was the first reis url-kuttâb; it is usually said to have been Djâlî (Djeblî), Zâde Mustafa Çelebi [q.v.] (cf. Babunger, G.O. W., p. 102). This well known historian, whose genealogy is taken back to the legendary founder of Byzantium, Vanko b. Mûdîn, was reis url-kuttâb in 931 (1524—1525) before becoming nishânpî, but the Nishânpî-i 'Urfâ-yî of Mehemd b. Mehemd refers to the death in 930 (1523—1524) of a reis url-kuttâb of the name of Haidar Efendi. According to other indications, it would even appear that the office goes back to Mehemd II (cf. the article NISHâNPî).

The reis or office of reis efendi lasted over three centuries during which its holder changed 130 times, the average tenure of office being 2 years and 5 months, which reveals a remarkable lack of ministerial stability: some of the occupants held the office twice, thrice and even four times.

Duties of the reis efendi. As secretary of state the reis kept records of all proceedings and reports (telkîh or takûrîr) presented to the sultan by the grand vizier acting as representative of the government and of the Diwân. These documents which were prepared by the imêdi-i diwân-i humâyûn or imêdiyî (referendari or reporter of the Imperial Diwân) were brought in a bag (kure) kept for the purpose to the ceremonial settings of the Diwân by the reis himself who handed them to the grand vizier. After being read they were given to a special officer, the telkîhî, whose duty it was to present them to the sultan.

As chancellor the reis had a kind of jurisdiction over all the civil functionaries and was the immediate
head of the department of the Imperial Divân (divân-ı kümâyûn kałemî).

This chancellory was divided into three offices (oda or kalemen):

1. the beylik, the most important, saw to the despatch of imperial rescripts (firman), orders of the viziers, and in general all ordinances (evvâmir) other than those of the department of finance (defterdar dâiresi). This office kept copies of them as did the grand vizier also. Ordinances bearing on the back the signatures of the clerk, of the chief editor (mimemêvisî), and of the head of the office (beylikgi) were submitted by the latter to the reis who placed his sign (reisî) upon them and, if it was a firman, sent it to the nishângi for the tâvârun [q.v.] to be placed upon it. — The beylik in addition retained the originals of civil and military regulations (kâmân or kâmîn-nâmê) (usually elaborated by the nishângi) as well as of treaties and capitulations (tâdâm-nâmê) with foreign powers. The reis had to consult these treaties, notably when certifying the deh-kâmân or "marginal" answers put by his subordinates on the requests or notes, known as verbal (tabir), which the ambassadors addressed to the grand vizier. It is this side of his activity which, gradually becoming more and more important and absorbing, ended by making the reis a Minister of Foreign Affairs.

2. office of the tahâni or "annual renewal" of the diplomas of the governors of provinces (beharî), of the brevets of the mellûs or judges in towns of the first class (tahâni), of the brevets of the timariots or holders of military fiefs (çabt firmanî).

3. office of the rûgân or "provisions" of different officials, as well as of the orders for pensions from the treasury (sergi) or from mabûsî (cf. the details of the organization of this office in Mouradgea d’Ossian, vii, 161).

The reis accompanied the grand vizier to the audiences which the sultan gave him and to those which the grand vizier himself gave to ambassadors. He shared with his master the midday meal as did the tawwîl bashêî (cf. ĝawxî and the two tebkerêgî, except on Wednesdays when these two were replaced by the four judges of Istanbul.

In the official protocol the reis had the same rank as the tawwîl bashêî with whom he walked in official processions, before the defterdar (which showed he was of lower rank than the latter).

The elâbî or epistolarv formulary to which they were entitled will be found in Feridîn, Mûnehbêî, p. 10. It is the same as for the agas of the stirrup [cf. kirmandêr] and the defter emimî. For the dress of the reis see Brindisi, Anciens Costumes Turcs, pl. 2; Castellan, iv. 107.

According to Mouradgea d’Ossian, the reis used to act as agents for the kâmân of the Crimâ

Administrative career of the reis. The reis, like all Ottoman officials, were chosen by the sultan or grand vizier as they pleased, but, except in case of appointment by favour, they followed a fixed line of promotion (parîk) in the administration. It was in the administrative offices, i.e., among the kudjuqân (Persian plur. which was given as an honorific title to the principal clerks or khodja or kalemen sâbitîvari) that this career was spent.

In examining the Sejfet id-ı-Risâ’î of Ahmed Resmi, we find that up to the reis Boyal Mehdem Efendi (Pâshâ) (d. 977 = 1569-1570) there is no information available about the career of the reis,

but starting with him we find that the reis were regularly chosen from among the former tekerêgî of the taxîrs or of the grand vizier. From Shekh-zade ʿAbdi Efendi (d. in 1014 = 1605-1606) the reis were mainly taken from the mektûbî or private secretaries of the grand vizier. These secretaries were themselves at the head of an office (oda) which contained a very small number of officials (khâlîf or kalifa, pl. khâlîfîs); there were only two between the years 1090 and 1000. When the number increased (at a later date there were about 30) the career of the future reis was as follows: khâlîfî in the office in question, called also mektûbî-i şadı or ali odâb, then ser-khâlîfî or bahk-kalifa "chief clerk," then mektûbî. The post of mektûbî was much sought after. It brought its holder into close contact with the grand vizier and it was then very easy to advance oneself. More rarely the future reis rose through the similar but less important office of secretary to the lieutenant to the grand vizier or Kâhya Bey (kethbâvâ khâtîb odâb).

The reis remained not the end of a career but gave access to still higher posts (see art. Nishângi for the old rules of promotion by which the reis became nishângi). It was one of what were known as the "six [principal] dignities", mescûbî sitti, namely, the nishângi, defterdar, reis-ul-kütâb, defter emini, shihî xâni defterdar, shihî xâni xâlib defterdar (Ahmed Râsim, Ta’rîkh, p. 756).

According to the Naşihatnâme (p. 39-40 of the French translation; cf. this Encyclopedia, iv. 815-816), the reis was under the authority of the Grand Defterdar (for financial matters only).

Increasing importance of the office of reis. — The growing influence of the reis is explained by the increasing importance of foreign policy in Turkey (the Eastern question).

Down to the end of the xvth century the nishângi were certainly superior to the reis: they controlled and even revised the orders and decisions of the divân (aḫânîm), but from the xvinth century onwards reis like Ogdé-żade Mehdem Shâh Efendi, Lám-i-Áli Çelebi and Huvmî Efendi shed a certain lustre on their office. From 1060 (1650) the incapacity of certain nishângi precipitated the decline of their office in spite of the ephemeral efforts by grand viziers like Shehid ʿAli Pâshâ and of the nishângi appointed by him (Râshid Efendi and Selim Efendi). It was in this period that the office of beylikgi was created (cf. above).

The Ottoman protocol (teh-ı-risâ) was nevertheless still retain for a long time traces of the originally rather subordinate position of the reis. For example they did not sit in the office of the Divân itself, called Divân-ı-kâmân (in the Kapu Sarayi or "Old Sarai"), but remained seated outside of the room in a place called reis tahtâs, "the bench of the reis", where there were also seated for certain other officials to wait upon. In the formal settings, even in those like the distribution of pay (sülîfe) to the Janissaries which took place in the presence of foreign ambassadors, the part played by the reis was rather limited. He carried in with slow step and the sleeves of his ışî turned up the bag containing the tâlîbîs (cf. above). He kissed the hem (teşk) of the grand vizier's robe, placed the bag on his left, kissed the hem of his robe against and withdrew to his place. He came in again to open the bag, handed the documents to
the grand vizier, took them back from him to fold them (bəshəmək), sealed them and gave them to the tekkəşif. If he was unable to be present, the bag of the tekkəşif was handed to the grand vizier by the sənəvi tekkəşif (Kaanın-nime of Abdulrahman Pascha, p. 85, 123 etc.).

Lucas (Société Populaire, Paris 1712, p. 216) writes that during the audience given by the grand vizier to the French Ambassadør on Grand Chanceler dumeurs debout et approuvé contre la muraille.

Things were changed at the reform of the Divan effectuated by the beginning of his reign (1792) by Selim devout of limiting the power of the grand vizier. The old Divan consisted of six vezirs of the dome (having only one consultative voice), of the Muftis (Sharkh-əl-Islam) and the two kasıkras. The new Divan was to consist of 10 members by right of office and others chosen in different ways (about 40 in all). The members by right of office were the Kislaya Bey, the Reis Efendi, the Grand Defterdar, the Celebi Efendi, the Tersane Emiri, the Cevsh baths etc. (Zinkeisen, Geschichte, vi, 1861, p. 321).

The office of reis tended more and more to become the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Sublime Porte, parallel to the post of Kislaya Bey (Interior).

Suppression of the dignity of reis. — The title of reis was suppressed by the khatfi kəmmən of Sultan Mahmud II addressed on Friday 27th Duv 1229 (March 11, 1823) to the grand vezir Mehmed Emin Pasha. The Turkish text will be found in the Silhəmme of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs: the French translation (or at least parts of it) was published in the Moniteur Ottoman of April 23, 1836 (according to A. L. Picard, Lettres sur la Turquie, p. 38, note 1). This document at the same time created two new ministries (μεταβατ) which in memory of their origin remained to the end in the same building as the grand vezirete (cf. Farnabi Ali in Suppl-i. 1, the Ministry of the Interior (originally of civil affairs and umur-em mu'vet, later Falişte), replacing the department of the Kislaya Bey, and 2. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (bəsheməket), replacing that of the reis). The preamble itself that, abandoning the old regulations of the service, the sultan had thought it advisable to create real posts of vezir (μεταβατ) and not honorary ones, but without its being necessary to give the new vezir of foreign affairs the title of paşa (q.v.) “which is mainly a military one”.

Bibliography: By far the most important source is the work known as Selfinet ul-Ku′rā (which consists of: 1. Ahmad Kesmi’s work (Bahgur, G. O. R., p. 300 sq) which contains the biographies of 64 reis down to Râghib Mehmend Efendi (1157 = 1744), and 2. its continuation by Sulaiman Fakıık Efendi which contains the biographies of 30 reis down to Ahmad Wâṣif Efendi at the beginning of the sixteenth century. According to the preface to Sulaiman Fakıık’s (not Fakıık) continuation, Ahmad Kesmi had entitled his work Hikmat ul-Ku′râ: in imitation of the Hikmat ul-Kurâ of Oğhman-ıde Tâbibi, but changed it at the suggestion of RâghibPATHA to Sahifet ul-Ku′râ (the references in the Catalogue of Turkish MSS, in the Bibliothèque Nationale by F. Blochet, n° 158, should be corrected accordingly) The word hikmat apparently makes no sense, that of Hikmat which is usually found in other works (Flügel, Cat., ii. 407, N° 1250; Babinger; Brussal Mehmend Tâhir, iii. 59 note), does not seem correct either. One ought undoubtedly to read Hikmat (which rhymes with the hikmat of the prototype). The Sahifet al-Ku′rā was published by the State Press in Istanbul in 1269.

Also in addition to the references in the text: Mouradjea d’Ohsson, Etat de l’Empire Othoman, vii., 1824, index; Joseph von Hammer, Die osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsregierung, Vienna 1845, ii, index Kanun-nime of Tewket (μεταβατ) Abulrahman Pascha, written in 1087 (1676-1677) and ed. by F. Kropula (M. T. M., p. 508); Esfâd Efendi, Teshkifatı Devlet-i Âlie, p. 85, 123 etc.; Silhəmme-i Nebret-i Khârifie, i year, 1301 (1885). Imprimerie Ebuzya, Istanbul (contains in addition a historical resumé and a chronological list of all the grand viziers and all the reis); Charles Perry, A View of the Levant, particularly of Constantinople etc., London 1743, p. 36. On the şâhih al-divan or reis (or) al-divan, see Kalkashandi, Sham al-Aṣkâr, i. 101 sqq.; vi. 14, 17-18, 50; Massé, Cours de la Chancellerie de l’Empire d’Hun al-Suarfa, in B. I. F. C., xi. 79 sqg. Among the Saldjaks, the offices of şâhih ad-divan and şerâzeh were quite separate: cf. Houtsma, Recueil des Textes..., Selîf, ii. 105.

(REYİO), the name given in Muslim Spain to the administrative circle (kûra) comprising the south of the Peninsula, the capital of which was successively Archidona (Arabic: Ṭugudhâna) and Málaga. The usual Arabic orthography is Xyî; in particular this is the form found in the Muğjam al-Bulûn of Yakît: but some Spanish MS’s, give the true orthography Xyî, more in keeping with the local pronunciation Reyiyo (Raiyu) attested by Ibn Hawkal. It is only, as Dozy thought, a transposition of the Latin reio (no doubt Malacitana reio): the suggestion put forward by Gayangos of a connection with the Persian town-name al-Raib is, of course, untenable.

When the friars in the south of Spain were assigned to the former companions of Balj b. Bahr [q.v.], the district of Reiyiyo was allotted to the duhul of Jordan (al-Sham). During the Emirad caliphate of Cordova, the kûra of Reiyiyo was bounded by those of Cabra and Algeciras in the west, by the Mediterranean in the south and by the kûra of Elvira in the east.


(LEVI-PROVENCAL)

RESHT, first a district, then a town and lastly the capital of the province of Gilan in Persia. As V. Barthold points out (Gilan po romanistenn Tekmauskogo, in Bull. de l’Inst. Cr. d’Hist. et d’Arch., Tiflis 1927, vol. vii.), our
information regarding the history and historical geography of Gilân is so far very scanty. Le Strange's remark that the position of the chief towns of Gilân cannot be exactly given is still true. The Tumanski MS., (tenth century) is the earliest to inform us that before the foundation of towns their names were already in existence as those of districts. In particular seven districts are mentioned in the eastern part of Gilân on this side of the river — Biêpsîh (Islam having penetrated there from the east), and eleven in the western part on the other side of the river — Biêpas. Among the seven eastern districts we find one called Lâhîdîn (i.e. Lâhîdîn) and among the eleven western one that of Resht. The towns of this name did not exist at this time. They are not mentioned, in fact, until the Mongol period.

General. Gilân is now divided into 10 districts (of which five are called Hamse-ye-Tavârlîkh), that of Mawâzî with Resht, capital of the province, being the most important. According to Rabino (1917), the town of Resht has a population of 30,000 and the district of Mawâzî 90,500 out of the total of 339,300 for the province. These figures must have increased by now. Resht, also called Dâr al-Marz or “frontierland”, lies between two small rivers, the Shahrâbâr or Seigilân in the east and the Gowher-rud in the west, which unite and flow into the Bay of Enzelî (now Pehlevi), which is eight miles from the town. The bazaars occupy a considerable part of the centre of the town, which is traversed by dark and narrow streets. Only a few years ago Resht had very few broad streets and was only partly paved. Recently there have been steps taken to improve matters. The town is divided into 7 mahalles: Zâhedân, Mahalle-ye-bâzîr, Khumairân, Khumairân-e-Zâhedân, Uståd Serâ, Çumâr Serâ and Kiâyâh. It has 6,000 houses, 3,300 shops, 20 caravanserais for merchants and 25 for caravans, 40 mosques, 12 sanctuaries, 36 tekkes, 6 medresses, 35 baths, and 7 bridges (all these figures refer to the period before the War). Among the mosques only the Masjîd-i Şâfi, the oldest, seems to be of any interest. Hasan Beg, author of the Ahsan al-Tawârîkh, calls it Masjîd-i Şâfi and adds that when Ismâ’îl Shah fled from Ardabil to Gilân, he spent some time near this mosque. In its courtyard there is a well into which women throw silver in order that their prayers may be granted. The Imám-Zâde Saiyid Abû Dâ’far is the most important sanctuary of Resht, near the governor's palace. The holy man buried there is called 'Abî al-Fattâh. Fûmenî Uståd Dâ'far, whence the name of the quarter Uståd Serâ. The ladies of Resht have always had the reputation of being of easy virtue. According to a poet of the country, Mewlâ Sa'îd Gilânî: “the young women of Resht, like intoxicated picnickers, used to go seeking a purchaser in every bazaar, holding in their hands the knot of their trousers”.

There are in Resht two important clans: the Tâife-ye Hâddîjî Samî (who came originally from Tabriz) and the Al-e Umshe (of very humble local country origin). The language of the common people of Resht is a dialect of Gileti. The upper and middle classes use Persian. Azari-Turkish is also spoken. The inhabitants are all Shi'ites except for a few Bah'î. Gilân was converted to Islam only at the beginning of the tenth century by the 'Alî Imâm Ĥasan b. 'Alî al-Utrush after a popular rising against the Djestâns (cf. Barthold, Istoriya-Geografiskii Ocher Irana, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 156). All the people of the Biepas were of the Ilâh bâl school except the chiefs of Fûmenâ and the inhabitants of Kûstîşâhân (Shâffîs). It was only after the annexation of Gilân to the kingdom of Persia by the Safawis that the people of the Biepas became converted from the Sunna to the Shî'â. According to another story however, Islâm was preached in Dailâm and Gilân in the year 1290 (903) by the Saiyid Nâsr Kapîr, one of the 'Alî pretenders to the caliphate, who belonged to the Zaidi Shî'â, “of which he was one of the learned men and an author”; in this account the conversion to Islam is placed under the auspices of the Shî'â (cf. Shekîr-râm-e gom nâm by S. A. Kasrawî Tabrizî, Teherân 1928, i. 32). The last traces of the religion of Zoroaster have not yet disappeared from Gilân. People look for white cocks because their crowing presages good fortune; the custom is observed of lighting a fire and jumping over it (for šanâme-ye akker-e râd). On the road from Fûmen, about one mile from Resht, a place preserves the name of Atesh-kâde. S. A. Kasrawî (op. cit., p. 31) does not however seem certain that Zoroastrianism was widespread in Gilân.

Generally speaking, the people were indifferent in matters of religion. We may note however that many trees, called saints, fîr or bûsr-wîr, are objects of worship, especially on the part of women (cf. notably: Welân near the Arâk bridge; Çehel Dookhter and Aghâ Bibi Zainab).

Resht is the principal export and import market for trade with Russia. Its importance as the economic centre of Gilân varies with the rise and fall in the silk-culture. Barthold thinks (op. cit.) that the development of urban life and industry in Gilân belongs to a period later than the tenth century. The geographers of the tenth century mention the cultivation of the silkworm and silks only in Tabaristan. In the eleventh century and later the silk of Gilân was particularly famous. At the end of this century, the silk of Gilân, according to Marco Polo, was sought by Genoese merchants, whose vessels first appeared in the Caspian shortly before Marco Polo wrote.

HISTORY. S. A. Kasrawî (op. cit.) gives a sketch of the dynasties of the Djestâns (end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century A.H.), Kângârids (beginning of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century A.H.), and Sâlîrîs (fourth century) who, especially the first, played a certain part in the destinies of Gilân.

In Rabino's work we have a complete historical survey from the Mongol conquest (1307) to the Persian revolution. The Tumanski MS., unknown to Rabino, contains some information about the preceding period.

In it Gilân is described as a populous and wealthy country. All the work was done by women. The men had no occupation except fighting. Throughout Dailâm and Gilân in every village there were one or two fights a day: every village fought with every other. Many people were often killed in a single day. These quarrels and battles went on until the men went to war or died or grew old. When they grew old they became pious and were called mudastîb marâfîk (knowing the customs). In all the districts of Gilân, if any one insulted another or became intoxicated or committed any act that caused injury, he was punished with
The Tumaniski MS. does not give the distances between the towns nor any form of itinerary. The only one known is that of Makdisi who wrote some years later than the author of the Tumaniski MS. The principal town of Gilan at this time was Dušâb. As Rabino points out, the only period of independence in the history of the district of Rešt (Masjed-e Rešt) was between the beginning of the 17th century (706 = 1306–1307) and the end of the ninth (880 = 1475–1476) which was spent in fighting with neighbouring chiefs of Fümen and Íáhidjân. The former were victorious and for a time the Biepas, including Rešt, was under the Ishâqjî dynasty of Fümen. With the coming of sultân Ahmad Khân of Biepas the Láhidjân dynasty won the upper hand. This period lasted from 911 (1506) till 1502 i.e. till the annexation of Gilan to Persia by Shâh 'Abbâs. Among the events of this period was the establishment in Gilân, of which Rešt became the administrative and economic centre, of the “Muscovite Company” founded in 1557 (Anthony Jenkinson, Richard and Robert Johnson), who taking the Russian route sent ten expeditions into Persia between 1561 and 1581. It is to noteworthy that the last independent ruler of Gilân, Ahmad Shâh, sent ambassadors to Moscow to seek help against Shâh 'Abbâs and obtained promises of protection which however came to nothing. The Cossacks at the same time were plundering in Gilân and Rešt and trying to gain the support of the Russian court. The most notable invasion was that of Stenka Razin who sacked Rešt in 1045 (1636). On the 2nd Safar 1082, the day of Stenka's execution, the Persians in Moscow at the time were invited to be present at it (cf. the magazine Kâtesh, No. 12, N.S., Dec. 1, 1921). From 1722 to 1734, Rešt and Gilân were occupied by the Russians (Shipov, then Matuškin) invited by the governor who was threatened by the Afgânjân. In 1734, Gilân was restored to Persia after a treaty which guarantees a Persian testimony in favour of the Russian occupation. For military reasons the Russians cleared the jungle round Rešt.

The history of Gilân and that of Rešt, which has always played a preponderant part in it, merges into the general history of Persia after its annexation. We may however touch on a few points in the very modern period short of which Rabino's work stops. During the Persian Revolution, a body of Social Democrats was sent by the Regional Committee of the Caucasus to Rešt, and there helped in Feb. 1909 to overthrow the authority of the Shâh and to establish a revolutionary committee which elected as governor the Sepêhdâr 'Arâm, who played a prominent part in the history of the period along with Sêrdâr Asad Bakhtyärî (cf. Persia: torki za mas'âl, by Pavlovich and Iran斯基, Moscow 1925). Rešt then became the base of operations of the northern revolutionary army. A few years later, during the Great War, Rešt again attracted attention in connection with the movement of the djengeli, created by Mirzâ Kâûk Khân, the object of which was to fight against foreign occupation of Persian territory. Assisted by German (von Passchen), Turkish and Russian officers, an armed force was organised to oppose the passage of the English troops under General Dunsterville on their way to Bâkû, without much success however (battle of Mendjîl, June 12, 1918). The English were able to force their way through with the help of Bičakchîv's detachment of Cossacks and established a garrison in Rešt. A second battle with the djengeli in the town itself on July 20, 1918 also ended in an English victory. On Aug. 25, peace was signed with Kâûk Khân at Enzelî. At one time, at the end of March 1918, the position of Kâûk Khân was so strong that the capture not only of Kazvin, but even of Teherân was feared. The English Vice-Consul at Rešt, Mr. Maclaren, the manager of the Imperial Bank of Persia in this town, Mr. Oakshott, and Captain Noel of the Intelligence Service were taken prisoners by the djengeljî, the latter being held for five months (cf. The Adventures of Dunsterville by Maj. Gen. L. C. Dunsterville, London 1920).

Rešt again became the arena of the revolutionary movement in 1920. After the capture of Bâkû on April 28, 1920, by the Reds, the White Fleet sought refuge in the port of Enzelî, which was held by the English. Comrade Raskolnikov, commander of the Red Fleet in the Caspian, pursuing the Whites occupied Enzelî on May 18, 1920 and forced the English to beat a hurried retreat. The appearance of Soviet troops at Enzelî encouraged the revolutionary movement in Gilân and on June 4, a revolutionary and anti-English government of Northern Persia was proclaimed at Rešt with Kâûk Khân at its head.

At the first appearance of Red forces at Enzelî and Rešt, the peasants had refused to take the land which the communists proposed to take from the landowners. The peasants feared that the Khàn's would return and make them pay dearly for their expropriation. But at the second occupation (Oct. 1920) of Rešt by the Reds the peasants greeted them frantically. Large numbers of them came among the Red soldiers and said that now they would not deliver rice to the landowners any longer and that they would seize all the harvest. The military situation was however confused. After the evacuation of Enzelî the English at first remained on in expectation of events, but they were forced to retire from Rešt in June, setting fire to all their military stores. A month later they left Mendjîl blowing up the bridge over the Sefid Râh and began to return to Baghâdîd. In the meantime the Teherân Government had sent a military expedition against the revolutionaries in Rešt. After initial successes, the Persian Cossack brigade suffered checks. It was after this that the second occupation of Rešt by the Reds mentioned above took place.

On their side, the English demanded on Oct. 25, 1920 the dismissal of the Russian (White) officers, the instructors of the brigade, who were to be replaced by English. Muṣûl al-Dawâlî's government refused to agree to this and resigned on Oct. 27. It was replaced on Nov. 1 by that of Sepêhdâr, which acceded to the English demands, so that all the armed forces of Persia were now under English control. The latter then on Dec. 19, 1920, sent an ultimatum to the Teherân government ordering the meglîs to be summoned with a view
to the ratification of the Anglo-Persian treaty of Aug. 9, 1919. The English plans were however thwarted by the rapprochement between Persia and the Soviets. On May 20, 1920, Tehran notified Moscow of her recognition of the Soviet Republic of Adharbadijan, and her desire to enter into pourparlers with the R.S.F.S.R. Having reached Moscow at the beginning of November the Persian delegate Mughawar al-Memalek opened negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty with the Soviets. On Nov. 28, Moscow asked Tehran to accept the Soviet envoy, M. Rosthen. After an attempt in Jan. 1921 to regain the position lost in the north of Persia, where the Soviets still had their troops, by inspiring the Persian note of Jan. 23, which demanded that the Soviets should withdraw their forces from Gilan, the English, in view of Moscow's firm refusal, took the first steps to remove their troops from Persia and on Feb. 26, 1921 Persia and the R.S.F.S.R. signed a treaty re-establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries. On April 25, 1921, M. Rosthen came to Tehran and in the course of the year the Soviet and English troops left Persian territory. Gilan and Reht then returned definitely to Persia. The last echoes of the revolution in Gilan were the risings of Kerbeli Ibrahim and of Saiyid Djail in 1921 and 1922.

Bibliography: H. L. Rabino's work, "Les Provinces Caspiennes de la Perse. Le Gilan", in R. M., xxxii, 1915-1916, is authoritative. It contains a very complete bibliography to which we can only add, in addition to a few books and articles mentioned above in the text, a curious brochure entitled "Tavsiye-yi Hafiz", written by Hajiqai Saiyid Mahmud of Reht and published in 1910. It deals with the agrarian system in Gilan. — La domination des Dailamites par V. Minorsky (publ. by the Societe des etudes Iran., No. 3, Paris 1932) may also be mentioned.

(En. Nikiforou)

Resmi, Ahmad, Ottoman statesman and historian. Ahmad b. Ibrahim, known as Resmi, belonged to Rethymno. He was known (epithet?) in Crete and was of Greek descent (cf. J. V. Hammer, G.O.E., vii, 202). He was born in 1112 (1700) and came in 1146 (1733) to Stambul where he was educated, married a daughter of the Reis Efendi Ta'akdji Mustafà and entered the service of the Porte. He held a number of offices, in various towns (cf. Siddilii: Othmanii, ii, 38o sq.) in Safar 1171 (Oct. 1757) he went as Ottoman envoy to Vienna and on his return made a written report of his impressions and experiences. In Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1176 (May 1763) he was again sent to Europe, this time as ambassador to the Prussian court in Berlin. He also wrote a very full account of this mission, which early attracted attention, in the west also, for its views on Prussian policy, its description of Berlin and its inhabitants and all sorts of observations on related topics. After filling a number of other important offices he died on the 2nd Shawwal 1197 (Aug. 31, 1783; on this date cf. Babinger, O. W., p. 309, note 2) in Stambul. His tomb is in the Selimeyquarter of Suctari.

In addition to the descriptions already mentioned of his embassies (scrini etin) to Vienna and Berlin, Ahmad Resmi wrote in connection with the Russo-Turkish war and the peace of Kuchik Kainerde (1760-1774) a treatise entitled "Khallatul-Fitiha", in which as a participant in the campaign and eye-witness, he gave his impressions of this important period in the history of Turkey. Of especial value are his biographical collections, particularly his "Khaliyet Ul-Rus'at" (composed in 1157 = 1744) with the biographies of 64 chancellors (reis efendiler), and his "Humadey (Humadey) Ul-Kaher"a, in which he gives the lives of the chief eunuchs of the Imperial Harem (hizir aghalari).

Of a similar nature is his continuation (written in 1772 = 1766) of the "deaths" (efeyzet) of MeHmed Emin b. Hajiqai MeHmed called Alay-Beyl-zade, in which he gives in twelve lists the deaths of famous men and women (cf. the accurate list of contents in J. V. Hammer, G.O.E., xi, 137 sq., No. 14). He also wrote several other works on geology and proverbs. The reports of his embassies are available in numerous manuscripts (cf. the list in Babinger, O. W., p. 314, to which should be added: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. Or. 4° 1502, fo. 27b to 46b [inclusive]. Paris Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc No. 510 [7], Paris, Cl. Huart Coll.), printed editions and translations, which are listed by Babinger, O. W., p. 311.

To these is to be added the Polish translation Podre Rezmi Ahmed-Efendego Po Polski z posielst-wo igie do Prus 1177 (according to Wasiq, Tarik, i, 239 sq.) in J. S. Siekowski, Collectanea z Dziejow Turczech, vol. ii, Warsaw 1825, p. 222-289.


(En. Baringer)

Rewani, an Ottoman poet. His real name was Illya or Sheyla and he belonged to Adrianoople. He is said to have taken his pen-name of Rewani from the river Tanjia which flowed past (rewan) his garden. He entered the service of Sultan Bayazid II (1481-1512) in Stambul and was sent by him as administrator of the "muk" (annual sum for the poor of Mecca and Medina, to the holy cities to distribute the money. He embellished a part of it however and on the accusation of the Meccans his salary was stopped; a malady of the eyes, which then affected Rewani, was described by a poet hostile to him as the just punishment of God, whereas upon Rewani answered him, also in verse, and calmly confessed: "He who has honey licks his fingers". He then fled to the court of Prince Selim in Trebizond and entered his service. But he had to disappear from here also as he had committed some indiscretion and his property was confiscated (some sources put his appointment to the muk at this date); he was however pardoned by Selim and henceforth served him all the more faithfully. When Selim in 918 (1512) came to Stambul to dethrone his father Bayazid, Rewani is said at the last decisive council of war to have thrown his turban in the air with joy and to have praised the day. After Selim's accession he was appointed superintendent of the kitchen (mash'ak emini), then entrusted with the administration of the Aya Sofia and of the hot baths (kahfiyata) in Brusa. He built a mosque in the Kik Cheme quarter of Stambul which was called after him and he was buried there on his death in 530 (1523).

Rewani left a diwan and a methkenu entitled "Efret-nenni or Kik-i Wansli. In the still unprinted methkenui, which is not very long, he describes the drinking bouts of his time in all
brought it within the range of Islamic expeditions on several occasions.

In the first century of the Hujra, the Caliph Mu’awiyah [q.v.] sent a fleet under the command of Djasada b. Abi Umayya al-Qadi to invade Rhodes. The date is variously placed in 52 and 53 (672–73) (see Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, for this variance in the sources). Little is known about this early expedition, except that the Arabs founded a short-lived settlement, which was evacuated in 69 (679–680) by the order of the second Umayyad Caliph Yazid [q.v.]. The island was thus recovered by the Byzantine Empire in whose history the sources of the Arab occupation was long remembered by the complete destruction and sale of the famous bronze ‘Colossus of Rhodes’ to a Jewish merchant of Emesa. The metal is said to have amounted to 880 camel-loads.

In 1308 or 1310 A.D., during the reign of Andronicus II Palaeologus, Rhodes was seized by the Knights Hospitallers who had been expelled from ‘Akka in 1291 by Sulthan Khahlil [q.v.], son of Kali’un. The Order of Saint John of Jerusalem now came to be known as the Knights of Rhodes, under whose rule the island became a thorn in the side of Islam as one of the strongest outposts of Latin Christianity in the Levant. Thence the Knights played a prominent part in most of the forthcoming crusades against Turkey and Egypt, notably in the capture of Smyrna in 1344, the sack of Alexandria in 1365 and in the Crusade of Nikephoros [q.v.] in 1396. The second of these attacks determined the Egyptians to start preparations of counter-crusades against Cyprus and Rhodes. Three naval expeditions in 1424, 1425 and 1426 resulted in the annexation of Cyprus as a tributary state to Egypt.

The Mamluks then turned their plans to the conquest of Rhodes during the reign of Çakmak. In 1440, they manned a flotilla of 15 galleys with 200 regulars and several hundred volunteers. These sailed from Damietta to Cyprus for revictualling and to ‘Alaya in Asia Minor, where its Muslim Amir reinforced them with more warriors and four galleys, then direct to Rhodes. The Knights were, however, prepared for the attack, and, after a few skirmishes, the Mamluk fleet retreated under cover of night. In 1443, another fleet sailed from Damietta to Bairitt, Tripoli, Larnaca, Limassol and Adala to collect free provisions from subject and friendly states. Their first objective was the little island of Châteauroux or Castellar, known in the contemporary Arabic sources as Kasjitti al-Ra’d. This island belonged to the Knights and the Egyptians had no difficulty in reducing it. Afterwards they returned to Damietta owing to the approach of winter. In 1444, a third and more elaborate expedition was launched against Rhodes. The Egyptian fleet, carrying no less than a thousand Mamluks, sailed from Damietta to Tripoli and direct to Rhodes. This time they succeeded in landing on the Island and in setting siege to the city of Rhodes for a period of forty days, during which they pillaged all the neighbouring villages. Finally, the Knights sailed from the beleaguered town and took the offensive. Thus taken by surprise, the Egyptian army sustained considerable losses and sailed back to Damietta.

The success of the Knights in the repulse of so strong an enemy as Mamluk Egypt may be ascribed to three main causes: first, the system...
of espionage which the Order maintained in all hostile countries in order to keep their headquarters in perfect readiness for effective action at the appropriate moment; second, the great strength of the fortification of Rhodes which was made possible by its prosperity as one of the chief centres of trade in the Levant; and third, the nature of the military training of the Knights, their unity and their extraordinary valour in battle. Peace was eventually established between Egypt and Rhodes through the mediation of Jacques Cœur, the great French merchant prince of the fifteenth century, who was in favour at the court of the Sultan. The task of a decisive counter-crusade against Rhodes remained for the Ottoman Sultans. Muḥammad II besieged the capital with some slender measure of success in 1480, but it was not till the reign of Sulaimān the Magnificent [q.v.] that the Knights were finally overthrown after one of the most heroic defences ever known. On December 24, 1522, the island became the seat of a Turkish Paša, and remained under Ottoman sovereignty until it was captured by Italy during the war of 1912 and finally passed to Italian rule by virtue of the Treaty of Lausanne (July 24, 1923).


(Â. S. Âtiva)

In the year 1912, during the war between Turkey and Italy, the Italians occupied the island of Rhodes and the Southern Sporades and held them till 1923 when Turkey (treaty of Lausanne) renounced all claim to Rhodes and the islands, which are now under the sovereignty of Italy, and constitute the "Possedimento delle Isole italiane dell' Egeo"; the principal islands are 14 in number; we give them here with their historical Turkish names which are really Greek, in brackets (with the exception of Indjiri): Rodi (Rados), Calchi (Karki and Khaki), Calino (Kalimnos), Caso (Kashti), Castelrosso (Kastelorizo, Meyis), Coo (İskonkoy), Lero (Leros), Lisso (Lipos), Nissiro (Nisos, Indjiri), Patmo (Patmos), Piscopi (Ptikopis), Tilos (Eliyaki), Scarpanto (Kerpe), Simi (Sumbeki), Stamplia (Astropalia).

The extent of the "Possedimento" is 2,697 km. and the total population 130,855 (census of April 21, 1931) of whom 54,818 are in the island of Rhodes. The inhabitants are distributed as regards language and religion as follows: 104,485 Greek Orthodox speaking Greek, 8,276 Muslims speaking Turkish, 4,481 Jews speaking Spanish Hebrew, 8,000 Roman Catholics speaking Italian. The Muslims are in the islands of Rhodes and Coo. Like the rest of the population, the Muslims are exempted from military service; they have elementary schools, a medrese in Rhodes, special tribunals at Rhodes and Coo for questions of private law.

Turkish and Muḥammadan monuments. The Turks did not modify very much the topography of Rhodes; at most they did something to intensify an appearance already generally oriental; they turned the churches into mosques and built new ones; the most remarkable are the mosque of İbrahim Paşa (947 = 1540—1541), the mosque of Redjeb Paşa (996 = 1587—1588), the mosque of Murad Re'si (celebrated re'si killed in a naval battle off Cypria in 1609), built by Abū Bâkî Paşa in 1604 (1636—1637) and repaired by Muradībî Hūsan Bey in 1212 (1717—1718), the mosque of Sulṭān Muṣṭafâ (1178 = 1764). The mosque of Sulṭān Sulaimān is modern.

We may also mention the library at Rhodes which contains Arabic, Persian and Turkish MSS., founded as a waqf between 1761—1792 and 1799 by the Rhodian Ḥâfiz Ahmad Agha.

The Muslim cemeteries, which lie under the walls of the fortress, go back in part to the siege of 1522; there are many tombs of men of note who died in captivity or exile in Rhodes in the enclosure of the tekhre of Murad Re'si; amongst them we may mention: Djiānī Girāy Khān (d. 1636), Shaḥīn Girāy Khān (killed 1640), Saʿdēt Girāy Khān (d. 1695); Sāfī (the pretended son of Sultan, Sâd of Persia, d. 1175 = 1755—1756), the poet Ḥāmeth (d. 1182 = 1768—1769), the grand vizier Vūsaf Paşa (killed in 1715), the general 'Abd al-Kurîm Paşa (d. 1302 = 1884—1885).
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RIBA (A.), lit. increase, as a technical term, usury and interest, and in general any unjustified increase of capital for which no compensation is given. Derivatives from the same root are used in other Semitic languages to describe interest.

1. Transactions with a fixed time limit and payment of interest, as well as speculations of all kinds, formed an essential element in the highly developed trading system of Mecca (cf. Lammens, La Mequée à la veille de l’histoire, p. 139 sqq., 155 sqq., 213 sqq.). Among the details given by the Muslim sources, we may believe at least the statement that a debtor who could not repay the capital (money or goods) with the accumulated interest at the time it fell due, was given an extension of time in which to pay, but at the same time the sum due was doubled. This is clearly referred to in two passages in the Koran (Sura ii. 130: xxx. 39) and is in keeping with a still usual practice. As early as Sura xxx. 39 of the third Meccan period (on the dating cf. Noelle-Schwall, Geschichte des Qorans, i.) the Koran contrasts riba with the obligation to pay zakat but without directly forbidding it: "Whatever ye give in usury to gain interest from men's substance shall not bear interest with Allah, but what ye give as zakat in seeking the face of Allah ye shall gain double". The express prohibition follows in Sura ii. 130 (Medina, obviously earlier than the following passage): "Believers, do not the riba with continual doubling: fear God, perhaps it will go well with you". This prohibition had to be intensified in Sura ii. 275-280 (evidently of the earlier Medinene period, cf. on the following passage): "Those who deviate riba shall only rise again as one whom Satan strikes with his touch; this because they say, 'selling is like usury', but Allah has permitted selling and forbidden usury. He therefore who receives a warning from his Lord and abstains shall have pardon for what is past and his affair is with Allah: but they who relapse to usury are people of Hell, they shall remain in it for ever. Allah abhors usury and makes alms bring interest: Allah loveth not sinful unbelievers... Believers, fear Allah and remit the balance of the riba if ye be believers. But if ye do not, prepare for war from Allah and his apostle. If ye repent, ye shall receive your capital without doing an injustice or suffering injustice. If any one is in difficulty, let there be a delay till he is able to pay, but it is better for you to remit if ye be wise". To evade the dogmatic difficulty of an eternal punishment for the sin of a believer, the passage in question (already presupposed in Tabari) has been interpreted to mean that by remission is meant the holding lawful and not the taking of interest; in any case the Koran regards riba as a practice of unbelievers and demands as a test of belief that it should be abandoned. It comes up again in Sura iv. 161 (of the period between the end of the year 3 and the end of the year 5; this also gives a clue to the date of the preceding passage) in a passage which sums up the reproaches levelled against the Jews: "and because they take riba, while it was forbidden them and they knew not the substance of the people". The fact that the principal passages against interest belong to the Medina period and that the Jews are reproached with breaking the prohibition, suggests that the Muslim prohibition of riba owes less to conditions in Mecca than to the Prophet's closer acquaintance with Jewish doctrine and practice in Medina. In the later development of the teaching on the subject as we find it in tradition, Jewish influence is in any case undeniable (cf. Juyroux, Handling, p. 286).

2. The traditions give varying answers to the question what forms of business come under the Kur'anic prohibition of riba, none of which can be regarded as authoritative. The ignorance of the correct interpretation is emphasised in a tendentious-tradition, obviously put into circulation by interested individuals (the tradition is probably older than Lammens, op. cit., p. 214, thinks); according to this view, the principal passage in Sura ii. is the latest in the whole Koran, which the Prophet could not expound before his death. That the rigid prohibition of usury in Muhammadan law only developed gradually is clear from many traditions. Alongside of the view repeatedly expressed, but also challenged, that riba consists only in (the increase of substance in) a business agreement with a fixed period (naz'a, naqiva, dain) we have the still more distinct statement that there is no riba if the transfer of ownership takes place immediately (ya'dan bi-yad). But even in arrangements with a time limit, a number of traditions presuppose a general ignorance of the later statutes: for example we are told that in Basra under Rabi' II gold was sold on credit for silver (this may have an anti-Umayyad bias—cf. below on Mudawwiyah—but it is illuminating); but at a later date such forms of the traditions against riba were to some extent dropped. What was generally understood in the earliest period as the riba forbidden in the Kur'an, seems only to have been interest on loans (chiefly of money and foodstuffs); anything that goes beyond this is to be regarded as a later development. The reason for such prohibitions is at different times said to be the fear of riba and sometimes we have underlying the recognition that there is no tradition of the Prophet relating to this. This is also expressed in the form that nine-tenths of the permitted is renounced or that riba was conceived as going as far as ten times the capital. The view which later became authoritative is laid down in a group of traditions of which one characteristic example is as follows: "gold for gold, silver for silver, wheat for wheat, barley for barley, dates for dates, salt for salt, the same thing for the same thing, like for like, measure for measure; but if these things are different, sell them as you please if it is (only) done measure for measure". Another common tradition expressly forbids the exchange of different quantities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. below).
Other traditions demand equality of quantity even in the sale of manufactured precious metals. This last case seems to have been especially discussed, and on more than one occasion Ma‘awiyah appears as champion of the opposite view and practice (this again has a distinctly anti-Umayyad bias). Particularly conscientious people went even further in their limitation of ribā than the generality and would only exchange wheat for barley in equal quantities. Still stricter was the view that the exchange of even the same quantities of the same thing, especially of precious metals, was ribā. This view must be held older than a difference from the usual opinion (e.g. Muslim, Bāb bāi ‘irāq mithallā hamīdīhū), which is based on the secondary interpretation of an already recognized tradition, which obviously only forbade the exchange of different kinds of quantities of the same thing but of different quality (cf. above). This same general prohibition of exchange is also given for dates. The question whether one party to an agreement can voluntarily give the other a bonus, is denied for an exchange, but affirmed for a loan. The reduction of the amount of the debt if the loan is voluntarily paid before it falls due, is sometimes approved as the opposite of ribā, sometimes disapproved, sometimes forbidden as being equivalent to ribā; in any case it is clear that the practice existed. On the sale of an animal for an animal on credit, opinion is also not unanimous. Numerous traditions forbid ribā without defining it more closely; the Prophet is said to have uttered this prohibition at his farewell pilgrimage (scarce historically). Ribā is one of the gravest sins. Even the least of its many forms is as bad as incest and so on. All who take part in transactions involving ribā are cursed, the guilty are threatened with hell, various kinds of punishment are described; in this world also gains from ribā will bring no good. In spite of all this tradition foresees that ribā will prevail.

In connection with ribā tradition mentions various antiquated forms of sale of special kinds, like muhāsala, muhābara, muhāhama etc., which concern the exchange of different stages in the manufacture or development of the same thing, or of different qualities, and which are forbidden: an exception is made, obviously because of its undeniable practical and social necessity, of what is known as ‘arija (plur. ‘arāyā), fresh dates on trees intended to be eaten, which it is permitted to exchange in small quantities for dated dates.

3. While the existence of the Kur‘ānic prohibition of ribā has never been doubted, the difference of opinion that finds expression in tradition regarding the relevant facts is continued in the earliest stage of development of Muḥammadan law. Unanimity prevails regarding the main lines of the limitations to be imposed upon the exchange of goods capable of ribā (māl ribāt); it is only permitted if transfer of ownership takes place at once and, so far as goods of the same kind are concerned, only in equal quantities. In the case of a loan it is forbidden to make a condition that a larger quantity shall be returned without regard to the kind of article. Gold and silver are generally regarded as māl ribāt (only quite exceptionally are coins of small denomination included). All the greater are the differences of opinion as to what things outside of the precious metals are liable to the ribā ordinances. In isolated cases one still finds views that show themselves uninfluenced in principle by the authoritative group of traditions (cf. above), e.g. when everything realisable is subjected to the ribā ordinances (Ibn Kāsīm) or all business dealings in things of the same kind (Ibn Sīrīn, Ḥammād) or when everything liable to zakāt is considered capable of ribā (Rāshīd b. ‘Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān). Other opinions differ in the treatment of property capable of ribā from that group of traditions, although it is not known what they understand by this; possibly if at an exchange of the same kind of thing not equality of quantity but equality of value in two quantities is demanded (Ḥasan al-Ḥaṣrī) or equality of quantity also in the exchange of different kinds apparently within a limited circle of goods capable of ribā (Ṣa‘īd b. ʿUṭubār). The old interpretation that there is no ribā if the transfer of possession takes place at once is ascribed to ‘Aḥmad b. Ṭalha and the jurists of Medina. The views of most authorities however and in particular those which survive later in the law schools assume the literal acceptance of the text of that group of traditions and differ only in its interpretation. Thus there are mentioned as precurors of the later Zāhirī doctrine: Tāwūs, Māsūk, al-Šāhī, Kātāda, ʿOthmān al-Battāt; as precurors of the Ḥanafī view: al-Zuḥrī, al-Ḥakam, Ḥammād (cf. however above), Sufyān al-Ḥaṣrī; as precurors of the earlies view of al-Shāhī: ʿUṣayn b. ʿUṣayn, al-Muṣāniyyah and others; as precurors of his later view: al-Zuḥrī (cf. however above) and Yaḥyā b. ʿUṣayn. On the question whether a loan can be paid in another kind is hotly disputed if defects are revealed in an exchange of māl ribāt after it has changed hands, there are old differences of opinion.

4. In the above mentioned group of traditions the following goods in addition to gold and silver are expressly mentioned as bearing the prohibition of ribā at their exchange: wheat, barley, dates and salt (sometimes also raisins, butter and oil). The Zāhirīs, as a result of their refusal on principle to accept analogy (ṣıṣa), assume that the prohibition applies only to the six things especially named (the other kinds are rejected as not well attested). The other schools of law, on the other hand, consider the kinds mentioned in tradition only as examples of the variety of things that come under māl ribāt, but differ from one another in their lists of these things. According to the Ḥanafīs and Zaidīs (also al-Awzaʿī), gold and silver represent examples of the class of things defined by weight (māṣīh) and the four other things those sold by measure (naqīl). The Imāmī teaching is practically the same. According to the Mālikīs and Shāfīʿis, gold and silver represent the class of precious metals and the four other things the class of foodstuffs: the latter, in the Mālikī view, including actual eatables so far as they can be preserved, according to the older view of al-Shāfīʿi, provisions which are sold by weight and measure; according to his later view, which is also that of his school, foodstuffs without any qualification. The teaching of the Ḥanbalis corresponds to that of the Ḥanafīs; as regards the "four kinds", two further opinions of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal are handed down which correspond to the two views held by al-Shāfīʿi. In these, wheat and barley are regarded as two different kinds by the Ḥanafīs, the Shāfīʿīs and the better known tradition of the Ḥanbalis (as well as Zāhirīs, Zaidīs and Imāmīs); as one kind
according to the Hanbalis (also according to al-
Lahbi b. Salih and al-Awza'i). The Hanafis and the
Imāmis, in contrast to the other schools, are content
so far as it is not a question of the exchange of
precious metals, with fixing the quantities, and do
not demand actual change of ownership during the
negotiation (mādjel). The Zāhiris, in the strict inter-
pretation of the text of one tradition, in every case
demand a change of ownership in the fullest sense at
once. The sale of fresh dates for dried dates is
forbidden by all schools except the Hanafis on the
authority of one tradition, the bārāʾī of 'Arīṣ on the
other hand is not permitted by the Hanafis, but regulated by the other schools, without any
uniformity: as regards exchange of the same material in
different stages of manufacture there are many
differences of opinion. As regards the exchange of
goods of which the kind which are not māl
sahari, the difference of quantity is generally
permitted, postponement (waṣtra, nasr) of the
single payment still forbidden by the Hanafis and
Zaidis but permitted by the other schools (with
differences in detail). At the sale of wares, even
of those which are māl sabari, for precious metal,
the payment at later date (sulam) and sale on
credit (bait al-ʿinā) with postponement of delivery
or of payment is permitted. The apparent contra-
duction of analogy in the sulam, which forms a
type of transaction by itself, has given rise to dis-
cussions on principle. The postponement of both
sales of the transaction is regarded on the authority
of a tradition as entirely forbidden in all agreements;
sales or exchange.

5. The prohibition of ribā plays a considerable part in the system of Muhammadan law. The
structure of the greater part of the law of contract
is explained by the endeavour to enforce pro-
hibition of ribā and masir (i.e. risk; q.v.) to the
last detail of the law (Bengtsson, in bil., xiv 79). Ribā in a loan exists not only when one
interests upon the repayment of a larger quantity,
but if any advantage at all is demanded. Therefore
even exchange (zamānda) is sometimes actually
forbidden (as by the Šafiis) because the vendor,
who is regarded as the creditor, reaps the advantage
of avoiding cost of transport. This did not prevent
the wide spread of this arrangement in the Arabic
middle ages and its influence upon European
money-lending. But they were always conscious
that a direct breach of the prohibition of ribā was
a deadly sin. Fears Muslims to this day therefore
not infrequently refuse to take bank interest. The
importance of the prohibition of ribā on the one
hand deeply affecting everyday life and the require-
ments of commerce on the other have given rise to
a number of methods of evasion. Against some
of these there is nothing formally to object from the
standpoint of the law; they are therefore given
in many law-books and expressly said to be per-
mitted. The Šafiis, the later Hanafis and the
Imāmis have recognised such methods of evasion
while the Mālikis, the Hanbalis and the Zaidis
reject them. The recognition of these methods of
evasion is not contrary to the strict enforcement of
the prohibition of the ghuk. The inner signifi-
cance of decrees of the divine law naturally
cannot be understood by the mind of man. This
is shown in the case of ribā in the limitation to
certain kinds of goods. The Zāhiris are thus among
the most energetic defenders of evasions of the
prohibition of ribā. Their line of argument is based
not only on their formal negative rejection of
deduction by analogy but also upon their positive
estimation under the intention underlying the evasions.
One of the oldest transactions of the Qurašids
against which several traditions are already directed, is the double contact of sale (from one of its elements it
is called bāt al-ʿinā, credit sale par excellence); one
sells to someone who wants to lend money
at interest something against the total sum of capital
and interest which are to be due at a fixed date,
and at the same time buys the article back for the
capital which is at once handed over. This
transaction was taken over in medieval Europe
under the name of mahātra (from the Ar. musāhara;
cf. Jayniboll, Handleding, p. 289, note 1, and
E. Bassi, in Rivista di storia del diritto italiano,
iv., part 2). Another method of evasion consists of
handing over to the creditor the use of a thing as
interest by a fictitious agreement to sell or
to pledge. All these practices are still in use and
in spite of the prohibition of ribā money-lending is
a flourishing business in most Muslim countries
(50% is often regarded as moderate interest).
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(JOSEPH SCHACHT)

RIBĀ (A.), a fortified Muhammadan
monastery. Of the various explanations that
have been given of this word from the root root
r-b-a: "to bind, attach," the most reasonable is
that which refers to the Kurān, viii. 62: "Prepare
against them (the enemies of Allah) all that ye
possess of strength and places for horses . . . ." (min
ribā 'l-khail). The ribāt is originally the place
where the mounts are assembled and hobbled to
be kept in readiness for an expedition. Ribāṭ also has the closely related meanings of relay of horses for a courier, caravanseri. The word however was early applied to an establishment at once religious and military which seems quite specifically Muhammadan.

The institution of the ribāṭ is connected with the duty of the holy war [see MAHD], the defence of the lands of Islam and their extension by force of arms. The Byzantine empire was acquainted with the fortified monastery, like Mandrakon built at Carthage near the sea, mentioned by Procopius; but it seems doubtful if the monks living in it played any military part. The monks' hierarchical occupants of the ribāṭ are essentially fighters for the faith. The ribāṭ are primarily fortresses, places of concentration of troops at exposed points on the Muhammadan frontier. Like western castles, they offer a refuge to the inhabitants of the surrounding country in time of danger. They serve as watch-towers from which an alarm can be given to the threatened populace and to the garrisons of the frontier and interior of the country who could support the efforts of the defenders. The structure of the ribāṭ therefore consisted of a fortified surrounding wall with living rooms, magazines of arms and storehouses for provisions and a tower for signalling. This architectural scheme, the development of which will be indicated below, was of course often very summarily treated. The ribāṭ in many cases was reduced to a watch-tower and a little fort like those the Byzantines built on their frontiers. This explains the considerable number of ribāṭs mentioned by the geographers. We are told that in Transoxiana alone there were no less than 10,000 (Ibn Khallikân, transl. de Slane, ii, 159, No. 3). The coasts were also amply provided for. There were ribāṭs all along the coast of Palestine and of Africa. The fire-towers, attached to the ribāṭ or isolated, enabled messages, we are told, to be sent in one night from Alexandria to Ceuta. This is clearly an exaggeration. Nevertheless we may note a fairly rapid system of signalling and the mention of Alexandria, the pharos of which seems to have served as a ribāṭ. The Spanish coast also had its ribāṭs, as had the frontier against the Christian kingdoms, especially after the coming of the Almoravids, which saw an intensification of the jihād. For Sicily, Ibn Hawkal gives some curious information about the ribāṭs near Palermo and we know the little town of Rabato in the island of Gozo in the Maltese archipelago.

Devotion to religion stimulated individuals to multiply their foundations, notably in Ifriqiya in the vicinity of towns like Tripolis and Sfax. It was a work of piety to build a ribāṭ at one's own expense or strengthen its defences. It was equally meritorious to urge men to go there to serve the cause of Islam, to revictual the garrison, lastly and above all to go there oneself. For the coast of Palestine, al-Mukaddasi tells us of another use of the ribāṭ equally pleasing to the piets. Their fires were used to signal the approach of Christian vessels bringing Muslim prisoners whose exchange had been arranged. Everyone endeavoured to take part in this according to his means.

The building of the large ribāṭs and of many of the smaller ones was naturally the task of the sovereigns of the country. In Ifriqiya it was that of Monastir [q.v.] built by the Abbasid governor Hāvjâma b. A'yân (179 = 795). The third (ninth) century was the golden age: the Aghlabids all along the eastern coasts multiplied ribāṭs in the strict sense and muhras; this word means a fortified area containing a small garrison or a watch-tower. Monastir retained the pre-eminencc which the Prophet himself is said to have foretold for it. In the xiiith century the dead were brought from al-Mahdiya to enjoy the blessing of being buried there. But the ribāṭ of Sīs founded by the Aghlabid Ziyâdat Allah in 206 (821) had assumed considerable importance. We know that Sīs was the port from which the troops embarked for the conquest of Sicily. Compared with the muhras, the inhabitants of the ribāṭ were essentially threatened by attacks of the Mām or which was the base for expeditions across the sea, the rest of the Barbary coast was less well supplied. There were however ribāṭs on the coast of the extreme Maghrib, at Nakīr and Arzila to prevent raiding by the Norman pirates, and at Salē to facilitate the war against the Barghawâṭa [q.v.] heretics.

If the majority of the ribāṭs were official foundations, the service done by the combatants in them does not seem to have been in any way compulsory. The men of the ribāṭ, the murābiṭûn, were volunteers, pious individuals who had taken a vow to devote themselves to the defence of Islam. Some may have entered the ribāṭ like a monastery, to end their days in it, but the great majority only stayed in them for longer or shorter periods, and the garrisons were changed completely several times a year. In the ribāṭ of Arzila, this change in the garrison took place with the festival of Az Hurrâ (10th Maharram), the beginning of Ramadan and al-Īd al-Kabîr. An important fair was held on the occasion. In case of alarm the garrisons were reinforced by able-bodied men from the country round, summoned by the beating of drums (Palestine, according to al-Muqaddasi).

The ribāṭ was spent in military exercises and on guard, but also in devotional exercises. The marabouts prepared themselves for martyrdom by long prayers under the direction of a venerated shâikh. The traveller Ibn ʿAqil reveals a dark side to this edifying picture. Speaking of the ribāṭs of Palermo in the fourth (tenth) century, he tells us that "they were the rendezvous of the bad characters of the country who thus found a means of livelihood outside of regular society and at the expense of the pious and charitable".

The double character — military and religious — of the life of the marabouts found expression in the architecture of the old ribāṭs that have survived. Tunisia has preserved those of Monastir and Sīs. The first is still very imposing but the frequent restorations have complicated the original plan. The second which is simple may be taken as typical. With its high square wall flanked with semi-circular towers at the corners and the middle of the sides, it recalls the Byzantine forts of the country. The only entrance was by one of the salients in the middle of the wall. A staircase went down in the interior into the central court surrounded by covered galleries and very simple cells. The first storey, reached by two staircases, also consisted of cells on three sides of the court. Along the fourth side was a hall with a mihrâb. This was the oratory of the ribāṭ. The khibla wall was pierced with embrasures. On the level of the
terrace which are above this first storey, is the door of the signal tower, cylindrical in form, which rises from the square base of a salient at one corner and dominates the fortress from a height of about 60 feet. A little dome which also rises above the terraces crown, as in the mosque of the period, the square area in front of the minbar in the oratory.

The ribāṭ of Sūs takes us back to the heroic times when the institution had distinctly a warlike character and these frontier posts played a strategic role on the borders of the lands of Islam. It retained this character in the xii-th century and its architecture, the Maghrīb, with which the Christians in Spain kept alive the tradition of the djihād. We know that a ribāṭ built on an island in the Lower Seuqal was the starting place of the career of the Lamtūna Berbers and gave them the name of Almoravids (al-muḥābībīn) under which they became famous in history [see ALMORAVIDS]. The Almohads who succeeded them had also their ribāṭs, two of which at least are worth mentioning. The ribāṭ of Tàzā [q.v.] was fortified in 528 (1135) by 'Abd al-Mu'min at the time when he was conducting against the Almoravids a campaign which had all the appearance of a djihād. The Ribāṭ al-Fāṭy, the present name of which is that of the town of Rabat [q.v.], was, if not the port of embarkation, at least the great camp of concentration for the armies preparing to cross to Spain. The prestige of this Almohad foundation survived the dynasty which built it. Rabat, or rather the adjoining little town of Shalla, also regarded as a ribāṭ, was the necropolis of the Marinid princes, who in being buried there hoped to share in the merit of the warriors of the faith.

In the xiii century to give warning of landings by the Christians on the coast, mābrāz and signal towers were still being built "to serve as ribāṭs." Ibn Marāqī, the historiographer of the Marinid Abu 'l-Hasan, who tells of them, says however that these posts were occupied by paid soldiers. They were not true ribāṭs, the garrison of which consisted of volunteers. If however we find down to the xv century, in the extreme Maghrib, a ribāṭ like that of Asīr playing a military part in the struggle with the Portuguese, in the east, in the lands where the infidels no longer threatened Islam, the institution had changed its character or rather the ascetic discipline and the pious recitations which were the regular practices in the old ribāṭs had entirely taken the place of military exercises. From the xiv (xvii) century or perhaps even earlier, the development of mysticism and the grouping of the Sūfis into communities gave these barracks a new raison d'etre by making them monasteries. From Persia, where it originated, this evolution of the ribāṭs rapidly spread through the Muslim world. In the east the ribāṭ merged into the Persian ḥāmāstāb, Ibn Dżybar (ed. Wright and de Goeje, p. 243) refers to a ḥāmāstāb founded by Sūfis which was also called a ribāṭ, at Rās al-‘Ain to the north of the Syrian desert. When however a writer like Ibn al-Shīrīn describing Aleppo seems to distinguish the ḥāmāstāb from the ribāṭ, the difference between them escapes us. It may be supposed that the ḥāmāstāb were inhabited by hermits residing in the mountains, who spent their whole lives there and that the ribāṭs, as before, received devout men for limited periods, but one cannot assert definitely that this was the distinction.

In any case the four ribāṭs within the city of Aleppo (one attached to a mābrāz and the mausoleum of its founder with Ḥurān readers and Sūfis) had no longer anything of a military character. It was the same with the two ribāṭs of Mecca mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭāt. In Cairo the only inscription found by Van Berchem in which a ribāṭ is mentioned is that of the convent of Malik Ashraf Ḥanāl (860 = 1455).

In Barbary, which the wave of eastern mysticism had reached in the xii-xiii century, the term ribāṭ was likewise retained but applied to the ṣawīyā [q.v.] in which ascetics gathered round a shāhiğ or a shuyukh. At this period, the division of the djihād connection makes a distinction which nevertheless still remains obscure. Speaking of the ṣawīyās founded by Abu 'l-Hasan, his master, he tells us first that Ḥanāstāb, a Persian word, has the same meaning as ribāṭ and adds: "In the terminology of the fiqīrs, one understands by ribāṭ the act of devoting oneself to the holy war and to guarding [the frontiers]. Among the Sūfis it means on the contrary the place in which a man shuts himself up to worship the divinity". This last use of the word seems to be the usual one in his time. The ribāṭ al-‘Ubdīb is the group of pious foundations near Tiemcen that have grown up around the tomb of the famous mystic Shīrīb ‘Ubd al-Mu’mīn. The ribāṭ of Tāskelelt to the south west of Oran is dedicated to a saint of the Banū Iznāsen; the ribāṭ of Tāferjast on the borders of the Wādi Sūh contains the tomb of the famous Sūfī Shīrīb Ibb-al-Mu’mīn. The ribāṭ of Tāskelelt to the south west of Oran is dedicated to a saint of the Banū Iznāsen; the ribāṭ of Tāferjast on the borders of the Wādi Sūh contains the tomb of the famous Sūfī Shīrīb Ibb-al-Mu’mīn.

With this erroneous use of the old Arabic word we might connect the parallel change undergone by the word marābit (marabout). It is applied to a saint, an individual who by his own merits or the mystic initiation which he had received or his relationship with a ṣawī [q.v.] enjoys the veneration of those around him.

In Muslim Spain, the last land of the djihād, we may suppose that the ribāṭs continued to support the successive frontiers which the "reconquista" imposed on the lands of Islam; but to be certain we must wait until the study of the texts and the enquiry being conducted by F. Hernandez and H. Terrasse into the military architecture of Muslim Spain give us precise details regarding the date of the castles and their object. The evolution in meaning of the word ribāṭ would lead one to think it had ceased to mean a fortress. Among the Arabic authors of Spain and al-Masjāri as among the ṣawīs mentioned by Ibn Marāqī, ribāṭ is often used to mean a holy war, generally defensive, and it passed into Spanish in the form rebato as j. Oliver Asín has shown with the meaning of "sudden attack executed by a body of horsemen in keeping with Muslim tactics". If the Arabic term had lost its original meaning, however, another word derived from it was commonly used in a slightly different meaning. Spain saw the ribāṭs multiplying and their memory is preserved in place-names in the forms Rápita, Rávita, Rabida. The word ribaṭ was also known in Barbary. It meant "a hermitage to which a holy man retired and where he lived surrounded by his disciples and his religious servitors" (cf. Mağd, transl. Colin, p. 240 and the article ZAWĪVA). Everything points to its having been the same in the Peninsula. The multiplication of ribāṭs in Spain and their possible confusion with ribāṭs are
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connected with the great movement of mystic piety which, starting in Persia, had brought about the substitution of monasteries — khanābād in the east, zawiyā in Barbary — for the foundations, more military than religious, of the heroic age of Islam.


**Riḍā,** an **Ottoman biographer of poets.** Mehemd Ribād b. Mehmēd, called Zehir Marzūde, belonged to Adrianople. Of his life we know only that he was for a time musīf in Uznar Kupra (near Adrianople) and died in 1082 (1671) in his native city. Besides a collection of poems (Dīwān) Ribād wrote a Tezkīret al-Sharh, a biographical collection in which he dealt successfully in alphabetical order with the poets who lived in the first half of the 6th century A.H., i.e. c. 1591-1640. In the introduction he deals with eleven sultans who wrote poetry. The book was completed in 1060 (1640) as the taʾrīkh shows. It has been edited by Ahmad Djewdet Bey (Tezkīret-i Ribād, Istanbul, 1316, 109 p. 8")


**Riḍā Kūlī Kān B. Muḥammad Ḥādī b. Ismāʿīl Kāmīl, Persian scholar and man of letters, *"l’un des hommes les plus spirituels et les plus aimables que j’ait rencontrés dans aucune partie du monde"* (Gobineau). A descendant of the poet Kamāl Khuḍjānī [q.v.], the grandfather of Riḍā Kūlī, chief of the notables of Carah Kelateh (district of Dāngahān), was put to death by the partisans of the Sāfāvīs at whom he had supported the Kādjar (cf. Relation de l’embassy au Khârem, transl. Scheler, p. 205). He father became one of the dignitaries of the court of the Kādjar; in 1215 (1800), while on a pilgrimage to Mashhad, he heard of the birth of a son in Teherān to whom he gave the name of the imām. Becoming an orphan in 1802, Riḍā Kūlī spent his early years in Fārs; he was brought back from Fārs to Teherān, lived some time with relatives at Barfurūsh (Mazandarān), then returned to Fārs where he received his education; he then entered the service of the state of the governor-general of Fārs. His earliest efforts in poetry were published under the pseudonym of Čakir which he soon changed to that of Hīdāyat. In 1829 on the occasion of Fath ʿAḥn Shīkh’s stay in Shīrāz, he composed a panegyric and other poems which gained him the royal favour; but a serious illness prevented him from leaving Shīrāz. In 1838 Muḥammad Shīkh showed such esteem for him that he entrusted his son ʿAbdās Mīrzā’s education to him. The political troubles that followed the Shīkh’s death in 1848 sent Riḍā Kūlī into retirement. In 1851 Naṣir al-Dīn Shīkh recalled him and sent him on an embassy to Khwājā. He was next appointed to the Ministry of Education, became Director of the Royal College (dār al-fonūn), then fifteen years later, tutor (qāṭūna) to the crown prince Muṣṭafā al-Dīn whom he followed to Tabrīz where he spent several years. He returned to Teherān where he died in 1288 (1871).

Of his very numerous works, several are still unpublished, e.g. works on etymology and letters (we mention only the Miṣfah al-Khawānī, a commentary on difficult verses in Kāhānī, and the Nizād-nāma-yi Salātīn-i ʿajam-nizād, on early Persian dynasties: analysed in *J.R.A.S.*, xvii., p. 198). The bulk of his lyrical poetry (Dīwān) is also still unpublished; it totals about 30,000 lines. Of his six mathnawī (enumerated by himself, Maṭna al-Fuṣūd, ii. 582) only the epic entitled Bektâsh-nāma (or Golestān-i Fram, lith. Tabriz, 1270 = 1853) is published: it celebrates the tragic loves of the hero and the Persian poets of Arab origin Râhsī Kīkārī Balghī, known as Zāi[n] al-ʿArab. His other works which are published are mainly of a documentary nature and therefore very important. The Fikhrī al-Tawāriskh ("RePERTory of Chronicles", chronology, lith. in part at Tabriz) was presented to Naṣir al-Dīn Shīkh before the author’s departure to Khvārizm (1851); the Aghnum al-Tawāriskh (lit. Tabriz 1283) is a short précis of the history of Persia composed for the crown prince Muṣṭafā al-Dīn; the Rawdat al-Safar-yi Nāṣīrī, continuation of the Rawdat al-Safar of Mir Khvāndow down to 1270 (1853) (Teherān 1270, 3 vols. fol.), is a work of considerable size, based on eastern sources (of which several are still unpublished) and on official documents, most of which are reproduced in full; in addition to the record of political events the work contains much geographical, literary and artistic information. The Riyād al-Afīrin ("Gardens of the Initiated"), biographies of mystical poets, with an excellent introduction on Šūrism, was prepared for Muḥammad Shīkh (not lith. until 1305, Teherān). It is closely connected with the Maṭna al-Fuṣūd ("Assembly of eloquent Individuals"), of first importance for the history of Persian poetry (lith. Teherān, 2 vols. 1744); this last work, the author’s best, contains after a general introduction a collection of the history of Persian poetry, biographies and select pieces from all the poets (the poet-laureates form the first section); at the end is an autobiography and an anthology of the poems of Hīdāyat (ii., p. 581-678; autobiography and a number of the verses reproduced by the author of the Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣīrī, ii. 125-
The researches necessary for these last two works showed Hidayat the inadequacy of the dictionaries at his disposal; he intended to remedy this by his Farhang-i anguman-ārā-yi Naṣīrī (lith. Tehran 1288) which, preceded by a remarkable introduction, gives the different meanings of each Persian word, with quotations from the classical poets. The work entitled Madārīg al-Dalā'īgha (lith. 1331) is a glossary of rhetorical and poetical terms with many examples taken from different poets. Lastly we owe to Hidayat the first editions of the Dāīm of Manūchir (lith. Tehran 1297), of the Khānā-nāme (ibid. 1275) and of the Naṣīḥat al-Majdūr (history of the fall of the Khwārizm empire) of Muhammad Zaidari (publ. posthumously, Tehran 1308). Its autobiographical character gives the attractive Narrative of a Journey to Khwārizm" (Nāṣīḥat-nāme-yi Khwārizm, ed. and tr. Sal. Shefer, in P.E.O.V., Paris 1879) a special place among his works; he undertook this journey in 1851 as ambassador sent to settle the differences between the courts of Tehran and Khiwa. This journal is a valuable document for the history of the Khānates and has been utilised by later Persian historians (notably Mohammad Ḥasan Khān; q.v.); besides valuable historical, archaeological and geographical matter, the book, which is written in a simple and natural style, is a contribution to the study of the manners and customs of the period (notably conditions of travel); we find in it pretty pictures of native life and charming landscapes. Several of Hidayat's descendants have taken a prominent part in literature, politics and administration.


(II. Massé)

RIDĪYA (1276-1420 A.D.), the only woman to succeed to the throne of Dīlāh during the period of the Muslim rule, and, with the exception of Shādjar al-Durr [q.v.] of Egypt, the only female sovereign in the history of Islam.

After the death of his eldest son, Ḥūrtimish [q.v.], despite the protests of his advisers, nominated his daughter Kīdaya as his successor on the grounds of her fitness to rule. On the death of Ḥūrtimish the courtiers, disregarding the late king's wishes, raised one of his sons, Kūnk al-Dīn Firuz, to the throne. The new king wasted his time in riotous living; all real power being in the hands of his mother, Shāhīr Turkūn, whose cruelty disgusted the people and finally led to open revolt. Eventually in 634 (1236), despite the strong Muslim aversion to female rulers, Kīdaya was proclaimed queen by the people of Dīlāh and a certain section of the army. Although the war, fought by the Malik Muhammad Dūnān, refused to acknowledge her, this was sufficient to crush all opposition. She appointed Khwādā Ṣāḥib al-Dīn Ḥusain as her wazir and placed Malik Saīf al-Dīn in charge of the army with the title of kūfūz al-Dīn Aītagīn was made amīr-i kūfūz. The Turkish amirs, however, took great exception to the favours shown by the queen to an Abyssinian, Malik Dīmāl al-Dīn Yākūt who held the position of amīr-i kūfūz (Master of the Horse). Eventually the Turkish amirs rose in revolt, put the Abyssinian to death, imprisoned the queen, and placed her half-brother, Bahārum Šah, on the throne (Ramāḍān 636 = April 1240). Malik Ḥūrtimish al-Dīn Alīnūn, the governor of Bhāītina, in whose custody the deposed queen had been placed by his fellow conspirators, decided to champion her cause. With this object in view he married her and marched on Dīlāh, but was defeated near Kažhal. On the day following this defeat both he and Kīdaya were put to death.

The only original source for her reign is the Taḥāfṣāt-i Naṣīrī of Minhādī al-Dīn [see Minhādī], the accounts of all later writers, such as Ibn Bāṭūta, Firīshā, Bahārānī, and the author of the Taḥāfṣāt-i Akbarī being untrustworthy. All that Minhādī al-Dīn relates is that she treated the Ḥubushī with favour, but this was enough to enable the later historians to interpret it as undue fondness on the queen's part. It was only towards the end of her reign that she laid aside her female attire and appeared in public clothed as a man and unveiled. The real cause of her downfall seems to have been the opposition of the Turkish amirs.

sistance; his troops scattered and there was nothing left for him but to return to Halab. Yâghi Basân then went over to Dukâk and suggested he should besiege Rîdwan in Halab. The latter however appealed to Şûkman b. Ortoğ in Sarûqî, who, at once hurried to his assistance, and when the two brothers met at Kinnârsîn [q. v.], Dukâk was completely defeated and had to recognise Rîdwan as his overlord (496 = 1096 or 497 = 1097). In order to receive financial and military support from the Fātimids, Rîdwan for four weeks had prayers said for al-Mustâ'fa, the caliph in Egypt; but on the representations of Şûkman and Yâghi Basân, who had in the meanwhile made peace with him, he again paid homage to the 'Abbasîds and asked for forgiveness from the Caliph al-Mustâ'farî in Baghdad. About the same time Dja'âmî al-Dawla left Rîdwan, settled in Himîr, and improved the defences of the town. He then took up a more independent attitude to his overlord Rîdwan: on the advice of the Fâtimids he returned to Himîr. Soon afterwards the Christians under Bohemund and Tancred again threatened Aintâkiya. The latter appeared at the head of a powerful army by a Muslim army [see DANNÎMA'LÎYÂ]. They suddenly withdrew. Bohemund fell into an ambush and was taken prisoner, Rîdwan and Dja'âmî al-Dawla won several successes, but in the end quarrelled with one another, and a year or two later (495 = 1102 or 496 = 1103), the latter was murdered at the instigation of the Assassins of Halab. In Sha'bân 498 (April—May 1105) Tancred, who had succeeded Bohemund as prince of Aintâkiya and was also count of Edessa, won a brilliant victory over Rîdwan. When Tancred besieged the fortress of Artâh, the governor there appealed to Rîdwan for help. The latter appeared at the head of a powerful army and the two forces met near Kinnârsîn. On seeing the superiority of the Muslim forces, Tancred wanted to open peace negotiations; Rîdwan for his part was not unwilling to meet him but allowed himself to be persuaded by a subordinate commander to refuse, and when the battle began, the Franks at once took to flight but returned and cut down the Muslims while they were plundering. Tancred then occupied Artâh. In 499 (1105—1106) the latter also took the important fortress of Aflamiya (Apamea). An Assassin named Abî Tâhir [q. F. ASSASSINS] who was on good terms with Rîdwan, had disposed of the commandant there, Khâlîf b. Mala'âît. One of his sons fled to Tancred and asked him to expel the supporters of Rîdwan; Tancred who had already received an appeal from the Christians of Aflamiya, laid siege to the town. He withdrew after a time but soon returned and starved the town into surrender.

When Câwâli Sakawan, governor of al-Mawsl, lost the favour of the Saljûq Sulûn Muhammad b. Malikshâh [q. v.], and was replaced by Mawdûd b. Altunêgin, he gave count Baldwin and Joscelin, who were prisoners there, their liberty on condition that they paid a ransom, liberated Muslim prisoners and assisted him against his enemies. But when Tancred refused to restore the county of Edessa to Baldwin, hostilities broke out and the latter sought the help of Câwâli. After peace had been restored between the Frankish leaders and Edessa was restored to Baldwin, Rîdwan wrote to Tancred and warned him against Câwâli, who, he said, had already taken the town of Bâlis, and was now threatening Halab whereby he might become dangerous to Christian rule in this region. In Safar 502 (Sept.—Oct. 1108) Câwâli, who had joined Baldwin and Joscelin, was defeated at Tell Bâshîr [q. v.]. He lost Bâlis, and since he could not hold his own against Rîdwan and Mawdûd, he had to make his peace with the sultan. The Christian princes then combined to besiege Tripolis, Sâ'da and Bairût. Tancred took the fortresses of al-Ahâsirî and Zardanî, and when the news reached them, the Muslims abandoned Mubiḏît and Bâlis again, and Rîdwan had to promise he would dearly (504 = 1110—1111) when sultan Muhammad summoned the princes, his vassals, for a vigorous attack on the Franks under the leadership of Mawdûd, the latter was appealed to for help by Rîdwan, whose lands the Christians were laying waste in revenge for the damage done by him in Syria. Mawdûd came to his assistance but when he appeared before Halab, Rîdwan, who no longer needed him, shut the gates and took no part in the war against the common enemy.

Rîdwan died in the last days of Djamâ'î 507 (Nov. 1115). As a partisan of the Ismâ'ilî Assassins he had at one time been one of two of his brothers, 'Alî Tâhir and Bahramshâh, assassinated. Ibn al-Athîr (3.439) also says that his manner of life was by no means laudable (kâmûn Rîdwan ghair maḥnûdâ).


Rîfâ'a Bey al-Tâhîwî, a famous writer of the first century and one of the principal creators of the modern Arabic *Renaissance*. He was born at Tâhî in upper Egypt in 1801. His parents, although of noble descent, were poor. When quite young, he devoted himself to the study of the Koran; when a young man, he went to al-Azhar where he studied seriously under the direction of Sheikh Hassân al-'Atjâr.

On leaving al-Azhar in 1824, he was appointed pay-master of the Egyptian army. At this period the celebrated Muhammad (Mehemet) 'Ali was ruling Egypt. The latter at the instigation of the French scholar Jomard sent to Paris in 1826 a group of students to learn French and study modern sciences. They were put under charge of Rîfâ'a. In Paris the latter made the acquaintance
of Oriental scholars like Jaubert, Jomard, Sylvestre de Sacy and Caussin de Perceval. He made rapid progress and soon had a deep knowledge of the French language. From his stay in Paris dates a lively and interesting account entitled Tārikh al-lībī (Bālīk 1:53) in which every line reveals a charming vivacity, and the enthusiasm aroused in this oriental mind by the manifold aspects and lights and shades of French life and culture (cf. Carra de Vaux, Peuples, v. 237 sq.). On his return to Egypt (1832) he was attached as interpreter and professor of French to the school of Medicine directed by Dr. Clot Bey and also entrusted with the editorialship of the Informations égyptiennes which later became the Journal officiel. In 1853 he was transferred to the School of Artillery and in 1853 appointed Director of the School of Foreign Languages (originally the *Translation Office*). He remained in this post until the accession of Abbas II. Unfortunately this ruler did not continue the brilliant work of his predecessor: the School of Languages was closed and its Director sent — a disgrace barely conciliatory — to the Sudan to organise the High School at Khartum.

On the death of Abbas I, Rifaa returned to Egypt. Sa'id Pasha appointed him Director of the Military School, for a very brief period, however, for the School in its turn was closed and Rifaa found himself unemployed.

In the reign of Isma'il in 1863, the School was reopened and our author again became Director of the *Translation Office*. In 1870, he became editor in chief of the educational review Kawafat al-Ma'ārif (founded) and died in 1873.

Rifaa Bey was one of the most important Arabic writers of the sixth century and his name is closely associated with the brilliant revival of literary and scientific activity in the modern east. An achieving spirit of unusual intelligence, he left behind him a considerable amount of work in all fields: history, geography, grammar, law, literature, medicine etc. details will be found in Sarks, Dictionnaire bibliographique, p. 942-947. We may note here only his translations of Telémaque, of Malte-Brun's Geography and the French Code Civil.

To appreciate the magnitude of the part he played, it must be remembered that at the dawn of the last century, the Arab world was in a state of semi-torpor and separated from European learning by a dense barrier: it was with difficulty that al-Ahmar shed a dim light on the darkness that covered this period.

As a result of his works, his activity and the phalanx of experts and translators which he gave the country, Rifaa accomplished the miracle of popularising European science, of opening the east to modern ideas, enlightening the minds of his contemporaries, awakening dormant energies and preparing the future.

We can measure the effort if we reflect that he and his pupils translated into Arabic and Turkish nearly 2000 works.

On the other hand by expanding the framework of the old classical language and by vivifying it and enriching it with a mass of new words, he enabled Arab thought to adapt itself to progress and to extend its light over modern Islam.


(Maurice Chevrol)

Al-RIFAI, AHMAD B. 'Ali ABU 'AL-'ABA', founded of the Rifaa's family, died 22nd Jumada I, 578 (Sept. 23, 1183) at Umm Abida, in the district of Wasi. The date of his birth is given by some authorities as Muharram 500 (Sept. 1168), but others say Rajab 1422 (Oct. — Nov. 1168) at Kārīyat Hasan, a village in the district of Baṣra. 'Ali, his fathār, al-Ṣabah (q. v.), has the further name al-Ṣabāḥī; al-Rifai is usually explained as referring to an ancestor Rifaa, but by some is supposed to be a tribal name. This ancestor Rifaa is said to have migrated from Mecca to Seville in Spain in 317, whence Ahmad's grandfather came to Baṣra in 450. Hence he is also called al-Maghribi.

Ibn Khallikān's notice of him is meagre; more is given in Dāhibā'ī's Tārikh al-Islam (Bolehan MS.), taken from a collection of his Mansāḥ bi 'Allaṣ bi Ṭabī' al-Dīn Ahmad b. Sulaimān al-Ḥamāð, recited by him to a disciple in 630. This book does not appear in the list of treatises on the same subject furnished by Abu 'l-Huda Efendi al-Rāzī al-Kalālī al-Sayyādī in his works Twair al-Abār (Cairo 1306) and Kitāb al-Dirāshāt (Bairut 1301), the latter of which is a copious biography, frequently citing Tārikh al-Maṣhārī by Taš' al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd al-Muṣīn al-Wāṣiti (d. 744; known to Hāджī Khālid 'Abd al-Ṭāhir, Umm al-Barādār by 'Āṣīm b. Hādī, Dāhibā'ī, al-Majka'ī by 'Izz al-Dīn al-Fārūqī (d. 694), and others. Al-Hamādi's statements are cited from one Ya'qūb b. Kurāz, who acted as mu'ātek (assistant) for the Rifaa. Great caution is required in the use of such materials.

Whereas according to some accounts he was posthumous child, the majority date his father's death 519 in Baghadj, when Ahmad was seven years old. He was then brought up by his maternal uncle Mansūr al-Balāṭi, resident at Nahr Dālī in the neighbourhood of Baṣra. This Mansūr of whom there is a notice in Shārīngī's Layālik (Amāran), i. 178) is represented as the head of a religious community, called Ahmad (if he is correctly reported by his grandson, Saltā'ī, p. 83 al-Rifaa'ī; he sent his nephew to Wāṣiti to study under a 'Adibī da'īk: Abu al-ʿIṣāqī, the author of al-Naqī Ḥājī, ʿAmārī was buried in the following year (546) Mansūr died and bequeathed the headship of his community (muḥākha) to Ahmad to the exclusion of his own son.

His activities appears to have been confined to
Umm 'Abida and neighbouring villages, whose names are unknown to the geographers; even Umm 'Abida is not mentioned by Yākūṭ, though found in one copy of the Marāqī j al-Ittā'ī. This fact renders incredible the huge figures cited by Abu l-Hudā for the number of his disciples (murīdūn) and even deputes (khilāfīn) of the princely style and the colossal buildings in which he entertained them. Sībū ibn al-Jauzī in Mirā'ī al-Zāmān (Chicago, 1907, p. 236) says that one of their shaikhs told him he had seen some 100,000 persons with al-Rifā'i on a night of Sha'ban. In Shaqīgarāt al-Dhāhah the experience is said to have been Sībū ibn al-Jauzī's own, though this person was born 581, three years after al-Rifā'i's death. In Tāmir al-Ahār (p. 7, 8) his grandfather as well as himself is credited with the assertion.

His followers do not attribute to him any treatises, but Abu l-Hudā produces 1. two discourses (maqāṣid) delivered by him in 577 (3rd Radjab) and 578 respectively; 2. a whole divūs of odes; 3. a collection of prayers (adā'ī), devotional emblems (āwā'id), and incantations (aḥād); 4. a great number of casual utterances, sometimes nearly of the length of sermons, swollen by frequent repetitions. Since in 1, 2 and 4 he claims descent from ʿAlī and Fāṭima, and to be the substitute (nādh) for the Prophet on earth, whereas his biographers insist on his humility, and disclaiming such titles as kubb, ḍawāṭī, or even ḍahāb, the genuineness of these documents is questionable.

In Shaqīgarāt al-Dhāhah (iv. 260) it is asserted that the marvellous performances associated with the Rifā'i, such as sitting in heated ovens, riding lions, etc. (described by Lane, Modern Egyptians, i. 305) were unknown to the founder, and introduced after the Mongol invasion; in any case they were no invention of his, since the like are recorded by Tanākhī in the fourth century A.H. The anecdotes produced by Dhahabi (repeated by Subhi, Tabakāt, iv. 40) imply a doctrine similar to the Indian ahoinsa, unwillingness to kill or give pain to living creatures, even lice and locusts. He is also said to have inculcated povery, abstinence and non-resistance to injury. Thus Mirā'ī al-Zāmān records how he allowed his wife to belabour him with a poker, though his friends collected 500 dinārā to enable him to divorce her by returning her marriage gift. (The sum mentioned is inconsistent with his supposed poverty).

Inconsistent accounts are given of his relations with his contemporary ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Ghānī. In Bagdād al-Aswār it is recorded by apparently faulty intelligence on the authority of a princely style of al-Rifā'i, and a man who visited him at Umm 'Abida in 576 that when ʿAbd al-Kādir in Baghdad declared that his foot was on the neck of every saint, al-Rifā'i was heard to say at Umm 'Abida "and on mine". Hence some make him a disciple of ʿAbd al-Kādir. On the other hand, Abu l-Hudā's authorities make ʿAbd al-Kādir one of those who witnessed in Medina in the year 555 the unique miracle of the Prophet holding out his hand from the tomb for al-Rifā'i to kiss; further, in the list of his predecessors in the discourse of 575 al-Rifā'i mentions Mansūr, but not ʿAbd al-Kādir. It is probable therefore that the two worked independently.

Details of his family are quoted from the work of al-Fārāḥī, grandson of a disciple named 'Umar. According to him, al-Rifā'i married first Mansūr's neice Khādīja; after her death, her sister Rabi'a; after her death Nalīsa, daughter of Muhammad b. al-Kāsimīya. There were many daughters; also three sons, who all died before their father. He was succeeded in the headship of his order by a sister's son, ʿAlī b. Uthmān.

Bibliography: The sources of this account have been cited above.

(R. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH)

RIHĀ, the name of two towns.

1. The Arabs called the Jericho of the Bible Riḥâ or Arīḥā (Clermont-Ganneau, in J.A., 1877, i. 498). The town, which was 12 mil E. of Jerusalem, was reckoned sometimes to the Djund of Filastīn (Yākūṭ, Ms'dām, iii. 913, e.g.) and sometimes to the district of al-Balḳāʾ (Yākūṭi, in B.G.A., vii. 113); sometimes however it was called the capital of the province of Jordan (al-Urdūn) or of Ghawr, the broad low lying valley of the Jordan (Nahr al-Urdūn) from which it was 10 mil distant (Yākūṭi, i. 227). As a result of its warm moist climate and the rich alluvial lands around it, the potashiferous fields of the country round the town produced a subtropical vegetation; among its products are mentioned, some already known in ancient times, dates and bananas, fragrant flowers, indigo (prepared from the warma plant), sugar-cane, which yielded the best Ghawr sugar. Not far from the town were the only sulphur mines in Palestine (Abu l-Fīḍāʾ, ed. Reinau, p. 236). There were however many snakes and scorpions there and large numbers of fleas. From the flesh of the snakes called tiriyākīsya found there was made the antidote called "Jerusalem tiriyākī" ( kartīsī ṭawāṣīs).

In the Kurān, Arīḥā is the town of the giants captured by Joshua; there was shown the tomb of Moses and the place where, according to the Christians, their saviour was baptised. The eponymous founder of the town (Arīḥā) was said to have been a grandson of Arphakshād, grandson of Noah. The town was particularly prosperous during the Crusades but then began to decline and was in ruins in the xith century. The modern Erīḥā in the Wādi el-Kelt occupies the site of the town of the Crusaders; it is about 800 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

2. A little town in the district of Halab. According to Yāqūt it stood in a wooded, well watered area "on the slopes of the Djebel Labānīn". By this term the Arabs meant not only the Lebanon but also its northern continuation as far as the Orontes (Lamme, *Notan Lo Liban*, ii. 6; *M.F.O.B.* i. 1906, p. 271). But in the pre-Christ period the heights to the east of the Orontes are certainly wrongly included in the term. Rihā on the contrary was the northern edge of the Djebel Barm 'Claim' ( Ibn al-Shihna, Barsim, p. 102, 130), the modern Djebel Arbanā, a part of the Djebel Rihā or Djebel iz-Zāwiye (cf. the map Djebel Rihā or Djebel iz-Zāwiya by Roh. Garett and F. A. Norris in *Public. of the Princeton Univ. Arch. Exp. to Syria*, div. ii., sect. B, part iii. 1909).

M. Hartmann suggested that the name Rihā was concealed in the name of a *kiyāb Maṣarat yāziqyo in* the district of Abisimia in an inscription of Conclauda at Aquileia (C. I. G., v. 5732 = I. G., xiv. 2334), and that this corresponds to the Maṣqāra about 6 miles south of Rihā, while Dussaud (*Topographies de la Syrie*, 264 sq.) in 1857, the wishes to identify with Rihā itself, Harant wrote as follows in support of his view (Z. D. P. V., xxii. 145, note 3): "As in the case of Jericho, the form Rihā may have been current alongside of Rihā; in favour of this is the fact that Yāqūt, ii. 855, expressly protests against the spelling Ariha for the little town in the district of Halab: it should not be written with *alif*, while both forms were usual for the town in the "Ghawr". This supposition is certainly correct; for Ibn al-Shihna twice writes Ariha (p. 130 with the variant Rihā) and J. B. L. Kousseau (*Liste alphabetique... in Recueil de voyages et de monuments*, ii, Paris 1825, p. 2154) also knows of Ariha (Kaijā) alongside of Rihā as the name of the place and of the *nāṣja* (cf. also the Sūnāma of Halab for the year 1286, p. 118). But the identification of Maṣarat yāziqyo with Maṣqāra or with Rihā cannot however be maintained for the former is already known in the year 472 (1079) in Kamīl al-Dīn (Zubdāt Halab fi Tārikh Halab, Paris, Bibliot. Nat., MS. Arāb. N°. 1666, fol. 101) as "Maṣaratīkī in the district of the Kafrāṭīf" (E. Honigmann, in *Syria*, x., 1920, p. 252; vii., 1931, p. 99) and is still found as Maṣaratīkī about 20 miles south of Rihā (of Masmul del Uaisson, in *Syria*, xii. 99 sq.) with sketch map.

The identification of Rihā with the *Rūqja* or *Chelit Ruqja* of the Franks is also untenable; as Dussaud (I. G., *Topographies de la Syrie*, p. 167, 174, 176, 213) rightly points out that this should rather be identified with al-Ūrij of the Arabs.

There is a place noted for its ruins of antiquity called Ruwātā ("little Rihā") about 8 miles, S.E. of Rihā.

Rihā is very frequently mentioned in modern travel literature as it was on the main road from Halab to Hamā (Ritter, *Edmund*, xvii. 1522; Dussaud, *Topographies de la Syrie*, p. 151), over which Nāṣir Khusraw (before 1047) and Ibn Batūṭa (1326) travelled in their day. The town is therefore mentioned by Delon du Mans (1548), Pietro della Valle (1615), Wansleben (1671), Poocke (1737), and Damm (1754). C. Niebuhr (1778),
travelling. For example one said that so-and-so was “in the service of the imperial stirrup” (Houtsma, Recueil... seligondeis, iv. 377; iii. 18) or “in the service of the parasol (taşık) of the imperial stirrup” (ibid., iv. 7). In modern Persian one says “to be at the stirrup of a prince” for “to be attached to his court” (Kazimirska, Dialogues, p. 493 and 482–483).

In Turkish usage the same expressions were applied to:

The imperial cavalcade and the procession formed on this occasion. However, in order to avoid confusion with other uses of the word rıkib, there was also used, especially in the reigns of Mahmut II and Abd al-Medjid, the Turkish word binib which was applied to all public appearances of the sultan, whether on horseback or in a boat (Mouradgja d’Ohsson, vii. 141, 144; Jouannin and van Gaver, Turquie, p. 377 note; Androsovs, Constantinople et le Bosphore, p. 33, 494). The prince’s procession was also called meykip (meykip-i hümâyûn) (Houtsma, ii. 18; on these words in Arabic and Egyptian usage, cf. p. 485). Cf. also the name of rıkib selçük given to the eight sultân lieutenants who walked by the sultan’s stirrup in the great procession (Mouradgja d’Ohsson, vii. 25, 317).

2. The audience given by the sultan (resmi rıkib or simply rıkib), whether or not he was in procession. The grand vizier himself could only be introduced to the sultan’s presence by the latter’s formal order and his admission was called rıkib. There were ordinary rıkib and ceremonial rıkib (Mouradgja d’Ohsson, vii. 155 sqq.). Cf. details of the Mecelle rıkib-i teşrifî in Aslı Türkî, i. 23; cf. Zenker, Dict., i. 468; Ahmed Râsim, Türkî, iv. 1014.

3. The service of the sultan or simply his presence (Sekowski, Collectanea, Warszaw, 1824, i. 24). The presence was not necessarily immediate. Thus the expression rıkib-i hümâyûn (in the locative “with the sultan” was used in speaking of the troops (kapû-baîn) of the capital (‘Abd al-Râmân Şeref, Türkî, p. 292) or of the grand vizier in so far as he was endowed with the full powers of the sultan (M. T. M., p. 528). Similarly the words rıkib-i hümâyûn (in the dative) were used for petitions (arzûsât) addressed to the sultan (Meninski, Thesaurus; “Sulaimân’s Canon” or Naṣṣat-nâmê, p. 151), whence the expression muvaçîr-i rıkibîse applied to these petitions.

It is from this connection that we have the use of the words rıkib-i hümâyûn or rıkib in the sense of interim or substitute. When the grand vizier moved from place to place, the government was thought to go with him and there was appointed “to the sovereign a substitute for the grand vizier who was called rıkib-i hûmâyûnî” (Bianch, Dict., 1st ed.; Perry, A view of the Levant, London 1743, p. 37). The other chief dignitaries of the Sublime Porte had also their substitutes “of the imperial stirrup”.

Rıkib aghalarî or aghayanî rıkib-i hümâyûn or hümâyûn aghalarî. — These names were applied to a certain number of important officers or dignitaries of the palace (from 4 to 11 according to the different sources). They were the mir-arîm or “standard-bearers”, the two mir-arib (imbrokar) or “squires”, the kapûdar bâkîyân or “chief usher” and other dignitaries with different offices (cf. Lutfi Pasha, Aslı-nâmê, in Türk. Bibliothek, xii. 18 and 21 of the Türk. text ed. by Tschud; Beauvains, Notice sur la Cour du Grand Seigneur, 1809, p. 54; Mouradgja d’Ohsson, vii. 144; v. Hammer, Staatsverf., i. 61, with references to Castellani and ‘Ali; esp. M. T. M., p. 526, for the şâmîn or “usages” regarding the ağalar of the stirrup; Feridîn, Mawâdî, p. 10, for the rıkib or protocol relating to them). The following is a translation of the passage in the Aslı-nâmê which is a comparatively old text (Lutfi Pasha died in 1559): “The defenders of the fires have precedence (tasâdûr) over the szerîh beyî and the üçüngi agâhalarî. The principal (bâkî darbî) of these is the ağala of the Janissaries, next comes the mir-âlem, then the kapûdar baîlî, after him the mir-arîm, then the bâkî darbî, the bâkî darbî bukîlî and the bâkî darbî aghalaî” (starting with the ağala of the Janissaries, we have here then an enumeration of the üçüngi agâhalarî).

Considering the authority of these sources, we must conclude that the variations are the results of changes which, as far as we can tell, does not lead us to conclude that the tradition of the palace left the sultan a certain freedom in this respect. We know moreover that admission to the rıkib was in general subject to the irteân or “approval, pleasure” of the sultan.

The most important function, at least in principle, of the ağalar of the stirrup was exercised when the sultan mounted his horse: the grand mir-arîm held the inner stirrup (iç rıkib), the baş-kapûdar-baîlî agha, the outer stirrup (rück rıkib); the mir-arîm held the bridge and the teşnegir-baîlî assisted the sultan by holding him under the arm or “under the ampi” (kolmuz girmek). The kapûdar-baîlî or “chamberlains” stood all around and the agha khatfî (kâfîî) held the horse’s head (M. T. M., p. 526).

On the functions of the chamberlains, who to the number of 150, headed by the baş-kapûdarbaîlî, already mentioned, were in the service of the stirrup, and for other details see Mouradgja d’Ohsson, vii. 18 and especially M. T. M., loc. cit. Their duties were to take to the province important firmanûs and to carry out various confidential missions.

Sometimes epithets rhyming in -êb were added to the word rıkib in the language of the court: e.g. rıkib-ê hûrûmûzî “stirrup shining like the moon” (Türkîî-i Wajîf, i. 105); cf. also the epithets: hamûn, gerdân qûsûn, dawâr-sîltûn (Meninski, Thesaurus).

The tribute which the Woiwods of Wallachia and Moldavia sent to the sultan in their own name, supplementary to that (gîyâr) paid by their subjects, was known as rûkîsîyé and Ülûfe (Ahmed Râsim, i. 380; cf. Sâneau, Infirmita orientala, Bucarest 1900, i. 249).

Bibliography: Cf. the works quoted in the text. (J. DENY)

RİKÂBDAR or RİKİBDAR, a Persian derivative from the preceding (Turkish pronunciation rikâbdar, rikûbdar, rekeptar and rikiptar), properly “one put in charge of the stirrup, one who holds the stirrup, when his master mounts” (cf. French esquint, Ital. stoffiere, Russ. strimennoy, English groom of stirrup, words formed from stuf, string, stirrup = French strem, mod. Stier). In fact, remembering that the word rıkib has been given or has assumed a wider meaning [see the article],
rikābdār meant "a kind of squire, groom or riding attendant who had charge of the care and maintenance of harness and saddlery and of everything required for mounting on horseback". The pronunciation with an i in the second syllable (rikībdār or rikībdār) used alike in Egypt (Dozy; Sprio, p. 198) and in Turkey (Moldavian-Wallachian richcap or richcapar in Sanea, ii. 99) is due to a (Persian) corruption analogous to that found in the words stilībdār for stilībdar and rītīdīr for rītīdīdz (cf. the Turkish translation of the Burākān-i kāfi, p. 405). In Arabic we find the forms rikībd and jāḥībd-airībd. (Below we leave out of account the use of rikābdar in the sense of cupbearer, derived from rikāb ṣup) [used for drinking the *stirrup-cup*]*:1*. If this explanation is correct, the two rikābdār may very well be the same.

Maškārī mentions a personage who was jāḥībd-airībd already to the first Umayyad caliph of Spain (138–172 = 756–785; cf. Analectes, i. 605, reference given by Dozy). In Egypt at the court of the Fātimids, there were over 2,000 rikābdīs, or šīhībd-airībd-al-ḥādī, so called "on account of their costume (ṣayyīf)"), whose duties were the same as those of the stilībdār and tebrīdār of the time of Kalkashandī (Suleimān, ṣubn.-i, 481). As to the Persian form rikābdār, it must have been in use among the Saldājūs for we have to admit by analogy that it was from them that the Ayābīds and later the Mamlūks borrowed the term, like many others of the same kind.

In Persia itself, the term rikābdār was replaced by its (Turkish) synonym uṣenī (or uṣunī) kūrīzī (cf. Chardin, 1711 ed., vi. 112; Fere Raph. du Mans, État de la Perse, p. 24). According to the Burākān-i kāfi, the rikābdār were replaced by the ḥabīdārdī (from ḥabīdā, bridle), but it should be noted that the office of the latter was contemporary with and independent of that of uṣenī kūrīzī.

In Egypt the rikābdārs of the Mamlūks, also called rikābdīs, were members of the rikābd-kāhān, like the other "men of the sword" (arībd-al-ṣawāf), such as the šayyākārd, mahmūtārd, ḫārā-jāhām and nāḥūm-mamlūk. The rikābd-kāhān (the kīmanīt al-ṣawāf of the Fātimids) was the depot for harness and in general for all the material required for horses and stables. The heads of this service were called ṭikār (cf. the Ottoman motār whose duties were different and humbler). The rikābdārs were under the command of the mir al-ḏānī, "Marshal of the Court" (cf. the kāhdūnlar ḏāhiyat of the Ottoman court). Cf. Kalkashandī, iv. 12, 20; Ḫabīl al-Zahiri, p. 124; Gaudreoy-Demobbayes, Syrie, p. 411, 413.

The word rikābdār is found in the Jōt Nīght, where it is translated "palefriener" by E. Gautier, vi. 168 and "groom" by Burton, x. 365, note 2. From the context we might also suggest "riding attendant". Bothor gives (for Syria?) rikābdār under the French "écurier (qui enseigne a monter à cheval)" and rikābd al-khālī under "groom (celui qui monte à cheval)". The synonymic expression qāšī al-rikābd, in the sense of "good squire, one who mounts a horse well", is found in the romance of "Antara". In contemporary Egyptian usage rikābdār or rikābd means "jockey, groom" (Sprio, Habiteche). (According to the Burākān-i kāfi [Turk. transl.], the rikābdār of Egypt were replaced by the sārdājī "saddler" mentioned by Volney and others).

Turkish usage. — In Turkey the office of rikābdār must have been taken over directly from the Saldājūs but instead of becoming assimilated to that of humble grooms or rikābdī, as in Egypt, it became an important dignity at the sultān's court reserved for a single officer. It is in the reign of Orkhan (1326–1360) that we find the first Ottoman rikābdār: he was called Kočja Elys Agha ("Afī Türkādī", i. 94). It was however only under Selim i (1512–1520) that the duties of the rikābdār were defined. According to the organisation at this time, the rikābdār agha was a khaus-oddlī, i.e. he was one of the khaus-oddlī (and not odadal) or "company of the corps (Mouradaga d'Ohsoss); chambre suprême (Castillan); innerste Kammer (v. Hammer)" which was the first of the six groups of officers of the household (il or erdenn-i) of the Serail and consisted of the fixed number of 40 officers or pages including in theory the sultān himself. It had been formed by Sultan Selim to guard the relic of the Prophet's mantle (khirka-i cebed) brought back after the conquest of Egypt (Afī, i. 208; for details of the organisation see ibid., and Mouradage d'Ohsoss, vii. 34 sqg.). The rikābdār was the third of these officers in order of precedence (following the stilībdār and the tebrīdār and preceding the dulend aghası) and an officer passed in this order from one office to another. The four officers just mentioned were the only khaus-oddlī who had the right to wear the turban.

According to the usual definition repeated everywhere, the chief duty of the rikābdār agha was to hold the sultān's stirrup. It may have been so at first, but none of the documents available show the rikābdār performing this duty in practice. Indeed we have seen [cf. Rikan] who were the "aghās of the stirrup" entrusted with this duty. Now in spite of his name, the rikābdār was not one of these. The Arabic version of the Aṣfāʾ-nāme (Bairatti, p. 9, note 7) and the German translation (Turk. Bibl., No. 12 [1910], p. 17, note 1) have therefore confused rikābdār agha and rikābd aghāsı, which has given rise to an erroneous interpretation of the whole passage [cf. the corrected translation in the article Rikan].

On the other hand, western writers of the xvith century mention as the third officer of the household (icğhan) after the stilībdār and tebrīdār a "cup-bearer"! Theodore Spandon (Spandony Canthac), calls him sharabārd (cf. Garzoni, 1573) and Leinclavius khipar "hearer of the (water-)jar", a name also found in Lonicer (p. 69). This water-carrier was given other names later. D'Ohsoss (pl. 158) and the Afī Türkādī (i. 282) speak of a kish-ekki or "keeper of the kis, probably for the Arabic-Persian kis-e[r] or water-jar". Wearing a berata, he carried a ewer (masirupa) of warm water at the end of a stick. V. Hammer calls this official mātaradji or bearer of the gourd (mātara for mathara).

The use of warm water is easily explained by the fact that, as an author writing in 1631 tells us, the third gentleman of the sultān's chamber "carried him 'sherbet' to drink, and water to wash with" (De Stochove, Voyage du Levant, Brussels 1662, p. 84: Ischiopar, for rikābdār; cf. Baudier who writes: rechiopar).

On the other hand, there was an officer whose duty it was to carry a stool (sīneme) plated with silver which the sultān used in mounting his horse when he did not prefer the assistance of a mute
went on his hands and knees on the ground (Castellan, Moeurs..., i. 139; 'Ata, loc. cit.; d'Ohsllon, pl. 157). He was the iskemle aghasi or iskenetiqilir bashi, chosen from among the oldest grooms (kapudan ektisi). Wearing a dolama and a kele, he rode like the water-carrier on horseback in processions (rMal). Probably through some confusion Castellan calls him rikibdär, but adds that in his time the rikibdär was chosen not from among the khâş-adalî, but from the iskâni (mistake for kapudan'). Nor must we confuse, as Saineau (Influence orientale, ii. 104, s.v. iskembet or iskmen) does, the iskemle or iskemun aghâsi with the special commissioner of this name who was charged along with the samiqah aghâsi, to install on the throne (iscâni) the new kâdî-pasars of Moldavia and Wallachia (cf. Milange Iorja, 1933, p. 202). They were also iskemle aghâsi similar to those of the sultan in certain provinces (Rousseau, Description du pacha-dik de Bagdad, Paris 1809, p. 27).

Among the special duties of the rikibdär, we shall only mention the custody and care of the harness etc. of the sultan (as among the Mamlûks) and his pabuc or shoes and šarâme or boots (kânîn of Sulamîn or Nasîhâr-nâmê, p. 132).

It should be noted that, according to the 'Ata Târîkhî (i. 208), the services of the rikibdär like those of the lokhdars were only required on gala days (gîyâm-i-rezîmiye). This practice is said to have been introduced under Mustafa III (1757–1774) out of consideration for the age of these persons concerned for they were generally over 60 and had spent 40 years in the service of the court (âddâk yula). According to the same work, these duties were reduced to very little. During the ceremonies (selâmâlik) of the Prophet's birthday (mevlid or mevluk), the two baîwams and at the biniq or ceremonial appearances of the sultan, the rikibdär sat opposite the sultan in the imperial barge with the silhâr, khashoda bashi and the two lokhdars.

From all this we may conclude that if there really was a rikibdär in the time of Orkhan he performed not only the duties of a squire but also those of a "cup-bearer" and we know that in Persian rikibdär means "cup-bearer". In time, the rikibdär became more and more important personage, these duties were divided between two special officers: on the one hand, the koz-bekti and similar officials, and on the other, the iskemle aghâsi.

The rikibdär aghâsi, like the lokhdars, received a daily salary or šulâmî of 35 aspers (âfèî) while the silhâr drew 45 (Herâfîrens, MS. A.F.T. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 188). Like the lokhdars they had in their service two latas of the khashoda, a karaqollaci, a hallâgî with tasselled caps (cîlìyê), two şofulis, a khebîqi and two medekîs. The rikibdars who did not attain the rank of silhâr were put on the retired list (became tirad) with a pension of 60–100,000 piastres. In the absence of the lokhdar, the rikibdär performed the duties of the silhâr. On the quarters in the palace occupied by the rikibdär, cf. 'Atâ, i. 312, sq.

The four chief officers of the khashoda, including the rikibdär, were often called by the name — not official, however — of şulâmî vâzîserî or "vizziers of the armpit" because they had the privilege of touching the sultan, particularly of giving him their hand or taking him by the arm during a walk and they frequently attained the rank of wezir (Cantemir, Hist. Emp. Ott., Paris 1743, i. 119–121). The rikibdär aghâralı [cf. RIKÂB] were also şulâmî vâzîserî.

The same four officers were also called 'arz aghâralı because they had the right to present ('arz) to the sultan any petition which reached them, like the master of petitions (Rycaut, Bk. i., p. 97 of the French transl.; Castellan, iii. 185). According to Ahmad Râsim (i. 639), in processions, the iskemle aghâsi had the task of returning to those concerned petitions which were not granted.

The rikibdars were abolished by Mahmûd II, probably about the same time as the koz-bekti (in 1248 = 1832–1833; cf. Luzzi, iv. 68) and the silhâr (in 1246; cf. Luzzi, iv. 61); cf. v. Hammer, Hist., xvii. 191.

Bibliography: See the works already quoted above of which the most important is the 'Atâ Târîkhî. See also Ahmad Râsim, Türkîh, i. 186, 479; ii. 526; Hammer, Hist., vii. 15 for references not used here. (J. Deny)

RISÂLÂ. [See RASULî.]

RIYÂDÎ, Ottoman biographer of poets. Molla Mehmêd, known as Riyâdi, was the son of a certain Muftâ Efendi of Birge (S.E. of Smyrna) and was born in 980 (1572). He was first of all employed as a maddârî, later became kâfi of Aleppo and died on 9th Safar 1054 (April 17, 1644) (according to J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vi. 44 in Cairo). He was known as at-Adâmî, the "dumi". His chief work is his Riâyîl al-Shûrârî, a biographical dictionary of poets containing 354 names. It is known to have been finished by 1018 (1609). He also wrote an abbreviated translation into Turkish of the Wûsîyât al-A'âyân of Ibn Khallûkin. The lexicon has not yet been published but is accessible in a number of manuscripts, a list of which is given by F. Babinger, G. O. W., i. 178 (add: Stambl, Lâlî Ismâîl, N°. 314). On a German translation of an extract from it by V. v. Rosenzweig-Schwanau, cf. Z. D. M. G. xx. (1866), p. 439, No. 3 (filling 20 pages).

Bibliography: Riyaî, Tezkîire, p. 38 sq.; Süleymî, İwâmînî, ii. 425; J. v. Hammer, Ge- schichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, iii. 367; Brüsalî, Mehemêd ba'î Hânî, i. 81, 157, 118, 119, 123. [with references]: F. Babinger, G. O. W., i. 177 sq. (Franz Baringer)

RIYÂH, an Arab tribe, the most powerful of those that, regarding themselves as descended from Hilal [q.v.], left Upper Egypt and invaded Barbary in the middle of the 9th (ixth) century. Their chief at that time was Mânîs b. Vâlyâ of the family of Mirdas. The Zirid emir al-Mu'izz [q.v.], who did not foresee the disastrous consequences of the entry of the Arabs into Ifrikiya, tried to come to an arrangement with him and to win over the Riyâh. The latter were the first to lay his country waste. But thanks to the protection of the chiefs of the Riyâh, to whom he had married his daughters, al-Mu'izz himself succeeded in escaping from Kairawân and reaching al-Mahdiya [q.v.].

At the first partition of Ifrikiya which followed the invasion, the Riyâh were naturally the best served. They obtained the greater part of the plains, which the Berbers had abandoned to seek shelter among the mountains; they had thrust their relatives, the Ashâbî, towards the east. They held Bedja which the caliph in Cairo had allotted to them in anticipation. The people of Gabes took
the oath of loyalty to Mūnis. "It was", says Ibn Khaldūn, "the first real conquest of the Arabs." The Djāmi', a family related to the Rīyāh, made Gaes a regular little capital, which they adorned with their buildings. Lastly, a chief of the main tribe, Muhābīz b. Ziyād, made himself a fortress in al-Mu'allaqa (a Roman circus?), among the ruins of Carthage. The powerful lords of al-Mu'allaqa, however, supported the policy of the Zirids of al-Mahdiyya, and joined them in their resistance to the Almohads.

This resistance did not long impede the expeditions sent by the Maghribis against Ifriqiya in anarchy. Defeated by 'Abd al-Mu'min in 546, 555, 583 (1152, 1160 and 1187), the Arabs were ordered to supply contingents for the holy war in Spain. 'Abd al-Mu'min, leaving a section of the Rīyāh in Ifriqiya under command of 'Ashārīr b. Sulṭān, took the others to the Maghrib with their chief, 'Ashārīr's brother Ma'sūd, known as al-Halib ("the axe"). On this occasion, the very capable and experienced military envoys of the Caliph (Dubai, al-Diyyā, and--above all--E. Fagnan), the Caliph, left the plains of the north of Bū Regres. This control was little in keeping with the traditions of the Rīyāh; Ma'sūd fled to Ifriqiya and there gave his support to the Banū Ghāniya [q.v.] who were trying to revive for their own advantage the Almoravids.

We know how the trouble stirred up by the Banū Ghāniya led to the Almohad caliph's appointing a governor of Ifriqiya invested with very extensive powers, Abū Muhammad al-Hāfīd [q.v.] family. This governor naturally attacked the Rīyāh and in order to be rid of them, encouraged the settlement in the country of the Sulaim Arabs hitherto quartered in Tripolitania. Under the pressure of the Sulaim, the Rīyāh, the principal family of whom at this time was the Dawwāsī, migrated to the plains of Constantine where they were henceforth to remain.

In their new home the position of the Rīyāh remained a very strong one. They had rights over all the centre of the modern department of Constantine, approximately from the region of Guelmâ to that of Bougie. In the Zāb [q.v.] they were on terms — which were sometimes friendly but more often hostile — with the Banū Możni of Būkra, who ruled this Hāfīd province. This is how the Banū Możni had to fight against that curious movement, at once religious and social, stirred up by the Rīyāh marabout Sa'da. The Dawwāsī, and in particular their most powerful family, the Awlād Muḥammad, held winter lands and enjoyed revenues paid by the people of the Oura in the Saharan region of the Wād Rūgh.

During the middle of the xviith century, the two chief branches of the main tribe, the Awlād Muḥammad and the Awlād Saβh, were actively engaged in the politics of the Hāfīd princes and the 'Abd al-Wādūls of Tlemcen, in the enterprises of the pretenders who threatened their dynasties. The power of the Rīyāh of central Barbary lasted till the xviith and xviith centuries. According to Bernaldo of Mendoza, they had in 1536 10,000 horsemen and large numbers of foot. The xviith century saw them assuring the Turkish Bey of Constantine, to whom they were connected by marriage and the independent sulţāns of Tuggourt. In 1644, Cathari and Warnier noted that the name Dawwāsī was still synonymous with "noble Arab."

Another group of the Rīyāh played a notable part in the history of the Zanīta states. In the extreme Maghrib, bodies of them transported by the Almohads to the plains of the coast faithfully served this dynasty, by trying to check the advance of the Marinids [q.v.]. Defeated near the Wād Slīb in 614 (1217), the Rīyāh were mercilessly punished by the victorious Marinids. Decimated and weakened, and driven northwards, they submitted to the humiliation of paying an annual tribute. Their name no longer figures on the map of modern Morocco except at a place near the road from al-Šārīf to Tanger.

Finally, at the other end of Barbary, in their first home, the name survives in the nomenclature of the tribes. The Tunisian caidate of the Rīyāh lies between Teboursuk and the hills which surround the Gulf of Tunis.


(GEORGES MARÇAIS)

RIYAL (a.), riyal franci, from the Spanish real (de plata), the name given in the modern world to the large European silver coins which formed the international currencies of the xvith and xvith centuries; the most important was the Spanish dollar (peso; properly 8 reals) but the name was also given to the Dutch, German and Austrian dollar, the French écu and Italian scudo. In the late xvith and xixth century the Austrian Maria Theresia dollar took the place of all its rivals and it still circulates to the present day around the Red Sea. The name riyal survived with it.

In the currencies of the modern Muslim kingdoms of the Ifrik and the Hīḏżjā riyal is the name of the largest silver coin, the standard being that of the Maria Theresia dollar. A riyal was also issued by the sulţān of Zanzibar in 1880. In modern Persia riyal is a money of account: originally (1930) 1 riyal = £ 1 sig. but by the system finally adopted in 1933, 100 dinars = 1 riyal = 1 pahlavi = £ 1 sig.

J. ALLEN)

RIYALA or RIYALA BEY, abbreviation of riyalu-ι humayūn kapudān, "captain of the imperial [gally]-royal" from the Italian riyaile (secondary form from riâle, abbrev. from galea reale, "the royal galleys"), a general officer of the Ottoman navy who commanded the galleys of the same name, later "rear-admiral". There was also a popular pronunciation riyaile with the prothetic i frequent in Turkish in loan-words with an initial r (cf. Hindigoua, p. 113 under "contre-amiral" and p. 457 under "riâle"; the form riyaile is found as early as Ewitty Čelebi, viii. 466 sq.). The Italian pronunciation riyaile is attested in the Itinéraire
Admiral in his absence. From 1246 onwards:

3. Tesrîn-i ʿamîr-i kâtib-i ʿâli (Bayazîd) agha
   "Intendant des galères", "Lieutenant of the Arsenal",
   "Sachwalter des Arsenalen". He was particularly
   concerned with the police of the Admiralty.

b. Admirals with the title of bey.

(Except the 4th, these officers were sea-going
admirals and took the name, of Venetian origin,
of the vessels they commanded. The name might
have the addition of humâyiyn "imperial" in a
Persian construction whence the official barbarisms:
babštarda-i humâyiyn, kapudan-i humâyiyn, etc).
The full titles in theory were: babštarda-i humâyiyn
kapudan, kapudan-i humâyiyn kapudan etc.

1. Babštarda, babštarda, babštarda-i humâyiyn
   — Ital. bastarda, Fr. bastarde oder batarelle.
   This was not the largest unit of the fleet.
   In Turkish as in Venetian usage the bastarda was a
galley larger than the gala sensile (Turk. kadırga or
   tekhir), but smaller than the galea or galiass
   (Turk. nauza) and had a very rounded poop
   "like a water-woman" (körpüs hili). Among the
   Turks it contained 26—36 oträk or benches of
   5—7 rows. The one which had the Kapudan
   Paşa on board was called (kapudan-) paşa bâbštarda
   and had 26—36 oträk. It was distinguished
   by the three lanterns (fener) attached to the poop
   in addition to that on the main mast (Tezhs, fol. 69;
   Dicwct Basha Türkî-l, 1309, p. 131). As it
   flew the flag of the Grand Admiral, it was some-
times (Menin-sk. Theanuus, i. 663; Barbier de
   Meynard) called "Captain" but we shall see that
   among the Turks this name was given to another
   vessel. Chancal has noted that the first syllable
   in the word babštarda means in Turkish "head",
   "chief" but it is difficult to say that the Ottomans
gave first place to this ship simply as a result of
a popular etymology. The disappearance of the
ship propelled by oars resulted in the abolition of the
babštarda. Officially disbanded in 1764,
according to d’Ohsson, it was still used from time
to time on certain ceremonial occasions. The sailing-
ship (balysn, "galleon") which became the flag-
sign of the kapudan-paşa, was commanded by
the "Flag-Captain" who, according to d’Ohsson,
was called in Turkish siwari kapudanı "captain
of the ship-commanders" and, according to von
Hammer (Staatsverf., ii. 493), sanıjak kapudani,
Esad Mehmed Efendi calls this officer, probably
by an archaism. babštarda-i humâyiynı paşa
"commander of the imperial babštarda of the
(kapudanı) paşa.

2. Kapudanı bey. Kapudana comes from the
Venetian (galea or nave) captana "gally or ship
holding the leader of a naval expedition, flag-
sign" (Jal). In France it was called "la capitaine"
or "capitanes" but these terms disappeared in
1669 with the office of general of the galleys, and
in the French navy pride of place was given to the
Rêale [see below]. On the kapudana which
took part in the naval battle of Çeşme (1770) cf.
Jaubert, Gravinaire, appendice, p. 3. Kapudana
and kapudana have often been confused (Hammer,
Staatsverf., ii. 291; Blochet, Voyage de Corfier de
Pion, p. 128: Douin, Naviacr, p. 250, 276,
295, 311). We find the full title of kapudanı-
humâyiynı kapudani, e.g. in a letter from Mehmed
Alı Paşa (of Egypt) to the grand vizier of the
29th Ramadán 1231 (July 1, 1821), register, No. 4, p. 71.

3 *Patrona bey.* Patrona comes from the Venetian (galea or nave) patrona or padrona, Fr. la patronne "galle carrying the lieutenant-general or the next in command to the chief of the squadron" (Jal). The earliest mention of an officer of this rank known to us is connected with the years 1676–1685 (cf. *Sūrijīlät ‘otkānāni*, i. 112, *infra*). Patrona Khallī, a janissary, leader of the rebels who deposed Ahmad III in 1730, owed his epithet to the fact that he had been *levon* on board the *Patrona* (*Relation des 2 rebellions*, p. 8; Eng. transl. in Charles Perry, *A View of the Levant*, London 1743, p. 64). — We also find the forms applied, it is true, to Christian ships: *paterna, patrona, botorna*, and even *botorna* (*Eyliya Celebi*, viii. 579, 12; i. 104, 71; viii. 447, *infra*; p. 446, 10; Hasan Așa, *Qawāhir al-Tawārīḵ*, Ms. Bibl. Paris., S. T. 506, fol. 160v—161). All these pronunciations show that the word was already well known, but was finding difficulty in being acculturated in the new order.

4. *Limān rēsî* "captain (admiral) of the port" of Constantinople, Germ. "Kapitan des Hafens". He was also commander of the mid-shipmen (*mandlidži*).

5. *Riyala bey.* Riyala comes from the Venetian (galea or nave) reale "galle which carried the king or princes" (the same name was often also applied as an epithet to vessels belonging to the king, i.e. to the state, in contrast to privately owned ships). For the lexicology of this borrowing from the Italian see the beginning of the article.

At the battle of Lepanto, Don John of Austria, Captain of the League, sailed in a Reale. A Patrona Reale went astern of the Reale of the Prince and of the Capitana of the "General Capitan dell’ Armata" of Venice. Except for these two ships, none of the 202 vessels of the allies was given the name of Reale (Contarini, *Historia delle cose . . . della vittoria della mosca da Silim Othoman o a Trincani*, Venice 1572, fol. 36v sqq.). In France the Reale was also in front of the Patronne and was the first ship of the navy, intended to carry the king, princes, the admiral of France or in their absence the general of the galleys (Jal). At the conquest of Cyprus, in 1570, Contarini (Venice 1595) gives for 185 Christian ships: 18 capitana, 7 padrona and 1 bastardella (no Reale); for the 276 Turkish ships: 1 real (sic) and 29 capitana (these terms do not correspond exactly to those of Turkish usage of that time).

It is not explained how the title of Reale came to descend among the Turks until it was applied to the ship of the admiral of lowest rank. We may suppose that they were misled by the same meaning of the word Reale [cf. above] or that they confused him with the English "rear-admiral".

*Marşulli* (State Militari, 1732, i. 146) mentions the Turkish "commandante nella Reale" as having a higher rank than the *garden-bahş* who was in turn superior to the captain of an ordinary galley. According to Esad Efendi, the *riyala* came before the *kaşunlar* bābātı.

All the officers here mentioned from the *kapudan paşa* to the *riyala* were *gâdik* deînek, i.e. they had the right to carry, in imitation of their Venetian colleagues, a commander’s baton or cane, deînek, also called *gâdikârî* aqâ (*Esad Efendi*, p. 109, 7) because it was encrusted with mother of pearl of different colours [cf. below]. It was what the Venetians called the giunetta o cana (*canna*), from canna d’India, "Indian cane", often taken in the sense of "bamboo" from which we also have the English word "cane". They alone wore small turbans and fur-trimmed robes (cf. D’Ohsson, pl. 228).

When under ‘Abd al-Hamid I [q.v.] or later under his successor Selim III, the naval hierarchy was organised and to some extent modernised, three grades of admiral were instituted (independent of the *kapudan paşa*, who was the Grand Admiral or "amiralissimo"). They were:

1. the *kapudan paşa* "Admiral". Meşmed Şükri regards his rank as equivalent to the more modern one of *șahrași bahşîye rēsî* "president of the Higher Council of the Navy". He had a fixed monthly salary of 4,500 piastres (1 piastre = 3 fars.) and in addition received pay for 1,000 men (on which he was liable to make various grants) but with the obligation to give to the *kapudan paşa* spices or *alçâlî* to the value of 4,000 piastres. He carried a green cane and had the right to have a pennon below the flag on the main mast (that of the *kapudan paşa* was above).

2. *Patrona bey* "vice-admiral" (Meşmed Şükri), modern Turkish *vis amiral* but we also find the French equivalent of "guidon" (Siymi Bey: Tungahir-Sinapiyan). Salary: 3,500 piastres. Pay of 800 men. *Dâlî* to the *kapudan paşa* of 3,000 piastres. Blue cane. Flag on the fore-mast.


It may be noted that in theory there was only one officer of each of these ranks at one time.

All three took part in the battle of Navarino in 1827 (Douin, *Navarin*, p. 250 and *passim*). They were under the command of Tâhir Paşa who had the rank of *mirâmir*—He was himself patrona but this does not mean duplicating the function of the patrona, who was subordinate to him because the commanders-in-chief of the fleet (*rayâk* or *bahş-bahş*) were chosen without regard to rank. Hüsîr-Elyas (Enderûn Türkî, p. 481) mentions a *limân rēsî* with the rank of *patrona* in 1826.

The flag-commander of the *kapudan paşa* retained his functions but seems to have occupied a position on the edge of the hierarchy which the presence of the Grand Admiral on board sometimes made unenvious (v. Hammer, *Staatserf.*, ii. 293).

We do not know at what period these ranks were replaced by the more modern terms of *mishir*, *ferîk* and *rîcâ*. The equations of rank varied considerably. The *riyala* is regarded as *mir alay, mirâmir, lûvâ, ferîk* and even *bîvindî* ferîk. It is probable that it was necessary to choose a grade between these. At Sebastopol in 1854, the Turkish frigate was commanded by a *botorna, Ahômad Paşa* (cf. Ahmad Râsim Türkî, iv. 2015).

In Egypt under the Khedives there was for a time a *riyala paşa* in command of the fleet.

However does not mention it. We still see there several remains of the Muslim period, such as a remarkable gate in the suburb of San Francisco. The cathedral of Santa Maria La Mayor has taken the place of the great mosque; the ancient citadel or Alcazaba of the Nasrid period was destroyed in 1808.

The principal fortress of the district of Tájarorná was for a long period Bobastro [q. v.] which was the headquarters of the rebel 'Umar b. Ḥaṣān [q. v.]. On the fall of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, Ronda became the capital of a little independent state in the hands of the Berber Banū Ifrā‘; among these rulers were Abū Nūr Hilāl b. Abī Kurra b. Dūnās who was proclaimed in 431 (1039) and died in 449 (1058) after having been the prisoner of his redoubtable neighbour, the king of Seville, al-Mu'tazīd [q. v.] Ibn ‘Abdāl, and his son Abū Naṣr Faḍlā, who after having held out for some months at the capital of his principality was killed at the instigation of the Abbadīd ruler, who annexed his state in 450 (1059). Ronda then became the residence of a prince of Seville until a son of al-Mu'tamīd [q. v.], al-Raḍāl, had to surrender it to the Almoravid forces under Gārūr in 1091.

Ronda played an unimportant part under the Almoravids and Almohads. In the Nasrid period [q. v.] it was for some time the appanage of the vizier and family of the Banū 'I-Hākim and was directly concerned in the internecine fighting of this period. It was taken by the Catholic Kings after a siege of 20 days on May 20, 1485.


ROSETTA (Arabic Kāshīd), a town in Egypt, situated at 31° 24' N., 30° 24'E., on the Western bank of the Rosetta branch of the Nile (the ancient Bolbitine) about ten miles above its mouth, which is known as al-Armūsīya and is dangerous to enter. Till the ixth century a.d., ships sailed direct to Fūwa; but owing to the excessive depositing of the silt in this region, Rosetta began to take its place during the reign of al-Muta-wakkl. In the xiiith century, however, Abu 'l-Fida' remarks that it was still smaller than Fūwa; and, in the xivth, Ibn Dūmnāk (v. 114) says that it was exclusively inhabited by garrison troops (al hādīhī 'l-mudīna kulluhum muḥīthūn). After the Ottoman conquest of Egypt in 1517 A.D. and the decay of European trade through Alexandria, Rosetta became an important centre for maritime trade with Constantinople and the Aegean territory of the Turkish Empire. The Viceroys 'Alī Pasha, in 915 (1509), restored its old khâns (warehouses) and funduqs (hostels), built new ones, and cleared the silt from its docks. The town continued to flourish until Muḥammad 'Alī [q. v.] reconstructed the Mahmūdiyya Canal for navigation between Alexandria and the Nile, and thus diverted the course of trade from Rosetta which declined rapidly to a mere fishing town with but few minor local industries such as rough cotton weaving, rice pro-
duction and oil manufacture. Its population in 1907 was only 16,666.

The topography of the town is largely medieval in character and it still retains many noble buildings which mark its past prosperity. Its streets and lanes are both narrow and circuitous with only one large fish market. Till modern times its wall was maintained for defence against Arab raids. At the mouth of the River, near Kām al-Afrāh, two castles guarded the waterway entrance to Rosetta in the past. Vansleb, who saw these castles in May 1672, describes them thus: "One stands at the East-side of the River, and the other on the West. That which is about a mile and a half from Rosetta is square, encompassed about with strong Walls, built according to the old Model, having four Towers. One hundred fourscore and four fountains are in the Garison... The other Castle is but a Mosque, before it stands seven Pieces of Artillery on the Guard: Here commands also an Aqūr over a Company of Moors, who examine all that go in, or out of the City." (State of Egypt, London 1675, p. 105).

In history, only few events may be gleaned about Rosetta. In 1234 (675) it was the scene of a serious but abortive Coptic revolt; in 1326 (927) the ʿAbbāsīd fleet of ʿAbū Saʿīd Šāmil routed the North African fleet of ʿAbūd Allah al-Mahdī [1, v.] commanded by a certain Sulaiman in the waters of Rosetta; in 1218 (1803) it witnessed the ʿAlāʾīd's victory over the combined sea and land forces of the Ottoman Porte; and in 1222 (1807) it was saved by the English who came to help al-Mukāhir and his Mamluk successors. It must also be remembered that in 1799 A.D. in the neighbourhood of the town, Boussard, an officer of the French Expedition, discovered the famous Rosetta Stone now in the British Museum.

Bibliography: See works already mentioned in articles on other Egyptian towns. (A. S. ATIVA)

ROUBA B. AL-ʿADJDĀDI AL-TAMĪMĪ, an Arab poet. The name Ruba is more frequent among men from eastern Arabia than is generally supposed. Arabic philologists have given many explanations of the peculiar name: I am however certain that it is the Persian word ʿarba, meaning "four," which is implied in the name ʿAdjdādi. Al-Tamīmī is a poet of the Banū Malik b. Saʿd b. Zaid Manāt b. Tamīm. He became celebrated as a poet of adīr verses, in which genre he surpassed both his father and the latter's rival Abu ʿl-Nadżm al-ʿIdjī. Of his life very little is known. Like his father he spent most of his life in the desert (ʿadījī) and only came into the towns when he sought presents for his panegyrics from the great. Born about 655 (685), in his middle years he went about with the armies which were spreading the power of ʿAlī. His earliest productions are entirely lost, but we have a panegyric (No. 22) on al-ʿĀṣim b. Muḥammad b. Ḥaḍāf, the conqueror of Sindh, on his return from India in 94 (713). As in the following year al-ʿĀṣim was taken into prison and murdered, the date of this poem is fairly certain. Our poet then travelled in Eastern Persia, either as a soldier or a merchant, and a further poem by him (No. 26) is dedicated to another governor of Sindh, ʿAbd al-Malik b. Kāīs b. al-Dhībī who was there about 10 years later.

Whether he was in Khurāsān during the troubles that broke out after the death of Kūtaibah b. Maslamān (60 = 715) is not clear, but several poems are dedicated to individuals who took part in the fighting there. His poem attacking al-Muhallab (No. 27) shows that he was against the Yamanis as do his poems in praise of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik who conquered Yazid b. al-Muhallab and killed him (102 = 720). But he must have again been in eastern Arabia or the ʿIrāq, as is shown by his poems on Kūthīlī ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAskārī, Abūn b. al-Walid al-Badjalī and al-Muhādījir b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kīlābī. At a later date, he dedicated poems to men who were active in Persia like Muḥammad b. al-ʿAṣfāṭīk al-Kūthāī who was in Kīrman in 129 (747) and particularly Nāṣr b. Saiyār, who failed to put down the rising of Abū Muslim and died in 131 (749). A poem (No. 41) is dedicated to the last Umayyad caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad of whom he still hopes that he will conquer all his enemies.

As he had in this way shown his attachment to the Umayyads, it is no matter for surprise that Ruba did not feel his life safe when he was summoned before Abū Muslim. Of the audience we only know that Abū Muslim showed himself a connoisseur of Arabic. Two poems in praise of Abū Muslim are to be found in Geyer's Nachträge (Diambis 4 and 6). Several other poems in praise of members of the new dynasty have survived; one (No. 55) is dedicated to Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-Saffār and two to his uncle Sulaimān b. ʿAli (Nrs. 45 and 47), and the latest poems of Ruba are in praise of al-Manṣūr, who succeeded his brother as Caliph in 136 (754) (No. 14 and Diamb. 8). He was then an old man and is said to have died in 145 (762).

All Ruba's poems are in the radīj metre; the few verses in other metres ascribed to him I have found to be by other poets and wrongly attributed to him. He had learned the art from his father, whom he even accuses of having taken credit for his poems when Ruba began to write, and we actually have a poem by Ruba against his father (No. 37). From his father he also inherited a fondness for unusual words and his poems are among the most difficult in the Arabic language, as they are full of words which are never or only very rarely found in other poets. One even suspects that for the sake of effect the poet coined new words which did not previously exist. He is fonder than any other poet of a kind of alliteration or, to be more accurate, an accumulation of a number of forms from the same verbal root. No one can make this sort of thing beautiful and Ruba's poems have probably survived only because the lexicographers found them a rich quarry for unknown words. A proof of this is the number of lines from his poems which are quoted in the great dictionaries, and in the Līsān al-ʿArab, for example, run to several thousands.

It is no wonder then that the learned men of al-ʿAsra and, less often, of al-Kūfa visited him to increase their knowledge of the ḥizāba until he became tired of them. We even find that Ibn Kūthawī in his Rāʾi ʿalā dājīm Sūra quotes Ruba for readings of the Kūran which have no other justification that they are different from the known readings. Ruba simply claimed to know better.

Ruba had two sons, ʿAbd Allāh to whom two poems are dedicated (20 and 56), and ʿUkba who
also wrote poems in the same metre as his father (Ḍāhī, Reyan, i. 23; Ibn Kutaita, Ṣifīr; Marzubān, Muwāṣṣiṭbān, p. 218 and 366; Ibn Rashīq, Ūmda, i. 136).

Rubās poems were collected by several scholars, among them Abū ‘Amr al-Shāhibāni, Ibn al-ʿAraṭi and al-Sukkārī, of whom the last two named are probably represented by the surviving manuscripts (cf. Dīambs 40–44). The contents of these manuscripts have been edited by Alvhwart (Berlin 1903), unfortunately without noting the commentary which is absolutely necessary for the poems of Rubā, and in the alphabetical order of the rhymes which makes it difficult to recognise the original arrangement of the collection. As this edition was incomplete, Geyer in 1908 published a collection of several rubās poets eleven further poems with the commentary under the title Alterarische Dymanben. Alvhwart had in his editions of other poets added a collection of verses which he had found in various works quoted as by Rubā. This collection was extended by Geyer in his Beyträge zum Dīwān des Rubā (Berlin, 1908, p. 156; 165). Even then there remain lines attributed to Rubā which have escaped both editors, while many lines are not by Rubā but belong to other poets. Confusion seems to have begun at quite an early date between the poems of Rubā and those of his father al-ʿAdidādi. Alvhwart also published a complete German translation of the whole Dīwān in rhyme. The value of this translation is unfortunately small as it is really only a paraphrase and does not help with the difficulties of the Arabic text.

Bibliography: Biographical notices on Rubā are found in Dījma, Tabākāt, ed. Hell, p. 147 (where unfortunately the MSS. have a lacuna); Ibn Kutaita, Kitāb al-Ṣifīr, ed. de Goeje, p. 376–381; Marzubān, Muwāṣṣiṭbān, p. 219; Kitāb al-ʿAqīābī, ex. 84–91; Ibn Khālīkān, ed. Cairo 1310, i. 187. — Lines by Rubā are quoted in large numbers in all the great dictionaries.

F. Krenkov

Rubaʿi, qua-train (plural rubā`īyāt, from the Arabic rubāʿi, "quadrupartite"). Its fundamental characteristics have also been defined (cf. the article ʿArbaʿî, in i. 470); on p. 468 sq., are given the forms of Arabic popular songs in quatrains.

It consists of two distichs (bayt) or four hemistichs (mīrāʿ) rhyming together with the exception of the third (unāb), the third being called ḥaṣṣ ("crastrated"); the two hemistichs of the first bayt (mugarrā) must rhyme. The rubāʿi in which the four hemistichs have the same rhyme is found particularly among the old poets (cf. ʿAṣūrī’s Dīwān). The rubāʿi lends itself to every kind of inspiration. According to one theorist, the first three hemistichs serve as an introduction to the fourth which ought to be sublime (bulūd), subtle (lajf) or epigrammatic (fit). According to E. G. Browne (Lit. Hist. of Persia, i. 472), the rubāʿi is "almost certainly the oldest product of the poetical genius of Persia". The Persian philologists attribute the invention of this metre to a child playing at nuts with its playmates; one of the nuts having fallen out of the hole by a rebound then fallen back rolling, the child called out ʿallām ʿullām hami ravea dā bare-gāw, "rolling, rolling, it goes to the bottom of the hole". According to the Taḥkīra of Dīwān, ed. Browne, p. 50; the child was the son of the emir Yaʿqūb b. Lāth the ʿAffārī and the officials of the court recognised in this hemistich a variety of ḥazāדī; they added a second hemistich (mīrāʿ) to it with the same rhyming, then a second line (bait) which they called ḥaṣṣ-bait ("poem in two verses"); but some scholars, considering that it consisted of four hemistichs (mīrāʿ) adopted the name rubāʿi and Rūdaki was the first to excel in it¹ (it should be noted that Asadi’s dictionary Layhātī Fārs, ed. Horn, quotes two rubāʿi by poets at least as old: Abū ʿl-Muʿayyad, p. 68 and Shahid, p. 112). The anecdote is again found in a work written in 1220 (nearly three centuries before Dīwān) called Maqām fī Maʿāṣīr Aṯār’ī by Shams-i Kāsi (ed. Mizrā Muhammad and Browne, p. 88): one holiday, in a street of Ḍīzmin, the poet Rūdaki ("at least I believe so"); says the author) was watching some children playing at nuts; a boy of ten to fifteen improvised the same hemistich in the same conditions. "These words seemed to the poet to be a suitable metre, a pleasing poetical form; he consulted the rules of prosody and recognised in it one of the derivatives of the ḥazādī; on account of the high place where the child’s eyes, Rūdaki confined himself to two lines (bait) for each poem;... as the inventor of the metre was a young and innocent boy (tar), Rūdakī called the metre tarāūna (cf. Horn, Grundr. der neu-persischen Etymol., No. 382 and n. 3: Niẓāmī’s hemistich is no doubt quoted from the Farhang-i Dījāngātī: tar ṭarāūna ṭarāūni moṣ.fig., "every young man was singing verses"). The Haft Rubā’ūn describes tarāūna as the rubāʿi of which the four hemistichs (mīrāʿ) have the same rhyme (which is at least disputable). According to Shams-i Kāsi (op. cit., p. 90), "the connoisseurs of poems set to music (mulḥūnāt) called tarāūna the rubāʿi set to music and ḥaṣṣ-bait the rubāʿi without music, because it had no more than two lines; the arabicised Persians (mustaʿriba) called the rubāʿi the ḥaṣṣ-bait, because in Arabic the ḥazādī has four muṣṭīlūn (while in Persian it has eight); each line of this [Persian] metre makes two Arabic lines [in other words: a Persian mīrāʿ is equal to an Arabic bayt]. From the fact that the metrical change used in this metre did not exist in Arabic poetry, Arabic was not written in this metre, but now the modern poets use it freely. Arabic rubāʿi have become common in Arab lands." On this point in his Dūmāt al-Kur (Aleppo 1349, p. 174), al-Bākhrzī (12th century; q.v.) says that his father repeated several Arabic rubāʿi to him; these may be reckoned among the earliest in this language. In the Sādīḳī period the vogue of the rubāʿī seems to have reached its height. Rawandi (Rūḥāt al-Suṭūr, ed. Muhammad lkbāl, p. 344) says a propos of a man of letters of Hamadān: "He was called Nādjm (al-Dīn) Dībait; he possessed wealth which he lavished on men of talent; with an inkwell and a pen he put into writing all rubāʿi that he found; he left neither property nor furniture;... his heirs shared 50 murān of manuscripts containing ḥaṣṣ-bait." No Persian metre admits of so many variations. Indeed, the theorists number 24 types of rubāʿi derived, half from the ḥazādī-ī aḥtram, half from the ḥazādī-ī ḥaṣṣ (the latter more pleasing to the ear, according to Shams-i Kāsi). The Khurāsānī philologist Ḥasan Kattān divides these two series into two trees (ṣāfāfara) which figure in the treatises on prosody (Shams-i Kāsi, p. 92; Blochmann, Prosody of the Persians, p. 68).
which clearly show the variations (azāhīf) of the ḥazāḏaj muḫammādan ẓālim (muḏfūlān. 8 times). Four different metres may figure in the four hemistichs of ruṣā. Shams-i Kāis thus explains the mechanism of this poetical form: "The beginning of the hemistichs of the dā-bātī is mužfūlā (called aḫrārā) or mužfūlā (called aḵrās). When the first foot is mužfūlā, the second becomes mužfīlān (ṣālim) or mužfīlān (μαφίλα) or mužfīlama (μαφίλα); when the first foot is mužfīlān, the second becomes mužfīlān or mužfīla or vālīlān (this last aḏlār). When the second foot is mužfīlān or mužfīlān, the third becomes mužfīlān or mužfīla; when the second foot is mužfīlān or vālīlān or mužfīla, the fourth becomes mužfīlān or mužfīlān. The (last) foot which follows mužfīlān or mužfīlān becomes fa (aḏṭer) or even fā (잡all); that which follows mužfīlān or mužfīlān becomes fafol (aḏṭum) or even fa (mužfīlama)." Further, according to Shams-i Kāis, some poets have written mužfāṭārā (pieces of several lines) in this metre, e.g. Abū Tāhir Khatānī (from whom he quotes a passage); Farruḫī also deliberately composed a kaḏa [q.v.] in the dā-bātī metre, sometimes retaining the same rhyme in the two hemistichs so that several ruṣā can be taken from it. It may be recalled that the formula ī naḥāv wa-lا ᴹα[--]a ṭa [q.v.] was used as niṣrā in certain quatrains (quoted by Ḥāfaiz Atmār Ṭāhir, Riṣālā-i Turān, ed. Behrooz, 1867, p. 9). Most Persian poets composed ruṣā in the metres mentioned. Some owe their fame to this metre: Abū Saʿd [q.v.]: Umār-i Khayyām; Bābā Afzāl al-Dīn Khānūn (ed. Ḥāfaiz-Nafisī, Teherān 1311-1312). A collection of them is attributed to Dālāl al-Dīn Rūmī (Sultān 1342, 400 p.). On the other hand, the name ruṣā is wrongly but traditionally given to the quatrains of Bābā Tāhir [q.v.] in Ḥāfaiz of maḏāhib (muḏfūlān muḏfīlān) and other quatrains in dialect (faḥlāziyāt; cf. H. Kohā Kirmānī, Turān-i milī, Teherān 1310); these are really faṭwās. On the quatrains in Arabic, cf. Dozy, Supplement, s. v. dā-bātī; Ben Cheneb, Tafsīr al-ʿA XBī Miṣām Aḏâr al-ʿArāb (Algiers 1928, p. 113-117); in Turkish: Gīlb, Ottoman Poetry, i. p. 85; in Hindū-tān: Gūrīn de Tasty, Litt. hindoue, 2nd ed. i. p. 36-37 and his edition of the Dīvān of Wāḥīd al-maṣṣūn (1906).


HENRI MASSE

RUDĀKĪ, ABŪ ABĐ AL-LĪ ʿABĀR B. MUḤAMMAD B.ḤĀKİM B. ABĀ B. RĀJĪM B. ADĀM, a native of Rūdāk in the vicinity of Samarkand; he is said to have been the first great poet in the Persian language; according to al-Balānī, vizier of Ismāʿīl b. Ḥāmid, emir of Khwārsān, he had no equal among either Arabs or Persians; he died at Rūdāk in 329 (940-941) (Samānī, Anābī, in G. S. M., fol. 262; similar text in E. G. Browne, Hand-List of Muhammadan MSS. in the University of Cambridge, No. 701). To be more accurate, Rūdākī was born and died at Bānūduj (Yakūt, Muḥjam, s. v.) near Rūdāk. Some writers wrongly say that his taḥkallūs came from his skill in playing the lute (rud, rudāk). In any case the pronunciation Rūdākī should be abandoned. We know few details of his life. From scattered allusions in his poems, it seems that Rūdākī left his native village to go to Būḥārā to the Sāmānīd amīr Naṣr b. Ḥāmid, whose pangsārī he became. Later he accompanied the amīr to Bāḏghīs and Herāt. There is located the incident, recounted by several biographers, of the courtiers desirous of returning to Būḥārā to spend the winter there begging Rūdākī to use his influence with the amīr Naṣr; the poet composed his famous poem ("The scent of the river Mūlyān") etc., which decided the prince to return at once; richly rewarded, Rūdākī returned to Samarkand, travelling sumptuously. Two verses attributed to Rūdākī refer to journeys to Samarkand and to Niẓāmī. The poets Abū Shābīr and Ṣūrān allude to a certain "Aṣyār, the favourite slave of Rūdākī. The biographers say that he was born blind, but a number of his verses which describe in glowing colours the beauties of the sensual world (quoted in Naṣfī, p. 550 sqq.), prove that he lost his sight at an advanced age; it has been supposed that the blindness was caused either by a clumsy oculist or was a reprimand on the protégés of the vizier Bālāmī. Rūdākī, banished from the Sāmānīd court on the dismissal of the vizier (326), is said to have retired to his native village; from this period (his three last years) date the verses in which he regrets his youth and his brilliant past (Naṣfī, p. 561). In his earlier days, according to his biographers and the allusions of later poets, his talents had considerably enriched him. Following Abū Saʿd Idrīsī (d. 409), author of a history of Samarkand, Samānī says that Rūdākī was buried on the hill behind Bāsūn (now a suburb of Samarkand); he adds that this pilgrimage used to be made to it (which proves his fame after death). According to some writers, Rūdākī wrote 1,300,000 bātī six maḏāhwān (the Farkhānī fraḵhāngī mentions one of them: Dāʿūrān-aḏāfā) in addition to his diwan of poetry; on the other hand, Thālī, Firdawīs and others agree in saying that he put the Kātīla wa-Dīnma (q.v.) into verse from a translation of the Sāmānīd emir Naṣr. Of his works only a few fragments remain. E. Denison Ross (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 609 sqq.) has shown that the edition of the Diwan of Rūdākī (Teherān 1315) consists chiefly of the poems of Kaṭrān of Ṭabriz [q.v.] who lived a century later. Does this confusion come from the name Naṣr, borne by the patron of both poets and figures in their panegyrics? E. D. Ross agrees that this attribution took place early to supply the loss of the poems of Rūdākī, whose fame had remained. Ḥasan Rāzī b. Lutf Allāh in his maḏāhībān (finished in 1049) says he had examined some twenty copies of Rūdākī's Divān and only attributed a dozen kaṣādas and 20 quatrains after collation to Rūdākī, the remainder to Kaṭrān. In all, according to Ross, we may attribute to Rūdākī the authorship of the following: 1. the isolated verses quoted in the Lughāt-i Furs of Asadī (ed. Horn, p. 18-19); 2. six distichs from the translation of the Kātīlah quoted in the Tafsīr al-Mūlīḥ (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 638); 3. four pieces quoted by Bāhākī (J. R. A. S., loc. cit., p. 639); 4. the 27 protrations in Shams-i Kāis (Muḥjam, ed. Mirza Muḥammad and Behrooz, index); 5. the famous ode on the river Mūlyān (Niẓāmī, Aḏāfā); 6. the 9 kaṣāda, No. 6 in Ethis' collection (Rūdākī, der
The pulpit mosque of the district was in Karadj, known as Karadj Rüdrāwār to distinguish it from the same place near Isphān, Karadj Abi Dulaf.

Barkiyāru 2 in 995 (1101–1102) went from Rūdrāwār via Maraj Karātēgīn to Sāwa (Ibn al-Athīr, ii. 157). Hamd Allāh al-Mustawfi calls the district Rūdrārūd with the towns of Sirkīn and Tusīn. On modern maps we find it in the southern base of the Alwand, and Tusīn after which the district is now called, a little farther south.

Not far from the village of Rūdrāwār, i.e. presumably of Karadj, was a village called Mughūn (al-Sayyid al-Murtada, Tājd al-Aṣrār, Cairo 1307, viii. 178; P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, v. 552)

The present ruins of Rūdlūwār (De Morgan, Mission en Perse, i. 136) are certainly those of Karadj, capital of Rūdrāwār (Le Strange, East Caliph., p. 197, note 1).


(E. HONGMANN)

AL-RUDHRĀWAR ZAHĪR AL-DĪN ABD SHU‘ḌA MUḤammad b. AḥṣAIN b. MUḤammad b. ABD ALLAH b. IHĀMĪ, an Aḥbāb al-wāṣi’d vizier. Al-Rūdrāwar was born in al-Ahwaz in 437 (1045–1046); his father Abū Ya‘lā al-Ḥusayn, who had died just as he was about to take over the vizierate to which he had been appointed by the Caliph al-Kā’īm [q. v.] (460 = 1067–1068), was a native of Rūdrāwar, a little town near Hamadān. He studied in Baghdad under the direction of Shaikh Abū Ishāk al-Shirazi and in 471 (1078–1079) was appointed vizier by the Caliph al-Muqtadid but dismissed after a short period of office. After the fall of Aḥmid ibn al-Dawla b. Ḍāhir [see Ibn Ḍāhir 2.] al-Muktaﬁd, again gave him the vizierate in Shahrān 476 (Dec. 1083–Jan. 1084), and this time he held ofﬁce for several years. In 1091 he was dismissed at the instigation of the Sādikī Sultan Malikshā [q. v.] and retired to Rūdrāwar. From there he went in 487 (1094) on the pilgrimage to Mecca; in the vicinity of al-Rabādha however, the caravan was attacked by Beduins and al-Rūdrāwar is said to have been the only one who escaped. He then settled in Medina where he lived till his death in the middle of Djamāda II, 488 (June 1095). He was buried on the Ba’t al-Gharkād near the tomb of Ḫūrām, the son of the Prophet.

Al-Rūdrāwar is praised by eastern historians not only for his piety and devotion to duty, but also for his eloquence and poetical gifts. He wrote among other works a continuation of the Tājdārīb al-ʿUmām of Ibn Miskawayh [q. v.], (Qāṭu Kāṭib Tājdārīb al-ʿUmām) containing the years 365–389 (979–999), edited and translated by Amedroz and Margoliouth, The Eclipse of the AḥĀbāb Caliphate, Oxford 1920–1921.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallīlīn, Wafayāt al-ʿAṣyān (ed. Wustenfeld), No. 712 (transl. de
RUDJU (Α.), return in the neo-Platonic sense, forms the main subject of the apocryphal "Theology of Aristotle". The question deals mainly with the individual souls who have descended or fallen into this earthly world of bodies but are purified by knowledge and who return to their original home, the spiritual world, either in an ecstatic condition or after separation from their bodies by death. Marduk is used alongside of rudju; the verbal forms from rudja are frequently employed; connected with these we find a number of expressions, sometimes related in meaning and sometimes giving a closer definition. The Arabic translators of the "Theology" took their terminology in part from the Kūfān and sacred tradition; we must however here confine ourselves to the neo-Platonic meaning and its reception into Islam.

In a certain sense the doctrine of return is a counterpart of the theory of emanation [cf. the article fā'ūl in the Supplement]. Everything comes from God and returns to him! Logos and (soul) myths are, however, more interwoven here than in the doctrine of fā'ūl. There is a general presupposition of the purely spiritual substantiality of the intelligent soul (nafs nūṭṣa) and of its immortality, which has not only a philosophical foundation but is supported by appeal to the ages-old cult of tombs and ancestors (see "Theology", ed. Huculak, p. 7 sq.). Orphic-Pythagorean traditions and views of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are combined and harmonized.

Let us begin with an outline from the "Theology" (p. 4-8 and passim). The human, i.e. intelligent soul does not feel at home in its association with an earthly body. Lying in the filth of matter it longs for return to its pure origin. It was once a part of the elevated world soul produced by God through the intermediary of the intellect (alab). So long as it was in the world-soul its place was in the centre of the all. The world-soul has a two-fold countenance: on the one side directed upwards, it looks to the alab and by it to God; on the other it turns to the corporeal world which engenders it and is guided by it (cf. "Theology", p. 20). In so far as the world-soul has caused the corporeal world, it knows its product, but as a spiritual being, it always remains within itself. It is however possible that parts of the all-soul may turn more deeply to the earthly, form an idea of it and demand to be united with it. This is the cause of the descent or fall of the individual souls (nafs; also nasaal, tanasal, tanasul etc. = Greek σασσεῖται). But as every individual soul partakes of spiritual being and immortal life it can never fall completely (cf. p. 132): in part it remains with itself in the upper world, in part it combines with the corporeal world and in part it wanders to and fro. Such migrations of the soul are naturally to be interpreted in the spiritual sense, i.e. independently of time and space.

The descent of the individual souls differs very much in degree. The deeper a soul sinks into matter, the more it forgets its heavenly origin. If it gives way to its passions and desires, it cannot rise again to its origin, and even after the separation from the body by death, only with great difficulty.

But the souls that turn away through asceticism from the sensual world, prepare themselves by good deeds and — this is the most important — purify and perfect themselves by love and knowledge, can, even in ecstasy ("Theology", p. 8; cf. thereon Massignan, Textes inédits, p. 131 sq.) or after death raise themselves to their origin (nafs, nāfšu, irṣifq, tabši = Greek ἄνδρας), where they see the alab and through it God himself in light and beauty. Plato had already spoken of this elevation (e.g. Republic, vii, p. 517 B: ὀριστὶν τῷ μὲν ἑαυτῷ τοῖς ἐπικροάδιοι ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἀνθρώπων). According to the "Theology", p. 9 sq., Heracleitos, Empedocles and Pythagoras also urged the soul to this ascent; the Ikhwan al-Safa' add Polchemy, the astronomer, and interpret the ascension of Christ and Muhammad’s journey to heaven (mi’riḍ) in a spiritual sense. Muslim philosophers and mystics did the same.

After what has been said, it is evident that the elevation (inūnd) of the soul to its origin (lli la‘al) can be called a return. It is more closely defined as a return to its interior, to its own being (lli dḥāثih). It is an entering into the self, a becoming conscious of one’s own self; not a losing of being, but a restoration. The speculative mysteries in Islam went a great deal farther in this direction.

According to the "Theology" (p. 18 sq.), the return to the origin or being can only be a state (lajil) of the soul, not of the mind. The alab always remains by itself and therefore never needs to return to itself; thinking, thinker and thought are always one in its being. When in the Liber de causis (ed. Bardenheuer, § 6, cf. § 14) a return to its being ispredicated of the alab, this can only be interpreted as an uninterrupted self-consciousness. So far the doctrine of the fall and return of the soul can be presented as fairly uniform. It shows a pessimistic conception of the life of the soul in combination with the body. But it also finds an optimistic interpretation ("Theology", p. 10 sq.). With Plotinus it is observed that Plato talks another language in the Timaeus (cf. p. 28 sqq.) from that of the Phaedo, Phaedrus and Republic. According to the Timaeus, God created this beautiful world and equipped it in his great goodness with mind (alab) and life (= soul). Not only has he sent the all-soul into the world but also our (part-)souls so that the world may be as perfect as possible. If the individual soul can only conceive the sensual world correctly, i.e. as the image of the intelligible world, its combination with the physical world will not be a misfortune for it. Both worlds have come from God, the pure good. The only question is, what is the purpose of the soul in this world?

To this the "Theology" answers (p. 43 sq.) that the union of the soul with a body is not a final aim for the individual soul. In any case, union with the world soul and the contemplation of the alab and of God gives it a higher bliss for which it longs; but first of all it has to prepare itself for this. It has a divine task. If it descends into the corporeal world, it receives strength from above in its form and guide a body. Provided it does not sink too low, it derives advantage and knowledge from it. Its previously dormant strength and the nature of this now become known to it. This is its very purpose, that it should come to know itself and its origin. The journey through the corporeal world is for it a course of training. Therefore (p. 80) the individual soul should not be blamed for leaving the spiritual world and coming into this world to
adorn it and to reveal its own nature. After it completes its work it returns to its origin.

Both expositions of the fate of the soul, pessimistic and optimistic, have influenced Muslim thinkers. With the gnostics, the Ikhwan al-Safa and many mystics, pessimism predominates, while from Farabi onwards the philosophers are more inclined to optimism. It is to be noted that the terminology of the “Theology” was only partially adopted. Rudjin, for example, is found only when from the context neo-Platonic influence can be deduced; but it did not become a proper technical term. In place of rudjin and marjd we usually find ma’dad and a’maud which are explained as return in the neo-Platonic sense.

That the teaching of the Ikhwan al-Safa turns almost entirely on the spiritual substance of the soul and its immortality is well known. Goldziher has often and expressly pointed out this out (e.g. Vorlesungen, p. 34, 163 and Koraanontling, p. 183 sqq.). The third part of their encyclopedia is wholly devoted to the soul (on ma’dad, especially rasā’il 32 and 38 sq, Bombay ed.). The 38th treatise is entitled: Fi l-’Ilam wa l-’Ukdār wa l-Kiyāma; these are three synonyms for resurrection, here interpreted in a spiritual sense. But in other parts of this work also (i. 3; ii. 27—29; iv. 43 sq), there is much to the point. The famous passage in the “Theology” on the Plotinian ecstasy (i. 3, p. 69) is quoted, and the pseudo-Aristotelian “Book of the Apple” modelled on the Phaedo of Plato is mentioned (iv. 2, p. 119 sq). The value of life in the world is, it is true, sometimes recognised but the misery of the wandering soul is more strongly emphasised. It is frequently pointed out that the weak souls cannot help themselves, that they require advice and instruction from prophets and philosophers in a community of life and belief so that they may be put upon the right path of return. The principal thing is the gnosis, for what food and drink are to the body, knowledge and wisdom (’ilm and ikhwanu) are to the soul (ii. 27, p. 313 sq). Like the physician Razi and the philosopher Kindi the Ikhwan chose the Socrates of Hellenistic tradition as their first leader; he is however not the only one. The individual souls require many philosophers and prophets and also living guides (generally a late Hellenistic principle). With their help the good, wise soul advances to union with the world soul and through this with the ’awl and God. The union of the individual soul with the world-soul, is the death resurrection (kiyāma); the major resurrection takes place when the world soul separates itself entirely from matter and returns to the higher world of the spirits and of God (cf. Tj. de Boer, Wiss. begr., preis Islam, Haarlem 1921, p. 77 sq, esp. p. 96 sq). The doctrine of the ma’dad became more complicated after the theory propounded by Farabi and more clearly developed by Ibn Sinā of the ten spirits of the spheres (_tabūt). The individual souls endowed with intelligence, according to this, do not descend from the world-soul as parts of it, but they are, like the bodies of the earthly world, products of the last spirit in the series of emanation, i.e. of the ’awl fā’il. The purified soul longs for this spirit and its return is in the first place to it. Its longing goes further, to come as near as possible to God and to become like him, so far as it is possible for man. The philosophers are distinguished from the speculative mystics by the fact that from Farabi to Ibn Rushd the first question they put is: How is the union (ittifāq) of our soul with its origin (the ’awl fā’il) possible? The mystics, on the other hand, however differently their inner states and stations are described, desire nothing else than becoming one with God himself (ittifād). According to Farabi, the soul finds its return by the way of right knowledge and pious acts, but knowledge is esteemed more highly than deeds. Deeds remain in the world but knowledge enters into the spirit [cf. the article ‘MAL in the Supplement].

With the doctrine of the ecstatic conditions of the soul Farabi combines in exemplary fashion his prophetology, especially in the “Model State”, a copy of Plato’s republic, but interpreted in the cosmopolitan spirit of the Stoics. This turns upon the harmony of religion and philosophy. The agreement is based on the fact that they both come from the same source: the difference is explained by the fact that the souls of the prophets and philosophers take up different attitudes. In their ascent in the ecstatic condition to the ’awl fā’il the soul of the prophet receives revealed truth through its imagination, while the soul of the philosopher receives illuminating wisdom through its intellect. But the truth is one and the same, so the philosophers down to Ibn Rushd and Ibn Sina (vii I. = xi. cent.), teach, and many mystics are of the same opinion. Cf. Fārābī, Abhandlungen ed. Dieterici, p. 69 sqq. and Musterstaat, p. 45 sqq.

According to Ibn Sinā’s “Division of the Sciences of the Mind” (khālam al-’Ulmā al-Faṣlīya in Tir Rāzī, Constantinople, p. 76 sq), metaphysics (with Aristotle here called Theology) presents in its fundamental parts (mu’ālik) among other things the theory of emanation, but on the other hand deals with the doctrine of the dīlam of ma’dad along with prophetology as derived or applied parts (furā’ī). This means that the theory of fūd possesses a higher place than the doctrine of the return.

Ibn Sinā here again supports Fārābī. More definitely than the latter he adopts the neo-Platonic doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. This is not merely the form of its body, as Aristotle taught, of course inconsistently, but a spiritual and therefore indestructible substance. Against Plato and Pythagoras it is asserted that it has no pre-existence in the world-soul and does not migrate from one body to another. The ’awl fā’il gives (presumably from an inexhaustible supply) a suitable soul to each body that is sufficiently prepared for it. In a sense one can say that it has come into enumeration, but it is not an adding. For this reason Sinā, as Ibn Ṭufail (Ifhīr, ed. Gauthier, p. 11) remarks, somewhat undecided in his opinion on the return of all souls, even of the wicked, Ibn Sinā, on the other hand, not; but both interpreted the rewards and punishments in the next world in a spiritual sense, as was also the case with the Ikhwan al-Safa. It is also to be noted that Ibn Sinā, especially in his mystical writings, uses terms of a more Şûfī character than Fārābī.

Ghazâlī took over from the philosophers just mentioned the doctrine of the spirituality and immortality of the soul, without however, at least in his principal works, drawing from this its logical spiritual deductions regarding the next world. In his Tahāfut (ed. Bouyges, p. 344 sqq.) he defends
the orthodox doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies on the last day, while in his esoteric writings he speaks in allegory after the Sufi fashion (cf. Ibn Rushd, in Tahâfut al-Tahâfut, ed. Bouyges, p. 530 sqq.). Ibn Rushd therefore accuses him of contradiction, defends the philosophers and observes that the Sufis believe in a spiritual return (masâd rûbûnî) and are still regarded as good Muslims. But what is the personal opinion of this philosopher? It looks as if he hesitated to come out with his real opinion. It must therefore be sought in his larger works on metaphysics and psychology which have not yet been sufficiently investigated. But it is often very difficult to say where the commentator and the philosopher begins. This much may safely be said that Ibn Rushd more than Fârâbî and Ibn Sînâ regards the soul as the form of its body. With this its spiritual substantiality and individual immortality would disappear.


(R. D. de Boer)

RUH (see NAFS.)

RUH b. HATIM b. KÂBISA, GOVERNOR OF IFRIKIYA, was appointed to this high office by the caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd in 171 (782). Under al-Ma’mûr he had been qâlîb, then governor of al-Hâra; then he was appointed by al-Mahdi successively governor of al-Kufa, Sind, Tabaristan and Palestine. He must have been advanced in years when Hârûn al-Rashîd sent him to Ifrikiya in the year after his accession to the throne. He belonged to the family of al-Muhallab, which had already sent two governors to the same province and was to supply two more after him. "It seems that at this period the caliph thought of entrusting the affairs of Ifrikiya to a vassal family" (Vonderheyden). The governorship of the Muhallabids which preceded that of the Aghlabids, was very successful. The rebel Berbers appeared to be finally overcome and the Khazars and the Avars were suppressed; so satisfactorily was the position that Rûh b. Hatim when he arrived at Kairawân in Radjab 171 (Dec. 787—Jan. 788) had no serious difficulties to face. Besides, he brought with him new contingents of the gûnûn, 500 horsemen, who were joined soon after by 1,500 others brought by his son Kâbiya. For the three years of his governorship, the country was peaceful. Rûh even succeeded in concluding a peace with ‘Abd al-Wâlhâb [q. v.], the Rustamîn of Ta’hart. The authors who are our authorities upon him, notably Abu l-‘Arab and Ibn ‘Idhârî, make special mention of his generosity, his stoicism in face of adversity and of his skill in disarming his opponents.

As he was showing signs of senility, the postmaster and a kâhid of the province requested the caliph to appoint a successor to him secretly, who could take his place if necessary. Following their advice, Hârûn al-Rashîd appointed Naṣr b. Haḥîb. Rûh b. Hatim died on 10th Ramadân 174 (Feb. 3, 791), and his son Kâbiya was formally recognised as his successor in the great mosque of Kairawân. But the postmaster and the kâhid informed Naṣr, the governor designate, and Kâbiya had to give way to him.


(G. MARÇAIS)

AL-RUHâ (See OREFA.)

RUHî, is the mahkûl of the historian, whose work was until 1925 known only from the references in ‘Ali’s [q. v.] Rûkûh ul-‘Abbâr and in Munêj-djmîhâ (q. v.). J. H. Mordtmann (M. O. G., ii, 129 sqq.) was the first to identify by conclusive arguments several manuscripts of the anonymous original work. They tell us practically nothing about the personality of the author and it is only a hypothesis (cf. F. Babinger Die frühmoslemischen Jahrbiicher des Urudsch, Hanover 1925, p. xiii.) that connects the historian Rûhî with a certain Rûhî Fâdîl Efendi who, like Muhîf al-Dîn Djamâlî (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 72 sqq.), was a son of Zenbîlî ‘Ali Efendi, distinguished himself as a poet and died young, in 927 (1528) it is said. As he is also called Rûhî Edrenewi, i.e. Rûhî of Adrianople, this hypothesis may be correct. But elsewhere (cf. Sehî, Tezkîh, p. 127), this Rûhî Fâdîl Efendi is said to have been born and to have died in Stambul.

The history of Rûhî entitled Tewârikhî Alî ‘Othmânî is written in a simple style and divided into two parts (kisâ). The author calls the first mehîbath, i.e. beginnings, the second metâfebih, i.e. elucidations. The first part falls into two sections of a general nature, the second contains eight chapters each of which describes the reign of one sulṭân. The chronicle was written in the reign of Bâyazid II (1481—1512) and ends in 917 (beg. March 31, 1511). Rûhî’s work has not been further investigated nor is there a critical edition of the text, which could easily be prepared from existing old and good manuscripts (Berlin, Oxford, Algis; cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 43). It is clear however that Luîfi Paşa’s [q. v.] Chronicle is dependent on that of Rûhî.


(FRANZ BABINGER)

RUKN AL-DAWLA, ‘ABD AL-HASAN B. BOYÉ, Second in age of the three brothers that founded the Bûyûd dynasty [q. v.]. His fortunes followed those of the elder brother ‘Ali (later ‘Imâm al-Dawla [q. v.]) up to the latter’s occupation of Fârs in 322 (934); Rûkûn was then given the governorship of Kâshân and other districts. But shortly afterwards he was forced by the ‘Abbâsid general Yâkût, at whose expense the Bûyûd conquest of Fârs had been made, to seek refuge with his brother; and when Yâkût was in turn defeated by the Ziyârid Mardwîd [q. v.], the Bûyûds’ former overlord against whom they had revolted, ‘Imâm, who then found it advisable to conciliate Mardwîd, sent Rûkûn to
him as a hostage. On Mardawijd’s assassination in the following year (323 = 935), Rukn escaped and rejoined ʿImād, by whom he was supplied with troops to dispute the possession of the Dībah with Mardawijd’s brother and successor, Washgmir. Rukn succeeded at the outset in taking Isfahan; but the first round of his contest with Washgmir ended in Rukn’s ejection from that city in 327 (939), when he again fled to Fārs.

In the next year Rukn’s help was sought by his younger brother al-Ḥasan (later Muʾizz al-Dawla [q.v.]), who had meanwhile set himself up in Khuszanḵān, against the BarIDL [q.v.]; whereas Rukn, being possessed of no territory, attempted to take Wāṣīt but was obliged to retire when the caliph al-Rādı [q.v.] and the amir Badḵjam [q.v.] opposed him. Almost immediately afterwards, however, he succeeded in recovering Isfahan, owing to Washgmir’s championship of Māhān b. Kākāḏ in a quarrel with the Sāmānī Naṣr b. Aḥmad [q.v.]; and when the latter ruler died in 331 (943), Rukn, who had meanwhile supported the Sāmānī cause, was able to drive Washgmir as well from al-Raʾy, of which he had momentarily regained possession on the retirement of the Sāmānī general Ibn Muḥtadī.

With al-Raʾy Rukn gained control of the whole Dībah; and for two short intervals (of about a year in each case) retained it for the rest of his days. Up to 344 (955–956), however, his position was highly precarious. For not only Washgmir, but also the Sāmānīs continued to challenge it. It was only by playing them off against each other and sowing dissensions between the Sāmānī princes and the officers they sent against him that Rukn was able to maintain it. Even so (as indicated above) he was driven from al-Raʾy, and his representatives were expelled from most parts of the province, once in 333 (944–945) and again in 339 (950–951), in each case by Sāmānī forces. Indeed he was obliged in the end to become the Sāmānīs’ tributary (at least two agreements for the payment of tribute being recorded); it was on this basis that he first made peace with them in 344 (955–956) as again in 361 (971–972). In the course of his long contest with Washgmir, who, until he was killed in an accident in 357 (968) never ceased to intrigue with the Sāmānīs against him, Rukn on several occasions invaded Ṭabaristān and Gurghān, but was unable to incorporate these provinces permanently in his dominions. And though in 337 (948–949), after he had defeated an attempt on al-Raʾy made by the Salārid Marzûbān b. Muḥammad, whom he took prisoner, he gained control of southern Adharbāḏjān, his ejection two years later from al-Raʾy itself [see above] naturally cost him this as well.

Rukn received his laḫab simultaneously with his brothers in 334 (945–946), on Muʾizz’s entry into Bāḡdād; and on ʿImād’s death in 338 (949), succeeded him as head of the family and amir al-ʿunūn (though this title was also held by Muʾizz). The last two years of his life were rendered unhappy — so much so that he never recovered from the shock induced by the news — owing to the conduct of his son, ʿAḍūd al-Dawla [q.v.], in taking advantage of an appeal for help sent by Bakhṭiyār [q.v.] (son of Muʾizz and his successor in the rule of al-Trāke), to imprison the latter, and, in conjunction with Rukn’s own waṣṭar Abu ʿl-Fāṭem Iba al-ʿAmid [q.v.], who had been sent likewise with a force to Bakhṭiyār’s aid, to seize that province for himself. And though ʿAḍūd obeyed his command to release Bakhṭiyār and return to his government in Fārs, Rukn was only with difficulty persuaded to visit ʿAḍūd in 365 (975–976) at Isfahan, in order to ensure that by receiving a confirmation of his appointment as heir, he should succeed without dispute. Rukn died at al-Raʾy in Muḥarram of the next year (September 976).

Rukn al-Dawla was fortunate in his employment of the remarkable waṣṭar Abu ʿl-Faḍl Ibn al-ʿAmid [q.v.] from 340 (951) for thirty years until his death in 359 (970), though, as that minister himself complained (see Miskawaih), he was prevented by the prince’s lack of royal blood and of culture from governing properly. Rukn (so he said) was in fact no more than a predatory soldier, who could secure the allegiance of his supporters only by means of largesse, and was not able to forgo revenue in the expectation of subsequently increasing its yield. On the other hand he is said to have been just and humane towards his troops and his subjects, and gave proof — especially in connection with the episode of ʿAḍūd al-Dawla mentioned above — of a tender sense of honour.


— (Harold Bowen)

RUKN AL-DIN, Sulaimān II b. Kūlid Arsān II, a Saḍḏūq ruler in Asia Minor. His father Kūlid Arsān b. Masʿūd [q.v.] in his old age divided his kingdom among his many sons. The consequence of this was that the latter set up as independent rulers and began to fight with one another so that at his death in Shaʿbān 588 (Aug., 1192) complete anarchy reigned. In the course of time however, Rukn al-Din brought the whole kingdom under his sway. Kūṭb al-Din Malikshāh who had received Siwās and Aḵṣara, began by attacking his brother Nār al-Din Ḥamādī, lord of Kāsāriya. The latter was killed and Kāsāriya passed to Kūṭb al-Din. On the latter’s death Rukn al-Din who ruled in Tokt (Dūkāt), attacked Siwās and took possession of it. He next seized the two towns of Aḵṣara and Kāsāriya. After some time, he turned against his other brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kalkhsuraw in Konya and laid siege to the latter. He had to give in and ceded his territory to his brother. In Ramadān 597 (June–July 1201) Malatya which belonged to Muʾizz al-Din Kaṣarsk̄ā b. Kūlid Arsān was captured. Erzerūm was the next to pass to Rukn al-Din. When the latter’s troops approached, the governor there, ʿAlī al-Dīn b. Malikshāh, the last of the Šaltūk dynasty, began negotiations by which the town was surrendered to Rukn al-Din who gave it to his brother Tughrîlshāh. Another brother, Muhī al-Dīn, who had obtained Angora when the kingdom was divided, long resisted Rukn al-Din’s lust for conquest, and only after a three years’ siege found himself forced to capitulate when supplies were completely cut off, but was promised suitable compensation. Rukn al-Din promised him
a fortress in a remote part, but laid an ambush for him in which he was attacked and killed as he left the town. Soon afterwards however, Rukn al-Din fell ill and died before the news of his brother's murder reached him. He was succeeded by his son Kılıç Arslan III (q. v.). Ibn al-Atîr (xxi. 128) gives the date of his death as the 6th Dhū'l-Qa'dā 600 (July 6, 1204); according to another statement (xxi. 59) however, the successor at Angoras and the death of Rukn al-Din did not take place till 602 (1205—1206).

Ibn al-Atîr describes Rukn al-Din as a strong and vigorous ruler: he is said to have held certain heretical views (mahdhab al-jātāsī) on religious matters which, however, he concealed from fear of his subjects.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Atîr, al-Kāmil (ed. Tornberg), xii. 57—59, 111, 119, 125 sq., 128 sq., 132, 295; Abu l-Fida', Annates (ed. Reiske), iv. 193, 209; Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens orientaux, t. ii. 69—72, 94; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljou- chides, ii. 15—25, 45—61, 72; iv. 5—9, 18—23, 28.

(K. V. Zettersten)

**RUKN AL-DIN.** [See Bairars I, Barkingšek, Tüchjehrîk, Kılıç Arslân.]

**RUKNÀBâD** (or $abî Rukn) the water of Rukn al-Dawla), a canal (kanât) which runs from a mountain (called Kula'â), P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, u. 48, No. 7) about six miles from Shirāz. Enlarged by a secondary canal, it follows for a part of the way the road from Isfâhân to Shirāz. Its streams reach as far as the vicinity of the town towards the cemetery of Imam Hârîrî, and is buried, when they are not entirely absorbed for irrigation purposes. According to Fāsī's Nāṣīrī, part ii., p. 20, "the waters of the plain of Shirâz come by subterranean channels except the water from the spring of Dushk... The best waters are those of the Zangi and Kûnî canals. The Kânî-î Rukn (i.e. Ruknabâd) was made in 338 (949—950), one and a half farsâh N.E. of Shirāz by Rukn al-Dawla, and the Dailami (cf. 897) its waters rise in the ravine of Tang-i Allah Akbar a mile north of Shirâz: it waters the plain of al-Masâlî [q.v.].

In the fourteenth century, Ruknabâd is mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭûta and by Hamíd Allah Mustawi Kâzîvin (Nizâk al-Kalâbî, transl. Le Strange, in G.M.S., p. 113: "the water comes from subterranean channels and is the best that of Ruknabâd"). But it is to the poets that this canal really owes its fame. In the fourteenth century Sa'îlî declares himself charmed by the land of Fârâz and the waters of Ruknabâd (Kūltûst, Calcutta 1791, fol. 296a, l. 4). In the following century 'Ubadî Zâkâni sings the zephyr which blows from al-Masâlî and the wave of Ruknabâd remove from the stranger the memory of his native land" (text quoted by F. G. Browne, which finds in it an echo of Sa'dî, *Persian Lit. under Tartar Dominian*, p. 238). Hârîrî in particular immortalised Ruknabâd in his verses: "Pour out cupbearer, the wine that is left, for in Paradise thou shalt find neither the stream of Ruknabâd nor the promenade of al-Masâlî" (ed. Khalâlî, Teherân 1306, No. 3, v. 2). "Shiraz and the wave of Rukn and the sweet breeze of the zephyr, blame them not, for they are the pride of the universe" (ibid., No. 35, v. 7): "The zephyr which blows from al-Masâlî and the wave of Ruknabâd will never allow me to depart" (ibid., No. 168, v. 9); "May God a hundred times preserve our Ruknabâd, for its limpid waters give a life as long as that of Kiliâd" [q.v. (ibid., No. 277, v. 2), and in a piece which may be apocryphal (ibid., part 2, No. 75): "The water of Ruknî, like sugar, rises in al-Tang (-i Allah Akbar)". According to later writers, Ruknabâd, which Ibn Baṭṭûta called a great water-course (al-nâkr al-kabîr), gradually dried up. Among the notable travellers of the xviith century, Chardin, almost alone in mentioning it, saw only a large stream and gives Ruknabâd the fanciful meaning "Ruknenabat, veine ou filet de sucre" (Voyages, ed. Langles, viii. 241). At the end of the xviith century, W. Franklin praises the sweetness and clearness of the waters of this little stream to which the natives attribute medicinal qualities. At the beginning of the xviith century Scott Waring notes that its breadth was nowhere more than six feet. Ker Porter observes that the canal has become choked up through neglect. The Kutlûsh namâz depeles the disappearance of the groves that surrounded it. At a later date we have the same observation by Gobineau ("Cette onde poétique ne m'apparut que sous l'aspect d'un trou bourgeois"), Curzon ("a tiny channel filled with running water") and Sykes ("a diminutive stream").

**Fāsî's Nāṣīrî** mentions a second Ruknabâd in Fars: "The source of the warm stream of Ruknabâd is part of the district of Bîhî-nâ (Lariastân); it is over a farshân north of the village of Ruknabâd; having a bad flavour and an unpleasant smell, it is of use for agriculture; it works in a few minutes' eggs put into it; one can only bathe in it at some distance from the spring" (ii. 318 middle and 258).


(H. Massêb)

**Rûm**, the name in Persian and Turkish for the Byzantine empire. Rûm means the land of the Rhomaes (Pàmâioi) or Byzantines although in Central Asia Rûm is also used for the Roman empire. In course of time the conception
became narrower. While Rüm still is the old name for König (q. v. and RUM-SALMIK), in the early Ottoman period Rüm comprises the district of Amasia [q. v.] and Sivas [q. v.] while Anatolia included the so-called province with the capital Kütühiya [q. v.] (cf. *Ist.,* x., 1920, p. 144, note 1). From the earlier name Rüm for old Hella (cf. *Iskandar-i Rüm, i.e. Alexander the Great*), Eastern Roman and Byzantine, it was applied in Turkey to designate the modern Greeks (also Urüm) in contrast to the ancient Greeks who were called Yunanîyan or Ionians. Rüm also sometimes meant Turkey in general; cf. the expression Rüm Pâlişâhi for the sültan. Rüm later was used in a derogatory sense. Rüm Mehmed was said of the Greek character, faithless, unreliable, flattering.

Cl. also ERSERUM (i.e. Erfi Rüm) and KUMELIA.

(FRANZ BIRINGER)

**RÜM KAL'A, a fortress in Northern Syria.** According to Arnold Noldeke's description, it is situated "on a steeply sloping tongue of rock, lying along the right bank of the Euphrates, which bars the direct road to the Euphrates from the west for its tributary the Merizman as it breaks through the edge of the plateau, so that it is forced to make a curve northwards around this tongue. The connection between this tongue of rock, some 3,000 feet long and about half as broad, and the plateau, which rises above it is broken by a ditch made by man about 100 feet deep. The walls of the citadel with towers and salients follow the outlines of the rock along its edge at an average height of 150 feet above the level of the Euphrates, while the ridge extending along the middle of the longer axis rises 100 to 120 feet higher" (A. Noldeke, in *Petermanns Mitteil.,* 1920 p. 53 sq., where the main road up to the citadel, the buildings etc. are also described).


While Th. Noldeke (N. G. W. Götze, 1876, p. 12, note 2) wished to distinguish Rüm Kal'a clearly from Olymbos and identify with the former place the modern Urüm, Hörum on the Euphrates, above Balqis, Urma is now generally identified with Rüm Kal'a (Marmier, B. Moritz, Cumont, Dussaud etc.). The name of the old bishopric of Urma last appears in Mêdînos of Edessa (ed. Warshafapart 1898, p. 323): in 561 Arm. (1112—1113 A.D. the Armenian Kogh Wasil returned to Talcond of Ani, who had taken the lands of Halim Sur, Toreh and Urem, which he had taken from the Franks. The first two are İhsan Mansur and Tîrîz (Turkish) and Urem is Urma (Histor. of the crusaded, Docum. arm., i. 102 J. Markwart, Südermanen und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, p. 182, note 1 of p. 177). The Syriac chronicles record (Mich. Syr., iii. 199; Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 279) that Kogh Basil or after his death Kurig, who acted as governor for his widow, held the towns of Kaisa, Rabban, Bûhhasen and Kal'a Rhômait. It is very probable that the latter, the Syriac for Rüm Kal'a, here corresponds to the Urem of the Armenians, which is later in Armenian always called Homklay and by similar names.

Rüm Kal'a later belonged to the county of Edessa. The metropolitan Abu l-Faraj b. Shum-

mâna of Edessa, who after the second capture and destruction of this town by the Turks (1146) escaped to Samosata, was imprisoned for three years in Rüm Kal'a by Joscelin; he then wrote several memoirs "with an account of the events" which caused his imprisonment (Mich. Syr., iii. 277b; Baumstark, Gesch. der syr. Literatur, Bonn 1922, p. 293).

At the request of an Armenian of Kal'a Rhômait named Michael in 1148 Beatrix, widow of Joscelin II of Edessa, and her son demanded that the Armenian Catholics Grigor III Pahlavuni should move his residence to the "fortress of the Romans" (Arm. Hromklay) which belonged to their territory, the county of Edessa (the capital of which since the fall of al-Raḥīm in 1145 had been Tall Bâshir). The Catholicus had lived since 1125 in Cowk ("little lake"), i.e. the fortress of Kal'at Šof in the Aljbal Sawf (Šof) to which Badr-al-Dîn Mahmûd al-Aīnî fled in 803 (1400—1401) from Timurlenk (Quatremer, *Histoire des Séliouk Mamelouks de l'Égypte, t. III, 1830, p. 227), and recently visited by Höussknecht, as is evident from Armenian sources which mention the "little castle of Cowk" in the region of Tlāk" (Dâlâk Tlāk). (Papken G. W. Guleserean, Cowk, Cowk-Tlāk and Hrom-

Grigor's successor, the poet Ner-sès IV Shnorhal, the "graceful" (patriarch 1166—1173), was called Klayeč'i from his place of residence in May 1170 and March 1172 negotiations concerning a church union took place between him, Theoranos as ambassador of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenos, and the bishop Iwannis (Elías) of Kaisîm and the monk Theodoros Bar Wahbûn as delegates of the Jacobite patriarch Michael the Great, who had remained in the monastery of Mar Bar Saâmûn (Briran), in Rüm Kal'a (Syr. Kal'a Kûmait or Hêmûn dê Kûmaitû, Greek Pausëios Koxês) and in Kaisîm (Syr. Kaisûm, Greek Kastôuô). (Migne, Patr. Graec., cxxii., col. 114—298; Barhebraeus, Chron. ed., ed. Abbelbos, Lamy, t. 549—551 expanded in *Mich. Syr.,* iii. 334—336).

After the death of Ner-sès (Aug. 8, 1173) his younger nephew was proclaimed Catholicos in Rüm Kal'a. His older nephew however induced his brother-in-law Mêh of Cilicia to obtain from Nür al-Dîn a charter, on the authority on which he threw his cousin into prison and had himself installed as Catholicos on Sept. 5, 1175 (Mich. Syr., iii. 353 sq.). As Grigor IV Tela (Degha, "the child") he was Catholicos from 1173—1193, the son of prince Wasil of Gerger, who was brother to Ner-sès Shnorhal. Under him in 1179 took place the synod of Hromklay, at which Ner-sès of Lampiron delivered a famous speech in which he recommended the adoption of the Chalcedonian creed (Mansi, xxii.,
col. 197—206). But the proposed union of the churches fell through because Manuel Comnenos died on Sept. 24, 1180. In the same year Theodoros bar Wabbin, who had seceded from his teacher and godfather Michael the Great and was seeking assistance everywhere to oust him from the patriarchate, came to the Catholicos in Rûm Kâla, who welcomed him kindly and sent him to Cilicia to Leon II (Syr. Lëbhûn; Armen. Lewon) of Little Armenia; the latter made him patriarch (1180—1193) of his whole kingdom (Mich. Syr., iii. 356 sqq.; Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. col. 585—585; J. Gerber, Zwei Breie Barathabius, Halle [diss.] 1911, p. 3—9).

When the emperor Frederick Barbarossa was on his way through Asia Minor, in 585 (1189—1190) the Armenian ğihe of Kâla-at-Rûm (i.e. Grigor IV) sent a letter to Saladin to ask for help; in the following year he (al-Kähkâh) again sent a letter to him (Abû Shâma, Kitâb al-Râuqâsun, in Rec. hist. or. crois., Hist. arab., iv. 435 v.—435—435). After the death of Grigor IV (July 1193), the Armenians made his young nephew Grigor V Manog ("the young") or as Michael Syrus calls him, Dirâsu ("the cleric") Catholicos (1193—1194; Mich. Syr., iii. 411 sqq.). Leon of Cilicia in 1195 had him carried off and thrown into the fortress of Gubadara (Kopotar) where he perished in an attempt to escape. The Armenians thereupon made his predecessor's cousin, Gregoros, son of Shahan, his successor as Catholicos Grigor VI known as Abirâd ("the son d'erd") (1194—1203; Mich. Syr., iii. 413; Hist. or. des crois., Docum. arm., i. p. cxx.). His successors were: Howhannes VI of Sis (1203—1221), Costandin I Barzberdeci (1221—1267), Hakob I Klayecci (1267—1286), Kostandin II (1286—1289) and Stephanos IV Hromklayecci (1290—1293).

In Rûm Kâla in the nineteenth century there were also many Jacobites, among whom the presbyter Ishô (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 665) and his sons (Bêné Ishô: Barhebraeus, i. 691, 695, 761, 754, 759; Yûkub (ibid., i. 683—685, 251, 779); the presbyter and physician Shêmôn (ibid., i. 735, 744, 747, 759—767) with his followers (Bêth Shêmôn: ibid., i. 750, 756, 767) and Ishô Şankiti (ibid., i. 740) played an important part. The Jacobite patriarch Ignatius II (Rabban Dawid, 1222—1252), celebrated for his wealth, endowed Kâla Rûmaita among other places with a splendid church (Barhebraeus, i. 665). Later he chose this fortress as the see of his patriarchate (Barhebraeus, i. 685). He did not come out openly against the Armenian Catholicos but he endeavoured as far as possible in secret to advance the Syrian church at the expense of the Armenian (Barhebraeus, i. 687—689). On the other hand, we are told that at this time, when the doubtless very profitable cult of the Jacobite saint Barsawwâm was at its height in the monastery at Gargar called after him (now Horsên Kâlaš between Malatya and Sumaisat), the Armenian also "out of covetousness" built a monastery "called after Barsawwâm" in Rûm Kâla and received many gifts from the people, to the vexation of the Jacobites. The patriarch Ignatius therefore resolved to build a Jacobite monastery there and also to buy a suitable site for it on the Nahhâ dhe-Pharzêmân (Arab.: Nahr Marzûban, now Merzûman-Câi) from the Bêné Ishô and also to get from them an agreement of sale by which they were to surrender any authority over the monks living there. When they stubbornly refused, the patriarch excommunicated them and established himself in a cave on the Euphrates but was brought back by the Armenian Catholicos. Later on he fell ill, and after a reconciliation with the Bêné Ishô through the offices of the Katholikos, died in Rûm Kâla on June 14, 1252 (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 691 sqq.).

In 1260 Hülaşû crossed the Euphrates by bridges of boats at Malatya, Kâla-at-Rûm, Bira and Kâkhtûs (Barhebraeus, Muhûtçar Târikh al-Doval, Bâirût 1890, p. 486; Chron. syr., ed. Bedjan, p. 509). In the decades following, the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius III (1264—1282) had to defend his possession of the Barsawwâm monastery at Gargar in a desperate struggle with the physician Shimôn of Kâla Rûmaita; both had received or alleged they had received new charters of ownership from Hülaşû and Abâkû (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 753—766; ii. 439 sqq.); later on they made up their quarrel (Barhebraeus, i. 769). After the death of Ignatius the Bânû Kâla Rûmaita made his nephew Philoxenos or Nestor patriarch in 1283 (Ignatius IV). The latter died at the beginning of July 1292 in the monastery of Barzawwâm (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 781); after his death the Jacobite patriarchate disintegrated and three rivals appeared in Malatya, Cilicia (Gawkît monastery) and Mardin and as a result of this permanent schism the Jacobite church sank to complete insignificance (Barsawwâm [2], additions to Barhebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 781 sqq.).

It was perhaps not merely chance that the end of the united Jacobite patriarchate which in recent years had been closely associated with the town of Rûm Kâla, happened almost the same day as the collapse of the Armenian Catholicate of Hromklay.

In the reign of Kâlûn an Egyptian army of 9,000 horse and 4,000 foot under Baisarî as well as Syrian forces under Husâm al-Dîn of Aîntab had come to Rûm Kâla and laid siege to the fortress on the Pharsian on May 19, 1280. The sultan demanded that the Armenian Catholicos should surrender the fortress and move with his monks to Jerusalem, or if he preferred, to Cilicia. When the Catholicos refused to do so, the Egyptians laid waste the country around the town which was inhabited by Armenians, on the next day forced the mayor over a wall only recently built into the town and set it on fire. The whole population fled into the citadel. After the Egyptians had ravaged and plundered the country round for five days, they retired.

In the reign of al-Eshraf Khalîl they undertook a new expedition against Rûm Kâla in 691 (1292) in which the prince of Hamîd, Malik al-Muzaffar, took part with Abu Yûsûf in his retinue (Abu Yûsûf, Annales Musulmânici, ed. Reiske-Adler, v. 542 sqq.). On Tuesday, the 8th Dûmmad II, the Egyptians appeared before the town and erected 20 pieces of siege artillery. It fell after a siege of 33 days. On the 11th Radjab (June 29, 1292) it was plundered and a massacre carried out among the garrison of Armenians and Mongols. Among the 1,200 prisoners who were mostly taken to the sultan's arsenal on June 28 (al-Nuwarî, Ms. Paris, fol. 100 v., in Quatremerre, Histoire des Sult. Mammût, i., p. 141, note 30) was the Armenian Catholicos (Arab.: Kâlûyat al-Mastûk, whom they called Kâlûyatûk); cf. Yûkût, iv. 164), Stephanos IV of Rûm Kâla with his monks; he died a prisoner.
in Damascus (Barhebraeus, Chron. syr., p. 579). According to the inscription of ownership in a Syrian manuscript (Brit. Mus., MS. Syr., N° 205), it belonged to a certain Rabban Barsamnā of Kāla Kōnātā, high priest of Rabān who in a note refers to the harsh imprisonment which he suffered from the Egyptians; Armenian verses on the fall of the fortress are preserved on a relic casket (Wright, Catal. syr. Mss. Brit. Mus., i, 231; Carrière, Inscription d'un reliquaire arménien, in Mélanges orientaux, Paris 1883, p. 210, note 1; Promus, Mem. dell' accad. di Torino, xxxv., 1884, p. 125-130). The inscription on the great gate of the citadel which was restored by al-Asfār (cf. above, vol. ii., p. 235) speaks of him as a victor who among other feats had put the Armenians to flight, an allusion to the capture of Kūm Kāla (van Berchem, in J. A., 1902, May-June, p. 456; the inscription published by Soberman, in Isr., xv., 1926, p. 176). The sulṭān sent boastful bulleins of victory to the cities of Syria in which he proclaimed the capture of this impregnable citadel as an unprecedented feat of arms and concluded with the words: "After the capture of this fortress, the road is open to us to conquer the whole of the East, Asia Minor and the [Irāq so that with God's will we shall become owners of all the lands from the rising of the sun to its setting" (al-Nuwayri, MS. Leyden, fol. 58, transl. by Weill, Gesch. d. Christen, iv. 183 sq.).

The fortress of Kašār al-Rūm was rebuilt by orders of the sulṭān by the niṣba of Syria, Sandjug Shujāj, and given the name Kašār al-Mamlūk; another part of the town was left in ruins however (Quatremerè, Hist. des Sultans Mamlouks, t/i, p. 139 sq.).

The successor of the imprisoned Armenian patriarch Stephanos, Grigor VII of Anbaraza (1293-1302) took up his residence in Sis in Cilicia, which henceforth was the seat of the Catholicos. Rūm Kāla, in spite of its restoration as a frontier fortress (cf. also Abu l-Fidāʾī, ed. Reinaud, p. 226; al-Dimishki, ed. Mehren, p. 214), under the Mamluks never seems to have recovered from the blow. In 775 (1373-1374) much damage was done by floods in Kašār al-Mamlūk as well as in Ḥalab, al-Ruha, al-Bira and Baghdād (al-Hassan b. Ḥabib, Durrat al-Aslāk fi Daulat al-ʿArāb, in Weijers, Orientalia, ii, Amsterdam 1846, p. 435).

In the spring of the year 1477 the Mamlūk sulṭān Kašīthāi made a tour of inspection as far as Kašār al-Mamlūk (described by al-Dījān Abu l-Baḡāʾī, ed. R. V. Lanzone, Viaggio in Palestina e Soria di Kaif Ba, Torino 1878; transl. R. L. Devonshire, in Bulletin l. F. A. O., xx., Cairo 1921, p. 1-43). After the battle of Mardj Dābīk, the fortress became Ottoman and in modern times came under the pashalik of Ḥalab (Ḫadżdżī Ḫalīfah, Qīḥānum-nūmā, p. 598).

The Armenian and European authors give the name Rūm Kāla or Kašār al-Rūm in many forms. Among the Armenians we find the forms Hromklay, Ḥromklay-Hofomakan, vulg. Arm. Outoum-gala (works of St. Nersēs, St. Petersburg, p. 80; his poems, Venice, p. 224, 277; Indijdjan, Altertumer Armeniens, iii. 278; Saint-Martin, Mémoires de l'Armeine, i, Paris 1818, p. 196). Gulielmus Tyrius (Hist., xvii. 16) writes Runculat; but it is no doubt identical with his Rangulatān (xi. 11; French text, ed. Paulin Paris, ii, Paris 1850, p. 164), which however he takes to be a quarter of Edessa. Schiltberger (Reise, p. 47) calls the fortress Urumbula.

Only a few remnants of the fortress now remain as well as of an Armenian monastery and a mosque (plans of the fortress in Moltke and following him in Humann-Puchstein, Reisen . . . , p. 175, and A. Noldeke, in Petren. Mitt., 1920, pl. 3, map; Plan von R. K. in: 1:2000; photographs: F. Fiech, in Geog. Zeitschr., xxi., 1916, pl. 1; Cumont, Études syriennes, p. 170, fig. 54; from the north: Humann-Puchstein, op. cit., p. 176, fig. 25; from the east with the Euphrates: A. Noldeke, op. cit., pl. 13).


RUMELI, RUMELIA. The name Rumeli, Rum-il-i (i.e. land of the Romaeans) was given in the narrower sense to the province proper of this name, which comprised Thrace and Macedonia i.e. an area which was bounded on the north by the Balkans, in the east by the Black Sea and the Bosporus, in the south by the sea of Marmara and the Aegean, the so-called White Sea, then by the Olympus range and in the west by the Pindos, Barros and Shahr-Dagh (Sa'ran planina), embracing the old territories of Thrace, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia and Albania as well as the ancient Hellas, with the exception however of the strip of coast and all the islands of the Aegean or Archipelago, which were a separate governorship (çiçekli) under the Grand Admiral (kapulan pasha; q.v.: after 1849 the Çiçekli-i Bahri-i Sefid formed an eyalet, cf. Reise de l'Orient, xvi. 117, and later a çiftlik).

The governorship of Rumelia (Rum-il-i eyaleti)
was bounded in the north by Austria and Wallachia, in the east by the Black Sea, in the southwest by the Ionian Sea and in the west by the Adriatic, in the northwest by Austria and Bosnia [q. v.]. It is to be noted that these frontiers include the san- dy lobbyist [q. v.] belonging to the governorship of the Archipelago (γραφείο το ελληνικού) Gallipoli [q. v.], Negropont (Egirdir, Euboea) and Aineboghi (Nau- pactos), the former of which comprised the coast from Sambul to the outlet of the Kara Su into the Aegean Sea with a considerable stretch of land running into the interior, the second an abbey (of which comprised the east and south coast of Greece proper with the exception of the Morea (Peloponnesus).

The area of the province at its greatest extent was estimated at about 5,100 square miles while the population was estimated at not more than 5,575,000 millions of different nationalities (μιλλετ), Turks (Ottoman, who, although the ruling nation, formed the smallest part), Tatars, Greeks, Slavs, Aranais, Armenians, Jews and Gipsies. The predominant religion was Islam, while the Christian confession of the so-called non-uniat Greeks was the largest.

The governorship of the beglerbeg of Rumelia was at first Philippopolis (Filibe, now Flovdiv), which was conquered by the Ottomans in 1353. The first governor to reside there was Yozma Sanha, conqueror of that country, whose turbe is still seen not far from Stara Zagora. In 1278 (1385) there appears Timurtash-Beg [q. v.] as beglerbeg (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i, 191), following Feridun-Beg with his residence in Sofia.

The governorship of Rumelia was divided into sandyaks, the number of which varied in course of time and the boundaries of which were constantly changing. About 1830 there were 24 of them, namely: Wiza, Krik Kilise [q. v.], Silistra (Silistra), Nikopolis [q. v.], Wicina, Sofia, Czarnom, Kustendil, Selanik [q. v.], Timisc (Triskala; q. v.), Varna (Vranca), Deliorna, Delvina, Ahtov (Kolona), Elbasan (cf. F. Balinga). Der Grundung von Elbasan, in M.S.O.S., ii, vol. xxiv., 1931, p. 80–93, iskenderiye (Scutari, Albania), Dukaghin (Dukadzin), Okhri (Uhrad, Ohrida), Perzen (Prizren), Velert (Vlora), Uskub (Skopje), Aladja Hsir (Krusevac) and Semendra (Smederovo). By an imperial khati-shrift of 6th Rabii I 1252 (June 21, 1836) the area under the Rumi, wali, governor of Rumelia, was redefined. As previously the position of Sofia as the centre of administration had favoured the rebellion of the mountains tribes especially in Albania, Monastir (Tolli Monastir, now Bitoli) at the S. E. extremity of this area was chosen as the centre of government. The province of the Rumi, wali, was divided as follows: 1. the district of the town of Monastir directly under the governor, 2. the personal estates of the sultan's mother (μιλλετ) or the land of Okhr, 3. the sandyaks of Elbasan, Kavaja, Tirana [q. v.] and Lesh (Alex- sio), which were governed by Aranau governors who could be dismissed, 4. the sandyaks of Ishkodra (Iskenderiye, Scutari), Erzen (Prizren) and Ipek (Ipek) which were under military officers (generals of division, ferik's), 5. the ayyelik's Podgorica, Bar (Antivari), Ulcinj (Dulciun), which were under native hereditary d'yan whose powers were very minutely regulated, 6. the districts of Zadrim, Mirdit, Dibra (Debar) which were under chiefs self-elected, the only Turkish officials being those who collected the taxes. The pašalik of Pristina, Niș [q. v.] and Tetovo, originally part of the eyalet of Rumelia, were transferred in 1839 to the mishir of Sofia. The pašalik of Uskub (Skopje) and Kalkandelen (Tetovo) were only under the political supervision and not the administration of the Rumi, wali, while the northern Arkan tribes and Montenegro (Karadagh), although nominally under the governor of Rumelia and in particular in that of Scutari, in reality were in no organic connection with the Ottoman government (cf. Josef Müller, Albanien, Rumellien und die österreichisch-montenegrinische Große, Prag 1844, p. 2–3). The remainder of the former Rumelia was divided into pašaliks of which Adriana- nople (formerly called sanjak of Cirmen), as Adrianopolis was the chief residence of the sultan; in 1840 there were still law-courts in Cirmen) and the three Bulgarian pašaliks of Rusçuk [q. v.], Vidin and Silistra were the most important (cf. Ami Boué, La Turquie d'Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1840, p. 181–189 with further details of the division and of the officials in 1840). The division continued to change frequently so that J. G. v. Hahn in 1860 found the eyalet of Rumelia divided into four holya, namely Ishkodra, Ohkri, Monastir and Kestryia (Kastoria) of which Ohkri comprised the whole of Central Albania i.e. down to the coast of the Adriatic (cf. J. G. v. Hahn, Reise von Belgrad nach Salonik, Vienna 1861, p. 116 = Denkschriften der Wiener Ak. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., vol. xi.). Rumelia remained divided in this way until 1864, when the first vilayet law — i.e. the law the object of which was to create larger provinces and entrust them to able governors — was promulgated. The new governors were to carry through the progressive plans of the government with the help of expert officials and numerous subordinate governors (mutesearefs). The governor-general, formerly eyalet, now called vilayets at the head of which was wali, remained divided into holya, formerly sanjaks, at the head of which was a mutesaarif. As a model province the Danube vilayet (Tuna vilayeti) was first created in Radijab 1281 (Dec. 1864) and entrusted to Midhat Pasha [q. v.] who had already made a name for himself as governor of Niș and Prizren. The vilayets of Salonica and Vania (Ioannina) were formed in 1867. The name Rumellia, Rumelia disappeared completely until it was revived in 1878. In this year by the treaty of Berlin, the new principality of Bulgaria, which was declared an independent tributary principality recognising the suzerainty of the sultan, was created and limited to Bulgaria on the Danube, the former Danube vilayet (Tuna Vilayeti). From the trans-Balkan district of southern Bulgaria, an autonomous province of Turkey was formed and called eastern Rumelia (cf. Carl v. Sax, Geschichte des Macht- verfall der Türken, Berlin 1913, p. 373, 446). Aleko Pasha from 1879 to 1884 and Gavril Pasha from 1884 to 1885 acted as governors there. Western Rumelia formed part of the Ottoman empire and was divided into three vilayets: Adrianople, Salonica and Monastir. While Eastern Rumelia was occupied by the Bulgars in 1855, by the peace of Bucarest (1913) Monastir (Bitoli) was ceded to Serbia and Salonica to Greece and
only the vilâyet of Adrianople [q.v.] remained to the Ottoman empire.

The history of Islam in Rumelia, which is closely associated with the expansion of Ottoman power on European soil, is still very obscure, at least as regards the xivth-xvith century. Political disensions and the mixture of peoples favoured in Rumelia more than elsewhere the formation of sects, so that even directly after the arrival of the Ottoman on European soil (cf. Joh. Drasecke, Der Übergang der Osmanen nach Europa im XIV. Jahrh., in Neues Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum, xxxvii. 7 sqq. and H. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire, Oxford 1916), perhaps even earlier in the Byzantine period, as is clearly shown by the not sufficiently explained problem of the Shi' sectaritan Şerif Salîkh Dede [q.v.; i.e. “Father Yellow Pate”, as an English traveller of 1652 explains the strange name], not to speak of the obscure history of the Turks in the Wardat valley (Wardariots), all kinds of Muslim sects developed in Rumelia, the study of which has not yet been begun. Islam has been transmitted upon still kinds of religious ideas, and a kind of syncretism was created which raises difficult problems for the study of religions.

In particular, we must recall the movements to Islam, formerly Bogomiles, who inhabited certain areas of Bulgaria, Bosnia and the Herzegovina, and the Muslim sects and dervish monasteries of northern Bulgaria, where the Kılıçbaşes have flourished down to the present day, being undoubtedly favoured in their rise by the remarkable sectarism of Shaikh Badr al-Dîn Mahmûd (d. 1416 in Serres: cf. BEN KADÎ SIMAWNA and Fr. Babinger, Şeyh Bâdî ed-Dîn, der Sohn des Rückerter von Sînavat, Berlin und Leipzig 1921), who gained an astonishingly large following in Southern Bulgaria, particularly in Deli Orman [q.v.]. Closely connected with the advance of Ottoman power is the history of the Bektaşîs [q.v.] in Rumelia. They founded settlement everywhere (cf. F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Seljuks, Oxford 1939, 2 vols.), and quickly propagated Şifa views as far as the coast of the Adriatic. At the same time in Bulgaria, in the inaccessible forests of the vast Deli Orman, the Kılıçbaşes seem to have made considerable progress (cf. thereon also T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, Cracow 1933). Their still unclassified history there seems to be closely connected with the holy man Demir Baba and his brothers and descendants who are still to be found there (cf. F. Babinger, Das Bekätschiklaster von Demir Baba, in M.S.O. S., ii., vol. xxxiv., Berlin 1931, p. 84 sqq.; cf. thereon already Ewliyya Celebi, Şîyâhîatnâme, vol. v., p. 579). After the prohibition of the dervish orders in Turkey, banished shâiks and monks to some extent have sought refuge here and found followers. As well as in Bulgaria the dervishes have flourished in the modern Southern Serbia where monasteries of the different orders are still to be found (cf. D. G. Gadžanow, in vol. i. of the Macedoniski Predlog, Sofia 1925, p. 59-66). A problem not yet fully explained is raised by the Pomak [q.v.] in the Rhodope mountains and round Loča (now Loveç; the so-called Pomak nâyże, cf. A. Boué, loc. cit., vol. ii., p. 24) and the Gagauz on the coast of the Black Sea. But even the history of official Islam in Rumelia still requires investigation. It is certain that in many places like Adrianople [q.v.], Philipopolis, Sofia, Sumla (Sumen), Razgrad (Herzogbad), Dupnica, Kustendil, Loča (Loveç), Plevna (Pleven), where there were the numerous and rich walis and buildings of the Mihkâl-oghlus; cf. Jordon Trifunovic, Lektor na gradu Plevna do dvostoljetnata zogna, Sofia 1933, p. 35-41), Uskub, Istop (Tipt), Prizren, Pristina, Kalkandelen (Tetovo), Prilep, Monastir (Toli-Monastir, Bitolj), and particularly in Thessaly and Macedonia, there were formed centres of Muslim culture, as the schools, mosques etc. founded there show. In these centres were born men who made a name for themselves in the intellectual history of Turkey. Uskub, Prizren and Pristina in particular are rich in such names and it may be assumed that their bearers were mainly South Slavs converted to and Islam. Epirus Albania play a special part in the cultural history of Islam; from there to the Ottoman empire, apart from Bosnia and the Herzegovina, drew its ablest and greatest statesmen and generals, for the supply was in the main maintained by the tribute of youths (dëvushma; q.v.) levied in the province of rumelia who played an important part in the political and intellectual life of Turkey is legion. They were almost exclusively natives, not Ottoman immigrants, the number of whom must always have been small, as the Turks confined themselves to exploiting the land, divided into large and small fiefs (zâmaât and tinmâr; q.v.). Ami Boué put the number of Turkish fiefs at 614 zâmaât and 8,360 tinmâr (cf. A. Boué, La Turquie d'Europe, vol. iii., Paris 1840, p. 182, without however saying to what date his figures refer).

The rule of the Ottomans in Rumelia, which began with the crossing of the Turks to European soil (1356—1357) and soon found visible expression in the capture of Adrianople in the spring of 1361 (cf. F. Babinger, in M.O.G., ii. 311 and the article OĞLAN), is only very superficially known, so far as the xivth and even the first half of the xvth century is concerned. It is, to be supposed that certain bases such as Salonica frequently given in their hands, which is the simplest way to explain the different dates given of the capture of this town for example. In view of the great political dismemberment of S. E. Europe the advance of the Ottomans met with varying degrees of resistance, and it looks as if the great Ottoman generals of the xivth and xvth centuries, who distinguished themselves on Rumelian soil and soon won tremendous influence as margraves and great landowners — e.g. the Ewnenos-oglu, the Mihkal-oglu, the Timurtash-oglu, the Malkoç-oglu, the Kawanos-oglu, a "feudal family of Asia Minor" (C. J. Jireček), who ruled in and around Tatar Bazar and since the xvith century, but perhaps already much earlier, till the year 1835 when the wali of Rumelia for the second time Kawanos-zâde Husain Paša died (cf. Sadzilî-i othmanî, ii. 223 sq. and ibid., ii. 206), families [see the articles on them] who were able to hold their hereditary estates in some cases down to the xivth century — were able to win over by an elastic policy the people who had lost their own princes and chiefs. In the course of centuries some tribal chiefs were here and there (especially in Albania and Epirus and in Thessaly) to make themselves more or less independent of the Porte so that they had to be granted a certain degree of autonomy. This is shown by the case of the Yurükbegs, of whom there were 7 in Rumelia about 1840, and
particularly of the a'yan in Albania who were able to make themselves more or less independent. The case of 'Ali lasha of Janina [q. v.] and his whole family is the most eloquent example of this. Although the decline of Turkish rule in Rumelia has now been going on for over a century, the influence of Turkish culture there is in many ways so distinct that even if there were no monuments of the Muslim period to recall the past, it will remain in manners, customs and traditions.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the numerous books of travel of all periods which form the most important source for the history of Turkish rule in Rumelia and of which the following are especially important: A. Grisebach, Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brusa im Jahre 1839, Gottingen 1844; Josef Muller, Albanien, Rumelien etc., Prague 1844; Ami Bon, La Turquie d'Europe, Paris 1849 (fundamental work also in German: Die europäische Türkei, Vienna 1889); also his Recueil d'itinéraires dans la Turquie d'Europe. Détails géographiques, topographiques et statistiques sur cet empire, Vienna 1854; the following may also be consulted: Maximilian Friedrich Thilen, Die europäische Türkei, intended as a work of reference for the newspaper reader, Vienna 1828; also A. M. Perrot, Itinéraire de la Turquie d'Europe et des provinces d'Asie. Description géographique et militaire de toutes les routes, villes, forteresses et ports de mer de cet empire, Paris 1855; C. Mostran, Dictionnaire géographique de l'empire Ottoman, Paris 1873; E. Isambert, Itinéraire descriptif de l'Orient, Paris 1874; very full statistics regarding administration, population, religion etc. of Rumelia are given in the following:


(FRANZ BABINGER)
RUMILI HIŞAR — RÜS

RUPİYA [See ANADOLI HIŞAR.]

RUPİYA (R.), an Indian coin, a rupee. In the latter xvith and early xvith centuries the silver tanka [q.v.] of the sultans of Delhi had become so debased that when Sher Shāh (1539–1545) reformed the coinage, the name could no longer be given to a silver coin. To his new silver coin, corresponding to the original fine silver tanka, he therefore gave the name rupiya = rupee, i.e. the silver coin (Sanskrit, rūpya, rūpaka), and tanka became a copper denomination. The weight of the rupee was 178 grams (11.53 grms.) and it rapidly established itself in popular favour. Under the Mughals it was struck all over India at over 200 mints and with the decline of Mughal power continued to be struck by their successors, notably the English East India Company. In the xvth century Akbar and Dālahāngir struck many square rupees; on one coin of Akbar the name rupiya occurs. Dālahāngir for a short period struck a heavy rupee of 520 grains (14.25 grms.), but on the whole the rupee has shown little variation in weight. In the xviith century the English rupee gradually drove the local issues out of circulation and with few exceptions the local mints have now been closed. Such native states as still issue their own rupees strike them on the same standard as the Indian government rupee.

Ahmad Shāh Durrānī adopted the rupee as his monetary unit on becoming independent and until quite recently it remained the standard coin of Afgānistān. The Hindu kings of Afsān also struck the rupee.

The Indian rupee having become current in British East Africa, it was adopted in 1890 as the standard coin of German East Africa also.


RÜS, the Russians; at first the Normans, then the founders of the dukedom of Kiev.

The Rūs of the west. In his description of “pain Yā‘ūbi, B.G.A., vii. 354, says that in 229 (843–844) “the Madjūs called Rūs” invaded Seville and committed all kinds of depredations. The name Madjūs [q.v.] is regularly applied to the Normans. The name even passed into the Spanish Primera Crónica General (xiiith century) according to which the Dimuwces were worshippers of fire (!). The origin of this use of madjūs is obscure. Did the Arabs and Spaniards allude to such rites as the cleansing of the dead [cf. Ibn Faḍlān? ] Masūd, Murshid, i. 364–365, speaking of events in Spain about 300 (912–913) also uses the term Rūs although he gives it a special meaning.

The Rūs of the east. There is quite a literature on the origin of the name of the Russians. The “Norman” school claims that the name Rūs “belongs to the Normans; the Finns call the Swedes Ruotsi whence in Russian Rūs (Pym), the name of the Finns Sūmi similarly becomes in Russian Sum (Cyma); the basis of Ruotsi/Rūs must be a Scandinavian word [cf. the names of the coast Reitagen and of its inhabitants Rods-karlar “rowers”). The names of the earliest Russian princes are undoubtedly Scandinavian (K’uruk < Ihroek, Igor < Ingvar etc.); the testimony of Constantine Porphyrogenetus (chap. ix.) is equally positive; in his list of the cataracts on the Don, he gives the names “in Russian” (iroposītī) and “in Slav” (rūpōmī), e.g. iulōrōm < in Scandinavian “klum isle” + fors “rapids” = οστρακομπές < in Slav ostrvony “of the isle” + prag “the cataract”. The “anti-Norman” school pronounces in favour of the native origin of the name but its arguments are mainly useful to show certain contaminations of the term Rūs (in Greek Ρος, Ρώσι) by names in Hebrew (Ῥως, Ῥωξ, Septuag., xxxviii. 2–3; xxxix. 1), Greek (ρωσία χαλκίδα “the red boats”) etc. [It is evident that the ajīhāb al-Rūṣ mentioned in the Korān with the ‘Ad and Thamūl (Sūra xxx. 40 and l.12) have nothing to do with the Araxes or the Russians, in spite of the late texts Dimnishki, text p. 106, transal. Mehren, p. 131 and the fancies of European commentators like v. Hammer, Sur les origines de l’état russe, St. Petersburg 1825, p. 24–29].

According to the Russian Chronicle, the Varangians (Vai’ag; see below) came from beyond the sea in 859 and leved tribute on certain Slav and Finnish peoples until in 862 they were driven away by the latter. The civil wars which broke out soon afterwards among them, however, forced these tribes to invite from beyond the sea “the Varangians called Rus”. The Rūs at first settled in the region of the great Russian lakes (Ilmen, Ladoga) but in 882 Oleg (< Halg) moved to Kiev. This was certainly not the first appearance of the “Russians” for previously under 839 the Annales Bertiniani mention the arrival at the court of Louis the Pious of a Byzantine embassy accompanied by envoys from the Rhow whom their king Charles had sent to Constantinople and who now wished to return home. An enquiry as to their identity showed that they were Swedes (gratis esse Scironum). The Normans in Kiev were not numerous and their marriages with Slav women accelerated their assimilation. Swiatoslaw (born in 942) already has a Slav name and c. 1000 the process of slavisation of the Normans was complete (cf. Thomsen, cf. cit., p. 123–124).

The sources of the xith and xith centuries. The Muslim sources are acquainted with the Rūs from their first appearance in eastern Europe. Ibn Khurdādbih, p. 154, mentions only Rūs merchants whom he regards as “a kind of Slavs” (qīnas min al-Sūdābīa), and describes their journeys (by sea): from the remotest parts of the Samekh to the Black Sea, to the Khasar capital and the Caspian Sea, and by land: from Tangier to Damascus, Baghād, Bayra and then into India and China; or again they travelled still farther beyond (= to the north of) Rome through the Slav countries to reach the Khasar capital, Balkh, the lands of the Toghuqzuh and China; cf. Ibn Faḍlān, p. 271). Ibn Khurdādbih does not assign any definite territory to the Rūs. It is true that the available text of his book is incomplete but another detail is significant. Ibn Khurdādbih, p. 154, speaks of “nahr al-Sūdābīa” which de Goeje identifies with the Tainais (Don) [Marquart, Streufels, p. 352, reads Tīn for Don]. The term later disappears from geographical literature but Ibn Hawkal, p. 276, and the Ištīfl al-ʿAlām
speak of a “river of the Rûs” and although the meaning they give to the term is doubtful, it is possible that their nomenclature indicates the transformation of the Šâhâbî into Rûs while Ibn Khurdâbîbh reflects the situation before the consolidation of Norman power in Russia. [In Idrîs, ii. 385, the Nahr al-Kûsya is certainly the Don].

On the other hand, the common source (Muslim b. Abi Muslim); cf. Masûdî, Tanbîh, p. 190) used by Ibn Rusta, the Hîsâb al-Âlam, Gardizi, Awwî, etc. formally distinguishes between the Kûs and the Slavs. The latter (probably the western Slavs) lived under their own princes, while the Kûs occupied, an island thirty days march in length and breadth, situated in the middle of a lake. Their king bore the title of khâkân Rûs. This version seems to refer to the sojourn of the Norman chiefs in the region of the great Russian lakes (cf. Novgorod, in Scandinavian Hold garv “the Town of the Lake”!). The Hîsâb al-Âlam adds that the Russians have many towns and Gardizi says that the population of the island is 100,000 men (marbûn); these additions may reflect the gradual expansion of the Kûs or rather their amalgamation with the Slavs.

The third tradition is represented by Iṣṭâkhri and Ibn Hawkal (A’Bu Zaid Balkhi) who place the Rûs between Bulghar and the Slavs. The point from which the description starts must be the town of Bulghar on the Volga. Three groups of Rûs are described. The king of the group nearest the Bulghar lives in Kûsâya (Kiev; Const. Porph., ch. 97). Kusâya, Kusâya. The most remote are the Salâzâs, perhaps the original inhabitants of Novgorod, the Sîrîs. The third group are the Aρghânîya whose king lives in A’rkhî (many variants, reading doubtful). They are savages who kill strangers; they come down the rivers to export the skins of black samûr and lead (riyû). Since the time of Frede, A’rkhî has usually been explained as Éća’a, the name of the eastern branch of the Finnish people Mordva (in the basin of the Soura, a tributary of the Volga to the west of Kazar). Another explanation (Reinaud, Chwolson) which starts with the variant ʿarôm and explains A’sûma by Barmian (Perm) is very doubtful. In both cases, it is necessary to suppose the previous subjection of these regions by the Rûs. In a recent work P. Smirnov seeks to prove the existence of a Russian “khâkân” in the region between the Volga and the Oka, cf. the incident quoted above from the Annales Bertianii, Cf. also M. Vasmer, Wikingerspuren in Russland, in S. B. Vr. Ak. W., 1931, p. 649–674, on the traces of Scandinavian place-names on the Upper Volga. The fourth independent source is Masûdî (cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 330–353). In the Murûtî, ii. 15, he calls the Black Sea “Sea of the Rûs” for they are the only people who sail upon it and they live on one of its shores. This last allusion may be to the Russian colony of Tmutarakan (Tumtarakin, the ancient Panticapaeum on the peninsula of Taman) [although Westberg and Marquart, op. cit, suppose the Baltic to be meant here]. Among the many tribes that composed the Rûs, Masûdî, Murûtî, ii. 18, mentions the Darbâlîs = Tantûs, p. 141; the Îmûliyûn = Tantûs, who trade with Spain, Rome, Constantinople and the Khazars. This name is probably identical with al-Urdâmân <

Nordmân of the Arab chronicles of Spain [cf. Marçûs] and with the Lordîmân of the Latin chronicles, i.e. the Northmen. [Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 352, prefers to connect the word with the Arabic manâ officially in the middle of Ibn Khurdâbîbh, p. 153, this name refers to Jewish merchants].

An attempt to define the frontiers of Russian territory is made in the Hîsâb al-Âlam (372–682) but it cannot be regarded as very successful. Of first rate importance for our knowledge of the manners and customs of the Rûs is the narrative of Ibn Fadlân (q.v.) who in 921–922 observed the customs and funerary rites of the Russians, somewhere on the Volga, perhaps near Bulghar, quoted in Yâgûtî, ii. 834–840. The Arabs knew of the expeditions of Sviatoslav against the peoples of eastern Europe (Bulgâr, Būrṭâs, Khażar), cf. Ibn Hawkal, p. 286, who dates the expedition in 585 (968–969), instead of 965 as in the Russian chronicles, but Barthold has rightly pointed out that this date really refers to the investigation conducted into the question by Ibn Hawkal, p. 282, at Djurdjian. Awwî [q.v.] who wrote before 633 (1236) has preserved the name of St Vladimir (Bîkâldîmîr, popular etymology “prince of steel”) who converted the Russians to Christianity in 988. Awwî’s version (perhaps collected in Khârim) puts the date of this event in 300 (912) and adds that the Russians, whose only trade was war, had repented of their conversion and sent envoys to Khârim, from which an imâm was sent to convert them to Islam (cf. Barthold, in Zepr., ix. 1895, p. 262–267). Ibn al-Âţîb, ix. 30 is better informed as he knows the circumstances of the marriage of the malîk al-Kûsya (Vladimir) to the sister of the two Byzantine emperors Basil and Constantine; but he puts the event in 375 (985–986; cf. Dimîghî, transl. Mühren, p. 378).

The Russians on the Caspian Sea. The Muslim statements regarding Russian raids to the south of the Caspian Sea are of considerable value. At the time when the ʿAlîd Ḥasân b. Zaid (250–270 = 864–884) was ruling in Taharistân the Rûs made a raid on Abaskan [q.v.]. In 297 (909–910) the Rûs coming in sixteen ships ravaged the same region. In the following year the Rûs penetrated as far as Sarî and Pandjâb-hâzâr but suffered a defeat in Gîlân (cf. Ibn Isfandîyâr, in G. M. S., p. 199). This last raid, according to the commentators (F. B. Charmoy, Kunik), must have taken place in 301 (913) after Igor’s accession. Masûdî, Murûtî, ii. 18–25, describes it in detail “after 300 (912)”; during the reign of the Shirwàštâb ʿAlî b. Hâlîm. In 332 (943–944) the Rûs ascended the Kur and seized Bardîha (q.v. and cf. Kitchens). The very circumstantial record in Ibn Miskawwah, The Eclipse, ii. 62–67.) Dorn’s Caspia, a book written without any definite system but full of facts, deals especially with these raids. Cf. also Barthold, Nûrûs fi rªkâspîyûkî ablàstî, Baku 1925. Wâranb. Another name applied to the Normans, Waranb (old Russ. Vare˘g), usually explained as “member of a merchant association who has taken the oath”, from the Scandinavian var “promise”, is found in Muslim literature at a much later date. Abu ʿI-Fîrîd, ed. Reinaud, p. 35, says that he found the term Bahr-Waranb only in al-Biruni and in the Tahkírât of Nasîr al-Dîn Tîsî. Cf. also Brûni, al-Tâfîm, ed. R. Wright, 1934.
p. 121, on a large gulf (the Baltic Sea) which separates from the Buhr al-Mahtā, and extends north of the Sa'āliba as far as the vicinity of the Muslim Bulgars.

Idrisi. After the tenth century Idrisi alone affords any independent information about the Rus, under cli., sect. 5 (the river of the Russians, the streams along the Doniepr) and cli. vii., sect. 4 and 5 (the sources of the Dnjes, Dnieper, Russia and Kumaniya, i.e. the land of the Comans); cf. Jaubert’s trans., ii. 395—398, 401, 404, 433—434; and the passage (cli. viii., sect. 7) transcribed in 0. Tallgren-Tuulio, Idrisi, La Finlande, Helsingfors 1930 (Soc. Orient. Fenntica), p. 115—121. Idrisi however confuses traditional and contemporary data by putting them in juxtaposition, e.g. Кургана is mentioned alongside of Ков (Kiev).

Persian poetry. Nizami in his Iskandar-nama celebrates Alexander’s campaign against the Russians who had devastated Bardha‘a and carried off queen Nadjiba, an ally of Alexander’s. The king of the Russians who rules over the Burtas, the Khazar, the Alans, the Isi (in Russian Vets) etc., is called "Khan, perhaps a corruption in transcribing or in hearing the title Khan (Russ. knez) already found in Ibn Khuradhdhi, p. 17. Cf. F. Erdmann, Die Expeditionen Russorum Berdaam versus, Kazan 1826, 1828, 1832, 3 vols., and the French translation by F. E. Charmoy, L’expédition d’Alexandre, St. Petersburg 1829. English by H. W. Clarke, R.S., The Skandar-nama, p. 663—664, German by F. Jacob, Iskanders Werterfeldzug, 1932 (free and incomplete version). In the Haft Païkar of Nizami, ed. H. Ritter and Rypka, 1934, p. 11, 178—196 (transl. C. E. Wilson, i. 171—188), is found the daughter of the king of the fourth cli. (i.e., "the fair Slavonian, rosy-red of cheek") who tells a story that happened in a "Russian" town. There is more reality in the odes of Khâkânî dedicated to the Shirvânish Khakhtân (550—590 = 1115—1103) from which we learn of a raid by the Russians which this ruler successfully repelled; cf. Khanîkî, in Bull. Acad. Spb., xiv. N°. 23—24 (= Mil. Asiat., iii. 114—136).

From the Mongol period. The statements by the later writers regarding the Russians are very fragmentary; cf. for the Mongol period: Ijwâ‘aini, l. 224; Abu ‘l-Fidā‘a, p. 201, 207 (the Russians, a Turkish tribe), p. 222; Dimishkî, transl. Mehrn., p. 311, 378 (the Russians live on the islands of the Maotol, probably confused with a northern lake); Mustawfî, Nusbat al-Kalâbû, p. 264; and for the period of Timûr: Zafar-nama, l. 750—762 (as well as the geographical introduction to the Zafar-nama, Br. Mus. MS. Or. 18406, fol. 13b, on the Rus, descendants of Japhet). Turkish libraries and archives must contain important information about Russia; cf. Babinger, G.O.V., p. 310 and ino. as well as the journal of a Turkish officer at St. Petersburg in the time of Catherine II, quoted in V. D. Smirnov, Obrasa, protav, evm. liter., St. Petersburg 1891, p. 228—242 (wasting in the edition of 1903). In Persia the Safawi chronicles only mention briefly the Russian embassies; the chronicles of the Khâdîjâs, such as the Makhîth-i sulîmî of ‘Abd al-Razzâk, Nâdîjatkhulû (transl. Brydige), the Rawdat al-Safā-yi Nâsirî of Râdâ-kul Khán, and the Nâsîkh al-Tâ’ârîakhir of Sipîhr (q.v.), contain information about the Russo-Persian wars and the subsequent negotiations [cf. Tehrân]; a curious paragraph no the Russians is to be found in the Bustân al-Siyâqa of Zain al-‘Abîdin Shîrâwî, Teherân 1315, p. 299; of no value from the geographical point of view, it is curious as reflecting the ideas of the Persians about 1350: the Russians, like the other Farsag, are clever in worldly matters (dar shârga), but devoid of spirituality (qâ‘ân nazaranda). Bibliography: See the article above. A bibliography of the Muslim sources will be found in the commentary on the Idrīsî al-‘Alâm by V. Minorsky (in G. M. S., in the press). The principal studies on the Muhammadan sources are: Fraehn, Ibn Foslands och andra Araber Berichten über die Russen, St. Petersburg 1823; Chwolson, Ivestiya Ibn Dasta (read: Ibn Rusta) etc., St. Petersburg 1869; Garkavi (Harkavy), Skazaniya musulm. pisatelej, St. Petersburg 1870 and 1871 (translations from 26 + 6 Arab authors; on the necessity for a new edition of these texts and the preparation of a Corpus of Arabic sources on the Russians etc. see Krackowskij, in Zap. Inst. Vost., 1932, i. 55—62); Dorn, and Kunik, in Caspik, in Mem. ac Spb., series vii., vol. xxii., N°. 1, 1875 (Russian edition ibid., vol. xxvi., app. i, 1875); Kunik and Rosenberg, Ivestiya al-Beker, St. Petersburg, i. (1878) and ii. (1903); A. Seippel, Rerum Normannicarum fontes arabici, fasciculus i. textum continens, Christiania, i. (1806), ii. (1928) (variants, critical remarks). Westberg, Zur Klarung oriental. Quellen, in Bull. de Spb., 1899, vol. xi., N°. 4 and 5, and Akhmatza ostándikch istočnikov, in Four. Min. Nar. Prov., 1909, xiii. and xiv.; Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 330—353 (Mavüdi on the Rus); A general survey of the literature on Russian origins has recently been given by V. Mošín, Vostro-russkij vopros, in Slavie, x. (1931), 1—3. A still valuable survey is that of Thomsen, The relations between Russia and Scandinavia and the origin of the Russian state, Oxford 1877 (new edition in Thomsen, Samlede Afhandlinger, i., 1919, p. 231—444); many difficult questions are dealt with in the works of Kunik, Marquart, Streifzüge, parsim, and Westberg. Among recent works must be mentioned P. Smirnov, Vostochny shlyakh ("The Volga route and the early Russians"), Kiev 1928 (in Ukrainian; an original work) (V. Minorsky).

AL-RUSAFÁ (RUŚAFÁT AL-SHÂ‘ÂN, RUŚAFÁT HÎJÂMÁN), a town in the desert in the Syrian Palmyrene, 4 farsakh or 25 miles south of the Ephrates.

The town already bore this name in the pre-Muhammadan period. The Assyrian lists of eponyms mention in the years 850, 838, 804. 775. 747. 761. 737 B.C.C, a town Ras-ap-pa as the residence of the Assyrian governor (shamun). On a relief stele of Adad-nirari IV Rasappa is mentioned among the lands governed by Urigallu-eresh and formed with Kani (now Tell Djellâl on the Khabîr) an administrative district (Unger, Reliefsstele Adad-nirari’s III. aus Saba‘a, Publikationen der Kurl. Osmanischen Museen. ii, Stambul 1916, p. 10—12, pl. 2, i. 23 sqq.). The identification of Rasappa with Beled Sindjar by E. Forrer (Preiszeitneicht des Assy. Reiches, Leipzig 1921, p. 15) can hardly be maintained (Musil, The Middle Ephrates, New York 1927, p. 210 sqq.). In the Bible (2 Kings xix. 12; Isaiah xxxvii. 12) Rešef, for which we should not doubt read Rešaf, is mentioned along
with Gozan, Ḥaran and Benē ʿEden in Telassar. Polemy (Geogr., v. 14, 19) mentions our town in Palmyrae as "Parzafa"; the Tabula Peutingeriana, which is the geographer of Ravenna (Cosmogr., ii 15, ed. Pinder-Parthey, p. 89, 1) Mississi, the Notitia dignitatum (or., xxxiii, 15, 27) Rosafa, the Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis in a lettre (Acta Concil. Oecumen., ed. E. Schwarz, tom. i, vol. iv, p. 171, 23) Rasapha. The name (cf. Razaf) means "cemented road" (Clermont-Ganneau, in R. A., iv, 1900, p. 112 sq.).

About 434 the town was raised to be a bishopric against the otherwise usual practice by the patriarch Ioannes of Antioch, not by the Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis. It was then famous for its church of St. Sergius dedicated to the memory of the two officers of the imperial palace Sergios and Bacchos ("in the reign of Maximiianus") (the Acta Martyr., ed. in Greek by Delahaye, in Anal. Bull., xiv. 373—395; in Syriac by Bedjan, Acta martyr. et sanctor., iii. 283—322, do not bear historical criticism: Harnack, Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur, ii. 481, note; Delahaye, in Anal. Bull., xxiii. 478). The first bishop of Parzafa was Marinianos, who is mentioned in 434, 444 and 451 (and not mentioned in the list of bishops of Resapa-Sergopolis in Le Quien, in O. C., ii. 951 sq.; cf. E. Honigmann, in Oriens Christianus, xi. 214—217). The emperor Anastasius (491—518) had the thumb of St. Sergios brought from Resapa to Constantinople and stories of the miracles associated with this relic spread even as far as Gaul (Gregor. Turonensis, Hist. Francor., vii. 31). In honour of this event the town was given the name Sergopolis and the privileges of an ecclesiastical metropolis (Ioannes Diakrinomenos in Cramer, Anastola Graeca et cod. Paris., ii. 109).

Perhaps we can have Grēkostos [I]ynos as early as 512 in the trilingual inscription of Zebed (Neubauer in Sachau, Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien, p. 126, note 1; otherwise in Prendere, Bull. de l'Acad. Archéol. Égypt. Grecque et Latine Insct., p. 262). Georgios Kypros (ed. Gelzer, v. 865) knows a third name of the town, "Alexandria", the correctness of which has wholly been doubted; probably the great basilica in al-Rusafa also dates from this emperor (Iussaud, Topographie de la Syrie, p. 254, who however also wrongly takes Tetrapyrgia to be a name of al-Rusafa). The Syriac name also remained in use, (τὸ Ραζάφα) Ioannes Moschos, Pratum spiritual, chap. 180, in Migne, Patr. Græc., LXXXVIII/iii., col. 3052). The Armenian Basileios who in the 4th century sought to transform the profane geography of Georgios Kypros into an ecclesiastical handbook added to the town the epithet "σταυρούς", from αὐτοκτόνοικος, the correctness of which has wholly been doubted; probably the great basilica in al-Rusafa also dates from this emperor (Iussaud, Topographie de la Syrie, p. 254, who however also wrongly takes Tetrapyrgia to be a name of al-Rusafa). The Syriac name also remained in use, (τὸ Ραζάφα) Ioannes Moschos, Pratum spiritual, chap. 180, in Migne, Patr. Græc., LXXXVIII/iii., col. 3052). The Armenian Basileios who in the 4th century sought to transform the profane geography of Georgios Kypros into an ecclesiastical handbook added to the town the epithet τὸ σταυροὺς ταύτα (M. Hartmann, in Z. A., xiv. 340 sq.; Chapot, La Frontière de l'Upatra, p. 330, note 8).

Rabbah Bar ʿIda (d. Jan. 8, 611), the teacher of the Persian ʿOyānann who wrote his life (Baumstark, Gesch. d. syr. Lit., p. 203, § 311), was born in Rusafa (E. A. W. Budge, The history of Rabbah Hūnīz Ardash the Persian and Rabbah Bar ʿIda, i. London 1902, p. 115).

The town, which was situated in the desert Σαμαξίουτο (Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 5, 29; Theophyl. Simoc. ed. de Boor, v. 13, 3; Syriac: Barbāzār: Kugener, in Oriens Christian, 1907, p. 408—412), was at first defended against the Saracens only by fortifications of no great strength; Justinian is said to have been the first to surround it with proper walls (probably before 542 A.D.) (Procop., De aedif., ii. 9, 3 f), a statement which however the results of modern archaeological research show to be exaggerated (Hezelin in Sarre-Hezelin, Archæol. Reise, i. 158; Guyer, ibid., ii. 28, 37). Justinian also built bazaars and other fine buildings and large cisterns to provide the town with water (Procop., De aed., ii. 9, 6 sqq.).

Khusraw I, who on his campaign to Syria in 530 had been promised by Kandivos, bishop of Sergopolis, 200 pounds of gold for the ransom of 12,000 captured inhabitants of Sitha on the Euphrates, on his third campaign in 570,2 proceeded to the bishop, who had come to meet him to make excuses for not carrying out his promises, and sent a force against the town, which had however soon to withdraw on account of the lack of water (Procop., Bell. Pers., ii. 20, 9—14). Half a century later, the story was already told of the miraculous rescue of the defenceless city by St. Sergios and his heavenly forces (Euagrios, Hist. eccl., iv. 28).

About 570 there were five bishoprics under the metropolitan of Sergopolis (Notitia Antiochoana, in Byz. Zeitschr., xxv., 1924, p. 75, 83). Besides the already mentioned bishops Marinianos and Kandivos we know of the following metropolitans: in 524 Sergios of Beth Rosāfā (Guidi, in Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei, 1851, p. 507), in 550 Joseph, bishop of the Sacred Monastery of Rasīfī (Assenario, in B.O., i. 117, 553 Abrahamios (Manu, i. 390; Wright, Catal. syr. MSS. Brit. Mus., i. 797), between 793 and 980 Michael Syrus (Chrón., transl. Chabot, iii. 451 sqq., 605 sq) mentions eleven further documents, and from inscriptions we know of a certain Sergios (between 910 and 922); cf. Mich. Syr., iii. 462, No. 18 and Simeon, who, in 1093, restored the great Baslica (Musul, Palmyrena, p. 160, 267 sq).

The veneration and piuses awe which was generally felt with regard to the sanctity of the place is shown with particular clearness in the fact that the Ghassânīd al-Mundhir b. Ḥārīth only dared to meet the Byzantine envoy here (summer of 578) as he felt himself safe nowhere else from their treachery (Johann. Ephes., vi. 4; Noldeke, in Mh. Pr. Ak. W., 1887, p. 24). At this time the town was apparently not in the possession of the Ghassânīds; the inscription ascribed to him νεκρός ἐκ τῆς Αλμοσοδαρωνειας, which was found among the "Central Church extra muros" also indicates that the inner town was still Roman at this date.

In the sanctuary of Sergios at a later date among the gifts dedicated to the saint was shown a richly decorated cross given by Justinian and Theodora, then taken to Persia by Khusraw I after the plundering of Kallinikos and Barbalissos (Mich. Syr., iv. 296), but given back by his grandson Khusraw II with another cross and a gift, both of which bore long inscriptions (Euagrios, Hist. eccl., iv. 28; vi. 1; Niceph. Kallist. Hist. eccl., xviii. 21 sq; Theophyl. Simoc. ed. de Boor, v. 13; Firdawsi 1466, in Noldeke, Tabari, p. 183, note 1; C. de Boor, in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch., p. 315—322). On his flight to the Byzantines Khusraw II lived in 590 in Edessa in the house of the general Johannes Rosāfā (a member of the family of the Persian Rosafāyeh (Mich. Syr., ii. 380, 412; Barbebraeus, Chron. eccl., i. 271). The cistern built by Justinian and later destroyed by a Lakhmid is said to have been restored by the Ghassânīd Nuṣrān b. al-Ḥārīth b. al-Alham (Hamza al-Iṣfahānī, Tuʾīrīk, ed. Gottwald, p. 120;

In the Jālānic period this desert town sprang into fame when the caliph Hīšām b. 'Abd al-Malik, who as a prince had moved his kaṭiba from the midge-plagued Euphrates thither, made it his residence in 105 (723–724); he died and was buried here in 125 (743) (al-Ṭabarī, Tā'rīkhā, ed. de Goeje, i. 1467, 1729 sq., 1731 sq.; al-Balādhurī, ed. de Goeje, p. 179 sq., 186; H. Lammens, in *M. F. O. B.*, iv. 94 sq.). The town therefore received the name of Ruṣafat Ḥīšām (al-Balādhurī, op. cit., to distinguish it from Ruṣafat Baghdād, the eastern suburb of Baghdād with the palace of the same name, cf. vol. i., p. 565); it was also called Ruṣafat al-Šaghīm. Whether Ḥīšām did a great deal of building is doubtful (cf. E. Reitemeyer, *Die Städtegründungen der Araber*, p. 246, n. 33).

Omer Omayyads also lived occasionally in this town; for example Marwān, Sulaimān b. Hīšām and Muḥammad b. al-Walid (al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1897, 1908; iii. 95, 98; Yākūt, ii. 786; Herzfeld, *Arch. Reise*, i. 139). Shortly after Ḥīšām’s death, his successor al-Walid ordered the confiscation of all his predecessor’s property in al-Ruṣafat (al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1751). Sulaimān b. Hīšām gathered an army in al-Ruṣafat in 127 (745), and then encamped opposite Marwān II’s army at Kinnāsir; after his defeat he came back to al-Ruṣafat (al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1896 sq., 1908; Mich. Syr., ii. 505). The ‘Abbāsid ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali came in 132 (749–750) to al-Ruṣafat and disbanded and burned the embalmed body of Ḥīšām (al-Ya’qūbī, ed. Houtouza, ii. 427 sq.). ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ali [q.v.] spent a night there when fleeing before the army of his nephew Abū Djaʿfar al-Mansūr in 754 (Ṭabarī, iii. 98).

In the spring of 144 (858) Mutawakkil came from Damascus to visit the town in order to see the palaces of Ḥīšām and Sulaimān and the old Byzantine monastery (al-Bakri, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 379). The sons of Zikrwaḥ b. Mihrwāḥ al-Kar mátī fell upon the town in 289 (902) along with the Bani al-Asbagh by order of Subk b. Dailamī, a mawālī of the caliph Muḥammad, murdered the inhabitants, burned the mosque and laid waste the neighbouring villages (Ṭabarī, iii. 2216). Ibn al-Šafīq (in 295 = 908) again mentions al-Ruṣafat as a flourishing town. Saif al-Dawlah passed in 344 (955) from Salamya via Tadmūr, Urd and al-Ruṣafat to al-Raṣqa (M. Canard, *Sayf al-Dawla*, Algiers–Paris 1934, 226, 231, 232). The Arab geographers describe al-Ruṣafat as situated in the middle of barren desert land; its inhabitants drank only water from cisterns within its walls or when this failed they had to bring water from the Euphrates 3–4 farsābāk distant. Al-Asmaʿī, who died in 215 (830), tutor of Ḥārūn al-Raṣidd, identifies the town with al-Zawrā and mentions the wonderful monastery there. The inhabitants had to pay tribute to the Banū Khaḍafīa in return for which they were protected. The rich inhabitants were merchants or landowners, the Beduins were labourers. As a flourishing domestic industry the weaving of woolen garments is mentioned (al-Asmaʿī in Yākūt, ii. 784); in addition to articles of clothing, bags and sacks were manufactured (al-Kazwīnī, *Aqāīd b*, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 132 sq.). According to Ibn Būṭlān (in Yākūt, ii. 784 sq.), Kaṣār al-Ruṣafat was smaller than the Dīr al-Khulāf of Baghdād. He describes the church, the outside of which was adorned with gold mosaics, and says it was built by Constance, son of Helena. Below this church and of the same dimensions was a subterranean cistern panelled with alabaster slabs. The inhabitants of the fortress were for the most part Christians who earned their living by guarding caravans and transporting merchandise, but they also made bargains with thieves and robbers. The desert around al-Ruṣafat is so flat that one can see to the horizon on all sides. According to al-Išrīṣī (transl. Jaubert, i. 137), the town in his day (1154) had a flourishing market; a much used road led from there through the desert to Salamya and Ḥims. Yākūt was still able to see in the centre of Ruṣafat Ḥīšām the monastery of al-Ruṣafat which, on account of its architectural beauty, he describes as one of the wonders of the world (Yākūt, ii. 660 sq., s.v. *Dair al-Ruṣafat*). Abu l-Fīdā (ed. Reinhard, p. 271) gives the distance of the town from the Euphrates as less than a day’s journey.

In 1240 the Khwārizmians on their return from Syria came via Salamya to al-Ruṣafat; troops from Ḥalab followed them and fought them at Siifīn (Abu l-Fīdā, *Annals Musulm.*, ed. Kieske-Ader, iv. 458). In 668 (1269) the inhabitants of al-Ruṣafat fled for fear of the Mongols to Salamya; henceforth the town remained uninhabited (B. Moritz, in *Z. G. Erdh. Berl.*, xvii. 174 sqq.; *M. S. O. A.*, i. 1898, p. 144).

In 1300 al-Dinānihī (ed. Meher, p. 205) includes Siifīn and Ruṣafat Ḥīšām, which, as he knew occupied the site of a Greek city, in the district of Bāli, while Ḥādījah Khašīfa (Stambul 1145, p. 593) includes Bāli and al-Ruṣafat in the province of Kinnāsir with Ḥalab as capital.

The imposing ruins of the town date almost entirely from ancient times. They have in modern times been several times surveyed, thoroughly examined and fully described.


RUSČUK, capital of a district and port on the Danube in Bulgaria (often wrongly written and pronounced Rusčuk) in Bulgarian Ruse (FYRCE Rousse), is situated at the junction of the eastern Lom (Turk. Kara Lom) and the Danube, here 1,400 yards wide, opposite Gurgiu (Gyurgyalja Vardar Yor Koli), part high on the left plateau, on the state railway from Rusčuk to Varna (since 1866) and Rusčuk to Tarnovo and is one of Bulgaria's nine ports on the Danube (with about 50,000 inhabitants). After the decay of the medieval Čerwen some 15 miles inland, which survived as the name of a Bulgarian eparchy and the ruins of which could still be seen in the xvith century (cf. HADİĐIJA KHALIFA, RUMELI VE BOSNA, transl. J. VON HAMMER, VIENNA 1812, p. 44), the new Ruse arose on the Danube half a day's journey away. The Turkish name Rusčuk, by which the town is still almost exclusively known outside of Bulgaria, is undoubtedly a diminutive from Ruse (Ruse = Rusčuk; cf. the name of the island of Rhodes, Turk. Rodos and Rodos-cık for Rodosto; q. v.), but only seems to have come into being in the first third of the seventeenth century. In the two treaties concluded between the Porte and Hungary on Aug. 20, 1503 (cf. J. V. HAMMER, G. O. H., I., 331 sq. and the text on p. 618: Ruse = Rusčuk) and April 1, 1515 (cf. THEINER, MONUMENTA HUNGARICA, II. 624: Kiskő for Rusčuk) and in Mercator's map of 1584 the Bulgarian form still appears. The town must have already attained considerable prosperity in the xvith century. It quickly developed under Turkish rule and became an important centre of traffic, trade, industry and strategy in Danubian Bulgaria and surpassed the two fortified towns of Nicopolis [q. v.] and Silistria which played the leading part there at the beginning of Ottoman rule (cf. A. BAYROV, BULGARIEN, LAND UND LEUTE, LEIPZIG 1917, II. 102 sq.). The French traveller PIERRE LESCOSPIEL, who reached Rusčuk on June 14, 1576, in his valuable journal, which has only been published in part, describes Rusčuk as a populous town: cette ville est peuple et y a quantite de marchandise de toutes sortes et des vivres en abondance et a bon pric (cf. REVUE DE L'HISTOIRE DIPLOMATIQUE, VOL. XXXV., PARIS 1921, p. 45). Shortly before, the famous Ottoman architect SINAN [q. v.] built a mosque there for the grand vizier RUSTEM PASHA [q. v.] still admired in the xvith century, presumably in the north at the water's edge. The figure given for the population as for mosques varies; of the latter Rusčuk had at one time a considerable number. The Franciscan Peter Bogdan BAKIĆ, later archbishop of Sofia, in 1640 found in Rusčuk 3,000 Turkish houses with 15,000 inhabitants and 10 mosques of stone (fatiha de Pietra Bianca), and 200 Armenian houses with over 1,000 inhabitants and a citadel with five towers (cf. EUG. FERMEYDIA, OR ON THE BULGARIAN ECCLESIASTICS = vol. XVIII. of the MONUMENTA SOUTIENHIS HISTORIANS SLOVORUM MERITOSIUM, AGRIM 1887, P. 74). In 1659 Filip Stanislav Novak counted 6,000 Turkish wooden houses with over 30 mosques (ibid., p. 263; cf. also P. 7, 10, 26, 31, 88, 137, 299 [Rusci o

Rudzień: 1685], 300 with further particulars) Ewlijy Čelebi (SEVİSHEMİNE, III. 313 sq.; cf. the Bulgarian transl. by D. G. GADŽANOVIĆ, IN PERIODISLO SPIZIJA NA BULGARSKO KNIJEZBO DRUŠTOVU V SIFANI, I. 1XX., FLODÍN 1900, P. 654 sq.) about the same time mentions 2,200 houses of wood, also three Christian quarters, the mosque of Rustem Paša, baths and three caravanserais in "URASČKE". The only Jews, he says, were those who visited the place on their trading journeys. The people, whom he praises for their hospitality, lived by commerce and spoke Bulgarian as well as the "language of Wallachia and Moldavia". Ewlijj Čelebi says the pumpkin (žuvna) there was particularly good, 10 being sold for 1 peni (5 of which = 1 Vienna groschen or 3 kreuzers, 150 = 1 talar).

Rusčuk is regularly mentioned in the many records of travel on the Danube in the following centuries. References to the town in the xvith and first half of the xixth century are in general agreement. The inhabitants seem at all times to have conducted a busy trade in wool, cotton, silk, leather and tobacco, which at an earlier period was for a considerable part in the hands of Rugusian merchants, who had a settlement there from 1673 to 1755. The English clergyman R. WALSH (1827) estimated the population at 15—20,000 souls. The streets of the town, which was surrounded by walls on three sides after the manner of Turkish fortresses, as a rule sloped steeply to the Danube which part was partly undefended. Turks, Greeks, Bulgars and Armenians lived in some 7,000 houses and conducted a busy trade with Turkey (cf. R. WALSH, A JOURNEY FROM CONSTANTINOPLE TO ENGLAND, LONDON 1824, P. 207). HELMHUT V. MOLTCHE who visited Rusčuk in 1835 and described it (cf. BRIEFEN ÜBER ZUHANDEN UND BEGEHLEHNheiten IN DER TÜRKEI, BERLIN 1877, P. 11 SQ., 132 SQ., 424 SQ.) was surprised that "this important Turkish fortress with its long, dominating and enfiled lines without outer works, half armed and defectively planned" could offer the enemy such resistance. As an important frontier fortress Rusčuk suffered a great deal in course of centuries. Sieges, confiscations and bombardments (the last by the Rumanians during the world war on Aug. 28, 1916) continually altered the appearance of the town which with its regular streets and large open spaces no longer has anything of an oriental appearance. In the Turkish period Russčuk was the residence of sandjak-bey, at one time of a paša (about 1840, when Bulgaria was divided into the three paša-beks of Rusčuk, Vidin and Silistria), until in 1864 it became the capital of the new Danube vilaiet (TUANA WILAYET) with the so-called (влади) of Rusčuk, Varna, Vidin, Tulcha, Tarnovo (Tornovo), Sofia and Niš, created and administered by the reformer Mihael Paša [q. v.] and formed out of the sąds in Silistria, Vidin and Niš [q. v.]. A special printing press was instituted and in addition to a newspaper a salname (TUAna WILAYETIN SALNAME) annually published, which gives a good survey of the administrative measures. After the devastation wrought in the Russo-Turkish wars of 1811 and 1828, Rusčuk attained new prosperity as the official residence of a governor (वाँग). In 1854 Bouché de Pertuis estimated that Rusčuk had about 30,000 inhabitants in 4,000 houses (cf. VOYAGE À CONSTANTINOPLE, VOL. II., PARIS 1855, P. 413 SQ.); the German physician C.
W. Wutzer who became acquainted with Rusçuk in the governor-generalship of Sa'îd Mehmêd Pasha, thought that the population was only 24—25,000. The number of mosques in Rusçuk is very variously given by travellers. In 1840 F. Hacklander says 29, C. W. Wutzer in 1856 only 16. The fact is that many mosques were destroyed in the fighting. Nowadays (1935) Rusçuk has 19 mosques (dja- wâmi'), 9 small mosques (ma'djidî) and the monastery of the Shâhidî darwâshes founded in 1252 (1836). While in the great battle that raged on July 4, 1811 around Rusçuk the fortune of war decided in favour of the Turks under the grand vizier Ahmed Pasha, and the Russians under Kutusov blew up the defences of the stronghold and retired across the Danube after setting the whole town on fire, in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877—1878 on Feb. 21, 1878, the Ottomans under Kâzîmer Ahmmed Pasha had to surrender the town and fortress to the Russians after a long siege. The defences, renewed for the last time in 1877, were razed to the ground in 1881. Since that date the town has been a Bulgarian possession.

Rusçuk was the birth-place of the grand vizier Çelebi-zâde Sherif Hasan Pasha (d. 1205 = 1791; q.v.), of the kâbiî Amâni Çelebi (d. 1100 = 1791, according to J. v. Hammer, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dietkultur, iii. 83) and of the famous Ottoman author Ahmed Sherif Hasan Mihamet Bey (1841—1912; cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 389 sq.)

Bibliography: (in addition to references in the text): Carsten Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, vol. iii., Hamburg 1837, p. 174;

(Franz Babinger)

RUSTAMIDS, a dynasty of îbâdî Khâ- ridjîs of Tâhert. The first of the Rustamid imâms, 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Rustam, of Persian origin, had been made governor of Kairawân when the Khâridjî Bebers of the Djebel Nefüsa, led by Abu 'l-Khâjaib b. Ma'âfarî [q. v.] seized the town in 141 (758). Three years later (144 = 761), Muhammad b. al-Ash'âth at the head of a strong Arab army recaptured Kairawân. Ibn Rustam fled to the west and founded Tâhert [q. v.] in a region where the Khâridjîs must already have been very numerous. Fifteen years later, the Ikhâsit conferred the imâmate upon him. Six members of the same family in turn succeeded him. The chronology of their reigns is however rather uncertain. With certain gaps it may be arranged as follows:

'Abd al-Rahmân b. Rustam 160—168 (776—784)
'Abd al-Wahabbâh b. 'Abd al-Rahmân 168—208 (784—823)
Abû Sa'îd al-Aflâh b. 'Abd al-Wahabbâh 208—258 (823—871)
Abû Bakr b. al-Aflâh, dethroned 258—? (871—?)
Abû 'l-Yâkhrân Muhammad b. al-Aflâh — 281—? (879—?)
Abû Hâtim Yusuf b. Muhammad, dethroned 281—? (894—?)
Ya'kub b. al-Aflâh, dethroned. . . . . . .
Abû Hâtim Yusuf, restored . . . . . .
Ya'kub b. al-Aflâh, restored 294—296 (906—908)

The history of the foreign relations of the Rustamids, all that authors like Ibn Khaldût, Ibn 'Idhârî or al-Bakri, knew of them, is limited to a few facts. Although the kingdom of Tâhert was surrounded by enemies (the territory of the Aghlabids of Kairawân included the Zâb [q. v.] and the Idrîsids of Fas were vassals of Tlemcen [q. v.]), its existence was not directly threatened for 150 years. We find the second imâm, 'Abd al-Wahabbâh, associated in the attack by the Khâridjî Bebers (Huwwâra and Nefüsa) on the town of Tripoli which was under the Aghlabid amirs. At the same time the Rustamids, who could not recognise the 'Abbasid caliphate and had to defend themselves against the Aghlabids who were vassals of Baghda'd, seem to have sought the friendship of the Umayyads of Cordova. Ibn 'Idhârî under 207 (822) mentions the magnificent reception given by the Umayyad 'Abd al-Rahmân II to an embassy from Tâhert which included the son of the imâm 'Abd al-Wahabbâh. We also know that this Umayyad had a Rustamid among his viziers (information supplied by E. Lévi-Provençal) and that in 239 (853) al-Aflâh received a present of 100,000 dinhems from the
Umayyad Muḥammad I. The reign of this imām al-ʿAlāmah saw a conflict between the Rustamids and the Berbers of the region of Tlemcen, partisans of the Idrisids of Fāṣis, in which Tābert was victorious. Lastly we know how in 968 (908) the kingdom of Tābert collapsed in a few days before the onslaught of the Kutāmah Berbers led by the Shīʿī missionary Abū ʿAbd Allāh (q.v.). Several Rustamids were put to death and their heads sent to Raḵkāda and carried through the streets of Kairawān. Others, among whom according to some authors were the imām Yākūb and his son Abū Sulaimān, were able to escape and reach the oasis of Wargla.

What is of more importance than the relations with the other powers of Spain and Barbary, is the internal life of the Rustamid state which our usual sources ignore but of which we get a glimpse from Ibāḍī chroniclers like Abū Zakāriyya. Although hereditary, the succession of imāms was in theory regulated by the vote of the Ibāḍī community. The imām, regarded as the most worthy, most honourable and best educated man, the temporal and spiritual chief of the state, whose prestige extended to the communities in the east, was in reality under the control of the religious caste: the rābīʿ, māṭabīʿ, talaiba, the guardians of the strict observance of the laws of the sect.

In a theocratic state of this kind, crises naturally took the form of schisms. The most serious took place during the reign of the second imām, Abī al-Wahhāb. At the instigation of a rejected candidate for the imāma a group of malcontents demanded that the elected imām should rule with the control of a regular assembly. This innovation was put to the Ibāḍī doctors in the east, who rejected the principle completely. The advocates of the reform separated from the community and formed the sect of the Nukārīs (q.v.).

A second schism took place in the region of Tripoli on the death of a governor of the province and the question of his successor designated by the imām of Tābert.

Crises not so serious which seem however to have been more of the character of dynastic rivalry, disturbed the peace of Tābert from the fourth imām. The claimants to the throne gained the support of an opposition formed of diverse elements. No less than the religious prestige of the imāms, the resources of the region and the activity of its commerce attracted to Tābert foreigners from Persia, the ancestral home of the Rustamids, or from different parts of Barbary, Arabs from Ifriqiya, Naṣūfa from Tripoli, and Christian Berbers. The Zenēta nomads of Ifriqiya and the Central Maḥrūb frequented its markets and grew rich in them. Among these heterogeneous groups, some, like the Neşifs, Persians and Christians, showed themselves regularly the supporters of the established authority: while others, the Arabs in particular, and very often the nomads, were disposed to encourage the ambitions of pretenders.

Exposed to the troubles stirred up by its guests and its neighbours, this ideal state had then a somewhat agitated existence. The dynasty included able politicians, like al-ʿAlāmah who, using the luxurieux et impérs, secured peace and whose regio marked the apogee of Rustamid power. Several Rustamids were learned imāms, caring less for their tastes as rulers than for theological speculations, not to mention profound studies like astronomy. Their surprising tolerance of foreigners, even those hostile to the sect, encouraged the entrance of dissident elements into the administration and prepared the way for the collapse of Tābert and the annexation of the kingdom by the victorious Shīʿīs.


RUSTEM PASHA, Ottoman grand vizier and historian, was born in 1500 in the vicinity of Sarajevo (q.v.; cf. the report of the Bailo B. Navagero in Albérì, Relazioni degli ambasciatori venuti al senato, ser. iii., vol. 3, p. 89: d’un cavali oppresso il serraglio di Bosna, i.e. Bosna-Seray), either in Botomor or perhaps on the western border of Sarejovsko polje (cf. Č. Truhelka, in Bosatich Post, Sarajevo 1912, No. 80, who comes to this conclusion because Rustem Pasha built a bridge with 15 arches over the Željeznica of which remains still exist), of parents probably originally Christian. In a sīdiyy of the Sherf-āt court in Sarajevo. "Neftsa Khanum, daughter of Mustafa and sister of Rustem Pasha" in the middle of Shaḥ 964 (June 1557) sold through her agent Ḩājī Ali Beg b. Khair al-Dīn, wādītわる of Rustem Pasha’s hāsīṣṭan in Sarajevo, her house there; this gives the name of the father Mustaṭfa. The family are said to have been originally called Oğuz or something similar to Č. Truhelka, op. cit., says the name was Čâgâtâ. The local tradition of Sarajevo knows Neftsa Khanum as a sister of Rustem Pasha and daughter of a Mustaṭfa Beg or Paša. Rustem Pasha’s brother was the kapudan paša (q.v.; grand admiral) Sinân Paša. As a boy Rustem entered the school for pages in Stambul and then the service of the court. He became stirrup-holder (vīkbūr; q.v.), gained the favour of the sultān and was appointed governor of Diyarbakr (q.v.), later of Anatolia. In 1553 he became third and in 1541 second vizier. On Dec. 1, 1544 he received the imperial seal for the first time. In 1553 at his own request Rustem Pasha was relieved of office and retired to Scutari where his wife Mihr-i Māh (q.v.), a daughter of Sulaimān I Kāchun (q.v.), had built a palace. But by 1555 he was again grand vizier, and held this office until his death in July 10, 1561 (26th Shawwāl 968: of the various dates given, this must be the right one; J. H. Morellmann, in M. S. O. S., xxxi., 2 [1929], 28, however, gives the 26th Shawwāl 978 [July 8, 1561] as the day of his death). He was buried in his own splendid türbe in Stambul beside the Shahāde mosque (cf. (Graphics GEORGES MARÇAIS)
and Ḫusain b. Ḫasūl, Ḫadiqāt al-Djawāmi"], i. 16; wrongly in Sīdīs-ī Ṭūmānī, i. 378). In addition to the many buildings, notably mosques, which he erected with his vast wealth in various parts of the empire and for which he employed the great architect Sinān, Rustem Pasha made a reputation for himself by a chronicle of the Ottoman empire, Tavārīkh-i Aṭī ʿOṯmān, which goes under his name. In the completes version that has survived, it comes down to 968 (1560-1561). The narrative, as regards the earlier period, closely follows the anonymous Tavārīkh-i Aṭī ʿOṯmān and the Annals of Muḥyī al-Dīn Djamāl and Nesrī [q. v.]. It is only from the reign of Mehemed II the Conqueror, that it shows a certain independence, although perhaps here also an original source may be found. It only becomes important when it describes the events of his time. Although Rustem Pasha is known to have encouraged historical studies (cf. F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 82, note), it is by no means certain whether he is himself the author of the Chronicle that bears his name or whether he only had his book compiled. A German translation of part of it was published by Dr. Ludwig Forrer under the title Die osmanische Chronik des Rustem Pascha in the Türkische Bibliothek, xxi. (Leipzig 1923; cf. thereon O.L.Z., xxvii. [1925], p. 246 sq.; ibid., xvi. [1925], p. 154 sqq., and Histor. Zeitschrift, vol. cxxxviii. [1928], p. 571 sq.).


RUYAN. A district comprising the western half of Mazaradān [q. v.].

Iranian tradition. According to Darmesteter, Avicenna, ii. 416, Ruyan corresponds to the mountain called Rāudīla ("reddish") in Yatḥ, 19, 2, and Rūyīgān-īnmand in Bundakht, xii. 2, 27 (transl. West, p. 34). Ibrānī, Chronologie, ed. Sachau, p. 220, makes Rūyīn the scene of the exploit of the archer Arish (cf. Zahir al-Din, p. 18 [Yatḥ 6, 6; in this connection mentions the hill Arūyā-xshnā)]. In the letter addressed to the mobad Tansar by king Gusnaspāhāvā (11th century [A.D.]), the latter claims to be lord of Tabaristān, Patishxīvār, Gar, Gilān, Dalālman, Ruyān and Damāvand.

Geography. According to Ibn Rusta, p. 150, and Ibn al-Fakhr, p. 304 [the latter cites Baladāhuri as authority, but the passage is lacking in the Futūh al-Buldān], Ruyān was at first an independent kūn attached to Dalām. It was conquered by Omar b. al-ʿAlī (after 141 = 758) who built a town there with a minār and attached it to Tabaristān. Ruyān comprised an extensive area the districts of which lay between two mountains [Ibn al-Fakhr: "between the mountains of Ruyān and Dalām"]; each township could supply from 400 to 1,000 soldiers [Ibn al-Fakhr: in all 50,000]. The kharāji levied on Ruyān by Ḫārūn al-Rashīd was 400,500 dirhams. The town of Ruyān called Kaddūjā was the headquarters of the wālī. Ruyān was near the mountains of Ray and was reached via Ray. The text of the two authors above quoted suggests that between Ruyān and unsubjected Dalām was a region which formed the military zone from which operations were conducted against Dalām. To this zone belonged Shalī (Qtāʿīs), a town called al-Ḵāhāra (situated opposite Kaddūjā), another (?) town called al-Muḥdāṣa and lastly Muzn. [But on these frontiers see the Hīdūd al-ʿAlam and Zahir al-Dīn].

Iṣṭakhrī, p. 206, enumerates the mountains of "Dalām" [in the broad sense] as the following: Ḫalābār Kārīn, Dībāt al-Ḵāhāra, Ḫalābār Rūyānī (according to Barthold: al-Rūyānī = Rūyān). In these last named highlands there were formerly kingdoms (mamālīk); in the part adjoining Tabaristān the kings were of Tabaristān and in the part adjoining Ray they were of Ray. According to the Hīdūd al-ʿAlam (written in 372 = 982, ed. Barthold, fol. 308), Nāṭīl (according to Iṣṭakhrī, p. 217: one marhala west of Āmu) Cūṣ, Rūdān (= Ruyān) and Kālār (west of Qtāʿīs) formed a province of Tabaristān but the authority there belonged to a king named Ustundār. Rudān produced red woollen materials for waterproofs and blue gilīn (a kind of carpet material).

Rūstardār. From the Mongol period we find the geographical term Rūstardār. According to the Yaqūt al-Kuli, p. 161, the greater part of its territory was irrigated by the Shāh-rūd ([,] and the Taʾrīkh-i Khānī, ed. Dorn. D. 298, says that Taḵān (on the upper Shāh-rūd) adjoined Rūstardār. On the other hand, Zahir al-Dīn gives the term a larger connotation and uses it sometimes as a synonym of Rūyān and sometimes with a special meaning. An examination of the passages leads R. V. Vasmer, op. cit., p. 123-124 to the conclusion that Rūstardār in the proper sense was situated towards Kudūr and Kālār while Rūyān primarily meant the country between Rūstardār and Kāsān (i.e., the country towards Ray). According to Zahir al-Dīn (p. 19-20), the eastern frontier of Rūstardār was originally at Si-sangān (near the mouth of the river of Kudūr), but in the time of the Sādūkī Sandgāz was brought back to Alūdā (near Āmu). The western frontier was at first at Malār (near Lengerdār, Gilān), but in 590 (1193) was brought back to Sakhtasar (on the eastern frontier of Gilān) and in 640 (1242) at Namāk-ṣawārūd (west of Kālārāstāk). It is curious that Zahir al-Dīn, p. 17 seems to place the "town of Rūyān" (Kaddūjā of Ibn Rusta) at Kudūr but the passage is not very explicit and the legend of the foundation of the town given by Zahir al-Dīn may belong to a period before the appearance of the term Rūstardār.

The princes of Rūyān. The title attested for the dynasty is Ustundār (perhaps *Ustān-dār < Ustān-dar; cf. Tabari, i. 263). It is not clear if the dynasty also took the title of padshūpān (< padshūpān) which in Sāsānian terminology was the first borne by the viceroy, the prerogatives of which were lessened in time by the increase in power of the military commanders (tpāh-šāh; cf. Christensen, L'empire des Sāsānides, p. 41, 43). The fact is that in the passage in Iṣṭakhrī, p. 206, the mountain of Fādūsān is mentioned separately and, it seems, to the east of *Rūyānī but it is possible that the
The names of the carpenters are Ahmed and Husain (I). The name of Ahmed b. Husain who carved a gateway at Bärfurûsh in 870, Rabino, op. cit., p. 146, and ibid., p. 141; Husain b. Ahmed who carved the gate of Buland-Imâm, near Ashraf, dated 873 (1468).

Bibliography: Cf. the art. Mâzandarân; Justi, Armanisches Namenbuch, s. v. Pâdâspân, Ustândar and p. 433–435; Marquart, Erân-Jâhân, p. 131, 135 (Rûm); Barthold, Istor.-geogr. obor Iranu, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 155 and 159; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 373–374; R. Vasmer, Die Eroberung der Tûbartân durch die Araber, in Islamica, III, 1917, p. 115–125 (a detailed analysis of the sources); Rabino, Mâzandarân in G.M.S., 1928, see index.

(V. Minorsky)
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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 1, read: M. is now a pretty little Arab town with 9,423 inhabitants. To the east of it is the Blad, which was formerly separated by a wall, now taken down, from the town which lay to the west of it. The whole area is surrounded by a wall which is pierced on the north by three, in the west by one, and in the south by three gates.

P. 41b, article LUR, l. 71, instead of: The clans (gurūk), read: The tribes (gurūk).

P. 42b, l. 28, instead of: mutafarriṅa, read: mutafarriṅa; l. 51, instead of: southern, read: northern.

P. 43b, l. 48, instead of: village, read: valley.

P. 43b, l. 62, instead of: like, read: as well as.

P. 44b, l. 11, instead of: Bāyid, read: Ziyārid.

l. 63, instead of: Mākān, read: Mākān.

P. 62b, l. 37, instead of: Siyat, read: Siyāt.

P. 76a, ll. 1 and p. 77a, l. 6 from below, read Rūmiya, for Rūmīya.

P. 76b, add on l. 22 from below: From January to March 1928, L. Waterman conducted excavations in the region of Tell Umar for the American Schools of Oriental Research (cf. their Bulletin, No. 30, 1928). The mound seems to conceal a sīgūratu (tower built in successive stages) with a large temple adjoining it which continued to be used in the Graeco-Roman period; a Roman cemetery was laid bare in another part of the ruined area. From inscriptions found here the equation Akshak-Upli (Opis)-Seleucia is made quite certain. For Akshak, cf. also the article by Unger in the Reallexikon der Assyriologie, vol. i., Berlin 1928, p. 64—65.

P. 77b, read iv. 447, 7 for v. 447, 7.


Add to the Bibliography of the article AL-MADAʿIN: Apart from the already mentioned poem of Patchachy, unimportant in matter, in the periodical Lughat al-ʿArāb, Baghdād, iii., 1914, p. 393, cf. especially the articles by F. Djebrān in the same periodical, iii. 136—141 (with corrections by Kāẓim al-Dudjaiṭi, op. cit., p. 292—294) and Kāẓim al-Dudjaiṭi, op. cit., p. 282—294. Djebrān deals particularly with the present settlements of Arab tribes in the region of al-Madāʾin, al-Dudjaiṭi also gives an account of the latter and gives interesting information also of the pilgrimages to the tomb of Salmān al-ʿFārisī, describes the interior of this “sanctuary” and gives notes on various mounds of ruins in the region of al-Madāʾin which form a welcome addition to Herzfeld’s toponography.


P. 224a, l. 29 and 33, instead of: Maʿmūnis, read: Maʿmūnids.

P. 224b, l. 3, instead of: Farīghūnīs, read: Farīghūnīs.

P. 432b, l. 11 ab infra, add: According to Ibn al-ʿAtlīr (ed. Tornberg, i. 314, 375, cf. Yāḵūt, iv. 294) Kawāzād destituted al-Mundhār b. Maʿ al-Saʿmāʾ because of his refusal to accept Mazdakism and appointed in his place the Kindāt al-Ḥārīṭ b. ʿAmr, who had embraced the new faith. Whatever may be the truth, the relations between the king of Persia and the Arab have been influenced by Mazdakism.

P. 496b, l. 11, 12 ab infra, read: Timur who stayed in Balat (Milet) on his return from Smyrna in the winter after the battle of Angora (1402) (Ducas, p. 76, ed. Bonn, various reading).


P. 505b, l. 19, instead of: Nukāt, read: Nukāt.

P. 514b, art. MIRĀT. To be added to the Bibliography: Peltier and Bousquet, Les successions agnatiques mitiques, Paris 1935.

P. 530b, l. 32, p. 543a, l. 29, instead of: 828, read: 282.

P. 640, art. AL-MUḤĀDĀRĪNA. Add: In modern times the name Muḥādirjūn has been applied to those Muḥammadan emigrants who, as a result of the transfer of Muḥammadan territory to the non-Muḥammadan rule left their native land and went to a Muslim country in order not to be impeded in the exercise of their religious duties. For example, towards the end of the xvith century and in the xviith century large bodies of such emigrants abandoned lands occupied by the Russians and sought a new home in Turkey. A similar phenomenon
accompained the liberation of the Balkan peoples from Turkish rule and the rise of the independent Balkan states. The Muhammadans deported to Turkey from Greek territory after the Treaty of Lussan (1923) as a result of an agreement with Greece were always called Muhadjirov, even in official language. Their affairs were regulated by a "General Office for Nomads and Emigrants (Asgâr ve Muhadjirovun Müdâriyeti) umumiyyeti)."

In modern Turkey the Muhadjirov constitute an important domestic and cultural problem. Their settlements which are distributed over the whole of Anatolia are as a rule centres for the advancement of Turkish culture. The word Muhadjirov also plays an important part in place-names in Turkish territory as an element in names, mainly of recent origin.


P. 673b, l. 22, instead of: 1101, read: 1108.

l. 62, instead of: Guha, read: Gyan.

P. 674b, l. 54, instead of: Sâ'ûn, read: Sâm.

P. 686a, l. 45, instead of: Wâki'ahınigär, read: Wâki'a nigär.

P. 688a, l. 43, 55, 63, instead of: Mîr, read: Mere.

l. 66, instead of: in May 1624, read: in May 1624.

P. 691b, l. 23, to be added: 13. Ilh-il-işân ve al-thâmin (extract in L. Massignon, Recueil p. 171, note 1).

P. 692, l. 29, to be added: He has been buried at the feet of the poet Niyâzi Mişri at Kastro (Lemnos), where his tomb was still shown in 1916 (cf. L. Massignon, Recueil, p. 164).

P. 701, l. 48, to be added: In an early period Turkish has also known the form muçu (from Sanscrit mucca, mong. motor, cf. W. Bang and A. von Gabain, Türk. Turfan-Texte, v. 53).

P. 701b, l. 60, to be added: Signature was something of a privilege. Of the surviving engravings of Istanbul two only possessed it: Yumı, the son of a famous father of that name, and Şashık. The personal seals in Latin characters, made up to this day (1933), are, with a few exceptions, barbarous.

The ethnographic museum at Ankara possesses a curious collection of metal seals proven to the shaikhs of the now dissolved tarika of the Bektashis.


P. 712, art. MUKÂTIL P. SUBAIMân. Mukâtîl's commentary on the Kurân as is evident from manuscripts recently found by Ritter and Schacht is called al-Tafsîr fi mutasâhabah al-Kurân and dealt with the different meanings of single words like kudâ, kufir etc. in different passages of the Kurân. There are manuscripts in Stambul, Hamidiya, No. 58, Faizullah, No. 79, Seryâ No. 74, Umîmi, No. 561; cf. Ritter, Ist., xvii. 249, and Schacht, Aus den Bibliotheken ..., i. 58; also al-Âshârî Mukâtîl, ed. Ritter, index, p. 46. According to Massignon, La Posse d'al-Halâl, p. 520, note 2 the commentary is quoted by Abu l-Hasan al-Malaštî, Tank. 1194 (Pers.) on p. 577. Massignon calls attention to Mukâtîl's importance as a source for homonyms in which al-Shafî followed him, cf. also p. 503.

(M. Plessner)


P. 756b, l. 60, instead of: 433 (1042), to be read: 453 (1061).

P. 764b, l. 59, instead of: Nizâ, to be read: Nizâr.

P. 731b, l. 12, instead of: Sûfrîte, to be read: Sûfrîtes.

P. 936a, l. 67, instead of: Leipzig, to be read: Upsala and Leipzig.

P. 927b, Addition to the bibliography of the art Nish: B. Lovrić, Istorija Niša, prilikom 50- godišnjice oslobađenja Konstantinovog i Nemanjinoj grada (11 januara 1878-11 januara 1928). Nish 1927 (a kind of illustrated monograph).
Just out:
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STUDIA ET DOCUMENTA AD IURA ORIENTIS ANTIQUA
PERTINENTIA VOLUMEN I

Contents:

I Personenmiete und andere Verträge über Arbeitsleistung im
Keilschriftrecht.

II Die eigentliche Personenmiete des altbabylonischen Rechts.
1. Terminologie. Der Aussteller der Urkunde und das Vertrags-
schema 2. Die Rechtsnatur des agārum-Vertrags. 3. Die Parteien
und die Vertragsabreden bei der Personenniete.

III Die Erntearbeiterverträge des altbabylonischen Rechts. Gattungsmie-

IV Hybride Formen der Personenniete.

Quellenregister — Sachregister.

From the Preface:

"Die genaue Feststellung des rechtsgeschäftlichen Typus der Ernte-
arbeiterverträge und der Unterscheidungsmerkmale der beiden Ver-
tragsarten liess das Vorkommen bisher überschener Mischformen
erkennen. Der günstige Stand der Quellen ermöglichte es, von den
verschiedenen Arten rechtsgeschäftlicher Verwertung menschlicher
Arbeitskraft für einen wichtigen Zeitabschnitt Babyloniens ein anschau-
lches Bild zu entwerfen, dessen Lebendigkeit durch Heranziehung
von Wirtschaftstexten erhöht werden konnte, die uns Aufschuss über
Arbeitsorganisation, Arbeitskontrolle und Lohnverrechnung gewährten".